

SENATE COMMITTEE ON  
WATER & LAND USE

Hearing Room  
Tapes - 93

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sen. Rod Johnson, Chair  
Sen. Bob Kintigh, Vice-Chair  
Sen. Neil Bryant  
Sen. Ron Cease  
Sen. Bill Dwyer

STAFF PRESENT:

Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel  
Patricia Wehrli, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD: SB 510 WORK SESSION

SB 600 WORK SESSION  
674 WORK SESSION  
1033 WORK SESSION  
1113 PUBLIC HEARING & POSSIBLE WORK SESSION  
1050 PUBLIC HEARING & POSSIBLE WORK SESSION  
1051 PUBLIC HEARING & POSSIBLE WORK SESSION

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 , SIDE A

004 CHAIR JOHNSON: Convenes the hearing. (1:12 p.m.)  
OPENS THE WORK SESSION ON SB 510

WITNESSES:

Kip Lombard, Oregon Water Resources Congress  
Ray Cox

028 KIP LOMBARD, OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS: Testifies in support of  
SB 510. (See EXHIBIT A)

070 CHAIR JOHNSON: Why is it necessary?

074 LOMBARD: The department would have to notify everyone otherwise.  
These types of entities are formally organized and have to go through  
certain procedures, people will find out from these processes and otherwise  
it would be redundant.

090 CHAIR JOHNSON: You wouldn't mind if there was a statement about the  
right of ways, for those who need it?

094 LOMBARD: Responds using a different example.  
--Explains the unnecessary expense of requiring the department to re notify  
people.

172 CHAIR JOHNSON: Questions the amendments on line 13. Asks for  
clarification.

180 LOMBARD: That is clarified in section 4.  
--Continues clarifying his amendments. (See Exhibit A)

216 SEN. KINTIGH: Is there a time limit on that permit?

220 LOMBARD: No

228 SEN. KINTIGH: Questions the delay of the permit.

239 LOMBARD: If he delays getting his right of way, the department has  
authority to demand that he produces it in a certain amount of time, if he  
delays then, then he's out of luck.  
--Refers to the bottom page three, testifies of proposed amendments.

324 SEN. DWYER: Ask for clarification of the "logical order."

330 LOMBARD: I think the logical domain comes from the land developer.  
Because a developer is not going to spend the money to develop a piece of  
property that he can't get water for.

TAPE 87, SIDE A

003 RAY COX: Testifies in opposition to SB 510.  
--Brings attention to the page 4 amendments. I do not feel that the  
changes addressed here will change my position.

114 CHAIR JOHNSON: Questions if Mr. Lombard would mind deleting "shall  
apply to any application pending"?

124 LOMBARD: If its canceled, then it reverts back and the district has to file a whole new application.

124 CHAIR JOHNSON: Why can't we be real clear by stating something like: "Any case currently being contested, shall not be effected by this bill".

152 CLOSES WORK SESSION ON SB 510  
OPENS THE WORK SESSION ON SB 674

WITNESSES:

Martha Pagel, Director, Water Resource Department  
Jan Boettcher, Oregon Water Resource Congress  
Kip Lombard, Oregon Water Resource Congress  
Jill Zarnowitz, Oregon Department of Fish and Wild Life  
Ted Hughes, Oregon Association of Nurserymen  
Richard Kosesan, Water for Life  
Karen Russell, Water Watch  
Scott Ashcom, Ted Hughes and Associates  
Jerry Schmidt, Oregon Board of Realtors  
Pete Test, Farm Bureau Association  
Todd Heidgerken, Ted Hughes and Associates

190 CHAIR JOHNSON: Asks for clarification of the SB 674-6 amendments.

210 MARTHA PAGEL, DIRECTOR, WATER RESOURCE DEPARTMENT: Explains the history of the 674 amendments.

222 JAN BOETTCHER, OREGON WATER RESOURCE CONGRESS : Testifies giving reference to the 674-6 amendments.

244 PAGEL: We have proposed conceptual amendments to the 674-6 version and they have now been drafted as the 674-17 and 674-18 amendments.

264 BOETTCHER: If there is not going to be a split fee provision, that those who have already filed the \$25.00 dollars under the current system, have some way to enter into the contested case process and pick up the balance fee. So if we switch from the \$200.00 fee to the split fee then we would have to make a change to a straight fee.

264 CHAIR JOHNSON: The 674-17 amendments only refer to the split fees?

268 PAGEL: Yes

270 CHAIR JOHNSON: Questions the language of the split fees.

272 PAGEL: I don't think any version refers to how we deal with the fees.

281 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains the intent of the 674-17 amendments.

278 BOETTCHER: Testifies in opposition to the SB 674-8 amendment. In reference to SB 674-9 testifies in support.

297 SEN. BRYANT: As water is put back into the stream then that water right changes?

303 PAGEL: That is correct.

306 BRYANT: What happens to that application if its denied? Does the main stream have priority over it?

312 PAGEL: Yes.

338 BOETTCHER: Gives reference of the 674-12 amendment. In between the first section and the second section of the language of the amendment it is inconsistent and should have the words "in the discretion of the court" removed.

358 CHAIR JOHNSON: Shouldn't we just put in "may"?

361 BOETTCHER: It would be more consistent, but it should be removed.

389 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains how with the word "mandamus" the word "may" wouldn't be appropriate, that the word "shall" should be used instead.

399 KIP LOMBARD, WATER RESOURCE CONGRESS: Explains the intent of the courts in reference to the language of the word "may" verses the term "shall" and advises consistency.

402 BOETTCHER: Opposes the language in the 674-12 amendment.

412 SEN. BRYANT: Do you have any objections to 674-14 amendments?

422 BOETTCHER: We oppose SB 674-14 amendments.

435 SEN. CEASE: Questions what she means by a lack of clarity on SB 674-14 amendments.

447 BOETTCHER: By retaining that language you are clearly defining the public interest, which is already defined in that particular statute. It further clarifies where it would confuse someone. It is not consistent.

014 LOMBARD: We are talking about granting water rights to individuals. We've always felt that even though it is already in the law, that it is very difficult to support standing alone with out looking towards the public interest.

038 PAGEL: If a person comes forward with an application and shows that there is a beneficial use, then we would grant the permit under the conditions of the current law.

050 SEN. CEASE: Do you think it would help to add some clarity?

052 PAGEL: No.

062 LOMBARD: In recent years we have renewed the interest of public determination in consideration that water rights application will be granted or not. Up to this point we have a fair amount of direction from the statutes. But we don't have any direction on how much weight to give to these issues. We need language to clarify the position of these applications.

079 SEN. DWYER: How much damage do we cause, because of public interest?

087 LOMBARD: I don't think we're damaging the public interest, what your saying to the public is that it has an insufficient effect.

093 SEN. DWYER: It would be in our interest to work with the public interest.

098 SEN. BRYANT: My intention was to clarify the issue. Some adjective is needed.

104 SEN. CEASE: Is there more discussion on this?

123 PAGEL: (In response to Sen. Bryant) The standard has never been applied to weigh the factors that are pointed out in the statutes. The concern is the term "measurably", it is much more difficult to measure these issues and this will inhibit the applicants, regardless of the amount of applications.

142 BRYANT: My concerns will be in the interpretation of the statute without any history and will be interpreted by the courts under there own intentions, rather then the intention of the legislation.

156 SEN. CEASE: Suggests giving the issues a chance to work.

169 BOETTCHER: Proposes more amendments.

183 PAGEL: We have no objections to that.

192 SEN. CEASE: What would the impact of that be?

193 BOETTCHER: There should be at least three qualified parties including the department.

194 SEN. CEASE: Can I get an idea of how many cases you hear?

201 PAGEL: Our concerns here are to hear cases of out side party members.

206 CHAIR JOHNSON: This amendment was designed to effect larger, more complex issues.

213 BOETTCHER: In reference to line 19, testifies of the amendment that she proposes.

223 SEN. DWYER: This is consistent with the other language on this issues.

239 BOETTCHER: Suggests "if available."

240 PAGEL: That is not our recommendation. We want that to be readily available.

246 SEN. BRYANT: That was our intent in the earlier draft of the bill.

251 BOETTCHER: Testifies over the proposed amendments.

340 JILL ZARNOWITZ, OREGON FISH AND WILD LIFE: Testifies on the proposed 674-20 amendments.

TAPE 89, SIDE A

029 SEN. DWYER: How can you request more water, then what is actually there?

023 ZARNOWITZ: When the model takes a look at the river that has a wide channel that is used for flood purposes in certain times of a year. The model then decides that in order to rear a group of fish you need "X" amount of water, which is more then what the river flows during its usual course of the year.

078 CHAIR JOHNSON: If we would provide an amendment that would state that In Stream Flow shall be the minimum quantity of water necessary to support the public, requested by an agency, would that take care of your concerns?

083 ZARNOWITZ: That's correct. It seems simpler to us though to keep it in statute.

090 CHAIR JOHNSON: What is the difference?

091 ZARNOWITZ: If its left open to be defined, then there is no difference.

199 TED HUGHES, OREGON ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN: Testifies in opposition to the SB 674-6 amendments and provides his own proposed amendments. (See Exhibit F)

121 CHAIR JOHNSON: Do both of those figures come from the technical report?

123 HUGHES: Yes. Continues testimony.

154 CHAIR JOHNSON: The minimum amount would be below that too. The department's application haven't been reasonable, so that's the reason for the SB 674-7 amendments.

167 PAGEL: I feel that it is a different issue. I think it's reasonable to state that a permit shouldn't be issued for what's more then the average flow and this amendment may be the answer to that question.

191 CHAIR JOHNSON: Every in stream application will take all the water that was thereafter you grant any in stream right on any stream, there will never be another out of stream user be able to use that right.

197 PAGEL: I'm not sure that would be the effect.

217 CHAIR JOHNSON: Doesn't the word necessary take care of that need?

219 PAGEL: In some instances Fish and Wild Life might request more then the minimum, if their goal is to recover a certain species.

223 CHAIR JOHNSON: If you think that it should be limited to the amount necessary, then it should be addressed specifically.

233 ZARNOWITZ: If the minimum is defined we don't have a problem with that language.

247 SEN. DWYER: What's the difference between the "minimum amount" and the "necessary amount?"

258 ZARNOWITZ: I do not see a difference as long as they are based on the same goals.

283 RICHARD KOESAN, WATER FOR LIFE: Proposes further amendments.

312 KAREN RUSSELL, WATER WATCH: Testifies in support for addressed amendments. (SEE EXHIBIT G)

356 SEN. BRYANT: There might be some confusion with the current language; I need to address some language that could address this issue.

375 RUSSELL: We like the language as it is.

Sen. Bryant is excused to fulfill his responsibilities for another committee.

TAPE 88 SIDE A

003 RUSSELL: Continues her testimony in support of the 674-14 amendments.

--Testifies supports the 674-17 amendments.

--It is our intent to not have the hearings officer involved with every case.

--We support the ability to allow the courts to take action. We strongly oppose any language that takes this power away from the courts.

111 SCOTT ASHCOM, TED HUGHES AND ASSOCIATES: Proposes Amendments to SB 674. (SEE EXHIBIT F)

160 SEN. CEASE: In reference to page 9. Why are you suggesting that this be changed back to the original?

178 ASHCOM: Draws attention to the proposed amendments. (See Exhibit F)  
-- No fee should be charged in protest. (See Exhibit F)

204 SEN. CEASE: If what the applicant is requesting will impact your own rights, don't you think \$500 is too steep?

ASHCOM: Most of them are form letters. This will call out only the illegitimate protest.

240 SEN. CEASE: What makes you think that it won't eliminate the real protests too?

243 ASHCOM: The value of an approved water right is enough to get together the fee.

252 SEN. CEASE: Questions in relationship between big operations and

normal people.

255 ASHCOM: Under circumstances of where its their lively hood, they will be able to afford the five hundred dollar.  
--proposes further amendments.  
--Compares SB 294 to SB 674 in reference to Sen. Dwyer's question asking for clarification.

328 JERRY SCHMIDT, OREGON BOARD OF REALTORS: Testifies on the proposed amendments.

TAPE 89, SIDE B

003 SCHMIDT: Continues testimony addressing the 674-20 amendments.

006 CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there a law out there that states that? (In reference to charging \$10 for a copy.)

012 SCHMIDT: The arbitrary amount of 10 dollars would be substantial, but they could charge that if they wanted too.  
--delete line 5of the 674-10 amendments.

056 CHAIR JOHNSON: Do you support the 674-9 amendments?

060 SCHMIDT: Yes, with some provisions.

064 PETE TEST , FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION: Until the advisory staff has a chance to review this bill, we cannot be in full support.  
--We would support amendments in regard to the filing fee.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Recesses the meeting at 3:50 p.m. Reconvenes at 4:00 p.m.

138 ZANORKOWITZ: Sub three is not clear. If it's wide open, then we don't have a problem with it.

147 TODD HEIDGERKEN, WATER FOR LIFE: Testifies about the methodology used by most government agencies.

154 RICHARD KOSACH: Testifies about the methodology needed to amend the SB 674-7 amendments.  
-- The Oregon method does not take in account the true amount of water flow.

188 SEN. DWYER: What does it look like, a standard methodology?

205 KOSACH: A principle looking at flows rather then looking at biological issues that are beneficial to fisheries.

209 CHAIR JOHNSON: Is this a standard that most states use?

213 ZARNOWITZ: Yes, the Oregon method is not out of date. It also is not intended to determine the public interest in the use of the streams. That is up to the Water Resource Department.

244 CHAIR JOHNSON: How does it happen then that a permit is issued for 4 times the amount of water that flows through the stream?

251 ZARNOWITZ: During the summer when the stream is flowing at its maximum, there is sometimes an over look of the natural flow, but this is always taken up by the department.

263 SEN. DWYER: Can the Oregon method be looked at as a standardized methodology?

270 ZARNOWITZ: It often is.

281 KOSACH: The Oregon method is based on biological means. It doesn't always bare in mind the actual resources available.

309 CHAIR JOHNSON: If the method isn't working, then we should clarify it in our language.

321 ZARNOWITZ: It should be clarified so that we will be protected from law suits.

334 PAGEL: The provisions in this amendment are addressed in a house bill and our position would be to keep the house bill.  
-- If it was only to accept standard methodology then we wouldn't oppose it.

360 KOSACH: It should be recognized that Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife chooses the standard methodology. With these amendments the in stream flow is defined.

TAPE 90 SIDE A

005 TODD HEIDGERKEN, WATER FOR LIFE: Testifies about the proposed issues.

013 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains the proposed amendments to the SB 674-7 amendments.

027 PAGEL: We just got the amendments and we have no idea what they're about.

043 RUSSELL: We do not support any of the SB 674-7 amendments.

049 KOSACH: Explains section 33.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the language between line 5 and 16 on page 3 of the SB 674-7 be deleted.

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that line 11 and twelve on page 1 be deleted.

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that SB 674-6 amendments be amended with the SB 674-10 amendments.

VOTE: Hearing no objections the motion carries.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves changing "may" in line 3 and 7 to "shall".

163 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains the intent of the court.

172 SEN. DWYER: I don't think the intent of line 7 is the same.

180 CHAIR JOHNSON: Take out "for the discretion of the court".

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves changing "may" to "shall" , and deleting out "for the discretion of the court " on line six of the SB 674-12 amendments.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended with the SB 674-12 amendments as amended.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

212 PAGEL: Explains the proposed amendments.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended by the SB 674-13 amendments.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion carries Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-17 amendments be amended as proposed.

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

336 PAGEL: We have had experiences with multiple parties and it's very difficult to get them all together. We still support this though.

361 SEN. KINTIGH: How many issues do you have?

366 PAGEL: Fewer then five. There are plenty of times though that there's an objection. Much more then five issues.

TAPE 91, SIDE B

004 CHAIR JOHNSON: Why wouldn't we want to add the same phrases on line 18 as on line 17 ?

007 PAGEL: We would.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-18 amendments on line 8, after the word "party" before the semi-colon put ", not including the department;"

VOTES: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended by the SB 674-18 amendments as amended.

VOTE: Hearing no objection motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

037 JERRY SCHMIDT: Proposes an amendment to the SB 674-19 amendments.

042 CHAIR JOHNSON: We okay the longitude language because of the word "OR".

047 SCHMIDT: Line 6 and line 9, you have taken action by another amendment. On line 23 the site should be 537.525.

058 PAGEL: We would take the position that there needs to be several provisions to protect the ground water.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-19 amendments be amended as proposed.

VOTE: Hearing no objection motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended by the SB 674-19 amendments as amended.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

200 PAGEL: Explains the reason for the SB 674-20 amendments.

228 SEN. DWYER: Explains his current amendments to the SB 674-20 amendments.

311 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains the proposed amendments.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-20 amendments be amended as proposed: Line 2 delete the phrase "delete line 30 and 31," Delete line 6 and 7 and 13 and 14.

VOTE: Hearing no objection motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended by the SB 674-20 amendments as amended.

VOTE: Hearing no objection motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

388 CHAIR JOHNSON: CLOSES THE WORK SESSION ON SB 694

TAPE 90, SIDE B:

013 CHAIR JOHNSON: OPENS THE WORK SESSION ON SB 600  
CLOSES THE WORK SESSION ON SB 600  
OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1113

Witnesses:  
Andy Andersen  
Gordon Clappison  
Jerry Purvis

060 ANDY ANDERSEN: Testifies in support of SB 1113. (SEE EXHIBIT H)

125 GORDON CLAPPISON: Testifies in support of SB 1113. (SEE EXHIBIT I)

177 JERRY PURVIS: Testifies in opposition to SB 1113. (SEE EXHIBIT J)

218 CHAIR JOHNSON: RECESSES PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1113  
OPENS WORK SESSION SB 674

MOTION: SEN. BRYANT moves that in the SB 674-15 amendments the word "substantially" be changed to the word "significantly".

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended by 674-15 amendments as amended. SB

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sen. Cease is excused.

379 PAGEL: Testifies in opposition to the proposed SB 674-7 amendments.

TAPE 92, SIDE A

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended with the SB 674-11 amendments.

VOTE: In a roll call vote the motion carries.: Sen. Bryant, Kintigh and Chair Johnson Vote AYE. Sen. Dwyer votes NAY. Sen. Cease is excused.

068 CHAIR JOHNSON: Discusses the SB 674-9 amendments.

070 PAGEL: I've been advised that it's been taken out.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-9 be amended as proposed.

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sens. Cease and Dwyer are excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves that the SB 674-6 amendments be amended with the SB 674-9 amendments.

VOTE: CHAIR JOHNSON: Hearing no objection the motion is ADOPTED. Sens.

Cease and Dwyer are excused.

084 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains the next issues.

MOTION: SEN. KINTIGH: Moves that SB 674 be amended with the SB 674-6 amendments as amended.

VOTE: In a roll call vote the motion carries: All members present vote AYE. Sens. Cease and Dwyer are excused.

MOTION: SEN. BRYANT moves that SB 674 as amended be further amended with the SB 674-7 amendments line 19 and 20.

VOTE: Hearing no objection the motion carries. Sen. Cease and Dwyer are excused.

MOTION: CHAIR JOHNSON moves to send SB 674, AS AMENDED to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation. (Subject to President's Smith's approval.)

VOTE: In a roll call vote the motion carries. Aall members present vote AYE. Sens. Cease and Dwyer are EXCUSED. CARRIER: JOHNSON

CHAIR JOHNSON: CLOSES THE WORK SESSION ON SB 674  
OPENS WORK SESSION SB 510

156 CHAIR JOHNSON: Discusses the proposed amendments to SB 510.

MOTION: SEN. BRYANT moves that SB 510-1 be amended as proposed.

VOTE: CHAIR JOHNSON: Hearing no objection, motion carries.  
Sens. Cease and Dwyer are excused.

MOTION: SEN. BRYANT moves that SB 510 as amended, be sent to the Floor with

a DO PASS recommendation.

VOTE: In a roll call vote the motion carries. All members presence vote  
AYE. Sen. Cease and Sen. Dwyer are excused. CARRIER: JOHNSON

170 CHAIR JOHNSON: CLOSSES THE WORK SESSION ON SB 510  
OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1113

176 JERRY PURVIS: Continues testimony in opposition to SB 1113.

356 ERNIE KURNZ: Testifies in opposition to SB 1113. (SEE EXHIBIT K.)

TAPE 93, SIDE A

110 CHAIR JOHNSON: Have you ever had a sky diver on your property?

114 KURNZ: Not on my property, but I have seen it.

129 CHAIR JOHNSON: When did you buy your property?

136 KURNZ: In 1989.

155 JERRY JUSTICE: Testifies in opposition to SB 1113. (SEE EXHIBIT  
N.)

231 CHAIR JOHNSON: Explains his position on the issues of airports.

273 JUSTICE: I don't think that we are at issue on your basic concept.  
We have collectively said in an effective State wide policy, that these are

to be maintain. I hope we can look towards maintaining a viable  
aeronautical system.

318 KURNZ: Points out the ambiguity of the term "airports."

331 BOB RINDE, DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT:  
Testifies in opposition to the present writing of SB 1113 and has suggested  
amendments.

TAPE 92 SIDE B

010 RINDE: Continues testimony and proposed amendments.

450 CHAIR JOHNSON: CLOSSES THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1113

Chair Johnson adjourns the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Patricia Wehrli Karen Quigley  
Committee Assistant Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

A - Testimony on SB 510--Kip Lombard--11 pages  
B- Testimony on SB 674--Martha Pagel, Water Resource Department--3 pages  
C- Testimony on SB 674--Jan Boettcher, Water Resources Congress--3 pages  
D- Testimony on SB 674--Martha Pagel, Water Resource Department--1 page  
E- Testimony on SB 674--J. Zarnowitz, Department of Forestry--4 pages  
F- Testimony on SB 674--Scott Ashcom, Ted Hughes and Associates--4 pages  
G- Testimony on SB 674--Richard Koesan, Water Watch--6 pages  
HA- Staff Measure Summary, SB 1113--Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel--1 page  
H- Testimony on SB 1113--Andy Andersen--2 pages  
I- Testimony on SB 1113--Gordon Clappison--1 page  
J- Testimony on SB 1113--Jerry Purvis--18 pages  
K- Testimony on SB 1113--Earnie Krunk--31 pages  
L- Testimony on SB 1113--Keith Bartholomew, 1000 Friends of Oregon--4 pages  
N- Testimony on SB 1113 Jerry Justice, Clackamas County Office of  
Governmental Affairs-- 3 pages  
P- Proposed Amendments to SB 674--Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel--25 pages  
Q- Proposed Amendments to SB 674--Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel--25 pages  
R- Proposed Amendments to SB 510--Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel--2 pages  
S- Proposed Amendments to SB 600--Karen Quigley, Committee Counsel--9 pages