Tuesday, June 2, 2015

Regarding HB 2938 To: Senate Committee on Business and Transportation Senator Lee Beyer : Chair Senator Fred Girod : Vice Chair Senator : Rod Monroe Senator : Chuck Riley Senator : Chuck Thomson Committee Administrator: james.LaBar@State.or.us

OCVA has testified for HB 2938 twice before but there is an important point that must be made.

We spoke about the overwhelming House vote supporting HB 2938 (59:1).

We believe this overwhelming House support is because <u>HB 2938 offers meaningful</u> relief to rural Oregonians already suffering from the economic decline. See attached chart. (**Poverty rate** 16.9%; **Unemployment rate** 8.10%; **Food Stamps** 20.9%. Portland Oregonian <u>http://projects.oregonlive.com/maps/foodstamps/</u>)

HB 2938 clearly and effectively solves a problem for tens of thousands of Oregonians who choose to live outside cities and need or desire to improve their homes.

Your House colleagues recognized this when they passed the bill <u>as written without</u> <u>amendments.</u>

Let HB 2938 work without limitations.

Limiting the bill to protect only homeowners living outside UGBs makes no sense. Cities either can't or won't annex land outside their UGB without that land first being brought into the UGB. The problem HB 2938 solves occurs <u>inside</u> UGBs.

## Let HB 2938 work without exemptions.

Exempting provisions written into IGAs, USAs, Comp Plans or other local contracts/ agreements render the bill useless. Every city would take advantage of this.

## Let HB 2938 work FOR the taxpayers

After reviewing the testimony we found no one from the general public objecting to this bill. The opposition is from those who benefit financially from forcing people to annex where there is no legitimate reason for such a demand.

Please let the Senate decide the merits of the bill as is.

Sincerely,

Richard Reid, Chair Oregon Communities for a Voice in Annexations <u>www.ocva.org</u> :: info@ocva.org PO Box 1388, North Plains, OR 97133-1388 541-747-314

PS - A more complete version of the Legislative Council's legal opinion, "ORS 222.115 in the context of the 1991 Act through which it was adopted, we interpret the statute to be the defining source of and limitation on city authority to obtain consents to annexation in exchange for extraterritorial services. We also interpret the statute to allow that procedure to be used by cities only when they are the providers of services." (Jan 9, 2006, LC letter to Representative Krummel)