

SENATE COMMITTEE ON WATER AND LAND USE

April 30, 2003
3:00 p.m.

Hearing Room D
Tapes 59 – 62

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Sen. Ted Ferrioli, Chair**
 Sen. Charlie Ringo, Vice-Chair
 Sen. Jason Atkinson
 Sen. Rick Metsger

STAFF PRESENT: **Judith Callens, Committee Administrator**
 Megan Jensen, Committee Assistant

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: **HB 820 Public Hearing and Work Session**
 HB 2689 Public Hearing
 SB 293 Public Hearing
 HB 836 Public Hearing
 HB 418 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.

| TAPE/# | Speaker | Comments |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| TAPE 59, A | | |
| 003 | Chair Ferrioli | Calls meeting to order at 3:18 p.m. and opens public hearing on SB 820. |
| <u>SB 820 – PUBLIC HEARING</u> | | |
| 010 | Sen. David Nelson | District 29 State Senator. Provides testimony in support of SB 820 and -5 amendments dated 4/30/03 (EXHIBIT A). States that the Columbia River should be protected but also provide for economic development uses. |
| 025 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for the main points of the -5 amendments. |
| 030 | Sen. Nelson | Explains that -5 amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Request a 250,000 acre feet reservation of water• Create a temporary ten year reservation• Create a task force to study the effects on interstate compacts, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and effects on the state |
| 038 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires if the work group included WaterWatch and other environmental groups. |
| 040 | Sen. Nelson | Affirms and lists organizations involved in the work group. |
| 055 | Martha Pagel | Schwabe Williamson and Wyatt. Provides information on the work group and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBITS B AND C). |
| 088 | Sen. Ringo | Asks about reserving 250,000 acre feet of Columbia River water. |
| 092 | Pagel | Explains that the Columbia River main stem is not part of the reservation and will be withdrawn from future appropriation. |
| 096 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires if there could be withdrawals from the Columbia River without legislative approval. |
| 098 | Pagel | Affirms and explains the process for requesting a withdrawal. |
| 102 | Sen. Ringo | Asks about the origin of the 250,000 acre feet figure. |
| 103 | Pagel | Explains it is a rough estimate of what might be a reasonable amount. |

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| 112 | Sen. Ringo | Wonders if the majority of the water will be used for agricultural purposes. |
| 114 | Pagel | Believes the water would be used for agricultural uses but also for industrial and municipal development. |
| 120 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires about the temporary ten year limit on SB 820. |
| 123 | Pagel | Explains the intent is to have a systematic plan for long term water needs. |
| 135 | Sen. Ringo | Asks what issues need further deliberation. |
| 139 | Pagel | Refers to the four key issues listed on page two of her submitted written testimony. |
| 155 | Sen. Ringo | Wonders if amendments are required to address the concerns. |
| 159 | Pagel | Believes the -5 amendments address those concerns and elaborates. |
| 176 | Sen. Ringo | Clarifies that some concerns could be addressed at a future point. |
| 183 | Pagel | Confirms that the -5 amendments address the problems but there are plans to continue working on the bill on the House side. |
| 189 | Chair Ferrioli | Discusses the reservation of water as the first key component of the -5 amendments. |
| 199 | Pagel | Points out the language in SB 820 that reserves 250,000 acre feet of water. |
| 204 | Chair Ferrioli | Discusses the second key provision of protection for instream flows. |
| 206 | Pagel | Points out language in the -5 amendment that addresses instream flows. |
| 210 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks about the third key provision of comprehensive river management. |
| 212 | Pagel | Explains comprehensive river management plans in the -5 amendments. |
| 238 | Chair Ferrioli | Talks about the four states that share the Columbia River in different appropriation percentages. |
| 241 | Pagel | Replies that those issues can be addressed in an interstate compact. |
| 250 | Chair Ferrioli | Discusses the fourth key provision regarding the ESA. |
| 264 | Pagel | Explains the process for consulting with agencies regarding how the proposed water withdrawal will affect the ESA. |
| 280 | Chair Ferrioli | Points out the requirement for a report to the Legislative Assembly in two years. |
| 285 | Sen. Ringo | Asks about the inclusion of the ESA in the -5 amendments. |
| 300 | Pagel | Explains how the Water Resources Department (WRD) will consider applications with regards to the ESA. |
| 310 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires if the term "this reservation" refers to the 250,000 acre feet and not the 1.42 million acre feet originally requested. |
| 320 | Pagel | Affirms. |
| 322 | Sen. Ringo | Asks about a fiscal impact. |
| 328 | Chair Ferrioli | Comments that there is no fiscal impact statement yet and elaborates. |
| 335 | Pagel | Explains the plan is structured for a minimal fiscal impact. |
| 338 | Chair Ferrioli | Remarks that SB 820 is a work in progress. |
| 350 | Bill Burke | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). Provides testimony against SB 820 and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBIT D). |
| TAPE 60, A | | |
| 005 | Burke | Continues testimony in opposition to SB 820. |
| 098 | Sen. Ringo | Asks if some water could be freed up immediately while the |

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| | | study is taking place. |
| 102 | Burke | Believes no water should be made immediately available. |
| 108 | Sen. Ringo | Expresses concern regarding the economic downturn and wonders if some amount of water could be allocated for economic uses in interim. |
| 118 | Burke | Reasserts his concern for the well-being of Columbia River salmon. |
| 122 | Rick George | CTUIR Water Resources Department (WRD). Talks about WRD's process for granting a new water right. |
| 134 | Chair Ferrioli | Summarizes crucial issues surrounding SB 820. Asks if CTUIR could support the committee moving SB 820 to the House with the understanding that the work group will continue work on the bill. |
| 234 | George | Responds that CTUIR would prefer that more time be spent addressing concerns about the impacts to the hydrosystem and instream flows in the Columbia River. |
| 263 | Chair Ferrioli | Remarks that there is very little time left in the legislative session to address those concerns adequately and states that those subjects will be included in legislative reports. Talks about three issues that must be addressed before water is ever even appropriated. |
| 300 | Adam Sussman | WRD. Provides testimony in support of SB 820 and -5 amendments and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBIT E) . Believes there will be no fiscal impact to the general fund. |
| 312 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires how much time WRD requires to assess a fiscal impact. |
| 313 | Sussman | Explains the length of time is difficult to estimate. |
| 318 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for an estimate of the time necessary to produce a fiscal impact statement. |
| 320 | Sussman | Restates he cannot accurately estimate the length of time. |
| 330 | Chair Ferrioli | Talks about water right application costs being used to fund WRD work. |
| 336 | Sussman | Believes the SB -5 amendments require agencies comply reports of policy coordination issues. |
| TAPE 59, B | | |
| 020 | Jill Zarnowitz | Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Provides testimony on SB 820 and -5 amendments and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBIT F) . |
| 055 | Sen. Metsger | Asks about specific concerns with the -5 amendments. |
| 059 | Zarnowitz | Explains ODFW is satisfied with the -5 amendments. |
| 064 | Sen. Metsger | Asks if ODFW supports the bill with the -5 amendments. |
| 067 | Zarnowitz | Explains ODFW is remaining neutral on SB 820. |
| 070 | Sen. Ringo | Asks how the water withdrawal will affect the amount of water in the Columbia River. |
| 074 | Sussman | Replies that there are pending applications for Columbia River water use and elaborates. |
| 087 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires if the pending applications will affect water withdrawals in the next two years. |
| 089 | Sussman | Explains that applications waiting for water will go forward regardless of any other water use decisions. |
| 098 | Sen. Ringo | Asks if SB 820 will affect people currently in the application process. |
| 100 | Sussman | Replies that SB 820 will enhance coordination between agencies and the federal government but it will not allocate water. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 105 | Sen. Ringo | Reiterates his question regarding whether SB 820 will make it more likely that additional water will be removed from of the Columbia River over the next two years. |
| 109 | Chair Ferrioli | Clarifies that it will depend on each water right application. |
| 115 | Kimberley Priestley | WaterWatch. Provides testimony in opposition to SB 820 and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBIT G). States that WaterWatch would accept the proposed water withdrawal if the remaining water is withdrawn from future consumptive appropriation. |
| 185 | Sen. Ringo | Asks if WaterWatch would accept SB 820 in its entirety under that assumption. |
| 187 | Priestley | Explains that WaterWatch would be comfortable with the water withdrawal if a clause was included allowing for an instream water right. Continues testimony and discusses the reporting requirements. |
| 200 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for WaterWatch’s opinion on the 250,000 acre feet reservation request. |
| 203 | Priestley | Replies WaterWatch will not accept water withdrawal as long as target flows for healthy fish are not being met. |
| 207 | Aubrey Russell | Oregon Trout. Provides testimony in opposition to SB 820 and refers to submitted written materials (EXHIBIT H). |
| 272 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for his opinion on the addition of “consumptive” on page three of SB 820. |
| 280 | Pagel | Explains that it would allow an instream water right application to be filed but might erase any benefit of the water reservation. |
| 299 | Fred Ziari | Eastern Oregon Irrigation Association. Provides testimony in support of SB 820. Believes SB 820 will assist economic recovery in eastern Oregon. |
| 324 | Gary Reed | Umatilla County. Submits written testimony in support of SB 820 (EXHIBIT I). |
| 330 | Chair Ferrioli | Closes public hearing and opens work session on SB 820. |
| <u>SB 820 – WORK SESSION</u> | | |
| 335 | Chair Ferrioli | Explains an scrivener’s error in the -5 amendments to be corrected in the House. Clarifies CTUIR is concerned with fish survival and water flow. States those issues must be dealt with on any application for water rights and elaborates. |
| 370 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for clarification on the scrivener’s error. |
| 375 | Chair Ferrioli | Provides clarification and explains there will be a conference committee when SB 820 moves to the House. |
| 395 | Sen. Atkinson | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 820-5 amendments dated 4/30/03. |
| 400 | | VOTE: 4-0 |
| | Chair Ferrioli | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. |
| 406 | Sen. Metsger | Summarizes issues surrounding SB 820. |
| TAPE 60, B | | |
| 023 | Sen. Ringo | Offers supports for SB 820 but comments on the arbitrary nature of the 250,000 acre feet reservation. |
| 039 | Sen. Atkinson | MOTION: Moves SB 820 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation. |
| 043 | | VOTE: 4-0 |
| | Chair Ferrioli | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. The motion CARRIES. |
| | | SEN. NELSON will lead discussion on the floor. |

Directs staff to create an amendment regarding demonstrable progress and charges the work group to continue working on SB 820. Closes work session on SB 820 and opens public hearing on HB 2689.

HB 2689 – PUBLIC HEARING

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 062 | Rep. Tootie Smith | District 18 State Representative. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT L) . |
| 125 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if the -4 amendments are under consideration. |
| 128 | Rep. T. Smith | Replies that the -5 amendments are under consideration because there was a drafting error in the -4 amendments. |
| 180 | Sandy Flicker | Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT M) . |
| 230 | Harlan Levy | Oregon Association of Realtors. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and -5 amendments and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT N and EXHIBIT O) . |
| 275 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for his opinion on the -4 amendments. |
| 278 | Levy | Replies that some aspects of the -4 amendments are not acceptable. |
| 281 | Sen. Ringo | Believes there should be discussion on both the -4 and -5 amendments. |
| 290 | Chair Ferrioli | States there will be a presentation of the HB -4 amendments. |
| 294 | Don Schellenberg | Oregon Farm Bureau. States support for HB 2689 and -4 amendments. |
| 324 | Art Kegler | Morrow County. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689. Discusses the economic benefits of a new raceway in Morrow County. |

TAPE 61, A

| | | |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 008 | Sen. Ringo | Asks about the particular land use rules that impeded the establishment of a raceway. |
| 015 | Kegler | Explains that commercial businesses were not allowed outside the urban growth boundary (UGB). |
| 019 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires if the raceway itself was considered a commercial business. |
| 021 | Kegler | Replies that the amenities associated with the raceway were considered commercial development. |
| 025 | Sen. Ringo | Asks who made the decision that impacted the establishment of the raceway. |
| 026 | Kegler | Responds that the Department of Land Conservation and Development made the decision. |
| 029 | Chair Ferrioli | Explains that the commercial development related to the raceway was disallowed. |
| 032 | Kegler | Reiterates that the decision was made because the proposed location was outside the UGB. Explains that HB 2689 would not allow “mall sprawl.” |
| 040 | Sen. Ringo | Asks if HB 2689 would resurrect the racetrack proposal. |
| 043 | Kegler | Affirms and elaborates. Discusses the -4 amendments and believes the size limitation of 40,000 square feet is unreasonable. |
| 068 | Sen. Ringo | Asks for his recommendation on a size limit. |
| 069 | Kegler | Replies that he is unsure of an appropriate size limit. |
| 075 | Sen. Ringo | Asks if the -4 amendments would adequately address the problem if the size limit is removed. |
| 077 | Kegler | Affirms. |

| | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 090 | Chair Ferrioli | Discusses the difference between urban commercial and rural commercial zoning. |
| 100 | Kegler | Clarifies the difference between urban commercial and rural commercial zoning. |
| 106 | Don Saari | Central Oregon Coast Board of Realtors. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT P) . Discusses the background of HB 2689. |
| 200 | Saari | Continues testimony in support of HB 2689. Expresses support for the HB 2689-5 amendments and expresses concern regarding the -4 amendments. |
| 260 | Bob Rindy | Department of Land Conservation and Development. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and -4 amendments. Discusses economic development on rural industrial lands. |
| 370 | Sen. Metsger | Asks about building size limitations. |
| 375 | Rindy | Explains that the basic premise of land use planning is to limit sprawl and keep costs down. |

TAPE 62, A

| | | |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 011 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks about rural commercial uses. |
| 018 | Rindy | Offers to research the issue. |
| 028 | Jay Waldron | Glenwood Auto Parts. Provides testimony in support of HB 2689 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT Q) . Asserts that HB 2689 will assist small and medium business owners in Oregon. |
| 118 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if he has read the -5 amendments. |
| 119 | Waldron | Responds he has not read the -5 amendments. |
| 125 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if there is a retail component to his business. |
| 128 | Waldron | Affirms. |
| 130 | Chair Ferrioli | Requests he study the -4 and -5 amendments. |
| 140 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires how he researched whether the land could be used for his business. |
| 142 | Waldron | Explains he worked with the land use planner in Lane County. |
| 150 | Sen. Ringo | Inquires how much time he spent working with the planner. |
| 152 | Waldron | Responds he spent approximately half an hour working with the land use planner. |
| 165 | Sen. Metsger | Inquires if his business use was deemed industrial use. |
| 168 | Waldron | Affirms. |
| 172 | Sen. Metsger | Clarifies that what prevented him from establishing his business was the imposition of the 7500 square foot building size limitation. |
| 175 | Waldron | Affirms and elaborates on the new rule that went into effect during the process of acquiring his business site. |
| 178 | Sen. Metsger | Asks for clarification on the new rule. |
| 193 | Waldron | Responds the building size limit changed and new ownership regulations went into effect. |
| 197 | Chair Ferrioli | Closes public hearing on HB 2689 and opens work session on SB 293. |

SB 293 – WORK SESSION

| | | |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 200 | Dick Stradley | Sherman County Assessor. Explains he is neutral on the issues of SB 293. Discusses the -6 amendments and expresses concern about administrative costs that might be imposed on assessors. |
| 245 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks who is the owner of record on the river banks. |
| 252 | Stradley | Believes the deeds show that property is owned to the center line of the river. |
| 254 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if the river bed is included in tax assessments. |

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| 257 | Stradley | Affirms. |
| 259 | Chair Ferrioli | Confirms that property owners own the river beds. |
| 263 | Donald Cossitt | Wheeler County Assessor. States that the John Day River is taxed to the center line of the river. |
| 270 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if tax payers would have the right to recover payment of taxes back to five years if the river was declared navigable. |
| 273 | Cossitt | Affirms that tax payers could recover payments back to five years if it was deemed a clerical error. |
| 276 | Chair Ferrioli | States that changes in the method of assessment would have to take place if the -6 amendments were adopted. |
| 283 | Cossitt | States that the John Day runs through exclusive farm zones and explains the process for adjustments to the taxable value. |
| 293 | Chair Ferrioli | Inquires about mapping processes. |
| 293 | Cossitt | Explains different mapping processes. |
| 298 | Chair Ferrioli | Remarks that mapping processes would be a burden on counties and the Department of Revenue. Asks about cost estimates. |
| 301 | Cossitt | Responds that there is no cost estimate. |
| 303 | Chair Ferrioli | Clarifies that property values are assessed to the center line of the river and the property is taxed. |
| 315 | Pat Shaw | Gillam County Assessor. Expresses concern about exempting property up to the high water mark because the administrative process will be burdensome to counties. |
| 340 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks for an explanation of meander surveys of river banks. |
| 345 | Scott Jackson | Department of Revenue Cartographer. Explains meander surveys and states the John Day has not had a meander survey. |
| 361 | Chair Ferrioli | Clarifies that he would have to do a meander survey from the headwaters of the John Day River before he could declare the high water line and declare assessable property values. |
| 365 | Jackson | Affirms and elaborates. |
| 367 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks who would pay for the survey. |
| 368 | Jackson | Replies that the Department of Revenue and counties would share the costs. |
| 370 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks about the tax base in Wheeler County. |
| 372 | Cossitt | Believes the tax base is around \$80 million. |
| 373 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if Wheeler County is over 98% on tax deferral. |
| 375 | Cossitt | Responds that about 98.4% is either exempt or deferred currently. |
| 377 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks for the annual revenue from that value. |
| 379 | Cossitt | States the levy for the entire county is \$487,597. |
| 381 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks what a meander survey would cost. |
| 410 | Jackson | Believes a meander survey would be expensive. |
| 415 | Cossitt | Comments on the cost and length of time for a meander survey. |
| 424 | Chair Ferrioli | Elaborates on the complications of a meander survey. |
| TAPE 61, B | | |
| 025 | Sen. Metsger | Asks if the recovery of taxes back five years for errors or omissions would be applicable under SB 293 or the declaration of navigability. |
| 035 | Chair Ferrioli | States that the potential liability would come from the error of assessing land that is not owned by the land owner. |
| 040 | Stradley | Affirms and elaborates on exemptions. |
| 046 | Sen. Metsger | Talks about the process of determining what property is not taxable. |
| 055 | Stradley | Affirms. |
| 058 | Sen. Metsger | Talks about property owners on the Sandy River. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| 070 | Cossitt | Explains the process in Wheeler County. |
| 100 | Sen. Metsger | Remarks that the state must reimburse a county for the costs involved with taking property. |
| 107 | Jackson | Clarifies that there is no money in the account the state would use to reimburse counties. |
| 115 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks about the effect on the total value of the land if the property to the center line of the river is lost. |
| 122 | Stradley | Explains that the land has relatively little value. |
| 133 | Chair Ferrioli | Believes the Sandy River property has a higher value and talks about assessments on the Sandy River. |
| 151 | Jackson | Offers to research the issue. |
| 165 | Bill Koran | West Linn. Provides testimony in opposition to SB 293 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT R) . |
| 288 | John Garren | National Organization for Rivers (NORS). Provides testimony in opposition to SB 293 and refers to submitted written testimony (EXHIBIT S) . Believes the state does not have the resources of staff and funding for development of a river recreation management plan that would duplicate a federal plan already in place. |
| 365 | Chair Ferrioli | Asks if he would like the federal John Day River management plan submitted for the record. |
| 369 | Garren | Replies that the federal management plans are available through the Bureau of Land Management in Prineville. |
| 378 | Sen. Ringo | Comments that there has been no reference to the federal management plan for the John Day River in the public hearings. |
| 380 | Garren | Talks about the federal management plan as it relates to the John Day River. |
| TAPE 62, B | | |
| 008 | Garren | Continues discussion of facilities on the John Day River and the federal management plan. |
| 020 | Chair Ferrioli | Closes work session on SB 293. Discusses management plan issues. Opens public hearing on SB 836. |
| <u>SB 836 – PUBLIC HEARING</u> | | |
| 050 | Steve Purchase | Division of State Lands Assistant Director. Reports the progress of SB 836. |
| 080 | Chair Ferrioli | Closes public hearing on SB 836 and opens public hearing on SB 418 |
| <u>SB 418 – PUBLIC HEARING</u> | | |
| 085 | Chair Ferrioli | States that SB 418 amendments will be discussed at a later date (EXHIBIT T) . Closes public hearing on SB 418 and adjourns meeting at 6:42 p.m. |

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A – SB 820, SB 820-5 amendments dated 4/30/03, staff, 5 pp.**
- B – SB 820, written testimony, Martha Pagel, 3 pp.**
- C – SB 820, written testimony, Martha Pagel, 9 pp.**
- D – SB 820, written testimony, Bill Burke, 4 pp.**
- E – SB 820, written testimony, Adam Sussman, 3 pp.**
- F – SB 820, written testimony, Jill Zarnowitz, 3 pp.**
- G – SB 820, written testimony, Kimberley Priestley, 1 p.**
- H – SB 820, written testimony, Aubrey Russell, 1 p.**

I – SB 820, written testimony, Gary Reed, 2 pp.
J – HB 2689, HB 2689-4 amendments dated 4/30/03, staff, 3 pp.
K – HB 2689, HB 2689-5 amendments dated 4/30/03, staff, 5 pp.
L – HB 2689, written testimony, Rep. Tootie Smith, 2 pp.
M – HB 2689, written testimony, Sandy Flicker, 3 pp.
N – HB 2689, written testimony, Harlan Levy, 12 pp.
O – HB 2689, written testimony, Harlan Levy, 8 pp.
P – HB 2689, written testimony, Don Saari, 4 pp.
Q – HB 2689, written testimony, Jay Waldron, 2 pp.
R – SB 293, written testimony, Bill Koran, 3 pp.
S – SB 293, written testimony, John Garren, 5 pp.
T – SB 293, written testimony, Steve Christensen, 1 p.
U – SB 293, written testimony, Phil McCorkle, 1 p.
V – SB 293, written testimony, Tony Brauner, 56 pp.
W – SB 293, written testimony, Vaden Green, 3 p.
X – SB 293, written testimony, Jim McConnaughey, 1 p.
Y – SB 293, written testimony, Lyell Asher, 1 p.
Z – SB 293, written testimony, John Richen, 1 p.
AA – SB 293, written testimony, Jason Wells, 1 p.
BB – SB 293, written testimony, Gordon Ferlitch, 1 p.
CC – SB 293, written testimony, Brian O’Leary, 1 p.
DD – SB 293, written testimony, Ephraim Payne, 3 pp.
EE – SB 293, written testimony, Rob Allen, 2 pp.
FF – SB 293, written testimony, Lawrence Edwards, 6 pp.
GG – SB 293, written testimony, Rhett Lawrence, 1 p.
HH – SB 293, written testimony, Tim Grinstead, 1 p.
II – SB 293, written testimony, Keith Slonecker, 2 pp.
JJ – SB 836, written testimony, Bill Sanderson, 1 p.
KK – SB 418, SB 418-1 amendments dated 4/28/03, staff, 1 p.
LL – SB 418, SB 418-2 amendments dated 4/28/03, staff, 27 pp.