

# HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMART GROWTH AND COMMERCE

April 18, 2001  
3:15 PM

Hearing Room 50  
Tapes 118 - 120

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rep. Bill Witt, Chair  
Rep. Tim Knopp, Vice-Chair  
Rep. Betsy Johnson  
Rep. Alan Bates  
Rep. Alan Brown  
Rep. Janet Carlson  
Rep. Richard Devlin  
Rep. Bill Garrard  
Rep. Laurie Monnes-Anderson  
Rep. Vicki Walker

**MEMBER EXCUSED:** Rep. Jerry Krummel

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dan Clem, Administrator  
Patrick Brennan, Administrative Support

**MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:** HB 2941 Work Session  
HB 3925 Public Hearing and Work Session  
HB 3660 Public Hearing and Work Session  
HB 3703 Public Hearing  
HB 3664 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>  |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| <b>TAPE 118, A</b>                 |                |  |
| 004                                | Chair Witt     | Calls the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m. Opens a work session on HB 2941.   |
| <b><u>HB 2941 WORK SESSION</u></b> |                |  |
| 010                                | Dan Clem       | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that the -1 ( <b>EXHIBIT A</b> ) and -2 ( <b>EXHIBIT B</b> ) amendments have been submitted for the committee's consideration. Provides a brief description of the amendments. Notes that the bill has no fiscal or revenue impact.  |
| 031                                | Steve Kanter   | Dean of Law School, Lewis and Clark College. Testifies in support of HB 2941 and the -1 and -2 amendments. States he was initially cautious about the prospects of bringing Major League baseball (MLB) to Oregon, but that after careful study of the progress made he is now an enthusiastic supporter. Says information regarding the prospect of bringing MLB to Portland are credible. Mentions that the group is working with a pre-eminent sports facility contractor that has experience in building high-quality, successful facilities on budget. Applauds the extraordinary team of lobbyists that has worked on the bill. Notes the broad sponsorship for the effort, including Portland Mayor Vera Katz, former Senator Mark Hatfield, and former Governor Neil Goldschmidt. Declares he is convinced that MLB has the potential to be a community-building asset and economic engine for the entire state. Remarks about the soundness and |

|     |              |   |
|-----|--------------|---|
|     |              | prudence of the effort and says the economic benefits are relatively easy to understand.  |
| 080 | Kanter       | Explains that money set aside for MLB can be used for other purposes if the city fails to bring a team to Portland. States that revenue generated from taxing player salaries alone will be a significant boost to the General Fund, meaning that the decision whether or not to support bringing MLB to Portland is not a choice between baseball and education. Asserts that the MLB business plan can help revenues in Oregon so that the state need not fight over diminishing dollars. Guarantees that MLB will pay back its investment. Cautions that unless the state acts now it may not get another chance to attract a MLB team.  |
| 108 | Randy Vataha | Game Plan. Testifies in support of HB 2941. Provides a brief overview of the current state of MLB. States that teams that are struggling face possible contraction and elimination as part of the commissioner's plan for fixing inequities in the sport. Remarks that no MLB team has relocated during the past 30 years and that Commissioner Bud Selig wants to ensure that relocation does not become rampant as it has in the National Football League (NFL) and the National Hockey League (NHL). Reiterates that Portland has a unique and fleeting opportunity. States that if HB 2941 passes, Portland will be the only city with financing in place for a new stadium. Comments that the average player salary will increase 14 percent this year and that the business plan calls for only a 7 percent increase. Refers to estimates that show as many as 30 percent of Seattle Mariner tickets are sold to residents of Oregon and the Portland metro area. |
| 164 | Chair Witt   | Requests confirmation that the business plan's additional revenue estimates are on the low end.   |
| 167 | Vataha       | Replies affirmatively.  |
| 171 | Chair Witt   | Asks how new stadiums in other cities have been financed during the 1990s.  |
| 176 | Vataha       | Indicates that the last three cities to build new stadiums, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Milwaukee, are markets similar in size to Portland that financed their new stadiums with 80 percent public money. Stresses that the 80-20 formula is important if Portland is to be competitive. Asserts that the new generation of stadiums is the economic engine that drives baseball, as they provide fans with an intimate connection to the game. Notes that the Portland plan calls for slightly more than 20 percent private funding.   |
| 202 | Rep. Devlin  | Asks Mr. Kanter if the revenue estimates from income tax proceeds were based on the premise of gross salaries, as players may or may not be able to shelter their incomes from taxes.   |
| 211 | Vataha       | Replies it is difficult to shelter income from state taxes at the income level of the typical MLB player.   |
| 215 | Rep. Devlin  | Mentions that the constituents in his district are solidly opposed to spending state funds to bring baseball to Portland. Expresses interest in the possibility of bringing additional revenues to the state. Asks what the ownership is prepared to do with regard to changing public opinion should the bill pass.  |
| 228 | Kanter       | Responds that one problem is that the public sees the financing as a gift to the ownership, rather than an investment for expected return. Predicts there will be a change in the public attitude as  |

they learn more about the project. Remarks that Portlanders like baseball, but don't want to sacrifice public programs to finance it.

263 Rep. Johnson Recalls that there was a team that was being recruited to come to Portland.

267 Vataha Indicates the team is the Montreal Expos, which is in financial straits and may be forced to move by the MLB Commissioner. Remarks that it is not the group's intention to steal a team, but to be ready when the opportunity comes.

279 Rep. Johnson Comments that the letters and telephone calls she has received on the bill are 10 to 1 in opposition. Admits she does not like MLB. Wonders why Portland is pursuing an unsuccessful team like the Expos.

300 Vataha Responds that the Expos are currently in first place. States that the team is in financial straits because there is little interest in MLB in Montreal. Says the team has had no luck getting a new stadium deal from the city. Argues that the team had a good organization and good farm system, but says players leave when their contracts come up to pursue bigger contracts and more palatable cities.

318 Kanter Acknowledges that average ticket prices are rising, but says that is due in part to the new stadiums and their additional boxes and club seats, which raises the average price. States that most parks have a large number of low-price affordable seats, meaning that the average person can still attend a MLB game. Contends that MLB is a good community-building asset because anyone can go and you can't tell how rich someone is by where they sit in the stadium, save for in the boxes or club seats.

356 Rep. Brown Asks why the language related to repaying the loan is deleted by the -1 amendments. Inquires whether it is the intent to repay the loan.

369 Kanter Explains that the bill does not create a loan in the traditional sense, as no team would come to Portland if it inherited such a debt, and says the money will come back to the state in the form of tax revenues.

381 Chair Witt Adds that the word "loan" never referred to a loan in the traditional sense of the word. States that the business plan pays the debt service through direct tax revenues alone, in addition to the indirect revenue that will benefit the city and the state.

398 Rep. Bates Admits he is not opposed to MLB and mentions he once worked with the Kansas City Royals. Indicates he is as yet neutral on the bill, despite the fact that southern Oregon strongly opposes it. Emphasizes the need to educate people on the issue, to show them that MLB is financially beneficial to the state. Solicits the help of the proponents of HB 2941 to do so. Opines that the public should be informed as to the cost of debt service versus anticipated revenue.

**TAPE 119, A**  
008

Vataha

Relays cost and benefit estimates:

- Debt service of \$13 million over 15 years
- Total interest and principal of approximately \$200 million
- Player salary tax revenue of approximately \$433 over 25

|     |                      |   |
|-----|----------------------|---|
|     |                      | years   |
| 019 | Rep. Bates           | Remarks that revenues will continue into perpetuity. Suggests the information should be provided to the public in yearly numbers. Asks why the Expos will be successful here where they failed in Montreal.   |
| 029 | Vataha               | Replies that Olympic Stadium in Montreal is a detriment, as it is old and not designed for baseball. Says the right stadium is part of the experience, comparing Olympic Stadium unfavorably to Jacobs Field in Cleveland. Notes that the Canadian dollar is weaker and Canadian taxes are higher. Reiterates that MLB has tried and failed to provide a new stadium in Montreal and that the team will move to Portland only if a new stadium awaits.  |
| 047 | Rep. Garrard         | Asks if the players will have reason to stay in Portland. Concedes it is difficult to keep players and their skyrocketing salaries. Says baseball will succeed or fail based on whether the ownership makes the financial investment to keep a good team and hold the public interest.  |
| 066 | Vataha               | Indicates that their research shows Portland can sustain a MLB team for the long term. Says Portland is the largest market with one major sports team. Notes Portland's high growth rate and high per capita income.  |
| 082 | Rep. Garrard         | Clarifies it is quality ownership that is paramount to sustaining a successful franchise. Says there is no way to guarantee that the ownership will commit enough resources to maintain a competitive team.   |
| 090 | Vataha               | Replies that Commissioner Selig recognizes these problems. Acknowledges that there will be spending disparities, adding that the goal is to reduce them where possible. Says MLB is trying to keep owners from dipping into their own pockets to stay competitive.  |
| 114 | Chair Witt           | Remarks that many small market teams have been financially successful, most notably the Colorado Rockies and St. Louis Cardinals.   |
| 123 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Finds the panel's enthusiasm to be infectious and laments that the same effort is not made in support of more important issues. Asks if the -2 amendments are designed to keep the facility sustainable, as they prevent the facility from taxation even if leased by a tax paying entity.  |
| 139 | Mark Gardner         | Portland Family Entertainment (PFE). Testifies in support of HB 294 and the -1 and -2 amendments. Replies that the -2 amendments acknowledge the reality that most facilities are operated by the franchise or publicly owned. States that the tax exemption allows the combined enterprise to generate revenues to be successful. Remarks that the combination of market size and the proposed facility plan makes Portland a feasible market. Indicates that if property taxes were paid on the stadium the franchise would be losing \$50 million and moving to Portland would not be an option. |
| 178 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Asks if that is the reason the group has pursued the 80-20 funding ratio.   |
| 185 | Gardner              | Replies that the current trend is to have this formula of financing, as it allows for the flow of revenue to keep the payroll moving.   |
| 200 | Kanter               | Clarifies that no one is asking for public support of team  |

|     |                      |   |
|-----|----------------------|---|
|     |                      | operations, only a one-time capital investment of \$150 million. Says his support for the proposal is rooted in the fact that more revenue will flow into the state from income taxes than will be expended by the financing. Clarifies the bill is simply putting the offer on the table for MLB to consider.                                      |
| 221 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Asks whether the team will be self-sustaining with regard to team operations, concessions, power, and other related costs.  |
| 231 | Gardner              | Replies affirmatively, adding that the formula has proven itself in other cities. Explains that the team is a business from which revenues flow back to state. Says sports facilities are not traditionally taxed and should not be automatically simply because they are publicly owned.   |
| 246 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Asks if the City of Portland supports the –2 amendments.  |
| 250 | Gardner              | Replies affirmatively, adding that Multnomah County does as well.   |
| 254 | Rep. Devlin          | Mentions that PGE Park is owned by the City of Portland and is tax exempt.  |
| 265 | Gardner              | Says the exemption needs to be clarified in statute.  |
| 268 | Rep. Devlin          | Asserts that operational revenues should be taxed.  |
| 272 | Chair Witt           | Asks for a description of how a team like the Expos will move to Portland. Wonders whether it will be feasible for the team to play in another venue while the new stadium is under construction.   |
| 283 | Vataha               | Replies that there is no inherent authorization to use PGE Park, as the AAA Portland Beavers play there. Says that if all parties agree that PGE Park could be used for 2 years it might help solidify Portland’s efforts to secure a team.   |
| 305 | Gardner              | Remarks that PFE has worked for two years to reach agreement with neighbors regarding PGE Park. Says MLB would attract a much larger number of fans and more games would be played. Says a relocating team need not use PGE Park, as they would have the option of remaining in their current city until the new stadium in Portland was completed. |
| 338 | Kanter               | Hypothesizes that PGE Park could handle the higher attendance for the short term with the knowledge that it was only short term.  |
| 351 | Rep. Brown           | Mentions that the Port of Newport leased property that was subsequently taxed, meaning that making the stadium tax exempt would be the exception to the rule.   |
| 362 | Gardner              | Explains that the difference is that sports facilities are traditionally publicly owned and are used by the general public, making them inherently different than other publicly owned facilities. Says the financial structure is the end result of an evolutionary process.   |
| 375 | Chair Witt           | Reiterates that the City of Portland supports the bill and amendments despite tax exemption.  |
| 379 | Kanter               | Concludes that the city and state will only go through with this if it is a good investment. Predicts that the economic return will far exceed the initial investment. Acknowledges that the city will need to make investments as well but says the benefits will overcome them.   |
| 399 | Chair Witt           | <b>MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2941-1 amendments dated 3/19/01.</b>   |
| 405 |                      | <b>VOTE: 8-0-3</b>  |

|                                      |                   |   |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
|                                      |                   | <b>EXCUSED: 3 - Carlson, Devlin, Krummel</b>  |
|                                      | <b>Chair Witt</b> | <b>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</b>   |
| 411                                  | <b>Chair Witt</b> | <b>MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2941-2 amendments dated 3/22/01.</b>   |
| 415                                  |                   | <b>VOTE: 8-0-3</b>  |
|                                      |                   | <b>EXCUSED: 3 - Carlson, Devlin, Krummel</b>  |
|                                      | <b>Chair Witt</b> | <b>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</b>   |
| 420                                  | <b>Chair Witt</b> | Declares that the bill will be scheduled for a subsequent work session on Friday April 20 <sup>th</sup> . Closes the work session on HB 2941 and opens a public hearing on HB 3925.   |
| <b>TAPE 118, B</b>                   |                   |   |
| <b><u>HB 3925 PUBLIC HEARING</u></b> |                   |   |
| 018                                  | Dan Clem          | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that testimony was submitted by the City of Portland ( <b>EXHIBIT C</b> ) and League of Oregon Cities (LOC) ( <b>EXHIBIT D</b> ).   |
| 040                                  | Chris Crean       | Miller Nash. Testifies in support of HB 3925 ( <b>EXHIBIT E</b> ). States that the vested right of owners of real property to use that property by reasonable reliance on land use regulation is was created by the Oregon Supreme Court but is not codified in statute. Explains that this is problematic because without the code there is difficulty in enforcing the right or negotiating settlements.  |
| 095                                  | Crean             | Says the bill allows landowner to go directly to the court to determine whether the right exists. Indicates the bill shifts the process from the purview of the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) to the circuit court. States that third parties can participate if they have an interest in the outcome. Remarks that there are circuit courts located throughout the state and that this process will allow decisions to be made locally. Mentions that work is in progress on amendments and requests that the bill be scheduled for a subsequent hearing. |
| 143                                  | Phil Grillo       | Miller Nash. Says the current system is very “lawyerly,” while the measure will make the process shorter and more efficient.  |
| 150                                  | Chair Witt        | Asks if amendments have been prepared.  |
| 152                                  | Crean             | Replies that the –1 amendments ( <b>EXHIBIT F</b> ) were drafted by Legislative Counsel, but that both parties wanted to make changes so they are requesting that they not be considered.   |
| 156                                  | Rep. Johnson      | Asks if the bill is retroactive.  |
| 159                                  | Crean             | Replies that the bill is retroactive to only a single case.   |
| 170                                  | Rep. Garrard      | Asks whether the bill allows a circuit court decision to override a previous or subsequent LUBA decision.   |
| 175                                  | Crean             | Responds that if a landowner disagrees with the LUBA decision they would likely take their case to circuit court. Describes the changes that the –1 amendments make to the bill. Indicates that the intent was to encapsulate current law, but says further discussion indicated the –1 amendments fail to do so. Emphasizes the need to be able to take a case to circuit court without violating code.  |
| 210                                  | Chair Witt        | Asks whether the –1 amendments take away the directive to the court.  |
| 214                                  | Crean             | Replies affirmatively, adding that the body of case law requires a landowner to prove their case to the court.  |

|     |                |  |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 217 | Rep. Johnson   | Wonders why the legislation is necessary if the one case that could be affected is not subject to the provisions of the bill.  |
| 222 | Grillo         | Explains that the current practice of reaching the court through the “back door approach” is not good public policy.   |
| 226 | Rep. Johnson   | Asks whether the process created by the bill would solve the case in question.   |
| 229 | Grillo         | Answers no.  |
| 232 | Crean          | Assures that the bill does not predetermine outcomes.  |
| 235 | Rep. Johnson   | Acknowledges the need to avoid predetermining outcomes.  |
| 242 | Grillo         | Clarifies that the bill is not an attempt to change substantive law but rather to make a necessary change to process.  |
| 256 | Mike Collmeyer | 1000 Friends of Oregon. Testifies in opposition to HB 3925 <b>(EXHIBIT G)</b> . States the bill allows a landowner to go through a case and then seek a declaratory judgement in circuit court if they don’t like the result of their case.                                  |
| 294 | Rep. Devlin    | Asks Mr. Collmeyer if he has reviewed the –1 amendments.   |
| 299 | Collmeyer      | Replies that 1000 Friends opposes the bill with the –1 amendments.   |
| 301 | Rep. Devlin    | Offers a hypothetical case where requirements have changed since purchase of land parcel. Says that in some cases local governments will allow the builder to go forward with a project. Asks whether it would not be preferable to have something affirmative to rely upon. |
| 321 | Collmeyer      | Answers that HB 3925 bill does not do that, but instead creates a second process by which the first process can be superceded.   |
| 340 | Rep. Devlin    | Asks whether 1000 Friends would oppose the bill if it were modified so that either route could be selected.  |
| 347 | Collmeyer      | Acknowledges that would be less objectionable but remains supportive of the current LUBA process.  |
| 357 | Rep. Garrard   | Declares he is not a strong supporter of LUBA. Asks why 1000 Friends opposes giving property owners additional choices of doing what they wish with their property.  |
| 367 | Collmeyer      | Responds that is not the case. States that the current process is in place and is fairly clear. Submits that HB 3925 provides landowners a parallel and supplemental forum in which to avoid current land use rules, which is inefficient.                                   |
| 397 | Chair Witt     | Comments that LUBA cannot currently make decisions based upon equitable principles.  |
| 405 | Collmeyer      | Contends that LUBA has the authority to make determinations.   |
| 017 | Chair Witt     | Inquires whether there are cases where LUBA has found a vested right and the local government denied continuation of the investment.   |
| 022 | Collmeyer      | Replies he is unaware of any such cases.   |
| 023 | Chair Witt     | Asks whether local governments should have the right to an appeal when the property owner does not.  |
| 027 | Collmeyer      | Answers that local governments do not have the option of choosing either route under an enforcement action, but instead can choose only to go to circuit court. Reiterates that cities do not have more options.   |
| 035 | Chair Witt     | Asks whether enforcement actions are tantamount to restricting vested rights.  |
| 039 | Collmeyer      | Responds that enforcement cases do not necessarily hinge on whether a property owner has a vested right.   |

**TAPE 119, B**

|     |                      |  |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| 045 | Chair Witt           | Offers a hypothetical example in which a city hinders vested rights. Says that the landowner in such a case can take their case only to LUBA. Asserts that there seems to be a situation where local governments can take their case to LUBA or to the courts, while property owners have only a single.   |
| 060 | Collmeyer            | Says it may be true that a property owner could convert a vested rights determination into an enforcement action by continuing a project upon which a decision has already been handed down.   |
| 066 | Chair Witt           | Replies that is a different issue. Reiterates that local governments seem to have more options.  |
| 075 | Collmeyer            | Comments that a city's options are limited to a single forum, depending on the situation. Indicates that if a landowner does not force the local government to undertake an enforcement action then the landowner and the local government become engaged in a process of determinations.  |
| 084 | Chair Witt           | Asks whether LUBA can apply common law equitable doctrine the same as a court.   |
| 088 | Collmeyer            | Replies affirmatively.   |
| 089 | Chair Witt           | Requests confirmation that this is the case, in light of a quote by LUBA that they may not have the authority to do so.  |
| 104 | Collmeyer            | Responds that a full reading of the opinion would clarify whether they have the ability to apply equitable principles but also whether or not cases are assigned based upon the authority to apply.  |
| 119 | Art Schlach          | Policy Manager, Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). Testifies in opposition to HB 3925. Clarifies that AOC does not oppose changing the venue from LUBA to circuit court. Emphasizes the need to ensure that there is a level playing field to argue cases in circuit court. Says the -1 amendments begin to address those concerns but indicates further work is necessary. Pledges to continue working on compromise amendments. |
| 143 | Rep. Devlin          | Requests that a representative from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) testify at the next hearing on the bill.  |
| 146 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Asks whether DLCD would present LUBA's point of view.  |
| 152 | Chair Witt           | Indicates he will request that they attend when the bill is scheduled for a future hearing   |
| 154 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Reiterates that it would be valuable to be informed regarding DLCD's perspective on the measure.   |
| 160 | Rep. Devlin          | Remarks that DLCD is usually available to comment on land use issues.  |
| 166 | Chair Witt           | Closes the public hearing on HB 3925 and opens a public hearing on HB 3660.  |

**HB 3660 PUBLIC HEARING**

|     |                |  |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 170 | Dan Clem       | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Special Districts Association (SDA). Testifies in support of HB 3660 ( <b>EXHIBIT H</b> ). Describes the Community Facility Projects program and describes the criteria special districts must meet in order to qualify. States that the bill broadens the definition of municipality so as to allow all special districts to qualify for the program. |
| 183 | Hasina Squires |  |
| 208 | Betty Pongracz | Testifies in support of HB 3660. Says the programs offer loans and grants to municipalities dealing with compliance. States that   |



|                                      |                            |  |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
|                                      |                            | there are 24 different types of districts, six of which are already eligible for the loans. Describes the different types of districts. Asserts that passage of the bill will benefit communities. Says she is not certain how many projects will be generated.  |
| 252                                  | Rep. Carlson               | Opines that HB 3660 is a good bill, as it cleans up statute by not requiring legislation for each new special district. Requests information regarding the status of SB 292.   |
| 258                                  | Pongracz                   | Replies that bill is currently in the Committee on Ways and Means, having passed out of substantive committee. Indicates that bill allows for the funding of grants for essential community facilities. Indicates that special districts are interested in obtaining low-interest loans.   |
| 277                                  | Rep. Carlson               | Notes that the bill will have fiscal impact and that Ms. Pongracz' agency will be impacted. Asks how many positions will be necessary to carry out the program.  |
| 281                                  | Pongracz                   | Replies she is not certain and mentions that they do not intend to request assistance for the remainder of the biennium.   |
| 292                                  | Chair Witt                 | Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on HB 3660.   |
| <b><u>HB 3660 WORK SESSION</u></b>   |                            |  |
| 299                                  | Rep. Johnson               | <b>MOTION: Moves HB 366- to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.</b>   |
| 305                                  |                            | <b>VOTE: 7-0-4</b><br><b>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.</b><br><b>EXCUSED: 4 - Bates, Knopp, Krummel, Walker</b><br><b>The motion CARRIES.</b>  |
| 314                                  | Chair Witt<br>Rep. Johnson | <b>MOTION: Moves HB 3660 be placed on the Consent Calendar for floor consideration.</b>  |
| 315                                  |                            | <b>VOTE: 7-0-4</b><br><b>EXCUSED: 4 - Bates, Knopp, Krummel, Walker</b><br><b>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</b>   |
| 316                                  | Chair Witt                 | Closes the work session on HB 3660 and opens a public hearing on HB 3703.  |
| <b><u>HB 3703 PUBLIC HEARING</u></b> |                            |  |
| 320                                  | Dan Clem                   | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill.  |
| 328                                  | Chair Witt                 | Explains that the bill will be brought back for a hearing in the near future, as its chief sponsor, Rep. Krummel, is not in attendance. Closes the public hearing on HB 3703 and opens a public hearing on HB 3664.  |
| <b><u>HB 3664 PUBLIC HEARING</u></b> |                            |  |
| 335                                  | Dan Clem                   | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill.  |
| 343                                  | Rep. Brown                 | Testifies in support of the bill.  |
| 374                                  | Kristi Halvorson           | President, Halvorson-Mason Corporation. Testifies in support of HB 3664 ( <b>EXHIBIT I</b> ). Explains the difficulty her company has experienced as a result of Oregon Real Estate Law, which stipulates only an owner of a property or an officer of a corporation that owns property can sell that property without a licensed realtor. |
| <b>TAPE 120, A</b>                   |                            |  |
| 020                                  | Halvorson                  | Describes the cost and inconvenience of maintaining a realty office. Indicates that sales could be lost due to the excessive steps that must be taken under current law. Mentions that her company's current broker is in Lincoln City, 30 minutes away  |

|     |                      |  |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| 070 | Halvorson            | from the properties. Notes that the bill includes a minimum development size of 50 units. Says any developer seeking approvals may receive approval for a temporary real estate office, which this bill will allow to remain in place. |
| 100 | Chair Witt           | Distributes additional testimony from interested parties who were unable to attend the hearing ( <b>EXHIBIT J</b> ).   |
|     |                      | Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on HB 3664.   |
|     |                      | <b>HB 3664 WORK SESSION</b>  |
| 107 | Rep. Devlin          | <b>MOTION: Moves HB 3664 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.</b>   |
| 114 | Rep. Monnes-Anderson | Wonders whether AOC should testify regarding their position on the bill.   |
| 123 | Rep. Devlin          | Replies that AOC would have been in attendance to testify if they had a desire to do so.   |
| 127 |                      | <b>VOTE: 7-0-4</b>   |
|     |                      | <b>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.</b>   |
|     |                      | <b>EXCUSED: 4 - Bates, Johnson, Krummel, Walker</b>  |
|     | Chair Witt           | <b>The motion CARRIES.</b>   |
|     |                      | <b>REP. BROWN will lead discussion on the floor.</b>   |
| 130 | Chair Witt           | Closes the work session on HB 3664. Discusses upcoming committee schedule. Adjourns the meeting at 5:45 p.m.   |

Submitted By,

Reviewed By,

Patrick Brennan,  
Committee Assistant

Dan Clem,  
Committee Administrator

**EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

- A – HB 2941, -1 amendments, staff, 1 p.**
- B – HB 2941, -2 amendments, staff, 1 p.**
- C – HB 3925, testimony, Kathryn Beaumont, 2 pp.**
- D – HB 3925, testimony, Linda Ludwig, 1 p.**
- E – HB 3925, testimony, Chris Crean, 2 pp.**
- F – HB 3925, -1 amendments, Chris Crean, 1 p.**
- G – HB 3925, testimony, Mike Collmeyer, 1 p.**
- H – HB 3660, testimony, Hasina Squires, 5 pp.**
- I – HB 3664, testimony, Kristi Halvorson, 7 pp.**
- J – HB 3664, testimony, Kristi Halvorson, 8 pp.**