

In my testimony in opposition to HB 2144 below, I echo the concerns expressed by my wife, Laurel Hines. She expressed herself so well, I simply copied her excellent letter (husbands can plagiarize in our household). We both fought the Measure 37 subdivision that threatened our neighborhood's wells, and which seemingly might be able to be brought back to life under this bad bill.

— Brian Hines

Brian Hines

10371 Lake Drive SE • Salem, Oregon 97306

Phone: (503) 371-8892 • Email: brianhines1@gmail.com

February 15, 2017

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Oregon State Capitol

900 Court Street NE

Salem, OR 97301

RE: HB 2144

Honorable Committee Members,

I urge a "no" vote on HB 2144, and urge that it not be passed out of your committee. This bill appears to be a return to Measure 37, which was ultimately rejected by voters in the passage of Measure 49.

This bill seems designed just to benefit a few individuals at the expense and disapproval of the general public who would be affected by badly planned development that would not normally be allowed under current standards for good planning and public safety.

There seems to be no real reason for this bill in terms of benefit of the public. Rather it would likely only benefit a specific few who seek the bill as a way around current standards for proper and safe development.

We all face laws that say we cannot do what we once could do. We used to be able to drive cars without seat belts, or drive while holding a cell phone to our ears, before it became known that such actions endangered everyone else on the road as well as ourselves. Standards and laws change to account for new knowledge and to benefit the safety and welfare of the general public.

This bill is like saying that a few people should be allowed to text while driving or hold a phone to their ear while driving, because they bought their phone or installed just a lap belt before the shoulder belt requirement came into effect.

Creating a law to benefit a few at the expense of many, circumventing current laws and regulations, is a very bad precedent. The legislature should not be in the business of granting special favors to a few people by creating specific laws to benefit them.

This bill could allow development that threatens prime farm or forest land, increasing infrastructure costs by creating poorly planned development where no infrastructure exists. It also could allow development where current regulations show that groundwater is threatened, or where septic requirements have changed, due to new information about the area involved.

HB 2144 appears to be a very bad bill.

Sincerely,

Brian Hines

Brian Hines
Salem, Oregon USA