

Submitter: Tonia Moro  
On Behalf Of: Self  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure: HB3382

Senate Rules Committee Members, Chair and Vice Chair,

I have been an attorney based in Southern Oregon for over 30 years, with experience in Oregon's land use system. I litigated some of the land use issues on behalf of Coos County residents who were in opposition to the Jordan Cove project. These are my comments, my individual comments. My effort to oppose this bill has been futile thus far, but I have to try one more time.

If you care one iota about climate change, Oregon's resilience and the resilience of its fisheries, you should not advance this bill. Of course I can't say that there are "fiscal impacts" to the state budget for you to consider today, but we will be paying for this mistake for a long time and impacting generations of Oregonians. Look at the record comments of the scientists who know Coos Bay, Mike Graybill, Jan Hodder, Christine Moffitt. Mr. Graybill testified that there will not be a way to ensure no-net loss of the eel grass that is so important to the ecosystem. They and others, including Bob Morrow, have also laid out that the container terminal (the impetus of this bill) that Mr. Clem says will save Coos Bay is impossible. It is economically impossible. Do not put your fingerprints on this misguided grant of authority to the Port of Coos Bay pursue a pipe dream by avoiding important policies contained in our Coastal land use goals. DEQ and DSL will not be able to save the day and we will be fools to give away incredible authority to stop projects (under the Coastal Management Act) that are unable to demonstrate that they will not infringe on the public trust rights or that could not demonstrate that they are needed more than the salmon fishery, for example.

Do not be persuaded that local authority does not matter. That is what this bill is about. Eight of the local decisions were rejected by LUBA in the Jordan Cove matter and that is why this bill is now on your plate. The proponents needed to set a new path because those decisions are in the way of its project. And as such it the counterpoint to the proponents patronizing argument that "there is still a land use process, so don't worry about the arguments from the opponents that we are cutting out the community." If they can satisfy the community, why does this bill exist? What is left for the community to apply are insignificant standards, not the ones that stopped the ridiculous Jordan Cove project.

There is a long and disappointing story about this bill that you are missing. It includes the absolute assault on Oregon values by powerful, corporate interests; the proponents have set fire to them. I can only hope that one day the full story is written.

I, for one, would not want to risk being associated with the destruction of those values or the potential destruction of one of our greatest resources.

Look at the comments - you will see that this will have a long-term negative fiscal impact to Oregon; do not advance this bill. Hold another public hearing where the public has sufficient notice and can address you directly.

Thank you for listening.