

I am writing in support of HB 2645. It is unfortunate that the current statute does not include the definition for 'dog training facility', only 'equine training facilities', thus ORS455.315 must be amended. This bill treats dog training facilities the same as horse training facilities for purposes of the building code only – not land use law. This is an important distinction as the building USE is the same as what equestrians use their buildings for - training for the activities and/or sports we do with our canine partners; training clinics and classes for agility, scent work, SAR, obedience, and so many more. Further, dog training facilities are allowed as a Conditional Use in EFU zoned land in most counties or regulated in some manner by local jurisdictions via land use law which would require owners to first gain land use approval from the jurisdiction where the facility will be located.

Section 1 adds a definition of “dog training facility” to ORS 455.315.

This statute contains an exemption from the state commercial building code for buildings used as “equine training facilities.” The exemption only applies if the farm building is:

- A. Located on a farm;
- B. Occupied by 10 or fewer people at all times;
- C. Not a building regulated by the State Fire Marshal; and
- D. Not within a floodplain.

If all of these criteria are met, then a farm building used to train horses is not subject to the commercial building code. If the farm is within an incorporated city, which is unlikely, the city can disregard the statute and apply building code regulations. As long as all things remain equal for horses and dogs there is no reason to hold dog trainers to a different standard than horse trainers for purposes of the commercial building code.

Section 1 of this bill corrects the inequity. It does nothing more. I'm hoping that you will approve this bill and let us continue to train all animals, equally.

With thanks - Sharon Gretch.