

## Winkel Karen

---

**From:** Rayburn Troy  
**Sent:** Monday, February 18, 2013 9:04 AM  
**To:** Winkel Karen  
**Subject:** FW: Why I signed -- 1. My farm in

For the file / public record on HB 2696:

**From:** Daniel and JoAnn Keeley [mailto:mail@change.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 18, 2013 9:01 AM  
**To:** Rayburn Troy  
**Subject:** Why I signed -- 1. My farm in

Dear Oregon House Committee on Transportation and Economic Development (Committee Administrator),

I just signed Friends of French Prairie's petition "[Oregon House of Representatives: Stop House Bill 2696](#)" on Change.org.

Here's why I signed:

1. My farm in the way
2. Climate Change Issue
3. Viable Agricultural Area

Sincerely,  
Daniel and JoAnn Keeley  
St. Paul, Oregon

---

There are now 10 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Friends of French Prairie by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/oregon-house-of-representatives-stop-house-bill-2696?response=91934d5d0884>

Dan and JoAnn Keeley  
5975 Buyserie Rd. NE  
St. Paul, OR 97137  
February 6, 2013

Transportation Committee Members

It has come to my attention the Transportation Committee has agreed to grant a hearing to HB 2696, the "Coastal Parkway" bill. I ask you to consider opposing this ill-advised project for the following reasons:

1. It is bad traffic engineering. I-5 is at capacity now. Shifting traffic from 99E to I-5 will simply relocate the mess from Dundee to Tualatin and points north along I-5. ODOT has the right approach with the Newberg bypass which is actually under construction now.
2. It is bad land use planning. It will generate enormous pressure to develop the northern portion of French Prairie. The project will generate very large traffic volumes through the middle of French Prairie, inflate land values and profit speculators, make it difficult to continue farming, and increase pressure for conversion of land to urban uses. I have reviewed many development applications as a land use engineer for Marion County (I'm now retired) and can say from experience the land use program cannot (and should not) prevent development if agriculture is not a viable use for the land. The land use system cannot be counted on to control development under these circumstances.
3. It is opposed by the local jurisdictions such as Marion County and the City of St. Paul as well as by ODOT. Remember the design life of an ODOT highway pavement is usually specified as 20-30 years. The developers will be kindly donating it to the taxpayers just in time for ODOT to repave it.
4. The greenhouse gas problem is real and may be very serious indeed. We need to reduce our energy consumption at least until we know for sure, not promote afternoon trips to the Casinos.
5. The politics is very bad. I think most legislators do not yet understand the depth of anger building such a project would generate. And not just from us farmers, either, you are going to have every land use planner, property rights advocate and environmental activist in the state on your hands.

Also, please be advised the drafters of the bill have included a zinger for good measure. See Section 2(5), eminent domain. The bill will require the promoters to reimburse ODOT for only the "compensation paid to property owners by the department" during a condemnation. This is generally a small fraction of the cost of such an action with most of the expense being legal fees, appraisals and other paperwork. Given the exaggerations and outright lies we got from this outfit the last time they were proposing this construction, I doubt this language is an accident.

And finally, this matter is not an emergency under any definition I know of. The problem has taken 20 years to develop and it would take 5-10 years to fund, permit and build the project. Bypassing standard protections for implementation is ridiculous under these circumstances.

Sincerely,  
Dan C. Keeley, P.E.

JoAnn C. Keeley, Farmer