

David S. Wall
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [(408)-287-6878]

February 22, 2021

To: Joint Committee on Natural Resources; others

Re: I OPPOSE [SB 5530]...Don't be fooled, again!

The Department of Land Conservation and Development's budget needs to be trimmed a bit.

Taken from [SB 5530 DLCD Budget review]: A Policy Option Package (POP) discussion now ensues.

"Policy Option Package 110 Housing Planning: \$3,904,344 General Fund, 6 positions, and 5.50 FTE to continue implementation of HB 2001 and HB 2003 (2019). The request includes \$2,500,000 in technical assistance grants to assist cities with over 10,000 residents with completion of work required by HB 2001."

Eliminate the General Fund allocation to support implementation of [HB 2001] and [HB 2003]. Tax moneys squeezed from property owners (via property taxes) should not be used to cause the prejudicial diminution of property values and or equities to provide housing instruments associated with middle-housing projects and their associated fee increases to support implementation.

The infrastructure required to accommodate the inclusion of middle housing could be significant. These costs do not include operations and maintenance. Why should an established community be compelled by bad law to financially subsidize middle housing projects? Looks mean-spirited and prejudicial to me.

The allocation of General Fund monies is not sufficient to complete the compelled actions of [HB 2001] and [HB 2003]. An unfunded mandate to fund compliance then rears its' prejudicial head requiring additional fee increases. Also, the General Fund allocation doesn't included monies required by the State of Oregon to defend multiple causes of actions to defend the Constitutionality of [HB 2001] and [HB 2003] and ensuing property value and property equity losses. Compensation to settle Plaintiff's losses could be significant.

POP 111 and POP 112 on Climate Change, their corresponding vagaries and ambiguities could be considered "environmental mumbo-jumbo," certainly not worth a dime of General Fund money especially, when China and India's pollution will negate any and all accomplishments Oregon will hope to even to dream of achieving.

To illustrate how the State of Oregon's Legislature cares about the "climate," focus on the following; **[HB 4079 (2016)]→[HB 2282 (2021)]**; Note how Bend's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) was allowed to expand in **[HB 4079 (2016)]**and the reasons why...and...the devious way **[HB 2282 (2021)]** involving the Department of State Lands, DLC&D, the LC&D Commission and the City of Bend is allowing to "end-run" Land Use Laws" for the sake of Economic Development. I can't find any "Climate Change" crap here.

Let us not forget to view; **[HB 2336 (2019)]**, How is life in Redmond these days? Rich pensioners are quiet people. **Also, check-out the following (2021) legislation: [HB 2708], [HB 2160] and [SB 16]**. Where's all the "Climate Change and Vehicle Miles Traveled " in these pieces of legislative crap? So much for **POP 090** too.

The inclusion of systemic racism in **[HB 2488]** will invite civil rights and reverse discrimination causes of action.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David S. Wall