

Submitter: Sheila Dooley

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2422

Chair Marsh, Vice-Chairs Andersen and Breese-Iversen, and Members of the House Committee on Housing and Homelessness

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on HB 2400, HB 2422, and HB 2316.

I oppose all 3 bills due to their impact on Oregon's resource lands. They would override Oregon's land use laws and allow sprawl onto lands currently zoned for agriculture, forestry, rural uses and natural resources. These bills are harmful to the agricultural and forest land that Oregonians rely on.

These bills also increase wildfire risk. As someone who has been evacuated five times, I find this very concerning.

HB 2400

In rural Oregon, this bill would allow an additional dwelling for occupancy of a relative of the owner. However this provision only applies to the initial application, allowing the owner to then sell the house to anyone, thereby undermining the bill's intent.

This bill is unnecessary as Oregon law already allows new homes for relatives of agricultural and forest land managers, and additional new homes for unrelated farmworkers. We don't need additional dwellings that would fragment Oregon's resource lands.

Additional dwellings make farming more difficult as farmers need large tracts of undeveloped land to operate. More dwellings drive up the cost of farmland, making it unaffordable for new farmers.

HB 2422

This bill overrides existing state policy that requires a planning process to increase dwelling densities on rural land. Planning is needed to ensure that any increased densities will not have unintended negative consequences for Oregon's resource lands. The one acre upzoning allowed by this bill would result in haphazard sprawl onto areas that lack needed infrastructure.

HB 2316

This bill would override all land use laws by opening up publicly owned lands outside urban growth boundaries to sprawling, expensive development.

There is already a process in place for expanding urban growth boundaries in Oregon when there is a proven need. Development should take place within the existing UGBs where needed infrastructure exists.

Thank you,

Sheila Dooley