

## Hamre Jaime

---

**From:** Eva Eagle <eva.eagle@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 5, 2018 10:44 AM  
**To:** Hamre Jaime  
**Cc:** Rep McLain; Rep Salinas; Rep Barreto; Rep Smith D; Rep Sprenger; Rep McKeown; Rep Esquivel; Rep Witt  
**Subject:** HB4031

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Members of the House Agricultural and Natural Resources Committee:

I want to express my strong opposition to HB4031. I would like to have testified at the hearing that is scheduled, but have only just heard about the bill and seen its text. I hope this input will be useful at the next phase of decision making.

This bill is part of a series of bills following on protection of the Metolius in which the developers who could not build their destination resorts there were given some sort of 'development opportunity' in other locations. They did not build any such resort, and then the "TDOs" were extended for another period of time. And still there is no activity, so once again there is an extension proposed here.

It is unfortunate that the language surrounding these bills has become rather exaggerated, with people speaking of development 'rights' for the landowners involved. There were no rights involved, and so the extension of special opportunities to build are nothing that the legislature is obligated to grant. It seems to me that after so many years during which no development has begun, the time for these special opportunities is long over.

Far more unfortunate, though, is the fact that this bill has new provisions not included in earlier extensions, specifically Subsection 7. This section is appalling, as it grants the developers to violate any statewide land use planning goals with which they might wish to ignore. I simply do not understand why it would be good legislation to grant one property owner the license to violate state laws. Section 7 must be deleted from this bill.

Finally, I am troubled by the addition of yet another provision, applicable to a completely different topic, an "economic development pilot program." This specifies a distance of 78 miles away from an urban boundary, rather than the more common standard of a 100 mile distance. The legislation, if passed, needs to be a lot more specific and more clear about where it applies.

In any case, however, I am opposed to this bill and most of all opposed to Subsection 7.

Thank you for listening.

Eva Eagle  
Sisters, OR