

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

July 19, 1993 Hearing Room 357 10:00 a.m. Tapes 84 - 87

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Cedric Hayden, Chair Rep. Carl Hosticka Rep. Patti Milne Rep. Chuck Norris Rep. Lonnie Roberts Rep. Sharon Wylie

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Rep. Ken Baker Rep. Jim Edmunson, Vice-Chair Rep. Del Parks

STAFF PRESENT: Janet Adkins, Committee Administrator Julie Dow, Committee Researcher Priscilla Boyle, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: SB 7 SB 797 SJR4 SB 1071 SB 420 SB 784
SJM12 SB 1105 SB 323 SB 486

[--- Unable To Translate Graphic ---]

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. [--- Unable To Translate Graphic ---]

TAPE 84, SIDE A

007 CHAIR HAYDEN: Calls meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

WORK SESSION ON SB 7 WITNESSES: Jane Ard, Special Assistant, Division of State Lands

008 JULIE DOW, COMMITTEE RESEARCHER: Reviews SB 7 > This bill is at the request of Division of State Lands > Bill excludes archeological objects from definition of Treasure Trove > A joint jurisdiction between the archeological permit and Treasure

Trove permit for some items > Enters memo from James Hamrick into the record (EXHIBIT A) > Treasure Trove permit allows for a finders fee up to \$5,000 and up to half of the value over \$5,000, after determination the true owner can not be found and the item is not of sufficient historical value to

warrant placement in a museum

035 REP. NORRIS: Does this fit comfortably with SB 61?

038 JULIE DOW: Its basically companion Legislation to that bill.

040 REP. NORRIS: If somebody finds a treasure on a sunken ship and there is a chest of goods, does somebody decide these are really historic value, archeological or are they going to be able to make money? Have we aired that issue or has anybody done it?

044 JULIE DOW: Passage of this bill would clarify that the ship wreck would be archeological in nature and the finders fee in the Treasure Trove

permit would not be applicable. The ship wreck would become the stewardship of the State of Oregon.

048 REP. NORRIS: If someone recovered something of substantial monetary value at their own expense, they would not be able to make claim to it?

051 JULIE DOW: Jane Ard from Division of State Lands is here to answer any questions. (To Ard) Can you answer that?

055 JANE ARD, SPECIAL ASSISTANT, DIVISION OF STATE LANDS: The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) maintains a database with a list of known or suspected ship wrecks off the coast of Oregon and some of those are of significant archeological value. If it wasn't on that list it

would be subject to a Treasure Trove permit and would be recoverable under Treasure Trove rather than as an archeological resource.

063 CHAIR HAYDEN: I would presume that the State would be reasonable if a vessel sunk with quite a valuable cargo within the last 30 or 40 years

that they would allow recovery of that as Treasure Trove rather than designating it as an archeological object.

067 ARD: If it was within the last 30 or 40 years, yes it wouldn't be an archeological object, its a 50 year limit.

070 REP. ROBERTS: That bothers me because you can put anything on that list that is over 50 years old. Why should anybody take a chance in

investment if they can't keep it?

076 ARD: Under current law a person would have to get two permits from the State in order to go out and look for a ship wreck that might be an

archeological object. What we're seeking here is a clarification so that if something doesn't fit in the archeological permit, you know ahead of time that if you get a Treasure Trove permit to look for something that is not of historical value then you would be able to keep a finders fee and 50% of the value.

085 REP. ROBERTS: What happens if you're looking for one thing and find another? 086 ARD: I'm not sure what the answer is, I think it will depend on if it is an archeological object, it's not a Treasure Trove permit under the

proposed bill therefore you would have to get an archeological permit.

089 REP. ROBERTS: I was here and on the committee when we

changed the Treasure Trove several years ago from 25% to 50% because nobody was

going out there because of expense. Now we're going to throw a roadblock in and end up telling people we're going to make it so tough nobody is going to go.

097 REP. MILNE: You commented on whether something is significant and then there is this list of places. Is significant the same as what's on the

list or is there some other criteria along with the list that determines significance?

101 ARD: No, there is no other criteria other than the significance that is defined in SB 61. The division has nor does SHPO have any other

criteria it uses to determine significance.

110 REP. ROBERTS: I think you could name anything archeological and that's what bothers me. I'm not in support as it is and I understand it.

112 CHAIR HAYDEN: The letter handed out from James Hamrick says that the State Historical Preservation Office has always considered ship wrecks

and State waters to be archeological sites. The letter doesn't differentiate, you say some are and some aren't.

116 ARD: Some are not significant, therefore they don't meet the definition of archeological object.

118 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To members) We can vote this up or vote it down or hold it and have the people concerned draft some amendments to change it.

What do you think?

120 REP. WYLIE: I still want to be a little clearer on my understanding. What I'm understanding is unless we have SB 7 there's still an ambiguity where people can invest and put forth the effort and not have the

Treasure Trove they assumed they had because it would be ruled after the fact to be archeological. Is that correct right now?

126 ARD: That's correct.

REP. WYLIE: So this is an effort to create the maximum opportunity to know what the rules and necessary permits are ahead of time?

129 ARD: That's correct.

130 REP. WYLIE: So this actually gives people more information on what

they might keep and what they might not keep?

131 ARD: Before they ever go out and look, right.

132 CHAIR HAYDEN: Is there substantial possibility they can get a Treasure Trove permit to get treasure?

135 ARD: Under the current scenario there is a moratorium issued by the State Land Board, so its impossible, but if SB 7 was to pass, yes I

think there is a likelihood.

141 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Roberts and Rep. Norris) What do you want to do? Do you want to draft up an amendment to broaden the scope so

there's more Treasure Trove?

143 REP. ROBERTS: I have no problem with anything over 50 years old.

146 JULIE DOW: There are other criteria.

147 ARD: There are other criteria other than being 50 years old.

149 REP. ROBERTS: Under whose determination?

152 ARD: I believe that would be SHPO's determination on whether something's an archeological object.

154 REP. ROBERTS: Before or after the find? Before the find I have no problem. I appreciate the museums and I want people out there hunting

for it, I don't want to destroy it.

163 ARD: (To Rep. Roberts) With the list that SHPO has now, we have some clarification of that. The likelihood of not finding something on that

list is slim to none.

167 REP. ROBERTS: What if it's on the list?

ARD: We have information about where it came from.

168 REP. ROBERTS: What do you tell the people?

169 ARD: From the list we can determine whether or not it would be of significant value if it's found. We can tell people if it's not one of

the significant suspected or known ship wrecks then it would fall under the Treasure Trove permit and you need to seek a permit from the

Division of State Lands in order to search it out.

175 CHAIR HAYDEN: What good is an archeological site if its not explored, researched, investigated, on land if a dig is done? What good is a ship wreck under water? Are we photographing them, sending divers

down to

catalog what's there, what are we doing?

179 ARD: I don't know what SHPO does with ship wrecks when they find one. The Division of State Lands does not photograph or anything else under

the Treasure Trove permits.

187 CHAIR HAYDEN: You're speaking from the background of Division of State Lands?

188 ARD: Right.

CHAIR HAYDEN: No one is here from SHPO?

ARD: I don't believe so. 189 REP. NORRIS: What is SHPO?

CHAIR HAYDEN: State Historic Preservation Office.

191 REP. NORRIS: In the bill as written it says "bullion found hidden in the earth or other private place where the true owner thereof is

unknown." Does other private place include the submerged artifacts?

198 ARD: Yes.

REP. NORRIS: Is that descriptive enough or other private place?

199 ARD: I think that might be for example if it was in a box, lost cabin, etc. I don't think it refers specifically to ship wrecks.

203 REP. NORRIS: But you feel it would encompass ship wrecks? We're talking strictly inside a three mile limit?

205 ARD: Right.

206 REP. NORRIS: Outside of territorial waters, Oregon's waters we have no control?

ARD: Right.

207 CHAIR HAYDEN: Three mile, not twelve mile?

208 ARD: I believe its three mile we have jurisdiction over.

209 REP. NORRIS: I think twelve mile and 200 miles for fishing.

213 REP. MILNE: I'm uncomfortable with this unless I have a better idea what's on this list and how this is being determined.

217 CHAIR HAYDEN: Rep. Milne recommends this be set over for a hearing. Any objection?

219 REP. NORRIS: Is there a conceptual amendment we can deal with today so we don't have to meet to consider it?

221 CHAIR HAYDEN: I'd be open to having someone draft amendments and

hear it again. The Work Session is closed. Rep. Roberts would you be in

charge of a working group to work this bill and draft some amendments to make it better?

WORK SESSION ON SB 797

234 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Review SB 797. > A meetings law to allow public comment on any item on an agenda and

written comment before public final action is taken on an issue > Allows public inspection of any material that's provided to members

of the governing body at the same time the material is provided to

the members > Requires public meeting notices contain references to the public

comment period > Submits (-A5) Amendments from Joyce Boles (EXHIBIT D) > Deal with neighborhood association > Submits (-A6) Amendments from City of Eugene (EXHIBIT E) > Requires public comment be taken prior to final action on a

matter, but not on any item on the agenda > Submits (-A7) Amendments from Rep. Schoon (EXHIBIT F) > Complaints about executive sessions or violations of executive

sessions authority by public bodies can be referred to the Ethics Commission > Have been incorporated into (-A8) Amendments > Submits (-A8) Amendments from Rep. Hayden (EXHIBIT G)

277 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Roberts and Rep. Milne) Have (-A7) amendments been incorporated into the ethics bill that we are hearing in another

committee?

280 REP. ROBERTS and REP. MILNE: Not certain, can't answer.

281 JANET ADKINS: I talked to the Ethics Commission this morning and he knew they were being proposed as amendments to SB 159, but he didn't

know how the meeting would come out this morning.

286 JANET ADKINS: The (-A8) amendments incorporate several separate bills. > Adds a policy statement that no order, directive, final action or

decision of a governing body shall take effect unless it is adopted

by a majority of the body

310 CHAIR HAYDEN: This bill incorporates suggestions from Frank Gearhart, Senator Grattan Kerans, Rep. Mason, Rep. Schoon, myself and one or two

others.

318 JANET ADKINS: Continues to review SB 797.

341 CHAIR HAYDEN: We'll work the proposed amendments one at a time. Reviews (-A5) amendments submitted by Joyce Boles.

333 REP. NORRIS: Do the neighborhood associations have the official standing that we should include them in a statute?

357 REP. ROBERTS: The associations in Portland are recognized by city council.

366 REP. MILNE: I share that concern, and I know there are valid concerns from the people in the neighborhood association, but do they have a

legal status that we can include them?

374 CHAIR HAYDEN: My thinking would be yes. Rep. Hosticka would you say they are an important part of civic government? I can't speak to their

legal status but I know they are a potent citizen force.

379 REP. HOSTICKA: They're established under city ordinances. 381
REP. WYLIE: What does recognized mean?

396 REP. MILNE: If we have three families that get together and have a neighborhood watch program is that included in neighborhood association? How do we define neighborhood association?

405 CHAIR HAYDEN: Recognized by the city.

406 JANET ADKINS: That was the purpose of adding recognized by the city. I asked Legislative Counsel whether recognized by the city meant that the city knew they were out there or whether it was something formal and

they said it would take something in writing that they've been recognized. That doesn't necessarily mean they're chartered.

416 REP. WYLIE: Cities would have to have clear recognition procedures. Have any of the cities responded to this?

442 JANET ADKINS: We have representatives from the League of Oregon Cities in the audience but I haven't received any response.

444 REP. WYLIE: I'm inclined to be supportive unless I hear a good reason not to be.

449 MOTION: REP. WYLIE MOVES TO ADOPT (-A5) AMENDMENTS TO SB 797

VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

466 CHAIR HAYDEN: Looking at the (-A6) amendments to SB 797. (To Rep. Hosticka) Are you familiar with this?

470 REP. HOSTICKA: What it seems to be dealing with is the issue of whether or not you have to give that opportunity for public comment at

every

meeting or whether you can do as the Legislative Assembly by holding public hearings at one point and having work sessions at another point and time. Work sessions would be times where you wouldn't necessarily have to take public comment as long as you gave an opportunity for public comment before there was a final action.

495 CHAIR HAYDEN: That's basically the technique we use here.

TAPE 85, SIDE A

030 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Committee) What do you think about the (-A6) amendments before you?

031 REP. WYLIE: My understanding is this particular amendment is critical to the cities.

038 JANET ADKINS: Reviews the (-A6) amendments.

047 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA MOVES THE (-A6) AMENDMENTS TO SB 797

VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES 050 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS
MOVES THE (-A8) AMENDMENTS TO SB 797

052 REP. HOSTICKA: Page 1, lines 20-24, how would anyone know that had occurred, what kind of evidence would they use, what kind of enforcement would there be for that kind of activity? It's alleged that it happens

all the time.

061 REP. ROBERTS: It doesn't say anything about alleged. I think they would have to have official evidence to prove it. I think it's more of

a guideline stating what you shouldn't be doing.

067 REP. HOSTICKA: Is this a provision enforced in court or in the Ethics Commission?

069 JANET ADKINS: Violation of public meetings are not enforced by the Ethics Commission, they're enforced through court.

071 CHAIR HAYDEN: We understand clearly that a quorum of this committee could not meet outside a hearing room and make decisions and come back

here and vote. This is a standard operating procedure.

076 REP. HOSTICKA: This doesn't say that decisions are made by the public body as a whole and, in my experience, its been alleged that certain key members of a body make decisions and come in and the rest of the members ratify that without much discussion. Would that be an evasion of the

public meetings law under this provision?

082 CHAIR HAYDEN: I don't think if I made a decision on how I would vote on any given topic, that that would bind you to any decision.

094 REP. HOSTICKA: I'm concerned about putting provisions in the statutes and creating litigation and court cases.

101 CHAIR HAYDEN: What if on line 21 we would just reiterate what is current law and after the word may say "by a quorum of the body"?

105 REP. HOSTICKA: That would help.

106 CHAIR HAYDEN: The suggestion was made on line 21 after the word may we just reiterate what is current law and standard operating practice and

say "made". If a decision is made by a quorum of the body out of the public view.

110 REP. NORRIS: Section 5 reads to me like a piece of the preamble rather than the statute and it is an unclear law that we're sort of

editorializing within the body of the statute and I don't think that's appropriate. The current law should really be obeyed.

121 JANET ADKINS: Regarding the enforcement question, refers to ORS 192.680.

139 REP. NORRIS: Refers to ORS 192.630(2). I'm wondering if this isn't already covered under current law.

144 CHAIR HAYDEN: I think we understand clearly that a quorum can't do that. I would presume the drafters thought was that a plurality of a

committee would not meet and make decisions.

153 REP. WYLIE: My feelings are we want to make sure things are not rigged and citizens are not excluded.

175 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To members) Do we want to wordsmith or drop it and move on, what do you want to do?

179 REP. WYLIE: I'd be happy either dropping it and leaving what's in current law or reiterating what's in current law by saying a quorum.

181 REP. MILNE: I'd just as soon drop it, I think it's covered in current law.

183 CHAIR HAYDEN: Let's set Section 5 aside and move on.

184 REP. HOSTICKA: In Section 10, page 2, line 30 beginning with "holds a meeting . . . for consultation purposes" I'm unclear what

they're

talking about. Is that similar to when we were talking about neighborhood organizations of a formal advisory group? What kind of standing does a non-profit organization that represents tax payers have to have before they can make that request?

197 CHAIR HAYDEN: This would be an organization like Oregon Tax Research that has filed a business name and has acquired non-profit status with

the State and has filed a notice with the organization, the State agency, that they would like to be notified in writing.

202 REP. HOSTICKA: Do we have a process that creates those kinds of organizations?

203 CHAIR HAYDEN: Corporate law.

205 REP. HOSTICKA: Is the Democratic or Republican Party a non-profit organization representing taxpayers generally?

206 CHAIR HAYDEN: Yes, that would be my understanding.

208 REP. HOSTICKA: What's a private group recognized or designated by the state agency for consultation purposes? Are we talking about advisory

committees primarily or the state agency contacting the Association of General Contractors about contracting law?

215 CHAIR HAYDEN: I think on page 2, line 30, sub (a) you could substitute by saying "(a) At least 24 hours before a state agency holds a meeting

with Associated General Contractors that is recognized or designated by the state agency for consultation purposes, they would notify in writing the Oregon Tax Research if they were meeting."

224 REP. WYLIE: I'm uncomfortable adding this provision without knowing what the fiscal impact is and what it does that isn't already done. I'm also concerned with the omission of meeting in private groups, seems to include just about everything and I'm concerned about any government

processes being made to look ridiculous to citizens. What we're striving for is openness, but we also talk a lot about flexibility, innovation and streamlining government. This doesn't do both of those.

244 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Wylie) I think there would be a small community of non-profit organizations. This would deal only with non-profit

organizations who have actually written to the agency and asked to be

put on their mailing list.

253 REP. WYLIE: When it says "meeting means between an official or employee of a state agency", are we only causing this to apply to state?

257 CHAIR HAYDEN: Yes.

REP. WYLIE: "with the authority to make a decision", what kind of decision, is it any decision at all? I'm uncomfortable with it being this vague.

266 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Wylie) On page 3, line 19, it stipulates that these are not personnel decisions or policy, they are expenditure of

state moneys decisions.

271 REP. WYLIE: Will there be any cap on that?

CHAIR HAYDEN: There's not in the bill, but a cap could be placed on it.

294 REP. NORRIS: I'm uncomfortable with it. This would suggest you can't even enter into an exploratory phase of trying to come up with some

improvement or action without having a public meeting.

312 REP. HAYDEN: (To committee) Would we like to set aside Section 10?

313 REP. ROBERTS: Set it aside, I didn't have much trouble with it, I can understand what they're talking about.

316 CHAIR HAYDEN: Set Section 10 aside. (To Janet Adkins) If we set Sections 5 and 10 aside, what do we have left?

320 JANET ADKINS: Sections 8 and 9 which were in Rep. Schoon's amendment where violations of executive sessions could go to the Ethics

Commission. > Changes made to the existing bill on the first page of the amendment

328 REP. HOSTICKA: Sections 6 and 7 are still there, aren't they?

329 JANET ADKINS: I'm not clear if Sections 6 and 7 are related back to Section 5 directly.

350 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To members) Would you be open to move forward with whatever you choose to pass and resolve conflicts in Conference

Committee?

354 REP. NORRIS: Yes.

355 REP. WYLIE: Can we delete Sections 5 and 10 and move the entire

(-A8) amendments? 358 CHAIR HAYDEN: We have conceptually deleted Sections 5 and 10 and moved the amendments.

360 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES THE (-8) AMENDMENTS DELETING SECTIONS 5 AND 10

367 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

368 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES SB 797 AS AMENDED TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

374 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Wylie will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION ON SJR4

389 JULIE DOW, COMMITTEE RESEARCHER: Reviews SJR4 > Addresses whether a vacancy in elective office is filled through an

election or by an appointment based on when the vacancy occurs > Submits Fiscal Impact Statement (EXHIBIT H)

420 MOTION: REP. WYLIE MOVES SJR 4 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO ADOPT RECOMMENDATION

430 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Roberts will carry the bill.

TAPE 84, SIDE B

PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 323 WITNESSES: Sen. Grattan Kerans, District 20 Rollie WiSB rock, Chief of Staff, Oregon State Treasury Angie Brugato, Internal Auditor, Oregon State Treasury Bob Muir, Attorney General's Office Don Waggoner, Director, Division of Audits Annette Talbot, Counsel, Senate Ethics, Elections & Campaign Finance

Committee

011 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews SB 323. > Submits Staff Measure Summary and Fiscal Impact Statement (EXHIBIT I) > Designed to address a concern that there were losses of investment

funds that were not being publicly reported > Reviews what each section does

035 REP. ROBERTS: Does the Treasurer's Office have a problem with Section 3 of this bill?

038 JANET ADKINS: There are amendments (-A3) proposed by the Treasurer's Office and they will present those. (EXHIBIT J)

042 REP. ROBERTS: In a conversation I had with Sen. Kerans prior to committee he mentioned there was a problem with Section 3 and I

notice

he has amendments that create a new Section 5.

048 SEN. GRATTAN KERANS, DISTRICT 20: Rep. Roberts is correct. Testifies in support of SB 323. > Have agreed to have Section 3 taken from the bill > Submits (-1) Amendments (EXHIBIT K)

145 REP. NORRIS: What is the definition of loss?

149 SEN. KERANS: It is where you have revalued an equity interest, real property or investment in a business. Stock market is not included.

We're talking about decisions made by the Treasury and the investment counsel to be recorded in this fashion.

157 REP. NORRIS: Is that defined elsewhere with a clearer meaning of what the word "loss" entails?

158 SEN. KERANS: I tried to do that in Section 3, but the Treasury was concerned about it and we've deleted it. We're talking about the intent of the Legislation as it affects the Treasury. > When there is a loss that has occurred outside the guidelines that

they've adopted > Where it is an omission of an action required by the guidelines or

something that occurred as a result of a missed step taken by them > Where it is an actual loss which occurred upon sale that it be

recorded > All the money which money managers handle are not included in that

172 REP. NORRIS: Should we say something to the effect that the loss other than one incidental to market influences or somehow to corral this

thing.

175 SEN. KERANS: I would have no objection to you making it better, I would suggest you could find that language in Section 3 and cannibalize it

there and indicate what that loss is.

181 REP. WYLIE: Who sets on the Oregon Investment Council (OIC)?

182 SEN. KERANS: The Treasurer is named and four citizen members including one who also has a cross membership on the PERS Board of Directors.

They are non-paid citizen directors.

185 REP. WYLIE: Do they get paid to be on there?

186 SEN. KERANS: No, only per diem.

187 REP. WYLIE: Is this amendment intended to apply only while they are on the council and while the State has an equity interest in that business?

190 SEN. KERANS: That's correct.

191 REP. WYLIE: So, if the State no longer has an equity interest it would be okay and if they leave the investment council they would be free to

be on a board or involved in the companies any way they wanted to?

195 SEN. KERANS: That's correct.

197 REP. MILNE: I just want to concur with Rep. Norris' suggestion at defining loss and I like the way he had defined it versus what was in

Section 3.

200 CHAIR HAYDEN: Is there a close connection between the new language in Section 1, Sub (2), lines 8 and 9, is that language essential to the

meaning of Sections 2 and 4?

204 SEN. KERANS: It is for the meaning of Section 2 but not of 4. We're talking in Sub (2) we're simply including within the definition of state agency any state departments which would include the Department of

Treasury and whether it's headed by an elected or appointed state officer or member of board or commission, so we would draw in both the investment council and the Treasury for purposes of Section 2. Section 4, lines 8 and 9, specifically says "An audit of the funds . . . shall be conducted annually." was a very straight forward prescription.

217 REP. HOSTICKA: I think the IRS probably has elaborate rules defining what a loss is and when its realized we might want to refer to it at

some point. Is your concern that people not be compensated for serving on a board of directors?

222 SEN. KERANS: My concern is that their interest be undiluted.

234 REP. HOSTICKA: If the state has a substantial equity position, we as the state might have an interest in being on the board of directors to

assure ourselves that our equity is being managed in our interest. Do we have competing interests here that could be resolved by saying they wouldn't be compensated for that service or is there something beyond

that?

242 SEN. KERANS: My concern and the concern of the council itself in having their own memoranda which excludes these is to retain the position of

investor, but not manager and not have the interests of the corporation and its other partners or investors influencing the interest of loss as an equity investor.

253 REP. HOSTICKA: From your point of view, our only recall would be if we think the investment is being poorly managed is to pull it out?

256 SEN. KERANS: That's exactly correct.

269 ROLLIE WISB ROCK, CHIEF OF STAFF, OREGON STATE TREASURY: Testifies in support of Section 4 only of SB 323. > Section 4 codifies an agreement between the Treasurers Office and the Secretary of State to have Secretary of State's Division of Audits

conduct annual audits of the Treasury > In agreement we have asked them to contract with six big accounting

firms to provide them with audit expertise > We feel the reporting of losses portion of the bill is unnecessary > Treasury reports annually to the Oregon Investment Council on each investment class > Treasury Department supplies a summary of investment activities in an annual report as public record

308 ANGIE BRUGATO, INTERNAL AUDITOR, OREGON STATE TREASURY: > All losses are recorded on the Treasury books > In compliance with all accounting standards

323 BOB MUIR, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE: > We're not here to testify in support or opposition to SB 323. > In answer to Rep. Hosticka's question concerning sitting on boards of entities in which the state is invested, I will note for the record, we issued an opinion to the Deputy State Treasurer in 1985 stating

that it was permissible for the chair of the Oregon Investment

Council (OIC) to sit on the board of the Fred Meyer Corporation in

which the state had invested precisely for the purpose noted by Rep. Hosticka. However, the OIC chair or any other representative of the

state in such a position may not take any action when the state's

interest are in conflict with those of the corporation. > A policy is in place now that would require OIC members notify the

OIC prior to assuming such positions on boards

347 WISB ROCK: We feel that all the provisions of SB 323 are already being conducted by the Treasury in the OIC except for Section 4 and we

strongly support that.

352 REP. ROBERTS: Have you seen the new Section 5 proposed by Sen. Kerans?

354 WISB ROCK: Yes.

362 REP. ROBERTS: I was called out for a moment, did you comment? Do you have any problem with it?

363 WISB ROCK: Yes. Bob Muir will respond to that.

366 MUIR: Repeats what he said earlier.

WORK SESSION ON SB 323

400 REP. ROBERTS: I would move to delete Section 3 of SB 323.

408 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Roberts) I think you might want to move the (-A3) amendments.

411 REP. ROBERTS: You're correct.

412 REP. HOSTICKA: I think the (-A3) amendments delete Sections 1, 2 and 3.

414 REP. ROBERTS: Do they?

CHAIR HAYDEN: Is that different than your intent?

415 REP ROBERTS: I don't want to move the (-A3) amendments, but I'll go along with them on Section 3. I want to maintain Sections 1, 2 and 4

and delete Section 3 from the bill.

425 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES TO DELETE THE PRESENT SECTION 3 FROM SB 323-A

434 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

434 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES THE (-1) AMENDMENTS TO SB 323

442 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Hosticka) Should I place the motion?

443 REP. HOSTICKA: I have a suggestion for alternate wording.

445 REP. ROBERTS: I'll remove my motion if you want to amend the (-1) amendment.

448 REP. HOSTICKA: I would suggest that on line 4 of (-1) amendments we eliminate the words "appointment to or" and substitute the words

"compensation for" . I'm persuaded we might want to have people on those boards to look after our interests, but I don't think they ought

to be paid to do that if they're already on the investment council and doing other things.

472 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To members) What do you think about that?

473 REP. ROBERTS: It's Rep. Hosticka's, if he wants it I would ask him to move the (-1) amendments as amended.

477 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA MOVES THE (-1) AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED TO SB 323

483 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

TAPE 85, SIDE B

008 REP. NORRIS: I'm still concerned about the definition of loss. I think we need to conceptually include some definition of loss, perhaps on line 11 of the (-A) where we could say "when a state agency sustains a loss

of public funds or property from other than market influences under circumstances . . ." I think if we just say loss in the general sense, you buy high and sell low you have a loss.

017 REP. ROBERTS: I understand that was covered by a statute now. If Rep. Norris wants to make it explicit, I have no problem with that.

021 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Norris) You would be amending current law, do you wish to proceed with that?

023 REP. NORRIS: Current law deals with this one way or another?

CHAIR HAYDEN: On Section 2, line 11.

024 REP. NORRIS: I see that's current law, but I think current law may be a bit imperfect. I think we ought to give Treasury the benefit of what

kind of loss we're talking about.

026 CHAIR HAYDEN: Rep. Norris moves that line 2 would read "when a state agency sustains a loss of public funds or property from other than

market influences under circumstances." Is there any comment from the committee?

031 REP. ROBERTS: (To Chair Hayden) I would ask that it go to Legislative Counsel for better clarification.

032 REP. HOSTICKA: It seems all Section 2 requires them to do is report it and so I don't know that we need to change much because I believe there are standard accounting principals that define what a loss is and they

record that information as is.

047 WISB ROCK: The reporting that takes place on a monthly basis that would be required by Section 2 would be a substantial set of documents, that's why we would rather be held to the standard of reporting on an ongoing

basis to the Secretary of State's Division of Audits and on a yearly basis to the OIC with a final report.

059 REP. ROBERTS: (To WisB rock) You're saying there's a fiscal impact?

061 WISB ROCK: Photocopying alone would be a fiscal impact.

063 NORRIS: Do you believe we should attempt to define loss as I suggested or just let it go?

064 WISB ROCK: I would suggest not redefining loss in the way you've suggested and deleting the new language in Section 2, because we do

report loss on a regular basis to the OIC.

075 REP. NORRIS: I'll withdraw my motion.

076 REP. HOSTICKA: (To Brugato) Are you saying that stock records every loss or every transaction?

079 BRUGATO: The majority of transactions are stock transactions. We get a report every day that shows the transactions and it tells us whether

there was a loss or gain on the sale.

092 REP. HOSTICKA: Does that come to you in electronic or paper format?

093 BRUGATO: Paper, daily. 095 REP. HOSTICKA: I think if it's electronically it would be trivial matter to sort the losses out and separately file them in electronic

format.

098 WISB ROCK: I agree and we will get there.

103 DON WAGGONER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF AUDITS: > Division of Audits is neutral on SB 323 > Section 2, adding the words "in writing" is a good improvement > Makes the matter of reporting the loss a public record > Section 4, we have already agreed with the Treasurers Office that we

will do that annually

122 ANNETTE TALBOT, COUNSEL, SENATE ETHICS, ELECTIONS & CAMPAIGN FINANCE COMMITTEE: Section 2 does apply to all state agencies in losses of

public funds > State Treasurer's Office fits under Section 2 now according the

Attorney General's Office > The Senate added Section 3 to assist the State Treasurer in

determining what actually was a loss or not in the investment context

144 MOTION: REP. MILNE MOVES THE (-3) AMENDMENTS TO SB 323

146 REP. ROBERTS: We've been talking about (-3) amendments and that takes out Sections 1 and 2.

148 JANET ADKINS: Everything except Section 4.

156 REP. HOSTICKA: (To Muir) Based on Annette Talbot's comments that its the interpretation of the Attorney General that ORS 297.120 already

applies to the State Treasurer. Could you comment on that?

161 MUIR: Yes, we did advise the Treasurer's Office that in our opinion, even without a definition this provision was intended to cover all state agencies including the Treasurer's Office.

164 REP. HOSTICKA: So, if we adopt the (-3) amendments the Treasurer still has to report all losses, but the only difference is they don't have to report in writing and that 30 days after discovering the loss the

Division of Audits won't do an investigation?

168 MUIR: Yes, that's true. I also agree with Annette Talbot on how ORS 297.120 had been interpreted. Section 3 is intended to instill a

reporting requirement generating reports and the original law was interpreted that way.

175 REP. HOSTICKA: So if they had a loss, they're suppose to report it?

176 MUIR: Report the specific loss to the Audits Division under the current law.

178 REP. HOSTICKA: Can you tell us what the difference between passing this bill and not passing it in terms of the practice?

180 MUIR: The way I think it would operate is Subsection 1 and 3 would require all losses to be reported at least annually. That information

is already compiled by the Treasurer's Office, it would just be transmitted to new parties.

184 REP. HOSTICKA: I'm not talking about Section 3 anymore, only Sections 1 and 2.

185 MUIR: Sections 1 and 2 of the A-Engrossed bill? The only difference Section 1 clarifies our advice, Section 2 would require the

report to

occur within 30 days. The only difference is a time requirement on the report to the Division of Audits.

197 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE, REP. MILNE, REP. NORRIS AND REP. WYLIE, VOTING NO, REP. HAYDEN, REP. HOSTICKA AND REP. ROBERTS. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE, REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Motion Fails

202 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA MOVES SB 323 AS AMENDED

205 REP. ROBERTS: Is there going to be some clarifying language regarding loss or are we satisfied with the present statutes in the description of loss?

210 CHAIR HAYDEN: I'm satisfied. (To Rep. Norris) Are you satisfied?

211 REP. NORRIS: Yes.

212 JANET ADKINS: You're moving Sections 1 through 4 of the bill?

214 REP. HOSTICKA: We adopted Rep. Roberts motion to delete Section 3 and we adopted Sen. Kerans re-written Section 1 and the A-Engrossed Sections 2, 4 and 5.

226 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE, REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Hosticka will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION ON SB 1071 WITNESSES: Nina Johnson, Secretary of State's Office

225 JULIE DOW, COMMITTEE RESEARCHER: Reviews SB 1071. > Deals with a political disclaimer statute > Same statute as in HB 3151 > An effort to clarify which election related materials, both written

and broadcast, must include the disclaimer > Submits Staff Measure Summary for SB 1071 (EXHIBIT M) > Submits (-2) Amendments (EXHIBIT N)

267 REP. ROBERTS: Did I just understand we'll have to start putting disclaimers on lawn signs?

270 CHAIR HAYDEN: Correct.

REP. ROBERTS: I'm not supporting this bill.

275 REP. NORRIS: I don't go along with the sign amendment and I won't support the bill with it in there.

280 CHAIR HAYDEN: What if it were dealt with signs that were printed after passage of the law?

283 REP. NORRIS: How much proof would you have to have if you were challenged they were printed before the law?

289 CHAIR HAYDEN: We don't have five votes. (To Johnson) Do you want to make a statement?

273 NINA JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE: The alternative we proposed to the subcommittee which would be fine with us would be to at least

give us some rule making authority to define what a sign is. We did promulgate a rule last spring that was distributed to all candidates and lawn signs would clearly fall within that exception. That would be an alternative, that language has been drafted and as a fall back that would be fine with us.

303 CHAIR HAYDEN: In your rule making authority would you be interested in adopting what I said, some candidates use them five or ten years?

306 JOHNSON: I think in defining it we would just have the definition be no matter when they were printed so you don't get into proof problems. Go

ahead and leave the sign exception in but give some ability to define what a sign is.

322 REP. ROBERTS: Back in 1987 or 1989 we sat down and described how many square inches, etc. I thought we described that back then.

325 JOHNSON: That has never gotten into the statute. I don't believe a size has ever been in a statute.

331 REP. ROBERTS: I remember there was 420 square inches, we worked on it a long time.

335 JOHNSON: We defined a sign in our rule as anything 21 square inches.

339 REP. ROBERTS: It isn't the smallness of it, it's the largest of it when you get into city and county ordinances.

351 JULIE DOW: The (-1) amendments which the subcommittee rejected would have restored the sign exemption, but made sure Elections Division had

clear authority to write rules defining what is a sign.

358 CHAIR HAYDEN: The subcommittee rejected your proposal. Is that correct?

359 JOHNSON: Yes, we presented that as an option to the committee to make it clear there are different ways of approaching this. > Original bill suggested we have a disclaimer on everything > Label the back, no size rule > The statute now does not say what a sign is

388 CHAIR HAYDEN: What's in the bill besides lawn signs that you need?

389 JOHNSON: We would like to have the news media exemption because we think it strengthens the constitutionality of our law and we want to

delete the language on line 7 of the bill stating "relating to any election". > We've been questioned about whether or not voter registration drives

have to have disclaimers on them, I don't think that was the intent of the Legislature

398 CHAIR HAYDEN: What can we do with this bill instantly that would address Rep. Roberts' concerns, take the lawn signs completely out of it and still give you media, etc?

402 JOHNSON: The most instantaneous way you could do what everybody wants is to adopt the (-1) amendments.

405 CHAIR HAYDEN: Which completely deletes the sign?

406 JOHNSON: Which reinstates existing law related to political disclaimers except for the breathe of any election and then adding the news media

exception.

418 REP. ROBERTS: All I care about is exempting the lawn signs from the disclaimer.

420 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Roberts) The (-1) amendments would have current law on the signs. > You wouldn't have to have a disclaimer > Everyone would have to contact the Secretary of State's Office and have sign approval

426 REP. ROBERTS: Not necessarily, let the State put a minimum on it and the cities and counties put a maximum on it.

438 MOTION: CHAIR HAYDEN MOVES THE (-1) AMENDMENTS TO SB 1071

439 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

453 MOTION: REP. WYLIE MOVES SB 1071 AS AMENDED TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

460 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENTING VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS.

Rep. Milne will carry the bill.

Recess till 1:00 p.m.

TAPE 86, SIDE A

WORK SESSION ON SB 420

003 JULIE DOW, COMMITTEE RESEARCHER: Reviews SB 420. > The bill allows a person who will turn 18 years of age after the filing deadline, but on or before the primary election to file for and be elected precinct committee person and file for and receive political party nomination > Submits Staff Measure Summary for SB 420 (EXHIBIT O)

017 MOTION: REP. NORRIS MOVES SB 420 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

021 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Milne will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION ON SB SJM12

032 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews SJM12. > Submits Staff Measure Summary (EXHIBIT P) > Memorializes congress to retain existing earthquake funding levels

and encourages federal agencies to assist the pacific states in coordination of technology transfers and mitigation strategies > Bill is aimed at current studies ongoing about better characterizing areas of the state for earthquake potential and damage to existing infrastructure

043 MOTION: REP. MILNE MOVES SJM 12 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO ADOPT RECOMMENDATION

046 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Hayden will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION ON SB 1105 WITNESSES: Randy Fraser, Hearings Office, Department of Transportation

054 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews SB 1105. > At the request of Motor Vehicles Division of ODOT > Submits Staff Measure Summary for SB 1105 (EXHIBIT Q)

072 REP. NORRIS: What are the advantages or disadvantages of the administrative review as opposed to the hearing?

074 JANET ADKINS: It's cheaper. They mostly look at whether things were done properly in terms of the paperwork notification and if it's

something that's been carried by the court there's no reason for the person to be able to go over the facts of the case, etc.

079 REP. NORRIS: If any of the parties involved are dissatisfied with the administrative review, could you go on to a hearing if that was desired?

082 JANET ADKINS: Appeal to a court.

084 REP. NORRIS: Would that constitute the formal hearing as indicated in this bill?

085 JANET ADKINS: Not at DMV, but through court.

REP. NORRIS: DMV could not conduct a formal hearing if the administrative review is inconclusive?

089 RANDY FRASER, HEARINGS OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION: What this would do is the due process review by Motor Vehicles Division for people who already had a court appearance and the facts in the underlying

grounds have been determined by a court. After an administrative review the person wishes to pursue it further, they do have the right in law to pursue it in Circuit Court. The only review by DMV would be an administrative review, meaning it would not be on the record, there would not be a hearing convened and it would not be before a hearings officer.

100 REP. NORRIS: So once that administrative review is done there is no more chance for a "formal hearing by the division".

101 FRASER: Correct.

REP. NORRIS: So it's in lieu of?

102 FRASER: It is the only review in lieu of a contested case.

107 MOTION: REP. NORRIS MOVES SB 1105-A TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

110 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

Rep. Norris will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION SB 784 WITNESSES: Marshall Coba, Oregon Trucking Association

122 REP. ROBERTS: Explains SB 784. > Submits (-A4) Amendments

(EXHIBIT R) > If the speed is greater than 65 miles an hour they can put the

additional \$40 on the fine > This bill was intended to catch the real speed limit violators

154 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Makes additional clarifications. > The bill applies to any vehicle that requires a commercial driver's

license to operate > The bill has a subsequent referral to Appropriations > Submits Fiscal Impact Statement for SB 784-A (EXHIBIT S) > Amendment may change some of the figures in Section 3 as to

percentages that go to various accounts

174 REP. ROBERTS: (To Coba) Are these the adjusted figures?

176 MARSHALL COBA, OREGON TRUCKING ASSOCIATION: Yes, these are updated figures. > Submits Unitary Assessment Fee Modelling Spreadsheet (EXHIBIT T) > The numbers were changed from the assumptions we had made last

week when we prepared for the hearing

196 REP. MILNE: Of the citations written, or of the citations for truck violations?

198 COBA: For convictions of truck speed. This also applies to the basic rule violation in a truck or with a commercial motor vehicle.

202 REP. ROBERTS: The basic rule is you've got to keep your vehicle under control at all times.

215 JANET ADKINS: Makes two additional points. > This act only takes effect until December 31, 1995. > The amendment references in lines 7 and 9 to those two statutes > The first violation of basic rule > The second is violation of maximum speed for trucks > There is Legislation being considered in another committee to raise

finer for everyone

228 REP. ROBERTS: They want to double the fines and put half of it in general fund.

230 COBA: My understanding is all the money would go into the court system, that the State Police would not be getting any of that. > The Oregon Trucking Association is in strong support of the (-A4)

amendment

236 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES THE (-A4) AMENDMENTS TO SB 784-A

240 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES 243 JANET ADKINS: These figures need to be made in the bill as well as a conceptual amendment.

247 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES TO INCLUDE THE FIGURES ON THE OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT UNITARY ASSESSMENT FEE MODELLING SPREADSHEET

IN

SB 784

252 JANET ADKINS: In explanation, the figures in the far right-hand column in the adjusted percentages column. > These are all the amounts that go to other bodies under the law > The new line is Sub (15) in lines 36 and 37 going to the Department

of State Police

266 REP. NORRIS: Those percentages in the far right-hand column, will they be percentages of this \$480,000?

269 JANET ADKINS: I think they're percentages of the total.

271 REP. NORRIS: Do they all pertain to the surcharges under this bill we're considering?

272 JANET ADKINS: No, my understanding is these percentages are calculated to in effect have the whole amount of the new money go to State Police

overtime.

284 COBA: That is correct. In the unitary assessment statute everything listed here gets a portion of the unitary assessment. This additional

surcharge will go into the unitary assessment fund to be broken out.

Percentages change as unitary assessments are added or changed.

291 JANET ADKINS: You don't have it in the bill, but the current amount in ORS 137.303 for the BPST is 16.4116% so they have a larger percent, but there's going to be more money so they'll have a smaller percent of the total now.

298 REP. NORRIS: If we include this in the bill are we clarifying?

301 JANET ADKINS: Evidently there's not just a way to say that the new money all goes to the State Police.

305 REP. ROBERTS: The State Police get a certain percentage of what is now before you put the additional on.

308 JANET ADKINS: State Police for enhanced enforcement for traffic laws is not in the unitary assessment right now, its a new category for the

list.

312 REP. ROBERTS: (To Coba) Please give a quick description of what the unitary assessment is.

315 COBA: My understanding is the unitary assessment was created in the 1991 Legislative Session because of surcharges on different things to

make it easier to track various things that money is dedicated towards.

> \$40 surcharge will go towards enhancing commercial vehicle enforcement

330 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES THAT THE PERCENTAGES IN THE UNITARY ASSESSMENT FEE MODELLING SPREADSHEET UNDER THE COLUMN ADJUSTMENTS BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THOSE PERCENTAGES IN SECTION 3 OF SB 784

341 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

342 MOTION: MOVES SB 784 AS AMENDED TO APPROPRIATIONS WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

348 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS

WORK SESSION ON SB 486

367 JULIE DOW, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews SB 486. > Deals with roadside rest areas along highways > Attendants for disabled persons > Requires ODOT to allow a permit system > Allow non-profit groups to provide non-alcoholic beverages and

cookies > Submits Staff Measure Summary and Fiscal Impact Statement (EXHIBIT V)

416 REP. ROBERTS: As I understand it, you would actually have three restrooms > Men, Women and Disabled

431 MOTION: REP. ROBERTS MOVES SB 486-A SUBSEQUENT REFERRAL TO APPROPRIATIONS WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

447 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE, ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE. MEMBERS EXCUSED ARE REP. BAKER, REP. EDMUNSON AND REP.

PARKS

474 JANET ADKINS: Announcements.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Priscilla Boyle
Committee Administrator

Janet Adkins Committee Assistant

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony on SB 7 - Hamrick - 1 page B - Testimony on SB 7 - Staff - 1 page - (not mentioned) C - Testimony on SB 7 - Gustafson - 2 pages - (not mentioned) D - Amendments to SB 797 - Boles - 1 page E - Amendments to SB 797 - City of Eugene - 3 pages F - Amendments to SB

797 - Rep. Schoon - 1 page G - Amendments to SB 797 - Staff - 3 pages H
- Fiscal Impact Statement on SJR4 - Staff - 1 page I - Staff Measure
Summary/Fiscal Impact Statement on SB 323 - Staff - 2 pages J -
Amendments to SB 323 - Treasurer's Office - 2 pages K - Amendments to
SB 323 - Sen. Kerans - 1 page L - Overview of Investigations/Public
Records/Audits to SB 323 - Staff - 3 pages - (not mentioned) M - Staff
Measure Summary on SB 1071 - Staff - 1 page N - Amendments to SB 1071 -
Staff - 3 pages O - Staff Measure Summary on SB 420 - Staff - 1 page P
- Staff Measure Summary on SJM12 - Staff - 1 page Q - Staff Measure
Summary on SB 1105 - Staff - 1 page R - Amendments to SB 784 - Rep.
Roberts - 1 page S - Fiscal Impact Statement on SB 784 - Staff - 1 page
T - Unitary Assessment Fee Modelling Spreadsheet on SB 784 - Coba - 1
page U - Amendments to HB 2084 on SB 784 - Staff - 8 pages - (not
mentioned) V - Staff Measure Summary/Fiscal Impact Statement on SB
486 - Staff - 3 pages