

In support of HB0081

If property owners are forced to give up their land, they absolutely should be well compensated. There may be unintended consequences to this bill as written, however. One potential unintended consequence is that, by guaranteeing owners of farms and agricultural properties 350% of the highest appraisal value, while not similarly compensating the owners of resource conservation zoned land such as forested and other ecologically sensitive properties, the bill, if passed, may drive infrastructure development into the most ecologically sensitive properties in the state. I believe that a primary justification for the 350% multiplier is in recognition of the fact that farms/ag. land provides ongoing economic value to owners. Similarly, forested land may be managed by owners to sustainably supply fuelwood, timber, foraged and hunted food, and a wide variety of forest products and ecological services. I suggest a friendly amendment to HB 0081: include land in resource conservation zones as well. Forests, similar to agricultural land, provide ongoing economic benefit to the land owners, and thus owners should be compensated similarly for that loss of economic value.