

Submitter: Karon Johnson
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2400

Chair Marsh, Vice-Chair Andersen, Vice-Chair Breese-Iverson, and members of the House Committee On Housing and Homelessness, thank you for the opportunity to comment on HB 2400.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary. Oregon law already allows several ways for owners to add an additional residence onto their existing farmland. It appears to me that the bill is structured ultimately to allow land owners to subdivide their land for a commercial sale.

As well, how is it to be enforced? The additional house is only supposed to be for certain specified relatives. Who is going to monitor this? If the State is going to take this seriously, it will have to set up a separate bureaucracy to vet the proposed recipient and ensure they are in fact a qualifying relative. What is this going to cost taxpayers? Second, if the relative moves out, the property owner can lease the house for 18 months, then sell it to anyone. What agency is going to monitor: 1) when the house is vacated; and 2) that it remains a rental for 18 months before resale? Obviously, there will not be any way to monitor compliance for this program, without huge administrative costs.

Which makes one think that the real purpose of this bill is a back-door way of allowing farm land to be subdivided for commercial purposes, without a developer having to pay the necessary additional infrastructure costs. The result will be thousands of more people living in the country and working in the city, with the increased costs of having to improve the county roads. We know who will pay for that: the taxpayers.

Thank you,
Karon Johnson