

From: Russ Dondero <dondero1@easystreet.net>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 12:42:34 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Cc: Mary Kyle McCurdy <mkm@friends.org>
Subject: Written Testimony in opposition to SB25



TO: Senate Committee on Environment & Natural Resources

Member [Senator Michael Dembrow](#)
Chair [Senator Chris Edwards](#)
Vice-Chair [Senator Alan Olsen](#)
Member [Senator Floyd Prozanski](#)
Member [Senator Chuck Thomsen](#)

FROM: Russ Dondero, Professor Emeritus of Political Science & Vice Chair WC CAN -
<http://www.wc-can.org/>

Dear Chair Edwards & Members of the Committee

Since I have another bill to testify on next Monday which is up at the same time in another hearing as SB 25, allow me to submit my written testimony now.

As senior policy analyst for WC CAN - Washington County Citizens Action Network I've worked closely with a variety of groups in the past two sessions to preserve Oregon's land use planning system and the legacy of former Governor McCall.

When the dust settled after the "grand bargain" over urban/rural reserves (a decision I supported) - we knew there would be those who would want to reverse course in this session. Senate Bill 25 is the first but probably not the last effort of this sort.

I strongly oppose SB 25.

We live in one Oregon not two Oregons. The concepts of Senate Bill 100 and our land use system in Oregon are designed to protect our farm, forest and environment whether one grew up in Roseburg as I did or lives in the Metro area as I do now.

Allowing cities and counties to rezone any or all farm and forestlands is exactly what created the controversy over urban/rural reserves necessitating a long legal battle and then engaged the legislature. This should not happen again but if SB 25 passes, it likely will... We don't need to go down that road!

Oregon needs balanced and smart growth not unlimited growth which puts at risk a \$22 billion dollar agriculture industry. Additionally as a housing advocate for over 20 years I'm very concerned that SB 25 will negate good planning for transportation, infrastructure and housing - especially affordable housing for those in the 50%- MFI...

Oregon needs a balanced approach to manage growth and to protect the quality of life we are so famous for but which is increasingly at risk all over Oregon.

Thanks for your consideration of my perspective.

Russ Dondero
1506 Limpus Lane
Forest Grove, Or 97116
503-357-3345

From: John Paul <cameronwinery@gmail.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 6:22:51 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Dear Ms. Reiley,

I own a farm in the Willamette Valley but I have friends who ranch and farm in Eastern Oregon. SB25 is an affront to their farming/ranching ambitions and as one farmer standing up for my friends in Eastern Oregon I want you to know that!

Please stop this travesty from happening.

Sincerely,

John Paul

Dundee, Oregon

From: William Simkoff <wmsim@teleport.com>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 9:44:35 AM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Cc: <mkm@friends.org>
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 25, on which a vote is pending. Three of Oregon's top five producing agricultural counties are located in Eastern Oregon. One in eight jobs in Oregon is agriculture-related, and the industry brings in \$22 billion in sales of goods and services. And these benefits, from port and trucking jobs to food processing work, are in cities and towns (big and small) statewide—not just in Eastern Oregon. Because this bill would allow certain counties to re-designate all resource lands and develop sprawling subdivisions, Oregonians can expect to see farm- and forest-related jobs disappear.

In these eight counties, the bill would also cripple planning efforts related to transportation, infrastructure, and housing. The counties' would also have no requirements to protect wildlife and natural places, avoid developing in areas with a high risk of natural hazards, or allow citizen participation in the land use planning process. Oregonians understand the success of our state's land use program. They've seen it protect farm and forest lands, prevent expensive sprawl and support livable, walkable towns and cities with housing for all.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to vote NO in SB 25 !

Sincerely,

William Simkoff, M.D.

From: <tyghredfield@aol.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 3:38:27 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: No on S.B. 25

Beth Reiley, I am writing to express my opposition to S.B. 25. Passage of such a Bill could undermine statewide land use planning goals for rural communities as defined by S.B. 25 leading to changes in the rural character of these counties and communities destroying years of compliance with the States successful land use laws. The threat to existing ranch, farm and forestlands for the stated reasons in the Bill, suggests a slow unraveling of a process that has proven over and over its success in preserving the very resources that Oregonians want to protect. Please vote no on Senate Bill 25 Tygh Redfield

From: Tony Oliver <tonyjo@teleport.com>
Date: February 21, 2015 at 12:32:26 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Good morning Ms. Reliey --

I am quite concerned about SB 25. This change of re-zone will have significant impact of the health of Oregon. Farmers cannot continue to farm if the value of their lands are pushed to high as they would be by developers. Forestlands contain renewable resources . Just this morning the Bend Bulletin reported the sale of 200,000 acres to a Chinese company. The views on this piece are spectacular. Soon it will be developed. It impact will be short lived construction and then how do we employ the people or how many gated communities or resorts can we afford.

Please vote no on this issue.

Sincerely,

tony oliver
redmond, oregon

From: Thomas Keffer <tkeffer@gmail.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 3:55:06 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer written testimony on SB 25.

It is a false linkage between whether a county has population growth, and whether it should be exempt from statewide land use planning goals.

The state land use system is not just about managing population growth, it is also about how we develop our lands and, in particular, ensuring the economic viability of our farm and forest lands. It's easy to imagine large private estates located next to a pig farm in Eastern Oregon. Who would win?

It's these sorts of conflicts that our system is designed to prevent. Let's keep our farm and forest lands, along with the jobs they generate, intact.

Tom Keffer
1201 Country Club Rd.
Hood River, OR 97031
541-490-9507

From: TI Ranch [<mailto:ti.ranch@hughes.net>]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 9:02 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Cc: Rep Bentz; Sen Ferrioli
Subject: Written Testimony Opposing SB 25

Chair Edwards, and members of the committee:

My name is Rusty Inglis and I am a rancher in Harney County. I am submitting testimony today in opposition to SB 25, which would allow certain rural counties to set their own land use plans without regard for the statewide planning goals.

I oppose this legislation because Oregon's land use system currently provides important protection for agricultural lands, and individual counties should not be able to undo these protections. Oregon law recognizes the importance of keeping Oregon's most productive land in production in order to ensure that agriculture remains one of Oregon's largest industries. Allowing rural counties - largely in Eastern Oregon

- to set their own land use planning goals jeopardizes this system, and could make it more difficult for ranchers like myself to stay in business.

If the statewide planning goals ceased to apply to several rural Oregon counties, land prices would become extremely variable, making it difficult for me to purchase any land necessary to expand my operations and ensure that productive land remains in production. Presently acquiring additional land for grazing has become very difficult. This is also making it difficult for young beginning ranchers to acquire land and stay in the business. Additionally, any changes to the local zoning could allow non-compatible uses to be placed next to each other, increasing the risk of conflict. Given the scale of most Eastern Oregon ranches, it is already very time consuming for most ranchers to check monitor their herds, and the cost and time investment of this monitoring would only increase if conflicting uses - such as a recreational facilities, non-farm dwellings, mines, or industrial facilities - were allowed to be sited anywhere within a county with no regard for existing uses.

I am very concerned about the impacts of this bill on agricultural operations in Eastern Oregon. Agriculture (Primarily cattle) is the largest industry in Harney county, and I believe it is imperative that it is protected. I urge you to oppose this bill. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Thurston (Rusty) D. Inglis

--
TI Ranch
Thurston (Rusty) D. Inglis
58830 Lava Bed Road
Princeton, Oregon 9772
Home Phone: 541-493-2117
Cell Phone: 541-413-0778

From: [Reiley Beth](#)
To: [Koopman Samantha](#)
Subject: FW: Written Testimony for SB25
Date: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:58:06 AM

Beth Reiley
503.986.1755

From: sue wolling [mailto:sue.wolling@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:58 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I'm writing to express opposition to SB 25. This bill would undermine the land use system that has protected Oregon's farm and forestland for many years, and would reduce Oregon's ability to prepare for an uncertain future.

One in eight of Oregon's jobs are related to agriculture, and three of our top-producing agricultural counties are in eastern Oregon. These agricultural lands are important to the entire state, as farm products are harvested, processed, transported and sold throughout the state and beyond. We need to keep farmland as farmland. There is no more of it being made.

Climate change makes it even more important to preserve our land use system. Increasingly drought, fires and temperature fluctuations may affect how and where food is produced, timber is harvested, wildlife can survive, and water and energy come from. Our farm and forest land can help us adapt to changing conditions. Meanwhile, our cities and towns need the certainty the land use system provides to invest wisely in infrastructure that will reduce vulnerability to climate or other disruption, and provide a high quality of life for future generations of Oregonians.

The land use system has served Oregon well, and we need to maintain it.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Sue Wolling
108 High Street
Eugene OR 97401

From: Stephen D Williams <stephendwilliams@earthlink.net>

Date: February 22, 2015 at 6:47:23 AM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

There is no doubt SB25 is a bill that would be very unwise for the state of Oregon if it passed. First and most important it sets a terrible precedent for the state's ahead-of-it's-time land use program no doubt making it easier to abandon the Goals for the rest of the state down the line. It's hard not to see SB25 as a step towards the degradation of the whole land use system that is largely responsible for our quality of life here in Oregon. Please do not let this step be taken and say NO to SB25. Thank you for your service to us all.

Stephen Williams
Chair, Williams, Oregon CAC

From: Sally & Ray Hollemon <rhollemon@comcast.net>

Date: February 21, 2015 at 10:57:32 AM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB 25

Dear Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

I oppose Senate Bill 25. While Eastern Oregon counties need to be treated somewhat differently than the Willamette Valley due to their different soils and climate, agricultural and forest lands still need to be protected from development.

Please support Oregon's land-use goals by opposing Senate Bill 25.

Sincerely,
Sally Hollemon
3335 Crestview Dr. S
Salem, OR 97302

From: Kevin Blair <akblair@comcast.net>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 9:52:35 AM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Fwd: Senate Bill 25

From: Sheila Dooley <sdooley3300@yahoo.com>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 9:48:34 AM PST
To: "beth.reiley@state.or.us" <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Oppose SB 25
Reply-To: Sheila Dooley <sdooley3300@yahoo.com>

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

We are writing to express my concern with Senate Bill 25. Suspending the goals of the land use program in eight Eastern Oregon counties would set a dangerous precedent and go against the will of the voters. Oregon's land use program needs to remain intact not only for economic reasons but for the protections for wildlife and Oregon's natural places. Another result of this bill would be the disappearance of many farm and forest related jobs while allowing sprawling subdivisions in their place.

Please oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dooley and Phil Swaim, rural residents of eastern Oregon

From: Roz Shirack <rozshirack7@gmail.com>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 4:35:39 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

Please **oppose** SB 25, which would suspend the Statewide Planning Goals in Eastern Oregon. The Statewide Planning Program has achieved benefits for Oregon for both the development of our towns and cities and the preservation of agricultural lands and other natural resources. It must not be unraveled in eight counties in Eastern Oregon. Oregonians statewide depend on its application in Eastern Oregon as well as in Western Oregon for the health of our agricultural economy, tourism, and the efficient use of public funds spent on roads and other infrastructure in Eastern Oregon. Citizen participation in land use planning, an under appreciated benefit of the Statewide Planning Program, would no longer be guaranteed. That alone would be a tremendous loss to the people of Oregon.

Thank you for your consideration.

Roz Shirack
1645 Church St. SE.
Salem, OR

From: Gronowski, Ron [mailto:ron.gronowski@zgf.com]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 10:30 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Dear Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I am writing against SB 25 because of its potential impact statewide.

This bill would allow certain counties to re-designate all resource lands and develop sprawling subdivisions, and as a potential outcome we might expect to see farm and forest-related jobs disappear.

In these eight counties, the bill would also cripple planning efforts related to transportation, infrastructure, and housing. The counties' would also have no requirements to protect wildlife and natural places, avoid developing in areas with a high risk of natural hazards, or allow citizen participation in the land use planning process. I and many other Oregonians understand the success of our state's land use program. We have seen it protect farm and forest lands, prevent expensive sprawl and support livable, walkable towns and cities with housing for all. Please don't let SB 25 limit the program's ability to continue building prosperous communities across the state.

Thank you for this consideration.

Ron Gronowski
2160 Crest Drive
Lake Oswego, Or. 97034
ZGF Email Disclaimer<https://www.zgf.com/ZGF_Email_Disclaimer.html>

From: Lee Christie [<mailto:lchristie@gorge.net>]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 8:33 AM

To: Reiley Beth

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

My Good People,

I have lived and worked in Oregon for 25 years. And, for the last 16 years have lived in a highly productive farming area: with a good mix of landuse. One of the principal reasons I moved here from California and Washington was because of the strong Land Use Laws and Regulations.

Please do nothing to weaken our working guidelines; if anything at this point in time they could use a bit more strengthening. This state will be under a lot of pressure for development on many levels; please do not cave in.

Thank-you for your time and consideration,

Lee Christie
Hood River, Oregon 97031

From: [Reiley Beth](#)
To: [Koopman Samantha](#)
Subject: FW: Written Testimony for SB25
Date: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:58:14 AM

Beth Reiley
503.986.1755

-----Original Message-----

From: Franklin Meyer [<mailto:fmeyer@willamette.edu>]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:51 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

As a former supporter of Measure 49, I hope you do not pass out of committee SB 25, which suspends land use program in eight Eastern Oregon counties. The land use program exists to control growth. Since the Eastern Oregon counties involved are primarily agricultural, it does not make sense to have different rules for E. Oregon than in the rest of the state.

Please do not vote out SB 25.

Thank you.

Melinda Woodward
955 Holiday Court S
Salem, OR 97302

From: Melissa Cadwallader [<mailto:melissa.cadwallader@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 1:27 PM

To: Reiley Beth

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

Chris Edwards, Chair

Members of the Committee

I am not able to attend your hearing Monday, February 23, 2015 on SB 25. I want, however, to go on record against this piece of legislation. Oregon's current land use legislation has done an excellent job of maintaining the economic health of Oregon's agriculture endeavors as well as preventing sprawl. I believe SB 25 would begin to unravel the integrity of our state's land use fabric.

Thank you in advance for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Melissa Cadwallader
Cannon Beach OR

From: [Reiley Beth](#)
To: [Koopman Samantha](#)
Subject: FW: NO on SB 25
Date: Monday, February 23, 2015 8:52:23 AM

Beth Reiley
503.986.1755

From: Merry Ann Moore [mailto:merryannmoore@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 8:51 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Fwd: NO on SB 25

Hi Ms. Reilly, I mistakenly sent my email to you soon. Please refer this went to the committee.

Chair Edwards and the committee:

I am strongly opposed SB 25. Our land use laws have made Oregon a special place. They have protected our natural resources and thereby contributed to our strong tourism industry. They protect wildlife habitat, which is an important value for Oregonians. They protect agricultural land, contributing to our traditional farm economy. Stay the course and preserve the system that is working so well. I urge you to vote no on SB 25. Thank you for considering my views, Merry Ann Moore

Merry Ann Moore
merryannmoore@gmail.com
Office 541-549-2468

Begin forwarded message:

From: Merry Ann Moore <merryannmoore@gmail.com>
Date: February 23, 2015 at 8:44:03 AM PST
To: "beth.reiley@state.or.us" <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: NO on SB 25

To Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

SP 25 is a terrible idea for Oregon. Our land use laws are the reason for our right now industry, great recruiting tool for bringing me a businesses here

Merry Ann Moore
merryannmoore@gmail.com
Office 541-549-2468
www.merryannmoore.com

Twitter @MerryAnnMoore

From: Mona Linstromberg [<mailto:lindym@peak.org>]

Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 12:27 PM

To: Reiley Beth

Subject: Please stop SB 25 in its tracks

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

I am a fourth generation Oregonian and continually celebrate the wisdom of Oregon in the passing of SB 100 and the protecting of Oregon's farm and forestlands. Oregon's natural resources belong to all Oregonians not just a vocal minority representing their regional self interest. There is a larger picture that is being ignored to the peril of these eight Eastern Oregon counties. Oregon today would have a vastly different landscape had we not had the land use goals that are in place. I fear for the landscape of these counties. I fear for the loss of farmland. I fear for the loss of habitat for wildlife. Please stop SB in its tracks and make a statement that Oregon's vision for wise land use is intact.

Regards,

Mona Linstromberg

831 E. Buck Creek Rd.

Tidewater, OR 97390

From: Pamela Burry <pamelaburry@gmail.com>

Date: February 21, 2015 at 7:59:17 AM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Against SB25

Dear Beth Reiley,
Below please find comments regarding SB25 and my opposition to it. Thank you.

Dear Chair Edwards and members of the committee, and Beth Reiley,

I need you to know how concerned I am about SB25 and the idea that all of Oregon's Land Use Laws may be disregarded in 8 rural counties.

I am an Oregonian who loves this land and all the beauty and value it holds. I am sure you are, too. Our Land Use Laws are here for a reason and all counties must be held to them.

Do you want our state to begin to look like Arizona? Or New Mexico? If you have driven through those states in the recent years you will know how the outlying counties are strewn with ill-thought out development, sprawl, poor water regulation, ragged disbursement of agricultural lands etc. After this sad process begins there is no going back. Oregon would begin to lose its unique standing as a place where its people work hard to protect its natural beauty to great effect.

The public needs to have input into the process and SB25 hugely curtails this.

ALL counties must be held to our Land Use Laws.

It is misleading to assume that SB25 will provide more long term jobs. Temporary construction jobs perhaps, but not long term agricultural jobs, as, given the impact of SB25, Ag lands will shrink in light of development.

SB25 heads us to a willy-nilly approach to development, sacrificing what we value the most: our natural landscape, Open Space, protected wildlife, all things that make rural Oregon the unique place it is.

Please say NO to SB25. Keep rural Oregon, Oregon.

Thank you for your time.

Pamela Burry

From: [Reiley Beth](#)
To: [Koopman Samantha](#)
Subject: Fwd: SB 25
Date: Friday, February 20, 2015 5:44:26 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Dewey <paul@deweylaw.net>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 5:29:33 PM PST
To: "Beth.Reiley@state.or.us" <Beth.Reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: FW: SB 25

From: Paul Dewey
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 5:22 PM
To: 'sen.chrisedwards@state.or.us'
Cc: 'beth.reily@state.or.us'
Subject: SB 25

Dear Senator Edwards:

I am writing to request that you not vote to put forward SB 25, which would exempt low population/growth counties from our state land use goals. The premise of the bill appears to be that it is necessary in order to retain and enhance the rural job base. Not only is there no evidence of that premise or connection, but in my two decades of experience with land use matters in eastern Oregon, including in Harney County and Grant County, I have not seen development proposals rejected by the counties on the basis of the statewide planning goals. In fact, I don't recall seeing any rejections of development proposals by the counties. With all due respect, any problem with the land use system in eastern Oregon is not with the counties limiting anything. What specific development proposals are we talking about? If there are specific problems, then they should be dealt with rather than have all statewide goals thrown out.

I am aware of a couple of examples of eastern Oregon land use developments being rejected by the Oregon Court of Appeals and LUBA, one for a resort/school on top of Steens Mountain in Harney County and one for a jet airport next to the John Day Fossil Beds National Monument in Grant County. Is that what you want to support? I also represented farmers in northeast Oregon who successfully opposed a Measure 37 development that would have rezoned land in the heart of critical ag lands. The statewide goals protect these farmers who have farmed their land for generations.

That protection should be thrown out because someone wants to add new development jobs (at the expense of the existing jobs)?

Any bill such as this, which grants wholesale exemptions from statewide goals which have been the basis for our land use system for at least 40 years, should have a strong established factual basis and justification. Instead, the bill appears to be based on mere conjecture and rhetoric, that the land use system MUST BE hurting our economy. Our laws and legal system need to be based on more than supposition.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Dewey

Paul Dewey, Attorney at Law

1539 NW Vicksburg Ave.

Bend, OR 97701

541-420-8455

pdewey@bendcable.com

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this message by error, please notify us immediately and destroy the related message. Thank you.

From: Paul Lipscomb <judgelipscomb@gmail.com>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 12:36:05 PM PST
To: <sen.chrisedwards@state.or.us>, <sen.chris.edwards@state.or.us>
Cc: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: SB 25

Chair Edwards and members of the Committee:

I am a former long term Presiding Judge from Marion County who retired to Central Oregon several years ago. I try to keep an eye on Central and Eastern Oregon legislative issues as they develop.

I write now to express my concerns about SB 25. Certainly it has good intentions, and I understand the desire to "do something" to help the rural counties, some of which are still struggling to come out of the Great Recession that started in 2007. My concern is that the unintended consequences of this well intentioned bill would only make matters worse, not better, for the residents and elected officials of these counties. SB would harm the only two remaining "golden geese" that these folks still have left; their environmentally based tourist industry and their agricultural industry. And it would do so without adding much of anything else of any significant economic value.

The timber and mining industries may be long gone from Eastern Oregon, but the natural beauty of these areas still draws in more and more recreational uses and other tourism activities each year to complement the existing agricultural base. Allowing new residential sprawl and highway strip commercial developments, however, will discourage tourism and related recreational uses. And such poorly planned development would increase the financial burdens on local governments of providing police, fire and medical emergency services. Worse yet, it would do so without adding significant additional tax resources to support such increased services. Unfortunately, I fear that these unintended consequences simply cannot be avoided if this bill survives.

As one example of this kind of environmentally problematic and costly strip development, I think of the LaPine area to the south of Bend. That sort of extensive, miles-long highway based commercial development is economically marginal and visually unsightly. It lowers rather than raises nearby property values, and it acts as a significant deterrent to major business or industrial development in the local area. Like sagebrush subdivisions, the costs of providing emergency services to outlying commercial areas increases dramatically with the distances that must be traveled. It also discourages recreational uses and other tourism activities. There is no persuasive reason to subject new areas of this state to similar

problems.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Paul J. Lipscomb, Deschutes County resident

From: [Reiley Beth](#)
To: [Koopman Samantha](#)
Subject: FW: Written Testimony for SB25
Date: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:40:26 AM

Beth Reiley
503.986.1755

-----Original Message-----

From: RICHARD A GORRINGE [<mailto:richgorr@msn.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2015 11:33 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

The land use planning program needs to remain intact. Since this bill would allow certain counties to re-designate all resource lands and develop sprawling subdivisions, Oregonians can expect to see farm- and forest-related jobs disappear. Note that three of Oregon's top five producing agricultural counties are located in Eastern Oregon. One in eight jobs in Oregon is agriculture-related, and the industry brings in \$22 billion in sales of goods and services. And these benefits, from port and trucking jobs to food processing work, are in cities and towns (big and small) statewide—not just in Eastern Oregon.

In these eight counties, the bill would also cripple planning efforts related to transportation, infrastructure, and housing. The counties' would also have no requirements to protect wildlife and natural places, avoid developing in areas with a high risk of natural hazards, or allow citizen participation in the land use planning process. Oregonians understand the success of our state's land use program. They've seen it protect farm and forest lands, prevent expensive sprawl and support livable, walkable towns and cities with housing for all. This bill is merely the first salvo and more will follow if it is successful. Don't let SB 25 limit the program's ability to continue building prosperous communities across the state.

Richard Gorrige, Ph. D.
3574 NE Stanton
Portland, OR 97212

Sent from my iPad

From: Howard Miller [<mailto:howdymiller@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 9:51 AM

To: Reiley Beth

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

To: Chairman Edwards and Committee members

From: Howard and Deborah Miller

Re: SB 25

We ask that the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources vote to oppose SB 25. Land use laws in Oregon have provided assurance to owners and potential purchasers of the approved uses of the land; no one needs to worry about waking up to a neighbor bulldozing his wheat field for a resort (which would use how much more precious water?) or other (now) unpermitted uses, yet not having a say in what would seriously jeopardize his livelihood in which he had planned and invested.

All citizens of the state should care about protection of habitats for wildlife and the quality of our water sources. If land use laws are not in effect, carrying out these mandates is made harder for conscientious residents and local officials. The whole state suffers when its precious resource, the land, is not treated with caution and an abiding concern for any present decisions that would adversely affect the future. We need to have the laws in place that help owners, renters, and the government do just that; in the long run, we all will prosper.
Thank you.

From: <HKpaine@aol.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 2:18:42 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Dear Chairman Edwards and Members of the Committee:

Senate Bill 25 is bad legislation. Agriculture and forestry is important to Oregon's economy. Those lands should not be turned into residential housing and commercial developments.

Every acre of our farm land must be used to provide food for America. The current drought conditions have curtailed food production on the West Coast.

I have been a resident of Oregon for 83 years, with a good part of that time on a farm. Also, I have worked in plywood manufacturing. Please deny SB 25.

Thank you.

Howard Paine
34939 Sunset Pl.
Chiloquin, OR 97624-8711

From: Jeanne Roy <jeanneroy62@gmail.com>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 2:22:33 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: SB 25

To: Chair Edwards and Members, Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources
From: Jeanne Roy
Date: February 20, 2015
Subject: SB 25

Please do not move SB 25 out of committee.

I have been proud of Oregon's land use law. It has protected farm and forest land and prevented sprawl unlike the State of Washington. My understanding is that SB 25 would undo the law in certain counties by allowing local governments to re-zone farm and forest lands.

Oregon's agricultural-related jobs and income are essential to all of us in the state. Please do not allow local re-zoning!

From: <HKpaine@aol.com>

Date: February 21, 2015 at 11:38:30 AM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Dear Chairman Edwards and Members of the Committee:

Farm and forest land is important to Oregon's economy, it should not be turned into residential and commercial development.

Every city in Oregon has an Urban Growth Boundary, if a city is fully built-out they can apply to have their UGB enlarged.

Governor Tom McCall was instrumental in developing Oregon's land-use laws. His goal was to prevent urban sprawl like California has. Those laws should not be changed.

Our land-use laws work, Goal 1 is Citizen Involvement. Every citizen has a say in the process, and I say there should be no change. Deny SB25.

Thank you.

Kathryn Paine
34939 Sunset Pl.
Chiloquin, OR 97624-8711

From: Ken Maddox <kmaddox@hrecn.net>

Date: February 21, 2015 at 2:48:58 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

Oregon is one State, rather than a collection of counties, and there ought to be one State rule that applies State law to all. Please defeat any attempt to make exemptions for some counties from State statute.

Ken Maddox

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I am a resident of Albany, OR and my husband and I have farmed almost 2000 acres of grass seed in Linn County for over 40 years. I am concerned about SB25 allowing changes to rezone farm and forestland. We must protect those lands because sprawling cities will gobble up the prime farm ground and it will be lost forever. Farming and forestry are very important industries in Oregon and provide jobs not only for seasonal workers but the many year-round employees as well. We must protect the animals and resources on those lands also. I would like to ask you to have additional input for your decisions from the private sector that makes a living in farming and forestry. I urge you to vote no on SB25.

Sincerely,
Kristi Miller
34166 Goltra Rd SE
Albany, OR 97322

From: **Donna Lipscomb** <donnamarielipscomb@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 1:20 PM
Subject: SB 25
To: sen.chrisedwards@state.or.us
Cc: beth.riley@state.or.us

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

As a resident of Deschutes County, I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 25. I realize that this particular bill does not include Deschutes County as currently written, but the concern of many residents here is that it will set a very dangerous and destructive precedent for development that may spread throughout Central Oregon and, indeed, the state.

As the drought throughout our southern states continues and intensifies, more residents will move north in search of better ranching and farming environments. Likewise, as severe weather events occur more frequently and destructively throughout the Midwest and Eastern sections of our country, even more people will be looking to the Pacific Northwest for a refuge and new start. Even now, Oregon ranks as the top moving destination in the U.S., with Deschutes County leading the way with the most new residents.

Have no fear, the growth will come to our state, including to the eastern portion. The task before our leaders is to determine the best ways to manage and support that growth. Dismantling our strong land use system is most definitely not the best approach. On the contrary, selling our most valuable resources of forests, farm lands and water to the highest bidders would be incredibly short-sighted.

Our leaders in the past have had the foresight to protect the natural beauty and value of our state which is what continues to set Oregon apart from the rest. We, obviously, must prepare to share our unique resources with many more incoming residents. But we must remain wise and very careful about the ways in which we do so. Continuing to insure the future protection of Oregon's resources is essential to the healthy, long-term growth and thoughtful development we need.

I urge you to oppose SB 25 and its negative consequences for Oregon.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Lipscomb

From: Christie Nelson <chrisnels22@gmail.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 2:45:59 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Senate Bill 25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

We are opposed to S.B. 25 as it weakens the goals of the land use program currently in place. The goals of preventing sprawl, protecting agricultural land, and protecting valuable wild lands are very important to us as they represent the best future for Oregon.

Likewise, being able to develop housing in areas with a high risk of natural hazards would be an expensive mistake. The risk is not worth the resulting hazards and hardships of such a loose approach.

It is vital to continue to allow citizen participation in the land use planning process. Citizens are the ones who know the land and how to use it, and they should be able to have their say in the process.

Thank you for your consideration of our view.

Sincerely,

Christie and Mike Nelson
155 Wallace Lane
Grants Pass, OR 97527

From: <hap@nwtec.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 2:16:51 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB 25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

Proponents of SB 25 insist cities and counties should be allowed to rezone any or all farmlands and forestlands. They are wrong. The land use planning program needs to remain intact. Why?

Three of Oregon's top five producing agricultural counties are located in Eastern Oregon.

One in eight jobs in Oregon is agriculture-related, and the industry brings in \$22 billion in sales of goods and services.

The benefits from these jobs, from port and trucking jobs to food processing, are in cities and towns (big and small) statewide, not just in Eastern Oregon.

SB 25 would allow certain counties to re-designate all resource lands and develop sprawling subdivisions.

In the eight counties effected SB 25 would cripple planning efforts related to transportation, infrastructure, and housing.

The eight counties effected would have no requirements to protect wildlife and natural places, avoid developing in areas with a high risk of natural hazards, or allow citizen participation in the land use planning process.

Oregonians could expect to see farm and forest-related jobs disappear.

Oregonians understand the success of our state's land use program. We have seen it protect farm and forest lands, prevent extensive sprawl and support livable, walkable towns and cities with housing for all.

Don't let SB 25 limit the program's ability to continue building prosperous communities across the state.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harry Freiberg

610 Mardon Court
Brookings, OR

From: Hal Anthony <threepines@jeffnet.org>
Date: February 21, 2015 at 7:32:55 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

SB 25 does not provide requirements to protect wildlife and natural places, it lack safety hazard standards for natural hazards, and it does not allow Citizen Involvement, as per Oregon Statewide Goal #1 under Senate Bill 100.

Please don't let SB 25 limit Goal 1's ability to continue building prosperous communities across the state. Citizen participation is not only crucially prerequisite to democratic and elective government, locales and neighborhoods, it must also be both enforced, and cultivated, by cities and counties throughout Oregon by state law and statute, tone and trust.

Also, because one in eight jobs in Oregon involves agriculture, and because the industry brings in \$22 billion in sales of goods and services, this bill would also stifle planning efforts related to transportation, infrastructure, and housing.

Port and trucking jobs, food processing work, and related entities exist in cities statewide—not just in Eastern Oregon. Because this bill would allow certain counties to re-designate all resource lands and develop sprawling subdivisions, Oregonians would also see farm and forest jobs disappear if this bill becomes law.

Please help resolve this and rule for the State of Oregon's long term health and a state children will inherit with safety and pride.

Respectfully,

Hal B. Anthony
3995 Russell Road
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526
www.threepines@jeffnet.org

To the Senate Environment and Natural Resources Committee:

I have read with alarm the text of SB25 and wish explain why this is a very dangerous bill.

As the owner of land now zoned EFU-40 with a Wildlife Overlay, I understand the restrictions and the benefits that ensue when we protect rural lands. So while I appreciate the importance of stimulating economic development in rural areas, we should not use this goal as an excuse to abolish Oregon's land use laws. This land use system has protected family farms and ranches for decades. In addition, it has protected many special natural areas from the kind of sprawl that would destroy or greatly compromise them.

SB25 is promoted as an economic win for rural counties, but its true effect would be to favor certain economic interests over the ones that already provide the foundation of the rural economy. SB25's proposal to short cut our land use system in rural counties may possibly help the construction or extractive industries in the near term, but the resulting activities will harm the agricultural base of existing rural employment. Imagine 'ranchettes' side by side with real ranches, leading to the type of conflict that Oregon's land use laws were originally established to protect.

In protecting natural areas from sprawl, Oregon's land use laws have also protected a growing ecotourism in rural counties. Imagine a destination resort just outside of French Glen, adjacent to the Malheur Wildlife Refuge and the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area? The jobs projected from such an endeavor might sound tempting, but at the cost of introducing sprawl between a tiny rural town and two important resource areas. These are the types of development that our current system has been able to protect and against which is still needed.

In addition to posing these hazards, SB25 proposes to restrict citizen participation in the land use process, a vital principal that should be upheld.

Please don't let this ill-advised legislation progress beyond your committee. Don't endanger our beautiful state by gutting the land use system that has kept Oregon special.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,



Eva Eagle
17212 Pine Drive,
Sisters, OR 97759

Date: February 22, 2015
To: Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources
From: Douglas R. Allen
734 SE 47th Ave.
Portland, OR 97215

Subject: Testimony regarding Senate Bill 25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

I urge you to reject SB 25 for the following reasons.

First of all, the criteria for which counties to except from Oregon's land use laws are so arbitrary as to be irrational. Based on population information in the "Oregon Blue Book", it would appear that Baker, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Sherman, Wallowa, and Wheeler qualify because their populations shank between 2000 and 2010, and their populations are less than 50,000 each.

However, of those counties, Wallowa, Sherman, Malheur, Gilliam, and Baker actually grew in population between 2010 and 2013. Meanwhile, Crook and Curry counties are also below 50,000 population, but fail to qualify because they grew in population between 2000 and 2010. Yet those two counties shrank in population between 2010 and 2013. This sort of arbitrary law is absurd on its face no matter what the subject.

Even if this legislation contained rational criteria, it is extremely detrimental to the future of Oregon. I lived in Oregon prior to the Senate Bill 100 that originally set up Oregon's pioneering system of state wide land use goals, and I lived here through the notorious era of Rajneeshpuram, when certain county officials fell under the sway of the blandishments of a powerful economic interest. Fortunately, Oregon's land use planning system had important standards that preserved our important values. Perhaps most important of the state wide goals is the requirement for public involvement in planning. Who thinks that certain areas of the State should be exempt from that goal? How about the goals that preserve Oregon's valuable resource lands, and ensure the right of ranchers and farmers to be free from incompatible uses and interfering neighbors? Should the rights of all be subject to the short term economic interests of developers who can easily capture power in the short term, long enough to obtain approval for developments that conflict with traditional uses? Should residents be saddled with the resulting costs to serve incompatible development?

Oregon's land use system already allows compatible economic development, and provides for exceptional uses on land that is unsuitable for farming and forestry. Urban level development should be within an urban growth boundary, for a myriad of well thought out reasons. Our land use laws should protect all Oregonians.

Sincerely,
Douglas R. Allen

To Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee:

I write to oppose SB25. Oregon's farm and forest lands are important to us all and should not be allowed to be developed into subdivisions. Oregon's very successful and necessary land use program should not be circumvented in any part of the state. This bill should be rejected and development should be carried out with careful planning within the framework of existing zoning laws.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Charlotte Campbell
3425 NW Pineview Pl.
Albany, OR 97321

From: Carol <clm@SpiritOne.com>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 9:32:02 PM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: **Written Testimony for SB25**

I support Oregon's land use system and laws. Having lived in areas where there is no such thing, I see a loss of good farmland, an impact of mixes of uses which affects a place's livability, and job opportunities.

Let's keep Oregon special, at least in the land use laws.

Carol Mastronarde

From: Bill Burley <sceloporus08@gmail.com>
Date: February 21, 2015 at 9:43:45 AM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Cc: Bill Burley <sceloporus08@gmail.com>
Subject: SB 25 should fail; Land-use planning in Oregon is long a good model to follow

Chair Edwards and Committee Members,

I strongly urge you to reject SB 25 now before you.

Land-use planning in Oregon remains probably the best of the state planning models in the US and it should be protected. The battles of the 1970s never end, each decade brings new sets of hackneyed old challenges to our sensible planning of Oregon's precious landscape.

I was personally involved in the passage of SB-100, the establishment of DLCD in the mid-1970s and the subsequent beginning of sensible land-use planning in our 36 Oregon counties. We were providing volumes of natural resources data for each of the county comprehensive plans.

It has been very discouraging to see the frequent 'reassessments' of the process in Oregon. Today's SB 25 is only the latest ill-thought challenge. If passed, it would open the door to much landscape and natural resources degradation in Eastern Oregon. Our High Desert and plateau portions of Oregon must be carefully protected and managed. Demand for more often temporary jobs and for land parcelization never will cease ----- only our continuing vigilance will ensure Oregon remains a state which is increasingly seen as a model in the West. We who are lucky to live here enjoy its riches by recreating in myriad open-space landscapes. Visitors enjoy it here too, leaving lots of tourist dollars. Some long-time residents also benefit from increasingly-better-managed resource production. SB 25 could change all this, in a direction which would be regretted by tomorrow's Oregonians.

Please ensure that SB 25 does not pass.

Sincerely,
Bill Burley, retired biologist
Bend, Oregon.
CellTel: 360-610-5443
Email: sceloporus08@gmail.com

From: Kevin Blair <akblair@comcast.net>
Date: February 22, 2015 at 9:52:35 AM PST
To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>
Subject: Fwd: Senate Bill 25

From: Kevin Blair <akblair@comcast.net>
Date: February 21, 2015 1:47:47 PM PST
To: Beth.reiley@state.or.us
Subject: Senate Bill 25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I am writing out of concern that Senate Bill 25, if passed, will chip away and erode Oregon's outstanding land use laws and guidelines that have preserved farm and forest lands in our beautiful state.

I believe that this senate bill is short-sighted in it's benefits and blind to the long-term deleterious impact on farm and forest lands. Growth has been and always will be uneven throughout the state. To change what works very well for the whole of Oregon is a mistake that would set a precedent for future changes and would ultimately diminish the very reason we Oregonians and visitors choose to be here--the preserved beauty our state has to offer. Oregon is reportedly the number one destination for relocation currently. As we enjoy the financial benefits of this, our land use laws, as they are currently written, insure that we can still enjoy adequate crops from protected farm lands that can feed the increasing population, natural beauty in forest land and on our waters, and preserved habitats for our bountiful wildlife.

Please consider the long range damage that Senate Bill 25 would have on our forest and agricultural lands and do not support this bill. It is a big mistake to do otherwise.

Sincerely,
Ana Blair

From: Alice Elshoff <calice58@gmail.com>

Date: February 20, 2015 at 4:28:43 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edward and the rest of the committee,

Why on earth would we want to undue our extremely effective land use program in 8 rural counties? Our rural lands need just as much protection as our populated areas.

Please oppose Senate Bill 25

Respectfully,

Alice and Cal Elshoff

From: Warren Troy <wgtroy@ccountry.net>

Date: February 23, 2015 at 7:24:38 PM PST

To: <beth.reiley@state.or.us>

Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

We oppose SB 25. Warren and Sharon Troy

From: Brian Hines [<mailto:brianhines1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 11:27 AM
To: Reiley Beth
Subject: Written Testimony for SB25

Chair Edwards and Members of the Committee,

I'd like to express my opposition to SB 25, which would weaken Oregon's highly successful land use system. I realize that many Oregon counties are facing difficult economic times, but this isn't because of land use laws.

The legislature should deal with what will actually work to promote rural economic development, not what won't. Resource lands (farm and forest) are one of the driving engines of rural economies. It makes no sense to take away protections for what needs preserving in rural Oregon.

It appears that some people have a fantasy that if more subdivisions and sites for industrial land sprout up in rural counties, these areas will become akin to Washington County —attracting large corporations and all that comes with them.

Almost certainly, this wouldn't happen. Rural is different from urban and suburban. Further, Oregon's more metropolitan counties have done well economically under the current land use laws. So why weaken them, when they have promoted economic development in this state as a whole?

Again, fix what needs fixing in rural economies. Just realize that Oregon's land use system isn't one of those things. Sure, improvements always can be made to it. But a wholesale undermining of it isn't called for — not in rural Oregon, not anywhere.

Sincerely,

Brian Hines
10371 Lake Drive SE
Salem, Oregon 97306

Brian Hines
Salem, Oregon USA
brianhines1@gmail.com
<https://www.facebook.com/OregonBrian>
<https://www.facebook.com/StrangeUpSalem>
<http://twitter.com/oregonbrian>
www.hinesblog.com (blog)
www.churchofthechurchless.com (other blog)

February 23, 2015

Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources
Oregon State Capitol
900 Court St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

SB25 OPPOSE

Dear Chair Edwards and Committee Members,

Being a farmer that lives in Central Oregon I view this as a “feel good” bill to help the rural communities, but really it is **a bill that will really hurt farmers and ranchers** to make it easier to develop non-farm uses (houses and businesses) in the EFU zone. Allowing counties to have different standards than the current statewide land use rules is opening Pandora’s Box.

The state wide land use system works well overall. Built into the state wide land use system are steps for counties to use to have exceptions. This bill is not needed. **Agriculture is a key stabilizing business base for the rural communities; please recognize that we are businessmen and women as farmers and ranchers.** This bill will destabilize the protections that the current land use system has for the EFU zone for agriculture.

If this bill became law and my county was a county that chose to use the new ability to have their own land use laws my farm would be greatly impacted and probably be developed for houses or at the very least the impacts from more houses being allowed next to me would bring about such a financial burden that I would leave farming.

All that I want to do is farm, which the current land use system allows me to do without additional conflicts to impact my operation. I am a NIMBY (not in my back yard); please vote no on this bill.

Sincerely,

Mickey Killingsworth
Sheep Farmer
Jefferson County
Cell phone 503.250.2460