

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** Tim Jaskoski <tjaskoski.1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 12, 2017 10:14 AM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Subject:** SB1024

Dear Honorable Committee Members,

I strongly disapprove of the changes proposed in SB 1024 and urge you to vote against its adoption.

It assures nothing in the way of providing low-cost housing. If it did, and it involved changes within the urban growth boundary, then it might have merit. Otherwise, it appears to benefit only those who want financial gain who don't need it as well as to promote something along the lines of urban sprawl in rural areas.

Certainly, this would lead to neighbor conflicts. Most people in rural residential areas seek privacy and a little escape from the compact, crowded urban setting. Some may have livestock, as is the case where we live, which might lead to some conflicts. It would not be right for those who purchased rural properties expecting them to remain rural to be faced with such undesirable changes in zoning.

Additionally, and quite importantly, there have already been expensive legal battles over limited groundwater in areas such as South Salem and Silverton. By allowing additional pressure on areas where that has been an issue in the past, it will result in further conflict over this limited and essential resource.

It could be expected that noise complaints would increase as well.

According to the book *The Great Inversion and the Future of the American City* by Alan Ehrenhalt, the trend nationally is in the opposite direction as this SB would take us, that is, renewed, more livable and more compact urban living with mixed housing that includes more affordable housing. There are many more good reasons for such a trend than SB 1024, by a long shot.

For the above reasons, I strongly oppose this bill and urge you to kill it. It provides no certain solutions, rather promises more problems.

Sincerely,  
Tim Jaskoski