

Submitter: Denise Caire

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1578

Dear Chair Pham, Vice-Chair Anderson and other Legislators,  
I appreciate this chance to present my comments in opposition to SB 1578. Please vote "No" on SB 1578.

It's an It is unorthodox solution, to circumvent our Land Use Rules sanctioned for over 50 years.

I'm a Hillsboro resident of 39 years and moved from Portland to Aloha in 1956 when I was only 5 years old. I have an undeniable connection with this place and land. My great-great-great-grandparents arrived to settle here in 1841, and founded Glencoe, the predecessor to North Plains until the railroad was built in 1908. I guess one could say that I'm very, very well connected with roots that span 185 years deep.

I love Oregon, my beautiful land of phenomenal ancient rock formations, thick stands of cathedral-like evergreens, winding rivers and wild lakes, dusty deserts, and gusty high plateaus. Do you agree?

If you DO, have you ever stopped to think about "why and how" this state is so breath taking, from the sea to the mountains? The reason is because THIS STATE has LAND-USE RULES, and people have protected, nurtured, and defended THIS LAND through the Land Use Rules for over 50 years.

Please vote "No" on SB 1578.

Abiding by our Land Use Rules tends to keep the people who only want to exploit our natural resources at bay. It's just too darn arduous to comply with all that's required to go by the "book," or, in our case, by the "rules."

And this is why I find this bill so EXTREMELY CONFUSING. Since you agree that our Land Use Rules and System has proven to be successful, then why do you want to add 50 acres of farmland per small city and not follow our long-standing, well-proven Land Use Rules? Everyone else has followed the Rules, so why can't these small cities?

Please vote "No" on SB 1578.

Are the small cities looking for additional tax revenue? That seems to be the term the "public relations experts" have concluded are to be the "open sesame" jingle across

the board. "Tax revenue" and "JOBS" have been deemed acceptable to use in this ruse (one of many).

But that's an over simplification with regards to this bill. This bill Might equate to more tax revenue, but where's the guarantee of that? Have any IMPACT studies been where is done? What IMPACT studies have been defined and implemented? Traffic impact? Economic impact? Environmental impact? Agricultural impact? Wildlife impact? Archaeological evaluation?

If one does the work to conduct various IMPACT studies, then one can develop mitigation options to address the areas of greatest concern that may damage or harm the most residents. That's the right thing to do.

Please vote "No" on SB 1578.

No bill or individual should condone or be granted a way to avoid the Oregon State methods to control endless sprawl. We value our land today, tomorrow, and always. Oregon is not a cheap hussy that can be bought by the highest bidder. Be clear headed and don't trick yourself on this.

It's worked wonderfully well so far. If you want to continue protecting, nurturing, and defending OREGON lands, just abide by and follow our 19 Land Use Rules. It's simple.

Please vote "No" on SB 1578.

Thank you for seriously considering my long-term perspective. I want future generations to live in the same beautiful Oregon as I do. Please don't circumvent our Land Use Rules.

Best regards,  
Denise Caire