HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WATER POLICY

May 13, 1997 Hearing Room D

3:00 p.m. Tape 80 - 81

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Ken Messerle, Chair

Rep. Tim Josi, Vice-Chair

Rep. Steve Harper

Rep. Jeff Kruse

Rep. Jim Welsh

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Jo Ann Bowman

Rep. Tony Corcoran

VISITING MEMBER: Rep. Bob Jenson

STAFF PRESENT: Pat Zwick, Policy Analyst

Rebecca M. Scott, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: SB 133 Public Hearing

HB 3634 Work Session

SB 1157A Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 464 Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 415 Public Hearing and Work Session

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 80, A | | |
| 003 | Chair Messerle | Calls meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. |
| <u>SB 133</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> | | |

| 005 | Chair Messerle | Opens public hearing on SB 133. |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 006 | Pat Zwick | Policy Analyst, summarizes SB 133 and submits -2 amendments. (EXHIBIT A) |
| 026 | Martha Pagel | Director, Water Resources Department (WRD), submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 133. (EXHIBIT B) |
| 084 | Chair Messerle | Asks the position of WRD on the -2 amendments. |
| 085 | Pagel | Have seen the -2 amendments which relate to supplemental water rights. Are not concerned with the concept of these amendments. However, the department is concerned about attaching a substantive policy change to basically a department bill. Believe there is another vehicle to which the amendments could be attached. |
| 094 | Chair Messerle | Asks what that would be. |
| 095 | Pagel | Possibly SB 417. |
| 099 | Pagel | Discusses other proposed amendments which have not been submitted yet. |
| 110 | Rep. Kruse | Asks for status of SB 417. |
| 115 | Pagel | Currently being considered in the Senate. |
| 117 | Rep. Josi | Asks if there is any controversy surrounding SB 417. |
| 118 | Pagel | Don't believe so. |
| 120 | Rep. Kruse | Comments on concerns about amending a Senate Bill after it has passed without amendment. |
| 125 | Chair Messerle | Asks if the -2 amendments will have any fiscal impact. |
| 126 | Pagel | No. |
| 132 | Jan Lee | Executive Director, Oregon Water Resources Congress, testifies in support of SB 133. Regarding -2 amendments, supports them in concept, but have had some discussion with Water for Life that there will need to be some changes to include the Willamette system. |
| 151 | Chair Messerle | Asks if both proposed amendments are acceptable. |
| 155 | Lee | Yes. Discussing some possible changes with Water for Life and Steve Applegate. |
| 164 | Chair Messerle | Asks if Steve Applegate is in the building today. |
| 167 | Lee | He had planned to be here today, but he thought SB 133 would not be scheduled today. |
| 178 | Richard | Representing Water for Life, discusses the -2 amendments. Neither support, nor oppose SB 133. Would leave the question of whether these amendments |

| | Kosesan | should be attached to any specific bill to the committee. |
|--|--------------------|---|
| 207 | Chair Messerle | Comments that this will be discussed further on Thursday. |
| 211 | Kosesan | It is a question of how soon SB 417 moves from the Senate to the House. |
| 219 | Doug Myers | Representing Oregon Environmental Council, comments that there is no opposition to SB 417A. |
| 227 | Jeff Curtis | Representing Water Watch, testifies in support of SB 133. |
| 236 | Chair Messerle | Asks if there is a preference as to where the amendments are attached. |
| 237 | Curtis | Would like to examine the amendments more closely prior to making a decision. |
| 243 | Chair Messerle | Closes public hearing on SB 133. |
| IID 2/2 / | <u> </u> | |
| <u>HB 3634</u> <u>WORK</u> SESSION | | |
| 245 | Chair Messerle | Opens work session on HB 3634. |
| 258 | Martha Pagel | Director, Water Resources Department. Submits and reviews -4 amendments to HB 3634. (EXHIBIT C) |
| 286 | Richard Kosesan | Representing Water for Life, testifies in support of -4 amendments. |
| 296 | Rep. Josi | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3634-4 amendments dated 05/12/97. |
| | Chair | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. |
| 300 | Rep. Josi | MOTION: Moves HB 3634 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 5-0 |
| | | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. |
| | | EXCUSED: 2 - Bowman, Corcoran |
| | | The motion CARRIES. |
| | Chair | REP. MESSERLE will lead discussion on the floor. |
| 311 | Chair Messerle | Closes work session on HB 3634. |
| | | |
| <u>SB 1157 A</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> | | |
| HEARING | | |

| 312 | Chair Messerle | Opens public hearing on 1157 A. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 326 | Pat Zwick | Summarizes SB 1157 A and submits -A2 amendments. (EXHIBIT D) |
| 365 | Pete Test | Representing Oregon Farm Bureau, submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 1157 A. (EXHIBIT E) |
| TAPE 81, A | | |
| 006 | Martha Pagel | Director, Water Resources Department, submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 1157 A. (EXHIBIT F) Submits and reviews -A3 amendments (EXHIBIT G) and the -A4 amendments (EXHIBIT H). |
| 020 | Rep. Harper | Asks for clarification on the emergency clause contained in the -A1 amendment. |
| 022 | Test | The Oregon Water Resources Congress requested that amendment, but the Oregon Farm Bureau had no objection. |
| 027 | Jan Lee | Executive Director, Oregon Water Resources Congress, discusses the -A2 amendment. |
| 030 | Pagel | Comments on the value of the emergency clause. |
| 034 | Jeff Curtis | Representing Water Watch, testifies in opposition to SB 1157 A. Concerned about the issuance of time-limited licenses. |
| 067 | Chair Messerle | Closes public hearing on SB 1157 A. |
| <u>SB 1157 A</u> WORK SESSION | | |
| 069 | Chair Messerle | Opens work session on SB 1157A. |
| 071 | Rep. Josi | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1157A-2, -3, and -4 amendments dated 05/12/97. |
| | Chair | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. |
| 075 | Rep. JOSI: | MOTION: Moves SB 1157A be sent to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 5-0 |
| | | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. |
| | | EXCUSED: 2 - Bowman, Corcoran |
| | Chair | The motion CARRIES. |
| | | REP. JOSI will lead discussion on the floor. |
| 080 | Chair | Closes work session on SB 1157A. |

| | Messerle | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| | | |
| <u>SB 464</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING</u> | | |
| 081 | Chair Messerle | Opens public hearing on SB 464. |
| 083 | Pat Zwick | Summarizes SB 464. |
| 097 | Jerry Schmidt | Representing Oregon Association of Realtors, submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 464. (EXHIBIT I) |
| 147 | Schmidt | Continues review. |
| 186 | Rep. Harper | Asks why it was vetoed last session, and why he thinks it won't be vetoed this session. |
| 188 | Schmidt | Has no idea why the Governor vetoed this last session. |
| 207 | Martha Pagel | Director, Water Resources Department, submits and reviews testimony in opposition to SB 464. (EXHIBIT J) |
| 227 | Rep. Josi | Asks if this could still be done by order. |
| 229 | Pagel | The provision Mr. Schmidt referred to, relating to order, deals with orders of withdrawal which were enacted many years ago. The problem is that the provisions were written prior to the enactment of the Administrative Procedures Act. |
| 279 | Pagel | Continues review |
| 295 | Chair Messerle | Asks for clarification on testimony referring to assisting people locate water. |
| 299 | Pagel | WRD does not provide this service, but they will come to WRD asking the department to help find water. Can try to provide information to warn people of potentially serious water shortages. |
| 306 | Chair Messerle | Asks if it is normal to form an association. |
| 311 | Pagel | Often that is the final solution. Basin planning provisions apply to all types of water uses, surface and ground water. Exempting one category from the basin plans would be creating a special exception that others would not have. If a basin plan which limited new exempt uses was adopted, then a person would have the opportunity to request an exception to the basin plan in order to develop their property. If they were denied that, they would be able to get a contested case hearing or judicial review of that determination. If any one person feels that they are going to be unduly harmed by this, they do have recourse to go before a contested case hearing or a judge. |
| 339 | Rep. Josi | Asks for further discussion on the recourse a person has if they are denied an exception. |
| | | The basin plan, which is adopted by rule, sets out classifications of uses. If it is included that there will be no more exempt uses, or a limitation of exempt |

| 347 | Pagel | uses, that would be the basic plan for the entire basin. Any person can apply for an exception to the basin plan based on one of several criteria, such as undue or extreme hardship. |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| 368 | Rep. Josi | Asks about process for rule-making for the basin plan. |
| 375 | Pagel | That is a rule-making process which includes a notice and at least one public hearing in the basin. Have agreed to give more extensive notice. |
| 381 | Rep. Josi | Asks what process the public would have, other than testifying before the Water Resources Commission. |
| 385 | Pagel | In a rule-making process, the opportunity is to comment on the rules and try to influence the decision, similar to the legislative process. Once the rule is adopted, it can only be challenged on the basis of a procedural failure. The purpose of rules is to describe a general standard that applies to everybody. After adoption of the basin plan, applications for water rights have to be looked at to ensure that the use is authorized under the basin plan. That is where the individual opportunity for comment comes in. If the owner of a piece of property cannot get a water right because of a basin plan provision, then they can apply for the exception. |
| TAPE 89, B |] | |
| 009 | Rep. Josi | What is this based on. |
| 010 | Pagel | Based on the impact to them as an individual, and the final agency determination applying to that individual. |
| 014 | Rep. Josi | Asks if an individual, through judicial review, could contest the legitimacy of the findings of the Commission when the basin plan was developed. |
| 017 | Pagel | No. |
| 018 | Rep. Josi | Asks what they can do. |
| 018 | Pagel | Can request an exception to the basin plan, for such reasons as undue hardship, the use is non-consumptive, and several others outlined in statute. |
| 022 | Rep. Josi | Asks if they can challenge, through judicial review, the basin plan. |
| 027 | Pagel | They can't challenge the rule except as to whether there was sufficient record on which to base the rule, and whether the procedures were followed. |
| 032 | Rep. Josi | Asks if individual can dispute findings. |
| 035 | Pagel | A rule can be challenged in a separate process, looking at either the procedures or whether the agency did not have evidence in the record. |
| 037 | Rep. Josi | Asks if that is adequate evidence of a shortage of water. |
| 038 | Pagel | Not the factual basis, but the policy basis, for the rule-making. There is a very limited ability to overturn a rule once the adopting body has made a policy choice. A person can challenge the way the rule is applied to them in a separate process. |
| 043 | Rep. Josi | Asks for further discussion on the order of withdrawal. |
| | | The process laid out in statute for an order of withdrawal roughly describes giving public notice, holding a hearing, receiving testimony, and issuing the order withdrawing the area. The order that is issued applies to everybody in |

| 047 | Pagel | the area. Historically, it was done the same as how rule-making is done now. The use of the word "order" is misleading. Before the Administrative Procedures Act was enacted, the term "order" was not specifically designed. Because of this, "order" means something that is directed to a named individual. That would mean that because the statutes refer to this as an "order of withdrawal," rather than a "withdrawal determination," the department would have to give notice, by name, to all of the people affected in the basin. Each one would them be able to request a contested case hearing, or seek judicial review in the local circuit court. This would change the essence of the basin planning process. |
|---|-------------------|---|
| 075 | Gayle Killam | Representing Oregon Environmental Council, testifies in regard to SB 464. Concerned about the portion of the measure which prohibits the department from regulating the exempt ground uses in areas which have been designated, through the basin planning process, as ground water limited. Discusses particular situations in the Willamette basin. |
| 112 | Jeff Curtis | Representing Water Watch, testifies in regard to SB 464. |
| 120 | Chair Messerle | Closes public hearing on SB 464. |
| <u>SB 464</u> <u>WORK</u> <u>SESSION</u> 127 | Chair Messerle | Opens work session on SB 464. |
| 128 | Rep. KRUSE: | MOTION: Moves SB 464 be sent to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 4-1 AYE: 4 - Harper, Kruse, Welsh, Messerle NAY: 1 - Josi EXCUSED: 2 - Bowman, Corcoran |
| | Chair | The motion CARRIES. REP. KRUSE will lead discussion on the floor. |
| 135 | Chair Messerle | Closes work session on SB 464. |
| <u>SB 133</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> HEARING |] | |
| | | |

| | Chair | REP. HARPER will lead discussion on the floor. |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | EXCUSED: 2 - Bowman, Corcoran The motion CARRIES. |
| | | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. |
| | Kruse | VOTE: 5-0 |
| 247 | Rep. | MOTION: Moves SB 415 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. |
| 246 | Chair Messerle | Opens work session on SB 415. |
| <u>WORK</u> SESSION | | |
| SB 415 |] | |
| 244 | Chair Messerle | Closes public hearing on SB 415. |
| 236 | Martha Pagel | Submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 415. |
| 226 | Lee | Because the 190 organization does not cover some of the functions which irrigation districts do. Short of making these changes, if the districts group together and do a project, they are no longer protected by tort liability as a group, although they would be individually. |
| 224 | Rep. Harper | Asks why this can't be done currently. |
| 190 | Jan Lee | Executive Director, Oregon Water Resources Congress, submits and reviews testimony in support of SB 415. (EXHIBIT K) |
| 173 | Pat Zwick | Policy Analyst, summarizes SB 415. |
| 171 | Chair Messerle | Opens public hearing on SB 415. |
| <u>SB 415</u> PUBLIC HEARING | | |
| 168 | Chair Messerle | Closes public hearing on SB 133. |
| 147 | Steve Applegate | Testifies in regard to SB 133 and the concerns of municipalities in the lower Willamette Basin. Discusses proposed amendments. Will be meeting with WRD to discuss this amendment and to work out any problems which may arise. |
| | Messerle | |

| 1255 | Chair Messerle | Closes work session on SB 415. |
|------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | |
| 1/5/ | Chair Messerle | Adjourns meeting at 4:33 p.m. |

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Rebecca M. Scott, Pat Zwick,

Administrative Support Policy Analyst

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A SB 133, -2 Amendments dated 05/13/97, Staff, 4 pp.
- B SB 133, Written Testimony, Martha Pagel, 7 pp.
- C HB 3634, -4 Amendments dated 05/12/97, Martha Pagel, 2 pp.
- D SB 1157 A, -2 Amendments dated 05/12/97, Staff, 1 p.
- E SB 1157 A, Written Testimony, Pete Test, 1 p.
- F SB 1157 A, Written Testimony, Martha Pagel, 3 pp.
- G SB 1157 A, -3 Amendments dated 05/13/97, Martha Pagel, 1 p.
- H SB 1157 A, -4 Amendments dated 05/13/97, Martha Pagel, 1 p.
- I SB 464, Written Testimony, Jerry Schmidt, 6 pp.
- J SB 464, Written Testimony, Martha Pagel, 2 pp.
- K SB 415, Written Testimony, Jan Lee, 2 pp.
- L SB 415, Written Testimony, Martha Pagel, 2 pp.