

Submitter: Tom Triplett  
On Behalf Of: Self  
Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness  
Measure: HB3501

I have studied the text of this deeply flawed proposed legislation. There are several concerns which come to mind. The text is sufficiently ambiguous to be a gold mine for the litigious. For example the term "public space" uses the words "including but not limited to". So there is no clear definition to guide the local authorities. So do you err on the side of an expansive scope to avoid penalties? What is a public transportation facility? A private bus terminal open to the public? How about a street, a highway or easements abutting them?

In central and eastern Oregon, there are high risk areas of wild fire. Allowing unfettered access to conservation easements adjacent to residences enhances the danger of a careless cigarette discard or a campfire spreading and causing life threatening conflagration.

It is also tempting to argue about the premise of this bill. It assumes that the homeless are without fault and that times and tides have conspired against them. Is that premise universally true? What about the drug addict? Without fault? What of the person who volunteers to be a nomad? What about the person who is discharged from their job for theft?

Bottom line. This bill is deeply flawed and should not, without more in depth review, emerge from committee