

Amber Mathiesen - Statesman Journal Article on Creekside Golf Course

From: Marque Haeg <mrhaeg@gmail.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/15/2016 4:10 PM
Subject: Statesman Journal Article on Creekside Golf Course

Today, I read an article in the Statesman Journal entitled "Creekside Golf Club Wins Water Rate Cut" stating that "Salem's residential water rates would rise an average of 65 cents per month next year to accommodate a rate decrease for irrigators under a plan approved Thursday by a city water advisory committee".

I adamantly oppose such a measure and would like this email to serve as my testimony regarding this matter.

It is ridiculous to assume that the cost to keep the private Creekside Golf Course open should be absorbed by those who do not and cannot benefit by this action. Furthermore, this opens the door for others to seek such treatment who are much more deserving such as the Salem-Keizer School District.

Maybe a far better plan would be to make the Creekside Golf Course a public course and charge fees to play golf OR do as the developer suggests, build single-family residences on the property.

If I need to submit my testimony on a different form for the Salem City Council, please let me know.

Marque Haeg

Amber Mathiesen - 65 cent/month H2O increase

From: Bruce Westerberg <brucemw@comcast.net>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/15/2016 8:02 PM
Subject: 65 cent/month H2O increase

I can not believe the advisory committee approval of increasing residential water rates to accommodate the failure of a private business to succeed. To argue the loss or retention of 50 jobs is a joke at best. Iâ€™d guess that the proposal to build 300 plus houses in the golf course, â€œIF" it goes under, would create more than 50 jobs and create a revenue stream of income for the city far in exceed of raising water rates on residential customers. Voting yes on this ludicrous proposal is simply bad public policy at worst: and questions what the City counselors will consider as â€œgood" for the citizens of our fine city next.

Iâ€™d be glad to support a \$0.65: NO, a \$65/month increase in tax/fee to increase police protection, especially traffic control.

I ask you to think and act for the betterment of our city and vote **NO** on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Bruce Westerberg

Amber Mathiesen - Water Rate for Creekside

From: Rebecca Arce <rebeccaearce@gmail.com>
To: <Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/16/2016 8:03 PM
Subject: Water Rate for Creekside

Councilors,

I have the read the article in the Statesman Journal referencing the new water rate for Creekside Golf Course.

I am ok subsidizing water rates for community programs and entities, nonprofits that serve our entire community. I'm am not ok with subsidizing a private, for profit entity. I think you are all voting against the advice of Mr. Fernandez and the best interest of the people of Salem. \$.65 is not a large figure in and of itself but combined with increases to housing and food costs we are putting too much of the burden on our struggling and middle class families.

Please reconsider your vote.

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

Amber Mathiesen - Creekside Golf Course water issue

From: <rvjtodd@comcast.net>
To: <Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/17/2016 11:11 AM
Subject: Creekside Golf Course water issue

Dear members,

I am very disheartened by the ongoing issues related to Creekside golf course. It seems all is being done to pressure residents of Creekside to succumb to the developers/owners wishes. The city itself is now being brought into this fray by the latest water issue/proposal. Water usage is an expense all must absorb and make choices relative to cost, usage, etc. This is clearly a business choice which Creekside Golf Course has not fully evaluated for the best course to pursue.

The latest "proposal" is a major affront to Salem citizens in terms of an unfair cost burden as well as an inequitable use of resource.

A sounder alternative to reduce water costs is for the developer/owner of the golf course to install 2-3 wells to support the water needs of the golf course. Depending on the aquifer, one well may be all that is required. The \$300,000 currently spent each year by the golf course, currently to pay for water, could be totally eliminated by such an action for about one third of the cost. For subsequent years the \$300,000 cost would be eliminated for the Golf Course.

I encourage you to not accept the current proposal to increase water rates for all residents of Salem to offset Creekside Golf Course water costs. This is an issue for the golf course owners to resolve as a business decision not as a city subsidy paid for from the pockets of all city water customers .

Thank you for your service to the community.

Respectfully,

Vic Todd

2180 Irene CT S,
Salem, Oregon 97302

Amber Mathiesen - Creekside Golf Course

From: Suzi Pettey <suziq1717@gmail.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/17/2016 4:22 PM
Subject: Creekside Golf Course

I am a citizen of Salem since 1972. I am female 70 yrs young.

I am writing to state I am vehemently opposed to the water bill increase for all households in the city in order to subsidize Creekside Golf Course, a private exclusive club for the wealthy who live in their million dollar homes around it.

I am a senior citizen living on social security fixed income, \$750 a month. I have received no COLA (cost of living allowance) for the last few yrs, while the cost of everything is soaring! I am struggling to pay my own water bill.

I want to know how you all justify this action. How can u possibly expect people living below poverty level to subsidize this cost so the rich can play golf on a course I can't afford to walk on?

Let the wealthy, rich and affluent living around there taking advantage of the facilities and amenities pay the costs themselves, they have PLENTY!!!

Tokarski has a shaded past with the city, even a felony conviction for loan fraud if I remember correctly, and yet u favor this crook to even consider this? Let them build their single family homes, which will create way more jobs and benefits to the taxpayers than their exclusive rich persons' club!

Additionally, Councilor Steve McCoid, a RESIDENT and MEMBER of this affluent, exclusive place, PROPOSED this idea. Wow, smacks of conflict of interest, doesn't it?

Please stop this unfair subsidy for the wealthy. If Creekside can't make it, just like any other business, they move on to the next right thing.

Their plans to blackmail residents of Creekside and the surrounding homes to pay more fees or see their lovely green turned into a subdivision failed, so now the desperate owners want taxpayers to subsidize their golf course, and 99.9 percent of us could never afford to step foot on the place!

And isn't it interesting that ol' crook Tokarski has threatened the wealthy homeowners with building single family homes? Haha, like no one sees thru that?

I would appreciate a response.

Thank you,

Susan M. Pettey
Taxpayer citizen

From: Robert <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/19/2016 2:28 PM
Subject: Creekside Golf Course Water issue

From: Bob Elliott West Salem 1775 Macaw St, Salem, Or 97304

To: Dear Council, I just returned home and read the story in the paper about spreading the cost of the golf course water bill to all residents. I find it hard to believe that the committee and Peter are supporting this angel to keep the golf course up and running. I hope you all will see that the only ones who gain anything are the 50 employees and the wealthy residents that edge up to the course or have a view to help keep their property values up.

I have come to the council about the fact that you allowed Peter to have the water bill add the "sidewalk and streetlight" payments to be spread out to all of us. I told you I paid for my sidewalks and formed my own light district but now I have to pay for all the others who do not have sidewalks and street lights. Now you have a chance to say "no" to people having to pay for the green grass and the course that the public can not play on.

If all the citizens are going to pay to keep the water pouring onto the entire area let us play on it. Also what are you going to do the next time another company wants a break on a bill.

I know Larry is very connected and many of you know him, what is wrong with him building homes if the residents do not want to pay the bill. Golf is slowly going away, look at the use on other courses. One day I'm afraid the residents will come back and want more breaks because not enough use of the golf course to pay the bills.

Enough having others pay for special deals. Please stop this. Thank you, Bob Elliott

Amber Mathiesen - Creekside and Increased Water Rates

From: <Persels@comcast.net>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/22/2016 1:34 PM
Subject: Creekside and Increased Water Rates

Good afternoon -

In response to the request of Creekside Golf Course to modify their water rates, thus reducing their water bill, I wanted to indicate my opposition to this proposal. There are many options available to Creekside that does not affect the other citizens of the City of Salem. I understand their plight, but it is, alone, their plight and should not effect others. The Creekside community are exclusive, and they understood that exclusiveness when they purchased their homes or became Creekside members. To put their burden on the rest of City residents is unfair, and to make such a request knowing others would be financially impacted is unjust. The amount of the increased billing for Salem citizens is not relevant to this conversation -- the matter of fact is that there would, in fact, be an increase.

Again, there are other options. Other options that Creekside members have rejected, which is their right ... they can reject those options. However, their rejection(s) should only impact themselves.

Please note my strong opposition to this proposal -
Thank you -

Dawn Persels
1431 Ranier Loop NW
Salem, OR 97304
[\(503\) 910-9720](tel:5039109720)

From: Lois Stark <lois.stark@comcast.net>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 8/26/2016 1:28 PM
Subject: creekside golf course

Hello city council people,

First of all thank you for your service to our community. I know it isn't easy doing what you do. It is sometimes a thankless job.

There are several issues that concern me right now in our city:

- 1) The reducing of water rates for the Creekside Golf course. As water becomes a scarce commodity because of climate change, it seems to me that we should be charging MORE to private for profit companies for their big water use. I don't think we should charge more for the school district or non-profit groups.
- 2) Also, this "special" treatment for a for profit outfit is unjust.
- 3) I am very concerned about the trees that will be cut north of Center street where the State Hospital used to be. I know this is state land. However, these trees are part of Salem's urban forest. Please let me know what we can do about this issue. Should I talk with my state representative?

Thank you for reading this (hopefully someone will). I'm not sure if writing this will make a difference but at least I feel that I am speaking up about issues that are disturbing to me.

Lois Stark
440 21st SE
Salem, OR 97301

From: Maren Wryn <marupa@aol.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/1/2016 5:18 PM
Subject: Creekside

Dear City Council: 2016 is my 30th year in Salem. I am a landowner, and operate rental property in Salem. I am, however, not wealthy.

I am furious that the Council would even consider sticking the residents of this City with a totally bogus, made-up scheme to have us pay (apparently in perpetuity) for the discounted irrigation of a private golf course exclusively serving the rich residents of Creekside in South Salem.

My neighbor's and friends all over town are also furious. If you want to offset the Creekside costs, fire some of the City Staff who came up with this bait switch scheme! Tell the Creekside residents to pay their own way. I bet they could make a lot of money if they let the public play golf there.

See you on October 10th

Maren Wryn
Ward 2

Sent from my iPhone

From: <epwhitehouse@comcast.net>
To: <Citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
CC: <manager@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/9/2016 10:48 AM
Subject: Creekside
Attachments: Records request 8262016.docx; Records request 09082016.docx

Councilors, if you decide to reduce irrigation rates, I hope that you will use accurate information. Yesterday staff distributed charts purporting to show that Creekside Golf Club is the 17th largest irrigation customer AND that the effect of a 30% reduction in irrigation rates would be a \$600,000 decline in overall revenue. But if Creekside benefits by \$60,000, the total overall revenue decline must be AT LEAST one million dollars (\$60,000 x 17). There are many other data problems, as indicated by the two public records requests that I have filed (attached). While my wife and I can afford an extra 65 cents per month in our water bill, other citizens are not nearly so fortunate (see question #6 of my August 26 (unanswered) public records request).

Thanks for your service to our City, Evan White

From: Eric MacKnight <ericmacknight@mac.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/17/2016 12:21 PM
Subject: new bridge (and water rates)

Dear members of the Salem City Council,

I would like to add my voice to those calling for the city to stop spending money on planning for a new bridge over the Willamette River.

First priority should be given to seismic upgrading for the existing bridges and for the Library / City Hall complex.

Once those critical seismic upgrades are completed, the relatively mild traffic problems during Salem's rush hour should be addressed with improved public transportation combined with park 'n ride lots and protected bike lanes for commuters.

Finally: I sincerely hope that the ludicrous proposal to raise water rates for all of Salem in order to give Creekside Golf Course a rate reduction has been abandoned once and for all.

Sincerely yours,

Eric T. MacKnight
2240 Wildwood Drive SE
Salem OR 97306
Mobile: 626-203-7887
<http://www.EricMacKnight.com/>



Northgate

Neighborhood Association

Salem, Oregon

Sept. 19, 2016

To the Mayor and City Council:

The Northgate Neighborhood Association strongly opposes raising residential water rates to provide a price break to Creekside Golf Course and other irrigators.

Before voting at our Sept. 13 meeting, our group held a balanced discussion of the proposal's drawbacks and merits. We acknowledge and do not take for granted the likely loss of jobs if the golf course closes. We also are aware of the property's role in flood management. And we also know that the golf course would be the largest — but by no means the only — beneficiary. But most opinions focused on the audacity of asking working families to pay more so a golf course they could never afford to play remains open.

Many Salem residents — and a higher percentage of Northgate residents specifically — live on fixed incomes. They are either living on a meager Social Security retirement after a lifetime of hard work, or are unable to work. They and working families throughout Salem must endure rising rents or property taxes on top of everyday inflation, the new streetlight fee and an upcoming garbage rate hike. In November, we will be asked to raise taxes to build a modern police station that won't collapse in a major earthquake. However justified, these add up.

From an environmental perspective, lowering the irrigation rate provides a perverse incentive given the broad scientific consensus of manmade climate change and the subsequent impact on water resources. In turn, city policy toward irrigators should encourage water reuse and conservation in word and in deed. Any city-imposed restrictions on such practices that are not state or federal mandates should face serious scrutiny.

Please include this letter in any meeting packets where this issue is discussed.

Sincerely,

Jason Cox
Chair, Northgate Neighborhood Association
By vote of the Association, Sept. 19, 2016

Cc: Ann Mintie, NNA secretary

Amber Mathiesen - Creekside Water Rate Cut

From: Bryant Baehr <BryantBJB@msn.com>
To: "wbednarz@cityofsalem.net" <wbednarz@cityofsalem.net>, "ampeterson@cityo...
Date: 9/21/2016 10:13 AM
Subject: Creekside Water Rate Cut

Good Morning,

I would like to add my voice to the growing list of City of Salem residents that oppose raising resident water rates so the Creekside Golf Course can have a lower water bill (approx \$65,000) per year. When times were hard (and they continue to be for some) water rates did not go down - although services provided by the city diminished - like code enforcement.

I can understand the issue of development versus open space in the Creekside area. However, that is their issue, not a city wide issue. Either they need to make the investment as a neighborhood to sustain the golf course or move on.

Again, this is not a city wide issue and the cost should definitely not be passed on to us all - that's not an equitable solution.

Bryant Baehr
Bailey Ridge Neighborhood

Amber Mathiesen - Against Creekside Water Rate Cut

From: Linda Baehr <msbaehr@icloud.com>
Date: 9/21/2016 3:25 PM
Subject: Against Creekside Water Rate Cut
CC: "wbednarz@cityofsalem.net" <wbednarz@cityofsalem.net>, "ampeterson@cityo..."

Good afternoon,

I would like to voice my opinion against the proposed Creekside water rate cut.

I am aghast that the city would even consider giving a rate cut to a golf course that is a for-profit private business.

The golf course and the community surrounding it are only concerned about themselves - the golf course wants to stay open and the community doesn't want additional development bringing down their property values.

It is ludicrous that the Creekside homeowners, (Creekside housing development, IMO is an upscale community), want all the residents of Salem to pay extra water fees to save their property values.

Robin Hood would turn over in his grave as it supposed to be "steal from the rich and give to the poor", not "steal from the poor and give to the rich".

If Creekside homeowners want to keep it a golf course they should calculate the extra cost of the water into their homeowner's dues and divide it equally amongst themselves. This would be the right thing to do!

All Salem residents should not have to pay for a rate reduction that only benefits one neighborhood and a for-profit golf course.

It should not even be considered.

What happened to not giving a "gift of public funds"? In my opinion giving a discount and passing the cost on to others is a gift and an unfair one!

As it is said in Shakespeare's play Hamlet, "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark". IMO it should be revise to say, "Something is rotten in Salem".

Again, if the homeowners at Creekside wish to continue to have their golf course and not have it developed, they need to pay for it themselves!

I guess they don't know what it's like to be poor and have your water shut off. The poor are the ones who should be getting their water subsidized, not a golf course!

Come on city council, do you not have a heart?

Any rate cut should be given to only those residential customers who cannot afford to pay their own water bill. Again it should not be given to a for-profit business.

I believe it is shameful of the city to even consider giving the Creekside golf course a rate reduction.

IMO it is even more appalling for the the homeowners of Creekside to even be asking for it.

Shame, shame, shame!

Linda Baehr
Salem, OR

Amber Mathiesen - Water & Lights

From: Un Known <nfx4me@hotmail.com>
To: "manager@cityofsalem.net" <manager@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/21/2016 4:45 PM
Subject: Water & Lights

Water bill will soon go up. How is that? Is Mother Earth increasing its bill to the water company? No? Or is the city just stealing it so everybody in the city can get a fatter paycheck? Believe this is 2nd time in a year.

Aside from raising rates, I understand you are still poisoning the population with Fluoride. What balls. LOOK IT UP. Stop listening to the ignorant.

Residents are also paying for the maintenance of street lamps, but the maintenance isn't being done. So, what's happening to the money?

Keep it up. We'll soon be in the dark like Detroit, MI with no street lights.

Can you spell ASS U ME? Don't assume I have money to support your BS.

Amber Mathiesen - Citizen comment about proposed water/wastewater and stormwater rate increase

From: John Emery <emeryjohnh@gmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/22/2016 9:00 AM
Subject: Citizen comment about proposed water/wastewater and stormwater rate increase

Recently, the city of Salem implemented a fee for street lights, the public as well as myself was outraged over this. Now, city planners are attempting to squeeze MORE funds out of the public with water fees? The city already appears to have plenty of funds to build new parks, add a pedestrian bridge to Minto Brown park and purchase more vehicles/equipment for many of it's departments. Why the need to squeeze more funds from it's citizens?

Also, with all of the new housing developments especially in the south Salem areas as well as the new South Block development across from city hall, it appears to me that the increase of populous equals additional taxes/utility payments that should MORE than offset the the need to raise utility rates from those who are already struggling!

Amber Mathiesen - Proposed water and sewer rate increase

From: David Goodwin <dmjgoodwin@gmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/22/2016 1:25 PM
Subject: Proposed water and sewer rate increase

Please enter the following as a comment from the home owners at 3566 Aldous Avenue S. Salem, Oregon

I received the notice of proposed rate increase for water, sewer etc al from the City. My comment is that the rate is too high right now.

We have lived in this residence for nearly 25 years. Over that time period we have seen several rate increases in the water and sewer rates. In addition, the City saw fit to change to monthly billing instead of bi-monthly billing. The rates have continued to climb, with little add on features like impervious water surfaces etc.

We actually have less impervious water surface for our residence now than we did 25 years ago. In addition, our family has decreased from 6 people living here to 3 people living here, and is about to have one less than that. Despite this, our rates keep climbing and climbing.

We are on a fixed retirement income and have to live within that income which is our only means. I would like to suggest that the City of Salem learn to live within its income, instead of constantly passing on increases to the residents.

You can look at our historic water uses if you wish and see if there is justification in your minds to be constantly increasing our rate. Please enter these comments into the public record for this and other proposed rate increases.

David A. Goodwin
3566 Aldous Avenue S.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Amber Mathiesen - Public Hearing Comment

From: <cm4737@hotmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/22/2016 2:51 PM
Subject: Public Hearing Comment

Email from the City Contact form app.

Message Type: Public Hearing Comment

Details:

- From: craig Miracle at: cm4737@hotmail.com
- Message Body: The problem is you have all kinds of franchise fees and street light bills and who knows what else. You call it a water ,wastewater, and stormwater tax. dont call it one thing and then add a bunch franchise fees to it. You should just call it a city tax. You will raise the bill.

Amber Mathiesen - Public Hearing Comment

From: <ericmacknight@mac.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/22/2016 5:32 PM
Subject: Public Hearing Comment

Email from the City Contact form app.

Message Type: Public Hearing Comment

Details:

- From: Eric T. MacKnight at: ericmacknight@mac.com
- Message Body: To the Salem City Council: I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the ludicrous proposal to raise water rates for all of Salem in order to give Creekside Golf Course a rate reduction. The suggestion that schools, cemeteries, etc., would receive the same reduction is a laughable attempt to clothe this obviously unfair proposal in equalitarian robes. Neither schools nor most cemeteries irrigate during the dry summer months as golf courses do, or (in the case of football fields, for example), as extensively as a golf course does. I find it outrageous, frankly, that this proposal to subsidize the costs of a private golf club at the expense of everyone else in the city ever left the desktop of the first city employee to whom it was brought by the Creekside Golf Course. This proposal should be rejected absolutely and utterly, for once and for all. Sincerely yours, Eric T. MacKnight 2240 Wildwood Drive SE Salem OR 97306 [\(626\) 203-7887](tel:6262037887)

From: Sally & Ray Hollemon <rhollemon@comcast.net>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/22/2016 1:08 PM
Subject: Proposed Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater rate increases

Dear Salem City Counselors,

We think the water rate for irrigation, such as at Creekside, should stay the same as it is currently.

The reason irrigators are charged more than the residential rate is to give them an economic incentive to conserve water. That reason is still valid. In fact, with climate change bringing less snow in winter, earlier snowmelt in spring, and hotter summers, conserving water is more important than ever.

If the people whose homes overlook Creekside want the golf course to continue, they should work out a financial arrangement with the owner. If they don't care enough about the view to do that, the owner is free to develop the land. If any of the land is needed for flood control, the City should set requirements for that before approving development.

Please vote against reducing the water rate for irrigators.

Sally & Ray Hollemon
3335 Crestview Dr. S
Salem, OR 97302

Amber Mathiesen - Rate increase for Water, Wastewater, and stormwater

From: "Anna Haskell" <a.m.haskell49@gmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/23/2016 12:54 PM
Subject: Rate increase for Water, Wastewater, and stormwater

NO NO NO and NO.

PGE has already raised rates, NW Natural is raising theirs, Pacific Sanitation will be raising theirs in October (thank you Marian County), and there are already fees that are cycling thru to raise the water bill.

If you want to send a petition to Social Security for a cost of living increase I'm sure every Salem citizen on fixed income would appreciate it, so we won't have to give up something to pay all these increases.

Anna Haskell
2760 Hollywood Dr NE
Salem OR 97305
a.m.haskell49@gmail.com



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com

Amber Mathiesen - Proposed Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rate Increased, for 2017 and 2018.

From: Stephen Fitch <fitchsfitch@aol.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/23/2016 3:57 PM
Subject: Proposed Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rate Increased, for 2017 and 2018.

We are writing to express our opinion regarding proposed rate increases for water, wastewater, and stormwater for 2017 and 2018. We do not object to the proposed 2017 increases of 2.0% for water, 2.5% for wastewater, and 3% for stormwater for "all customers". Nor do we object to the 2018 increases of 3% for all three (water, wastewater, and stormwater) for "all customers".

We are adamantly opposed to recent proposals to lower water rates for certain large volume irrigators, including Creekside Golf Club. The audacity of raising water rates on the general public, in order to support private investments, including a private golf club, is beyond outrageous. The Creekside Golf Club development, as a private endeavor, should live or die of it's own volition, without public bailouts or backroom deals at the expense of families already burdened with ever increasing prices.

We quote from a recent Statesman Journal article; "Lowering the irrigation rate provides a perverse incentive given the broad scientific consensus of man-made climate change and the subsequent impact on water resources, the Northgate Neighborhood association wrote. City policy toward irrigators should encourage water reuse and conservation in word and deed.

At a meeting of the city's water advisory group, public works director Peter Fernandez said the conservation incentive was among the reasons the irrigator rate was set higher than other rate categories. We concur with Mr. Fernandez, rates for large irrigators should remain higher than residential customers, to incentivize conservation."

The Creekside owners/developers, Larry Tokarski and Terry Kelly, keep stating that without cuts in their city water rates they will be forced to close their business, Creekside Golf Club, develop the property, and eliminate 50 jobs. If their private business is not going to be successful without a bail out, funded by the general public, then their business plan is not feasible. Developing the property with additional housing would help alleviate a tight housing market, and the attendant construction would be a boost in construction and real estate jobs. We see more upside to Creekside closing, than keeping a sick business model limping along on the public dole. Alternatively, we would support a reasonable special increase in water fees for "all customers", if these funds would be used to buy the Creekside Golf Club business and convert it to a public park that all could utilize and enjoy!

Cordially,
Stephen & Gail Fitch
2466 Crestmont Circle, South
Salem, OR 97302

Amber Mathiesen - Utility Rate Hearing written comments

From: J Stembrij <stembrij@yahoo.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/23/2016 5:47 PM
Subject: Utility Rate Hearing written comments

Dear Mayor and City Councilors,

I am writing to you after reading the material on the City of Salem website about the proposed utility rate increases for Salem residents.

I noted that the Task Force decided to deny the request by Creekside Golf Course for a substantial reduction in their fee for irrigation of their golf course and the current proposal for a rate increase does not reflect a subsidy to Creekside Golf Course.

Thank you for your courage to refuse the request of this private landowner/developer, and in so doing, you have gained my support for a utility rate increase for Salem residents.

I am a believer in infrastructure maintenance, and I am quite willing to pay for good governance.

Thank you for your civic stewardship,
Joan Stembrij
1695 Winter Street S.E.
Salem, OR. 97302

[503 569-7968](tel:5035697968)

Resident of Salem: 38 years

From: Karen Sewell <kjsewell@comcast.net>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/24/2016 11:32 AM
Subject: proposed water rate increase

To my city officers/councilpersons,

I am willing to pay my share of the proposed water increase BUT not if a "deal" is made with Creekside golf course, to lower its" bill.

Creekside is a private club, with membership required to play on any given day. Golf at Creekside is a past time hobby, where one chooses to become a member and pay the dues.

I do not choose to spend my money or time in that way, and therefore do not support any reduction in water rates for them.

I would say YES to parks, schools, hospital, or any other non-profit organization if they asked for a rate cut.

Sorry, but Creekside does not meet this criteria.

Sincerely,

Karen Sewell
449 Washington S
Salem, Oregon 97302

Amber Mathiesen - Fwd: Water rate increase

From: Bryant Baehr <bryantbjb@msn.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/24/2016 2:17 PM
Subject: Fwd: Water rate increase
CC: Linda Baehr <msbaehr@msn.com>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Bryant Baehr <bryantbjb@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 24, 2016 12:16 PM
Subject: Water rate

I received the notice of water rate increase. I understand cost increases and do not have an issue due to processing, providing good, clean water. However, increasing the rate so that Creekside can lower their rates is wrong. Please do not increase so that private business, and the more affluent and have a golf course.

Bryant Baehr
Shale Street - Salem

Amber Mathiesen - rate increase

From: Mary Lamb <mlamb20@gmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/24/2016 9:00 PM
Subject: rate increase

I am retired, on a fixed income and with a husband in a care facility. Money is very tight. I don't water my lawn during the summer. I save the water for my vegetable garden. I have mostly native plants in my large back yard. I am extremely frugal with water use. The rate increase estimate is outrageous! I suppose at least some of this goes for watering the greens at Creekside Golf Course which is about 1/2 mile down the road from me. I have no control over this increase but I do vote and I will take this increase into consideration when I vote on other issues that include spending my hard earned money. I vehemently oppose this increase!

Joan Massey
mlamb20@gmail.com

Amber Mathiesen - Public Hearing Comment

From: <pookafish@comcast.net>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/24/2016 9:36 PM
Subject: Public Hearing Comment

Email from the City Contact form app.

Message Type: Public Hearing Comment

Details:

- From: Dawn Schmidt at: pookafish@comcast.net
- Phone:
- Message Body: first you throw in stormwater wastewater fees, then lighting fees, (have not seen ANY action/improvements) NOW you want to increase water/storm/ waste fees. What's next?? Maybe you folks need to manage your budget better, quit putting employees to work on Saturdays (overtime) on non emergency work. I know the board will approve this NO MATTER how many people dissaprove. I haven't had a raise in 4 years, and I'm sick and tired of the City of Salem putting their budget \$ into junk. Like the stupid walk bridge connecting East and West Salem. If you have that kind of money to spend on NON generating revenue you need to have an audit on your budgets and put the money to better use to help sustain and revitalize the citizens of Salem! NO NEW RATE INCREASES OF ANY KIND! Neext thing will be proprty tax increases!! I have to budget every month, SO SHOULD THE CITY OF SALEM!!

Amber Mathiesen - SOUND PUBLIC POLICY NEEDED FOR "IRRIGATORS" AND DOWN-STREAM FLOOD VICTIMS

From: Jerry Bennett <jbestg@comcast.net>
To: "ampeterson@cityofsalem.net" <ampeterson@cityofsalem.net>, "crbennett@...
Date: 9/25/2016 4:00 PM
Subject: SOUND PUBLIC POLICY NEEDED FOR "IRRIGATORS" AND DOWN-STREAM FLOOD VICTIMS
CC: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Attachments: Creekside water water 5 26 16.docx

City Council members, et al; and Mayor Peterson:

I'm in receipt of the City notice informing Salem citizens of the Monday, Oct. 10 meeting to allow interested parties to give input on proposed water, wastewater, and storm water rate increases. The hearing follows a series of meetings by City representatives and select citizens for the purpose of reviewing, giving input, and making studied recommendations on a complex set of administrative proposals under the general heading of utility rate proposal -- water rates being a major issue.

A great deal of time and energy was directed at present water rates as they adversely effect a unique class of water users that are now loosely classified as "irrigators" for lack of a better term. Such discussions were at times focused on Creekside Golf Club's request for meaningful equity-based rate revisions to said classification, as well as certain down-stream flooding conditions that would likely increase if the golf course was closed and replaced with a 300-plus residential housing project. Considerable interest has developed in South Salem concerning any decisions that the Council might make on such matters.

The request for a rate increase was not advanced only to address the golf course owners' expressed needs to make Creekside Golf Club a financially sound and enterprising business. The focus of the 30-member Member Strong Committee (representing approximately 500 full-time and partime members) was primarily to preserve Creekside Valley as a whole and to preserve recreational, entertainment, and healthy life style opportunities for the whole of South Salem, now and into the future. Creekside Golf Club is much more to the South Salem community than an 18-hole golf course. It's a natural habitat, environmentally protected valley that provides multiple opportunities to young and old citizens, as well as a safe zone to multiple sets of wild life. And, of course, there's much more, i.e. every year club members and others sponsor the very successful Komen Foundation to provide funding for cancer purposes. There is, of course, much more. As per the attachment, coupled with numerous personal and/or written testimonials at the upcoming hearing, you'll become acutely aware of the relevancy of having a championship facility like Creekside Golf Club in South Salem.

-
 The graphical documents presented by Peter Fernandez, Public Works Director, to the Task Force on September 8, 2016, meeting were recently upgraded from earlier presentations to provide a more factual illustration of usage and cost. One of the puzzling issues with the paper work was a page that showed considerable disparity between hypothetical projected usage in the future with real-life declining usage, the latter of which was well above the required infra structure line. Any reasonable person reviewing that particular graphic would immediately challenge the hearing notice that clarifies: "Rate changes are proposed for 2017 and 2018 due to the increased costs to operate water, wastewater, and storm water systems and to provide needed funds for repairing and replacing aging infrastructure".

In that the natural flow Santiam and Willamette Rivers are the two key pipe lines providing water to Salem, and

builders have to finance all the costs of water-related equipment up to the connector point of the City's system; and that water usage is considerably less now than in past years: and that all residential water users have to pay about half what the "irrigators'" rate of \$4.21ccf is – even though golf courses don't grow anything to sell and exist for recreational purposes; and the City recently negotiated a \$16m water easement from the Willamette River to nearby Hillsboro, etc., etc., where is the comprehensive explanation justifying any rate increases, coupled with no comprehensive reasoning behind the hesitancy to provide cost equity measures to the so-called "irrigator" class, with emphasis on Creekside Golf Club. I trust that such information will be presented at the hearing.

As a retired Oregon public school administrator with extensive experience in school funding matters, I don't understand how a simple request for equitable water services and pricing could become a political issue. If the matter had been handled properly with all of the actual facts presented on a timely basis, it'd simply have been another line item in a very large budget presentation. As a Salem citizen and home owner, I urge you to give the matter full consideration and to make cost efficient, performance effective decisions on both "irrigator" rates and down-stream flooding problems – both of which directly involve Creekside Golf Club's future, as well as the thousands of people within and around Creekside Estates in particular and all of South Salem in general.

Gerald J. Bennett -- Citizen first, Advocate for Creekside Golf Club & Creekside Estates, Recreational Enthusiast,
804 Creekside Dr. SE
Salem, Oregon 97306
[\(503\) 589 9669](tel:5035899669) E-Mail: jbestg@comast.net

Amber Mathiesen - Trying to Comment

From: Reed Steve <steve.reed@state.or.us>
To: "planning@cityofsalem.net" <planning@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/23/2016 1:09 PM
Subject: Trying to Comment

I am trying to comment on the proposed water rate increase. The flyer says go to
"cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net to make my comment, but this is not a working link.
Help; I want submit my comment to please do not raise the rates....

Steve Reed
330 Rural Ave. S.
Salem, Oregon 97302

From: Razyel R <razyel14@yahoo.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/26/2016 9:02 AM
Subject: proposed rate increase water & wastewater & stormwater

My name is Jody Rose. i live at 610 highland ave ne salem or.
i am against this rate increase !. i am on a limited income do to disability from a work accident.it is hard
enough to make it through the month with things as they are.
and you propose to increase yet another monthly necessity.
you have elderly people trying to decide on there medicines or food and you want to add to that burden.
.i feel the city of Salem should have to do what everyone else does and make do with what they have!.
try spending more responsibly .
thank you.

J. Rose

Amber Mathiesen - Proposed Rate Increases (water, etc.)

From: ROBERT MALCOM <BOBLMALCOM@msn.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/27/2016 11:25 AM
Subject: Proposed Rate Increases (water, etc.)

I support the proposed water wastewater, and stormwater rate increases. Salem is a rapidly growing city, judging by increased traffic alone, and our utilities need to be ahead of the game and not forever playing catch-up. Replacing and repairing our aging infrastructure is a must.

Sharon L. Malcom
5933 Mission Hills SE
Salem, OR 97306

Amber Mathiesen - Change in Water Rates

From: Neil Pierson <neilpierson25@gmail.com>
To: <citycouncil@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/27/2016 11:48 AM
Subject: Change in Water Rates

I am opposed to the proposed change in water rates to assist Creekside Golf Course.

My main objection is that it won't work. That golf course is not a viable business in the long run. The rate change would take Salem residents' dollars away from people who don't receive any benefit to a business that will fail anyway.

I feel bad for the property owners around the course whose values will go down when the course closes, as it inevitably will. But the focus should be on how to minimize the impact of the closing, not on a short delay in the date it closes.

The claim that the golf course provides 50 jobs is suspect. How many of those are full-time, living wage jobs? Whatever the number, it should be compared to the jobs that will be created after the land is repurposed.

Neil Pierson
770 Candalaria Boulevard South
Salem, OR

--

Neil Pierson
neilpierson25@gmail.com
[\(713\) 252-1674](tel:(713)252-1674)

SOUND PUBLIC POLICY NEEDED FOR “IRRIGATORS” AND DOWN-STREAM FLOODING!

Salem residents are fortunate to have a water system with optimal water holdings! The city inherits its drinking water from the North Santiam River via ancestral water rights. It also has 1976 rights to an abundance of free Willamette River water – which allows it to sell \$16.2 million worth “excess” water to Hillsboro. Such blessings should motivate City leaders to provide cost efficient and equitable water services to its diversified user base. Yet, 600-plus “irrigators” have been singled out to lower water rates for all other users. Too, City planners continue to shelve available backup plans for South Salem's annual flooding problems – which increase each year due to increased population and traffic. These problems are driven by ongoing annexation, new businesses, and multiple sub-divisions. A cursory review of available data on water usage and infrastructure costs suggests that the City Council should not raise any user-fee rates for 2017-18. And, it should lower the \$4.21/ccf “irrigator” rate to levels residential (\$2.65) and/or commercial (\$2.19) entities enjoy.

Categorizing water users for fee purposes is a subjective process. A process that should never be politicized. By definition there are vague differences between industrial, residential, commercial, agricultural, institutional, public, multiple dwellings, and “irrigators” – recreational/gaming categories are absent. Surprisingly, irrigators are charged double over all other classifications. The wide variance between posted water fees is difficult to comprehend. “Irrigators” has become a catch-all for schools, golf courses, colleges, city and state lands and parks, churches, etc., into play as they are all “quality of life assets” that address educational, amusement, economic, recreational, environmental, and health opportunities for Salem communities and businesses. However, only one of five Salem-based golf courses is adversely effected by water – the lack of it. Battle Creek Golf Course was, and Creekside Golf Club is, impacted in part because neither had/have water rights to available streams running through them. Battle Creek suffered closing processes in 2007 and Creekside Golf Club (and the pristine valley it occupies) faces a similar fate. Such losses can be devastating to South Salem's need of recreational and amusement outlets, businesses, and housing needs, as well as schools and colleges.. For effect, imagine the other courses, Riverfront and Bush parks, and proposed \$9m Fairview Park, without gifted or subsidized water. Threat of closure? Unthinkable!

South Salem residents and neighborhood associations don't begrudge the good fortune of the three major golf course entities (Illahe CC, McNary Golf Club, Salem Golf Club). They are blessed with springs, wells, and/or water rights to adjacent rivers/streams! Still, they are similar to Creekside Golf Club in that all are central attractions to their respective residential and business developments, as is Creekside Estates to 600-plus residential home sites, where residents are solely responsible for funding their sidewalks, streets, lights, maintenance, garbage containment, and security needs. Creeksiders are required to maintain their lawns and grounds – without city subsistance! The golf course is in the middle of the estates. It can effectively accommodate a 400-plus regular membership and 200 part-time Social/Health Members. It also provides access to area colleges, schools, clubs, and business-related needs. And, it has a modestly priced guest program. But, exorbitant water bills has kept it in the black since its 1993 beginning. It is a 155-acre, environmentally protected valley that is in the base of a 12-miles water shed area with three seasonal creeks – none of which are available for watering the golf course. This is also the case for excessive run-off water. On the dark side, the valley has also been the source of considerable down-stream damage in the past to KoosKooski, Battle Creek, and down town Salem.

Although having private club status, Creekside welcomes non-member golfers to participate as guests or as part of numerous contracted golf events that clubs, businesses, colleges, and high schools utilize – Roth Inc. had 200 employees enjoying Creekside in July. Corban college practices and competes at Creekside. It has hosted NAIA and Oregon Senior Association events and hopes to host the OSAA golf tournament in the future, as well as many youth activities. And the Creekside Pub/Restaruant and Lottery is open to the public. The swimming pool is open to members and their children, as well as other paid memberships. The Homeowner Association utilizes the facilities for meetings and special events. But, if the golf course's owners can't achieve balanced budgets, they'll necessarily consider other ways to protect their investments., one of which would be a major housing development. This, according to past FEMA and city studies , could have the effect of increasing down-sream flooding to KoosKooski and Battle Creek neighborhoods, as well as down town Salem.

The city routinely supports urban renewal projects, approves enterprise zones, and promotes major projects (Minto Island Bridge & Park, Waterfront Park, and now \$9m Fairview Park] to bring businesses and tourists to Salem. But, it's been reluctant to play a role with its golf-based entities, which are a major draw for all of Salem's housing developments and businesses. It should be a no-brainer considering the employment, recreation, property taxes, water fees, and new resident drawing power -- coupled with minimal required city services. But, that's not the case for Creekside Golf Club -- the "Jewel in the Crown" of South Salem. However, a cooperative flood control effort between the city and the golf course owners would be smart, preventative action to keep down-stream entities safe into the future. But, again the City waits for the next big flood before dusting off its studies that demand preventative action. Where are all of the waterfront, park, and transportation renewal grants or subsidies when one of Salem's biggest enterprises needs help?

If Creekside Golf Club is forced to close, it's a fact the city loses cash flow, 50 FTE and 120 seasonal jobs, and property taxes. Equally important, the 155 acre valley is the catch-all basin of a twelve-square mile water shed area that is the main cause of down stream flooding. If a 300-plus housing development replaces it, a beautiful, natural habitat valley is lost; multimillion dollar water shed problems will increase, making the 2008/2012 flood damages look minor to past KoosKooskie, Battle Creek, and down town Salem areas. And, environmental quality will be lost throughout the valley. And, wild life (deer, migrating birds, hawks, squirrels, etc.) will be forever lost.

Currently, residential (\$2.65) water rates are 88% less than irrigation \$4.24 rates and the Industrial rate is only \$1.54 -- why?. So, if 350 residential houses replace the golf course, the houses will use more water on an annual basis at about half the cost of watering the course. Definitely not a win-win interchange for anyone! Besides, Creekside Golf Club is an integral part of a residential community. It is a combined commercial (\$2.19 rate) and recreational entity, not an irrigation farm land. And, why do approximately 600 other so-called irrigators pay more in water rates than residential folks when the currently non-profit golf course simply serves a non-profit recreational purpose? Imagine Salem School District or Bush Park letting its lawns and fields go to dust? An outrage! Solution? A compressed water rate for irrigators would also allow the district more funds for teacher supplies, etc.

Non-vested spectators on the peripherals wrongly embrace mythical gains if the course closes: if the golf course and estates shut down, property values and taxes will be lowered? Water rates will go down -- as will City revenues? The City will pick up all of the usual 'n customary street, roads, lights, security costs of Creekside home owners? Golfers go elsewhere? Right? . Probably not! The City Council has a unique window of opportunity to adhere to sound public policy methodology in assuring equitable water rates for all Salem-based water users. NOW is the time to act accordingly!

Jerry Bennett, Retiree, Golf Advocate, Citizen; 804 Creekside Dr. SE, Salem, OR 97306; 503 403 9217

Revised: 9 - 26 - 16

285 Leffelle St. S
Salem OR 97302
September 22, 2016

City Recorder
To: City of Salem Room 205
555 Liberty St. SE
Salem OR 97301

From: Paula Hayatt
Re: Water, Wastewater, & Stormwater
rate increase.

I've enjoyed living, just outside Salem in
Marion Co., and for the past 14 years in the
city. I understand rate increase seems
necessary, but as a Senior Citizen, I
have a problem.

My husband & I are long retired! Our
income is low as a result. Then, our Social
Security income did not go up two last year
& our resources go down.

garbage cost just went up, now
water & sewer are to go up? What's
next? We manage to get by, but we hope
we have enough to last a few more years.
we try to conserve where we can, we're
careful about what we spend, where we can.
Please - not another rate increase!!!

Paula Hayatt

P.S. Some seniors have had higher income for longer
years, we're not among those.

P.S. And we're told our medical ^{premiums} will rise again
these years. Without having med insurance, we
would fast be out of money at all?

Amber Mathiesen - Re: rate increase

From: Mary Lamb <mlamb20@gmail.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/27/2016 7:54 PM
Subject: Re: rate increase

I am retired, on a fixed income and with a husband in a care facility. Money is very tight. I don't water my lawn during the summer. I save the water for my vegetable garden. I have mostly native plants in my large back yard. I am extremely frugal with water use. The rate increase estimate is outrageous! I suppose at least some of this goes for watering the greens at Creekside Golf Course which is about 1/2 mile down the road from me. I have no control over this increase but I do vote and I will take this increase into consideration when I vote on other issues that include spending my hard earned money. I vehemently oppose this increase!

Joan Massey
mlamb20@gmail.com

On Sat, Sep 24, 2016 at 9:00 PM, Mary Lamb <mlamb20@gmail.com> wrote:

I am retired, on a fixed income and with a husband in a care facility. Money is very tight. I don't water my lawn during the summer. I save the water for my vegetable garden. I have mostly native plants in my large back yard. I am extremely frugal with water use. The rate increase estimate is outrageous! I suppose at least some of this goes for watering the greens at Creekside Golf Course which is about 1/2 mile down the road from me. I have no control over this increase but I do vote and I will take this increase into consideration when I vote on other issues that include spending my hard earned money. I vehemently oppose this increase!

Joan Massey
mlamb20@gmail.com

Amber Mathiesen - Comment on Salem Water Rate Increase

From: Robert Johnson <robjoh@saif.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/29/2016 9:05 AM
Subject: Comment on Salem Water Rate Increase

I am writing to communicate my disagreement with another water rate increase without independent verification of the recommendation that more money/resources is what the program really needs.

I get that there is inflation but there is also opportunity for increased efficiencies in how city water is managed/operated.

I would encourage you to request an internal audit of how city water is managed/operated and post it for us (the public) to see as justification for any proposed changes or rate increases. Or, at least post some documentation to layout the case—where is this extra money going, where did the extra money from the last rate increase go? Is the bulk going to salary increases or is it really going to infrastructure replacement? If it is infrastructure replacement, why isn't there a measure proposed to issue bonds to pay for new infrastructure?

If the audit comes back saying that the solution for the water program is proposing rate increases every year then I would feel as though I have some assurance that this really is the best course of action.

If it comes back identifying significant opportunities for shoring up existing operations/management, recommendations for increased efficiencies with the resources that the program already has, and recommendations for a revised billing structure that charges the elderly less, businesses more, and low usage households less, then I stand by my disagreement with repeated water rate increases without independent due diligence performed and publicized to justify that repeated rate increases is the optimal solution for managing the city of Salem's water program.

Robert Johnson, MBA, CPA, CISA, CIA
Salem resident

Confidentiality Notice: This email may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this email in error, please advise us immediately at helpdesk@saif.com, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: Linda Gray <lindaanddoug@msn.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/29/2016 10:59 AM
Subject: Water rate increases

STOP! Stop subsidizing businesses and schools! Start making developers pay their own way when putting in new neighborhoods. Our water, wastewater and stormwater charges are high enough. Start using the funds that are collected more wisely. Cut out wasteful spending and start doing your jobs more efficiently. We already subsidize schools by paying our taxes. Private businesses need to pay their own bills particularly ones who cater to elitist groups. NO NEW RATE INCREASES!

Linda Gray
6787 Pelton Ct. SE
Salem, OR 97306

Amber Mathiesen - Rate Increase

From: Karen Robinson <robbyk921@yahoo.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 9/29/2016 1:44 PM
Subject: Rate Increase

I received notice of a rate increase public hearing.
I have attended two of these public hearings since moving to Salem.
Both times I felt council's mind was already made up ahead of time.
Members seemed uninterested in listening to people speaking their feelings and hardship
of proposed increase. Some were even condescending.

Since the mayor probably has already supported this increase, like she has forcing the Bridge measure upon us also, I feel the general public is not represented fairly. What a waste of our time and tax dollars.

We are told to conserve water and then when we do, all too well, you raise rates because you are not making enough money.

When council members become Senior Citizens on limited income maybe they will understand and show some respect.

I would rather see tax money spent in more efficient ways.

For all the good these letters or comments make-

Karen Robinson

Amber Mathiesen - Water/Sewer Rate Increases

From: "Floyd and Cheryl Eby" <feby@qwestoffice.net>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 10/3/2016 5:22 PM
Subject: Water/Sewer Rate Increases
Attachments: image001.gif

It is once again that time when Peter Fernandez, director of public works, comes to you with hat in one hand and the other seeking to pick the pocket of the ratepayers. We want to direct this letter particularly to those of you who are new to the council—Tom Andersen, Steve McCoid, Daniel Benjamin, and Jim Lewis. We are hoping you men have not yet been corrupted by the other members of the council who have sold out to Mr. Fernandez in regards to rate increases and given him carte blanche every time he appears before you. And to the rest of you still on the council, we know your scheme all too well. It has been pretty obvious in our previous attendances at these hearings that you have already struck a deal with Mr. Fernandez before any of us, the ratepayers, have ever spoken out pro or con. We're not stupid and we have figured it out. And we have also figured that because a deal has already been struck, there is little point in any of us attending any more public hearings. Our opinions mean nothing to this council; the decision has already been made. So now I want to turn to why we, once again, oppose another rate increase.

According to city of Salem charts, the water/sewer expects, as of the third quarter of this year, revenue of \$81.9 million and expenditures of \$81.7. The estimated ending working capital for this year is \$34.6 million. Then there are franchise fees projected for the end of this year of \$15,133,158. For all this revenue and expenditure, we surely do not see any major water/sewer projects going on, and we don't believe it takes almost \$82 million to run Willow Lake on a yearly basis. So where is all the money being spent? That brings us to employee wages/benefits. This, without a doubt, is the biggest money waster of city government. We routinely see city work crews doing something somewhere where you have 8-10 people and only 2-3 actually doing any real work while the rest stand around. How about cutting the number of public utility employees significantly and then having work crews that actually work? The savings in salary and benefits will be enormous. City employees, including the public works director, who two years ago was making \$140,000 a year, more than the governor, have salaries and benefits that are far in excess of the private sector for the work they do. A pay freeze would be in order at this time.

Our pet bugaboo, however, are the franchise fees which all utilities must pay the city in order to do business here. These types of "fees" are, as an employee for the franchise department for the state of Oregon stated, "a scheme." He's right. Mr. Fernandez apparently spends most of his time dreaming up new ways to part

the ratepayers from their hard earned money for more pet city projects. The latest is now a new fee for streetlights/sidewalks. These funds will never be spent on these needs. I have already outted Mr. Fernandez in the Statesman Journal about city sidewalks being in deplorable condition for years now, and no repairs of any kind being made. Basically, the water/sewer bill has become the catchall to create what we view as a public works "kitty" for funds that somehow just never seem to get to where they are supposed to go. So our big question is—WHERE IS ALL THE FRANCHISE FEE MONEY GOING?? There is no breakout in the city budget, so is it just accruing or what? It certainly isn't being used for public works projects. And why are city ratepayers paying a franchise fee for a water/sewer that WE own?

We will not be attending the city council meeting on this issue as we have done so numerous times in the past to no avail. Our views mean nothing to the city council. Mr. Fernandez, so far, has managed to work deals with the council in advance of these meetings to assure he will get a yes vote to his increasing demands for revenue at our expense. It is a waste of our time. We just want to encourage you to stand firm on the side of those who voted you into office, and not be swayed by Peter Fernandez's continued smug bleating for his poor public works department.

Floyd and Cheryl Eby
1960 Garfield Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

Amber Mathiesen - Proposed Water Rate Increases

From: Sandra Lewis <slkoala2bear@aol.com>
To: <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 10/3/2016 7:29 PM
Subject: Proposed Water Rate Increases

To Whom It May Concern,

I have received the notification of the proposed water/sewer rate increases on the same day I received my latest water/sewer bill. I must say that I **protest** this increase.

I find it laughable that this rate increase comes on the heels of your decision to give a **private** golf course in South Salem a huge discount on their water bill ie. \$30,000, stating in your decision that the costs will be spread out over the residential user fees, which should only be a couple bucks a month. Oddly, this increase is \$2.20 a month. Then you say that there are, I can't remember the exact number but 634 comes to mind, other large water users that could be included (what's good for one should be good for all, right?). So, let's see, if one large user is \$2, then \$2 times say, 500 other large users would be...how much? Only about \$1000, but the average residential customer can pay that, right? Oh, and then there was the enclosure in the bill about helping families in need to pay their water bill. That will be every customer, at the rate you are going! **What happened to your adage about the customer only paying for what they use?** If those high water consumers use that much water, **they can pay their own bill!**

On that same vein, I feel that I am currently paying for, at minimum, **700 gallons that I don't use!** You state on the bill that a unit is 748 gallons. 748 divided by 30 days is roughly 25 gallons per day. I don't think I used that much. Here is my situation:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->I am the sole occupant of my little house, and I do not have company very often.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Last summer, since we were in a drought pattern, I started collecting my excess morning shower water in buckets. I have continued to do that, ever since.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->With the 7-9 gallons of excess shower water daily, I use most of it to flush my toilet. Any extra goes into the washing machine, to offset the water needed for the first fill.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->I work four 10's, so I am gone most of the day on my work days. On those days I flush my toilet once in the morning, and once before bed. On my days off, it can be 3 or 4 flushes, all offset by approximately 2 gallons of recycled shower water.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->I do one load of laundry a week.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->I do my dishes about once a week, sometimes every two weeks.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->I do not water my lawn.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->8. <!--[endif]-->I have washed my car, I believe, twice in the last 6 months.

Regardless of what I have done to minimize my usage, my bills for the last year have been consistently; 2 months at 1 unit, 1 month at 2 units, 2 months at 1 unit, 1 month at 2 units. This month's bill, however, was back to 2 units after only 1 month at 1 unit. Obviously, even with recycling

approximately 210 gallons a month, I am at the cusp between those units, so a couple gallons, one way or the other, will throw me into the higher or lower usage bracket. If you were actually being fair to your consumers and making them pay for only what they use, as you so often refer to, there would be a decimal point in your calculations, ie. 1.1 units, 1.5 units, 1.7 units. You have one in your Wastewater Volume (Units) on the bills. Why isn't there a decimal point in the Water Volume?

Since there is no decimal point, I feel that you are already getting an overpayment from me, for the huge amount of water I am being charged for, but not using. The difference between 1 unit and 2 units is a lot, and I don't think I use anywhere close to 1,496 gallons, more like maybe 760 gallons on a "high use" month. That also has a direct impact on how much you charge me for the wastewater and in the establishment of my wastewater base. So it is to your advantage to be sure that I am charged for 2 units at least once a year, and preferably more, to make base average equal more than 1 unit.

I totally understand that everyone should pay for a minimum of one unit, and I fully support that. However, any units after the first one should be pro-rated (the decimal point stated above). Your various base rates alone already cost me \$29.98 a month, without a single drop of water, so it is all profit for you. Let's see, $\$30 \times 12 \text{ months} = \360 a year, times, say (lowball) 150,000 households, is \$54 million! Add to that the overage that I, and many others, pay for water we are not using; I have been charged at 2 units 5 times in the last year so $5 \times \$2.65 = \$13.25 \times 150,000$ households is \$1,987,500 plus \$54 million...hmmm, damn near \$56 million. Add to that, whatever you make off those Hugh use consumers, and that is not enough to cover the "repairing and replacing of the aging infrastructure"? You need \$3.96-\$8.1 million more!

Here is what I think: adjust or get meters that show more accurately the actual amount of usage. Let those high users pay their actual share and don't let them have any more breaks. As I understand it, they are already charged a lesser amount than the residential customers for their water, so why do they need anything else? By the way, I went to the website you stated in your proposed rate increases, and all I saw was information from 2010-2014. What does data from 2-6 years ago have to do with a rate increase for 2017-2018? I would think that would pertain to the 2013-2014, or maybe the 2015-2016 rate increase at the outside.

At some point, the residential customers should be considered as people, whose incomes are not limitless. Many have not seen a pay increase, or a very small one, in the last few years. Why should they be expected to subsidize the high use consumers who whine that they can't afford their water bill? (I sure hope that the money you get for the families in need is not being used to subsidize these high use consumers). Maybe the high use consumers should do like the rest of us and cut back or conserve water wherever they can. For example, golf courses could use drought-resistant grass, so they wouldn't need to water as much. The other thing that galls me is that most of those high use consumers are obviously making money for whatever they are selling/manufacturing/providing, and can pass their costs onto their customers (which is always the fall back statement) if they have a shortfall in their revenue, so why do they need a break from you?

For myself, I have received a notice in the last couple of weeks that my car insurance, garbage bill and now my water bill are going up. I can't wait to see what the electric and natural gas will do.

Sincerely,

Sandra K. Lewis

1090 19th St NE
Salem, OR 97301
Account # 24474-0001

Amber Mathiesen - Water rate increases

From: Philip Ratcliff <skazz999W@hotmail.com>
To: "cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net" <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>
Date: 10/4/2016 3:33 PM
Subject: Water rate increases

To Whom It May Concern:

I live on a cul-de-sac in Salem, with no streetlights. Yet, my neighbors and I are paying a monthly streetlight fee. I inquired into when we might expect streetlights. I was informed that it may be many years. So, I object to the proposed hikes for water services. The rates are already high enough. I lived in the small town of Cloverdale, CA, before moving here. I was paying less for water there, than I am here. And Cloverdale's water source was four wells drilled close to the Russian River. We often had to undergo either voluntary, or mandatory, water rationing.

These are not inflationary times. The Federal Reserve has kept the interest rate near zero for several years. That means that inflation is under control. You have little reason to hike your rates. You can do your infrastructure upgrades, without gouging your customers.

So, stop ripping us off with your already high rates, and your proposed hike of those high rates.

Ratcliff

Tragen Ct. SE

97302

Philip

4665

Salem

Testimony of Evan White before Salem City Council, October 10, 2016
Public Hearing on Proposed Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rate Increases
(Representing the Sunnyslope Neighborhood Association¹)

Because the Water/Wastewater Taskforce spent considerable time discussing reduced irrigation rates, it is prudent to comment because there may be an attempt to resurrect this bad idea.

*"What you say in the dark shall be heard in the light."*² Public Works Director Fernandez probably did not have that verse in mind when he met with Councilor McCoid to discuss creative ways to lower water rates for the Creekside Golf Course. These proposals might be called "Reverse Robin Hood," because they would take money away from 40,000 families, 26% of who live in poverty, in order to give money to 286 golf club members.³

Oregon's public records laws encourage transparency and accountability in government. So I filed several public records requests to get to the bottom of the issues. City staff demanded that I first pay nearly \$1,000 in fees before they would release any information, and cited a court case that dealt with medical experiments on monkeys.

This much we know from the City's refusal to provide information. We know that staff has no support for some of the statements that it made to the Water/Wastewater Taskforce. We know that the network of pipes, pumping and storage facilities has not changed much over the past four years, when the City's consultant found that, on a per unit basis, irrigation customers are by far the most expensive class of customers served by the City's water system.

The reason for this is simple. All the pipes, pumping and storage facilities remain, month after month, even when they are not needed for irrigation during the rainy seasons. The water system is designed for peak usage, so that customers will have adequate water pressure when they take a shower – even at times when their neighbor – or a golf course – is irrigating. All year long, residential customers flush toilets, take showers, wash dishes, do laundry and pay water bills to offset the costs of the system. But irrigation customers pay for water only when they are actually irrigating during the dry, hot summer months. The costs associated with seasonal usage never go away. That is why irrigation customers are more expensive to serve on a per-unit basis.

Enclosures:

Guest opinion, 9/1/2016 Statesman Journal

2012 Cost of Service Analysis (COSA), page 4-4

9/21/2016 letter to Mr. Walter M. Beglau, District Attorney (eight pages, including three attached and unanswered public records requests – 8/26/2016, 9/8/2016, 9/9/2016)

9/27/2016 letter from Asst. City Attorney Katrina L. Brown (two pages w/o attachments)

¹Pursuant to the 9/15/2016 unanimous vote of the Board of Directors.

² Luke, 12:3. Thanks to the Statesman Journal for shining a light on this issue.

³Or to its wealthy owner, Mr. Larry Tokarski, who has threatened to close the golf course.

RECEIVED

OCT 05 2016

CITY OF SALEM
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

Irrigation price break has costly consequences



GUEST OPINION
EVAN WHITE

Creekside Golf Club, a private golf club in an affluent part of Salem, has been paying at least \$200,000 per year to the city of Salem to water its acreage during the summer months. Recently, representatives of the golf club negotiated a 30 percent rate reduction with a task force of Salem City Council.

Because Creekside is just one of 638 irrigation customers of the city, the subcommittee rightfully decided that other irrigation customers should be treated in the same manner.

So instead of benefiting just Creekside, with an annual rate reduction of

\$60,000, extending the rate discount to all irrigation customers creates a total \$600,000 revenue deficiency which must be made up by other water customers. The proposal to raise the rates of residential and other non-irrigation customers will be presented at a public hearing in October.

The typical approach to utility rate-making is to conduct a cost of service study and meticulously account for all costs of providing service to different customer groups.

City staff has been employing this approach for many years. As explained by the consultants: "The cost of providing water to customers depends not only on how much water they use, but also on how that use occurs over time ... Water utilities attempt to meet all of the water

demands of their customers; (therefore) water systems are sized to meet their customers' peak requirements. (D)uring off-peak periods there are usually significant costs associated with the unused capacity of the system ... these costs must be allocated to customers in proportion of each customer class's contribution to the system peak."

Irrigation customers, such as Creekside, are almost twice as expensive to serve as residential customers, on a per unit basis at system peak. Unfortunately the task force chose to ignore this important finding.

It could be argued that an irrigation rate break is needed to save jobs.

Here's why that argument doesn't hold water. If 50 jobs are at stake at the golf club, and if the cost to other custom-

ers of extending that rate break is \$600,000, then the jobs saved subsidy is \$12,000 per year per employee, year after year (\$600,000/50 employees). But since most Creekside restaurant and landscaping employees would be able to find jobs elsewhere, the per-employee public subsidy would be much higher.

The developer's threat to shut down the Creekside Golf Club and create a new subdivision raises many moral, ethical and legal issues. But the majority of Salem residents did not cause these issues and should be not asked to pay for the costs of playing golf.

Evan White of Salem is retired after a 27-year career at the Oregon Public Utilities Commission. He can be reached at epwhitehouse@comcast.net.

Standard Formulas

The peaking factors used in this study are for coincidental peaks. This means that the estimates of maximum-day peaking factors measure the probable ratio of each class's use during the system's peak day to each class's use during its average day. Similarly, the maximum-hour peaking factor is based on the customer class's use during the system's maximum hour. Thus, the peaking factors estimated in this analysis are the expected peaking factors for each customer class during the system's maximum day and maximum hour. For Salem, the system peak day and hour production usually occur in July or August. The following equations show the standard calculations of peaking factors for each class:

Maximum-Day Peaking Factor:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Class Consump. During System Max. Month}}{\text{Avg. Month for Class}} \right) \times \left(\frac{\text{System Peak - Day Rate of Flow}}{\text{System Max. - Month Rate of Flow}} \right)$$

Maximum-Hour Peaking Factor:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Class Consump. During System Max. Month}}{\text{Avg. Month for Class}} \right) \times \left(\frac{\text{System Peak - Hour Rate of Flow}}{\text{System Max. - Month Rate of Flow}} \right)$$

These equations provide a general approximation of peaking factors by class. They are the best estimating technique available in the absence of more specific information on particular subsets of the customer base.

Estimated Peaking Requirements. Data on monthly water system production and water usage by customer class was available for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 for inside-city customers⁹. Peaking factors were estimated for each of these years based on the standard formulas. The two-year average peaking factors are shown in Table 4-4. Irrigation customers have the highest peaking factors, followed by residential and public. Summer irrigating, car washing, and other activities usually result in higher usage for residential customers in summer months.

Table 4-4
City of Salem Cost of Service Analysis
Water System Peaking Factors

	Max Day	Max Hour
Retail		
Residential	2.18	3.28
Institutional	1.59	2.39
Irrigation	4.04	6.05
Commercial	1.64	2.45
Industrial	1.70	2.55
Institutional	1.26	1.88
Public Building	2.09	3.14
Wholesale		
East Salem Water District	1.63	2.44
City of Turner	1.75	2.62
Orchard Heights	1.88	2.82

⁹ Prior to FY 2009-10, the City billed customers every two months.

Mr. Walter M. Berglau
Marion County District Attorney
555 Court St NE, Suite 3250
Salem, OR 97301

September 21, 2016

RE: ORS 192.440(6) Petition to Review Denial of Request for Fee Waiver

The City of Salem has denied three requests that I have made for fee waivers to inspect public records, all related to a proposed water rate reduction to favor Creekside Golf Course at the expense of the other water customers of the City of Salem.

At the July 14, 2016 meeting of the City of Salem's Water/Wastewater Taskforce, Public Works Director Peter Fernandez disclosed that he had a pre-meeting with Salem City Council President Steve McCoid, who apparently had requested a reduction in the irrigation rates paid by the Creekside Golf Course.¹ Councilor McCoid owns property at Creekside and is a golf club member.

I have filed four public records requests related to this matter, and each time requested a fee waiver. The first request, on August 22, was granted, and I received materials that had been distributed at previous meetings of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce.

My August 22, 2016 letter to the City said that the fee waiver is appropriate because the information would primarily benefit the public. ORS 192.440(5) The proposed irrigation rate discount would come at the expense of other water customers in the City of Salem. I also said that I am uniquely able to analyze this material because I regularly reviewed cost of service studies during my 27 year career with the Oregon Public Utilities Commission.

Most of the documents that I have requested either exist or they do not exist. For example, I have asked for any workpapers or calculations used by Director Fernandez when he met with Councilor McCoid. I have also asked for documents supporting the claim that peak costs are now approximately 20 percent of total costs (when four years ago they were said to be about one-third of total costs). Staff either has or does not have any studies showing the impact of the rate shift upon the approximately 26% of Salem residents who have incomes below the poverty level.

Even the amount of the proposed benefit to Creekside is unknown. Although staff distributed documents asserting that a 30% rate reduction would produce a \$60,000 in savings to the golf club, the record also shows that Creekside paid \$288,000 to the City. A 30% rate cut should therefore produce \$86,400 in savings for three hundred golf club members (at the expense of other customers).

The perceived "need" to provide a rate reduction for Creekside Golf Club has dominated all of the meetings of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce. At the last meeting, staff distributed a document that was patently false – asserting that the Creekside Golf Course was the 17th largest irrigation customer in Salem (actually it is the largest irrigation customer).

Councilor and mayor-elect Chuck Bennett has thanked me for making these public records requests and expressed his frustration at the lack of information provided by City staff.

I believe that a fee waiver is in the public interest because the information that I have requested would primarily benefit more than 43,000 residential, commercial, institutional and industrial water customers of the City of Salem. I also have the requisite experience needed to analyze this information due to my 27-year career with the Oregon Public Utility Commission. I have demonstrated an ability to disseminate this information, through frequent appearances as a witness at City Council meetings. I used the information which I obtained from my August 22, 2016 public records request to write a guest opinion that was published in the September 1, 2016 issue of the Statesman Journal.

Furthermore, the City's cost estimates are objectively unreasonable. The City proposes to bill me for five hours of staff time at \$72.54 per hour, and four hours at \$155.00,² which suggests to me that they are more interested in creating "spin" than in releasing the information that was available at the time that I made my requests.

Staff's demand for \$982.40 in fees effectively denies me access to these materials, which I need to prepare testimony for the public hearing on October 10, 2016.

Evan White
4553 Brock Loop S.
Salem, OR 97302
503-585-4814
epwhitehouse@comcast.net

Copy: City of Salem Legal Department

Enclosures:

8/22/2016 fee waiver request letter (one page)
8/26/2016 public records request (three pages)
9/8/2016 public records request (one page)
9/9/2016 public records request (two pages)
9/9/2016 response from Councilor Bennett (one page)
9/15/2016 City of Salem denials (three pages)

¹ Director Fernandez, speaking as recorded on the July 14, 2016 audio tape: "Councilor McCoid is the Council President and resident at Creekside and member of the [Golf] Club [and] is very interested in this issue. So we had a pre-meeting with him so we could fill him in. He's not allowed in the room because then we'd have a quorum. So he'd love to be here but we told him, no no you gotta go. But he came up ... in discussing it he came up with another option, we conceptualized another option, where we perhaps just lower the irrigation rate, the commodity rate a little bit, or some amount, and that actually is an idea beyond these options that actually has legs and we think it might be a very good way to go to address issues..."

²There is a typo in the response to request no. 16-1909. From the totals, it is clear staff meant \$155.00 per hour.

City Recorder
City of Salem
555 Liberty Street SE, Room 205
Salem OR 97301

August 26, 2016

RE: Public Records Request & Fee Waiver

Some of the following requests refer to the August 2012 “Cost of Service Rate Study” (COSA). dated August 2012.

1. Page 4-1 of COSA states that *“The equitable allocation of revenue requirements... begins with an analysis of user characteristics... For the water system, costs are allocated to customers based on their average and peak water demands.”* For each customer class, please provide the most recent information on average and peak water demands, using the format shown at COSA Table 4-2.
2. Please provide the most recent data on maximum day and maximum hour peaking factors, using the format shown at COSA Table 4-4.
3. Please provide data similar to COSA Table 5-8, which shows that *“Almost half of water system costs are allocated to average day demand, and about one-third of costs are related to peak demands.”*
4. Please provide data similar to that shown by COSA Table 5-12 which shows current and revised water revenue by class, with and without the proposed change in irrigation rates. Mr. Fernandez indicated that this information is available at the August 25, 2016 meeting of the Water/Wastewater Task Force.
5. Please provide data on the current and revised water rates, with and without the proposed change in irrigation rates, similar to the format used by COSA Table 6-1. Mr. Fernandez indicated that this information is available at the August 25, 2016 meeting of the Water/Wastewater Task Force.
6. Since 25.8 percent of residents in Salem have incomes below the poverty level (Tab E, 7/14/2016 taskforce agenda), please provide any analyses staff may have conducted on the effects of shifting irrigation costs to these customers.
7. Creekside Golf Course has been described by one Creekside resident as “the Jewel in South Salem’s Crown,” providing flood control benefits to those who cannot afford to play golf or live at Creekside. Please provide any reports, by staff or others, which discuss these flood control benefits. Also please provide any information discussing the appropriateness of allocating the \$600,000 irrigation discount only to residents inside the Salem City limits if the flood control benefits extend beyond the city limits.

8. The draft minutes of the July 28, 2016 meeting of the Water Wastewater Task Force state that Councilor Lewis made a motion to “*reduce the irrigation rate to reflect current usage characteristics.*” Please provide the current usage characteristics of irrigation customers, and indicate how they have changed relative to other customer classes.

9. The draft minutes of the July 28, 2016 meeting of the Water Wastewater Task Force indicates that Councilor Lewis also made a motion to “*eliminate peak costs.*” In view of statements made in the COSA about the importance of peak costs (said to comprise about one-third of total costs), what was the rationale for eliminating these costs (if known)? Were peak costs eliminated for all customer classes, or only for irrigation customers?

10. In its “A-Irrigation Cost Relief Options (Revised 7/28/16)” document, responding to rate reduction requests by the golf course, staff indicates that “*Data from 2015 show a modest reduction (almost 10 percent) in irrigation demands relative to other customer classes.*” Please provide the available data showing the almost 10 percent reduction.

11. In its “A-Irrigation Cost Relief Options (Revised 7/28/16)” document, responding to a request by the golf course, staff also states that “*Peak hour costs represent approximately 20 percent of total irrigation costs.*” Please provide any documents showing why irrigation customers now have lower peak hour costs than other customers (since the COSA states that peak costs comprise one-third of total costs).

12. The “A-Irrigation Cost Relief Options (Revised 7/28/16)” document, responding to rate reduction requests by the golf course, staff indicates that “*Data from 2015 show a modest reduction (almost 10 percent) in irrigation demands relative to other customer classes.*” Staff also states that “*Peak hour costs represent approximately 20 percent of total irrigation costs.*” Assuming that both statements are true, please provide any available worksheets or calculations illustrating how an “almost 10 percent reduction” of something that is only 20% of total costs becomes a 30% rate reduction. Did staff simply add these two numbers?

13. At the July 14, 2016 meeting of the taskforce, Mr. Fernandez disclosed that he had a pre-meeting with Councilor McCoid, a golf club member, who is “very interested in this issue” and who “came up with another option.” Did the 30% irrigation rate reduction idea originate with Councilor McCoid? Please provide any workpapers or calculations that led Mr. Fernandez to agree that Councilor McCoid’s proposal “has legs.”

I request a waiver of public records fees for the reasons stated in my letter of August 22, 2016, and the additional reason that I need this information to prepare my testimony for the October 10, 2016 public hearing. This information should be readily available and is customarily provided in public utility rate hearings.

Thank you for your assistance.

Evan White
4553 Brock Loop S.
Salem, OR 97302
503-585-4814
epwhitehouse@comcast.net

City Recorder
City of Salem
555 Liberty Street SE, Room 205
Salem OR 97301

September 8, 2016

RE: Public Records Request & Fee Waiver

1. For as many years as staff conveniently has data, please provide the time of annual water system peak day and peak hour, and the volume of usage at those times. Also please indicate the source of this information (in other words, how staff knows when peak day and peak hour usage occurs).
2. At today's meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce, staff distributed Exhibit 1, page 1 of 1, which shows proposed Inside Salem volume rates by customer class (marked in yellow). What are the current rates per customer class? (Page 8 of another handout is confusing – it suggests that without the proposed irrigation rate change, there would be a two cent reduction in single family residential rates).
3. At today's meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce, staff distributed graphs which show annual water demand (2015) for irrigation, commercial and residential customers. Please provide similar information for public, institutional and industrial customer classes.
4. At today's meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce, staff distributed a list of the top 30 irrigation customers. Please provide copies of any correspondence received from any of these customers that ask for irrigation rate reductions.
5. Please provide any available information on the elasticity of demand for water (which would suggest how volume of water might increase or decrease in response to price increases). Has staff conducted any studies showing how irrigation customers might respond to the proposed 30% reduction in water rates?
6. At today's meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce, staff provided a chart labeled "why an irrigation rate change is supportable" which compares "historic use" to "current infrastructure capability." The data ends in 2012. Please provide a chart with more recent data, if available. Is this the only information that staff has which suggests that an irrigation rate change is supportable?

I request a waiver of public records fees for the reasons stated in my letters of August 22, 2016, and August 26, 2016. This information should be readily available and is customarily provided in public utility rate hearings.

Thank you for your assistance.

Evan White
4553 Brock Loop S.
Salem, OR 97302
503-585-4814
epwhitehouse@comcast.net

City Recorder
 City of Salem
 555 Liberty Street SE, Room 205
 Salem OR 97301

September 9, 2016

RE: Public Records Request & Fee Waiver

This public records request is intended to clear up confusion about the proposed irrigation rate discount. The August 15, 2016 Statesman Journal said that the Creekside Golf Club “spends about \$300,000 on water” and I recall the number “\$288,000” from listening to one of the audio tapes of a previous meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce. A 30% reduction of \$288,000 would yield a savings to Creekside of \$86,400 – and not the \$60,000 savings mentioned in various staff papers.

One of the documents distributed at yesterday’s meeting of the Water/Wastewater Taskforce was labeled “Top 30 Irrigation accounts (2 years of consumption),” with the Salem-Keizer School District listed as the top irrigator. However I’ve learned from other sources that the school district in fact uses less irrigation water than Creekside. This table most likely includes all water usage, not just irrigation usage, and therefore gives a grossly inaccurate impression of the relative beneficiaries of the proposed irrigation rate discount.

1. Ranked in descending order, from highest usage to lowest, please provide a list of all irrigation customers served by the City of Salem in FY 2016, showing in one column the amount of water billed under the irrigation rate, and showing in a second column the dollar amount charged for that usage.
2. Page 10 of one of the handouts was labeled “Why an irrigation rate change is supportable,” and states that “[R]ate increases over past 20 years disproportionately affected the irrigation class – Irrigation volume rates have increased over 230 percent since 2001 when the city first implemented the irrigation class.” If the irrigation rate was first implemented in 2001, how could it have increased 230 percent over the past 20 years?
3. Please provide data to support the assertion that “[P]eaking factors have changed” (on page 10).
4. Please provide the data used to construct the graph labeled “[W]hy an irrigation rate change is supportable” and indicate the source of that data (on page 9).

I request a waiver of public records fees for the reasons stated in my letters of August 22, 2016, and August 26, 2016. This information should be readily available and is customarily provided in public utility rate hearings.

Thank you for your assistance.

Evan White
4553 Brock Loop S.
Salem, OR 97302
503-585-4814
epwhitehouse@comcast.net



LEGAL DEPARTMENT / ROOM 205
555 Liberty Street SE
Salem, OR 97301
Telephone: (503) 588-6003
FAX: (503) 361-2202
TDD: (503) 588-6009

September 27, 2016

Walter M. Beglau
Marion County District Attorney
Post Office Box 14500
555 Court Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97309

City Attorney
Daniel B. Atchison
Deputy City Attorney
Natasha A. Zimmerman
Assistant City Attorneys
Katrina L. Brown
Thomas V. Cupani
Sarah D. Foreman
Douglas C. Hanson
Jason H. Ramey
Marc A. Weinstein

RE: Petition to Review Denial of Request for Fee Waiver dated September 21, 2016, from
Mr. Evan White

Dear Mr. Beglau:

I am writing in response to the petition received by your office on September 21, 2016, from Mr. Evan White appealing the City of Salem's denial of a fee waiver for certain records. As stated in his petition, Mr. White submitted four separate public records requests to the City of Salem within a three week period: a one-page request on August 22, 2016; a three-page request on August 26, 2016; a one-page request on September 8, 2016, and a two-page request on September 9, 2016. For each of these requests, he sought a waiver of all associated fees. Mr. White's first request for a fee waiver was granted by the City on August 23, 2016. After reviewing the three subsequent request, City staff sent Mr. White an email regarding each request with a cost estimate detailing the time and cost to fulfill each and denying his request for a fee waiver. These cost estimates were based on the amount of staff time involved in summarizing, compiling, and tailoring the documents to fulfill Mr. White's three requests. These costs are specifically allowed under ORS 192.440(4)(a). ORS 192.440(4)(a) provides: "The public body may establish fees reasonably calculated to reimburse the public body for the public body's actual cost of making public records available, including costs for summarizing, compiling or tailoring the public records, either in organization or media, to meet the person's request."

The Salem City Council adopted the City's current public records fee schedule by resolution in December of 2015 in an open meeting of the City Council. A copy of that resolution is attached for your information. As provided in ORS 192.440(4), the fees adopted by the City Council are reasonably calculated to reimburse the City for its actual costs in making the City's records available.

The City's adopted fee schedule also addresses fee waivers and allows fees to be waived or substantially reduced if the waiver or reduction is in the public interest because making the record available primarily benefits the general public. This language mirrors that found in ORS 192.440(5). However, as pointed out in *In Defense of Animals v. OHSU*, 199 Or App 160, 112 P.3d 336, (2005), a public body is not required to grant a fee waiver or reduction even if the public body determines that the request is in the public interest. A public body has discretion in this decision, but it must act reasonably. The Court of Appeals further stated, "Reasonableness is an objective standard, under which we examine the totality of the circumstances presented." *In Defense of Animals*, 199 Or App at 190.

In the present case, Mr. White has submitted four public records requests to the City of Salem in a span of three weeks. He has requested information, reports, analyses, worksheets, charts, data, and calculations in one form or another potentially affecting all water users in the City of Salem. The amount of information requested and the amount of staff time needed to compile and tailor these records is substantial. As Mr. White points out in his petition, the City did grant his first request for a fee waiver. He then peppered the City with three more requests within a two week period. One of these requests is over two pages in length and contains thirteen separate requested items. Granting three, additional fee waivers for the same requestor within such a short timeframe would be an undue burden on City resources.

The City's denial of Mr. White's requests for a fee waiver is reasonable based on the totality of the circumstances. Therefore, the City respectfully requests that the Petition to Review Denial of Request for Fee Waiver dated September 21, 2016, be denied.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Katrina L. Brown". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Katrina" being more prominent than the last name "Brown".

Katrina L. Brown
Assistant City Attorney

Enclosure