



Coalition Opposes HB 3062

This bill represents an overreach that adds complexity to Oregon’s already intricate land use and environmental permitting framework. The purported “problem” it aims to solve is not a statewide or systemic issue but rather an overreaction to isolated incidents involving legal and appropriate land use decisions. Instead of addressing legitimate concerns, the bill opens the door for activist-led interference in the regulation of economic and infrastructure development, which is already highly controlled and overseen.

As currently drafted, the bill is unworkable. Targeting a limited range of industries doesn’t improve the proposal; it merely intensifies the harm. Based on the amendment language we’ve reviewed we remain steadfast in our opposition. There are no amendments that could turn this bill into sound policy. This remains true for any other legislative vehicle aimed at moving these concepts forward (HB 3831, for instance).

Oregon’s zoning and land use laws are already rigid, and uses within a single site can vary significantly, even if the property is uniformly zoned. For instance, a manufacturing facility may include office space, warehousing, research and development, packaging, and other functions, all within the scope of industrial zoning. Attempting to further micromanage specific uses within a site will be burdensome and harmful to a variety of industries, exacerbating the shortage of industrial land in the process.

The bill’s inclusion of “sensitive uses” with the proposed 1000-foot buffer — and even more so with the half-mile buffer suggested for fuel facilities — creates an unnecessarily broad and burdensome reach. These “sensitive uses” include:

- Residences
- Schools and daycares
- Parks
- Nursing homes

- Hospitals

This provision effectively creates a constant, unavoidable regulatory requirement on the targeted users, especially those located near population centers. The bill applies to “any existing” industrial land as well as new industrial land, regardless of whether the land had previously supported similar uses. For example, even if the industrial use remains unchanged but a new tenant occupies the space, the requirements would still be triggered. Furthermore, it applies regardless of whether new “sensitive uses” have emerged near the land since its original designation, offering no protections to prevent sensitive uses from locating near industrial areas. Oregon has even proactively worked to place childcare centers near job hubs, yet this bill fails to account for that, or for those employers who include childcare facilities on the work site as valuable support for working parents.

We also note that in communities across Oregon, homeless gathering places, campsites and RV locations (sanctioned and unsanctioned) and some public and not for profit shelters, are in or near property use types and industrial zones targeted by this original bill and the amendment language. These overlapping uses would further trigger the environmental regulations established by this bill, impacting both industry and the many state and local efforts to address [Oregon’s homelessness problem](#).

Additionally, the bill seems to expand the Cleaner Air Oregon permitting process to cover non-point sources of emissions, making local land use approvals contingent upon state air quality permits. This reversal of roles shifts regulatory responsibility, as state air quality permits typically require a Land Use Compatibility Statement from local governments. The bill’s impact assessments would impose significant new costs, delays, and uncertainties.

Restricting or hindering fuel terminals, warehouses, and distribution centers will drive up costs and limit the movement of goods, further stifling economic growth opportunities. It will also discourage investment in Oregon, especially in facilities that create jobs and contribute tax revenue. As highlighted in the latest annual report from the Urban Land Institute, Portland ranked 80th out of 81 metro areas for real estate prospects. This bill seems certain to further deteriorate Oregon’s competitiveness and economic viability.