

I am writing to oppose any consideration given to moving land from rural to urban reserves through a legislative bill like SB 4, that undermines the Urban and Rural Reserves established by SB 1011. I would like to point out something obvious: passing bills like this will create a legislative back door which invalidates the entire reserves process, wasting six years of careful planning and public process across three counties, Metro, and then the additional eight years of hearings, challenges, and revisions up to the Oregon Supreme Court. As someone who participated in the entire process, I find it shocking that you are considering undermining the care and analysis and commitments involved. Taking high value farm and forest land and arbitrarily moving it in order to support industrial expansion today breaks the promises made to landowners that they could count on 40-50 years without this sort of jerking around with the passage of SB 1011. Whether the prompt is new federal funding or a complaint from a single land owner, the reasons to reject SB 4 and future legislative challenges to the reserves are as follows:

1. The core promise of SB 1011 was 40 to 50 years of certainty for both urban and rural reserve areas. Continued legislative proposals to change reserve designations badly undermine that certainty and the benefits it provides to urban service providers and urban planners, natural resource planners, farmers, private property owners and concerned citizens. It also puts yearly decision making back into the process, which is a terrible waste of time and resources.
2. There is no perfect outcome. One property owner's gain is another's loss. Trying to fix one property owner's complaint just shifts the losing line over a few acres. At the same time, these new bills don't suggest that other urban-designated land become rural. Little by little they will erode away our best farmland and our precious watersheds, the very thing the state wanted to protect in this reserves process. The net effect of the shift in SB 4 would be almost a 10% increase in urban reserves, and the total urban reserves would then exceed the 50 year urban reserve land supply allowed by SB 1011. The region does not need 2,000 more acres of urban reserves.

3. If the legislature starts making changes to reserves designations, there is no end to it. This year's losers will come back next year and ask to be made whole, and growing numbers of property owners or business interests will feel entitled to ask the legislature for a change that would benefit them.
4. I've been told that at a hearing for HB 4078, where Wa. County swapped urban reserves designations from north to south Hillsboro, representatives from all jurisdictions who testified in favor of the bill were asked by Committee Chair Rep. Val Hoyle if they promised to accept the compromises in the bill, and would not come back to the legislature to request changes, and that they all agreed. If the legislature modifies the compromises made in HB 4078, those commitments will no longer hold.
5. Legislative decisions are the usually the result of much shorter processes that can't include the kind of thorough research, analysis, and extensive public input that the regional process invested six years into (2006-2011). The reserve designations in SB 1011 were also appealed, remanded, revised, and challenged all the way up to the State Supreme Court, involving another eight years of review and legal proceedings (ratified 2019). The legislature and the governor are not qualified to overturn SB 1011 with the mark of a pen.
6. The governor and legislature don't have detailed knowledge of local conditions (as counties and Metro do) to accurately evaluate claims about how well land meets the long lists of urban and rural factors, or to weigh one set of parcels' qualifications for reserves effectively against another. The counties had many reports developed by experts to rely on. How well could the legislature evaluate whether modified urban and rural reserves met the regional "best achieves" balance standard?
7. Certain land owners stand to gain millions of dollars with the changes in SB 4's current proposal in lieu of utilizing other reasonable options within the UGB. Those few land owners lobbying through the back door should not have influence on a bill that impacts the entire metro area. The land the Semiconductor Committee is considering bringing in, and the land that Hillsboro staff advocated for, is, in fact, the exact

same 1700 acres that the NW Hillsboro Land Alliance has been trying to get brought in for years now, including via SB 186 and HB 4075. The Governor and legislature should not be favoring one group of land owners at the expense of others.

8. The main driver of semi-conductor growth in Oregon is Intel, and they already have stated they are planning their manufacturing expansions in Ohio, Ireland, and Germany over the next 10 years. In fact, \$80 Billion dollars are planned for European expansion and \$20 Billion for Ohio. They are diversifying the locations of their foundary sites to create "resilience and geographic balance." Oregon is already the largest site in facilities and workforce and not the focus for further expansion. The only current announced plans are within their Ronler site. In the U.S. they were relying on the passage of the federal assistance to build in Ohio, and today they are in financial distress and went so far as to cut stockholder dividends for the first time since 2000 this winter. There just isn't money in the budget for more capital investment in Oregon. Putting it simply, the additional urban acreage proposed is not needed anytime soon.

The state, counties and Metro agreed that it made much more sense to use a set of long range planning criteria to identify how to protect valuable farmland, environmentally sensitive areas, and grow where transportation, housing density and jobs made sense based on population growth forecasts. After 14 long years of research, community hearings, negotiations and approvals voted on by the county commissioners, legal appeals, more hearings, more votes, and a Supreme Court decision, SB 1011 established a balanced and fair plan justified with valid data. During that time, Washington Co. already made a last minute bargain/swap and chose to urbanize South Hillsboro rather than the areas to the North. Any bills which propose changing land designations at this point will completely undermine the careful work of many experts, community members, and government officials to provide some sort of stability and allow people to make longer term investment plans for their property. There will always have to be a line drawn of where it is best to build housing, conduct industry and business, and to farm, and there will always be some folks

who aren't happy with the line. But once the lines are clear for everyone in state law, the uncertainty will go away, we won't be revisiting the same decisions every 2 years, and these dreams of making a huge profit on the land will get more realistic.

Please, beyond just shutting down SB 4, I ask that you quickly also shut down further attempts to legislate individual pieces of property out of SB 1011 and keep the promises that Oregon, Metro, and the three counties have made to all the rest of the citizens here. I don't want to have to keep driving to Salem to testify, or sending this letter every six months.

Respectfully,
Susan Andrews
13410 NW Springville Rd.
Portland, OR 97229