



Main Office • 133 SW 2nd Ave, Ste 201 • Portland, OR 97204
Willamette Valley Office • 454 Willamette St, Ste 213 • Eugene, OR 97401
Southern Oregon Office • PO Box 2442 • Grants Pass, OR 97528

March 27, 2023

To: House Committee on Housing and Homelessness

From: Mary Kyle McCurdy, Deputy Director

Re: HB 3197– clear & objective standards on rural lands

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on HB 3197. 1000 Friends of Oregon is a nonprofit, membership organization that works with Oregonians to support livable urban and rural communities; protect family farms, forests and natural areas; and provide transportation and housing choice.

1000 Friends support HB 3197. It corrects an error made by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) in a case, *Community Participation Organization 4M and Jill Warren vs. Washington County* (LUBA No. 2020-110) concerning the interpretation of ORS 197.307, known as the “clear and objective” statute.

ORS 197.307 requires local governments to apply “clear and objective” standards, conditions, and procedures regulating residential development. As someone who has practiced law in this area for decades, I can attest that the clear and objective statute was intended to apply, and has applied, only inside urban growth boundaries (UGBs) until this LUBA decision.

Applying clear and objective standards for housing development inside UGBs makes sense; that is where we have focused housing development – near the things we all need to access regularly, like schools, stores, and services, and where we have invested in roads and pipes to serve the development.

It does not make sense *outside* UGBs, where the land is zoned mostly for farming, forestry, and natural resources – the places where we grow food and fiber, and protect and enjoy nature.
Farm land, forest lands, and natural areas are not residential zones.

Instead, these are areas where housing is *minimized*, so as to support, and not conflict with, farming and forestry and not interfere with streams, habitat, wetlands, and other natural areas. In these areas, statutes and rules have properly given local governments discretion to weigh factors and consider conditions in deciding whether a residential use will adversely interfere with farming and forestry practices and local resource-based economies, and to take those into consideration in determining how to site individual houses. Local governments also need that same discretion in protecting water quality, wildlife habitat, and other natural resources.

HB 3197 does not impact housing processes or production inside UGBs. Rather, it corrects a LUBA decision by setting the system as it was intended and has been working – inside UGBs – and it protects farm and forest lands and natural areas by providing counties discretion outside UGBs.

We urge you to support HB 3197. Thank you for consideration of our comments.