

Submitter: Mona Linstromberg

On Behalf
Of:

Committee: House Committee On Agriculture, Land Use, Natural Resources, and
Water

Measure: HB2192

I have reviewed some previously submitted testimony and found Alex Cuyler's of interest. HB 2192 may resolve the issues he focuses on, but HB 2192 does so much more to our (our forests) detriment that very possibly Mr. Cuyler should seek remedy elsewhere. I wish him luck as long as the forest resource lands in that particular situation are given due consideration.

As to the particulars of proposal before you:

1) Section 2 of the Bill removes the sunset clause from the 2019 Bill, HB 3024; the 2019 language was not intended to be permanent; the 2019 version was justified on the basis that the 1973 'look-back' language would sunset in 2024 and farm land provisions would revert back to the 2013 language, the five-year look-back.

Also of concern:

2) It changes the language for forestland replacement dwellings from "has" characteristics of a dwelling to "has, or formerly had" (i.e.the dwelling simply had to have been removed, destroyed, or demolished in 1973 or later; this is an end run around M37 and M49 because it resurrects the 'pre SB 100 era.'

3) it increases the amount of time for demolition, removal, or conversion from three months to one year, allowing for more misuse of the conditions of approval that require removal, demolition, or conversion to a non-residential use.

4) it increases the number of dwellings in forestland, which is contrary to Goal 4's policy and it will increase the likelihood of wildfire on forestland. It is also contrary to the legislative policy for farmlands/Goal 3, given that it removes the sunset provision.

Goal 4 intends to restrict development on forestland that conflicts with forestry practices. My property butts up to Siuslaw National forestland. We are very aware out here of allowed forest practices and the need to be ever vigilant.

Please deny HB 2192

Thank you for your consideration - Mona Linstromberg