

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

August 19, 2003 Hearing Room E
3:00 PM Tapes 124 - 126

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Dan Doyle, Chair
Rep. Linda Flores, Vice-Chair
Rep. Laurie Monnes Anderson, Vice Chair
Rep. Vic Backlund
Rep. Phil Barnhart
Rep. Betsy L. Close
Rep. Joanne Verger

STAFF PRESENT: Cara Filsinger, Administrator
Ray Kelly, Administrator
Janet Adkins, Administrator
Annetta Mullins, Committee Assistant

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: SJR 2 – Work Session
Introduction of Speaker-Approved committee bill
HB 3510 – Public Hearing and Work Session
SB 911 B – Public Hearing and Work Session
SB 920 A – Public Hearing and Work Session
SB 934 – Public Hearing and 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.

<u>TAPE/#</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tape 124, A		
004	Chair Doyle	Calls meeting to order at 3:47 p.m., announces order agenda items will be considered, and opens a work session on SJR 2 A.
<u>SJR 2 A – WORK SESSION</u>		
016	Rep. Flores	MOTION: Moves SJR 2 A to the floor WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION as to passage and the SUBSEQUENT REFERRAL to the committee on Revenue BE RESCINDED and BE REFERRED to the House Special Committee on Budget.
018	Chair Doyle	Explains that the committee has been asked to move the bill to the Budget Committee, and that it had a prior referral to Revenue. VOTE: 4-2-1 AYE: 4 - Backlund, Flores, Verger, Doyle NAY: 2 - Barnhart, Monnes Anderson EXCUSED: 1 - Close
038	Chair Doyle	The motion CARRIES.
039	Chair Doyle	Closes the work session on SJR 2 A and opens a work session on introduction of Speaker-approved committee bill.

INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKER-APPROVED COMMITTEE BILL

035	Rep. Flores	MOTION: Moves LC 3739 BE INTRODUCED as a committee bill (EXHIBIT A).
045	Rep. Verger	Asks what will happen to this measure if SJR 2A does not move.
048	Chair Doyle	Explains that this measure is being introduced as a committee

054

Chair Doyle
Chair Doyle

bill and assignment to a committee will be up to the Speaker.

VOTE: 6-0-1

EXCUSED: 1 - Rep. Close

Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.

Closes the work session on introduction of Speaker-approved committee bill and opens a public hearing on HB 3510.

HB 3510 –PUBLIC HEARING

057

Rep. Gordon
Anderson

District 3. Introduces Bill Peterson, City Manager of Grants Pass, and Robert Weber, Public Works Director for Josephine County. Testifies in support of HB 3510 (**EXHIBIT C**).

134

Robert Weber

Director, Josephine County Public Works Department. States that the Oregon Department of Transportation’s (ODOT) policy of transferring jurisdiction of state highways to local governments has major disadvantages for rural counties. It takes rural counties out of competition for modernization projects and believes it is an unreasonable shift of the maintenance burden to local governments that they cannot afford to carry. Believes ODOT’s policy is because of the fiscal situation but the rural counties and smaller cities are in a worse state than ODOT. Explains consequences of the county financial situation on road maintenance. They want to maintain what they have before moving on to new projects.

Weber

States that the Peterson will speak about a fourth bridge project that is needed in their urban transportation plan. As part of the project, ODOT wants to transfer 53 miles of roadway and has offered approximately 50 percent of the cost of maintenance for the next 20 years. After that the maintenance would be the responsibility of Josephine County and they see no improvement in the county’s financial picture other than what is taking place this year by the legislature.

185

Weber

Explains how Josephine County plans to spend the 2003 transportation financing package money; it will not provide any money for new roads. Contends that the state, county, and city transportation agencies are in the same financial straits with aging infrastructure, and believes that we need to discourage leveraging against the capacity of the local rural road agencies or cities to adequately maintain their roads with the carrot of the state modernization projects.

160

Bill Peterson

City Manager of Grants Pass. Comments he has seen a lot of changes in Grants Pass over the last 12 years. They want to find another way to cross the Rogue River because it is difficult to drive through Grants Pass. Explains their bridge locations and capacities and gives example of a successful road exchange in Coos Bay. States they are being blackmailed to accept 53 miles of roads which they cannot financially handle. Gives examples of six miles of roadway that would require

\$350,000 a year be put in a sinking fund to pay to rebuild the roadway after 45 years. Adds that the maintenance costs would be another \$300,000 plus, which would mean it would cost about \$670,000 to maintain and rebuild the road. With the mandate in place they cannot move a project which is critical to the county and the city. Adds that the county had the opportunity to accept

another series of roads, which would have represented about 50 percent of the maintenance cost and nothing toward long-term replacement nor modernization of the roadways they are being mandated to accept in the exchange.

285 Peterson Explains that HB 3510 simply allows them to not be mandated to accept; it does not say that they must accept the jurisdictional exchange or that they must accept maintenance in order to get a roadway that can be modernized and improved.

295 Rep. Barnhart Ask for a description of the project and an estimate of traffic volume.

Peterson Explains traffic volume on roads in Josephine County and cities.

325 Rep. Barnhart Asks how many miles of roadway they have.

Peterson Explains road system in their area.

Rep. Anderson Further explains road miles and system in Josephine County.

380 Rep. Verger Asks if Sixth and Seventh Streets were once state highways.

Peterson Explains that city traffic does move on those streets, but he would not classify them as no longer functioning as highways.

401 Rep. Verger Asks for clarification of connecting streets and highways in Grants Pass.

Peterson Describes traffic patterns.

419 Weber Explains further the highways under various designations.

430 Rep. Verger Asks what the leverage is in the exchange and what they expect in a modernization project.

Peterson Responds they are seeking approximately \$22 million that would reconstruct the segment of roadway that would provide a new crossing to the Rogue River and interconnect back into the municipal and state highway grids. In exchange for that, the state said that without a jurisdictional exchange, they would not have a project and that they must accept certain roadways in order for the state to consider the project.

446 Rep. Verger Asks if the \$22 million project is on the STIP.

Peterson Responds that it is not; it is on the DSTIP.

456 Rep. Anderson Explains that the Area Commission on Transportation, because of the major needs in Medford, Grants Pass, and Josephine County, has stepped back and said the interchanges south and north of Medford on I-5 have been a major need. Explains the road systems in the area, and states that the fourth bridge is very necessary because there is a major traffic jam between the other three bridges. The fourth bridge would take traffic off the other three.

493 Rep. Verger Asks if they have worked with ODOT in this matter.

495 Peterson States they have been at this for five years and believe they have attempted everything they have figured out to do, and have attempted to negotiate the relative value of what the lane miles might be in the exchange, whether they could they accept the exchange, and whether there is some portion of the exchange which would not be necessary, whether there is some other way to approach the project, and whether they could use toll bridges. Comments on volumes of correspondence with ODOT and efforts of a problem-solving group to work with ODOT.

TAPE 125, A
037 Rep. Anderson Adds that the City of Grants Pass has been open to making some kind of a deal with ODOT but not at the price that is being

		asked. Believes the smaller communities will be really hurt by this. They cannot trade when millions of dollars they will never have are required. If they can come to agreement with ODOT, that is acceptable. If they cannot come to agreement, then the project needs to go ahead as usual depending on the STIP or DSTIP.
056	Rep. Backlund	Asks for the history and development of the mandatory exchange process.
060	Peterson	Explains that the Oregon Transportation Plan became the basis for the exchange program.
078	Doug Tindall	State Maintenance Engineer, ODOT. Submits prepared statement (EXHIBIT B). States he agrees with much of the testimony, and that there are not enough dollars to maintain the transportation systems whether they are city, county, or state, and agrees with inflation concerns. States that the cities and counties are getting revenue for operation and maintenance as part of the new revenue package; the state is not getting dollars from that revenue package for operation and maintenance.
082	Chair Doyle	Asks if the transportation package does not provide enough funds.
088	Tindall	Responds that he is only talking about the way the money is divided up, and thanks the legislature for passing the transportation package. States that he doesn't believe ODOT would say they have mandated a transfer. They have been working with local governments and the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities to determine when a jurisdictional transfer makes sense.
102	Tindall	Explains the policy discussed in the Oregon Highway Plan endeavors to put the state resources on those highways which are of statewide importance, to cross the state, cross regions, or travel between cities. The particular concern with the bill, because of the way they write agreement to do a modernization project with a local government includes a number of facets. If a jurisdictional transfer is going to take place, it is generally in the agreement. They are afraid that the way the bill is worded, it may take away their flexibility; they do not disagree that they could still do jurisdictional transfers but it may make it more difficult as part of a modernization project. Adds that he understands and sympathizes with any county road master or city public works director and the problems they are facing. States that ODOT is committed whether this bill passes or not to working with local governments to put the sideboards around all jurisdictional transfers so everyone is on the same page about when it makes sense and when it will benefit both parties.
130	Rep. Verger	Asks Tindall if 6 th and 7 th Street are part of the local grid system.
124	Tindall	Replies that they are and addresses the function of the state freeway system as it relates.
133	Rep. Verger	Comments on the success of two jurisdictional exchanges in Coos Bay.
172	Rep. Backlund	References Tindall's earlier testimony and asks for clarification of his statement that if HB 3510 passes it would make a transfer more difficult.
176	Tindall	Clarifies earlier comments regarding modernization projects; it

		will not change the current process for jurisdictional transfers. Adds that this bill only addresses modernization projects.
182	Rep. Backlund	Asks if the Coos Bay projects could have been done if this bill had been in place.
	Tindall	Responds that the Coos Bay projects could have gone forward. There just would have been more in the negotiation process in terms of when the city took the road, whether it was before or after ODOT gave them the money.
195	Rep. Barnhart	Asks Tindall if ODOT's policy has been to get city streets out of its inventory and concentrate on traffic going longer distances.
	Tindall	Responds affirmatively.
203	Rep. Barnhart	Asks if that is what this is about.
	Tindall	Responds affirmatively and states it is a tool that perhaps they have not used as well as they could have in the past. They are hoping to work with AOC and LOC to make sure it works better to get the mission accomplished and make sure we have a true state highway system.
	Rep. Barnhart	Asks what operational difference it would make for ODOT if this bill were to pass.
215	Tindall	Responds that doing a jurisdictional transfer as part of a modernization project will become more difficult. It would not change other operational aspects. It would be more difficult because it says they cannot condition a jurisdictional transfer as part of a modernization project. ODOT reads that to say they cannot put it into the agreement that results in the modernization project.
234	Bill Penhollow	Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). Testifies in support of HB 3510. States that ODOT, cities, and counties are faced with a lack of resources. At the county level, they have about \$1 for every \$4 in needs. The county road system is currently 27,000 miles. The city system is 9,600 miles. The state road system is about 75,000 including many miles of interstate. The issue is trying to maintain the total system. When there is an issue of jurisdictional transfer, the jurisdictions should come together to see if they can work out an arrangement to make the transfer and not try to hand off roads that are in major need of improvement to another jurisdiction.
262	Penhollow	Explains the current statute that says a city and a county must agree on a transfer, and that has been the practice of the State of Oregon over the years. It has only been recently that this kind of approach has become more common because ODOT is faced with the problem of what to do with the district highways. The cities and counties are unable to assume the maintenance in the condition the roads are in.
256	Linda Ludwig	League of Oregon Cities (LOC). Concur with testimony by Penhollow in support of the bill. They believe these jurisdictional transfer cases are important to be discussed and decided upon on a case-by-case basis. States they would disagree with the interpretation that the language in the bill would preclude that happening for modernization projects.
288	Chair Doyle	Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on HB 3510.

291	Rep. Flores	MOTION: Moves HB 3510 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
	Rep. Monnes Anderson	Comments that it looks like there were some problems between Josephine County and Grants Pass and ODOT. States she is not disagreeing with the problems the cities and counties are having with money, but there are problems at the state level with funding and there needs to be cooperation by everyone. States she is opposed to making a major policy change such as this.
321	Rep. Verger	Announces that she will support this legislation with some reservation. States that solutions should not be arbitrary and capricious.
340	Rep. Flores	Acknowledges testimony by Rep. Anderson and the funding problems at the local levels and states that she will support the bill.
356	Rep. Backlund	Comments it seems that if the bill prohibited ODOT from requiring another jurisdiction to assume responsibility we would have one thing to consider, but it does not prohibit an agreement between ODOT and local governments. The bill is reasonable because there are possibilities for agreements. States he can acknowledge there will most likely be more negotiations, but they would not be impossible to complete. Believes this is a reasonable answer.
373	Rep. Barnhart	Comments on a seemingly clumsy method of interaction between ODOT, cities, and counties, and states that he understands this bill is not to prevent the jurisdictions and ODOT from agreeing to do a jurisdictional transfer in a modernization project, and if ODOT wanted to insist on a transfer as part of a modernization project, it would be couched in different terms. States he believes city streets should be maintained by the city. Adds that he does not believe the bill will address the problem that has been addressed and believes the issue should be taken up by the interim transportation committee to deal with the overall problem.
429	Chair Doyle	Comments that under Section 2 of the bill, agreements are allowed even on the highway modernization projects. The bill is recognition there have been cases where ODOT has used a heavy hand in trying to exert some influence on certain cities and counties in ways that are a cost shift, and that he will be an aye vote.
TAPE 124, B		
007	Rep. Barnhart	Comments that he has been reminded that the bill has been through the committee process he had advocated for, that his concern has been dealt with in detail, and that he will vote for the bill.
017	Rep. Monnes Anderson	States that she did not realize the bill had gone through the substantive committee, and she will be a yes, also.
020		VOTE: 7-0-0 (See Tape 125 at 196)
	Chair Doyle	AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. The motion CARRIES.
		REP. ANDERSON will lead discussion on the floor.
026	Chair Doyle	Closes the work session on HB 3510 and opens a public hearing on SB 911 B.

SB 911 B – PUBLIC HEARING

031	Linda Swearinger	League of Oregon Cities (LOC). Introduces Bob Cortright,
-----	------------------	--

		Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), and testifies in support of SB 911 B. Explains that SB 911 was originally HB 3213, which passed the House, and has been brought back. Explains that since passage of HB 3213 in the House they have been able to work out a compromise to gain the support of DLCD.
039	Swearinger	Explains provisions of SB 911 B. States that in an effort to move the bill, they agreed to have it applicable only to Eastern Oregon, and that the committee will hear testimony to include Southern Oregon, which would be an unfriendly amendment. States they agree with the amendment that will be offered by AOC which says counties have the right to be more restrictive than state late, but they have a concern about the timing this late in session.
096	Bob Cortright	Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). Comments that Swearinger has done an excellent job of summarizing the process the bill has been through. Explains that the experiences in Deschutes County would be used as the benchmark for how destination resorts are handled in the state. They are satisfied that the changes that are made continue to achieve the broad policy objective of getting destination resorts without undermining the protections that DLCD is interested in retaining.
113	Art Schlack	Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). Testifies in support of SB 911 B with the SB 911-B8 amendments (EXHIBIT D).
122	Schlack	Explains SB 911-B8 amendments (EXHIBIT D).
162	Chair Doyle Schlack	Asks if local government can now set more restrictive standards. Responds that he believes it is sometimes unclear whether they have that ability and under what circumstances; the SB 911-B8 amendments clarify that.
170	Chair Doyle Schlack Chair Doyle	Asks if Deschutes County has had litigation. Responds that he does not know. Asks if Schlack sees this legislation not allowing local governments to charge a reasonable fee for the maps.
179	Schlack	Responds he believes it is unclear because it says they must process it within the set times and removes the periodic review.
184	Rep. Backlund Schlack	Asks if AOC opposes the bill without the amendments. Responds he would be more comfortable with the amendments. Believes questions raised by county counsel should be addressed to prevent litigation in the future.
182	Martha Pagel	Attorney, representing clients interested in destination resort development in Jackson County. States that timing is everything and their timing is lousy on this bill and it is late for them to enter the process. They support the concepts in the bill and the bill. The changes are useful to all resorts without being detrimental to the land use system. If they can figure out another vehicle this session, they will be back next session to talk about Jackson County.
238	Carrie MacLaren	Staff Attorney, 1,000 Friends of Oregon. Testifies in opposition to SB 911 B (EXHIBIT E) and in opposition to the SB 911-B8 amendments (EXHIBIT D).
323	Rep. Barnhart MacLaren	Asks what the definition is of "Eastern Oregon." Explains where the dividing line is for Eastern/Western Oregon.
333	Rep. Barnhart	States that one of the arguments MacLaren uses to say these are

	MacLaren	more residential than resorts is the reduction from 45 to 38 weeks the unit must be available for rental. Asks if there are residents who only stay in their house 14 weeks a year.
	MacLaren	Explains the requirements for rentals to qualify for a destination resort. They do have substantial concerns under current law that it could be abused to allow residential development by increasing the amount of allowed residential development; people could use this as a loophole to build residential subdivisions in areas they are not planned for.
368	Rep. Barnhart	Asks if a builder can build and sell two houses for residences and one for a rental unit and qualify as a destination resort.
	MacLaren	Responds affirmatively and comments on a case in Douglas County that has been remanded back to the county on a number of issues.
402	Rep. Monnes Anderson	Asks if Sun River is a destination resort.
	MacLaren	Responds that Sun River is not, and explains the reason Sun River was developed.
303	Rep. Monnes Anderson	Asks whether it matters if one or eight families own a home.
	MacLaren	Explains the assumptions of what a destination resort would be when the law was enacted.
452	Rep. Barnhart	Asks if there are any developments that depend on this bill.
	MacLaren	Responds that she is not aware of any. States that an application has been filed in Crook County and it is unclear whether this legislation would apply to them.
470	Rep. Barnhart	Asks if this bill has any relationship to the Oregon Military Department.
473	MacLaren	Responds that to her knowledge, it does not.
TAPE 125, B		
016	Rep. Verger	Asks MacLaren to comment on Section 1(2) on high value crop area.
	MacLaren	Explains high value crop area.
036	Rep. Verger	Asks if MacLaren agrees the mapping standards are \$20,000 per project.
	MacLaren	Responds that she has no idea of the cost to counties. States that the mapping process is one way destination resorts can be sited; they can also go through the exceptions process. States that the Abandoned Dunes destination resort has been successfully built with no residential homes.
050	Rep. Backlund	Asks if Black Butte and Eagle Crest are destination resorts.
	MacLaren	Comments on status of areas.
079	Rep. Barnhart	Asks how MacLaren would fix the law.
	MacLaren	Comments on 1,000 Friends' suggestions.
108	Chair Doyle	Closes the hearing and opens a work session on SB 911 B.
SB 911 B – WORK SESSION		
110	Chair Doyle	Comments he does not believe the SB 911 B8 amendment (EXHIBIT D) would be necessary and given the timing in the session he would like to go forward with the bill as is, with the provision that if things don't happen as expected tomorrow, the committee can bring the bill back to committee, make the changes, and send it back to the Senate for concurrence.
135	Rep. Monnes	Comments she agrees with Chair Doyle but does wish the

	Anderson	amendments would be incorporated. Comments on cost to the county.
147	Rep. Flores	MOTION: Moves SB 911 B to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
151	Rep. Monnes Anderson	Comments on her support for destination resorts.
161	Rep. Barnhart	Comments on his support for destination resorts and states they can end up being a game of leap frog which land use planning is intended to avoid and this bill does not seem to get us there..
174	Rep. Verger	Comments she agrees with Rep. Barnhart. States she fears this opens a gate.
180		VOTE: 4-2-1 AYE: 4 - Backlund, Flores, Monnes Anderson, Doyle NAY: 2 - Barnhart, Verger EXCUSED: 1 - Close The motion CARRIES. REP. MONNES ANDERSON will lead discussion on the floor.
	Chair Doyle	
189	Chair Doyle	Closes the work session on SB 911 B.

HB 3510 – WORK SESSION

190	Chair Doyle	Explains that Rep. Monnes Anderson wants to change her vote on HB 3510.
192	Rep. Doyle	MOTION: Requests unanimous consent that the rules be SUSPENDED to allow REP. MONNES ANDERSON to CHANGE vote from AYE to NAY on the motion to send HB 3510 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. VOTE: 6-0-1 EXCUSED: 1 - Rep. Close Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. VOTES NO
	Chair Doyle	
197	Rep. Monnes Anderson	
198	Rep. Monnes Anderson	Explains that she has changed her vote because it has been brought to her attention that there may be a \$200,000 fiscal impact, and that when the Transportation Committee considered the bill, the assumption was that it would go to Ways and Means and die.
206	Chair Doyle	Opens a public hearing on SB 920 A.

SB 920 A– PUBLIC HEARING

211	Chair Doyle	Explains that SB 920 A has been put together by a work group. League of Oregon Cities. Explains that the original bill, SB 929, stalled in a Senate committee and that the legislation is now in SB 920 A. Explains the work group activities and SB 920 A (EXHIBIT F) .
221	Linda Ludwick	
296	Jon Chandler	Oregon Building Industry Association (OBIA). Comments on working with the work group and purpose of periodic review. States that periodic review is a good idea but has not helped anyone. OBIA thinks SB 920 A is a good bill; it is simply procedural on how DLCD gets through their process in a timely fashion, particularly in light of the budget cuts.

SB 911 B – WORK SESSION

306 REP. BARNHART

SERVES NOTICE OF A POSSIBLE MINORITY REPORT ON SB 911 B.

SB 920 A – PUBLIC HEARING

327 Nan Evans

Interim Director, Department of Land Conservation & Development. Comments that SB 920 A is a good bill that resulted from a good process. Explains there are reasons why the “lump” in the system exists. Some are reasons at the local levels having to do with resources, staffing, and the nature of the issues that local jurisdictions have to deal with. Some reasons at the state level are priorities, workload, and budget. This bill will move the workload through their department faster. States there is no fiscal statement on the bill because they believe they have adequate funding in their grant program to pay the costs of local governments during years three and four of the bill.

386 Rep. Verger

Comments that it is awful to see what the small cities have to go through without funding and then being put in periodic review.

Evans

Asks why this change has taken so long.

Responds there are a multitude of complex reasons. Comments on issues in the local jurisdictions.

441 Rep. Verger

Thanks Evans for the money for the Coastal programs.

442 Chair Doyle

Notes that the committee has the Legislative Fiscal Statement on SB 920 A (**EXHIBIT G**) that recognizes that as the backlog gets resolved DLCD may be able to reprioritize existing resources, and that “DLCD believes it will be able to absorb the work created by that committee if other work decreases as a result of this bill.” Asks if that is still the position of the department.

455 Evans

Responds that it is still her hope.

460 Chair Doyle

Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SB 920 A.

SB 920 A – WORK SESSION

463 Rep. Flores

MOTION: Moves SB 920 A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.

VOTE: 5-0-2

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

EXCUSED: 2 - Reps. Close, Monnes Anderson
The motion CARRIES.

REP. DOYLE will lead discussion on the floor.

Chair Doyle

Closes the work session on SB 920 A.

475 Chair Doyle

TAPE 126, A

001 Chair Doyle

Opens a public hearing on SB 934.

SB 934 – PUBLIC HEARING

008 Cindy Robert

American Institute of Architects. Explains this bill is a combination of two bills that unanimously passed the Senate, SB 209 and SB 210, and died in a House committee. SB 934 encompasses both bills and amendments to SB 210 that were agreed upon by everyone.

033 Carol Halford

Administrator, Board of Architect Examiners. Testifies in support of SB 934 (**EXHIBIT H**).

052 Rep. Barnhart
Robert

Asks what the amendment was to SB 210.

Explains that the amendment was on qualifications for being an architect.

073 Chair Doyle

Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SB 934.

SB 934 – WORK SESSION

074 Rep. Flores

MOTION: Moves SB 934 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.

078

VOTE: 6-0-1

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

EXCUSED: 1 - Rep. Close

Chair Doyle

The motion CARRIES.

REP. BACKLUND will lead discussion on the floor.

083 Chair Doyle

Closes the work session on SB 934 and adjourns the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A – Introduction of Speaker-approved committee bill, letter request and LC 3739, staff, 6 pp

B – HB 3510, prepared statement, Doug Tindall, 1 p

C – HB 3510, prepared statement, Rep. Anderson, 3 pp

D – SB 911, SB 911-B8 amendments, Art Schlack, 1 p

E – SB 911, prepared statement, Carrie MacLaren, 3 pp

F – SB 920, prepared statement, Linda Ludwick, 1 p

G – SB 920, Legislative Fiscal Statement, staff, 1 p

H – SB 934, prepared statement, Carol Halford, 2 pp