

Rosenberg Corey

From: Wayne Baum <wlbaum@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2017 10:57 AM
To: SHS Exhibits
Cc: Sen Courtney; Sen MonnesAnderson
Subject: Testimony re. SB 1024

shs.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov

Dear Senator Gelser and Committee members,

I live on a rural residential/special agriculture parcel SE of Salem in Marion County. SB 1024 appears to be an insidious attempt to circumvent our excellent land use laws that have served Oregon well for decades. While its sponsors promote it as a solution to much needed low income housing, its actual effect is to threaten our limited ground water supply, put stress on police, fire, and other essential services including school bus transportation, and increasing congestion and wear on rural roads. Further, it does nothing to actually address the needs of the low income and elderly populations.

This bill is likely to have a negative impact on rural residents and farmers. I live in a limited groundwater sensitive area. Our water is obtained by well, and like many others on my block, we are on our second well because the first one went dry. Also many of my neighbors suffer low flows by the end of the summer as a result of diminished ground water. This situation is not uncommon in many parts of rural Oregon, yet SB 1024 is so broadly written it provides no safeguards to protect against over-drawing. Not only would the water supply of current residents be threatened by doubling density, adjacent farm operations also would be put at risk.

I do not see how this bill would satisfy the desire to provide housing for low income individuals or elderly people. The bill would allow attached as well as detached self-contained units, yet it would not restrict these units from being large, expensive, and beyond the means of that targeted population.

It is not good planning to locate low income and elderly residential populations where there is no public transportation and essential services and when we talk about transportation options in most rural areas it comes down to the automobile. I live barely a mile from the Salem UBG, but the nearest Chariots Transit is more than 2 miles away and there is no shoulder, let alone a sidewalk to reach it. The nearest market is over three miles away; standalone bank, 6 miles. Even the bicycle does not offer a viable alternative. I am a lifelong cyclist, but I would not recommend Battle Creek Road (off which I live) to any but the most confident and experienced riders. County roads as a whole are not user friendly for pedestrians and most cyclists.

At a time when we are all struggling to limit the effects of global climate change, do we really want to *enlarge* our carbon foot print and increase our dependence on the automobile? If we are concerned about low income workers and their limited financial resources, do we want to harness them with the expense of owning and operating an automobile rather than encouraging more housing where there are jobs, services and transit and where a car is not essential? And let's not forget the children. Wouldn't we want them to be able to walk or ride their bikes to school rather than going by bus or car? Among other things, living in a car dependent area promotes obesity in children. Similarly, to stay healthy and active, the elderly need to live where they can walk or take transit to where they need to go.

I believe the authors of SB 1024 seek to undermine our land use laws for their own limited financial benefit. If the sponsors of SB 1024 or their legislative partners are promoting it as a solution to low income housing, they are mistaken and at the least, disingenuous. We've been here before, let's not be distracted by a bait and switch land grab. Let's preserve our farmland and water resources. I respectfully ask that you take a pass on this ill conceived proposal.

Sincerely,
Wayne Baum
3435 Fir Tree Dr. SE, Salem