## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

#### March 12, 1999 Hearing Room D

## 1:00 p.m. Tapes 65-67

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Jim Welsh, Chair**

Rep. Jackie Taylor, Vice-Chair Rep. Jason Atkinson Rep. Richard Devlin Rep. Juley Gianella Rep. Deborah Kafoury Rep. Jeff Kruse Rep. Jeff Merkley Rep. Susan Morgan

#### STAFF PRESENT: Kristina McNitt, Administrator

## Nancy Geisler, Administrative Support

### MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: HB 3054 Public Hearing

HB 2536 Public Hearing and Work Session

HB 2801 Public Hearing

HB 2650 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.

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
TAPE 65, A		
006	Chair Welsh	Calls meeting to order at 1:10. and opens public hearing on HB 3054.

## HB 3054 PUBLIC HEARING

010	Kristina McNitt	Administrator. Explains HB 3054, which declares that landowner is not liable for injury, death, or other damage to a trespasser that arises out of conditions existing on the land.
030	Rep. Mannix	District 32. Supports HB 3054. Explains a trespasser does not have permission to come on private property. Defines "attractive nuisance." Explains HB 3054 provides that a landowner is not liable to trespassers, but, at the same time, cannot prosecute trespassers.
057	Rep. Devlin	Asks what is meant by "conditions existing on land" in HB 3054 summary.
065	Rep. Mannix	Explains this refers to the distinction between what might be done to someone trespassing on property, as opposed to what is physically there on the land.
070	Rep. Devlin	Asks if an illegal or dangerous structure is on the land, would the property owner be protected from liability if they were also in violation of the law.
082	Rep. Mannix	Explains trespasser would still be liable and not able to sue the landowner for injury, but the landowner would still be liable for violating other laws.
087	Everett Cutter	Oregon Railroad Association. Testifies in support of HB 3054 and reads written testimony (EXHIBIT A). Notes HB 3054 is ideal for the railroadis trespass problem. Explains most people do not realize railroad property is private property and illegally trespass on the railroad tracks. Notes railroad companies have stepped up aggressive trespasser abatement programs and that legislation concerning trespassing has been helpful in several states.
133	Cutter	Underscores the cost to railroads of trespassing-related deaths and injuries. Adds that public education is part of the solution in preventing trespassing. Suggests HB 3054 is necessary to protect both landowners and railroads in trespasser casualties.
166	Tom Harris	Union Pacific Railroad Police Department. Testifies in support of HB 3054. Points to statistics on trespassing and criminal acts committed on railroads in the State of Oregon. Explains the railroads need assistance to help reduce trespassing in order to avoid injury or death to trespassers. Emphasizes the cost to railroads as a result of trespassers.
193	John Cyrus	Assistant to the Operations Manager, Willamette & Pacific and Portland & Western Railroads. Testifies in support of HB 3054 and reads written testimony <b>(EXHIBIT B)</b> . Notes the nature of the railroadsi property makes it indefensible to trespass. Points out that numerous grade crossings make fencing ineffective. Underscores the railroads want to focus on expanding knowledge of the dangers of trespassing on railroad property rather than using physical deterrents.
219	Cyrus	Explains that young people constitute most of the trespassers on railroad

		property. Comments the railroad companies he represents had cards printed out to be handed to trespassers asking them not to trespass on railroad property and advising about the dangers of trespassing. Notes people use railroad tracks for many different reasons, either innocently or for criminal intent.
253	Cyrus	Observes the news media unwittingly works at cross purposes to the railroadsí efforts to discourage trespassing by glorifying trespassing on the railroad tracks through photographs depicting people walking on the tracks. Adds that keeping the railroad tracks secure is an impossible task.
294	Rep. Taylor	Asks if HB 3054 is broader than the model Cyrus brought from the Council of State Governments.
304	Harris	Replies HB 3054 is broader in the sense that it applies not only to railroads, but to other landowners.
308	Rep. Taylor	Inquires if HB 3054 applies to highway crossings and not just trespassing.
316	Harris	Answers no, because a highway crossing is the only legal place to be on railroad property.
321	Rep. Taylor	Notes she likes the Council of State Government's suggestion that trespassing on railroad property be made a Class C felony. Wonders how the walking trail in Astoria which crosses railroad tracks would be handled under HB 3054.
345	Cyrus	Explains the railroad companies he represents do not own the railroad tracks in Astoria, so he cannot answer that question.
355	Claudia Howells	Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Rail Division. Testifies ODOT is neutral in regard to HB 3054 and reads written testimony (EXHIBIT C). Notes that ODOT and the railroad industry have been effective in reducing railroad-related accidents. Explains ODOT and the railroads have not been as successful in reducing deaths and injuries on railroad rights-of-way.
390	Howells	Explains railroads are increasingly a route of choice for the general public, partly due to messages conveyed through the media. Emphasizes there is a continuing increase in trespasser fatalities. States HB 3054 does not entirely solve the trespassing issue, and notes she hopes other legislation will give railroads and law enforcement agencies better tools to enforce the law.
430	Howells	Summarizes the ODOT Rail Division considers HB 3054 to be consistent with their long-term commitment to public safety. States in reference to Rep. Taylorís inquiry regarding the railroad situation in Astoria that the ODOT Rail Division is working with Astoria and the Portland and Western Railroad to develop a joint rail trails use.
TAPE 66	л	

011	Rep. Merkley	Asks if land is not clearly marked as private and a person enters onto it and is injured, does HB 3054 preclude liability to the landowner.
016	Howells	Responds that HB 3054 does preclude liability to the landowner.
031	Terry Lamers	State Issues Coordinator, Oregon Small Woodlands Association. Testifies in support of HB 3054. States the members of the Association frequently own large parcels of land in remote areas, and these areas are viewed as attractive to trespassers. Notes that sometimes a trespasser gets into trouble on the land, and lawsuits have been brought. Believes this is totally unfair and that HB 3054 addresses the issue.
044	Rep. Merkley	Notes that lawsuits can always be filed regardless of the law and asks if lawsuits have been won in regard to trespassers.
047	Lamers	Replies a trespasser on motorcycle was severely injured on posted and gated property. Indicates there was a long court battle, and there was a settlement.
064	Rep. Gianella	States if trees were being trimmed on posted property and a tree fell on trespassers, the landlord could be taken to court. Asks if HB 3054 protects the landowner in this type of situation.
074	Lamers	Answers he believes there is a right to harvest on timberland. Adds that usually great efforts are made around harvesting sites to alert people coming onto the property about dangerous conditions.
082	Rep. Merkley	Notes that HB 3054, as written, is broad and does not require measures be taken by the landowner to mark the land as private.
091	Lamers	Responds in agreement with Rep. Merkley. Notes HB 3054 works well with HB 2801, which allows another method of posting property for trespassing.
097	Chair Welsh	Closes hearing on HB 3054 and opens public hearing on HB 2536.
<u>HB 2536 I</u>	PUBLIC HEARING	
100	McNitt	Explains HB 2536, which raises the speed limit for boats on Diamond Lake until the lake is restocked for fishing. Presents ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT D) and ñ2 amendments (EXHIBIT E) to HB 2536.
120	John Gervais	Lobbyist, Diamond Lake Resort, and Representative of Oregon Forest Homeowners Association. Testifies in support of HB 2536. Explains Diamond Lake used to be one of the best fishing lakes in Oregon. Notes people brought in illegal bait (tui chub), which have now taken over the lake and destroyed much of the trout population. Explains the financial impacts of this on Diamond Lake Resort. Comments the amendments should allow for some recreational use of the lake, but limit this to certain hours and speed limits for boats. Notes that

lake, but limit this to certain hours and speed limits for boats. Notes that

		restoration of Diamond Lake is ongoing.
151	Gervais	Indicates Diamond Lake is 52 feet deep, so unwanted fish could be taken out easily and the lake could be restocked to bring back a healthy fishery and recreational activities.
161	Senator Bill Fisher	District 23. Testifies in support of HB 2536. States Diamond Lake is one of the major employers in the area and provides income to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) through fishing licenses. Notes HB 2536 would keep the economy at Diamond Lake viable and allow people to enjoy the lake.
203	Gervais	States that several homeowners on Diamond Lake support HB 2536. Adds there is concern regarding enforcement costs. Notes state police have officers at the lake. Reiterates HB 2536 is a requirement if the resort is to survive.
210	Bruce Baker	Vice-President, Diamond Lake Resort. Testifies in support of HB 2536. Introduces himself to the committee.
215	Chair Welsh	Asks if Baker has read (EXHIBIT E).
218	Baker	Replies he has read (EXHIBIT E) and supports the amendments.
251	Rep. Merkley	Inquires about attendance numbers at Diamond Lake Resort and how this has been affected by the fish problem.
260	Gervais	Responds there has been approximately a 38% reduction in attendance.
264	Rep. Merkley	Asks whether attendance is most affected in the spring and fall rather than in the summer and how HB 2536 would assist in recreational use of the lake.
269	Gervais	Emphasizes attendance at Diamond Lake is affected across the board because certain groups come at certain times of the year. Adds the draw has always been fishing and, without fishing, people are going somewhere else.
277	Rep. Merkley	States no public meetings have been held with the Diamond Lake stakeholders, nor has there been any testimony from the stakeholders.
287	Gervais	Replies a large number of homeowners support HB 2536, and a small number oppose it.
301	Sen. Fisher	Notes HB 2536 does not overlap with the entire fishing season, but is a stopgap measure to bring some people to the lake until fishing can be reestablished. Believes HB 2536 will mainly attract people to Diamond Lake in the summertime. Reiterates Diamond Lake is a valuable asset to Douglas County and needs a shot in the arm to survive.

		of businesses surrounding the resort.
352	Sen. Fisher	Explains Diamond Lake draws people from many areas, and these people patronize the businesses along the way.
370	Gervais	States there is a large impact on businesses bordering the area of the lake caused by people visiting the lake, and this has been reduced due to lack of fishing. Adds people tend to buy supplies before arriving at a resort because of the price difference, so this helps businesses in the are of Diamond Lake.
TAPE 65, B	<u>.</u>	Π
032	James Stone	Recreation Program Manager, Recreation Wilderness and Heritage Resources, U.S. Forest Service, Umpqua National Forest. Opposes HB 2536. (EXHIBIT F). Emphasizes the Forest Service has five issues which need to be addressed before final action is taken on HB 2536:
		<ul> <li>Limited public input</li> <li>Potential adverse environmental effects</li> <li>Impacts to existing recreational users at Diamond Lake</li> <li>Boat ramps and docks</li> <li>Increase in law enforcement needs</li> </ul>
060	Rep. Gianella	Asks if the Forest Service campgrounds are overloaded.
063	Stone	Answers their campgrounds are at near capacity in July and August.
067	Rep. Gianella	Reiterates that Diamond Lake is operating at full capacity and asks how that would change the situation in the Forest Service campgrounds.
071	Stone	Answers Diamond Lake is a popular place in July and August, but the Forest Service is concerned that additional boating uses on the lake would change the use of the lake.
073	Rep. Gianella	Inquires what if the Forest Service just shuts the gate when the campgrounds reach capacity.
078	Stone	Answers they do reach capacity in the summer months and have an overflow area with limited facilities.
082	Rep. Gianella	Asks if this could be solved with a sign stating "full."
084	Stone	Replies yes.

086	Rep. Kruse	Asks what activities occur at Diamond Lake in the winter.
)89	Stone	Responds all of the Forest Service campgrounds are closed.
)92	Rep. Kruse	States he recalls that many activities take place in the snow at the lake in wintertime.
00	Stone	Agrees there are many winter use activities.
102	Rep. Kruse	Comments that snowmobiles are noisy, similar to boats. Inquires how much repair on boat ramps is necessary for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance.
04	Stone	Responds he cannot give an exact answer.
06	Rep. Kruse	Indicates much of the repair on the floating docks would be related to the ability of disabled persons to get on those structures. Asks if all of the boat ramps have to be fixed to allow access to the handicapped.
08	Stone	Answers no.
110	Rep. Kruse	Theorizes one boat ramp could be upgraded to allow bigger boats to enter, and that would suffice for purposes of the ADA.
12	Stone	Agrees with this assessment.
14	Kruse	Notes, if all things are taken into consideration, the entire \$400,000 estimated for upgrades cannot be allocated to the activity proposed in HB 2536.
16	Stone	Answers in agreement.
18	Rep. Morgan	Asks how long the Forest Service has been working on the fishery problems at Diamond Lake.
20	Stone	Answers they noticed the tui chub population was returning about four years ago.
22	Rep. Morgan	Asks if four years is a reasonable time estimate for the amount of time the Forest Service has been working on the problem.
24	Stone	Answers they have not been working only on Diamond Lake, but on an effort to restore the fishery through an environmental impact statement (EIS) with ODFW.

126	Rep. Morgan	Notes Stone said the EIS would ideally be completed by 2002.
129	Stone	Clarifies the EIS will be completed in January 2000.
131	Rep. Morgan	Reads from <b>(EXHIBIT F)</b> regarding the target date. States the committee has been concerned about the ability of public agencies to go through the process of an EIS in a timely manner. Adds there is a great deal of concern that the business operators at Diamond Lake will be unable to increase business during the EIS. Asks what the Forest Service can do to ensure that the EIS process is timely.
146	Stone	Explains the Forest Service is a cooperating agency in the EIS, along with ODWF. Adds that timeframes on environmental documents are difficult to predict.
159	Rep. Morgan	Asks for clarification of the relationship between the Forest Service and ODFW concerning the EIS.
163	Stone	Answers ODWF has asked for funding through the Sport Fishery Restoration Fund and have hired a contractor to draft the EIS. Adds that, since ODWF manages the fishery at Diamond Lake, the role of the Forest Service is simply as a cooperating agency in the EIS.
172	Rep. Morgan	Verifies the Forest Service has no jurisdiction authority in this situation.
175	Stone	Asks for clarification of this.
177	Rep. Morgan	Expresses definition of "cooperating agency" in terms of the EIS.
179	Stone	Explains that, since the Forest Service manages the land and facilities around the lake, they would be involved in actions done with the lake. Elaborates fish, land, and water are tied in with land and lake uses.
187	Rep. Morgan	Asks why ODWF is doing the EIS and not the Forest Service.
197	Stone	Responds that ODWF had to use federal funds from the Sport Fishery Restoration Fund to treat the fishery at Diamond Lake and that this fund is managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife.
199	Rep. Merkley	Asks if it is currently illegal to use tui chub as bait.
203	Stone	States it is, in Diamond Lake.
205	Rep. Merkley	Inquires if making it illegal throughout Oregon has been tried before.

207	Stone	States he does not know.
210	Rep. Merkley	Notes that, since people use tui chub as bait, once it is eradicated from the lake, there is a good chance it will be reintroduced. Suggests other measures should be considered regarding use of such bait.
224	Stone	Agrees that education of the public is paramount. Explains this is the second time Diamond Lake has had a problem with bait overrunning the lakeis fish population.
241	Paul Donheffner	Director, Marine Board. Testifies in support of HB 2536. Introduces himself and looks over (EXHIBIT E).
247	Chair Welsh	Asks if the amendments address some of his concerns.
251	Donheffner	Answers (EXHIBIT E) provides clearer restrictions on the lake. Mentions a few concerns about the amendments, but states there is no insurmountable conflict. Asks at what point ODFW would determine that the health of the lake is restored.
278	Chair Welsh	Inquires about the speed limit around the lake.
284	Donheffner	Responds that currently there is a statewide rule of five miles per hour, slow, no wake around marinas, but this does not cover inlets and outlets of a lake in designated campgrounds and summer homes. States HB 2536 would supercede the administrative rule but, as a short-term interim solution, it is acceptable.
306	Chair Welsh	Notes the Forest Service had concerns about shoreline erosion and asks if shoring up boats differs from a storm or high winds. Notes that boats are allowed to shore up when they are fishing now.
312	Donheffner	Answers that more physical damage results from direct beaching than from waves. Notes shoreline erosion from boat wakes is not a significant issue.
316	Chair Welsh	Agrees with this assessment.
321	Rep. Kruse	Asks if the current five-mile speed limit on the lake is strictly observed.
326	Donheffner	Responds the Marine Board tries to enforce it around designated areas; however, the public does not necessarily adhere to the limit.
333	Rep. Kruse	Suggests if someone were going approximately ten miles per hour, this would probably be overlooked, and so the speed limit is somewhat confusing.

012		VOTE: 7-0
010	Rep. Kruse	MOTION: Moves HB 2536 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
	TAPE 66, B	<u>N</u>
	Chair Welsh	The motion CARRIES.
		EXCUSED: 2 - Rep. Devlin, Rep. Taylor
		AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.
	<u>      I</u>	VOTE: 7-0
407	Rep. Kruse	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2536-2 amendments dated 3/8/99.
HB 2536	WORK SESSION	
405	Chair Welsh	Closes public hearing on HB 2536 and opens work session on HB 2536.
397	McIsaac	Answers they do not plan to eliminate the stocking program as a result of HB 2536.
394	Rep. Kafoury	Asks if ODFW will continue to stock the lake if HB 2536 is passed and the speed limit is raised.
		Explains tui chub are in competition with trout. The trout are stocked at a very small size, so their survival rate is extremely low. Adds the fishery is in a state of collapse. Comments that trout stocking will continue and hopes the fishery can be restored. Adds ODFW is continuing the stocking program because some fish still survive and they do not want to diminish the fishery to zero.
360	Donald McIsaac	Fresh Water Programs Director, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.
354	Rep. Kafoury	Asks why a lake would be restocked with trout if they are just going to be eaten by chub.
347	Donheffner	Answers the lake was stocked with trout last spring, but the chub are eating the trout.
343	Rep. Kafoury	Inquires if the lake has been restocked with trout.
336	Donheffner	Agrees with this assessment.

		EXCUSED: 2 - Devlin, Taylor
	Chair Welsh	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
		REP. KRUSE will lead discussion on the floor.
090	Chair Welsh	Closes the work session on HB 2536 and opens the public hearing on HB 2801.
<u>HB 2801 I</u>	PUBLIC HEARING	
095	McNitt	Explains HB 2801, which modifies methods for posting privately owned property for purposes of Criminal Trespass II. Presents ñ1 amendments <b>(EXHIBIT G)</b> .
121	Rep. Jason Atkinson	District 51. States there have been both support and concerns regarding HB 2801. Notes (EXHIBIT G) is his original intent. Comments there has been concern about painting entire fence posts. Proposes painting the top of posts approximately 6" down.
134	Chair Welsh	Inquires why someone would be against this bill.
143	Rep. Atkinson	States his intent is to allow another means of posting private property. Talks about the 50 square inches of paint provision. States rocks could be painted, or anything which would signify private property. Believes the only problem is communicating this change to hunters.
163	Rep. Gianella	Asks about 50 square inches and asks if it is delineated in HB 2801.
173	Rep. Atkinson	Responds this is mentioned on HB 2801, line 13.
176	Rep. Gianella	Inquires about steel fence posts.
178	Rep. Atkinson	Answers the steel would be part of <b>(EXHIBIT G)</b> and refers to the top six inches of the post.
180	Rep. Merkley	Inquires if paint on a post, 50-inch blaze, and a sign all constitute the required notice of private property.
183	Rep. Atkinson	Answers yes.

185	Rep. Merkley	Asks how the public can be educated that orange paint means no trespassing.
193	Rep. Atkinson	Explains education in the agricultural community and in the hunting community are needed. Notes Oregon is a small state, and word of mouth travels quickly.
211	Rep. Kruse	Notes his concern with the language in <b>(EXHIBIT G)</b> which says "the top six inches" and wonders if a marker would be invalid if it is only five and a half inches wide. Suggests this be amended to say "approximately."
222	Rep. Atkinson	Replies this is a good suggestion.
224	Glen Stonebrink	Executive Vice-President, Oregon Cattlemenís Association. Opposes HB 2801. Notes Oregon Cattlemenís Association believes in private property rights. Indicates HB 2801 allows a landowner to close privately owned premises to motor-propelled vehicles. However, proposed changes to HB 2801suggest that areas such as fences could only be closed if painted with blaze or bearing a sign. Emphasizes that HB 2801 would be a burden on ranchers and would be extremely costly.
269	Stonebrink	Continues the public would become educated to the fact that orange paint denotes private property but, if there is no orange paint, people could enter the property. States he would like to see more trespassers arrested and prosecuted. Notes if the top six inches of a fence post is painted all the way around, this would constitute posting a neighborís property.
306	Rep. Kruse	Interprets removing motor-propelled vehicles from HB 2801 as being more inclusive than exclusive because it means the landowner can close the premises at any time. Adds signage is still the same, and a landowner can either choose to do it or not do it.
321	Stonebrink	Answers he read HB 2801 the same way at first, but began to see that it could be interpreted as all lands without the words "motor-propelled vehicles." Reiterates the original intent of the law was that the landowner could close the land, but HB 2801 is dealing with all land. Stipulates the landowner must do certain things to close his land off.
344	Rep. Kruse	Answers HB 2801 allows the use of signage or paint and does not mandate sole use of paint.
352	Stonebrink	Explains perhaps some landowners do not want to have to do anything to protect their land. Adds that currently the landowner does not have to do anything and can still fine someone for trespassing.
359	Rep. Merkley	Inquires what statute defines trespass by people as opposed to motor vehicles. States there are a number of trespass restrictions on entering buildings, but not on private land.
375	Stonebrink	Indicates he will look for such a statute, but adds this may be a common law

		practice among hunters and landowners.
385	Rep. Kruse	Asks if changing "must" on line 9 of HB 2801 to "may" would solve the problem.
387	Stonebrink	Answers no, because the problem is on line 5, where it seems to grant a landowner permission to close the land.
389	Rep. Kruse	Indicates line 5 is current language.
392	Stonebrink	States HB 2801 was written for motor-propelled vehicles entering on access.
399	Chair Welsh	Notes HB 2801seems to apply to everything (foot traffic, ATVis), not just motor-propelled vehicles.
407	Stonebrink	Answers that in order to close their premises, the landowners must do certain things. Reiterates some landowners may want to close their property and not do the things required in HB 2801.
TAPE 67	, A	
012	Rep. Kruse	Reiterates the language on the signage is already "must" language in current law.
016	Stonebrink	Points out that if HB 2801 does not deal with just access of motor vehicles, what does the landowner have to do if he wants to close his land. Adds that on a large ranch, several signs would have to be placed in order to close the land.
019	Rep. Kruse	States this has to be done currently, and if someone wants to close a ranch, the perimeter must be posted.
023	Stonebrink	Replies it would not have to be done to the extent specified in HB 2801 and that common law might prevail so it would not have to be done at all.
025	Rep. Gianella	Asks which line of HB 2801 they are referring to.
029	Chair Welsh	Answers the committee is referring to line 9 of HB 2801.
033	Rep. Morgan	States if posting were defined, there might not be difficulty in interpreting this section of HB 2801. Continues line 9 simply allows another option for notification of private property and does not substantially change the requirements for doing it.
038	Stonebrink	Answers he would be glad to work on this issue with his colleagues.

041	Chair Welsh	Explains the issue will be cleared up and brought back to the committee.
054	Terry Lamers	State Issues Coordinator, Oregon Small Woodlands Association. Testifies in support of HB 2801. Notes HB 2801 requires a notice be placed on the perimeters of private property. Explains since fence posts may be obscured by surroundings, they should be painted more than the top six or eight inches to make them visible and to differentiate them from standard markings by other fence post manufacturers who also paint their fence posts.
081	Chair Welsh	Closes public hearing on HB 2801 and opens public hearing on HB 2650.
PUBLIC	HEARING HB 2650	P
080	Kristina McNitt	Administrator. Explains HB 2650 and notes the ñ2 amendments (EXHIBIT H) completely replace the original bill.
090	Jan Lee	Oregon Water Resources Congress. Testifies in support of HB 2650. Mentions that Water Watch supports HB 2650 and believes it would be an improvement in management.
095	Chair Welsh	Notes the normal way to work on water bills is that everyone shares the amendments, and somehow Water Watch did not receive a copy of them, so he held the meeting over until today.
104	McNitt	Reminds the committee they wanted to delete Section 5 of (EXHIBIT H).
107	Chair Welsh	Closes public hearing on HB 2801 and opens work session on HB 2650.
	WORK SESSION	<u>N HB 2650</u>
109	Rep. Kruse	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2650-2 amendments dated 3/5/99.
		VOTE: 7-0 EXCUSED: 2 - Devlin, Taylor
	Chair Welsh	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
112	Rep. Kruse	MOTION: Moves to conceptually AMEND HB 2650-2 by deleting Section 5.

		VOTE: 7-0 EXCUSED: 2 - Devlin, Taylor
	Chair Welsh	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
115	Rep. Kruse	MOTION: Moves HB 2650 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0 EXCUSED: 2 - Devlin, Taylor
	Chair Welsh	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
		REP. MORGAN will lead discussion on the floor.
120	Chair Welsh	Closes meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Nancy Geisler, Kristina McNitt,

Administrative Support Administrator

# EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A HB 3054, written testimony and Railroad Trespassing Act, Everett Cutter, 3 pp
- B ñ HB 3054, written testimony and newspaper articles, John Cyrus, 8 pp
- C ñ HB 3054, written material, Claudia Howells, 1 p
- D ñ HB 2536, -1 amendments, staff, 1 p
- E ñ HB 2536, -2 amendments, staff, 1 p
- F ñ HB 2536, written material, James Stone, 2 p
- G ñ HB 2801, -1 amendments, staff, 1 p
- H ñ HB 2650, -2 amendments, staff, 5 pp