

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

If the state is breaking its promise to protect this land until at least 2065, then how can we trust that you won't break the promise that this land be for its currently proposed purpose? If it becomes a data center, those are known to suck energy and raise rates for local residents who are already struggling with rising costs.

This is disproportionately at the benefit of a couple property owners looking to sell their land as rezoned industrial land, rather than sell it to someone who wants to start or expand their farm operation. EFU land sells for about \$20–30k per acre, while industrial land can sell for up to over \$1million per acre. This will increase the cost of farmland, and reduce access to top tier soils, and impact carbon sequestration.

It's important that these lands stay as rural reserves until at least 2065 and follow the UGB. They are there for a reason – look to the experts advising you on this and the long history we have benefited from the UGB. Also, why was this amendment created through backroom conversations, an off-the-record vote by the Metro Council, and why did this not include community engagement? That is a major concern.

I oppose SB1586. It benefits few for the cost of our natural land and healthy environment for future generations. Instead, please consider economic development policies for industrial land readiness funding inside UGBs, investments in public education and childcare, accountability for creating good climate jobs.