

Submitter: Larry Sullivan  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Finance and Revenue  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1586

Much of the discussion of SB 1586 will be about land use. The bill proposes including about 1,700 acres into the UGB. How much land is 1,700 acres? An acres is about the size of an American football field. If all of the farm ground in Washington County were a \$100.00 bill, the 1,700 acres would be \$1.70. Using the same example state wide, total farm ground in Oregon is over 15 million acres so the 1,700 acres would be less than 2 cents. So the hype about losing farm ground is unwarranted.

Oregon's land use laws are based on 19 **EQUALLY** important goals. For this bill the focus will revolve around citizen involvement, agricultural lands, land for economic development and land for housing.

At Senate bill 100's inception the intention of the land use policies was to prevent dividing the Willamette Valley into 5 acre mini ranches. That succeeded. Over the years most of the original land use goals have been forgotten and the environmental community has used the preservation of farm land as a tool to block both residential and industrial growth. The courts have bought into this argument even though according to the land use goals land for agriculture is no more important than land for residences or industry. Since 1980 Oregon's population has grown 61% while land inside the UGBS has increased by 10%. This has restricted housing supply and is one of the factors for increased housing prices. Compounding the housing shortage is the fact in some cases houses are being torn down to create land for industrial development.

This is pretty basic stuff. If no land is available for business development or for residences the economy is going to collapse. Don't accept the worn out rhetoric of groups like Metro or some of the well-known environmental groups. During the CHIPS Act testimony Metro asserted there was ample land inside the UGBS to allow for industrial growth. The acreage may be there but because it is a conglomerate of many small parcels with many different owners it is not attractive to a major employer.

Because of the direction the majority party has taken the state over the past few decades many areas need attention before the state will become attractive to the business community. Take care of the land availability problem first. If there is no place for new businesses to come to or for in state businesses to expand to none of the rest makes much difference.

Consider this. If Oregon doesn't change its anti-business image and policies, what state will your children and grand-children be forced to move to find employment?