

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND REGULATORY REFORM  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Hearing Room  
Tapes - 21

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Cedric Hayden, Chair  
Rep. Lonnie Roberts, Vice-Chair  
Rep. Jerry Grisham  
Rep. Mike Lehman  
Rep. Bill Markham  
Rep. Ken Strobeck

STAFF PRESENT:

Anne Tweedt, Committee Counsel  
Annetta Mullins, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

HB 2486 - PUBLIC HEARING  
HB 2722 - PUBLIC HEARING  
HB 2874 - PUBLIC HEARING  
HB 2134 - PUBLIC HEARING  
HB 2869 - PUBLIC HEARING

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize  
statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks

report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings,  
please refer to the tapes.

TAPE , A

NOTE: THIS MEETING IS CONVENED IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING A JOINT MEETING OF  
THIS SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION.

008 CHAIR HAYDEN: Calls the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m and opens the  
public hearing on HB 2486.

HB 2486 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses:

Captain Ted Nutting, United States Coast Guard  
Rep. Peter Courtney  
Keith McGuire, National Transportation Safety Board  
Paul Donheffner, Oregon State Marine Board  
Gordon B. Clappison, Oregon Aviation Alliance  
Bill Zurcher, Oregon Experimental Aircraft Association and Columbia

Aviation Association

Dave Wiley, Columbia Seaplane Pilots Association  
Evan Boone, Oregon Pilots Association  
Daniel L. Miller, himself  
Steve Albert, Federal Aviation Administration  
Jacque Greenleaf, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
David Hill, himself and the Marine Board

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, proposed draft of amended HB 2886  
from Aviation Alliance and the HB 2486-1 amendments are hereby made a part  
of these minutes (EXHIBIT A).

001 CAPTAIN TED NUTTING, United States Coast Guard: Submits a prepared  
statement (EXHIBIT AA) and testifies in support of regulation of seaplanes.  
> bill would change the definition of boat to include seaplanes  
> the international regulations for the prevention of collisions at sea and

the inland navigation rules, both in Title 33 of the U. S. Code, define a  
vessel as "every description of watercraft, including non-displacement and  
seaplanes used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on the

water"

> in other Coast Guard regulations, the word "vessel" while not explicitly  
including seaplanes in its definition, appears to encompass that. "Vessel"

is defined as "every description of watercraft or other contrivance used or

capable of being used as a means of transportation on the water".

> when the Federal Boat Safety Act was passed in 1971, seaplanes were  
specifically excluded from the definition of "vessel"; about 10 years  
later the definition was changed.

> similar state legislation or rules regulating the operation of seaplanes  
on the water would compliment federal law on waters of concurrent  
jurisdiction and would place, in effect, parallel standards on sole state  
waters

027 REP. PETER COURTNEY: Submits a prepared statement, copies of newsclippings, and correspondence from the National Transportation Safety Board (EXHIBIT B) and testifies in support of HB 2486.  
> some perceived that seaplanes were coming too close to certain watercraft

and floating craft on the Willamette River

> was told by the FAA that when planes are on the water, they have no jurisdiction over them

> accident on the Willamette River was such that we should look at the situation to see if there would be some additional things we should do

> the work group met with the idea of coming up with something everyone could live with; one sticking point was when a seaplane is on the water, is

it a vessel or not

> doesn't believe the Seaplane Pilots Association is supporting (the definition)

> will let the State Marine Board talk about the other two parts of the bill which, I think, there is agreement on

> in testimony is copy of Corp of Army Engineers brochure that goes out

> Corps has restriction on seaplanes; under rules, Corps says the seaplane

is a boat when it is on the water

> hopes everyone from the original group can get together and reach closure

on the issue

> there is a need to come up with a bill that allows the Aeronautics Division to develop rules that affect seaplanes by working with the Marine Board

105 KEITH MCGUIRE, National Transportation Safety Board: Reviews the findings in the investigation of the July 31, 1994 seaplane accident on the Willamette River, and the NTSB 'S recommendations based on the investigation (EXHIBIT C).

158 MR. MCGUIRE, at the request of the Chair to shorten the length of his testimony, reads the last two paragraphs of his statement (EXHIBIT C).

176 PAUL DONHEFFNER, Marine Board: Submits and reads a prepared statement (EXHIBIT D) in support of HB 2486.

216 MR. DONHEFFNER: Continues his statement.

279 REP. MARKHAM: You want to control the waterways so you can reduce speeds so the float plane can't land there. Is that right?

MR. DONHEFFNER: We believe there is a problem right now where there are speed zones. A seaplane can travel through that zone and not be covered by

the existing on-water rules.

294 REP. MARKHAM: What would be wrong with asking the Aeronautics Division to put the restricted areas on the map and see if the FAA will put it on the sectional and regional maps? If they would land, they would be afoul of the law. Why would we need this if we can get the places posted that should have reduced speeds?

303 MR. DONHEFFNER: If the Aeronautics Division or the FAA were to adopt a local operating rule either by reference or put them on the charts, and if it would be enforceable, I think that would go a long ways towards solving the problem we are trying to address in the bill. They are excluded from the definition in the statute and I am not sure anything we would do in our

rules would reconnect that absent the definition of boat or vessel. If there is a way of doing that we would be glad to look at it.

326 REP. LEHMAN: How close were you to getting agreement?

REP. COURTNEY: Explains that the group, he thought, had said they would accept that (seaplanes) were vessels but that they needed to work out the

details with the head of the Marine Board. Things got messed up because Legislative Counsel drafted a bill that did not reflect the intent of the parties and trust was lost.

362 REP. LEHMAN: I wonder if there is some advantage to getting the parties back together. I would think the sea plane pilots would be anxious to get this behind them.

386 REP. COURTNEY: Agrees with Rep. Lehman that the best solution would be to get the parties back together to work out an agreement.

447 REP. STROBECK: When you are talking about drafting rules, are you talking about something like the Corps of Engineers brochure that would be very general or are you talking about referencing specific waterways? What is your intent?

456 MR. DONHEFFNER: The bill provides the Marine Board will review all its

existing administrative rules to see if they apply to seaplanes.

TAPE 20, A

039 CHAIR HAYDEN: Why would not the Aeronautics Division have the jurisdiction instead of the Marine Board?

MR. DONHEFFNER: One section of the bill does extend to the Aeronautics Division the authority to regulate seaplanes for takeoffs and landings. As we understand it, right now they do not have that specific authority to say that a seaplane cannot land or take off in a particular zone.

051 CHAIR HAYDEN: Clearly we need some regulation. The question is who should regulate that and why wouldn't it be the Aeronautics Division on the state level and the FAA on the federal level.

055 MR. DONHEFFNER: When they are on the navigable water, federal law treats them as vessels regulated by the U. S. Coast Guard. Right now in Oregon there is a regulatory gray area or a void where they are clearly airplanes in the air, but when they are on the water there is no authority to control them for speed zones, landings and takeoffs, with the exception of the Corps of Engineer lakes where they have used their own authority to do that.

066 REP. STROBECK: You told me earlier that the states surrounding Oregon have regulations defining seaplanes as vessels when they are on the water.

Is that correct?

068 MR. DONHEFFNER: The State of Idaho includes seaplanes in their definition of vessel. I am not sure about Washington and California. The NTSB report was a call to all the states to look at this.

076 REP. GRISHAM: I would join with Rep. Lehman in a request that Rep. Courtney lead a short work group to try to put this solution together. Perhaps at the chair's direction, they might be able to put it back together so the committee can pass something that satisfies both sides and protect the citizens of the state.

105 GORDON B. CLAPPISON, Oregon Aviation Alliance: Submits and reads a prepared statement in opposition to HB 2486 (EXHIBIT E).

BILL ZURCHER, Oregon Experimental Aircraft Association and Columbia Aviation Association; Submits and paraphrases portions of a prepared statement in opposition to HB 2486 (EXHIBIT F).

196 DAVE WILEY, Columbia Seaplane Pilots Association: Submits and reads a prepared statement in opposition to HB 2486 (EXHIBIT H).

237 MR. WILEY: Continues his prepared statement.

276 MR. WILEY: Continues his prepared statement

311 REP. STROBECK: How many members do you have?

MR. WILEY: There are probably about 80 seaplane pilots.

321 CHAIR HAYDEN: Announces there will be no work session on any bill today.

351 EVAN BOONE, President, Oregon Pilots Association:  
> Association has 1,000 members  
> legislation came out of one accident and that brings up the question of whether legislation is really appropriate  
> the pilot has had license action taken, criminal charges are pending and there are civil laws also  
> would like to work out a compromise  
> supports bill being tabled until the group meets

380 DANIEL E. MILLER, father of one of the Willamette River accident victims: Testifies in support of HB 2486.  
> no state or local law enforcement agency has accepted responsibility for public safety in this situation  
> rivers and lakes are going to become more congested  
> at FAA hearing in Portland an expert witness testified that the pilot of the float plane involved in the accident had a blind visibility spot at a 20 degree angle and for approximately 464 feet directly in front of the aircraft; at a speed of 35 to 40 miles per hour, it is less than eight seconds for the plane to travel that far and nobody can get out of the way in a matter of eight seconds  
> no other watercraft has a restricted visibility of 500 feet in front of the craft; that is intolerable in congested areas  
> urges support of this or a similar bill

TAPE 19, B

027 STEVE ALBERT, Federal Aviation Administration: Explains because of federal regulation he had to check the sign-up sheet as being opposed to HB

2486. He submits copies of correspondence to Legislative Counsel and memo from Federal Aviation Administration Assistant Chief Counsel (EXHIBIT H) and reads the citation of the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of Northwest

Airlines v. Minnesota on page 1 of the correspondence to Legislative Counsel.

> it is the FAA's position that the FAA has preemptive authority in matters

dealing with aviation

> reads memo from Assistant Chief Counsel.

070 REP. STROBECK: I don't think anybody questions that the FAA has the right to regulate airplanes once they are in the air, but when they are on the water functioning as a watercraft, what is the FAA's objection to allowing state regulations?

MR. ALBERT: I am the messenger on this. I have limited authority on the questions I can and cannot answer. If the answer is not sufficient, I will

recommend Committee Counsel address a letter to our Assistant Chief Counsel

in Seattle to get a more definitive position. The FAA regulates aircraft from the time they start their engines for the purpose of take off to the time they come to rest after that. In addition, F.A.R. 91, 13B, which governs careless and reckless operation specifically governs operations of aircraft when they are not flying for purposes of air navigation. So we do

regulate aircraft even in the event where they are not operating for the purpose of air navigation.

085 REP. STROBECK: Does that section include rules of the road when they are on the water?

086 MR. ALBERT: 91 115 does. It is the regulation that specifically speaks

to seaplane operations and it specifically speaks to rules of the road when

they are on the water. Something that has not been touched on is the requirements for certification of pilots. F.A.R. Part 61 specifically delineates seaplane operators as being a separate class of certification and there is an entire training curriculum and certification process that a seaplane pilot must go through for certification as a pilot.

092 REP. STROBECK: Once on the water, does it say seaplanes are to abide by the speed limits and other restrictions that any other water vessel would have to abide by?

MR. ALBERT: They don't give specific speed restrictions, but they do direct the seaplane pilot to abide by the rules of the road for water operations. They would have to give way to non-powered vessels--that sort of direction.

106 REP. STROBECK: Why shouldn't seaplanes have some sort of regulation when they are on the water functioning in the water environment.

109 MR. EVAN BOONE: I don't disagree that they should. I think the FAA regulations require that. One of the reasons we are here opposing the bill

is because the bill does not define what "on the water is" and "when it is in flight". At what point do we move it from a vessel to an aircraft? We

submitted comments that addressed that issue and they have not been incorporated into the bill.

115 REP. STROBECK: What is your definition of "when it is in flight"?

MR. BOONE: I don't think the Marine Board regulation should control when a plane is accelerating for take off or when it is decelerating after it has landed until it comes out of its roll.

135 JACQUE GREENLEAF, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department: Submits and reads a prepared statement in support of HB 2486 (EXHIBIT I).

168 DAVID HILL, representing himself and the Marine Board: Submits and summarizes a prepared statement in support of HB 2486 (EXHIBIT J).

227 CHAIR HAYDEN: Closes the public hearing on HB 2486 and opens the public hearing on HB 2722.

HB 2722 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Doug Hopper, himself  
Captain Ted Nutting, U. S. Coast Guard  
Sgt. McMullin, Lane County Sheriff's Office  
Sgt. John Emmons, Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
Rep. Bob Repine  
Jill Broggi, Oregon Federation of Boaters  
Paul Donheffner, Oregon State Marine Board

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT K).

235 DOUG HOPPER, representing himself: Submits and reads a prepared statement in support of HB 2722 (EXHIBIT L).

270 MR. HOPPER: Continues his statement.

303 CAPTAIN TED NUTTING, U. S. Coast Guard: Submits a prepared statement (EXHIBIT BB). The introductory language in the federal Boat Safety Act contains the words "to encourage greater state participation and uniformity

in boating safety efforts and particularly to permit the states to assume the greatest share of boating safety education assistance and enforcement activities, the secretary shall carry out a national recreational boating safety program."

> would like to emphasize the word "uniformity"

> there is no federal regulation concerning observers or mirrors for water skiing. However, Oregon, Washington, California, Idaho, Montana and Nevada

require a second person to be in the boat to act as the observer

> there is value to having similarities in such matters among the states because it makes things easier for people traveling from state to state

321 SGT. MCMULLIN, Lane County Sheriff's Office, representing himself, the Lane County Sheriff's office and the Marine Board: We have a tremendous

influx of people using our waterways, particularly in Eugene and the Fern Ridge area. We had an accident where there was no observer and alcohol was involved. We hear "we want to be out here by ourselves", but we don't think a person can pull a skier and keep a good outlook ahead for other boaters

350 SGT. JOHN EMMONS, Clackamas County Sheriff's Office: We have observed an increase in the safety factor since the inception of the observer law. On Sunday morning at 10:00 a.m. from the Sellwood Bridge to the Willamette Falls there were 406 boats fishing and as the weather improved water skiers, personal watercraft and other boaters were added. There is no way a boat operator pulling a water skier with a mirror could safely run the gauntlet. Having observers has enhanced the safety tremendously.

359 REP. STROBECK: What if this were amended to say it would be okay unless it is posted that the section of the river requires a spotter?

SGT. EMMONS: I don't think there is any part of the river where it wouldn't be a very good requirement to have the observer.

400 REP. BOB REPINE: I introduced HB 2722. I bring this issue because of some issues last session that deleted the language that I am attempting to add back in. A constituent suggests that the purpose of a spotter could be

effective and in some cases could be ineffective. Having a spotter does not guarantee the skier will be protected in all regards. There are senior

citizens who are young and enjoy outdoor sports. It makes it difficult to have to have a tag along. One of the witnesses spoke in opposition suggests that other states require a spotter for safety. I would remind the witness there are 45 other states and uniformity may exist on the other

side--maybe mirrors are the practical solution.

TAPE 20, B

REP. REPINE: Continues:

> it appears the Marine Board will speak in opposition to this, too

> suggests the Marine Board report information on how many and the types of

accidents there have been in the United States, comparing those states that require a spotter and those that do not

055 JILL BROGGI, Oregon Federation of Boaters: Submits a prepared statement and letter from the Oregon Federation of Boaters and reads her statement in opposition to HB 2722 (EXHIBIT M).

088 PAUL DONHEFFNER, Director, Oregon State Marine Board: Submits a prepared statement, data on states requiring spotters, and letters from the American Water Ski Association and the Oregon Water Safety Council (EXHIBIT N). He summarizes his prepared statement.

136 REP. STROBECK: What is the statutory citation for the operator of a tow boat to maintain a lookout?

136 MR. DONHEFFNER: I will send it to your office.

A letter and constituent comments in support of HB 2722 from Rep. Larry Wells is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT O).

A letter received via FAX from John and Virginia Feck in support of HB 2722

is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT P).

142 CHAIR HAYDEN: Closes public hearing on HB 2722 and opens public hearing on HB 2874.

HB 2874 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Judge Laura Pryor, Gilliam County  
Mike McHaney, Gilliam County  
Bill Penhallow, Association of Oregon Counties  
Joan Plank, Oregon Department of Transportation

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT Q)

155 LAURA PRYOR, JUDGE, GILLIAM COUNTY: Submits a chart on requested funding, a prepared statement, data on funding for counties, court documents on road vacations in Gilliam County, and letters of support from Rep. Chuck Norris and Rep. Ray Baum (EXHIBIT R).  
> explains chart (EXHIBIT Q, page 1) and summarizes prepared statement

194 MIKE MCHANEY, Road Master, Gilliam County: Calls members attention to the listing of funding for road miles and notes that Gilliam County is at the bottom of the list (EXHIBIT R, page 3).

220 BILL PENHOLLOW, Association of Oregon Counties: AOC supports the bill.

228 JOAN PLANK, Oregon Department of Transportation: Supports HB 2874 with the -1 amendments (EXHIBIT S).

248 MS. TWEEDT: The amendment looks like it has been changed. What did the HB 2874-1 amendments say originally?

248 JUDGE PRIOR: It read \$500,000. I asked DOT to give us the same amount of money that the cities received on their share. We talked about that in light of the demands on DOT, after consideration they felt they could help with the \$250,000.

271 CHAIR HAYDEN: Closes the public hearing on HB 2874 and asks Committee Counsel to schedule it for a work session, and opens the public hearing on HB 2134.

HB 2134 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Bob Russell, Public Utility Commission  
John Merriss, Department of Transportation  
Mike Meredith, Oregon Trucking Association and Oregon Truck Caucus  
Joe French, Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, HB 2134-1 amendments and charts on taxes collected under various methods of taxation for vehicles are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT T).

307 BOB RUSSELL, Public Utility Commission: Submits and summarizes a prepared statement in support of HB 2134 (EXHIBIT U).

340 JOHN MERRISS, Department of Transportation: Submits and summarizes a prepared statement in support of HB 2134 with the -1 amendments (EXHIBIT V).

378 MIKE MEREDITH, Oregon Trucking Association, and Oregon Truck Caucus: There are good parts and bad parts of the bill. The benefits outlined are doubtful. We don't believe it will make things more simple for those who have to pay the tax. We don't believe it will encourage carriers to add axles. Overall we think it is a pretty good bill because it has cost responsibility but we don't like going down to 26,000 pounds.

419 JOE FRENCH, Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association: Testifies in support of HB 2134.

444 REP. STROBECK: My question was whether or not it will encourage adding axles on older fleets.

453 MR. MEREDITH: I am not sure it would even have an effect on buying new vehicles. The theory makes a lot of sense, but it falls short on practicality.

465 CHAIR HAYDEN: Requests that Committee Counsel schedule HB 2134 for a work session and closes the public hearing.

TAPE 21, A

026 CHAIR HAYDEN: Opens the public hearing on HB 2869.

HB 2869 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Gary McKenney, City of Springfield  
Robert Layton, Professor, Oregon State University  
Keith Bartholomew, 1,000 Friends of Oregon  
John Replinger, David Evans and Associates  
Joan Plank, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Del Huntington, Oregon Department of Transportation

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT W).

037 GARY MCKENNEY, Traffic Engineer, City of Springfield: Testifies in opposition to HB 2869.  
> has worked 18 years in access control in traffic engineering and five years in the private sector as a consulting engineer  
> City of Springfield relies on ODOT to manage the state highway through communities; they use access management  
> to maintain access management, current policies need to remain and could be enhanced

064 ROBERT LAYTON, Professor, Oregon State University: Submits and summarizes a prepared statement (EXHIBIT X) and testifies in opposition to HB 2869.

106 KEITH BARTHOLOMEW, 1,000 Friends of Oregon: Speaks in favor of HB 2869.  
> cites Highway 97 in Bend as example  
> the cost to correct Highway 97 of \$100 million is the result of failure to control access  
> rather than limit the ability to control access, we should be moving in the other direction by doing a better job

109 JOHN REPLINGER, David Evans and Associates: Speaks in opposition to HB 2869.  
> present system is something we need to be refining and enhancing to protect mobility and integrity of the highway system  
> whether or not the use changes, this bill would allow continued use of a driveway  
> a family farm with one house on it could change to a regional shopping center with 30,000 cars a day coming in and out and would require a couple of traffic signals  
> to allow a developer to select the locations without any input from the state is a disastrous

136 JOAN PLANK, Oregon Department of Transportation: Testifies in opposition to HB 2869.  
> we need to balance access  
> recognize there are issues on both sides  
> Del Huntington's testimony (EXHIBIT Y) contains some proposals for what the department believes they can do to address some of the issue around access management  
> department proposes to go forward with the items outlined in Mr. Huntington's statement

149 DEL HUNTINGTON, Oregon Department of Transportation: Submits and summarizes a prepared statement in opposition to HB 2869 (EXHIBIT Y).

182 REP. GRISHAM: As a person who has owned several pieces of property that have been denied access by expansion of state highway facilities as the area developed, I see this as a taking. As we move toward more responsible access to highways we are denying the people who have owned the land for decades or years the right to do something with that property. How do you reimburse the landowner for that? There may be more to this bill than highway design. I would be interested in knowing if that is true.

200 MR. REPLINGER: There may be 10 trips per day from an individual house. Alternative access to another road, a collector street or some other method is quite acceptable. It might be acceptable to have one single driveway to an arterial street; however, if there is a fast food restaurant, which generates over 1,500 trips per day with over 150 in the peak hour, it can have very serious consequences for the adjacent traffic signals.

219 REP. GRISHAM: Would you agree that enabling access through a particular location could add hundreds of thousands of dollars to the property?

224 MR. REPLINGER: You need access to it, clearly. But for the owner of a farm or an orchard which has no traffic impact and no need for access, does not strike me as a taking if the owner is not able to develop to the ultimate dream.

236 MR. HUNTINGTON: In Oregon, everyone has the right to a safe and reasonable access unless the rights of access has been purchased from the property owner, which would be the case along the interstate. As we go into the next decade and see a movement of 750,000 people into this valley,

we are going to see an incredible increase of ADT on the transportation network. We are going to have to manage the system very wisely. We are not in a position where we are going to take access from people. There is an attorney general opinion from 1992 that describes alternate and reasonable access and will forward copies of that.

260 REP. GRISHAM: I suspect 20 years from now, in the name of good management, we will have continued taking property rights away from individuals. I would like to see us start addressing compensation.

A letter received from Goran Sparrman, Director, Bureau of Traffic Management, City of Portland, in opposition to HB 2869 is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT Z).

272 CHAIR HAYDEN: Closes the public hearing on HB 2869 and declares the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Submitted by,      Reviewed by,

Annetta Mullins Anne Tweedt  
Committee Assistant      Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

A - HB 2486, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, proposed draft of amended HB 2886 from Aviation Alliance and the HB 2486-1 amendments, staff, 6 pp  
B - HB 2486, prepared statement, copies of newspaper clippings, and correspondence from the National Transportation Safety Board, Rep. Peter Courtney, 11 pp  
C - HB 2486, prepared statement, Keith McGuire, 6 pp  
D - HB 2486, prepared statement, Paul Donheffner, 14 pp  
E - HB 2486, prepared statement, Gordon Clappison, 1 p  
F - HB 2486, prepared statement, Bill Zurcher, 6 pp  
G - HB 2486, prepared statement, Dave Wiley, 15 pp  
H - HB 2486, prepared statement, Steve Albert, 3 pp  
I - HB 2486, prepared statement, Jacque Greenleaf, 1 p  
J - HB 2486, prepared statement, David Hill, 1 p  
K - HB 2722, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff, 1 p  
L - HB 2722, prepared statement, Doug Hopper, 1 p  
M - HB 2722, prepared statement, Jill Broggi, 2 pp  
N - HB 2722, prepared statement, Paul Donheffner, 7 pp  
O - HB 2722, prepared statement and constituent responses, Rep. Larry Wells, 9 pp  
P - HB 2722, prepared statement, John and Virginia Feck, 1 p  
Q - HB 2874, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff, 1 p  
R - HB 2874, chart, prepared statement and court documents, Judge Laura Pryor, 16 pp  
S - HB 2874, HB 2874-1 proposed amendments, Joan Plank, 1 p  
T - HB 2134, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, HB 2134-1 amendments and charts on taxes collected under various methods of taxation for vehicles, staff, 20 pp  
U - HB 2134, prepared statement, Bob Russell, 2 pp  
V - HB 2134, prepared statement, John Merriss, 3 pp  
W - HB 2869, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff, 1 p  
X - HB 2868, prepared statement, Robert Layton, 2 pp  
Y - HB 2869, prepared statement, Del Huntington, 5 pp  
Z - HB 2868, letter, Goran Sparrman, 1 p  
AA - HB 2486, prepared statement, Ted Nutting, 1 p  
BB - HB 2722, prepared statement, Ted Nutting, 1 p  
AA -