

Submitter: Paul Ottaviano
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Joint Committee On Semiconductors
Measure: SB4

The fact that I have to submit opposition testimony to a committee that is seriously considering, if you haven't already made up your mind, circumventing UGB law and the long social contract that goes with it, all for industrial land speculation and the profit of a relative few, is repugnant to me. You should be ashamed that we're even at this point, and feel damn lucky that this state, for the most part, hates the Republican brand (which you Democrats are now acting like). But unfortunately, we have indefinite incumbency in gerrymandered districts, so I'm sure you all feel safe in your pursuit of profit in public service. And you Democrats, are you even Oregonian? Or are you just group-think partisans, following the lead of D.C. masters? We already have enough tech around here, and don't need to expand industrial sprawl with facilities that will be obsolete in approximately 10 years. Really, how much land will Intel demand from us in the long term? If you do this - and if a failing Intel (those pay and dividend cuts will surely recruit and retain talent!) chooses Oregon over other boot licking suitors - then your poor legacy is assured, and you'll be saddling PDX Metro with increased population, traffic, crime, and the incivility that already goes with this sort of "development". Furthermore, those of you who fashion yourselves Democrats who care about "health", environment, and "the science", will no longer have any credibility. How can you possibly make any arguments for climate action, when you're pushing to pave over soil that lies over a literal universe of microbial life and is essential to our viability as a species? Do you not realize that there isn't any "saving the planet" without an utter shift in attitude towards land use? You say the soil is no longer viable, according to whose reductionist metrics and industrial-capitalist scientism? And if true, why is the soil no longer viable? Hint: it's the industrial legacy of desecrating the land, that you seek to bring in. But the soil's viability is healthier than you might think and is up for honest discussion, to say the least. And it can be restored, if necessary, given what we're learning in soil science now. But I'm sure you all know that. Furthermore, how can you possibly prattle on about healthy individuals, when you're making people and communities more dependent on purchased inputs from mystery sources abroad? It's an utter absurdity the thought that we can have healthy individuals, without healthy communities, which you all seem fine disintegrating and gentrifying. (By the way, Washington County does not exist to help Mayor Wheeler out of his gentrification problem.) And yet here we are, a committee seriously considering compromising local food sources and the community around it. The global food system is fragile, very fragile. Weak nodes, strong links, little-to-no redundancy and no feedback. Ask you buddies at Intel about resilient or fragile systems, they should know. Combine it with global shipping chokepoints, that if choked, could cause a major disruption to food supply, if not a systemic collapse. In a disruption or failure of this magnitude, our social-political

problems of 2020 will seem easy. You may think a bailout is coming, but we're mistaken in thinking that having money also means having food. In addition to providing healthy food and being a catalyst for authentic local culture, local farms and food sources related to it help us smooth over the disruptions that are growing in frequency and intensity. Some might call policies compromising local food sources as insane, or even suicidal. So if you go through with this, in a quite frankly, underhanded manner, you may think that you're making our communities more robust with your religion of "growth" and "job creation", but you would actually be making us more fragile. Come back down from the ledge, and say no to this bad idea.