

February 10, 2018

Chair McLain and members  
House Transportation Committee

Thank you for listening to the testimony yesterday regarding House Bill 4092 - both those for and against the bill. One observation that I made was that no one argued against the lengthening of the runway. So, why the opposition against House Bill 4092?

- The bill is unnecessary. Those in favor of the runway extension can achieve their goals through the processes available to them. There is no need to avoid a public process. Proponents have plenty of time to address the process since the FAA has yet to determine that lengthening of the runway is justified.
- The bill creates a bad precedent. It represents legislation to avoid a process that has stood the test of time. Government should not exempt itself from its own laws.
- The bill begins the process of "super-siting". When someone is unhappy with our land use laws, they will now know that they can come to the Legislature, particularly during a short session, and seek to avoid the process and public input. For our land use laws, it is the beginning of "death by a thousand cuts".
- Amendment 3 to HB4092 is overreaching. It instructs another government body on how to act, without proper study of Oregon's overall Homeland Security preparedness. It is in the best interest of Oregonians that the Homeland Council be free to study all their data and act in a manner that best fulfills their mission.
- Amendment 3 also goes beyond the stated purpose of the bill, to apply only to Aurora Airport. The amendment clearly applies to all state owned airports.

House Bill 4092 is unnecessary and goes against the best interest of the citizens of Oregon.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ken Ivey', written over a horizontal line.

Ken Ivey, Chair  
Aurora Butteville Barlow Citizens Planning Organization