## SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES

#### April 29, 1999 Hearing Room 50

#### 4:30 p.m. Tapes 112 - 113

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Gary George, Chair**

Sen. Thomas Wilde, Vice-Chair Sen. Tony Corcoran Sen. Joan Dukes Sen. Ted Ferrioli Sen. Bill Fisher Sen. Marylin Shannon

### STAFF PRESENT: Brad Harper, Administrator

Patrick Brennan, Administrative Support

#### **MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: SB 12 Public Hearing**

SB 1152 Work Session

SB 964 Work Session

SJM 13 Work Session

#### SB 1151 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   |  |
|------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| <b>TAPE 112,</b> | TAPE 112, A          |  |  |
| 002              | Chair George         | Calls the meeting to order at 4:52 p.m. Opens a public hearing on SB 12. |  |
| <u>SB 12 PUB</u> | SB 12 PUBLIC HEARING |  |  |
|                  |                      |  |  |

| 007 | Brad Harper    | Committee Administrator. Indicates that the ñ5 amendments (EXHIBIT A), which are the product of the work group assigned to the bill, have been received, but that there are errors that must be edited by Legislative Counsel before the committee can take action. Suggests that members of the work group brief the committee on their efforts. Mentions that additional testimony was received by the committee for consideration (EXHIBITS B, C).  |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 014 | Chair George   | Thanks the members of the work group for their efforts.  |
| 020 | Dave Hunnicutt | Representative, Oregonians in Action. States that he is chair of the SB 12 work group. Asserts that the efforts of the work group resulted in "a pretty good product," significantly different than the original bill.   |
| 035 | Charlie Stone  | Assistant State Forester, Oregon Department of Forestry (OFD). States that the original bill was designed to deal with virtually all landslides, while the amended bill will deal only with the dangers related to rapidly moving landslides. Explains that the bill grants regulatory authority to local governments with regards to siting of developments and with the Board of Forestry with regards to the potential effects of forestry operations on landslides. Notes that the other parties mentioned in the original bill have been relegated to roles of assistance.  |
| 080 | Stone          | Indicates that the bill establishes a comprehensive legislative policy for rapidly<br>moving landslides that will control other efforts in that area. Says that local<br>governments will not be allowed to prohibit siting of homes, but will rather<br>outline mitigation standards for siting. States that property owners building in<br>high risk areas will be forced to sign a statement that they will not take legal<br>action against an adjacent landowner in the event of a rapidly moving landslide.<br>Indicates that the Forestry Boardís role will deal exclusively with rapidly moving<br>landslides related to forestry operations. Mentions that the burden of one<br>landholder that signs the waiver will not affect other landholders that build in the<br>area at a later time. Says that counties will maintain records about areas where<br>geo-technical reports have been performed. Mentions that a phrase was added to<br>the ñ5 amendments, at the request of the chair, dealing with transfer of<br>development rights. |
| 130 | Stone          | Indicates that ODF is concerned about additional housing developments in forest<br>areas. Says that there is a need to insure that only development rights that are<br>already transferable would be allowed transfer, rather than creating a new right.<br>Expresses the desire to protect the practices that have been developed over time.  |
| 160 | Sen. Dukes     | Asks if the transferable development rights are eligible to be sold.   |
| 163 | Stone          | Indicates that they are.   |
| 166 | Hunnicutt      | States that the person living within a debris flow path could take their right to develop the property and put it onto another piece of property in the same zone, or sell that right to another party.  |
| 180 | Sen. Dukes     | Wonders if a landowner could sell the property and development right to another party.   |

| 186 | Hunnicutt    | Replies that there would be a restriction put upon the property that development could never occur on that property.   |
|-----|--------------|--|
| 190 | Sen. Dukes   | Says that if the property were large enough so that only a portion of the parcel<br>was in a landslide area, there would be an opportunity for a third party to<br>purchase another portion of the parcel and develop it.  |
| 193 | Hunnicutt    | Indicates that the restriction would apply to the entire parcel. Says that the work group has discussed amendments that would allow mitigation measures for portions of the property that do not fall into the restriction zone.   |
| 207 | Sen. Dukes   | Asks if restrictions other than the landslide restriction would still apply, such as if a landowner wished to transfer their building privileges to another piece of forest land.  |
| 215 | Hunnicutt    | Replies that the transfer could be made to another piece of property that would otherwise not qualify. Indicates that a city lot would still be subject to city standards.   |
| 227 | Chair George | Clarifies that the two parcels need not be in the same zone.   |
| 234 | Sen. Dukes   | Clarifies that the second parcel need not be a parcel that would normally allow the owner to build upon it.  |
| 238 | Chair George | Suggests that the stipulation is reasonable, since the landowner would then be in possession of a piece of land whose value would be significantly reduced by the prohibition against development.   |
| 243 | Sen. Dukes   | Inquires whether the second piece of property would need to be in the same city or county.   |
| 244 | Hunnicutt    | Replies that the second property would need to be in the same zone, but not necessarily in the same city or county.  |
| 247 | Sen. Dukes   | Wonders how long a landowner could retain the transferable right.  |
| 250 | Hunnicutt    | Replies that there are no provisions for a time limit.   |
| 257 | Sen. Dukes   | Suggests that a landowner could use their transferable right to build a vacation home in Clatsop county 10 years later, or sell the rights to do so to a third party.  |
| 263 | Hunnicutt    | Indicates that the landowner would have two lots, upon which they could build,<br>with one restricted by the landslide provisions. Explains that the prohibition<br>against building imposed by the local governments would trigger the ability to<br>transfer the rights at some point in the future. |

| 276      | Chair George    | Clarifies that the amended bill allows construction of a "single family dwelling."   |
|----------|-----------------|--|
| 283      | Stone           | <ul> <li>Outlines the portions of the ñ5 amendments which need to be corrected:</li> <li>Page 3, line 28, the phrase "need not regulate" should read "shall not regulate"</li> <li>Page 7, lines 7-8, the phrase "due to a rapidly moving landslide" should read "under this subsection"</li> <li>Page 9, line 12, the phrase "ORS 527.710 (1)" should read "ORS 527.710 (11)"</li> <li>Page 13, lines 9-10, the phrase "personal injury or death" should read "serious bodily injury or death"</li> <li>Page 13, line 12, the word "safety" should be deleted, although this change may not be necessary</li> </ul>   |
| 350      | Chair George    | Comments on the efforts of the work group and the effort to make sure that SB 12 was fair to all parties.  |
| 365      | Peter Green     | Natural Resources Forestry Policy Advisor. Indicates that SB 12 will accomplish<br>many important things. States that there is a need to develop maps to allow<br>education regarding the risk of landslides. Mentions that ODF has begun the<br>effort to look for potential landslide areas on timberlands. Discusses the<br>responsibilities granted to local governments by the bill. Expresses concern that<br>the ability of local governments to prohibit building on certain areas has been<br>removed by the ñ5 amendments. Asserts that local governments and state<br>agencies must retain the ability to take action based upon available information.<br>Expresses support for the transfer of development rights. Echoes many of the<br>issues brought up by Sen. Dukes. |
| TAPE 113 | , A             |  |
| 037      | Chair George    | Wonders if there are any provisions for additional representatives of the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) to consider the coastal issues.  |
| 043      | Green           | Replies that there was no additional money allocated to DOGAMI for SB 12 considerations.   |
| 054      | Dennis Olmstead | Representative, DOGAMI. States that funding related to SB 12 is not in the departmentis budget.  |
| 060      | Sen. Dukes      | Indicates that the estimated fiscal impact of the bill upon DOGAMI is \$200,000.   |
| 063      | Olmstead        | Clarifies that the exact estimate is \$247,000 for one biennium, to pay for 2 FTE positions.   |
| 070      | Chair George    | Closes the public hearing on SB 12 and opens a work session on SB 1152.  |

# SB 1152 WORK SESSION

| 074 | Brad Harper   | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that the ñ3 amendments (EXHIBIT D) have been submitted but do not meet all of the requirements of the interested parties. Indicates that further changes may be made in the House.  |
|-----|---------------|---|
| 088 | John Holleman | Executive Director, Oregon Independent Miners (OIM). Testifies in support of the ñ3 amendments to SB 1152. States that negotiations have resulted in the ñ3 amendments, but that there are still changes that need to be made. Indicates that Subsection 2 and Section 3 require changes.                                       |
| 102 | Sen. Dukes    | Requests the changes to the language that would remain in Section 3.  |
| 108 | Holleman      | Clarifies the change.   |
| 110 | Sen. Dukes    | Suggests that the committee conceptually amend the ñ3 amendments according to Mr. Hollemanís specifications.  |
| 117 | Sen. Corcoran | Concurs with Sen. Dukes.  |
| 121 | Sen. Dukes    | Expresses support for the suggested changes, mentioning that she does not support the ñ3 amendments in their current form.  |
| 123 | Harper        | Explains that the suggested changes to the ñ3 amendments would remove lines 7-9 of section 2 on Page 2.   |
| 127 | Sen. Fisher   | Wonders what is wrong with the section being removed.   |
| 133 | Sen. Dukes    | Replies that mining operations have the potential to be detrimental to fish and that the language may be misinterpreted so as to prohibit the enabling of existing protections.   |
| 135 | Sen. Corcoran | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1152-3 amendments<br>dated 4/29/99 and that the measure be FURTHER<br>AMENDED on page 2, line 7, by deleting lines 7-9 and on<br>page 2, line 10, by deleting text beginning with<br>"Notwithstanding" and ending with "rules," on line 14,<br>and capitalizing the first letter of "any" on line 14. |
| 145 | Holleman      | Clarifies the changes for the purpose of the motion.  |
| 147 | Harper        | Reads the amendments to the ñ3 amendments into the record.  |

|                 | Chair George  | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.  |
|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 155             | Sen. Corcoran | MOTION: Moves SB 1152 to the floor with a DO PASS<br>AS AMENDED recommendation.   |
| 165             |               | VOTE: 6-0-1<br>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.<br>EXCUSED: 1 - Shannon  |
|                 | Chair George  | The motion CARRIES.   |
|                 |               | SEN. FERRIOLI will lead discussion on the floor.  |
| 175             | Chair George  | Closes the work session on SB 1152 and opens a work session on SB 964.  |
| <u>SB 964 V</u> | VORK SESSION  |   |
| 180             | Brad Harper   | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that the ñ2 amendments (EXHIBIT E) have been submitted for consideration by the committee, following negotiations by the interested parties. Says that the amendments would provide Metro with the necessary authority to deal with the substance in an appropriate manner. |
| 194             | Ray Phelps    | Representative, Metro. Testifies in support of the ñ2 amendments to SB 964<br>(EXHIBIT F). Indicates that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)<br>and other parties concur that the amendments provide the most reasonable way<br>of protecting employees of Metro.  |
| 208             | Sen. Wilde    | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 964-2 amendments dated 4/29/99.   |
|                 | Chair George  | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.  |
| 214             | Sen. Dukes    | Asks if the amendment will consider calcium hypochlorite to be hazardous waste.   |
| 216             | Sen. Wilde    | Replies that it will not be.  |
|                 | Sen. Dukes    | Suggests that other authorities may have to deal with the substance.  |

|                  | 1            |   |
|------------------|--------------|---|
| 227              | Sen. Wilde   | Says that Metro was the entity requesting the bill.   |
| 232              | Sen. Dukes   | Expresses concern with changing the classification of calcium hypochlorite to non-hazardous waste status. Indicates that other groups may object.   |
| 237              | Sen. Wilde   | Explains that the disposal process will be altered without granting the substance official hazardous waste status.  |
| 240              | Phelps       | Concurs with Sen. Wildeís assessment.   |
| 248              | Sen. Wilde   | MOTION: Moves SB 964 to the floor with a DO PASS AS<br>AMENDED recommendation.  |
| 251              |              | VOTE: 4-0-3<br>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.<br>EXCUSED: 3 - Corcoran, Ferrioli, Shannon  |
|                  | Chair George | The motion CARRIES.   |
|                  |              | SEN. WILDE will lead discussion on the floor.   |
| 257              | Chair George | Closes the work session on SB 964 and reopens the work session on SB 1152.  |
| <u>SB 1152 V</u> | WORK SESSION |   |
| 260              | Harper       | Acknowledges that the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT G) were previously adopted<br>by the committee and that the ñ2 amendments functionally replace them.   |
| 272              | Chair George | Closes the work session on SB 1152 and opens a work session on SJM 13.  |
| <u>SJM 13 V</u>  | WORK SESSION |   |
| 280              | Brad Harper  | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that the ñ1 amendments ( <b>EXHIBIT H</b> ) have been submitted for consideration by the committee. Explains that the ñ1 amendments were requested by the Farm Bureau and would ask the Federal government to use funds to purchase grain from local growers to feed geese. |
|                  |              |   |

| h   |              |  |
|-----|--------------|--|
|     |              | Testifies in support of the ñ1 amendments to SJM 13. Says that the plan to purchase feed may entice the Federal government to participate.   |
| 322 | Sen. Dukes   | Says that it there are refuges but not the feed to seed them. Asserts that it is difficult to convince the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to use the entire refuge as it is and that having funds to seed them would aid in the effort. |
| 326 | Test         | Replies that seeding of refuges could be accommodated, should the Federal government choose to grant the funds.  |
| 331 | Chair George | Suggests that stipulations could be put into the amendment to allow for seeding of refuges and sanctuaries.  |
| 340 | Sen. Dukes   | Suggests that the \$14 million reference be removed and replaced by language describing the proposal.  |
| 364 | Sen. Fisher  | Asks why Washington should be included in the proposal.  |
| 354 | Test         | Replies that Washington is part of the original program.   |
| 366 | Sen. Fisher  | Wonders if Washington would be opposed.  |
| 373 |              | The committee discusses conceptual amendments to the ñ1 amendments to SJM 13.  |

**TAPE 112, B** 

| 018 | Sen. Dukes   | MOTION: Moves to AMEND SJM 13-1 amendments<br>dated 4/29/99 on page 1, by deleting line 3, and on line 4,<br>replacing the "(b)" with "(c)", and on line 4 deleting<br>"Fourteen million dollars to", and on line 4 replacing<br>"fund" with "Funds for", and that the bill be AMENDED<br>on page 1, line 19, inserting ";" before "after". |
|-----|--------------|---|
|     | Chair George | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.  |
| 030 | Sen. Dukes   | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT AS AMENDED SJM 13-1 amendments dated 4/29/99.  |
|     | Chair George | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.  |
| 044 | Sen. DUKES:  | MOTION: Moves SJM 13 be sent to the floor with a BE   |

|                  |              | ADOPTED AS AMENDED recommendation.   |
|------------------|--------------|--|
| 046              |              | VOTE: 4-0-3<br>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.<br>EXCUSED: 3 - Corcoran, Ferrioli, Shannon   |
|                  | Chair George | The motion CARRIES.  |
|                  |              | SEN. YIH will lead discussion on the floor.  |
| 049              | Chair George | Closes the work session on SJM 13 and opens a work session on SB 1151.   |
| <u>SB 1151 V</u> | WORK SESSION |  |
| 050              | Brad Harper  | Committee Administrator. Gives a brief description of the bill. Indicates that the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT I) have been submitted for consideration by the committee.   |
| 070              | David Morman | Policy Manager, Forest Practices Section, Department of Forestry (OFD).<br>Expresses support for the efforts to renew rangeland through juniper<br>management. Indicates that the study mentioned in the bill will take place with or<br>without legislation. Expresses concern regarding Section 2 and says that<br>although the concept is good it is premature as a prerequisite to the study.<br>Indicates that landowners already receive a 25,000 board foot exemption under<br>the harvest tax law. |
| 100              | Ralph Opp    | Representative, Ad Hoc Steering Committee for the Commercialization of Juniper. States that there are concerns about the disincentives against juniper management, especially for private landowners. Asserts that the process must be sped up regarding a possible tax exemption.   |
| 125              | Chair George | Asks Mr. Opp if he supports section 2.   |
| 127              | Орр          | Explains that he would prefer that section 2 be left in the amendments, although he would support passage of the bill should it be removed.  |
| 144              | Sen. Wilde   | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1151-1 amendments dated 4/29/99.   |
|                  | Chair George | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.   |

| 150 | Sen. Wilde   | MOTION: Moves SB 1151 to the floor with a DO PASS<br>AS AMENDED recommendation.                                  |
|-----|--------------|--|
|     |              | VOTE: 4-0-3<br>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.<br>EXCUSED: 3 - Corcoran, Dukes, Ferrioli |
|     | Chair George | The motion CARRIES.  |
|     |              | SEN. FERRIOLI will lead discussion on the floor.   |
| 163 | Chair George | Closes the work session on SB 1151 and adjourns the meeting at 6:00 p.m.   |

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Patrick Brennan, Brad Harper,

Administrative Support Administrator

#### EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A ñ SB 12, -5 amendments, staff, 17 pp.
- B ñ SB 12, testimony, John Foster, 1 p.
- C ñ SB 12, testimony, Dale Riddle, 2 pp.
- D ñ SB 1152, -3 amendments, staff, 4 pp.
- E ñ SB 964, -2 amendments, staff, 2 pp.
- F ñ SB 964, testimony, Ray Phelps, 1 p.

- G ñ SB 1152, -1 amendments, staff, 2 pp.
- H ñ SJM 13, -1 amendments, staff, 1 p.
- I ñ SB 1151, -1 amendments, staff, 3 pp.