

Submitter: Denice Searcy
On Behalf Of: Retirees Landlords and Snowbirds
Committee: Senate Committee On Finance and Revenue
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1095
NO on SB 1095

SB 1095 would allow cities and counties to impose a fee on noncommercial residences that are vacant for more than 180 days in a calendar year. When owners of a second property spend time at their second home, they buy goods and services in the area, thus supporting small businesses and stimulating the local economy. And regardless of whether they are actively occupying the property year-round, they are still paying local property taxes.

There are many persons in Oregon who are “snowbirds” and others in very hot states that enjoy coming to their second home in Oregon during the blazing hot months. This is “double jeopardy” in the area of taxation, in effect penalizing a person for having a second or vacation home/cabin. Sometimes properties are vacant when up for sale for an extended amount of time going through the process of listing and escrow. What if a person works out of state, then this would be an encumbrance for them. There is a whole host of scenarios that would come under this ridiculous legislation. How do you propose to “monitor” occupancy? And what would the fee schedule be? Administered by city, county or state? So much confusion.

This is a very bad bill all the way around. It reeks of oppression and socialistic/communistic types of tyranny. It's not practical as well as being overly oppressive on the people. Who thinks of these things? I suggest fiscal responsibility with the taxes and fees that are already collected by one of the most heavily taxed states in the US. There are more tax bills this legislative session than ever before, it's too much. People are leaving this state in droves thanks to the liberal, WOKE policies and laws that we have here.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

Denice Searcy,
Eugene, Oregon