

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

**Via Electronic Mail**

April 18, 2019

**To:** Senate Committee on Finance and Revenue; **Senator** Thatcher; **Representative:** Post; Noble  
[and many others]

**Re: I DO NOT SUPPORT: [SB 1045]:** Rent a room get a property tax and taxing District exemption?

**[SB 1045]:** "Authorizes city or county to adopt property tax exemption for portion of principal place of residence used by homeowner to rent space in residence to individuals seeking such space."

When I read the text of **[SB 1045]** it dawned on me, having a rudimentary grasp of elementary mathematics is not a requirement for a Senator to be seated on the Senate Committee on Finance and Revenue. Even putting shoes on the correct feet is not a requirement-but no worries, when it comes to housing, we are in the world of "inclusion" or is it "illusion?" (It's my fault, I always confuse the two when reading the Housing Bills.)

**[SB 1045]** if anyone should take this Bill seriously, should be nestled into a section of one of the greatest waste of taxpayer's monies, expletive deletedly referred to, as **[HB 2003]** (which educated communities swear this Bill is the bastard progeny of **[HB 4006]**).

The amount of work **[SB 1045]** will hoist upon government and taxing Districts to execute the conditions referenced and incorporated in this Bill to accurately; track, record, report and audit its' requirements is so humongous no one knows how much taxpayer monies will be needed. There are "No;" Revenue Impact, Fiscal Impact and Budget reports to characterize and account for the costs of this piece of legislative crap.

Could **[SB 1045]** be used in the following scenario: Non-profit corporation "X" participates in the "home share program" and does so with the intent to acquire a property, let's say a single family home, flowing from the finances of revenue generated in conjunction with tax exemptions. After a few years, Non-profit corporation "X" uses the equity in the first house and repeats the aforementioned economic model and purchases additional properties using the "home share program-get rich scheme," for who knows how long. At some point in time, at the pleasure and convenience of Non-profit corporation "X," the property and or properties are placed for sale at market rate. Now don't fret to much as to the plight of those who are summarily "kicked-out" into the cold, wet streets because the "home share program" for them is, no more. These folks will be protected by **[HB 2916 A]** and the "yurt-villes" this Bill will create in public parks and or other properties within a city's UGB.

Meanwhile, before the Non-profit corporation "X" dissolves and cashes out, the population grows in the affected city triggering the dictates of **[HB 3317]** which compels a city to increase its' Urban Growth Boundary in proportion to the population increases.

So, the moral of this story is; **[SB 1045]** will make slick operators of non-profits rich, increase "yurt-villes" and increase the UGB of cities destroying more irreplaceable and priceless farm lands.

Just out of curiosity, who wrote **[SB 1045]** and how much taxpayer's money, some of it is my money, was spent to date producing this piece of legislative shite?

Do everybody a favor, let **[SB 1045]** die an ignominious death.

*Respectfully submitted,*  
/s/ David S. Wall