

Secretary:

Please enter the following vote explanation.

SB 2 is a fast track to existing land use laws for ten rural Oregon counties in exchange for a County giving up its appeal rights on unrelated environmental issues. In rural Oregon this would be known as preverbal horse trading. The choice to make the trade lies with the ten counties but what about the other 20, yes 20, rural counties? If this is a landmark land use law change where urban Democrats suddenly care about ten rural counties, amounting to 2-3 Senate Districts, why is the new historic bipartisanship not good enough for the other twenty (20) rural counties. What about the citizens in the left-out counties? Why? Because is it propaganda. It is horse trading. At the same time SB 2 is supposed to be historic land use cooperation by the Senate Democrats, the same Senate Democrats and Governor, using her own parable, are 'railroading' rural Oregon and rural citizens on HB 2020. In tandem, HB 2020 per its elected supporters eliminates 60,000 jobs, almost all rural. SB 2 does not offset raisings the rural poor's heating bills by hundreds of dollars, raises their commuting fuel by hundreds of dollars, and wiping out the rural cities and counties. While SB 2 might result in vote trades, or even some limited relief in one or two counties, why is the bill limited to just ten rural counties? SB 2's policy is OK given it is permissive but should have been applied to all of rural Oregon. Telling one-third of rural Oregon we like you and need your vote, while actioning the demise of the other two-thirds of rural citizens is not good policy even if it is good politics for urban Democrats. SB 2 is either good for all of rural Oregon or none of it. Respectfully submitted under the Oregon Constitution.

Brian J. Boquist
SD 12