

Submitter: Deb Evans  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Joint Committee On Transportation  
Measure: HB3382

Members of the Joint Committee on Transportation,

I am writing testimony in opposition of HB 3382. I have listened to the full hour and 27 minutes of public hearing testimony and believe that Oregon's land use laws have been precisely what has kept a balance of interests in Oregon without having certain interests with deep pockets be able to override critical natural resources in this state. I appreciate those speakers who said this is a starting point and I'm wondering how the rest of us will be able to weigh in in this important issue going forward?

It is profoundly important and a great asset of Oregon that we have a robust public process when it comes to permits covering a wide range of protections including our land use laws where tribal, environmental, industrial and other interests can all have a voice and their particular concerns and issues are heard and listened to. This robust public process has led to Oregon making balanced decisions when we have a long standing process that weighs often competing interests in a thoughtful and respectful manner. Our land use laws, for these select ports, should not be, point blank, discarded as less important than the ask by Mr. Clem, who stands to gain personally, just because he is an Oregonian with his own deep pockets and connections. We should have a process accessible to the public.

I appreciated and share Ms Nathanson's concerns that this seems like a binary (one or the other) decision and I would like to understand what precisely is causing the need to deepen the navigation channel and whether there are alternative ships that could be used? What specifically is keeping lesser draft ships from working? It seems another compromise point should be whether and what is the minimum channel expansion (depth and widening) needed to be successful?

Last, Mr. Clem mentioned they have staff working every single day in Oregon, the midwest, Washington DC and Utah on this project. I would like to know who in Utah is working on this and why? The suspension of the land use laws and port development also matters to what type of industry is being considered and whether the adverse effects outweigh the benefits.

I concur with the verbal testimony of Oregon Shores Association as we too were involved in the Jordan Cove, Pacific Connector Pipeline projects as affected landowners with property in Klamath County.

I urge you to oppose this bill. A much more robust discussion is needed and that discussion needs to include the public beyond this one short notice public hearing. Thank you.