



## Our Salem

### Public Meeting #2

May 8, 2019, 6 – 8p.m.

Court Street Christian Church, 1699 Court St. NE, Salem, OR

## Staff Attendees

### City of Salem:

Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, Community Development Deputy Director  
Eunice Kim, Planner III, Project Manager  
Julie Warncke, Transportation Planning Manager

### Consultant Team:

Scott Fregonese, Fregonese Associates  
Violet Brown, Fregonese Associates  
Alex Steinberger, Cascadia Partners  
Kristen Kibler, JLA Public Involvement

## Meeting Overview

The City of Salem and consultant team held the second public workshop on the first phase of the Our Salem project. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss draft results of an analysis of the city's existing conditions and future scenarios for how Salem could grow. The purpose was also to present draft results from Salem's first Community Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory. All of this work will inform decisions about how and where Salem should grow, particularly as the City looks to update the [Salem Area Comprehensive Plan](#) that guides development in the Salem area.

The workshop was attended by roughly 40 members of the public. It included a presentation, discussion, and comments from the public. The [presentation](#) can be found online on the [Our Salem project page](#). The presentation provided an overview of the Our Salem purpose and process, a profile of Salem, and the results from the first phase of the project as well as the draft [GHG inventory](#).

The results were reported in a [draft report card](#) that looked at how Salem performs against 20 top indicators the public helped select late last year. For each indicator, a grade – illustrated by colored icons – was given to show if Salem appeared to be heading in the right direction (green checkmark) or the wrong direction (red 'X'), or if it was unclear (yellow question mark).

The public visited seven staffed stations around the room with comment sheets and posters that reflected the report card. The report card and posters focused on indicators related to Welcoming and Livable Communities, Safe & Reliable, Efficient Infrastructure, Strong and Diverse Economy, Good Governance, Natural Environment Stewardship, Safe Communities, and GHG inventory.

The consultant team also presented the draft results of Salem's GHG Inventory. The draft results looked at GHG emissions by different sources, and it compared Salem's emissions to those of other

communities in Oregon.

A more in-depth description of the presentation and discussion is provided below. During and after the presentation, the public asked questions and discussed the results.

## Indicators: Analysis of Existing Conditions and Future Growth Scenarios

Scott Fregonese briefly reviewed the list of the top 20 indicators that the consultant team modeled for the Our Salem project. The indicators were modeled for Salem today and for Salem under two possible future scenarios. Both future scenarios assumed current policies related to development remained in place (e.g., no visioning and no policy changes).

- Future scenario 1 – Current Trends – seemed most likely. It assumed 54,000 new people by the year 2035, and it followed current trends in development with lower housing densities than what is allowed and some redevelopment of properties. Population forecasts assume roughly 60,000 new residents by 2035.
- Future scenario 2 – Zoning Buildout – assumed much higher growth, with 93,000 new residents by 2035. It assumed new housing would be built at the maximum density allowed per acre, and it included more redevelopment.

Scott showed maps from the scenario modeling of where new households and new jobs were likely to develop within both Salem city limits and Salem's portion of the urban growth boundary. In general, the areas of development follow what is happening now. However, with the higher growth scenario, Scenario 2, Salem begins to see more households downtown and larger areas of activity (housing and jobs).

Then Scott explained the grading system that was used to evaluate the future scenario compared to Salem today for each indicator. The grades reflected the data generated from the analysis and considered the City's adopted targets as well as national standards and peer city comparisons.

The public asked questions and commented at the end of the presentation. The following highlights reflect comments or discussion topics during the presentation and at flipcharts during discussion with staff and consultants:

- Questions on the tree canopy targets and calculation. Clarification that the model looks at planting associated with private development, not pro-active planting programs. Question about whether Salem staff knows what type of trees will be able to thrive in the future given climate change.
- Questions on the methodology for calculating percent of new housing through redevelopment and infill projects, which was listed as 31% for Salem today.
- Questions on the definition of Complete Neighborhoods; this may be defined differently by different people; there was a comment that neighborhoods should be able to have unique character.
- Questions on how expansions to the urban growth boundary (UGB) might factor into the model. The existing UGB is in the model.
- Comments about income equality and how that factors in the indicators for different people, i.e. locations of income segregation/concentrations of poverty, concern that detached single family homes have access to green space/yards.
- There were ideas for mapping different data for the indicators, such as proximity to parks for multi-family housing residents, proximity to parks by incomes, income and complete neighborhoods,

- Concern about crime.
- Concern about health impacts of LED lighting.
- Concern that people may want single-family housing and that denser housing may not be desirable for the market
- Concern about lower wage jobs being added to the mix
- Concern about how demographics data was being used in the presentation; there was a comment that the data on a growing Latino was irrelevant to the discussion

## Community Review of the Report Cards

As stated earlier, the report cards assigned grades – the colored icons – to each indicator. Attendees were able to share their opinions on each of the indicators.

Thirty-one people filled out their own “report card” and provided comments. Most participants did not rate every indicator, but they focused on indicators that were most important to them. The report card showed many indicators in the middle ground of questioning Salem’s direction given today’s policies. (This recognizes that there was opportunity for checking in with the community through visioning and setting targets.)

The participants’ individual reviews of the indicators showed:

- Most attendees who filled out forms had similar ratings to those established by the project team using the indicator data. There was a lot of middle ground – questions about where the community should be heading.
- There was confirmation that the city was not meeting targets or may be moving in the wrong direction on walk and transit friendliness and bicycle and pedestrian use. The attendees also indicated a lower rating for active transportation.
- More participants rated housing affordability and average wage lower than the project team had, citing that the distribution of income caused these indicators to be worse for some households. There was also concern about how young people/future generations were affected, specific to these indicators.
- More participants expressed concern about development occurring in developmentally sensitive areas, such as riparian areas or steep slopes. For attendees, the future scenarios appear to be heading in the wrong direction for every indicator in the natural environment stewardship results area.

The compilation of the attendees’ ratings and comments confirm there is desire to imagine and plan for a better direction. The next phase – community visioning – will shape how the policies in the comprehensive plan could be updated to reflect a new scenario for Salem’s future.

## Community Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory

Alex Steinberger of Cascadia Partners provided an overview of the GHG inventory process, why GHG inventories are conducted, and how communities or organizations use them over time. Many communities use the information to determine how policies can add to or help reduce GHG emissions. The inventories also help communities focus efforts depending on sources of GHG emissions.

Alex described sources of GHG and reviewed some draft results from Salem’s GHG Inventory. The draft results showed that more than half of Salem’s GHG emissions are from transportation. Combustible fuel

use by Salem residents and businesses is the next highest source. Alex reviewed the differences in the sources and gave some examples of how Salem compares to some other Oregon cities that have tracked GHG emissions.

## Next Steps

City staff will present the results of the first phase of the Our Salem project to the City Council in June and ask for confirmation that the City should start the next phase, community-wide visioning. Responses to the draft report card will inform the visioning, which is expected to start this summer.