

Susanna Julber

From: Irene Bernstein [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 10:43 AM
To: Susanna Julber
Subject: Septic to Sewer

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi,

I live on Desert Woods in Bend. I am very concerned about this project. I am 70 years old, and live on a minimal fixed income.

I am lucky to own my home without a lot of debt. But in the next several years I will need a new roof and heat pump. With the figures being put forward for the sewer project, I would be taking on a burdensome debt at my age in addition to these upcoming repairs to my home.

I think the city should go carefully lest they cause people like me to actually lose their homes. And, as you know, there are not affordable rentals in Bend.

So are we going to have more homeless people?

The city has had 20 years to plan for this. It is the ultimate unfairness to make us go into large debt for something that all the other homes in Bend are simply given.

I just happen to be unlucky to have bought this home at this time. What about the owner prior to me, or the one after me? Am I supposed to pay for this when they never spend a cent?

So unfair.

Thank you.
Irene Bernstein

Date: May 8, 2018

.

To: Susanna Julber, Senior Project and Policy Analyst

From: Robert Larkins

Re: For the record Southeast Bend Septic to Sewer Project

- Please include the following bullet points of my comments offered at the April 12, 2018 Septic to Sewer Advisory Committee meeting as public comment. I have included the comments made at the meeting and added additional comments:
- This is an important and vital project for the citizens of Bend. It must solve the waste disposal issues relating to this area but must also serve as a model for resolving this issue in other areas of the City.
- Not doing this project will leave residents in peril of the draconian measures of the "300-foot rule". It will also leave the city with a piecemeal sewer system that will likely cost more to construct, result in the continual disruption of city streets and cost more in maintenance and repair costs in the future.
- Any viable public policy must be both politically viable and financially achievable by both the City and the affected property owners.
- An ill-conceived public policy will not survive the scrutiny of public discourse.
- Ill-conceived public policy may result in major political opposition and a potential legal challenge. It is not equitable for project area residents to pay several hundred dollars per month for sewer service while most other property owners pay only the monthly service charge. Such a proposal may result in litigation based on the principal of "equal protection." In such a case no one wins and this critical infrastructure may not get installed.
- If it is the city's goal to provide sewer services to the unserved areas as quickly as possible any policy must not unduly burden the subjects of that policy.

- People are generally reluctant or opposed to change unless such change is necessary to solve an immediate and serious problem in their lives. Property owners with functioning septic systems will not see the benefit of paying significant amounts of money or incurring significant debt for something they perceive to be unnecessary.
- This project area and all of the other unserved areas in the city are part of the City of Bend. All residents of the city are required to be treated equally.
- Requiring the residents of unserved areas of the city to bear the full cost of these critical infrastructure improvements is not equitable. These costs should be spread throughout the entire city sewer district.
- What was the funding source for the Southeast Interceptor project?
- An equitable project funding will require fewer incentives. Proposed incentives will cost the city funds.
- The use of incentives should be included in the project to encourage participation in the project and assist those who are less able to pay for their connection to the system.