

**Oregon Building Officials Association**  
**Talking Points in Opposition to HB 3145**

*Local governments must go through a rigorous program assumption process with the State prior to being granted the authority to enforce the state building code on a local level. In order to assume authority to regulate building safety locally, a municipality must demonstrate to the State that it has the ability to provide a consistent, acceptable level of service to its citizens (ORS 455.150). And once a municipality has been granted this local authority, it must then periodically provide documentation to the State that service levels are being maintained and that the municipality is adhering to state law. The State, therefore, currently has significant ability to exercise oversight of the services delivered by municipalities to their citizens.*

While we certainly agree that it is in everyone's best interests that capital construction projects receiving state-supplied funding proceed in a timely and efficient manner, and that these projects be effectively managed and efficiently coordinated, we disagree that this cannot be accomplished by municipalities at the local level.

Local building departments throughout Oregon provide streamlined and expedited services currently. This bill would take away the ability for local building departments to continue providing streamlined services for projects that greatly benefit from this local coordination. The result of sending building safety oversight to the State would ultimately be counter to the goals and objectives of this bill: projects would take much longer to be approved and would cost more to build.

One critical area where streamlining occurs most effectively at a local level is with building departments coordinating timely reviews and inspections by Land Use, Fire, Public Works, and others. If the State were to assume the authority for building review and permitting, this coordination would be extraordinarily difficult and delays would undoubtedly occur.

Local building departments are able to adapt more quickly, innovate, and customize services to meet local challenges. This happens every day. Examples of what a local building department may provide:

- Inspections received by 7:00 am are conducted the same day;
- After hours and weekend inspections are offered to accommodate large concrete pours, alarm testing, or other time-sensitive inspections;
- Expedited plan review services are offered;
- Free pre-development and pre-construction meetings are offered;
- Online permitting is in widespread use and electronic plan review is quickly being adopted by many jurisdictions in Oregon.

Additionally, this bill takes away a municipality's ability to ensure the safety of its own citizens. Building safety regulation is a vital component of a municipality's public health, safety, and welfare commitment to its citizens. For the same reasons that it would be bad policy to remove local control over police and fire services, it is bad policy to remove local control over public safety within the built environment. Also, giving the State authority over permitting and inspection of State-funded projects with an emphasis on "expediting" and "cost saving" may not ultimately provide the level of rigorous public safety oversight that Oregon citizens expect and deserve.

For these reasons, the Oregon Building Officials Association opposes this bill.