

Submitter: Janet Redmond
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Natural Resources and
Wildfire
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1154

Committee Members,

I encourage you to vote no on SB 1154 as currently amended.

Ground and surface water pollution is a problem and in some cases in Oregon we are over subscribing our precious fresh water resources. This measure as currently drafted is not going to solve these issues and will only serve to add layers of regulation that impose unreasonable costs and administrative burdens on citizens and impedes progress.

The following provisions are particularly concerning to me:

1. The nutrient application permit provisions. Landowners or renters know and understand their land and the needs of the current and planned crops. There is no financial or other incentive for agriculture and forestry operators to over apply nutrients. Likely as a state our biggest risk in this regard is the average residential homeowner who purchases and applies any number of additives without understanding the actual needs or benefits. That is where the focus should be - not in creating new permit requirements.
2. The provisions related to installation of measuring or totalizing devices (e.g. water meters) go beyond reasonable and needed regulation. This opens up ordinary citizens to new, expensive requirements on wells that they have the established water rights to and have paid to install and maintain. It seems to me that this is shoving an urban solution (water meters for public water utilities) onto rural residents. As a trained agricultural and civil engineer, I know that there are ways to reliably and accurately estimate water use within a reasonable level of accuracy to forecast impact on groundwater aquifers without requiring meters or other similar devices on the wells used for residential or irrigation purposes.
3. The provision relating to a county prohibiting development of any new residential dwelling or ADU unless the dwelling is connected to an "urban" water supply is overly restrictive. In areas where the ground water is found to be insufficient - connecting to an urban supply should not be the only solution allowed. The infrastructure required could be cost prohibitive and the urban provider may not have sufficient capacity. Alternatives such as remotely brought in water, along with extreme conservation should be allowed. Let the homeowner determine the best approach when the local aquifer is not an option. If the water is contaminated and not suitable for human

consumption then an alternative might be for the homeowner to treat the water onsite or again a remote source. My point is that the proposed legislation offers one solution - likely the most costly solution. Please do not dictate the solution in law.