

To: Senate Committee On Finance and Revenue

Good morning Chair Broadman, Vice Chair McLane, and members of the committee,

My name is Anna Kemper, and I work as the Great Communities Program Director at 1000 Friends of Oregon. I am writing today as a member of the Portland Metro community. My work focuses on helping create thriving communities for all, places where people can afford to live, where farms and forests remain productive, and where we make smart, climate-conscious decisions about growth.

As a lifelong Oregonian, I am here today to oppose SB 1386 because it breaks a longstanding promise to protect rural reserve lands, threatens local food security and agricultural economies, and advances an economic development model that lacks accountability, all while pitting agriculture and tech against each other.

SB 1386 would increase the cost of farmland and reduce access to some of the best soils in the state. These rural reserve lands were designated to remain protected until at least 2065 to provide certainty to farmers, communities, and local governments. It allows farmers to invest in their operations, to expand, and to plan for the future. If the state breaks its promise now, how can we trust that future land use promises will be kept? And how can farmers compete when EFU land that might sell for \$20,000 to \$30,000 per acre suddenly becomes worth over \$1 million per acre if rezoned industrial? That kind of speculative pressure makes it nearly impossible for new and expanding farmers to access top-tier soils.

Protecting these lands is also about addressing the worsening climate crisis. High-quality agricultural soils are critical for carbon sequestration. Once they are paved over, that capacity is lost. These lands also protect watersheds, wetlands, and tributaries that are essential for downstream communities. We cannot say we are serious about climate goals while dismantling one of our most effective land use tools.

SB 1386 rewards cities that have not demonstrated accountability for the land they already have. Hillsboro, for example, has burned through significant amounts of industrial land over the past decade, much of it for land-intensive development like data centers that have not produced the quantity or quality of jobs promised. **The bottom line is this:** If strong job creation has not materialized within existing industrial land inside the UGB, how should we believe that expanding into rural reserves will produce a different outcome?

This bill would disproportionately benefit a small number of property owners who stand to gain enormously from rezoning, rather than farmers who want to continue working the land to feed our communities. That dynamic pits tech and agriculture against each other. Oregon should not be forcing a false choice between sectors. We can and must support both, but not by sacrificing the very resource that sustains our food systems and rural economies.

If we are serious about economic development, there are better tools. We need a comprehensive, statewide industrial lands inventory; funding to make existing lands inside

UGBs ready for development; investments in public education and childcare to support workforce participation; and real accountability standards tied to the creation of good climate jobs. Smart growth inside existing boundaries is how we build thriving communities without negatively impacting Oregon's agriculture.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask you to vote no on SB 1386. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Anna Kemper
SE Portland