HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TRADE

January 28, 1997 Hearing Room H-170

8:45 A.M. Tapes 1 - 2

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Jim Hill, Chair

Rep. Rep. Ron Adams

Rep. Rep. Tom Whelan

Rep. Rep. Cynthia Wooten

STAFF PRESENT:

Julie Neburka, Administrator

Coben Tistadt, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

House Measure 2124

House Measure 2142

House Measure 2143

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. <u>Only text enclosed in quotation</u> <u>marks reports a speaker's exact words.</u> For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

| Tape/# | Speaker | Comments |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Tape 1, A |] | |
| 001 | Chair Hill | Calls meeting to order at 8:45 A.M, opens public hearing on HB 2124. |
| HB 2124- Public | | |
| <u>Hearing</u> |] | 7 |
| 010 | Julie Neburka | Gives overview of House Bill 2124. |
| 022 | Tom Brumm | Program Manager of the Economic Development Department and former Director of Jobs Training Program, states that legislation in |

| | | HB 2124 is nothing new, that the proposed transfer has been in the works for years. Explains that HB 2124 aims to consolidate Oregon's job training programs, all of which serve the same customer base. |
|-----|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 050 | Bret West | Interim Administer for Office of Community College Services, (EXHIBIT A), discusses proposed merger of OCCS and Jobs Training Partnership Act services, cites similar customer base and funding advantages. |
| 067 | Roger Bassett | Education and Work Force Policy Advisor for Office of the Governor, states that the merger involves hard work. Talks of on- going work with various offices and of improved coordination. |
| 094 | Rep. Adams | Inquires as to the role of the JTPA. |
| | | States that there are six programs in the state. Notes that the program trains disadvantaged individuals, the elderly population, and the young. Discusses federal funding, including: |
| 99 | Brumm | * recent attempts in the U.S. congress to cut funds |
| | | * congressional interest in block grants |
| | | * current stability of programs' federal funds |
| | | Issues discussed: |
| | | * Workforce Quality Council's relationship to the JTPA |
| 127 | | * flow of federal funds |
| | | * how various services fit together |
| | | * structural cutbacks to AFS |
| 183 | | * desire to assist communities |
| 209 | | * number of positions being transferred to OCCS |
| | | * local integration |
| 230 | | * consolidation of work force services |
| | | * program consolidations and state cooperation with the private sector |
| 294 | | * repeal of requirement for expenditure reports by private industry councils (Section 21 of HB 2124). |
| 328 | Janet Hoofer | Staff for JTPA Administration, comments that the JTPA is no longer able to expend funds on economic development not directly allocated to participants' services, and so the ORS requiring expenditure reports is no longer applicable. |

| 340 | | Discussion continues on: |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | * state funds to match federal funds |
| 372 | <u> </u> | * structure of JTPA and its cooperation with different entities |
| 390 | | * local structure of JTPA and reporting requirements |
| 429 | | * history of JTPA |
| TAPE 2, A | | |
| 035 | <u> </u> | * federal funds and accessibility for services |
| 054 | Bassett | * administrative costs necessitated by federal regulations |
| 087 | Chair Hill | Closes public hearing of HB 2124, opens public hearing on HB 2142 |
| <u>HB 2142-</u> <u>Public</u> Hearing | | |
| 098 | Yvonne Addington | Manager of Regional Development Division in Oregon Economic Development Department, supporting HB 2142. Cites her past experience. Gives Community Development Block Grant Program's history, purpose, and accomplishments. Cites the expensive infrastructure needs of local governments. Discusses financing through: * the Oregon Bond Bank, * the use of state lottery funds * the pooling of communities' bond loans to facilitate payments * the Oregon Bond Bank's good reputation with buyers * the Oregon Bond Bank's guarantees against default * the need to erase divisions in the bond funds |
| 188 | Chair Hill | Asks for staff overview. |
| 191 | Neburka | Gives overview of HB 2142. |
| 208 | Addington | Continues description of the Oregon Bond Bank. Cites regulation regarding the sale of bonds. Mentions that pooling the bond markets enables smaller cities to participate. Explains request to increase population cap for receiving grants for preliminary engineering. |
| 237 | Chair Hill | Asks what percentage of total costs the proposed grant would cover for preliminary planning. Mentions the effects of Ballot Measure 47. |
| 245 | Addington | Mentions that every project is running at least a million dollars, mentions limit for selling bonds is ten million. States that the proposed grant is a match for local funds, and that the amount of the |

| | | grant is negligible. States that programs are based on a municipality's ability to repay. Mentions that terms for repayment are liberal. |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 282 | Rep. Adams | Asks if the grant is a planning grant. |
| 291 | Addington | Answers that it is for preliminary engineering, in order to understand the costs of a project. |
| 296 | Rep. Adams | Asks if loans are repaid by user fees or through local taxes. |
| 308 | Addington | Explains that local taxes might not be needed. Mentions liberal terms for repayment. |
| 329 | Rep. Wooten | Expresses approval of bill, encourages rapid passing of the bill. |
| 340 | Ken Armstrong | Executive Director of the Oregon Public Ports Association, supporting HB 2142. Cites example of St. Helens attempting to attract a five million dollar plant and the competition from the state of Washington. Mentions that the leveraging of proposed grants would be disproportionately greater than their percentage of total costs. Explains the OPPA's jurisdiction and purpose |
| 414 | Joanie Loan | League of Oregon Cities, supporting HB 2142. Briefly mentions impact of legislation and reasons for support. |
| 441 | Rep. Adams | Asks about page 2, line 26 of the bill adding "resolution or ordinance." |
| 445 | Addington | Explains that cities prefer resolutions over ordinances and the reasons why. |
| TAPE 1, B | | |
| 030 | Rep. Adams | Wonders about public perception of this issue and asks what the problems are with requiring an ordinance. |
| 046 | Loan | States that procedure to pass resolutions is relatively clean yet still requires notice, a meeting, and approval by city council. |
| 053 | Rep. Wooten | Describes resolution process on municipal level. |
| 067 | Armstrong | Offers that ports pass resolutions and have no ability to pass ordinances. |
| 075 | Chair Hill | Asks if voters can do a referendum for a resolution, and if the public is thereby being excluded from process. |
| 082 | Addington | Notes that a special public works program required an ordinance, while a water waste line program did not. |
| 089 | Chair Hill | Closes hearing on HB 2142, opens hearing HB 2143 |
| HB 2143- Public Hearing | | |
| 100 | Neburka | Gives an overview of HB 2143. |

| 117 | Addington | Manager of Regional Development Division in Economic Development Department. Explains that enterprise zones aspire to assist economically lagging communities. Introduces Art Fish. |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 135 | Art Fish | Enterprise Zone Coordinator for the Economic Development Dept., supporting HB 2143. Gives history and accomplishments of the program, explains purpose of zoning. Refers to handout showing current zoning (EXHIBIT B). |
| 165 | Fish | Describes tax exemptions resulting from zoning, explains requirement for tax exemptions. |
| 184 | Fish | Continues description of accomplishments of zoning program. Refers to the proposals of HB 2143. Cites that there is no opposition to the bill. |
| 230 | Rep. Wooten | States that she is familiar with foreign free-trade zones. Asks for clarification of a state free-trade zone. |
| 248 | Fish | States that free-trade classification does not duplicate a foreign free trade zone. States that classification might help marketing. |
| 262 | Chair Hill | Inquires as to implications of changing an enterprise zone to a free- trade zone. |
| 270 | Fish | Reiterates that as a moniker it could help attract outside interest. |
| 285 | Rep. Wooten | Asks further questions regarding effectiveness of designation as free- trade zone. |
| 301 | Fish | Affirms that it serves merely as a label. |
| 324 | Rep. Wooten | Expresses concern that the designation might negatively effect foreign free-trade zones which have a real impact. Asks about distance expansions included in bill. |
| 350 | Fish | Discusses application of distance changes. |
| TAPE 2, B | | |
| 009 | Chair Hill | States that there might be problems with the free-trade zone proposals. |
| 012 | Rep. Whelan | Asks about proposed tax abatements. |
| 015 | Fish | Responds that tax abatements are of minimal impact and affect local taxes. |
| 029 | Rep. Adams | States need to consider intricacies of bill. |
| 055 | Chair Hill | Cites various unclear portions of the bill, states that the committee will spend considerable time on the bill, mentions potential substantive changes to the bill. |
| 70 | Addington | Explains willingness to explain intricacies of bill. |
| 72 | Chair Hill | States that committee will first discuss policy issues and then implementation of policy issues pertaining to the bill. |
| 79 | Armstrong | |

| | | Executive Director of the Oregon Public Ports Association. Addresses enterprise zoning implications for ports. Mentions impact of distance changes. Refers to St. Helens attempts to attract business. States that state-free trade zoning would help marketing although it might or might not bring substantive changes. |
|-----|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 122 | Rep. Wooten | Lists areas of concern such as substantive implications of the state free-trade zone designation, false advertising issues regarding the designation, and distance issues related to zoning. |
| 146 | Rep. Adams | Asks if specific areas need this legislation. |
| 153 | Fish | Explains that the proposed distances for combined zoning takes into consideration present situation of smaller communities. |
| 170 | Rep. Adams | Cites that "marketing magic" of zoning designation is legitimate. |
| 184 | Rep. Wooten | Cites disadvantages of enterprise zones: inappropriate tax breaks and lack of accountability. Mentions that public calls to do away with free enterprise zones come from urban areas. |
| 204 | Chair Hill | States that there will be further discussion of bill. Asks for a representative from the counties for future meetings, and for examples of success and failure. |
| 216 | Armstrong | Wonders if committee would be interested in testimony from various ports. |
| 220 | Chair Hill | Responds affirmatively. |
| 224 | Rep. Wooten | Expresses desire to expand debate to include larger issues relating to enterprise zones. |
| 230 | Chair Hill | Adjourns meeting. |

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Coben Tistadt, Julie Neburka,

Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - HB 2124, Bret West, 6 pp.

B - HB 2143, Arthur Fish, 2 pp.