

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

May 20, 1997 Hearing Room D

08:00 AM Tapes 85 - 87

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Charles Starr, Chair

Rep. Terry Thompson, Vice-Chair

Rep. Dennis Luke

Rep. Ken Messerle

Rep. Kurt Schrader

Rep. Judith Uherbelau

Rep. Larry Wells

MEMBER EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT:

Judith Gruber, Administrator

Linda Kowal, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

SB 913 Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 1086 Public Hearing

SCR 9 Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 1202 Public Hearing

SJR 31 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 85, A		
008	Chair Starr	Calls the meeting to order at 8:07 am and opens the public hearing on SB 913.
<u>SB 913</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING</u>		
018	Sen. Thomas Wilde	District 8. States that SB 913 originated due to non-indigenous weeds that take over fields in a short time combined with the fact that pack animals need weed-free hay in the Wallowa's. Since Oregon doesn't have a certification process they have to bring in weed-free hay from out-of-state. Comments that this is a vehicle to allow farmers who choose to pay the Department of Agriculture a fee to check their fields and certify them as weed-free. The Department of Transportation expressed an interest in using weed-free hay on projects after completion. States there has been no opposition from anyone.
036	Rep. Messerle	Asks if counties are allowed to pass an ordinance that would not allow uncertified hay.
041	Sen. Wilde	Responds this is not their intent. The only area that has a restriction of some kind is the Wallowa's.
050	Rep. Messerle	Asks where this restriction comes from.
051	Sen. Wilde	Responds he believes it's a federal restriction. For the record, he prefers that restrictions don't happen. Weed seed transfers in other ways.
058	Rep. Messerle	Asks what will the cost be based on.
067	Sen. Wilde	Responds it would be a walk through the field for about \$300. Probably on a per trip basis.
070	Lorna Youngs	Oregon Department of Agriculture. Comments that these programs occur in several western states. The ODA sees this as an aid for an issue they have direct responsibility for, the prevention of the spread of noxious weeds. Authority would fall in general statutes that deal with commodity inspections. The program would be operated on a fee recovery basis and would use existing staff. It involves an inspection of the field and the surrounding fields, identifying the problems and goals, and the development of the certification process. Cost would depend on the level of expertise and may be a little higher than \$26 an hour.
093	Rep. Schrader	Asks for clarification of free from noxious weeds.
100	Youngs	Responds zero tolerance can't be achieved so it would be visibly free from noxious weeds.
106	Rep. Wells	Asks where the idea came from?

110	Sen. Wilde	Responds the native plant society approached him with this. Their sole purpose is to keep noxious weeds out of the state.
124	Rep. Wells	Comments the highway department uses straw which comes from certified fields.
132	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks when the weeds are proliferating, how can there be certification.
145	Sen. Wilde	Responds the intention is to give the farmer an incentive to eliminate the weeds themselves.
153	Rep. Uherbelau	Refers to interim testimony which describes it as a continual battle. States there needs to be a more concentrated effort, "it's like running in place."
162	Sen. Wilde	Responds he realizes this is a minimal effort.
168	Rep. Messerle	Concerned about how to get there and who will be using it.
180	Youngs	States the ODA has a noxious weed program but it's modestly funded. It is responsible for the survey, detection, control, and eradication of introduced weeds. Comments the department has been successful in biological controls, for example, they are in the process of releasing the gore spider mite on gores. These seeds last 40 - 50 years in the seed bank. Concludes that this is a modest bill but the weeds are a serious problem.
214	Rep. Schrader	Asks are there references in statute that this is a fee based program.
218	Youngs	Affirmative. ORS 632
225	Chair Starr	States this is a good bill. Refers to the earlier question about what was the impetus for this bill. As he understands, the impetus is that certified hay has had to be imported to meet the requirements in the Wallowa's.
244	Jim Myron	Oregon Trout. States this bill is a step in the right direction.
251	Pete Test	Associate Director, Oregon Farm Bureau. Weeds are a major problem and getting worse, prevention is the key. If the farmer could have the opportunity to have weed-free hay, (hay being where most of the weeds start), he may take the opportunity in a voluntary program.
277	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SB 913,
<u>SB 913</u> <u>WORK</u> <u>SESSION</u>		
280	Rep. Thompson	MOTION: Moves SB 913 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
282	Rep. Uherbelau	States she hopes "that we don't use it for an occasion to pat ourselves on the back and say we solved the problem. This is just a very, very small step and we need to keep the problem of noxious weeds on our radar screen and come up with some other ideas in the future."

290		VOTE: 6-1 AYE: 6 - Thompson, Messerle, Schrader, Wells, Uherbelau, Starr NAY: 1 - Luke
	Chair Starr	The motion CARRIES. REP. STARR will lead discussion on the floor.
	Chair Starr	Closes the work session on SB 913 and opens a public hearing on SB 1086.
	<u>SB 1086</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING</u>	
311	Rep. Schrader	Inquires if there's some background information on how this bill came about with regard to the Attorney General's opinion on land and water. Asks what was the exact language from the Attorney General that land became water and water became land.
337	Jean Underhill Wilkerson	Oregon Cattlemen's Association. The Attorney General's opinion was sought because the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODF&W) wanted to regulate water under the Endangered Species Act. The Attorney General went through an analysis to define land and water.
363	Rep. Thompson	Asks wasn't it more involved than only agricultural water and wouldn't it fall back to the laws of the seas and property rights for different countries.
368	Wilkerson	States the Oregon Endangered Species Act (OESA) is narrowly drafted as it applies only to land owning or managing agencies. If the definition of land was broadened to include water in the owning or managing terminology, that would bring in the Water Resources Department. If under the OESA land included water, there could be ramifications of private property being affected.
395	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks if the bill does not include bodies of water, then for purposes of the OESA we can't look at what may be happening to the water that could be harmful to these endangered species.
412	Wilkerson	Responds if there are bodies of water on state lands that are owned or managed by the state then she believes the state would be governed under OESA to activities on the land, banks, or beds of that body of water. The allocation of water which the Water Resources Department governs would not be governed under OESA as it stands now.
417	Sen. Ted Ferrioli	District 28. If the Water Resources Department becomes a land owning agency, it would require the department to develop a species protection plan under the OESA. Currently the Water Resources Department is in close cooperation with ODF&W. They have the Division 33 rule that requires them to take into consideration all

		bodies of water in the state of Oregon that have endangered species or any aquatic wildlife. Declaring that they are now a land owning agency means they have to file endangered species plans for every single species that is an aquatic species on the Oregon Endangered Species list. He does not believe that was the intention of the legislation that passed the OESA and it is not within the mission of the Water Resources Department.
TAPE 85, A		
023	Rep. Uherbelau	States her concern is we are taking away a tool that can be used with the OESA as to how we affect the use of our water.
034	Sen. Ferrioli	Reads a section from a Dec. 2nd letter from the Water Resources Department, "this would still allow the department to participate in the protection of endangered species without the requirement of developing species management plans, and needs of endangered species can be adequately addressed by following the process spelled out in the requirements for other than state land owning or managing agencies."
047	Rep. Schrader	Clarifies that according to the testimony, the OESA does not encourage any endangered species classification for anything that lives in the water.
056	Pete Test	Associate Director, Oregon Farm Bureau. Responds there are sensitive and endangered fish species listed by state classification. "The protections for those species are already built into state laws for each of the other agencies." * Oregon Water Resources Division 33 Rules. * DSL (Division of State Lands) has special protections for spawning grounds. * DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) has water quality standards for fish. What this does allow is for ODF&W to overshadow the authority of the other agencies.
087	Rep. Schrader	States he does not understand how the Water Resources Commission or DSL would have any knowledge of the biology of that endangered animal, therefore, doesn't ODF&W have to be involved in some fashion?
094	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds that ODF&W is responsible for managing aquatic and wildlife species in Oregon. The Water Resources Department has a different mission. States they do collaborate under Rule 33 and they relies heavily on the biological information provided by ODF&W. The point is, there are a host of state agencies that have a clear mission and role. The definition that land includes waters clouds

		those missions and may even require the duplication of efforts at different agency levels.
110	Wilkerson	States the issue is what people, what bodies, and what agencies are governed directly under OESA and what their requirements are under the OESA in addition to what is required under other Oregon statutes. States this is a clarification bill and will probably be revisited in the future.
130	Rep. Schrader	Comments that he agrees with the goal and asks does this language get at that goal?
135	Rep. Uherbelau	Comments that the Attorney General's opinion, is an opinion. Asks what did this opinion do?
147	Sen. Ferrioli	Refers to the letter from Water Resources and states the opinion was not from the Attorney General, it was from legal counsel for ODF&W. The indication was for the purpose of the OESA, state lands also include water. States "this statute would stop that opinion from becoming binding on other state agencies. Either we do this in statute or we do this in court."
164	Rep. Uherbelau	Responds ORS 496.172 already says that ODF&W shall work cooperatively with other agencies in this situation. The opinion from the attorney for ODF&W has less weight than the Attorney General's opinion and less weight than the courts. States she would like to see this letter of opinion before making any decision.
173	Rep. Luke	Comments that a complete rewrite of Measure 47 was because of an Attorney General's opinion. An agency has to follow the opinion until it goes to court.
178	Rep. Uherbelau	States this was not an Attorney General's opinion.
179	Rep. Luke	Responds that he understands that, but the agency will still follow legal counsel opinion until a higher authority tells them otherwise.
193	Jim Greer	(ODF&W) (EXHIBIT A) States that in 1995, HB 2120 rewrote the entire Endangered Species Act. It took away many of ODF&W's responsibilities and gave them to other agencies. Adds, they haven't completed the rule making process as they are waiting for the outcome of SB 1086.
275	Martha Pagel	<p>Director, Oregon Water Resources Department. Reiterates the impact of including them on the list. States they commented to ODF&W that they didn't feel they should be on the list because they already have a program in place. Concludes with regard to legal opinion there are categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * mandatory interpretation is absolute law that must be followed. * speculative interpretation is where the law could have different meanings and there's a range of options and it's a policy call as to how it is interpreted.

		States she feels the later is the type of advice that the ODF&W Commission received.
336	Rep. Wells	Comments as he understands the issue, the two agencies feel this can be worked out through administrative rule. However, the Cattlemen's Association and the Farm Bureau have been watching this since HB 2120 passed and feel the legislation is needed. Asks why does he think Senate went along with industry?
351	Greer	Offers no opinion.
358	Pagel	Responds she has no doubt the agencies will resolve this issue.
370	Greer	States the OESA is a very complicated bill and there may be some concern about the authority of agencies over landowners.
395	Rep. Thompson	Comments that the whole committee was not there.
402	Rep. Messerle	Asks when the Senate was dealing with this, did they have the same commitments that are here today from the Commission or has this evolved to a higher degree.
411	Greer	Responds this was the commitment they made to the committee prior to their vote. They had the commitment from the Commission at that time.
413	Rep. Messerle	Asks will the Commission act if they wait another week?
417	Greer	Responds their intention would be to move forward with the rule package they now have with this change.
422	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks if this bill passes, what doors does changing the definition open that is above and beyond the list issue.
435	Greer	Responds he believes it is much broader in terms of how it affects the entire OESA. Removing waters of the state away from the authority of OESA would require close attention. It would force them to look at all species currently listed or potentially impacted that rely on water for the majority of their life cycle.
TAPE 85, B		
023	Jim Myron	Oregon Trout. (EXHIBIT B) Adds that Oregon Trout was not a supporter of HB 2120 in the 1995 session because of the transfer of authority from ODF&W to the other agencies. They oppose this bill because it represents a major change to the act.
047	Steven Kafoury	American Fisheries Society. States they are a professional association of scientists. "Among the rules and objectives of our society are to provide scientific information on fisheries issues and fisheries management issues to aid the public discourse and natural resource management." Adds for clarity, "in contrast to what you may have read in some newspapers, American Fisheries Society <u>did not</u> oppose the Governor's plan, the Oregon Plan for Salmon Recovery. We have been involved in that process and we <u>are</u>

		<u>not asking the federal government to list this as a Federal Endangered Species Act."</u>
062	Kafoury	Continues and states the reason they are here on SB 1086 is they are very concerned about the effects of this bill. OESA only applies to species on state land. If you define state lands to exclude state water then there is no authority of the OESA over state fish. The result would be throwing it over to the federal government. They are concerned that if this bill passed it would be an open invitation to the federal government to manage our endangered species that live in water.
074	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing on HB 1086 and states he will not open a work session on this bill today. Opens the public hearing on SCR 9.
<u>SCR 9 PUBLIC HEARING</u>		
083	Sen. Ted Ferrioli	District 28. States that over the last dozen years the Baker City Watershed has deteriorated significantly and this watershed provides 82 percent of the water for Baker City. Talks about the threat of fire, insects and disease, and herbicide and pesticide sprays in the watershed areas. States there are dozens of cities in Oregon that depend on watersheds that are on national forest land for their water supply. These populations have no authority over the management of this resource. States SCR 9 suggests that the best possible answer is to connect the people who benefit from the watershed with the ownership and management responsibilities of the watershed.
126	Sen. Ferrioli	Continues that the objective suggests that federal lands that are in municipal watersheds should be transferred to the State Department of Forestry and Management. This is also an attempt to connect city counselors and decision makers with the responsibility of this management.
148	Rep. Thompson	Asks for what purpose would the federal government do this?
151	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds that the federal agencies are paying all the costs for municipal watershed management with no income. It would be a cost measure.
155	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks what was the discussion in the Senate? The vote was 19 - 10 and the 10 no votes were from both parties.
166	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds he feels the reasons for either vote was varied. Those who liked the resolution saw the connection between municipal objectives and managing watersheds. Some cities are concerned about bug management, others about fire risk management. Those who voted against the bill think this could lead to increased timber harvesting in municipal watersheds. He believes the reasons are as varied and diverse for both those in favor and those who oppose.
189	Rep. Luke	

		Clarifies there's no requirement for the government to give them the land just to manage it and the watershed.
191	Sen. Ferrioli	Affirmative. Anticipate this will be done with intergovernmental agreements for watershed management of the municipal water supply and it may not be necessary to transfer harvest rights.
196	Rep. Luke	Asks if there are requirements for local government to do this if they don't want to.
198	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds no, it's entirely permissive.
199	Rep. Thompson	Asks is it possible for a city take over forest management to defray the costs?
204	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds it's possible, this would be negotiated on a case-by-case basis.
215	Bruce MaCann	Regional Hydrologist for the US Forest Service representing the national forests for the states of Oregon and Washington.
223	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks how do you respond to the poor condition of the Baker City watershed?
230	MaCann	Responds it's managed under a cooperative agreement between the US Forest Service and the municipalities. States they're aware that northeast Oregon and the Wallowa Mountains forest health and stand conditions are of grave concern as are the fire risks. The Forest Service's clear intent is to work with Baker City to address these risks. It is highly dependent on the budget.
246	Rep. Uherbelau	Confirms that they already operate under a cooperative agreement with Baker City.
248	MaCann	Affirmative.
249	Rep. Uherbelau	Comments that he mentioned it depends on their budget and asks if Baker City puts any money into it.
251	MaCann	Responds he's not familiar with the Baker City agreement and doesn't know.
253	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks does this contemplate that if it's turned over to the municipalities that they will pay for the management.
257	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds he believes there would be a cost share. Under current cooperative agreements, to his knowledge, the cities don't very often share the cost with the federal agencies. Cooperation is a matter of definition. The point is, it's a matter of economics, appropriation, and priority all of which is the purview of the Forest Service in this case, however, it's also 82 percent of the municipal water supply for Baker City.
284	Rep. Uherbelau	Asks are the cities going to be willing to take on the cost if they take on the management?
287	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds the people of Baker City are. He believes other cities if given the opportunity would look at it on a case-by-case basis.
296		

	Rep. Messerle	Comments he's interested in the level of management by the federal agencies being directly related to their budget. Asks where is this going with regard to the balanced budget on the federal level and the lock up of the federal forest in regard to marketing the timber.
305	MaCann	The budgets for the US Forest Service, the projections, are on a stable to slight increase trend for watershed management funds.
331	Rep. Messerle	Asks if that's the case, will the revenue be coming from more general funds, from a shift of expenditures within the agency, or from an increase in harvest?
341	MaCann	Answers the funds are appropriated annually and would not be the result of increased harvests.
344	Rep. Schrader	Comments that the bill actually says it transfers management from the federal government to the state. Asks how do the municipalities gain local control.
352	Sen. Ferrioli	Responds the issue is whether the municipalities have the ability to become forest managers. It was thought that the Oregon Department of Forestry could provide management services on behalf of the municipalities.
360	Rep. Schrader	Comments that the state would do a better a job. Concerned about where the financial burden is placed.
372	Sen. Ferrioli	States there is a tremendous asset value in the watershed. He doesn't anticipate this would become a burden to the taxpayers as he believes the watershed users should pay for the management from the management of the resource.
397	Rep. Wells	Talks about the fact there will be concern any time they want to cut timber to offset that cost. He believes they need to be prepared to take the costs of managing the watershed with no income because people downstream will not want the timber cut.
420	Sen. Ferrioli	If the municipality decides they want no management there's a cost associated with that decision. The issue is who controls the asset and the resource and the trade off is that the municipality is allowed to have control of it's water supply.
TAPE 86, B		
018	Rep. Luke	Refers to the Three Sisters wilderness fire of last year and the difficulty of extinguishing it. States there is stuff in there that's six to seven feet deep and that's not management. The Deschutes National Forest people told him when they flew over the area the health of the forest was visibly different in the Warm Springs area where there is extensive management. You have to thin and the local jurisdictions need to have active participation to have a healthy watershed.
035	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing on SCR 9.
040	Rep. Luke	Comments that this is not a reflection of the Forest Service, their budgets have been cut and they are in a bind in some cases. States he feels they are doing an excellent job with the resources they have.

044	Rep. Schrader	Asks if the State Department of Forestry is going to testify.
045	Chair Starr	Responds no.
047	Chair Starr	Asks if they testified on the Senate side.
048	Sen. Ferrioli	Comments as he understands they are neutral but are watching closely.
049	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SCR 9.
<u>SCR 9 WORK SESSION</u>		
050	Rep. LUKE:	MOTION: Moves SCR 9 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
053	Rep. Thompson	States his concern is that a municipality such as Salem may not be capable to handle such a large watershed. It would require major forest management practices.
060	Rep. Messerle	Comments as he understood the testimony this would be voluntary. If a city had the need and the capability they could do so, no city would be forced into that action.
066	Rep. Uherbelau	Comments that although the testimony stated this would be voluntary, the resolution is asking the federal government to transfer the management of these lands to the state. Concerned that the costs to municipalities may force them to do more than what's necessary just to meet the associated costs.
087	Rep. Wells	States there's no better way to understand issues than to be involved. Allowing the states or cities to be involved in the management may help settle some of the battles going on.
096	Rep. Schrader	Comments that maybe this plays in the Salmon Recovery Plan and the way we're working with the federal government now. It involves more local control and there may be some funds available now that historically haven't been.
103	Rep. Thompson	Comments that he represents cities that have private land owners who log across the creeks and spray within 35 feet of the watersheds and they have no control over it. Comments he can understand the concern of everyone in the state, but he would like to see that concern brought to everyone's watershed not just those on federal lands.
110	Rep. Messerle	States he feels this resolution is sending a reality check to the Federal Government. They need to pay attention to the watersheds and put it on a higher priority. It's important to the cities and communities.
125	Chair Starr	Closes the discussion on SCR 9.
127		VOTE: 5-2 AYE: 5 - Luke, Messerle, Schrader, Wells, Starr

		NAY: 2 - Thompson, Uherbelau
	Chair Starr	The motion CARRIES. REP. MESSERLE will lead discussion on the floor.
128	Chair Starr	Closes the work session on SCR 9 and opens the public hearing on SB 1202.
<u>SB 1202</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING</u>		
139	Kevin Mannix	States SB 1202 proposes to add a military veteran preference to the law (EXHIBIT C) and that the bill would only affect a handful of people. Gives the rationale supporting this proposal and describes one particular case.
178	Rep. Thompson	Comments he believes there's wording relative to medical problems in the appeal process that would normally give you a deferment. Asks why they were told no?
182	Mannix	Responds you're allowed to seek an optional illness waiver. The rational of the permit board was you should have started sooner.
191	Rep. Thompson	Asks if he remembers what the votes in the appeal court were.
192	Mannix	Answers it was a four member board, 1 public member voted to grant the permit and the other 3 voted not to grant the waiver.
196	Rep. Uherbelau	Comments that it's been referred to that this bill affects a handful of people, however, as she interprets the bill it appears to be written for a specific person. Asks have the others been identified?
200	Mannix	Responds that he is passing on what Sen. Tarno told him.
210	Rep. Wells	Comments that exception issues are always difficult and recalls a previous issue.
224	Mannix	Points out that people would had to have been historically involved, it's not intended to rewrite history but to look back and take this into consideration.
251	Rep. Uherbelau	States the issue about opening the door is that once you open it for one it's hard to shut it to others who may have very good reasons also.
272	Mannix	Responds the fair way to approach this is if back in 1995 this additional issue had been presented, would you have added that as a qualification to other qualifying factors on the list.
294	Rep. Thompson	Asks what size vessel is involved?
296	Mannix	Answers it's the one that requires you land over 500 pounds not the 10,000 pounds or more.
300	Rep. Messerle	

		Comments his concern is there's an appeal process in place and this is trying to go beyond that. States he would like someone from that board to testify on this.
308	Mannix	States he has been waiting to hear from someone in ODF&W, or the board. The bill was printed, published, sent for hearing and nobody appeared and he has no letters. Gives his interpretation of the decision and comments he understands that the legislature sets policy and should not decide individual cases. Adds this is saying a long term veteran of 20 years.
338	Roy Elicker	ODF&W. Confirms they did not testify on the Senate side. Continues by saying as they understand the constituent went through the appeals process and lost. Their concern is not just with the Dungeness Fishery but with all limited entry fisheries, there's an appeals process in place, there was a lot of time spent in legislation and rule making processes and it's their sense to go with those. Adds as they understand this would affect a single vessel.
362	Rep. Thompson	Asks if he knows how many vessels have been turned down by the appeals board?
365	Elicker	Responds no but he can get the information, today if necessary.
368	Rep. Thompson	Comments that he believes not many have been turned down and he is curious to know.
373	Mannix	Adds that in this particular case, the commission pulled their decision back while it was being appealed and they rewrote and then reissued it. Senator Tarno got involved because of the concept to be given some credit for military service. This is limited to those who have been in the permit process.
397	Rep. Thompson	As he remembers there were fishermen who were involved in fisheries, other than the crab fishery, who lost their permit because they were only involved for one year. States his concern is if military service extended to people who were involved in other fisheries, in other parts of world, how this would be seen by the industry.
419	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing on SB 1202 and due to time constraints will not open a work session. Opens the public hearing on SJR 31.
<u>SJR 31 PUBLIC HEARING</u>		
442	Rep. Roger Beyer	District 48. Declares a conflict of interest because he makes a good share of his living growing Christmas Trees. States SJR 31 is a simple bill to declare December as Christmas Tree month.
451	Chair Starr	Closes the public hearing and opens a work session on SJR 31.
<u>SJR 31 WORK SESSION</u>		
TAPE 87, A		

017	Rep. LUKE:	MOTION: Moves SJR 31 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
026		VOTE: 7-0 AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.
	Chair Starr	The motion CARRIES. REP. ROGER BEYER will lead discussion on the floor.
033	Rep. Luke	States for the committee's reference, an agreement has been reached on HB 2499 and there is no need for the bill but would like to get them on the record to have an opportunity to tell what the agreement was.
036	Chair Starr	States they will do that on Thursday and mentions they may see one or more bills on the agenda for Thursday only if he has the votes to move them. Adjourns the meeting at 10 am.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Linda M. Kowal, Judith Gruber,

Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - SB 1086, statement, Jim Greer, 4 pp.

B - SB 1086, written testimony, Jim Myron, 1 p.

C - SB 1202, summary, Kevin Mannix, 1 p.

D - SJR 31, fact sheet, Rep. Roger Beyer, 1 p.