

Senate Committee on Housing and Development
RE: SB 462
Position: Oppose

Honorable Chair Pham Vice Chair Anderson, and members of the committee,

I am Derek Payne, a professional land use planner in Oregon, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 462. This bill mandates a new continuing education course for land use planners that is deeply flawed and will have negative consequences for our state.

My primary concerns with SB 462 are as follows:

1. **Unnecessary and Redundant:** Existing continuing education options through the Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association (OAPA) and APA National already ensure planners stay current on relevant topics. This bill creates a new layer of bureaucracy without addressing a demonstrated need.
2. **Biased Curriculum:** The mandated curriculum focuses heavily on economic principles and the development industry's perspective, neglecting crucial areas like environmental protection, community engagement, and social equity. This biased approach will lead to unbalanced training and potentially harmful planning decisions.
3. **Developer-Centric Instructors:** Requiring instructors to be from the development industry creates a conflict of interest and undermines the objective nature of the training. This will further skew the curriculum towards development interests and away from the broader public good.
4. **Financial Burden:** The bill imposes a new cost on local governments and special districts, potentially diverting resources from essential planning activities. This is particularly burdensome for smaller jurisdictions with limited budgets.
5. **Undermining Local Control:** SB 462 dictates a one-size-fits-all approach to continuing education, disregarding the diverse needs and contexts of different communities across Oregon. This undermines local control and flexibility in addressing unique planning challenges.
6. **Unclear Implementation:** The bill leaves many questions unanswered regarding course content, delivery methods, assessment criteria, and enforcement mechanisms. This lack of clarity will create confusion and administrative difficulties for both planners and local governments.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee to reject SB 462 in both concept and execution.

Sincerely,



Derek Payne
Professional Planner