CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON
HB 2260

June 2, 1995 Hearing Room HRB
8:00 AM Tapes 1- 1

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Rep. Chuck Carpenter, Chair
Sen. Joan Dukes
Sen. John Lim
Rep. Gail Shibley

MEMBER EXCUSED:
Sen. Paul Phillips

STAFF PRESENT:
Daniel Jarman, Administrator
Jodie Hall, Assistant

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 1, A

000 CHAIR CARPENTER OPENS MEETING AT 8:20 AM.

003 OPENS WORK SESSION ON HB 2260.

004 ARTHUR FISH, Enterprise Zone Coordinator, Oregon Economic Development Department: Briefly summarizes the Senate amendments dated May 23, 1995.

050 REP. SHIBLEY: Explains four choices she sees before the committee.
-Requests clarification on effects of making 50% or more below 80% median income or OEDD determining that there is a hardship for both urban and non-urban zones.

055 FISH: Responds to Rep. Shibley.
-Has drafted an amendment to address possible concerns.
080 -In response to Rep. Shibley: Yes, the amendment would clarify that HB 2260 applies to urban as well as non-urban.

094 REP. SHIBLEY: Comments that Section 5, Subsection 2 gives OEDD all the flexibility it needs.

100 FISH: Responds to Rep. Shibley.
118 -In response to Sen Dukes: Explains in more detail the effects of

Section 5.
133 -Responds further to Sen. Dukes: Yes, current zones can qualify for redesignation. Yet, will only allow for 10 zones altogether.

145 SEN. DUKES: Clarifies testimony she received in her office with that of Mr. Fish concerning requirements for non-urban enterprise zones.

150 FISH: Responds to Sen. Dukes, clarifies requirements for non-urban zones.
-Responds further to Sen. Dukes.

155 SEN. DUKES: Suggests removing Section 5, Subsection 1.

160 FISH: Responds to Sen. Dukes' suggestion.

178 REP. SHIBLEY: "What would be the effect of changing the Section 5, first half of that sentence? 'An area proposed as an enterprise zone, not distinguishing non-urban enterprise zones, proposed as an enterprise zone, must consist of a contiguos area in which (1) or (2)' "

186 FISH: Responds to Rep. Shibley's suggestion.

193 REP. SHIBLEY: Explains that if "we" want to clarify requirements for non-urban zones, what would be the practical effect of these changes?

214 FISH: Responds to Rep. Shibley.

230 REP. SHIBLEY: Comments further on Section 5, subsection 2 "or" allows OEDD much rulemaking authority. Concerned about making such immense policy changes.

245 FISH: Responds to Rep. Shibley. Explains some of the problems he sees with Section 5.
-Has drafted an amendment to address this concern.

260 REP. SHIBLEY: Clarifies what Mr. Fish means by undesirable.

275 CHAIR CARPENTER: Instead of moving this bill, would rather address concerns with possible amendments.

280 FISH: Suggests language he has drafted, which he believes addresses all the concerns brought up in the committee.

285 SHIBLEY: Is uncomfortable with "throwing out" income or unemployment.

290 CHAIR CARPENTER: Suggest Mr. Fish submit his amendments to staff and address the new amendments in another conference committee.

296 CHAIR CARPENTER ADJOURNS THE MEETING AT 8:45 AM.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

JODIE HALL DANIEL JARMAN
Committee Assistant Committee Administrator