

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

February 9, 2021

To: Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Wildlife Recovery; others

Re: I OPPOSE [SB 32]...as written...but, a creation of a "Fee District" could solve the problem.

I have been living in Newberg, Oregon a little over four years and to be quite frankly, I don't like how the Oregon State Legislature treats farmers, ranchers and other folks who preserve the resource economies of; Agriculture, Timber products, Fisheries and Mining.

The Legislature always speaks in "double-talk" the example here in [SB 32] language, "...change the fee cap for various fees..." should be more truthfully written as, "...we are going to raise the fee cap or fee caps for various fees related to livestock branding and feed lot licensure, get over it knuckleheads."

I am not a communist. I believe the Fee increases for Branding Inspections and Feed Lot Licensure must increase for a variety of well founded reasons.

I vehemently OPPOSE placing these "Fee Increases" on Ranchers and Feed Lot owners.

Here is my funding idea.

Currently, there are three(3) pieces legislative crap concerned with increasing UGBs working their way through committees. They are; [SB 16], [HB 2708] and [HB 2160] all designed to allow Oregon Cities to expand their Urban Growth Boundaries, so a few well-healed people can get rich quick under the government's illusory gimmick known as, "Affordable Housing."

So...Why not create a "Fee District" representing a "Fee" to levied on each acre a city expands their UGB?

Then apply the "Fee District" to the aforementioned pieces of legislative crap. Imagine a "mountain of cash" that could be raised.

A "Restricted Use FUND" could be created so the money could only be used to defray ranching and Feed Lot costs while providing the necessary overheads of good salaries and benefits for the Department of Agriculture Employees. Inspecting Cattle Brands in a Feed Lot is not for the weak hearted, pay these folks very well!

Further, funding for; upgrades and or creation of local rendering facilities, USDA Inspections, butchering and refrigeration costs could also be realized from the imposition of a "Fee District" and corresponding construction of the "Restricted Use FUND."

Now, don't be confused with the creation of "Fee District" with a "Taxing District."

Creation of a "Taxing District" requires voters to decide how and when to screw themselves. Cities across Oregon create "Fee Increases" all the time to fund all sorts of government sanctioned activities and most people grumble about it but so what, they pay it (like putting a garbage rate increase on a sewer bill for example).

[SB 32] is a "Fee Increase." It is stated as such. Is it time for a "Fee District?"

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David S. Wall