David S. Wall P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [408-287-6838]

May 22, 2021

To: House Special Committee on Wildfire Recovery; [others]

Re: I OPPOSE [HB 3126 A(-1)]...

Excerpt from [HB 3126 A(-1)] states, "SECTION 1. The Legislative Policy and Research Office shall study strategies to promote recovery from the 2020 wildfire season and present the results of the study in a report to an appropriate committee or interim committee of the Legislative Assembly, in the manner provided in ORS 192.245, on or before September 15, 2022.

Background:

Whispering Pines Mobile Home Park (herein WPMHP) is a commercial enterprise located in the Urban Reserve of the City of Phoenix but...Not in the City of Phoenix's Urban Growth Boundary.

The Charlotte Ann Water District service area is a scant fifteen (15) feet from WPMHP.

The issue concerning itself with [HB 3126 A (-1)] is permitting WPMHP to be annexed into Charlotte Ann Water District to receive access to safe drinking water through this piece of legislation rather than slug it out with the burdensome and oppressive government "red-tape" associated with [ORS 431.705(4) - ORS 431.760].

Questions:

WPMHP has been in existence since the "1970's." Why hasn't the City of Phoenix expanded its' UGB to incorporate WPMHP into its' UGB?

The "contract" between the WPMHP land owners and tenants was not entered into the record for your perusal. Why not? Are the owners of the WPMHP obligated to provide "safe drinking water" to the tenants?

WPMHP owners state their drinking water wells have been compromised due to the affects from suffering a wildfire which destroyed (46) mobile homes sparing (17) mobile homes.

Why has the owners of WPMHP relied on "ground water" to be the lynchpin for the success of their commercial enterprise when potable water from the Charlotte An Water District is a mere (15) feet away from the premises of WPMHP?

*Safe Drinking Water is available to WPMHP but is very expensive. Again, where is the contract between WPMHP owners and the tenants? Who is obligated to pay for water?

*Since Safe Drinking Water is available to WPMHP; [HB 3126 A(1)] at "Section 1: 6(b)" is not satisfied

*[HB 3126 A(-1)] is an issue of "convenience" for the property owners rather than a "threat to public's safety and health."

*The WPMHP owners had prior experience with wells running dry but, only drilled additional ones instead of petitioning the City of Phoenix to annex them into their UGB.

*WPMHP is a commercial enterprise who relied upon a never ending source of ground water when an alternative source of Domestic Water was a mere (15) feet away.

Until the aforementioned questions are answered into the public testimony I OPPOSE [HB 3126 A(-1)] as a legitimate strategy for Wildfire recovery.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ David S. Wall