

I am a resident of Central Oregon with a longstanding interest in land use law and policy. I would ask that this email be made part of the record in this matter.

I cannot attend the at the meeting of this committee on Apr 6th, but I would like to explain my vigorous opposition tho HB 2222, and now even more so due to the proposed amendment.

If the amendment proposed is adopted, HB 2222 would create the a statewide version of the 2012 - 2016 Southern Regional Land Use Pilot Project. (That pilot project was created by Executive Order #12-07 on May 5th 2012.)

It should be noted that the Southern Regional Land Use Pilot Project was a failure. None of the three pilot counties were able to complete the project. No land use designations were altered in any of the pilot counties. Despite receiving state grant funding of \$350,000, and having nearly 4 years to complete the studies, each of the three counties in their final reports released in 2016 cited the overwhelming amount of work that was required and that the costs greatly exceeded the funds allocated.

While some might believe that other counties could do a better job than the three pilot program counties in two years rather than 4, and without any state funding at all, that belief has no evidence base to sustain it. The state of Oregon paid \$350,000 in 2012 for a pilot project program to see if this regional approach to land use planning for non resource lands worked. We found out it did not work and that it was too time consuming and too costly. That, without more, should stop the discussion. The local taxpayers should not be asked for more tax dollars to support a study project that has already failed elsewhere even though state tax dollars were provided to assist with that pilot project program.

And of course, as a matter of first principals, it is a bad public policy idea to abandon state wide goals and guidelines for land use conservation and development that have worked quite well for 50 years, and to promote instead regional or even merely county-wide decisions on undeveloped lands. And under this bill it is not even clear if those proposed regional and county decisions would be reviewable at all by the Land Use Board of Appeals, or, if so, under what standards of review?

Wholesale residential development of dispersed parcels of land in forest and farm areas is, plain and simple, urban sprawl. That is bad public policy, and it runs counter to all of the underlying principals of Oregon's state wide land use planning goals and guidelines.

Statewide planning is a critical component of our conservation and protection of Oregon's land and water resources, as well as of our rural character and way of life.

Thank you for this chance to comment. Please let this bill enjoy a quiet death in this committee.

Paul Lipscomb
16991 Bartlemay Ln
Sisters, OR 97759