



Chair, Vice-Chair, and Members of the Committee:

For the record, my name is Amber Nieves, and I am submitting testimony on behalf of being a long-standing member of the Beaverton Area Chamber of Commerce in opposition of SB 1586.

SB 1586 represents a comprehensive and coordinated power grab to strengthen Oregon's political and wealthy elite by utilizing global capital and utility boards, to orchestrate Oregon's largest Industrial Land Annexation.

The strategic site readiness is about annexing some of the best farmland in the nation and overriding local land use protections while limiting public engagement. The targeted incentives will benefit the few, the rich, while local constituents pay more in taxes as a percentage of income than any of the manufacturing companies ever will or have, and while community members experience some of the highest costs of living in the nation.

The land once developed will not produce the very things the community needs, food or affordable housing. Perhaps the best use of the 1700 acres is to ensure that it's developed for mutually beneficial reasons. Break it up in 3's. One third for manufacturing development, one third for affordable housing and living space, and one third to remain as farmland for growing food and protecting vital water sources. This would be a better use of the land resource, vs. multiple tactical players like big energy, PGE, NW Natural, Pacific Corp, IBEW Local 48, and NECA, Cities, and Chambers represented by big landowner alliances. Basically, the power grid and those who own it and build it, along with rich lobbyists landowner alliances, city government relationship managers, and existing global manufacturers are the key influencers of this bill, to the detriment of the entire surrounding community. Engage the public on this issue before allowing interests of the few to pigeonhole the many.

I believe the community needs affordable housing and food. Without farmland there's no food and it cannot be replaced once the land is developed without great environmental cost.

This legislation addresses only the key factors that influence big business investment decisions: land availability and tax waivers to incentivize while most small property owners pay more, and the strategic consultants, lobbyists, mayors and chambers blindly support and forget what matters, community input.

Without true public input and a clear strategy to support local community by including what they need, like affordable housing and farmland to grow food, this bill is the latest big business power grab, and they are hoping the public doesn't notice. They are hoping that the public is too taxed with trying to survive that they will not participate in the conversation. When given the data, the public will see that

this is a carefully engineered legislative override designed to take away the public's voice and resources to fund and benefit the few. Let the public in on this conversation, let them in the facts of this bill and who stands to win and who stands to lose, and at what costs.

Last I checked we can't grow more farmland, or create more clean drinking water, once it's gone or polluted, it's gone forever. These are the vital resources the entire community needs. Long term growth by big tech in Washington County hasn't been delivered as promised. Ask Intel how many jobs it's lost since it's peak? Over 5,000! How many campuses are empty? One, while Ronler Acres, Jones Farm, Aloha, and Hawthorn Farm), significantly reducing operations. Manufacturing isn't coming to save us, the U.S. manufacturing sector experienced significant declines in 2025, with estimates suggesting between 70,000 and 78,000 jobs were lost over the course of the year. Manufacturing employment fell to its lowest level since before the pandemic, with sectors like fabricated metal, chemical, and beverage manufacturing suffering notable losses. Why is this bill only focusing on manufacturing while it's experiencing a huge national decline? Who benefits? Make it make sense.

Commonsense development will include affordable housing, farmland development to grow food, and repurposing vacant existing manufacturing properties or in-city sites, with a small portion of this potential annexation becoming new manufacturing development, if it's even feasible given the current facts about manufacturing in the US.

I respectfully urge your opposition for SB 1586.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Respectfully submitted,

Amber Nieves