

David S. Wall
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [(408)-287-6878]

March 19, 2019

To: **Senators:** Dembrow; Olsen; Bentz, Prozanski; Roblan; Thatcher; **Representatives** Noble; Post

Re: I OPPOSE [SB 88]. And any other cockamamie crap attacking irreplaceable and priceless farm lands.

Here we go again. Another legislative attack on irreplaceable and priceless farm lands by increasing the population in rural Oregon where public services; if they exist, are funded at the "bare minimum" or rely on "volunteers."

"Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)" in rural Oregon are the latest affordable housing gimmick and cheesy economic development scheme sired from the bastard loins of the "Senate Interim Committee on Environmental and Natural Resources."

Let's first discuss the finances of those who would construct an ADU on their rural property (two(2) acres minimum). Will the ADU's be exempt from the excoriating terms of **[HB 3349]** which denies (amongst other items) "mortgage interest deductions for a residence other than the taxpayer's principle residence?" Better yet, be prepared to explain how **[HB 3226]** could be used to building an ADU "across lot lines if the owner of the property has a recorded covenant not to sell the properties separately."

[SB 88] does not address aged septic systems and or water sources and their cumulative effects in rural areas. Can the property owners primary residence's septic system accommodate the flows from an ADU with, let's say, twenty (20) beer drinking, dope smoking college kids on spring vacation? Will an additional well have to be drilled if the primary residence's water supply is not adequate? In Yamhill County (which colloquially is more accurately referred to as "Scam-hill County) there will be absolutely "No enforcement" and or "Inspections" of these ADUs once permits are issued.

[SB 88] could also be extended to **[HB 2469]** which begs the legislature to allow "a second dwelling in forest lands due to the size of the primary residence owner's ever expanding family." The "ever expanding family" doctrine could include a commercial enterprise for housing farm workers who are now "forest workers" much like illegal aliens are considered "new Americans" under **[SB 856]**. The neat little kicker here is will "farm worker housing" be redefined as "forest worker housing" to qualify for **[HB 2137]** which extends the sunset for the tax credits associated with providing (affordable) housing for farm workers? You can bet your "Bippy" it will.

Now let's be fair and reasonable. If the aforementioned legislation occurs, isn't it reasonable that an additional fee be assessed as an additional funding source to fund a long overdue piece of legislation, **[HB 2856]** which is the study of "ground water" in Oregon?

So many pieces of legislation and so little time. Screw **[SB 88]** and its' environmentally unholy relatives.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David S. Wall

/// /// ///