

## Kelli Blechschmidt

---

**From:** Jackie Leung  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 31, 2019 6:34 AM  
**To:** Amy Johnson  
**Subject:** Fwd: Concerns on City "Revenue to Fund Essential City Services" Options Being Considered

Hello,

I believe the revenue ordinances are on the agenda in August? If so, will you please include this?

Thank you,

Jackie

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

**From:** "Hale, Matthew" <MatthewHale@corban.edu>  
**Date:** 7/28/19 12:58 PM (GMT-08:00)  
**To:** Jackie Leung <JLeung@cityofsalem.net>  
**Subject:** Concerns on City "Revenue to Fund Essential City Services" Options Being Considered

Dear City Councilor Leung,

I have some concerns about the proposed operating fee being considered by the City of Salem. This revenue is stated as "\$7.1 million in 2020 at \$8/month on single family residences, \$6.40/month for multi-family residential units, and \$38.56/month for public, commercial and institutional accounts".

After reviewing the proposed budget for FY 2020, specifically page #270, I notice that our city since FY 2017 has had more expenditures than revenue, yet our property taxes and associated City fees on our utility bills continue to rise every year. In fact, all residents experienced a huge property tax increase last November, with the Statesman Journal reporting an 11% property tax increase on average.

While I'm all for supporting essential city services, I'm concerned that the messaging to the public is that "An \$8 million reduction to services in the General Fund would be the equivalent of decreasing services by 65 police officers, or five fire stations, or all park maintenance and all the Library services" rather than providing us additional options to consider as the City Council debates this proposal.

I would rather see a more detailed debate on maintaining essential city services that includes options to reduce spending in other areas, or at least an option that all city departments share a reduction in spending so that revenue equals expenditures. Our City should seek to live within it's budget, rather than passing on tax increases to taxpayers without seeking voter approval.

Page #281 of the FY 2020 proposed budget assumes an increase in wages of 6.4%, an increase in PERS contributions of 33.6%, and an increase in employer provided health insurance of 9.9%.

Increases like these, amounting to \$8,045,656, can't be sustained by taxpayers, when our incomes are not rising this fast, and cost of living increases never match these large increases in government spending.

I ask that the City carefully consider their spending, and consider other options (e.g. employees contributing to their health insurance, across the board reductions in all city departments, a hiring freeze, etc.) rather than another tax increase passed along to taxpayers already burdened by a deluge of tax increases over the past year - 11% property tax increase, state gasoline tax increase due to clean fuels legislation, increased food and medical costs due to inflation, and many others.

Thank you for listening and taking time to consider other options.

Sincerely,

Matt Hale