

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

July 23, 1993 Hearing Room 357 9:30 a.m. Tapes 90 - 91

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Cedric Hayden, Chair Rep. Jim Edmunson,
Vice-Chair Rep. Ken Baker Rep. Carl Hosticka Rep. Patti Milne Rep. Chuck
Norris Rep. Sharon Wylie

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Rep. Del Parks Rep. Lonnie Roberts

STAFF PRESENT: Janet Adkins, Committee Administrator Priscilla
Boyle, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: SB 259 SB 316 HB 2123

[--- 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 90, SIDE A

005 CHAIR HAYDEN calls the hearing to order at 10:06 a.m.

GOVERNMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

WORK SESSION ON SB 316 Witnesses: Rep. Tim Josi, District 2 Paul
Levesque, Executive Assistant to Board of Commissioners for
Tillamook County and President, Oregon Public Property Managers
Association

008 REP. TIM JOSI, DISTRICT 2: Turns the time over to Paul Levesque.

010 PAUL LEVESQUE, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FOR TILLAMOOK COUNTY and PRESIDENT, OREGON PUBLIC PROPERTY
MANAGERS ASSOCIATION: Here to answer any questions.

013 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Government Subcommittee members) Does anyone
object to moving this bill to full committee?

MEMBERS: No objection. 016 MOTION: REP. MILNE MOVES THAT SB 316 BE
REFERRED TO FULL COMMITTEE WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

018 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING AYE.
REP. EDMUNSON AND REP. PARKS EXCUSED.

026 Government Subcommittee adjourned.

GOVERNMENT - FULL COMMITTEE

WORK SESSION ON SB 316 Witnesses: Paul Levesque, Executive Assistant
to Board of Commissioners for Tillamook County and President, Oregon
Public Property Managers Association Sen. Joan Dukes, District 1

029 PAUL LEVESQUE, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR TILLAMOOK COUNTY and PRESIDENT, OREGON PUBLIC PROPERTY MANAGERS ASSOCIATION: Reviews what SB 316 does. > Would reimburse counties for costs incurred in foreclosing on delinquent taxes > Would propose to amend ORS 275.275 to provide when the lands are sold, the counties could take \$50 per parcel and 5% of the judgment amount. > \$50 per parcel would help counties to reimburse out-of-pocket expenses for acquiring the necessary title reports > Will allow us to go to a title policy on sale and benefit

everyone > 5% will help reimburse the counties' cost for certified mail and publication of notices

058 SEN. JOAN DUKES, DISTRICT 1: Testifies in support of SB 316. > Reimbursement to counties for costs pertaining to preparation for the sale of the property > Property appraisal, public notices in newspaper, etc.

082 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Submits Revenue Impact Statement (EXHIBIT A)

090 REP. MILNE: (Refers to Staff Measure Summary from Senate Labor EXHIBIT B) In the second paragraph, second line starting "Rather than recover actual costs generated by individual . . . costs will be calculated." What would be used for the basis of calculation?

096 LEVESQUE: There are no calculations necessary. Its a straight forward application. > \$50 on each parcel sold > 5% of the judgement amount that was entered against that parcel during the foreclosure proceedings > For people who come in to redeem their property prior to the deed to the county, these amounts are paid by them to redeem their property along with taxes and interest

108 REP. NORRIS: A sale made now by a county on foreclosed property, where do the funds from that sale currently go? General fund? 110 SEN. DUKES: Taxing districts that the taxes are due on, i.e. school districts, court districts, county, city, etc. They are overdue taxes, so they get their taxes.

114 REP. NORRIS: Typically, is there anything left over?

115 LEVESQUE: No, because all the sale proceeds after costs are deducted are distributed in proportion to the levy of each of the individual taxing units to the total levy of that tax code. There is no overflow that goes back to the county.

122 REP. NORRIS: Even if the proceeds exceeded in the amount necessary to meet all the delinquent taxes?

123 LEVESQUE: Absolutely.

124 REP. NORRIS: So the taxing districts technically generate a profit out of this?

125 LEVESQUE: Yes, they recover more than their taxes.

128 SEN. DUKES: You ought to see what a county gets back through foreclosure. It always sound good, but to sell them can be a real challenge. > Houses can be in such poor condition, the land is

valued higher than the house

138 CHAIR HAYDEN: Once the lien has been paid, does anything revert to the owner?

139 LEVESQUE: No.

HAYDEN: The lien is paid, the county takes a 5% handling charge, nothing reverts to the owner?

141 LEVESQUE: That's correct. That's the laws that exist today and has in Oregon since we began this process.

144 CHAIR HAYDEN: It would seem once the taxes are paid the balance would be the owners.

146 LEVESQUE: The owner essentially has a five year period once the taxes are delinquent to come in and redeem the property and save his interest in the property. Once the two year redemption period expires after the judgement is entered then all the owner's rights are terminated, including the right to receive any excess of proceeds should there be any at sale.

152 SEN. DUKES: The counties notify the bank, and I think there is a statutory obligation if you don't own the property outright, if there's a lien or mortgage and somebody has an interest in it, the county is required to notify them. Everything is done to allow someone who has an interest in that piece of property to redeem it prior to sale. It has been addressed, but the Legislature has chosen not to change that.

170 REP. WYLIE: I did find out that in other states that have different kind of property tax system, this is not the case. > Multnomah has a large number of foreclosed property > Some are just right of ways that have been grassed over by resin and never will be marketed > King County they can go about five years without having a dwelling foreclosed because somebody always snaps it up > In Oregon process goes on a long time and taxes can get where they outweigh the value > Also a pattern for dumping, in some counties, apartment buildings that have been milked by the owner and are contaminated drug

houses or aSB estos ridden are a liability to the county

191 REP. BAKER: In Multnomah County although the county has no obligation to deal after the foreclosure with the land owner, my experience has been any time the county takes back a single family residence with any value at all they have an aggressive policy and program where they go out to that land owner who hasn't paid taxes for five or six years and works with them for about a year or so to get them to sign a contract that the land owner will pay money back and the county will resell them their house.

209 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Hosticka) Do you have any knowledge about the several hundred lots that Springfield foreclosed on?

211 REP. HOSTICKA: That was on bancroft bonding primarily. I don't have any particular knowledge of what happened to those lots, but I know we struggled with that for a very long time in the Revenue Committee and we did go through this process of setting up an elaborate system for the owner to get the property back if they wanted

to.

219 JANET ADKINS: In Sub (c) in the bill the county can already recover costs of maintenance and supervision of the property. This is more of a fee for processing the title report and notification.

224 MOTION: REP. WYLIE MOVES SB 316 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

228 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTE AYE. REP. EDMUNSON, REP. PARKS AND REP. ROBERTS EXCUSED.

Rep. Josi will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION ON SB 259

235 CHAIR HAYDEN: The reason for this work session is a technical adjustment. There was a referral to Appropriations on the bill. We referred it to the floor. The chairman of Appropriations does not want the bill in Appropriations and has asked we rescind referral to Appropriations and reinstate our referral to the floor.

244 MOTION: REP. BAKER MOVES THE RULES BE SUSPENDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECONSIDERING THE VOTE ON SB 259

246 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTE AYE. REP. EDMUNSON, REP. PARKS AND REP. ROBERTS EXCUSED.

259 MOTION: REP. BAKER MOVES WE RECONSIDER THE VOTE BY WHICH WE PASSED SB 259 TO APPROPRIATIONS 264 VOTE: NO OBJECTION, MOTION CARRIES

271 MOTION: REP. BAKER MOVES THAT WE RESCIND THE REFERRAL TO APPROPRIATIONS AND REPASS SB 259 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

276 VOTE: IN A ROLL CALL VOTE ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTE AYE. REP. EDMUNSON, REP. PARKS AND REP. ROBERTS EXCUSED

282 CHAIR HAYDEN: We are in recess until 11:15 a.m.

286 CHAIR HAYDEN: Suspends the recess and resumes deliberations.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2123 Witnesses: Rep. Jim Whitty, District 47 Rep. Bob Repine, District 49 Ray Gribbling, Recreational Vehicle Industry Association Bill Penhollow, Association of Oregon Counties Bob Keefer, Parks Manager, Lane County and President, Oregon Parks Association Dyrol Burluson, Director, Linn County Parks Department Rep. Tony Federici, District 1 Rep. Ron Adams, District 27 Rep. Veral Tarno, District 48

289 JANET ADKINS, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews HB 2123. > Increases registration fees for campers, travel trailers and motor homes > Changes distribution formula for fees

322 REP. JIM WHITTY, DISTRICT 47: Testifies in support of HB 2123. > None of the recreational vehicle registration fees pay for use of highways, bridges or rest areas in Oregon > All other automobiles and

trucks pay registration fees that are used for those purposes >
Excluding recreation vehicles, all other vehicles that use highways
and bridges have had a 50% increase since 1983 > The parks in my
district have recently been given increases in their fees and have
added fees to day use parks > We do not want day use fees added

377 REP. HOSTICKA: Do you have any assurance from the Parks Department
that if we pass this bill that they will rescind the day use fees?

381 REP. WHITTY: Both Rep. Baum and Rep. Tarno have received
those assurances. They were going to impose them earlier but held off
pending the potential for additional revenue here.

388 REP. HOSTICKA: I've seen day use fees at Silver Creek Falls Park
now, so its more than one park here and there.

390 REP. WHITTY: That's right, it is.

391 REP. HOSTICKA: I think that results in fewer people using parks and
less interest in the parks and creates hostility.

394 REP. WHITTY: It certainly creates hostility because letter after
letter to the editor have appeared.

397 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Whitty) My understanding was the
fees had already been increased at State Parks and in some County Parks
from 50% increase in the daily camping fee from \$2 to \$3, a 33%
increase in the reservation fee from \$4 to \$6 and a 250% increase in the
areas where the fees were imposed. Are those the fees that will be
rescinded?

407 REP. WHITTY: No, the fees that will be rescinded are the fees on
day use facilities.

410 CHAIR HAYDEN: Not camping, so the fees that have already been
instituted on camping will stay in place plus additional revenue
from the recreational vehicles?

413 REP. WHITTY: State Parks could answer that, I would be
presumptuous in answering. I have just been given assurance on those
parks in Rep. Baum and Rep. Tarno's districts.

420 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Hosticka) Isn't there camping at Silver
Creek Falls?

421 REP. HOSTICKA: Its the day use facilities they put the \$3 fee
on. If you just want to park and walk on a trail to see the falls, you
have to pay \$3.

425 REP. BOB REPINE, DISTRICT 49: Testifies in support of HB 2123. >
Speaks to the issue of County Parks > Josephine County seeks to get
money from every source they can > Seek grants that are available
through the Marine Board to do

enhancement > County commissioner keeps the price that is
incurred from maintenance to a reasonable rate > Counties feel day use
fees only discourage users > We feel the revenue from
recreational vehicles increased registrations would be the opportunity
we would be able to capture and maintain a very good form of parks in

Josephine County > Hope you would consider this bill and amend it to reflect HB 3260

TAPE 91, SIDE A

013 REP. WHITTY: HB 3260 when it passed the House initially and before the RV increases were added we added two feet to the allowable length of an RV and trailer and I would hope we can maintain that in the bill.

020 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Whitty) That isn't in the bill that's before us, is it?

021 REP. WHITTY: It's in HB 3260. CHAIR HAYDEN: I think your concern can be addressed in Conference Committee. I'd be willing to see that done.

028 RAY GRIBLING, RECREATIONAL VEHICLE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION: Testifies in support of HB 2123 and states they support the bill in any amended form that you find in HB 3260.

035 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Mr. Gribling) Your primary concern is with the length of the vehicles, but your industry supports the increased fees also?

037 GRIBLING: Yes, they do.

CHAIR HAYDEN: Have you contacted the various clubs as opposed to the industry?

038 GRIBLING: No, I have not. I would assume they were aware that the Legislation was before this body. I have talked to my principals in the East and they indicated support.

041 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Mr. Gribling) My concern is I don't believe they were contacted by the Senate side. I don't believe the actual payers of the fee were contacted when this bill was heard on the Senate side and we haven't contacted them here with the one hour notice. I would hope that we would work together to contact them when this bill moves to the Senate so they have a fair chance and have their input.

057 BILL PENHOLLOW, ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES: Testifies in support of HB 2123 with amendments. > Have agreed to work with State Parks on the amendments > Would like to join with Rep. Repine and Rep. Whitty in asking the committee that the provision of HB 3260 be placed in HB 2123.

067 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Mr. Penhollow) It's not my intention to take a motion to rework the bill. We're going to work the bill with minor amendments and pass it to the floor of the House. If you would like to have major

amendments done, we should have the opportunity to have Legislative Counsel make those and that can be done on the Senate side.

073 PENHOLLOW: We understand Legislative Counsel has been consulted with regard to placing HB 3260 into HB 2123 and indicated that is a simple procedure as a gut and stuff.

077 CHAIR HAYDEN: That's the point, we have agreed we would be

resistant to gut and stuff. I'm resistant to doing it in this committee at this time. There will be ample opportunity to do it on the Senate side or in Conference Committee.

082 PENHOLLOW: I would respectfully request we consider the amendments that were previously prepared by Rep. Whitty to this bill. > Changes the increase in recreational vehicle fees from 30% to 50% > Changes the distribution formula for counties from 20% to 30%

098 BOB KEEFER, PARKS MANAGER, LANE COUNTY and PRESIDENT, OREGON PARKS ASSOCIATION: Testifies in support of HB 2123. > Purpose of a fee increase is to provide an equitable distribution of the RV fund between Counties and State without negatively impacting the State > Do not want to hurt State Parks, but > RVs major user of the entire parks system > Fee has not been increased for 10 years > Oregon's license fee is almost nine times lower than most of the other Western states > RV license fee is already dedicated to State and County parks operations > Have contacted several motor home manufacturers in Lane County and an RV dealer about the proposed increase and are all supportive of the concept and felt an increase should be considered to help fund the County and State parks

128 CHAIR HAYDEN: Did you contact the RV clubs that would pay the tax?

129 KEEFER: No, I didn't.

137 DYROL BURLESON, DIRECTOR, LINN COUNTY PARKS DEPARTMENT: Testifies in support of HB 2123. > East Linn County has turned to tourism to offset loss of timber jobs > Our park system is used primarily by Oregonians (95%)

151 CHAIR HAYDEN: Are 95% of your users RV users?

152 BURLESON: In the primary largest park which is Sunnyside Park, an RV campground tied primarily to RVs, yes sir. > These RV fees would allow us to maintain our system and keep them open

165 CHAIR HAYDEN: Would you please contact the people paying the tax, I'd appreciate that.

170 REP. NORRIS: Do you feel you have maxed out on what you can charge on a daily basis for overnight camping in your parks for RVs?

176 KEEFER: Each county is different. In our County we try to stay close to what State Parks are charging to keep people there at a reasonable cost.

185 REP. NORRIS: The difference between a 35' executive motor home and a 4' x 5' pup tent is pretty distinguishable in terms of what they should be willing to pay for their overnight facilities. Do you feel you are about at the top of the market what you can charge people with the recreational vehicle?

190 BURLESON: I can address that from Linn County's perspective. > We are less than State Parks for water and power hook-up by \$2 or at

\$12. > We have senior citizens discount which is \$8 for water and power which are \$11 > Tent campsites are subsidized with \$8 per vehicle and \$5 for senior citizens

203 CHAIR HAYDEN: Do you have a discounted rate during the week days to attract clientele?

205 BURLESON: Yes, we are considering that.

206 CHAIR HAYDEN: And a seasonal rate for winter camping?

207 BURLESON: Yes.

CHAIR HAYDEN: So you could have a high fee for the weekend in the summer and a lower fee for summer weekdays and a very low fee for winter use?

210 KEEFER: (To Rep. Hayden) I believe that's what State Parks does now and it is our intention to move in that direction.

211 CHAIR HAYDEN: If State Parks does that, they've only started doing it recently because when I talked to them a month ago they were thinking about it.

212 KEEFER: I think recently in their fee proposal the discounted rate during winter was discontinued.

223 REP. TONY FEDERICI, DISTRICT 1: Testifies in support of amending HB 2123. > Raise the RV registration fees by 50% > Change distribution formula for those funds

267 REP. RON ADAMS, DISTRICT 27: Testifies in support of amending HB 2123. > Clackamas County is dependent upon those funds > The State needs funding and State Parks > State needs the County portion of this recreation opportunity > HB 3260 was changed in the Senate with permission from the originator of the bill and with HB 2123 we could substitute what came over

301 CHAIR HAYDEN: For the first time this session I do not intend to accept an amendment offered by this committee to gut and stuff this bill. The committee has the authority to override my decision.

307 REP. ADAMS: All of us have agreed that the 30/70 split should remain as originally agreed. We don't need to change it to 50/50.

315 CHAIR HAYDEN: Where did you come up with the 50/50?

316 REP. ADAMS: There was a proposed amendment that would change it to 50/50.

317 REP. VERAL TARNO, DISTRICT 48: Testifies in support of HB 2123. > Supports a fee increase

330 REP. HAYDEN: (To colleagues) My intentions are to propose that HB 2123 go to the floor basically unamended, although I will entertain a conceptual amendment dealing with the 50/50 split and vote that up or down. On HB 3260 I plan to refer it to Conference Committee and keep the 38/40 portion and restore it to the original bill. Would you care to comment on that at all?

341 REP. ADAMS: I'm at a disadvantage. I'm unfamiliar with HB 3260, but I think there were some changes in the fee schedule as it came back. The original schedule was how much increase in HB 2123?

349 REP. BAKER: Twenty to thirty. 349 REP. ADAMS: Twenty to thirty,

I would rather see the 50% language that came back from the Senate.

352 REP. HOSTICKA: When they are done we can pursue your intention. Let's play this one all the way out. If the Senate decides they want to change the fee schedule from a 30% increase in fees as proposed in HB 2123 to a 50% increase as proposed in HB 3260, is it an open vote on concurrence on the floor of the House or is the intention to request non-concurrence and then take that to the Conference Committee?

362 CHAIR HAYDEN: I don't know, I can't answer that question. It hadn't occurred to me.

365 REP. HOSTICKA: I would hope we would have the opportunity to vote on what's been distributed, at least to me and almost everyone else on the committee on the (-1) amendments which would have the fee schedule be in line with what is in the fee schedule proposed in the Senate version of HB 3260.

374 REP. FEDERICI: The new fee schedule and redistribution formula was adopted unanimously by the Transportation Committee and Ways and Means also in regard to HB 3260.

380 CHAIR HAYDEN: That's an interesting point, I have a copy of the Transportation bill HB 2871 before me, my understanding that the total fee increases in gas tax and registration fees would move Oregon into about the third highest State in the nation in total taxes. Have you heard that?

386 REP. ADAMS: I have not seen those figures, I wouldn't bet on HB 2871 if I were a betting man. I don't know how that is going to fair on the

floor and I don't know if I could project where that would put us as far as fees.

393 CHAIR HAYDEN: I think I had heard that the total package, of which this bill would be a small part, this bill does not stand in isolation, if the total package in HB 2871 were implemented it would be about a \$4,000 bill for each family in the state and it would make us about third highest in the nation.

402 REP. ADAMS: It would increase \$4,000 for each family in the state?

403 CHAIR HAYDEN: I think that's what I heard, this is antidotal, I don't have those figures before me.

405 REP. ADAMS: That would really surprise me, but I don't know.

407 REP. NORRIS: Would you be well advised to maybe reserve HB 3260 to deal with the size issue and concentrate on HB 2123 for the fee issue?

414 CHAIR HAYDEN: That's my intention.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2123

Rep. Baker refers to proposed (-1) amendment (EXHIBIT C).

421 MOTION: REP. BAKER PROPOSES ON PAGE 1, LINE 26 TO DELETE TWENTY AND INSERT FORTY AND ON PAGE 6, LINE 6, DELETE \$47 AND INSERT

\$54; LINE 7, DELETE \$47 AND INSERT \$54 AND DELETE \$4 AND INSERT \$4.50;
LINE 9, DELETE \$73 AND INSERT \$84 AND DELETE \$4 AND INSERT \$5

451 REP. BAKER: The reason for the motion is on the distribution between the counties and the State looking at the current formula it appears if we take 50% of the increase and give that to the Counties that is approximately going to be 38%-40% of the total amount. So we give 50% to the Counties and 50% to the State and retain the original formula. Regarding the increases on the \$54 and \$84 those are the Senate amendments. Effectively what I've done on this motion is propose the adoption of the Senate changes with the addition of additional percent to the Counties based upon a 50% increase of the increase we're talking about.

476 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Baker) Would you allow me to divide your motion and accept the motion on lines 26 and 27 at this time?

480 REP. BAKER: That would be correct. Do that and then come back to the other one?

481 CHAIR HAYDEN: Yes I will.

482 REP. HOSTICKA: Is a motion to amend a motion in order?

484 CHAIR HAYDEN: I haven't placed the motion and I will accept Rep. Baker's motion on page 1, lines 26 and 27.

TAPE 90, SIDE B

002 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Baker) Will this be 40% of the increase or 40% of the total?

003 REP. BAKER: 40% of the total, based on my rough calculation of the numbers would be the original formula plus half of the increase.

005 CHAIR HAYDEN: (To Rep. Baker) The thinking in having the 50%, and basically we have that amendment before you conceptually (EXHIBIT D), was that as the State Parks had already raised their fees appreciably that they would not need so much of the increase and that money could go to the County Parks instead. Had you factored that into your thinking? It was in order that State Parks didn't get a huge bite of the apple.

012 REP. BAKER: I don't believe that's going to take place. From the comments from the witnesses some of the County Parks may reduce their entrance fees.

014 CHAIR HAYDEN: I think on just day parks which is a small amount of it. The larger fees are on overnight parking where you have to make reservations and hook-ups, etc. I place your motion at 40%.

017 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA MOVES TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CHANGE 40% TO 30%

021 REP. BAKER: Let's try 40% first and if we don't get it we can go down.

022 CHAIR HAYDEN: I will not accept your sub-amendment at this time. Would you care to prefer with any parliamentary procedure?

023 REP. HOSTICKA: Well I suppose we can vote on this and then vote on the next one. I'll speak to why I want to make that motion. At this point if we start changing this too much from the Senate version we're going to jeopardize the whole process. A number of people have worked very hard on this and I would like to keep us, at this point, as close to the

Senate version as possible.

MOTION: PAGE 1, LINE 26 CHANGE TWENTY TO FORTY

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

Motion Fails

040 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA MOVES THAT ON LINE 26 OF HB 2123 WE REPLACE TWENTY WITH THIRTY

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

047 REP. BAKER: (To Chair Hayden) Has the administrator figured up what the percentage increase would be as far as the distribution of 50%?

049 JANET ADKINS: The Fiscal staff is ready to talk about the amounts that would be raised by the 30% and 50%. I don't know if she had time to do the 40%. We don't have a written fiscal or revenue statement from this bill because we didn't have enough notice to get one.

058 MOTION: CHAIR HAYDEN MOVES THAT HB 2123 AS AMENDED BE PASSED TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

059 REP. BAKER: (To Chair Hayden) I had a second motion.

CHAIR HAYDEN: I didn't accept your motion.

060 REP. BAKER: I will make the motion at this time.

CHAIR HAYDEN: I will not accept the motion.

REP. BAKER: I will challenge the decision of the Chair.

071 MOTION: REP. BAKER CHALLENGES THE DECISION NOT TO ENTERTAIN ANYMORE AMENDMENTS TO HB 2123 073 REP. EDMUNSON: My understanding is the Chair did not accept further amendments and now the motion is to over rule the Chair and for the committee to make the decision to accept more amendments. So, voting yes is a vote to accept further amendments and voting no would be not to accept further amendments.

080 REP. NORRIS: The yes vote would not be a vote for the amendment, but for the committee to accept it?

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

ROBERTS

087 MOTION: REP. BAKER MOVES ON PAGE 6 OF HB 2123 THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS: LINE 6, DELETE \$47 AND INSERT \$54; LINE 7, DELETE \$47 AND INSERT \$54 AND DELETE \$4 AND INSERT \$4.50; LINE 9, DELETE \$73 AND INSERT \$84 AND DELETE \$4 AND INSERT \$5

096 CHAIR HAYDEN: Its the intent of the Chair to vote no on these increases.

098 REP. MILNE: The bill as we have it here reflects an increase that we haven't discussed very much and I'm more comfortable with those increases than those proposed by Rep. Baker. I will be voting no on Rep. Baker's amendments.

105 REP. EDMUNSON: I don't think this is a prohibitive amount with the increase. I'm willing to pay this, I can afford it. I'm going to support the motion.

121 CHAIR HAYDEN: I enjoy the State and County Parks and use them a lot. I feel I should pay for my use of the Parks rather than have someone from out-of-state subsidize it for me, or even another Oregonian who doesn't take their RV to the Parks. I think that's an inequitable tax and it is an intent to tax a very small population group that basically doesn't have the ability to withstand that tax and I take a strong exception to it and I will vote no.

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

Motion Fails

135 MOTION: REP. EDMUNSON MOVES HB 2123 AS AMENDED ON LINES 26 AND 27 TO THE FLOOR WITH A DO PASS RECOMMENDATION

139 REP. HOSTICKA: Can we consider a recess until some other members might want to come and consider this issue?

140 CHAIR HAYDEN: No, I intend to vote no on this bill unless my vote is necessary to pass it to the floor in which case I will vote yes. I intend to vote no on the floor of the House.

142 REP. BAKER: (To Chair Hayden) HB 3260 was on the agenda in the House and was carried over until Monday, is that still on the agenda Monday?

145 CHAIR HAYDEN: I believe it will go to Conference Committee to rescue the original part of the bill.

146 REP. BAKER: You will ask to have it not concur on Monday?

CHAIR HAYDEN: To not concur and hear the bill in Conference Committee. I do not accept the request for recess. We have a motion before us and we will vote on it.

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

ARE REP. PARKS AND REP. ROBERTS

Rep. Hosticka will carry the bill.

Meeting adjourned

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Priscilla Boyle
Administrator

Janet Adkins Assistant

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Revenue Impact Statement on SB 316 - Staff - 1 page B - Staff Measure Summary on SB 316 - Staff - 1 page C - Proposed amendments to HB 2123 - Rep. Baker - 1 page D - Proposed amendments to HB 2123 - Rep. Hayden - 1 -page E - Testimony on HB 2123 - Staff - 4 pages (not mentioned)