

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LAND USE

June 14, 2005 Hearing Room D

8:30 a.m. Tapes 132 - 135

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Bill Garrard, Chair

Rep. Gordon Anderson, Vice-Chair

Rep. Mitch Greenlick, Vice-Chair

Rep. Robert Ackerman

Rep. Mary Nolan

Rep. Patti Smith

Rep. Mac Sumner

STAFF PRESENT: Sam Litke, Committee Administrator

Lindsay Luckey, Committee Assistant

MEASURES/ISSUES HEARD:

HB 3120 – Work Session

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
---------------	----------------	-----------------

TAPE 132, A

003	Chair Garrard	Calls the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m. and opens a work session on HB 3120.
-----	---------------	--

HB 3120 – WORK SESSION

013	Chair Garrard	Announces the new amendments are not ready so the committee will continue reviewing the proposed amendments that would replace the -3 amendments (EXHIBIT A).
018	Sam Litke	Committee Administrator. Advises that the committee left off at Sections 12 and 13. Summarizes the discussion from the previous meeting.
027	Rep. Greenlick	Expresses his concern with language that significantly expands the scope of Measure 37 (M37) rather than simply clarifies.
036	Chair Garrard	Comments on the consensus agreements reached in the amendments.
045	Bob Stacey	1000 Friends of Oregon. Notes his organization did not participate in the drafting of the -3 amendments. Raises questions about how much certainty should be provided to the landowners who obtain waivers under M37, and M37 as amended by the legislature.
082	Stacey	Urges caution about the effects of M37 in the future and suggests changing the waiver option from the “later” of two choices to the “earlier.” Suggests other changes to provide certainty.
124	Rep. Anderson	Submits that Mr. Stacey’s suggestions will force immediate development rather than it happening over time.
129	Stacey	Describes this as a trade-off and outlines why he prefers limiting the waiver time period including creating certainty about land uses for property owners.
138	Rep. Ackerman	Asks for other possible tests beyond recordation of the final partition or subdivision. Notes concern with waiver deadline.
148	Stacey	Suggests using the concept of “vesting” and elaborates.
160	Rep. Ackerman	States he was looking for something more specific such as issuance of a building permit.

165	Stacey	Addresses that a building permit would be a more substantial step in reliance on a subdivision plat than recordation but still recommends using vesting as it is broader.
176	Rep. Anderson	States that SB 100 (1973) locked land into exclusive farm use (EFU) permanently.
184	Stacey	Submits that EFU land is not locked in permanently and outlines possible changes in accepted uses.
211	Lane Shetterly	Director, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCDD). Advocates for the amendments that will replace the -3 amendments and lists the parties involved in the drafting. Discusses the agreed-to balance in the package so does not support discrete changes.
240	Glenn Klein	Attorney, Eugene, Oregon. Agrees with Mr. Shetterly's comments on the discussions on the scope of claims filing. Describes the amendments as a package and therefore cannot recommend small changes.
270	Rep. Greenlick	Discusses the narrowness of the work group and the parties who were excluded from participating. Remarks on objectives other than maintaining consensus within the work group.
303	Rep. Ackerman	Asks if the work group considered alternatives on the duration of waivers.
310	Klein	Recounts deliberations on this issue and explains the reasoning behind their decision.
353	Rep. Ackerman	Inquires if they considered that using recordation could have the long-term effect of granting waivers into perpetuity.
355	Klein	Responds that there was little discussion of this issue among the work group.
366	Chair Garrard	Refers to the Department of Justice (DOJ) position on the issue of transferability.
370	Klein	Comments on DOJ involvement in drafting and notes the decision would not be valid if the text of M37 is replaced by the draft.

391	Shetterly	Confirms this.
392	Chair Garrard	Asks if there is room for negotiation in the area of transferability.
400	Stacey	Raises concerns and cites criteria that would be sufficient to support the proposal.

TAPE 133, A

004	Klein	Adds that including some of the criteria mentioned is not a part of the work group consensus.
012	Chair Garrard	Requests contacting the parties involved to see if there is agreement in this area.
015	Rep. Greenlick	Notes the Attorney General (AG) opinion that states there was not transferability in M37 as written and asserts this draft is a clear expansion of M37.
023	Chair Garrard	Disagrees and states it is a clarification of the intent of M37.
027	Rep. Greenlick	Reiterates that the AG opinion says this is an expansion.
032	Chair Garrard	Responds they are not trying to change the intent but attempting to interpret the intent.
035	Rep. Greenlick	Doesn't believe that is feasible.
037	Chair Garrard	Seeks clarification that everyone who voted for M37 knew that there wasn't transferability.
039	Rep. Greenlick	Replies he does not think most of the voters even thought about transferability. Cites examples of attempts to clarify intent to suit their interests.
054	Chair Garrard	

Asks if he believes the voters for M37 did not anticipate that they could sell their property.

061	Rep. Greenlick	Cites that many of those voting on M37 do not own property and voted for the measure for a variety of reasons.
087	Rep. Anderson	Disagrees with Rep. Greenlick's interpretation and comments on the wide representation on the work group and his comfort in following their guidelines.
100	Rep. Greenlick	Responds to a point in Rep. Anderson's testimony on the past and future uses of M37.
112	Chair Garrard	Directs the committee to concentrate on the areas of concern and discusses the process for reaching a final version.
133	Klein	Explains the provisions of Section 14 (EXHIBIT A) dealing with M37 claims inside urban growth boundaries (UGB).
170	Rep. P. Smith	Asks if any of these provisions were in M37.
171	Klein	Responds negatively.
172	Rep. P. Smith	Submits it is an expansion.
173	Klein	Replies that it was not in the measure.
174	Chair Garrard	Inquires if this section is a part of the compromise.
176	Klein	Answers this ties to the local government support of transferability.
190	Stacey	Discusses opposition to this section which allows for "special treatment" of some property owners in UGB. Elaborates on their concern.
201	Rep. P. Smith	Asks what is meant by "restricts the residential use of residentially zoned land."

210	Klein	Explains that the provisions specify residentially zoned property rather than industrial or commercially zoned land and the desired use would have to be residential as well.
217	Rep. P. Smith	Verifies that this provision is aimed at residential property within the UGB.
220	Klein	Replies correct. Confirms this is intended to allow development of property for residential purposes.
223	Rep. Greenlick	Asks what it would mean if language read “restricts any use of residentially zoned property” instead of “residential use.”
229	Klein	Gives criteria for a claim under this section.
235	Rep. Greenlick	Provides a scenario under this provision if zoning were changed in the future.
243	Klein	Does not agree with the interpretation and clarifies what is allowed under this section.
257	Rep. Greenlick	Reads part of Section 15 and asks if a certain type of claim could be filed.
262	Klein	Responds that was not intended. Restates the criteria for use under this section.
276	Rep. Greenlick	Verifies that no claims may be filed under M37 within the UGB and gives exceptions.
282	Klein	Confirms this interpretation for regulations existing as of the effective date but not true prospectively.
289	Tom Gallagher	Urban Developers Coalition. Reports that commercial and industrial interests did not participate in the work group.
311	Chair Garrard	Notes difficulty in reaching compromise.
314	Gallagher	Reiterates suggestion to withdraw Section 14 (EXHIBIT A).

324	Rep. Ackerman	Describes a concern with the criteria that can disqualify claims within UGBs.
332	Klein	Elaborates on the process and the criteria to be demonstrated.
349	Rep. Ackerman	Raises concern that a claim may be denied with no adjudication.
356	Klein	Clarifies the intent in the section. Offers clarifying language.
370	Rep. Ackerman	Suggests including language to insure the protection of the claimant and to clarify the adjudication process.
376	Rep. Nolan	Raises concern with a possible claims scenario.
401	Klein	Responds and proposes clarifying language. Details Section 15 (EXHIBIT A) on claims in a proposed UGB study area.

TAPE 132, B

016	Chair Garrard	Asks for DLCD's opinion on how Section 15 would affect cities' response to expanding UGBs.
025	Shetterly	Explains that the proposal allows time to study those questions.
032	Rep. Nolan	Expresses interest in a map displaying UGBs. Asks if there is a minimum size of city before an UGB is required.
049	Shetterly	Responds that every city has an UGB.
071	Rep. Ackerman	Asks for the rationale behind Section 15(5) on Page 18 of EXHIBIT A .
080	Klein	Explains that offers an immediate option rather than a M37 claim.
090	Rep. Ackerman	Suggests that this provision grants more than what is allowed under M37.
100	Klein	Describes the intent. Suggests that clarification may be needed.

115	Rep. Ackerman	Agrees a language change is needed.
120	Rep. Greenlick	Asks about the consequences after 2015 if property is in an UGB and there is a valid claim.
129	Klein	Answers if the decision included the property in the UGB, the waiver was never effective.
133	Shetterly	Explains that the act of bringing property into an UGB substantially increases the property value.
144	Klein	Suggests delaying discussions on Sections 17 and 18 (EXHIBIT A). Explains that Sections 19 and 20 are conforming amendments and gives their corresponding sections.
175	Rep. Nolan	Asks if the Appraiser Certification and Licensure Board rules or statutes direct appraisers on calculations.
185	Klein	Replies the statutes direct adoption of administrative rules for appraiser responsibilities.
190	Rep. Nolan	Inquires about mechanisms in place to insure accurate, fair appraisals.
201	Klein	Comments on standards for appraisals and refers to Section 4 of HB 3120 which would direct the Department of Administrative Services to adopt fair and uniform administrative rules.
220	Rep. P. Smith	Inquires about a timeline for rule adoption.
222	Klein	Responds that there is nothing specific in HB 3120.
225	Klein	Advises Sections 22 through 24 (EXHIBIT A) are related and specify that if property owners apply to the government to change zoning they agree to abide by the rules in effect.
260	Rep. Ackerman	Asks how this applies to annexation.
261	Klein	Provides an example.
272	Rep. Ackerman	

Clarifies that a request for a zone change or annexation affects property for which an individual has a M37 claim.

280	Klein	Answers correct.
282	Rep. Ackerman	Believes that clarification is needed to ensure reference to M37.
290	Rep. Greenlick	Inquires if there is any other kind of annexation.
293	Klein	Replies it does not apply to a forced annexation.
295	Klein	Describes Section 26 (EXHIBIT A) .
325	Chair Garrard	Advises that the afternoon meeting will start with Section 17.
342	Chair Garrard	Recesses the work session on HB 3120 at 10:02 a.m.
343	Chair Garrard	Reconvenes the work session on HB 3120 at 1:15 p.m.
347	Harold Haugen	Retired Josephine County Commissioner. Testifies and submits written testimony in opposition to HB 3120 (EXHIBIT B) .
394	Chair Garrard	Assures that all actions will take place publicly in the committee.
402	Haugen	Cautions the members to act responsibly.

TAPE 133, B

008	Chair Garrard	Advises discussion is need on Sections 4, 17 and 18 (EXHIBIT A) . States that the committee is seriously considering eliminating Sections 17 and 18.
027	Klein	Begins review of Section 4 and details each subsection.
038	Chair Garrard	Cites the subsections that will possibly be eliminated and asks what changes would be needed if they were.
041	Klein	

Reads the language to be deleted. Continues with review of the exemptions that are primarily the same as those in M37.

053	Klein	Details Subsections 4(3), (4), (5) and (6) (EXHIBIT A) .
091	Chair Garrard	Suggests replacing “the date that the instrument conveying ownership is recorded” with the word “verifiable” in Subsection (6).
099	Shetterly	Offers the language can use some work.
109	Rep. P. Smith	Notes that older contracts didn’t even have to be notarized.
112	Shetterly	Agrees.
125	Chair Garrard	Proposes “the date of acquisition shall be verifiable” language.
133	Klein	Notes that in the next version, the issue of death of the property owner before a final decision, is addressed.
144	Shetterly	Discusses the “federal law exemption” issue.
157	Chair Garrard	Asks if the cities and counties are being given the responsibility rather than the state.
150	Shetterly	Indicates that there are statutes that also conform to federal law.
160	Klein	Refers to discussions to remove “conform to” language.
177	Chair Garrard	Asks Mr. Litke about his conversation with Legislative Counsel on the delay of the next version of the amendments.
181	Litke	Reports that Legislative Counsel was working diligently.
190	Klein	Believes the concept should be ready today.
194	Rep. Ackerman	Inquires if there were any exemptions considered that did not make it into the text of the agreement.

198	Klein	Answers there were two additional exemptions in SB 1037 that dealt with mountains and wild and scenic rivers, and those are not in here.
201	Rep. Ackerman	Asks about roads and highways.
202	Klein	Responds that view corridors were not part of the exemptions but also not in here.
210	Shetterly	Discusses the definition of coastal shore lands which may include land east and west of Highway 101.
219	Chair Garrard	Refers to testimony from John Griffith, Coos County Commissioner, discussing federal grants and whether or not to keep that section in.
233	Shetterly	Doesn't believe that was ever inserted at the request of DLCD but was in SB 1037.
240	Rep. P. Smith	Asks about Subsection 4(3)(b) (EXHIBIT A).
242	Chair Garrard	Comments there was discussion about changing the date.
246	Klein	Outlines the intention was to allow sufficient time for filing claims.
272	Dave Hunnicutt	Oregonians in Action (OIA). Describes this section will force people to act immediately to preserve those claims. Understands the concern and agrees that there should be a cut-off date but believes 2006 is too early.
300	Stacey	Suggests moving the date closer to allow the 2007 Legislative Assembly an opportunity for funding. Supports the cut-off date so that everyone is aware of the obligation and scope.
340	Rep. P. Smith	Asks if there was a date in M37 by which a claim should be filed.
343	Hunnicutt	Cites the dates based on regulations in effect prior to the effective date of M37.
358	Chair Garrard	Believes there are many claims being held back to see what this legislature will do.

368	Rep. Nolan	Indicates work will be completed prior to September 1, 2005, so people will have a full year to explore their options and still be able to submit and have considered timely.
396	Rep. Ackerman	Inquires about data on pending filings based on retroactive regulations.
404	Shetterly	Responds that numbers are increasing and they are receiving about 100 claims per month. Expects to see a spike in claims filed after the end of session.
420	Chair Garrard	Assumes that with the 2006 date there will be a big influx between now and the 2006 date. Asks if they can handle the workload.
440	Shetterly	Points to Section 17 (EXHIBIT A) which creates an “off ramp” for someone who wants to develop a dwelling on a tract of record. Informs that HB 3120 would take them out of the M37 process. Believes most are anticipating the December 2, 2006, date and plan to file by that date.

TAPE 134, A

018	Chair Garrard	Asks if an amendment can be made once a claim is filed.
020	Shetterly	Responds that M37 allows separate claims to be filed on the same property.
026	Rep. Anderson	Offers that if the initiative says two years, a full two years should be allowed.
031	Hunnicut	References (5) from the text of M37 (EXHIBIT B) and notes the difference between retrospective and prospective claims.
042	Rep. Anderson	Asks why it was made less than years.
048	Klein	Explains that using a December 2 filing deadline would not allow sufficient time for evaluation.

057	Stacey	Offers a suggestion for Section 4 of EXHIBIT A to have a minimum amount of loss to “trigger” a M37 claim. Supports 25 percent for both prospective and retrospective claims.
081	Klein	Describes Section 17 in EXHIBIT A as the tract of record provision.
090	Rep P. Smith	Asks about the 250-foot setback in Section 17(f) (EXHIBIT A).
100	Shetterly	Explains the intent of this provision is to limit conflicts of use. Recognizes it may not be feasible in all cases.
110	Rep. P. Smith	Inquires about county ordinances which require 130 feet.
112	Shetterly	Believes the 250 feet in statute would probably pre-empt county standards.
123	Chair Garrard	Comments it appears the majority of the committee does not favor the tract of record concept as it changes M37.
125	Hunnicut	Reports that OIA have taken a position in opposition to Sections 17 and 18.
130	Stacey	Distributes proposed amendment language to Sections 17 and 18 (EXHIBIT C) that would utilize both the tract of record concept and the high-value farmland concept. Proposes three levels of development authorization and references the highlighted portions of amendments (EXHIBIT C).
177	Chair Garrard	Comments that denies rights given under M37.
179	Stacey	Asserts it provides certainty of development in exchange for rights that a property owner has under M37, which may or may not be utilized and believes that under M37 these are not transferable.
184	Chair Garrard	Restates the difficulty interpreting the intent on everything.
200	Rep. Greenlick	Comments that he thought the -3 amendments were a compromise and asks about the effect of their opposition to Sections 17 and 18.
203	Hunnicut	

Discusses the negotiation process. Continues that before there was no tract of record or limitations on zoning of farm land, and expresses concern that amendments and decisions are being made quickly.

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 241 | Rep. Greenlick | Asks if OIA is comfortable with everything except Sections 17 and 18. Inquires of the work group members about the balance of HB 3120 without Sections 17 and 18. |
| 254 | Hunnicutt | Advises of need to check on the remainder of the sections so cannot commit publicly to a position. |
| 270 | Art Schlack | Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). Advises that they have been active in the work group preparing the replacement -3 amendments over the last six months. Reports that the AOC legislative committee conceptually supports the replacement -3 amendments but did not review in detail. Continues they are comfortable with most of the sections but did not spend a lot of time on Section 18 because of discussion on rural lands. Supports the process, procedures, claims requirements of the judicial review, and definitions. Adds that Section 17 is an option and does not replace a M37 claim. Explains the reason certain dates were picked, but the legislature has the ability to adjust if deemed appropriate. Concludes that AOC is supportive of the direction and content of the replacement -3 amendments with minor modifications. |
| 351 | Chair Garrard | Asks if the Farm Bureau has an opinion on Sections 17 and 18. |
| 354 | Don Schellenberg | Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. Agrees with Section 17 as written and Section 18 with some changes. |
| 364 | Rep. Ackerman | Has a problem understanding what triggers the tract of record. |
| 381 | Shetterly | Points to Section 17(1)(c) (EXHIBIT A) about removal of tract of record from the M37 process. Explains the criteria. |
| 400 | Rep. Anderson | Asks for the definition of “tract.” |
| 404 | Shetterly | Answers a single unit of land that may be composed of separate lots, if contiguous under common ownership. |
| 415 | Rep. Sumner | Seeks clarification that strict interpretation of M37 would allow the owner of those lots to build on each lot. |

424	Shetterly	Replies yes.
428	Rep. Sumner	Inquires if this option allows, without filing a M37 claim, one house only on the tract.
434	Shetterly	Answers if the owner elects this way, correct.
437	Rep. Sumner	Continues that the owner is not precluded from filing a M37 claim for all the lots.
440	Shetterly	Replies correct.
442	Chair Garrard	Asks how this would affect M37 claims being filed now.

TAPE 135, A

015	Shetterly	Responds that at least five percent of claims deal with a single dwelling.
028	Chair Garrard	Asks if those who elect to use the tract would not be under time constraints as long as they held the property.
030	Shetterly	Answers correct.
031	Rep. Greenlick	Inquires if after the M37 time frame is up, one can still use tract of record to build a single-family dwelling.
036	Shetterly	Responds yes as this is not limited to the filing deadline.
041	Rep. Greenlick	Comments that they no longer have a valid M37 claim.
043	Shetterly	Replies this is not predicated on having a valid M37 claim but on having the right to have built a house when the property was acquired.
044	Chair Garrard	Acknowledges clarification. Suggests putting Section 17 “back on the table” for discussion based on this information.
050	Schellenberg	Understands Section 18 covers parceling and subdivisions. Suggests changes in Subsection (4) (EXHIBIT A).

084	Chair Garrard	Asserts the county planning commission will determine the location of a septic tank.
091	Schellenberg	Believes that county health provisions would be pre-eminent.
100	Chair Garrard	Notes other considerations in siting utilities and suggests adding “if possible” rather than dictating to local governments.
106	Schellenberg	Has no problem with that.
114	Klein	Clarifies the suggestion is to add into Subsection (4) the kind of limitation that is in Subsection (1).
119	Rep. P. Smith	Asks why public water couldn’t be used under Section 18.
124	Schellenberg	Answers they would not discount that if a public water system was available.
135	Rep. Nolan	Seeks clarification on the intended process for dealing with comments.
139	Chair Garrard	Replies that when the initial review is completed, he plans to work on inserting sections of the -3 amendments into the -1 amendments to compose the final bill. Continues that suggestions from committee members will be considered and voted on if necessary.
144	Rep. Nolan	Asks if these “informal amendments” would be placed into one amendment for committee action.
150	Chair Garrard	States that the intent is to create one amendment including all the sections and their changes to create the -12 amendments, the final bill.
154	Rep. Nolan	Requests a “marked up” version to see all the changes.
161	Litke	Advises of the availability of the latest version which should be the -12 amendments to be provided to members.

165	Rep. Nolan	Clarifies that the -12 amendments will amend HB 3120 as it stands now, which contains the -1 amendments, so the -12 amendments will amend HB 3120 as amended.
168	Rep. Ackerman	Raises concern on how to use the -1 amendments unless the suggestions are incorporated. Continues with a question on how to eliminate language in the -1 amendments not wanted.
172	Chair Garrard	Believes the intent was to go through the -3 amendments to see what was wanted and not wanted. Indicates the next step is to eliminate from the -1 amendments what is not wanted.
180	Rep. Ackerman	Offers it would be easier to use the -3 replacement as the vehicle.
184	Rep. Nolan	Raises concern about the amount of time spent coming up with a package and now looking at pieces in isolation.
200	Chair Garrard	Reminds of the criteria at the beginning that there should be nothing in HB 3120 that undermines the intent of those who voted for M37. Continues that if HB 3120 changed M37, it would not be considered.
205	Rep. Greenlick	Indicates he thought that their charge was to only clarify M37.
208	Chair Garrard	Agrees. States that as his reason for initially eliminating Section 17 as being outside the boundaries of M37.
234	Harrison Conley	Deputy Legislative Counsel. Informs that the -1 amendments were similar to SB 1037A in terms of the claims process and judicial review provision. States that the -3 amendments are a different track. Advises that all amendments prepared have been either to the -1 amendments or to the original HB 3120 including the -1 amendments, or to the original HB 3120 with the -3 amendments. Suggests that if moving down the path of the -3 amendments, restore HB 3120 to its original status and adopt the -3 amendments with changes.
252	Chair Garrard	Offers that was Rep. Ackerman's suggestion.
256	Conley	Answers yes. Restates the two options.
271	Chair Garrard	Confirms that they need to simply move the -3 amendments into HB 3120 and remove the -1 amendments. Asks for a deadline for the committee to finish their work.

236	Conley	Advises of the status of the -11 amendments.
308	Chair Garrard	Clarifies that the -11 amendments are a “remake” of the -3 amendments.
311	Rep. Nolan	Expresses she thought the committee would have an opportunity for further review before a formal amendment was prepared. Believes it is premature to be drafting an amendment at this time.
325	Conley	Responds that it is in everyone’s best interest to review a Legislative Counsel draft rather than any other document.
340	Rep. Greenlick	Suggests Mr. Conley participate in future committee discussion.
351	Conley	Indicates he is available.
358	Chair Garrard	Has concern about the timeline to complete HB 3120.
367	Rep. Greenlick	Suggests the possibility of a “gut and stuff” to SB 1037 and then refer to a conference committee.
383	Rep. P. Smith	Wants to continue doing work in this committee.
389	Rep. Greenlick	Responds that if the committee has their work ready, it could be “gut and stuffed” into SB 1037 if received.
400	Chair Garrard	Requests Mr. Conley attend the committee meetings.
420	Rep. Ackerman	Inquires about the -11 amendments.
424	Chair Garrard	Answers they are the work group amendments to the -3 amendments.
430	Rep. Ackerman	Seeks clarification on the review process.

TAPE 134, B

001	Chair Garrard	Believes each committee member is making own amendment changes to the -3 amendments.
-----	---------------	--

002	Litke	Points out changes that will be reflected in the -11 amendments.
010	Rep. Ackerman	Clarifies that as a committee, amendments can still be submitted, and that the -11 amendments are not the last work product.
015	Chair Garrard	Replies that the -11 amendments will be the last product from the work group.
019	Klein	Concurs the -11 amendments are the last version from the work group, plus some consensus items. Plans to highlight the differences between the -11 amendments and the version the committee has been using.
030	Rep. Ackerman	Believes there will be one more review.
033	Chair Garrard	Agrees.
035	Rep. Anderson	Asks if the work group has had contact with the Senate.
037	Klein	Answers yes up until the time the Senate decided not to act on SB 1037.
044	Rep. P. Smith	Inquires if there will be a vote on the -3 amendments.
045	Chair Garrard	Responds no.
052	Conley	Plans to have the -11 amendments available for the next committee meeting.
056	Chair Garrard	Closes the work session on HB 3120 and adjourns the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A. HB 3120, proposed replacement amendments, staff, 25 pp**
- B. HB 3120, BM 37 text and written testimony, Harold Haugen, 6 pp**
- C. HB 3120, portion of amendments, Bob Stacey, 4 pp**

D. HB 3120, written testimony, Dana McCullough, 2 pp