

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS**

**March 26, 1997 Hearing Room E**

**1:00 P.M. Tapes 13 - 14**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**Rep. Mark Simmons, Chair**

**Rep. Michael Fahey, Vice-Chair**

**Rep. Mike Lehman**

**Rep. Leslie Lewis**

**Rep. Jim Welsh**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

**Pat Zwick, Policy Analyst**

**Marjorie Taylor, Administrative Support**

**MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:**

**HB 3586 Public Hearing**

**HCR 22 Public Hearing and Work Session**

**HB 2140 Public Hearing**

**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.**

<b>Tape/#</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>TAPE 13, A</b>		
004	Chair Simmons	Calls the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and opens the public hearing on HB 3586.
<b><u>HB 3586 PUBLIC HEARING</u></b>		
008	Rep. Josi	State Representative District 2. Expresses support for HB 3586.
		State Representative District 15. States that the neglect of state parks is a

023	Rep. Edwards	prominent issue. Explains that the two main needs of the parks are well documented, first being capital needs and second being operational needs. HB 3586 intends to address the capital needs and be part of a larger financial package to address future needs of the parks. Legislation proposes to establish an "Oregon Parks for the Future" fund with the help of lottery revenue bonds. Various revenues will be used to increase the fund. Explains how funds would be used for capital improvements or land acquisitions. States that with the issuance of lottery bonds, the capital costs would be spread over a number of years. Explains the issuance of lottery bonds, stating that the full amount does not have to be issued each year. Indicates that other bond projects have been successful. The fund will be spent on projects approved by the legislature. States that the annual budget impact would depend on the size of the bond <b>(EXHIBIT A)</b> .
104	Rep. Lewis	Asks if there would be objections to removing language related to new park acquisitions.
117	Rep. Edwards	States that the current needs of the parks are important, but there are pressures on the parks such that expansion will be needed in time.
130	Rep. Lewis	Suggests that language should reflect the needs of the parks now and think of new park acquisitions for the future.
134	Rep. Fahey	Asks if there is a limit to how much could be spent on acquisitions.
136	Rep. Edwards	Doesn't know.
140	Rep. Fahey	Agrees with Rep. Lewis that current needs should be addressed first.
146	Rep. Edwards	Agrees that current needs are important, but the future needs to be taken into consideration also.
156	Rep. Lehman	Asks if operational costs would decrease if money was spent on capital improvements.
161	Rep. Edwards	Indicates that it would probably help.
192	Rep. Beck	State Representative, District 12. States that HB 3586 is a step in the right direction. Believes that lottery bonding is a good interim measure, but encourages the committee to support long term funding sources. States that resources are needed to take care of the current needs and plan for the future. Explains that a land base for parks is needed and when the opportunity arises, lands need to be acquired.
262	Rep. Beck	Relates a personal story and uses it to illustrate how people can take advantage of opportunities to benefit the state parks. Discusses solutions for the Smith Rock State Park controversy. States that there are many people interested in parks issues and indicates that much work can be done with their enthusiasm. Encourages a focus on the long term solutions.
		Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. Expresses support for HB 3586. States that the top priority of the Parks Department is the backlog of needs and repairs for existing facilities. Explains that within the system

321	Bob Meinen	there are some opportunities for expansion. Reminds the committee that Oregon parks have some of the highest visitation rates in the country which has significant impact on the land use. States that HB 3586 would provide a needed infusion of revenue. It is a positive and creative interim solution, but encourages discussion of a long-term, stable funding solution. States that HB 2140, brought forward by the Parks Department, is not as good as HB 3586. Indicates that there are a few questions about HB 3586. Hopes to clarify Section 3 (6) which refers to the Department of Administrative Services administering the fund. Expresses concerns with Section 3 (2) which allows the Department of Administrative Services to work with other agencies to solve Parks issues <b>(EXHIBIT B)</b> .
<b>TAPE 14, A</b>		
013	Meinen	Makes two suggestions to the committee, first urging the committee to increase the bonding limit. Second, encourages the inclusion of language that allows the Parks Department to use a general contractor style of working on projects. Expresses support for HB 3586, but reiterates that it is not a long-term funding solution.
037	Kay Cogswell	Save Our State Parks Coordinator, Oregon State Parks Trust. Expresses support for HB 3586. Explains that it is a valuable component to a long-term funding package. States that the funding package should include an adequate operational budget and a dedicated long-term funding program. Indicates that HB 3586 can serve as a financial bridge to a permanent funding source. Questions who would make decisions about fund expenditures. Encourages thought on how decisions are made to spend money for the improvement of the parks system. HB 3586 is a positive interim solution <b>(EXHIBIT C)</b> .
087	Barb Adams	Volunteer, Sierra Club. Expresses support for HB 3586. States that it is a good interim solution, but long-term funding needs to be found. Agrees that the backlog of repairs should be taken care of. Explains that the expansion and creation of state parks has lagged the state's growth. Crowded parks discourage the use of the parks so people camp in other locations. Indicates that if it makes economic sense, the Parks Department should be able to acquire properties when they become available <b>(EXHIBIT D)</b> .
164	Chuck Smith	Director of Debt Management, Oregon State Treasury. Discusses bonding and debt management features of HB 3586. The measure contains debt management features which are related to a good bond program. Discusses general characteristics of state bonds. Explains that bonds are used by the state to acquire long-term assets. The use of bonds for long term assets is a fairness issue so that responsibilities can be shared with current and future users. States that Oregon bonds are of good quality and are authorized by the state legislature <b>(EXHIBIT E)</b> .
220	Smith	Explains that bonds in HB 3586 are revenue bonds which will be paid by the state lottery. States that revenue-backed bonds are paid first. Explains actual and forecasted lottery revenues. States that HB 3586 provides for good debt management practices.
261	Rep.	Verifies current bonding for the Westside Lightrail Project.

	Lewis	
264	Smith	States that bonds are \$10 million per year.
265	Rep. Lewis	Asks when that bonding ends.
266	Smith	Indicates that the last payment will be in the year 2009.
269	Rep. Lewis	Asks about total bonding for the state related to bonding authority and lightrail bonds.
282	Smith	Explains that \$375 million in bonds is used for lightrail. Limits are not legal limits, but financially practical limits.
297	Rep. Lewis	Verifies that practical limits still exist which will allow a sale of about \$475 million in bonds.
302	Smith	Approximately.
303	Rep. Lewis	Verifies that \$30 million in bonds will not approach the limit.
304	Smith	Answers affirmatively.
313	David Beem	President, People First for Disabled People. Expresses support for HB 3586 so that park access and services can be created for the disabled.
351	Chair Simmons	Closes the public hearing on HB 3586 and opens the public hearing on HCR 22.
<b><u>HCR 22</u></b> <b><u>PUBLIC</u></b> <b><u>HEARING</u></b>		
369	Chair Simmons	Provides a brief explanation for the bill. Enters written testimony from the Oregon Lands Coalition into the record ( <b>EXHIBIT F</b> ).
<b>TAPE 13, B</b>		
003	Jean Wilkinson	Director for Legal and Governmental Affairs, Oregon Cattleman's Association. Expresses support for HCR 22 for several reasons. The Association opposes large transfers of private property to public ownership. Explains that Oregonians are working very hard to maintain the resources and lands of the state. Indicates that pros and cons of a proposal for a national monument would have to be carefully considered. States that citizens should have notice of any proposed monuments in the state and participate in a public decision making process ( <b>EXHIBIT G</b> ).
031	Larry George	Executive Director, Oregonians in Action. Comments that citizen involvement in the land use decision making process is very important. With citizen involvement, adversarial relationships can be avoided.
048	Pete Test	Associate Director, Governmental Affairs, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. Expresses support for HCR 22 for several reasons. Indicates that federal land in this state is very important since it makes up a large percentage of the natural resource base. Citizens need to have input when land use is being changed from multiple use to single use. States that nature can't be pressed in a book to be preserved, it needs to be managed. Indicates that the 1969

		National Environmental Policy Act has a public input process which was not used in Utah when over one million acres were set aside as a national monument.
075	Rep. Welsh	Asks if there was an effort in Utah, prior to the designation of the national monument, to preserve those acres.
080	Test	Yes, but the acreage was much less. States that the land is now in a system that won't monitor the land. Preservation doesn't work, conservation does.
090	Rep. Welsh	Indicates that there was a lot of local involvement in the discussion of the land in Utah.
093	Test	Answers affirmatively.
098	Chair Simmons	Closes the public hearing on HCR 22 and opens a work session on HCR 22.
<b><u>HCR 22 WORK SESSION</u></b>		
100	Rep. Lewis	<b>MOTION: Moves HCR 22 to the full committee with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.</b>
102	Rep. Lewis	States that HCR 22 is positive legislation, since it will put the federal government on warning that Oregonians do value public hearings for land use policies. Since the majority of the state is federally owned it would be very appropriate for citizen input.
110	Rep. Welsh	Explains that other state legislatures are passing on similar legislation.
		<b>VOTE: 5-0</b> <b>AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye.</b>
120	Chair Simmons	<b>The motion CARRIES.</b>
124	Chair Simmons	Closes the work session on HCR 22 and opens a public hearing on HB 2140.
<b><u>HB 2140 PUBLIC HEARING</u></b>		
157	Bob Meinen	Director, Oregon State Parks and Recreation. Provides a summary of HB 2140. States that HB 3586 offers similar but better options than HB 2140. Expresses support for HB 3586 since there are so many technical issues that need to be resolved in HB 2140 ( <b>EXHIBIT H</b> ).
186	Chair Simmons	Expresses appreciation to Mr. Meinen for pointing out the differences between the bills.
193	Chair Simmons	Closes the public hearing on HB 2140 and adjourns the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Marjorie Taylor, Pat Zwick,

Administrative Support Policy Analyst

**EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

**A - HB 3586, Written testimony, Rep. Edwards, 2 pp.**

**B - HB 3586, Written testimony, Bob Meinen, 3 pp.**

**C - HB 3586, Written testimony, Kay Cogswell, 1 p.**

**D - HB 3586, Written testimony, Barb Adams, 2 pp.**

**E - HB 3586, Written testimony, Chuck Smith, 5 pp.**

**F - HCR 22, Faxed testimony, Committee Staff, 9 pp.**

**G - HCR 22, Written testimony, Jean Wilkinson, 1 p.**

**H - HB 2140, Written testimony, Bob Meinen, 1 p.**