

Submitter: Alana Kenagy  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Natural Resources and Wildfire  
Measure, Appointment or SB78  
Topic:

I am a 4th generation family farmer in Benton County. I feel immensely lucky to have access to live and make a living from land I would not be able to afford to buy in this day and age.

I support SB 77 & 78, as introduced, to supply sideboards/close loopholes which have been allowing things like vacation rentals and luxury home speculators to price young working people out of their chances at land based livelihoods.

My friend who has worked and managed other peoples farms for over 14 years, set out to buy land (with the help of marrying a nurse) a couple years ago. From asking their realtor, most of the properties they looked at were likely to be outbid by folks/companies looking to profit from AirB-n-b style ownership. Eventually they managed to get a farm, through a highly competitive application process with an SWCD east of Portland. She won the chance to buy and farm a 10 acre organic farm with a house, with below-market price due to a working lands conservation easement.

The confluence of land use policy and private property is often polarized, people care, and they have fears. What may feel like "limits to the freedom of capital(\$).... to do whatever," is a common concern. If you were fortunate enough to inherit, live long-term on, or buy, land in the EFU...it is by design that this land with high quality soils is supposed to be protected from runaway growth and development (pressures which are increasing).

I think the legislature needs to start looking more critically about the reality that people of my generation are being PRICED OUT OF LIFE by private equity, out-of-state companies, and other people and interests that have already accumulated wealth that allows them to exponentially buy more and more property. I know Mr. Hunnicut, has been succeeding in a strong(and sometimes untruthfully presented) agenda for the interests of people who may well already own multiple properties... But what about the people who are not/not yet property owners? Who represents them?

Having multiple streams of income is real. The exploitable open-endedness the existing home occupations and replacement dwellings are sometimes fine, the biggest issues I see relate to/are a question of scale: Do they make farming land more expensive for people who want to farm today, tomorrow and well into the future? Will the farming of neighbors and future generations be impacted?

I'm not advocating for telling people what to do with their property, but I am advocating for limits on opulence, limits on permanent changes to the landscape of

the state--which effects the Commons (that we all share), I hope these bills pass both houses. (I think it would be fine to adjust 77 a bit.) I think the questions with the broad umbrella of agrotourism are complicated. How do we support true farmers, without those opportunities mostly going to firms like Foley Entertainment Group and people who can afford to build trophy homes with a view? I am available to come to the table for creative thinking about this in the future. In the meantime, please help close the loopholes, via SB78 & 77 and be proactive. Thank you, senators, for your work on these bills and all the work you do to track, sense-make, and make nuanced decisions for our shared future.

Alana S. Kenagy  
Kenagy Family Farm  
Albany, OR, Willamette Valley, Kalapuya land.