

January 19, 2017

Testimony from Dee White

62 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Accept the City of Portland **2017 Federal Legislative Agenda** (Previous Agenda 28; Report introduced by Mayor Wheeler)

Federal Priorities

INVESTMENT IN URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE

The City will advocate for federal funding programs, partnerships, and finance opportunities (such as public-private partnerships) to address the infrastructure needs of our nation's cities, including surface transportation infrastructure, drinking water systems, sewer systems, broadband systems, and utility grid investments.

I am totally opposed to lobbying for ANY public/private partnership when it comes to financing our Bull Run water system. The Water Bureau has been piling on debt for unnecessary infrastructure for almost 15 years. We have too much storage, and because the over-abundance of water in this storage is in dark enclosed tanks, we now have a problem with aging water, which is a water quality issue.

Ratepayers have fought the city every step of the way to try and stop the construction of unnecessary, overpriced, unsafe infrastructure to no avail. Today, ratepayers are faced with some of the most expensive water in the US and no end to rate increases well into the foreseeable future. Any public/private partnership, even with as little as 5% ownership, means that there is no FOIA since the private part erases any chance of getting information on costs or bids, contracts etc And the **absolute truth** is that Portlanders value and love their Bull Run water system and would never stand for private ownership, even 5%. Do. Not. Go. There. Please.

We are demolishing our historic open reservoirs to the tune of \$220 million and counting because of an unfunded, industry-driven Federal mandate. Under the radar, due to the same unfunded mandate, an unnecessary, prohibitively expensive filtration plant is being actively planned for Bull Run by the Water Bureau.

Sure, try and ask the Feds for funding all you want. Portlanders would be most grateful for this relief. But NOT private/public partnerships and this includes any deals involving Mayor Wheeler's signature creation in Salem, the West Coast Infrastructure Exchange.

URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE

Chemical Security

Portland seeks continued assistance from Oregon's congressional delegation to maintain local authority over chemical treatments and processes for drinking water systems, and for the Environmental Protection Agency to be [sic] maintained as the agency in charge of chemical security-related matters related to drinking water systems.

This needs a better explanation. What are we talking about here? How will lobbying for this initiative be beneficial to citizens' health? Portland has a lead problem in their water. There's a radon and radioactive carcinogens problem. There's an aging water problem. There is another push emerging for fluoridation of Portland's water down in Salem (and perhaps in Portland?), despite the fact that we have voted down these reckless efforts twice. There is an affordability problem. There are ongoing trust issues that the public has with the Portland Water Bureau. When we started drinking all covered water last year, our water treatment and processes drastically changed as well as the quality and character of our water. There are issues with this.

When I read a vaguely written paragraph about lobbying for "local authority" under the heading "Chemical Security" I see red flags and a lot of questions.

Is this about the Chemical Security Act passed by Congress in 2006? Is this what these lobbying efforts will be concerned with? Are we talking about chlorine storage tanks? Why not say this? How is a vaguely-worded scary-sounding lobbying initiative about chemical security and our drinking water beneficial information for our community to have to contemplate?

The public deserves a more detailed explanation in this public document.

Thank you,
Dee White
3836 SE 49th Ave
Portland OR 97206

Parsons, Susan

From: Terry Parker <parkert2012@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 2:16 PM
To: Council Clerk – Testimony
Subject: Testimony for Agenda Item 28, January 12, 2017

Subject: Testimony to the Portland City Council on bike share funding contained in the City of Portland Federal Legislative Agenda.

A significant part of funding for transportation infrastructure should be user based and financially self-sustainable. Continuing to rob Peter to pay for Paul by allowing one user mode group to freeload off another user mode group when it has the ability to pay is not only social engineering, but it lacks equity and is a form of tax discrimination.

Be it by the state by state population related affirmative action of the Electoral College, one of the underlying reasons Donald Trump was elected as the next President of The United States was due to a direct correlation and response to the dictatorial social engineering mindset of the ruling party, and to bring back some equity, personal and financial responsibility to our democracy.

Equity requires that bicyclists need to be paying for the bicycle infrastructure they utilize and continually want more of. If the City of Portland wants federal funding for bike share programs, it needs to come from a pot of federal money that bicyclists directly contribute taxes and/or fees into, and not be siphoned off or raided from the Highway Trust Fund which is primarily supported by the federal user taxes on fuels that motorists and the trucking industry pay.

Instead of expecting the Highway Trust Fund to be an on tap ATM for the mode users that don't contribute into the account, the city needs apply equity to the bike share funding agenda item and include a way to create a federal pot of money that directly comes from the bicycle community. One potential way this can be done at the federal level is to propose assessing a national tax - possibly as much as a 10% tax - on the sale of new bicycles, bicycle equipment, accessories and safety gear.

Keeping the bike share program as written in the city's Federal Legislative Agenda continues to allow the bicycling community to shirk off any responsibility to pay their own way which is also reflected by the absence of bicyclists following the rules of the road they expect drivers to follow. If the city is unwilling to include equity with an option whereby the bicycling community makes financial contributions into a national pot of money, the bike share funding request needs to be dropped from the federal legislative agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker

Northeast Portland