From:	Ken Sinansky
To:	Sen.MichaelDembrow@state.or.us; Sen.AlanOlsen@state.or.us; Sen.HermanBaertschiger@state.or.us; Sen
	Prozanski; Sen Roblan
Cc:	Raszka Shelley; "Ken Sinansky"
Subject:	Please Oppose SB 186
Date:	Monday, April 10, 2017 5:17:36 PM

April 10, 2017

Dear Members of the Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources,

I am writing to request your opposition to SB 186 which includes a change to about 350 acres in Multnomah County from Rural Reserves to Urban Reserves.

I live in unincorporated Multnomah county in the Forest Park Neighborhood in close proximity to the Multnomah County parcel of land which is included in SB 186. I believe SB 186 is against the wishes of the majority of folks who live in the local area. As my neighbors and I were frustrated about being studied for UGB expansion every 5 years, we pursued long term protection for the valuable farmland and natural resources in our area. Starting in 2007, we actively participated in the Reserves process:

- We worked with Rep. Greenlick and then-Senator Avakian to ensure that SB 1011 would become law.
- We worked with Multnomah County to get the western part of our county designated as Rural Reserves to protect wildlife habitat and farm land, and we continue to follow the process.

The region invested several years and many hours of hearings in the Reserves process. Reserves decisions required regional consensus from start (SB 1011) to finish (deciding which areas to designate as Reserves). I want to explain why I strongly oppose changing the Multhomah County Rural Reserves to Urban Reserves:

- The proposed change in Multnomah County would create a new "Area 93" an urban area with no city or county capable of providing urban services to the area. That was a key reason this area was not designated Urban Reserve by the county.
- The roads in this part of Multnomah County are rural roads that are already highly congested due to urban traffic between urban Washington County and Portland, this is a poor location to add more urban development and traffic. These rural roads are also highly susceptible to landslides, and aren't suitable for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Public input during the Reserves process overwhelmingly supported Rural Reserves in this location. A Metro survey found 74% support for a Rural Reserve in this part of lower Springville Road.
- The establishment of Urban and rural reserves gave a promise of 50 years of certainty, ensuring that taxpayer funds would be spent on efficient infrastructure to create Great Communities, while rural property owners could plan for their future. Regional consensus was a core principle of the reserves process -- Metro and all 3 counties had to agree.

Reserve boundaries were painstakingly developed at the local level, based on extensive data and study, and large amounts of public input over a period of several years. Legislative meddling with Urban and Rural Reserves:

- Undermines the certainty that helps minimize taxpayer costs by ensuring efficient "right sized" urban infrastructure development.
- Eliminates the certainty was promised to farmers so they could plan their investments.
- Breaks the promises made to citizens who actively participated in the process in a effort to develop long-term certainty

I believe that local land use decisions like urban and rural reserve designations should be made by local governments who know the local situation and who work closely with local residents, not by the state legislature. If the local governments need help from the state, they'll work together and ask for it. The

legislature should only adopt Reserves related bills that are supported by Metro and the three counties.

It is wrong for the legislature to step in and redraw these boundaries established by regional government. I request your opposition to SB 186.

Sincerely,

Ken Sinansky 14125 NW Old Germantown Road Portland, OR 97231 5038073209