

April 25, 2023

From: Michael Taylor
2020 NW Northrup Street #210
Portland OR 97209

Re.: House Bill 3501

I have read this bill in its entirety and am opposed to it.

While this bill defines - at length - all of the proposed legal ramifications and remedies for campers, it is lacking in definitions.

What is considered a reasonable period of time to "rest"? What sort of structure is allowed? Where on public property is prolonged residence acceptable? How are the disabled and their access affected? Does this new bill seek to trump the legal access of the disabled, elderly, or those seeking to use public streets, sidewalks, and common areas? Under what conditions is it acceptable to legally expel someone who is "resting" and considered "homeless?"

Remember that there are a lot of recent arrivals who consider a tent or extended tarp structure their "home" and have no intention of moving to a regulated encampment that will have rules or restrictions.

This bill is not the answer and in fact redundant if the Idaho decision about allowing camping unless the local municipality offers an alternative is still in force.

Must we have bill upon bill, law upon law, agency upon agency, contractors upon contractors? It doesn't seem as though - if people, cities, counties, states, and the federal government - worked together on a common plan to address all issues around "homelessness" we'd have one goal, no city more "attractive" than another, and everyone pulling together.

Portland and Oregon are notorious for feeling they have to invent everything from scratch when it always makes more sense to seek success and emulate it, or strive for consensus and work together.