

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STATE AND FEDERAL AFFAIRS**

**July 20, 2005 Hearing Room 357**

**10:30 A.M. Tapes 41 - 44**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:        Rep. Rep. Wayne Krieger, Chair**

**Rep. Rep. Jeff Barker, Vice-Chair**

**Rep. Brian Boquist, Vice-Chair**

**Rep. Linda Flores**

**Rep. Greg Macpherson**

**GUEST MEMBER:        Rep. Bill Garrard**

**STAFF PRESENT:        Patrick Brennan, Committee Administrator**

**Cletus Moore, Committee Administrator**

**Joe O’Leary, Counsel**

**Bill Taylor, Counsel**

**Louann Rahmig, Committee Assistant**

**MEASURES/ISSUES HEARD:**

**SB 1083A – Public Hearing and Work Session**

**HB 3505 – Public Hearing**

**SJR 24A – Public Hearing and Work Session**

**SB 1067 – Public Hearing**

**SB 1068A – Public Hearing**

**SB 1018A – Work Session**

## **SB 1037B – Work Session**

## **SB 660A - Public Hearing**

**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.**

<b>TAPE/#</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>TAPE 41, A</b>		
003	Chair Krieger	Calls the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m. and opens a public hearing and work session on SB 1083A.

### **SB 1083A – PUBLIC HEARING AND WORK SESSION**

019	Cletus Moore	Committee Administrator. Explains SB 1083A which creates credit against personal and corporate income tax liability for increased labor costs associated with annual inflation-based increases in Oregon's minimum wage; limits credit to employers in farming activities defined as crop, livestock and horticultural production; explicitly excludes forestry, stabling equines, breeding greyhounds for racing, and aquatic species production from credit eligibility; allows credits to be carried forward for five tax years; permits taxpayers eligible for credit to sell credit to other taxpayers with Oregon tax liability; and authorizes the Department of Revenue to establish rules for marketing tax credits.
034	Rep. Jeff Kropf	House District 17. Testifies in support of SB 1083A. Cites personal circumstances. Discusses how the increases in minimum wage each year affect the agricultural industry.
077	Rep. Kropf	Continues that SB 1083A is important because agriculture cannot pass increasing costs on to the market place. Asserts the affects on family farms can be devastating. Points out that SB 1083A allows the sale of tax credits to someone else.
112	Rep. Mike Schaufler	House District 48. Testifies in support of SB 1083A. Adds that the bill is not about keeping people at minimum wage but about providing relief to farmers and ranchers who have to bear the burden.

152	Rep. Kropf	States no conflict of interest as he doesn't hire employees.
157	Rep. Barker	Asks what a tax credit would sell for.
159	Rep. Kropf	Answers probably 80-85 cents.
162	Rep. Barker	Asks if a worker is paid more than the minimum wage, the farmer does not get the tax credit.
167	Rep. Kropf	Responds that is his understanding.
168	Rep. Barker	Inquires then if the farmer would get the portion that applies to the minimum wage increase.
170	Vice-Chair Boquist	Believes that will be answered by another witness.
178	Paul Warner	Legislative Revenue Office. Informs how the revenue impact was calculated. Estimates there are 10,000 workers at minimum wage who would be eligible in the agricultural sector. Interprets the bill to apply to minimum wage increases that are attributable to ORS 653.025.
217	Warner	Responds to the marketability question. Cites an example.
228	Rep. Barker	Asks about the next shift.
230	Warner	Responds with interpretation that any increase would not be directly attributable to the statute related to indexing.
237	Rep. Macpherson	Asks if application is only to future increases.
247	Warner	Believes the key language is "increases in minimum wage."
258	Rep. Macpherson	Points to the language in SB 1083A that refers to pay for employment in "farming or ranching activities" and "farm use." Indicates there appears to be a disconnect in the language that needs to be fixed.
269	Warner	Responds that most of the language is current statute.

282	Rep. Macpherson	Reiterates that it looks like an inconsistency in language.
292	Bill Taylor	Counsel. Agrees there is some ambiguity as the farming activity term is not defined in the bill. Offers to obtain an amendment to remove “or ranching activity.”
324	Rep. Macpherson	Believes the language needs to mesh.
329	Warner	States that the original bill referred to ORS 215.203 which has the definition of “farm use.”
347	Rep. Macpherson	Cites the terms that create ambiguity.
348	Rep. Flores	Believes the activities listed under farm use pertain also to ranching.
371	Rep. Macpherson	Has a concern that certain activities are not necessarily farm use.
391	Steve Lanning	Oregon AFL-CIO. Testifies in opposition to SB 1083A. Believes this tax credit applies to all, not just those not doing well, and that the tax credit should be based on hardship. Suggests the money be given to the Department of Agriculture for disbursement to those who need it most.

#### **TAPE 42, A**

036	Jessica Stevens	SEIU Local 503, Oregon Public Employees’ Union. Testifies and submits written testimony in opposition to SB 1083A ( <b>EXHIBIT A</b> ). Believes further discussion is needed on what portion will actually be eligible for the tax credit. Indicates that SB 1083A does not save jobs or protect farmers from foreign competition.
065	Scott Ashcom	Oregon Agricultural Alliance. Testifies and submits written testimony in support of SB 1083A ( <b>EXHIBIT B</b> ). Points to the Oregon Department of Agriculture conclusion to a study on the effect of the minimum wage and cost of living on agriculture. Cites 2004 statistics on agriculture employment in Oregon and Washington. Continues that SB 1083A is about stopping the loss of jobs in Oregon to states that have a lower minimum wage. Cites some examples.
124	Don Schellenberg	Associate Director of Governmental Affairs, Oregon Farm Bureau. Testifies and submits written testimony in support of SB 1083A ( <b>EXHIBIT C</b> ). Asserts the bill does not reduce anyone’s wages.

189	John McCulley	Tree Fruit Growers. Testifies and submits written testimony in support of SB 1083A ( <b>EXHIBIT D</b> ). Believes the bill will be an incentive to retain the work force for hand harvesting of fruit.
207	Rep. Macpherson	Raises a concern about people earning just a little more than minimum wage and whether it will be a disincentive for the grower to raise the income. Asks how many earn just a little bit more than minimum wage.
227	Tim Bernasek	General Counsel, Oregon Farm Bureau. Points to the portion of SB 1083A identifying to whom tax credits apply. Details how to calculate.
294	Rep. Barker	Cites a possible situation and asks for clarification.
301	Bernasek	Agrees. Provides examples to clarify calculations.
327	Rep. Macpherson	Believes Mr. Warner's revenue impacts were based on a different interpretation of SB 1083A.
350	Bernasek	Continues that increases in employment cause a "ripple effect" up.
372	McCulley	Refers to the revenue analysis on HB 2597 on which SB 1083 is based. Advises that the Department of Revenue has a methodology in place to determine eligibility.
413	Rep. Macpherson	Comments he is hearing things that he doesn't see in the bill. Refers again to Mr. Warner's testimony. Cites some examples based on the different interpretations of SB 1083.

**TAPE 41, B**

030	Taylor	Advises that there are three more sets of amendments coming and explains what the changes will be.
043	Vice-Chair Boquist	Asks about the "farm use" and "ranching" definitions.
047	Schellenberg	

Comments that the farm use definition includes ranching. Concludes that agriculture must remain “whole” in this state.

061	Bernasek	Suggests a “test run” during the four-year period till “sunset.”
078	Rep. Macpherson	Iterates that the focus needs to be on people getting minimum wage. Asks again how many are paid just a little more than minimum wage.
084	McCulley	Responds that the Revenue Department estimated 12,500 workers would qualify.
090	Schellenberg	Interjects that piece rate depends on the worker.
099	Bernasek	Indicates that if this is tied just to those at minimum wage or slightly above, that would create an incentive to keep highly skilled workers at the lower rate because employers would lose their tax credit.
112	Rep. Barker	Asks if the farmer would get credit for any hourly worker.
116	Schellenberg	Answers that is the intent.
118	Rep. Barker	Comments that is not what Mr. Warner said.
120	Schellenberg	Indicates disagreement with Mr. Warner.
124	Chair Krieger	Requests Mr. Warner get together with the witnesses to verify the revenue forecast.

**The following written material was submitted for the record without public testimony:**

Northwest Treeplanters and Farmworkers United. Submits written testimony in opposition to SB 1083A (**EXHIBIT E**).

133	Chair Krieger	Closes the work session on SB 1083A.
141	Vice-Chair Boquist	Opens a public hearing on SJR 24A.

**SJR 24A – PUBLIC HEARING**

- |     |                   |   |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 142 | Cletus Moore      | Committee Administrator. Explains SJR 24A which honors service and accomplishments of former Governors Victor G. Atiyeh and Barbara Roberts; directs the Port of Portland to name a terminal at the Portland International Airport after Victor G. Atiyeh; resolves that the Oregon Department of Human Services building, headquarters for the department, be renamed the Barbara Roberts Human Services Building. |
| 154 | Sen. Bruce Starr  | Senate District 15. Testifies in support of SJR 24A. Comments on work with the Port of Portland on the resolution.  |
| 197 | Sen. Rick Metsger | Senate District 26. Testifies in support of SJR 24A.  |
| 217 | Sen. B. Starr     | Adds that Gov. Atiyeh needs to be recognized.   |

**The following written material is submitted for the record without public testimony:**

- |     |                    |  |
|-----|--------------------|--|
|     | Dan Lavey          | Resident, Portland, Oregon. Submits written testimony in support of SJR 24A <b>(EXHIBIT F)</b> . |
| 225 | Vice-Chair Boquist | Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SJR 24A.                                   |

-

#### **SJR 24A – WORK SESSION**

- |     |                    |   |
|-----|--------------------|---|
| 226 | Rep. Macpherson    | <b>MOTION: Moves SJR 24A be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.</b> |
| 228 | Vice-Chair Boquist | Announces that Chair Krieger and Rep. Barker are excused for other House business.  |
|     |                    | <b>VOTE: 3-0-2</b>  |
|     |                    | <b>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.</b>                      |
|     |                    | <b>EXCUSED: 2 - Barker, Krieger</b>   |
| 238 | Vice-Chair Boquist | <b>The motion CARRIES.</b>  |
|     |                    | <b>REP. MACPHERSON will lead discussion on the floor.</b>                           |

247 Vice-Chair Boquist Closes the work session on SJR 24A and opens a public hearing on SB 1067.

**SB 1067 – PUBLIC HEARING**

252 Joe O’Leary Counsel. Explains SB 1067 which amends the existing telephonic harassment statute. Goes on that the bill expands the crime of telephonic harassment to include sending to or leaving a text message, voice mail, or any other message, knowing that the caller has been forbidden from so doing by a person exercising lawful authority over the receiving telephone.

270 Vice-Chair Boquist Announces that he has the -1 amendments (**EXHIBIT G**).

279 Gina Skinner Oregon District Attorneys Association. Testifies in support of SB 1067. Describes cases that could not be prosecuted because the law did not include “text messaging.” Refers to the -1 amendments which exempt collection agencies. Believes that is beyond the scope of the current law.

339 Sybil Hebb Oregon Law Center. Testifies in support of SB 1067. Raises a concern about the -1 amendments which exempt a whole class of people. Continues that if an exemption is needed, it should be narrowed.

**TAPE 42, B**

014 Jim Markee Oregon Collectors Association. States that he is responsible for the -1 amendments which may be too broad. Agrees that ORS 166.090 was never intended to apply to debt collectors. Urges consideration whether a professional debt collector working for a commercial creditor should be subject to criminal action if accused. Provides copies of ORS 646.639 (**EXHIBIT H**). Continues that third-party debt collectors are regulated by the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

044 Vice-Chair Boquist Requests counsel to meet with the witnesses to review the amendment.

045 O’Leary Asks for clarification on how to better define the exemptions.

053 Skinner Responds that if a class is acting appropriately, they probably would not be opposed.



061	O’Leary	Reads back the issues to be clarified.
064	Vice-Chair Boquist	Closes the public hearing on SB 1067 and opens a public hearing on SB 1068A.

**SB 1068A – PUBLIC HEARING**

067	Joe O’Leary	Counsel. Explains SB 1068A which requires a peace officer to arrest a person without a warrant if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has been charged with an offense, is presently released as to that charge pursuant to a release agreement, and the person has failed to comply with a no-contact condition of the release agreement. Describes ORS 133.310.
083	Gina Skinner	Oregon District Attorneys Association. Testifies in support of SB 1068A. States that people getting released are given a release agreement to agree to a number of conditions to give victims some sort of protection; however, it is difficult to enforce such orders. Continues that there is no authority for a police officer to arrest for many types of harassment. Explains the compromise position to which agreed.
139	Sybil Hebb	Oregon Law Center. Testifies in support of SB 1068A. Explains that victims of sexual assault are given special protections under this bill that they don’t have currently. Comments on civil protection orders for victims of domestic violence, and that victims of stalking have similar protections.
159	O’Leary	Suggests that the “no contact” order pursuant to security agreement is not limited to victims but also covers witnesses in a criminal case.
164	Skinner	Responds that is correct. Explains that a release officer could add any appropriate people to the release agreement, which remains in effect while the criminal case is pending.
179	Vice-Chair Boquist	Closes the public hearing on SB 1068A.
202	Vice-Chair Boquist	Opens a public hearing on SB 660A.

## **SB 660A – PUBLIC HEARING**

- 204 Cletus Moore Committee Administrator. Explains SB 660A which requires a county board or local boundary commission to approve petition for formation of special district if petition meets specified legal requirements.
- 219 Amanda Rich Special Districts Association of Oregon. Testifies and submits written testimony in support of SB 660A **(EXHIBIT I)**. Offers that the bill clarifies ambiguity in statute.
- 248 Vice-Chair Boquist Closes the public hearing on SB 660A and opens a public hearing on HB 3505.

## **HB 3505 – PUBLIC HEARING**

- 253 Cletus Moore Committee Administrator. Refers to the -3 amendments **(EXHIBIT J)** and an opinion from the Department of Justice **(EXHIBIT K)**. Describes HB 3505 which provides that a public body may condemn property only if the primary purpose for taking the property is to allow property to be owned, maintained, occupied and used by the public for public purposes; specifies that conveyance of the condemned property to a private party is not public purpose; and exempts condemnation of certain properties.
- 278 Rep. Macpherson Asks about the various amendments.
- 280 Moore Explains the -3 amendments. Advises that the -1 amendments **(EXHIBIT L)** and the -2 amendments **(EXHIBIT M)** are to be ignored.
- 283 Sen. Bruce Starr Senate District 15. Testifies in support of HB 3505. Believes this is an important public policy issue that needs to be addressed in light of the recent Supreme Court *Kelo v. City of New London* decision **(EXHIBIT N)**. Discusses the -3 amendments and urges their adoption into SB 3505.
- 329 Sen. Floyd Prozanski Senate District 4. Testifies in support of HB 3505. Credits the work done on the bill. Refers to *The Oregonian* newspaper article submitted by Dave Hunnicutt, Oregonians in Action **(EXHIBIT O)**.
- 368 Dave Hunnicutt Oregonians in Action. Testifies in support of HB 3505 and the -3 amendments. Comments that many states are attempting to address

the Supreme Court decision on the *Kelo* case. Explains that this legislation would apply only in the situation of an unwilling seller, a very narrow set of circumstances, and creates a primary purpose test for the condemnation of property and exceptions.

**TAPE 43, A**

025	Hunnicutt	Discusses the definition of “blighted.” Continues that HB 3505 further defines “blighted” areas. Details the various sections of the bill. Points out that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has been exempted out at their request. Offers that this is not a “black and white” issue.
073	Rep. Macpherson	Expresses appreciation for proposing a statute rather than a constitutional amendment. Sees that HB 3505 still focuses on taking of property under eminent domain with a subsequent conveyance to a private party. Asks if this includes a lease hold.
093	Hunnicutt	Answers yes. Continues that the court would focus on the primary purpose for the taking. Indicates consideration was given to using a percentage requirement but that didn’t seem to be the best test for primary purpose.
109	Rep. Macpherson	Inquires about the contemplated timeline.
114	Hunnicutt	Responds that the primary purpose test would be measured at the time the local government issued the ordinance authorizing the condemnation.
118	Rep. Macpherson	Inquires that if a subsequent decision was to lease, it would not be a violation of statute.
121	Hunnicutt	Answers no. Advises that the court would determine the primary purpose by relying on the evidence which includes the ordinance for condemnation.
134	Rep. Macpherson	Asks if this would include a security interest in the property, like a deed of trust, a mortgage or other financing mechanism.
139	Hunnicutt	Replies that isn’t the intent.
144	Rep. Macpherson	

States that it appears under this language no property taken by eminent domain could be financed through any kind of security interest.

- |     |                    |   |
|-----|--------------------|---|
| 155 | Hunnicut           | Replies that is the correct understanding of trust deeds, but it is not the intent of the term “an interest in condemned property.” Believes the issue would be how the court would interpret, using the legislative history.                                   |
| 166 | Rep, Macpherson    | Comments that the “blight” definition may be too narrow. Discusses properties with environmental issues.  |
| 181 | Hunnicut           | Responds that the language used is nearly identical to the statute language from the early 1950s to 1979.   |
| 195 | Rep. Macpherson    | Asks if HB 3505 would prevent an activity similar to the one on public use involving the Port of Umatilla.  |
| 213 | Hunnicut           | Answers that depends on the primary purpose of the condemnation. Reminds that HB 3505 only applies when there is an unwilling seller.   |
| 229 | Rep. Macpherson    | Understands that property acquired by eminent domain could not then have leased space within it.  |
| 243 | Hunnicut           | Responds with explanation.  |
| 254 | Ronelle Shankle    | Department of Justice (DOJ), representing Attorney General Hardy Myers. Refers to the Attorney General memorandum ( <b>EXHIBIT K</b> ) and offers no position on the policy choices on HB 3505.   |
| 267 | Joe McNaught       | DOJ. Believes that most of the issues identified in <b>EXHIBIT K</b> have been addressed in the -3 amendments and by Mr. Hunnicutt. Discusses primary purpose doctrine as including incidental and ancillary private uses. Raises concerns about “public” uses. |
| 330 | McNaught           | Continues that conveyances and leases are potential problems. Discusses public housing condemnations and ODOT condemnations.  |
| 366 | Vice-Chair Boquist | Advises that Mr. Hunnicutt has accurately depicted for the record the interpretation of HB 3505.  |

376	Hunnicut	Responds to Mr. McNaught's additional concerns. Clarifies that "used by the public" is appropriate as use is by the public rather than "public body." Describes circumstances.
-----	----------	--

**TAPE 44, A**

023	Hunnicut	Advises that ORS 367.818 is included in the -3 amendments. Continues that ORS 366.330, which allows ODOT to condemn property, was excluded from HB 3505 and was done so intentionally.
-----	----------	--

041	Rep. Macpherson	Inquires about a prison.
-----	-----------------	--------------------------

045	Hunnicut	Believes the term public body is subsumed by the public. Expands on explanation.
-----	----------	--

057	Rep. Macpherson	Asks about "maintenance" of public buildings which may be contracted out.
-----	-----------------	---

063	Hunnicut	Provides an explanation based on the primary purpose of the condemnation.
-----	----------	---

089	Michele Deister	League of Oregon Cities. Testifies and submits written testimony on HB 3505 ( <b>EXHIBIT P</b> ). Explains that some of their concerns were addressed in previous testimony. Advises that cities rarely use condemnation. Discusses road and utility rights of way and pieces of "remnant property." Points out that public and private partnerships are becoming more common and may not be allowed under HB 3505. Cites an example. Concludes that HB 3505 does not address non-government condemnations.
-----	-----------------	---

147	John Fletcher	Legislative Liaison, Housing and Community Services. Testifies and submits written testimony by Jack Kenny, Deputy Director, as neutral on HB 3505 ( <b>EXHIBIT Q</b> ). Discusses public housing needs. Comments that all public interests need to be preserved.
-----	---------------	---

191	Eugene Schoenheit	Oregon Resident. Testifies on HB 3505. Advises that the City of Oak Grove has raised concerns about the applicability to county takings. States that "property" is undefined. Questions the emergency. Refers to the list of concerns provided to Rep. Boquist ( <b>EXHIBIT R</b> ).
-----	-------------------	--

251	Rep. Macpherson	Asks how cities use condemnation. Discusses "friendly" condemnations.
-----	-----------------	---

268	Deister	Responds that there could be a postponement of capital gains under certain circumstances.
296	Tim Bernasek	Oregon Farm Bureau. Testifies in support of HB 3505.
316	Bill Penhollow	Association of Oregon Counties. Testifies and submits written testimony in opposition to HB 3505 ( <b>EXHIBIT S</b> ). Shares the same questions and concerns as the Attorney General.
365	Penhollow	Believes HB 3505 could create unintended consequences. Refers to an Oregon Law Commission study on eminent domain and suggests reactivating the work group to review the provisions in HB 3505, to obtain consistency with 2003 legislation.
409	Chair Krieger	Asks about the 2003 actions.
413	Penhollow	Responds that several bills were enacted, consolidating ORS chapters 35 and 281 into a totally rewritten, revised and updated section of law in ORS chapter 35.
427	Chair Krieger	States that the recent Supreme Court decision places local governments in a position of being pressured. Asserts that a bill will be passed this session.

#### **TAPE 43, B**

015	Rep. Boquist	Asks if it is the counties' position that they want to have the authority to take private property from one private individual and give it to another private individual.
020	Penhollow	Responds that is not the primary purpose. Continues that on occasion when a county condemns for a road right of way, they may take more than necessary for the improvement. Discusses concerns about getting those pieces back onto the tax rolls.
041	Rep. Boquist	Comments that they are trying to protect private property and the court will always interpret the public purpose.
059	Penhollow	Believes improvements can be made and offers to work on further changes. Proposes another exception.

075	Rep. Boquist	Discusses the public good issues which are not in urban renewal. Doesn't see the county roads issue. Requests further clarifications.
085	Hunnicut	Objects to changing the "and" to "or" in Section 2 as suggested as it would "gut" the bill. Clarifies that nothing in HB 3505 expands the scope of condemnation authority. Comments that the definition of "blight" may not be as narrow as some may want, but it is narrower than the existing definition in ORS chapter 457. Responds to Rep. Macpherson's questions dealing with "brown fields." Doesn't object to amending the definition of "blight" to take care of that situation, or to clarifying the security interest question.
125	Chair Krieger	Asks several of the witnesses to get together with the counties to address the issues by early next week.
133	Hunnicut	Responds that he doesn't believe there will be agreement by all interested parties unless HB 3505 is "watered down" where it doesn't do anything at all.
146	Chair Krieger	Reiterates that the Supreme Court has put them in a position to do something.

**The following written material is submitted for the record without public testimony:**

Association of Oregon Redevelopment Agencies. Submits written testimony in opposition to HB 3505 (**EXHIBIT T**).

146	Chair Krieger	Closes the public hearing on HB 3505 and opens a work session on SB 1018A.
-----	---------------	--

**SB 1018A – WORK SESSION**

157	Bill Taylor	Counsel. Explains SB 1018A which modifies qualifications for and term of office for Poet Laureate of the State of Oregon; clarifies that Poet Laureate must have a significant body of published work and agree to the conditions and term of the appointment; and reduces the term from the current four years to two years.
165	Rep. Barker	<b>MOTION: Moves SB 1018A be placed on the CONSENT CALENDAR.</b>

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.**

**173            Chair Krieger            The motion CARRIES.**

175            Chair Krieger            Closes the work session on SB 1018A and opens a work session on SB 1037B.

**SB 1037B – WORK SESSION**

177            Patrick Brennan            Committee Administrator. Explains SB 1037B which formalizes the process for Ballot Measure 37 (BM 37) claims and the process for judicial review; specifies that the new claims process and judicial review will apply only to claims filed on or after the effective date of the measure; and authorizes Tract of Record dwellings under certain circumstances. States the bill has a referral to budget committee. Refers to the –B25 amendments (**EXHIBIT U**).

188            Rep. Bill Garrard            House District 56 and Chair of the Land Use Committee. Reports on the failure to produce a document acceptable to all parties so the result was the -B25 amendments, which were written by the authors of BM 37. Continues that the –B25 amendments clarify BM 37 in regard to ownership, transferability, the claims process, judicial review, the appeal process, and authorization of state agencies to waive statutes, and deletes the Tract of Record provision. Urges adoption of the –B25 amendments and forwarding SB 1037 to the budget committee.

217            Rep. Boquist            Seeks clarification that the family member clause is in tact.

223            Rep. Garrard            Answers yes it is there.

229            Chair Krieger            Comments on the ongoing dialog in the Senate on the intent of BM 37.

**240            Rep. Boquist            MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1037B-25 amendments dated 7/18/05.**

244            Rep. Macpherson            Discusses the reasons why he cannot support the bill or the amendments.



263	Rep. Boquist	Does not see the Senate bill as a consensus version.
		<b>VOTE: 4-1-0</b>
		<b>AYE: 4 - Barker, Boquist, Flores, Krieger</b>
		<b>NAY: 1 - Macpherson</b>
267	Chair Krieger	The motion CARRIES.
268	Rep. Boquist	<b>MOTION: Moves SB 1037B to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation and BE REFERRED to the House Committee on Budget.</b>
		<b>VOTE: 3-2-0</b>
		<b>AYE: 3 - Boquist, Flores, Krieger</b>
		<b>NAY: 2 - Barker, Macpherson</b>
281	Chair Krieger	The motion CARRIES.
283	Chair Krieger	Closes the work session on SB 1037B and adjourns the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

## **EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

- A. SB 1083, written testimony, Jessica Stevens, 1 p
- B. SB 1083, written testimony, Scott Ashcom, 20 pp
- C. SB 1083, written testimony, Don Schellenberg, 2 pp
- D. SB 1083, written testimony, John McCulley, 1 p
- E. SB 1083, written testimony, Northwest Treeplanters and Farmworkers United, 1 p
- F. SJR 24, written testimony, Dan Lavey, 2 pp
- G. SB 1067, -1 amendments, Rep. Brian Boquist, 1 p
- H. SB 1067, printed statute, Jim Markee, 3 pp
- I. SB 660, written testimony, Amanda Rich, 7 pp
- J. HB 3505, -3 amendments, staff, 1 p
- K. HB 3505, DOJ written opinion, staff, 6 pp
- L. HB 3505, -1 amendments, staff, 1 p
- M. HB 3505, -2 amendments, staff, 1 p
- N. HB 3505, Supreme Court decision, staff, 58 pp
- O. HB 3505, newspaper article, Dave Hunnicutt, 1 p

- P. HB 3505, written testimony,. Michele Deister, 2 pp**
- Q. HB 3505, written testimony by Jack Kenny, John Fletcher, 1 p**
- R. HB 3505, written concerns, Eugene Schoenheit, 1 p**
- S. HB 3505, written testimony, Bill Penhollow, 3 pp**
- T. HB 3505, written testimony, Association of Oregon Redevelopment Agencies, 1 p**
- U. SB 1037, -B25 amendments, staff, 16 pp**