

David S. Wall  
P.O. Box 756 Newberg, Oregon 97132; [408-287-6838]

May 5, 2021

To: Senate Committee on Energy and Environment; [others]

**Re: I OPPOSE [HB 2654 A]...[HB 2654 A] is deceitful as it is disingenuous with respect to compensation.**

Whereas I support bringing Broadband to the rural areas, I am thoroughly OPPOSED to conveying a life estate to any entity providing Broadband across my property.

The remedy to address the "life state" or "fee simple" as the case may be is wholly unacceptable.

**[HB 2654 A]** is a "land-grab" under the pretext "Broadband" is a "utility."

Broadband is a "luxury service" and not a "utility," therefore cannot be justified by force majeure on the property of another.

As a luxury service, Broadband entities cannot assert eminent domain to achieve their business objectives.

The remedy and compensation to a third party to compel the surrender of their property in perpetuity is insufficient to address a conveyance of a "fee simple" property interest to the Broadband entity.

**[HB 2654 A]** will compel landowners to hire Attorneys and spend who knows how much money, time and frustrations to protect their land.

The landowner should be in the "driver's seat" on conveyance of their land(s) to third party Broadband entities providing a much needed but, luxury service.

***Respectfully submitted***

/s/ David S. Wall

///  
///  
///