



May 6th, 2019

To: Senator Chuck Riley,

RE: HB2423

Dear Senator Riley and Committee,

I am writing to convey my concern for HB2423 and strongly believe it has been steered away from what the original intent of the bill was, to give a legal pathway for tiny houses to be part of the solution for the affordable housing crises we have across Oregon. I have two major problems with this bill as is, the cost of additional engineering and infrastructure for any sized sprinkler system if the residential code does not require sprinklers in all residential housing, and the lack of representation that the tiny house industry has in any future code committee.

The sprinklers are and have been a great addition to the cost of tiny house manufacturing. My company is the contractor working on the Hiatus project in Bend Oregon and we came across several additional fees with no clear path to navigating what the state building code was requiring us to do. We were told we could build to a single head calculation, but still ended up with 7 sprinklers in a 392 square foot house. We may be able to get less heads (5 would be minimum according to a conversation with the Oregon Fire Sprinkler Coalition), but that would take additional engineering and the cost is already well over \$10,000 in a \$100,000 house. This may work with the Hiatus development because 75% of that cost can be spread across 22 houses, but it is not feasible for the small developments or the individual builds. This does not help with the affordable housing issues we are fighting.

It is also concerning that sprinklers in tiny houses, not in the residential code in general, is the conversation that this keeps coming around to. I understand it is because of the loft and the lack of egress that some feel a loft space may have, yet there is no requirement for a rope ladder that can be hung from the egress window if there is a fire at the bottom of the stairs out of the loft. Is it better to break your neck jumping out of your loft window or burn in the fire? Perhaps an unfair question, but I hope you see my point.

My other concern I find to be an even more important topic to mention. It is frustrating and insulting that the tiny house industry has been excluded from any future committees. I have dedicated countless hours to understanding the codes we can build to and helping others understand that code. I have even lost a good deal of business to individuals that want, or can only afford, something that is not covered by code. I have always said, if there is not a clear path for people legally live, they will choose a different path. The industry knows what people are truly asking for. There should be a committee for the small house code, and there should be at least two tiny house representatives on that committee.

Unfortunately, I am unable to make tomorrow's hearing on the bill like I had planned, but I trust I have made my point clear enough and hope to continue to be part of this much needed conversation. I ask that we continue working on this bill and focus on how tiny houses are part of the solution.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly if you have any questions.

Nathan Light Watson

nathan@tinysmarthouse.com
**State Lead of Oregon Chapter
of American Tiny House Association
CEO of Tiny SMART House
www.tinysmarthouse.com**