

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

April 16, 1993 Hearing Room D 1:00 p.m. Tapes 60 - 63

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Liz VanLeeuwen, Chair Rep. Ray Baum Rep. Marilyn Dell Rep. Sam Dominy

Rep. Dennis Luke Rep. Bill Markham Rep. Chuck Norris

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Bill Fisher Rep. Tim Josi

VISITING MEMBER:

STAFF PRESENT: Catherine Fitch, Committee Administrator Pat Zwick, Committee Coordinator

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HJM9 - Work Session HB 3087 - Work Session SB 113 - Public Hearing and Work Session SB 117 - Public Hearing SB 405 - Public Hearing and Work Session HB 2581 - Public Hearing and Work Session

WITNESSES: Lorna Youngs, Oregon Dept. of Agriculture Kay Juran, Oregon Food Industries Terry Witt, Oregonians For Food and Shelter Fred Van Natta, Beekeepers Association John Mespelt, Beekeepers Association Ted Hughes, Oregon Association of Nurserymen Jack Bigej, Oregon Association of Nurserymen Rod Park, Oregon Association of Nurserymen Jack Long, Nursery Grower Lucille Whitman, Nursery Grower

[--- 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 60, SIDE A

005 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Calls the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Opens work session on HJM9.

WORK SESSION HJM9

015 CATHERINE FITCH, Committee Administrator: Summarizes progress on HJM 9 which memorializes the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to make no further additions to lists of threatened or endangered species

without consideration of human and fiscal impacts. Amendments have been proposed to make the memorial go to the President and Congress. This

amendment is contained in Exhibit A.

023 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves HJM 9, as hand engrossed by staff, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

028 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Repeats the motion.

032 VOTE: On a roll call vote, REPS. DOMINY, LUKE, MARKHAM, NORRIS and CHAIR VanLEEuwEN vote AYE. REP. DELL votes NAY. REPS. FISHER and

JOSI are EXCUSED.

040 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: The motion is passed.

042 REP. DOMINY will carry the bill to the full committee.

WORK SESSION HB 3087

045 FITCH: Reviews HB 3087 which deals with regulatory compensation. The suggested amendments have been hand engrossed into the bill (Exhibit B).

Oregonians in Action have requested an additional clarifying amendment to the original Sec. 7. Section 7 would read, "The provisions of sections 1 to 6 of this Act apply to any regulation adopted after January 1, 1994 and apply to any regulation implemented or administered after January 1, 1994, regardless of when that regulation was adopted.

Their suggestion is contained in Exhibit C.

060 REP. DOMINY: What does that say?

062 FITCH: It clarifies that where there are regulations in statute that have been adopted by any government entity to whom this applies, that if they apply those regulations any time after January 1, 1994, that the

provisions of this act will apply.

066 REP. LUKE: I think this will go against what we were doing all along. This would make it retroactive.

073 FITCH: Yes, that's correct. If there is a regulation on the books and a new applicant comes in to the city for a permit of some sort, and they are denied, that would be subject to HB 3087.

077 REP. LUKE: So it would be retroactive?

078 FITCH: No, it would not be retroactive to any action that was taken prior to January 1, 1994.

078 REP. LUKE: We would have a problem. These regulations could be adopted tomorrow and they could enforce it four or five years from now.

085 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Asks Dave Smith to come up and explain how the

bill will be retroactive.

094 DAVE SMITH, Oregonians In Action: The principle purpose of the language proposed is to ensure that we deal with the situation if there would be a rush of adopted regulations right up until the effective date. The

mere fact of adoption of a regulation does not normally allow the property owner to establish that the adoption has infringed on the value of his property. It's only when the regulation is applied that the devaluation of the property takes place.

My proposed amendment would ensure that if a decision made by government that implements a regulation after January 1, 1994 affects a property owner, that owner would be able to seek compensation under the bill.

Was troubled that the original Section 7 says that the provisions of this bill apply to regulations adopted after January 1, 1994, when Sections 1 and 2 were intending to apply to decisions made after January 1. This makes Section 7 consistent with Sections 1 and 2.

120 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: The January 1st date is still there.

125 REP. DELL: If I have land in the Willamette Greenway and apply to build a home and the permit is denied, do I get compensation?

137 SMITH: If you apply today under provisions of the bill, the answer is no, because the regulation has already been applied before the effective date. If you own land in the Willamette Greenway and made application

after January 1, 1994, it could apply to you.

138 REP. DELL: Would that be true even if my neighbor had been denied compensation this year?

145 SMITH: If you made application after January 1, 1994, you should be able to secure compensation. That was the essence of the committee's

discussion, that's where the cut would be made. The second question you raised is whether decisions made concerning the Willamette Greenway should appropriately be a subject of allowing compensation under this bill. I believe in HB 2899 we specifically exempted the Willamette Greenway and geologic hazard and fault areas from our bill. If the issue of the Willamette Greenway is troublesome, we should look back to HB 2899 and give some thought to importing that provision into HB 3087.

160 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: I thought we did not intend to go back retroactively. Is there any interest in the committee pursuing this

amendment?

170 REP. MARKHAM: I like the amendment. It is not retroactive. I prefer the bill become effective when the governor signs it. I wanted some

finality, but there wasn't agreement.

174 REP. DOMINY: Is prepared to move the hand-engrossed amendments, but not prepared to vote for the bill with the amendment in it.

180 FITCH: The purpose of the amendment was clarification of what already existed in the bill. The circumstances described would be under the

hand-engrossed version of the bill as well.

184 REP. DOMINY: What would happen without the amendment?

197 SMITH: Without the amendment in the hand-engrossed bill it is arguable that the applicant who applies after January 5, 1994 will be able to

recover under the bill. The intent of the -1 amendments made to

Sections 1 and 2 was to enable decisions made after the effective date

of the bill to trigger recovery under the bill. The problem I identify

is that Section 7 appears to be inconsistent with the -1 amendments,

Sections 1 and 2, and the ambiguity and uncertainty that the language of Section 7 creates, tends to undercut the effect of the -1 amendments.

The intent of the bill without the change to Section 7 was to allow

someone to recover. The only problem is Section 7 makes it look

ambiguous.

222 REP. LUKE: There's a difference between someone who bought a piece of ground, knowing what the restrictions were and somebody who owns a piece of ground and was able to do something with it and then the government

took that right away from them. I do not believe that someone who knew

they already had a restriction on their ground should be able to be

compensated. Under your example, a person who has lived under a

regulation for 10 or 15 years could come in and apply for compensation.

234 SMITH: That is exactly what the Sections 1 and 2 language already implies.

245 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Gives example. I do not see where the bill tells me that I can build that house or be compensated for that right being taken away from me.

253 SMITH: The -1 amendments described in section 1 that regulation means the imposition of a restriction. That language, the imposition of a

restriction, in Section 1 has the effect of opening up the door to compensation for someone upon whom that restriction is imposed.

275 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Notes that Sections 1 through 6 of this act apply to any regulation adopted after January 1, 1994.

275 SMITH: It appears that Section 7 is inconsistent with the hand engrossed amendments to Sections 1 and 2. It appears that the bill is

internally inconsistent.

300 REP. DOMINY: Have understood that we are not allowing retroactive rights. If I don't want to include retroactive rights, do we change

this so that regulation means imposition of a new regulation? 308

SMITH: That's approximately correct, or the word "imposition" could be changed to "adoption" on line 10. Play with language on line 12 where

it says including "the implementation of a state statute." I know the committee has had a concern over the imposition of riparian zone restrictions on forest lands. If Board of Forestry is quick and gets those restrictions in on December 31, 1993, private forest land owners will be precluded from recovering for the imposition of those restrictions.

The language in sections 1 and 2 is not retroactive in the -1 hand engrossed bill. If a decision is made after January 1, 1994, the decision is made. The option of local government or state agency is not to make the decision. There is no unfettered liability opened up because the Department of Forestry does not have to deny the written plan to log in the riparian zone, they can approve the plan, then they are not liable.

350 SUE HANNA, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL: Not sure what you are trying to accomplish with section 7.

When the bill was originally prepared there was a great deal of discussion whether it would apply to statues and rules on the books before the date of the Act. It was decided by people putting the bill together that they did not want it to apply to those rules and statutes

that were on the books before the effective date of this act. I believe Mr. Smith's amendment would carry out a different policy.

373 SMITH: Intent of proposed amendment to Section 7 is to make that amendment consistent with a hand-engrossed amendment to Sections 1 and

2.

383 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: On line 10 of Section 1, page 1, Mr. Smith said "imposition" needed to be changed to "adoption".

390 HANNA: Agrees that it would be better to change the wording on line 10. I'm still not sure about the new language in Section 7. I think we're

looking at a different focus than what we would have otherwise.

398 REP. LUKE: If you have "adoption", my rights on my property are not taken away by the adoption of a rule. The imposition of the rule takes

away the value.

TAPE 61, SIDE A

005 HANNA: Does the committee want this legislation to be retroactive?

Better course might be to make it prospective. I might need to get together with Dave Smith to see how we can get the best language.

015 REP. NORRIS: Refers to Smith's proposed amendment. Could be construed to mean that the entire rules and regulations of LCDC because they are

ongoing administration.

How are we going to pay for this?

028 REP. MARKHAM: If it is prospective, any agency wanting to implement on a person's property would have to get the money to pay for it.

034 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: If the Department of Forestry enacted their rules by the end of the year, it would jeopardize landowners' rights to harvest

the timber on their private lands. We need to fix that.

040 HANNA: That was specifically discussed in the working group and the decision was to allow the rules to go ahead with effective date. We can make it effective on passage.

057 REP. DOMINY: Mr. Smith also pointed out on line 12, it was another clarifying point to him that this says that anything that came up

afterwards would be eligible for compensation. We wanted rules enacted

after January 1 to be affected, not rules that were already in place.

075 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Closes work session on HB 3087.

PUBLIC HEARING SB 113.

085 FITCH: Reviews provisions of SB 113 which authorizes the State Department of Agriculture to assess and collect penalties for delinquent license renewals.

100 LORNA YOUNGS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: Reads written testimony in support of SB 113 (EXHIBIT D).

145 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: You are proposing a 60 day time period for payment without penalty. Where in that period of time would you send out the

registered letter?

150 YOUNGS: Letter would be sent out after 30 days.

Average license fee is \$105. The penalty would be \$30 or 30%.

172 REP. NORRIS: Did you see the proposal to print information on the back of licenses that would make it easier for license holders to reach your office with corrected addresses, in case they have moved and your

license renewal notice does not reach him? Maybe the delinquency rate would fall.

190 KAY JURAN, OREGON FOOD INDUSTRIES: Paraphrases written testimony in support of SB 113 (EXHIBIT E).

235 TERRY WITT, OREGONIANS FOR FOOD AND SHELTER: Summarizes written testimony in support of SB 113 (EXHIBIT F).

257 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Closes public hearing on SB 113-A.

WORK SESSION ON SB 113-A

259 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves SB 113-A to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

261 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Repeats motion.

264 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REPS. FISHER and JOSI are EXCUSED.

278 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: The motion CARRIES.

280 REP. DELL will carry the bill.

WORK SESSION HB 3087

300 HANNA: Page 1, line 12 delete the word "implementation" and insert the word "enactment", then the bill will be totally prospective. Sen.

Johnson's original testimony pertained to the wording with "implementation" included. He would like to clarify that that change would change his testimony.

320 SEN. ROD JOHNSON: It was my intent in previous testimony that this bill would apply to actions taken to enforce, or put into effect, old

statutes on new ground. I understand that the committee's desire is to be only prospective and so that's what the change on page 1, line 12 is about. On record, I reluctantly approve that change and understand it to mean that this bill will only apply to new statutes, or ordinances, or whatever, that are passed after January 1, 1994.

340 REP. LUKE: My concern was that if a person who bought a piece of ground, knowing what the rules were when they bought it, that they are in a

different situation than the person who owns a piece of ground and the rules change after they own it.

350 SEN. JOHNSON: I appreciate the distinction you're making. My thinking was more directed at if, for example, in some years past the legislature had given the Department of Fish and Wildlife, for example, the

authority to designate certain streams as scenic and before 1994 they hadn't designated a certain stream. And then after 1994 they come along and designate a stream then that situation would be covered. I understand that situation wouldn't be covered under the change we make today.

369 HANNA: If you have a statute on the book and someone declares a certain stream is now protected under the 1962 statute, that activity would have to be carried out in a rulemaking procedure. If they carried it out

under a rulemaking procedure, it would not be allowed without compensation. However, if the instance came up as part of a contested case hearing, that would be different and it would just be clarifying that statute. So if it comes up through a rulemaking hearing and they just decide it on a legislative policy basis, they would have to pay compensation. But if it came up as part of a contested case hearing, they would not. So it's how the particular situation arises.

400 SEN. JOHNSON: The point she's making is that on line 13 there is a separate thing other than state statutes that talks about the adoption

of any goal or rulemaking agency. If it's one of those kinds of actions, then under the existing language it would be a situation that would require compensation.

408 HANNA: There's also some case law that pertains to when an agency makes a rule. Sometimes agencies take actions and they may not have thought

those were rulemaking, but the court has found them in the nature of rulemaking and treated them as though they were rules.

TAPE 60, SIDE B

010 REP. BAUM: It's one thing to address new enactments of legislation but this also addresses additional rules under existing legislation that may change the way a person's property is affected.

The issue now is when to allow implementation of this to occur. The Forestry Department is considering amending the rules of the Forest Practices Act. If this occurs, they might rush before January 1 to get these rules enacted so they don't fall under this bill.

070 REP. NORRIS: What would it serve to include "goal, rule, or designation by a state agency" (Line 13)? So it could include a designation made

under a pre-existing rule, such as the designation of a stream as scenic or a historical site?

082 SMITH: The designation of a historic landmark would be covered under the adoption of a comprehensive plan amendment. So that's covered. I

don't think you can reach the issue of a certain stream designation.

095 HANNA: Believe you would be falling back into the retroactive.

100 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves that on line 12, second word, strike the word "implementation" and put in "enactment."

108 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Restates motion.

110 VOTE: CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Hearing no objection, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

116 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves that the hand engrossed, by staff, HB 3087-4 AMENDMENTS, (LC 1169-1) DATED 4/15/93 be adopted.

125 REP. BAUM: I assume from Rep. Dominy's motion that his desire is to not change the effective date of the Act. Is that correct?

126 REP. DOMINY: Correct.

127 REP. BAUM: Your concern about that was that you felt if it needed to be fixed, it could be done in the Senate?

130 REP. DOMINY: Correct.

124 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Restates motion. 160 VOTE: CHAIR
VanLEEUEWEN: Hearing no objections, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

163 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves HB 3087, AS AMENDED, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

165 REP. DELL: The purpose of the bill is to send a message to government entities that when they take people's property they need to pay for it. Need to look closely at the flow of regulation and which entity we're

talking to in this bill. Most regulations flow from the federal level down to the local level.

When we pass this bill we should say which government entity are we

talking to. In our hearts, we're talking to the federal government, but this does not allow us to do that. If the federal government continues

to do the things as they have done in the past, and the state has to pay for those regulations, you have written the largest blank check to the

federal government that my mind can comprehend. The scope is staggering.

212 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Which things are not considered for regulatory compensation?

220 HANNA: On Section 4, page 2, line 11 is written very specifically and some of the things that were meant to be excluded were such things as

protection of the spotted owl. An example of a specific public health issue would be if we were regulating streams, and an agency said you could not cut down some trees because if you did that, you would wipe

out the ground and the bridge would fall down. That would be a specific public health issue. I don't think we're looking at issues of federal regulation. Those are more of a general nature.

245 SEN. JOHNSON: It is my intent that if the state does not have money to do certain things and yet they are mandated federally, then it is time

for the state to say to the federal people that we just can't do that and wake up the federal system. There may be some consternation about

conflicts between the state and federal agencies, but the net result of that consternation will probably be good in the long run.

Has introduced bill to study the recent Supreme Court case that breathes some life into states rights bill. We are not obligated to do anything

the federal people tell us to anymore under that Supreme Court ruling.

It's only when we take money that they can force us to do things. The Supreme Court has decided that they don't have the power to just order us around anymore. It's time for the states to start taking back their role.

285 REP. LUKE: Speaks of Deschutes County incident where the Planning Commission was going to take control of 1/4 mile on each side of every

highway, stream, river, and creek and regulate which tree they could cut or plant, and what color they could paint their buildings. It is none of government's business what a person does to his or her own property unless it harms society as a whole.

300 REP. DELL: My response to that situation is that we can't let those things happen. However, there are two consequences to passing this

bill. One is that the State will have financial responsibility for federally implemented regulations regardless of the cost, or we will simply defy federal law.

310 VOTE: On a roll call vote, REPS. BAUM, DOMINY, LUKE, MARKHAM, NORRIS and CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN vote AYE. REP. DELL votes NAY. REPS. FISHER

and JOSI are EXCUSED.

315 VICE-CHAIR DOMINY: The motion CARRIES.

320 REP. BAUM will carry the bill.

330 REP. DOMINY: Closes work session on SB 113.

PUBLIC HEARING SB 117A

336 FITCH: SB 117A essentially deregulates the beekeeping industry in Oregon by deleting most statutory requirements for hive inspections and it deletes the requirements for the Apiary Advisory Committee.

370 LORNA YOUNGS, Oregon Department of Agriculture: Reads written testimony in support of SB 117 (Exhibit G).

TAPE 61, SIDE B

023 REP. DOMINY: What does taking away the \$1.20 fee per colony over six in number accomplish?

025 YOUNGS: Explains fee. Fee is currently \$10.

038 REP. DOMINY: Is the intent to raise the fee?

040 YOUNGS: No, just want fee to cover cost of just registering the colonies. We don't object if the industry just wants a flat fee.

045 FRED VAN NATTA, Representing Oregon State Beekeepers Association: Presents proposed amendment which would restore the original SB 117

(Exhibit H).

Desires an additional provision to eliminate the per colony fee.

119 Our amendments make registration mandatory. We propose leaving in the \$10 registration fee but eliminate the per colony fee.

175 REP. LUKE: How heavily are bees federally regulated for interstate regulation? Why do you not need the disease control?

178 VAN NATTA: Department of Agriculture can do check for diseases on a case by case basis and the applicant pays for it. Paying an inspector

to catch people who do not voluntarily want it costs too much money for industry to finance it.

200 JOHN MESPELT, Oregon State Beekeepers Association: Explains association's views and inability to afford inspections.

African bee is in Texas and that is only place where state and federal regulation is in effect.

245 REP. LUKE: If your bees are diseased would crop damage occur?

250 MESPELT: No.

255 REP. LUKE: Do farmers check for registration when they use hives?

267 MESPELT: No.

270 REP. NORRIS: Does the definition of bees cover the leaf cutters?

275 VAN NATTA: No, I don't believe so.

300 YOUNGS: Department has no opposition to a voluntary or mandatory fee as proposed by amendments.

314 REP. DOMINY: Closes public hearing on SB 117.

Also submitted for the record: testimony from Marjorie Ehry, past president of the Oregon State Beekeepers Association (Exhibit I).

PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 405 - SB 405 increases the fee paid by plant nursery license holders, greenhouse growers and retailers. It changes the name of the State Nursery Advisory Committee to the State Nursery Research and Regulatory Committee.

300 TED HUGHES, Representing Oregon Association of Nurserymen, Inc. Speaks in support of SB 405 and introduces Jack Bigej.

405 JACK BIGEJ, Oregon Association of Nurserymen: Testifies on need for SB 405 and asking for its passage.

TAPE 62, SIDE A

Letter from Clayton W. Mannon, Executive Director, Oregon Association of Nurserymen in support of SB 405 is submitted for the record (Exhibit J).

038 ROD PARKS, Oregon Association of Nurserymen: Testifies in support of SB 405 and recommends its passage.

090 REP. LUKE: What happens to any excess funds?

092 PARKS: Fees are carried forth from year to year. We are currently operating on cash reserves and will be in a little bit of a deficit at

the current rate.

104 JACK LONG, Nursery Grower: Testifies in support of SB 405.

145 LUCILLE WHITMAN, Nursery Grower: Testifies in support of SB 405.

180 KAY JURAN, Oregon Food Industries: Testifies in support of SB 405.

200 REP. DOMINY: Closes public hearing on SB 405.

WORK SESSION ON SB 405

200 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: Moves SB 405A to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

201 REP. NORRIS: Asks question about change of title. Do we have any precedence for a regulatory committee?

208 CLAYTON HANNON, Oregon Association of Nurserymen: Explains change of name to advisory committee.

225 REP. NORRIS: I'm concerned that if we use the words "regulatory" and "committee" together that we might end up with some sort of

administrative or statutory hang-up.

230 YOUNGS: Would have to have legal opinion on whether the name of the committee gives regulatory authority. That is not the intent of the

bill. If some other word could define intent, the Department would have no objection to the change.

245 REP. NORRIS: Thinks it is inconsistent with other terminology in statutes.

248 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Line 20 spells out their function is to advise and counsel with the Department.

250 REP. NORRIS: Ask that Legislative Counsel be consulted.

265 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REPS. BAUM, DELL, FISHER and JOSI are EXCUSED.

265 REP. DOMINY: The motion CARRIES.

REP. LUKE will carry the bill.

270 REP. DOMINY: Closes work session on SB 405.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2581

285 FITCH: Reviews provisions of HB 2581 which requires person suing landowner under pesticide liability statute to file with the Department of Agriculture and notice is then provided to the pesticide operator or applicant.

320 REP. MARKHAM: Wants to add words "or landowner" to HB 2581. Explains incident which resulted in HB 2581.

370 TERRY WITT, Oregonians For Food and Shelter: Submits and summarizes written testimony in support of HB 2581 and proposed amendment (Exhibit K).

TAPE 63, SIDE A

006 REP. NORRIS: Proposes more specific definition of landowner in the bill.

014 WITT: The definition can be further delineated. Notes definition in measure.

020 FITCH: Reads statute definition of landowner.

035 YOUNGS: The Department has adopted a policy that the report of loss does not necessarily trigger an investigation on our part. Could not

anticipate what paperwork costs could be. Chose to indicate we could absorb that unless later events prove that wrong.

050 CHAIR VanLEEUEWEN: Does pesticide response team come into play?

055 YOUNGS: No. This would increase our complaints list, and we might end up with some additional source investigation from this bill.

060 REP. LUKE: How are complaints accepted by you?

065 YOUNGS: We have a form that must be filled out. We review that

to see if there's probable cause for us to further investigate.

069 REP. LUKE: Could you use the same form for landlord notification?

070 YOUNGS: Yes.

072 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Introduces fourth graders from her district.

085 WITT: The bill states that the claimant would have to provide a true copy of the reports so that the landowner would see the same information as the Department of Agriculture receives.

093 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Closes public hearing on HB 2581.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2581

100 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves amendments to HB 2581 as proposed by Oregonians for Food and Shelter. 102 VOTE: CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Hearing no objection, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

108 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves HB 2581, as amended, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommended.

110 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Repeats the motion.

113 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REPS. DELL, FISHER and JOSI are EXCUSED.

115 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: The motion CARRIES.

REP. MARKHAM will carry the bill.

123 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Closes work session on HB 2581.

125 CHAIR VanLEEuwEN: Adjourns meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Sue Nichol
Administrator

Catherine Fitch Clerk

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - HJM9 - Hand engrossed amendments - Staff - 1 page B -
HB 3087 - Hand engrossed amendments - Staff - 3 pages C - HB
3087 - Testimony - David Smith - 1 page D - SB 113A - Testimony
- Lorna Youngs - 2 pages E - SB 113A - Testimony - Kay Juran - 1
page F - SB 113A - Testimony - Terry Witt - 1 page G -
SB 117A - Testimony - Lorna Youngs - 1 page H - SB 117A -
Amendments - Fred Van Natta - 3 pages I - SB 117 - Testimony -
Marjorie Ehry - 1 page J - SB 405 - Testimony - Clayton Mannon -
2 pages K - HB 2581 - Testimony - Terry Witt - 3 pages