

I support the Oregon legislature passing legislation providing direction on how to implement the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision, *Martin vs. Boise*. HB 3115 seems like a good approach giving individual jurisdictions the authority to set site-specific policy as long as it complies with *Martin vs. Boise*.

HB 2367, on the other hand, goes too far. It would remove a lot of local management. For example, many small neighborhood and other high-use parks are not suitable for long-term camping by homeless. HB 2367 would result in considerable local opposition in some areas. Some will be concerned about their children using playgrounds. It could result in parks and other areas being closed at night. Free parks, such as Pilot Butte State Park in Bend, could charge fees to be exempt from HB 2367 much to the annoyance of locals who live around it and use it regularly. I think this attempted blanket fix provided by HB 2367 goes too far and removes more knowledgeable local management of this issue.

I am supportive of major efforts to help homeless and other vulnerable populations and have participated in community forums on this topic. At a Bend Park and Recreation Board meeting last December I suggested the Board waive system development charges for any facility that serves homeless and other vulnerable populations. The Board adopted that policy. As a member of Bend's Urban Renewal Advisory Board, I championed including more services to vulnerable populations in the guiding documents creating the Core Area Urban Renewal District. Yet, despite my concern regarding this problem, I think HB 2367 is not the solution. I urge you to not support it.