

February 27, 2021

From: CPO 10, Washington County Oregon

To: Oregon Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

Re: HB 2645, Section 1

To whom it may concern,

CPO 10 of Washington County is a group of involved rural residents who meet monthly to discuss area concerns, activities and legislative updates.

CPO 10 would like to register our concern with the potential impact of Section 1 only of HB 2645. We believe the remaining Sections of the bill should be carried forward.

HB 2645 Section 1 removes needed protections from dog barking and containment in an area where many of our rural residents raise livestock and live peacefully. Section 1 would negatively impact farmers and their livestock. Barking is a known livestock stressor. Temple Grandin has done studies on barking's negative impacts. Yet, without the farm impact test applied to dog training, no barking mitigation would be required.

Additionally, Section 1 removes the dog waste requirement provided for under kennels and similar group dog activities. Most rural residents are on local wells fed by area streams and waterways.

Considering METRO and other agencies do not allow pets of any kind in their parks, including Chehalem Ridge Nature Park, allowing dog training facilities in rural areas does not make sense either for many of the same reasons.

In Washington County, part of the EFU zoning definition states "The purpose of the Exclusive Farm Use District is to preserve and maintain agricultural lands for farm use consistent with existing and future needs for agricultural products, forests and open spaces; to conserve and protect scenic resources; to maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources." Allowing dog training facilities, goes against this definition in every capacity. As HB 2645 states that no more than ten people would be allowed in a dog facility at any given time there is grave concern as to who will actually regulate this which is virtually impossible to know if there are ten or one hundred people all at once.

Given Oregon's strong environmental record protecting its watersheds, Section 1 of HB 2645 recklessly places the health of area residents and livestock at risk.

There are people who believe that it comes down to equity and that one type of facility and animal involved should not be favored one over the other. Under the 2012 bill, dog training is allowed anywhere on the property, either outside or within existing farm buildings. In Washington and Lane Counties, the building must have been in existence prior to 2019. In the other 34 counties, the building must have been in existence prior to 2015. From the 2012 bill this proves if dog facilities were approved in Section 1 it would already create more inequity since the building already has to be in existence in most places and goes against what those in favor

are desiring. Another major difference is that there are very few large scale dog breeding operations. Bovines and Equines are often raised in great numbers on the property where the buildings are located and with that comes increased regulations and are very different from canines and require different requirements for agricultural buildings. Bovines and Equines also do not have the ability to make continuous noise like barking dogs. **Further, dog training classes would be allowed to be conducted outdoors where a facility is not even needed which is often very different from bovine and equine agricultural buildings and therefore makes dog facilities in its own classification.** There is no requirement that dog training must take place on an active farm, growing crops, or livestock like other animals and facilities are.

Lastly, we expect that many of the people participating in non-Ag dog training activities are driving in from out of the area with their pet/product which changes the definition of agriculture.

I understand this is not a land use bill and section but if it is adopted everyone must consider all of the other ramifications at both the county and state level that come with it.

We respectfully ask that Section 1 only of HB 2645 be set aside for further impact study and pass the remaining sections of HB 2645.

Thank you for your time,

CPO 10 Chair

Andy Haugen

503-887-9601

Haug6741@pacificu.edu