

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** Aileen Kaye <arkaye2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 13, 2017 6:30 PM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Cc:** sen.petercourtney@state.or.us; Sen Boquist; Sen Gelser; Sen MonnesAnderson; Sen.michaeldembrow@state.or.us; Senator Burdick; Sen Prozanski; rep.brianclem@state.or.us  
**Subject:** "No" on SB 1024

Dear Sen. Gelser and members of the Committee,

I am urging you to not pass this bill out of committee. This bill creates massive negative impacts to rural residential lands/residents and neighboring EFU lands. This is almost as bad as M. 37. As you know, the people spoke and M. 49 prevailed.

I live in a rural area because I have horses. I utilize rural land for pasture, hay, and riding. People should not be moving out of urban areas unless they have needs that can only be met in rural areas.

Those currently living in rural residential areas and those who farm next to rural residential areas are going to be shocked when (if) they hear about this bill.

This bill is being heard in a social service-oriented committee instead of the Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources. With all due respect, I must say that this can lead to dangerous consequences not foreseen by those unfamiliar with the complexities of land use law.

Negative impacts of this bill:

1. Potential violations of Right to Farm as many more conflicts will result from the addition of a possible 12,000 more homes in rural areas.
2. Loss of property values for those currently living in rural residential zones. Over 12,000 new homes could be built in non-urban areas=travesty.

3. Increased crime due to renters who might be living in the second dwelling.
4. Loss of habitat; loss of open space; loss of soils conducive to growing crops, flowers, pasture for farm animals, etc.
5. Urban sprawl and urbanization of the countryside.
6. Water shortages.
7. Lack of adequate funding for emergency responders.
8. Loss of more rural lands for additional schools.

I could go on and on. This bill is an insult to our system of land use planning in Oregon.

I was told not to worry because county commissioners can deny requests for a second home. Fox guarding the henhouse. In most counties, the campaigns of county commissioners are financed by local chambers of commerce. Chambers of Commerce value housing starts, not farmland. I have NO faith that county commissions would deny applications for second homes.

Please do not proceed with this bill. It has no redeeming features and will cause havoc and litigation for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aileen Kaye  
10095 Parrish Gap Rd., SE  
Turner, OR 97392  
503-743-4567

