

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE

June 14, 1993 Hearing Room D 1:30 p.m. Tapes 144 - 146

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Bob Repine, Chair Rep. Marilyn Dell, Vice-Chair
Rep. Sam Dominy Rep. Bill Fisher Rep. Carl Hosticka Rep. Dennis Luke
Rep. Bill Markham Rep. Ray Baum

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Nancy Peterson

STAFF PRESENT: Kathryn Van Natta, Committee Administrator Karen
McCormac, Committee Clerk

MEASURES CONSIDERED: Public Hearing - SB 190 A-Engrossed - SB
1005 - SB 5

Work Session - SB 64 A-Engrossed - SB 65 A-Engrossed - HB 2595

WITNESSES: DON HULL, Director, Department of Geology and
Mineral Industries TOM BARROWS, Northwest Mining Association RICHARD
ANGSTROM, Oregon Concrete and Aggregate

Producers Association STEVE PURCHASE, Assistant Director, Division of
State Lands GARY LYNCH, Mineland Reclamation Land Administrator,

Department of Geology and Mineral Industries PAUL RIVERNECK, Land-Use
Attorney PHILLIP FELL, League of Oregon Cities GREG WOLF, Deputy
Director, Department of Land

Conservation and Development

[--- 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 144, SIDE A

005 CHAIR REPINE: Calls meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 190 A-ENGROSSED

012 KATHRYN VAN NATTA, Committee Administrator: All of today's bill
relate to mining, with the exception of HB 2595. Introduces meeting
materials, including a Senate Amendments to SB 190, a Senate Staff
Measure Summary, a fiscal impact statement which shows there is minimal
fiscal impact on the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
(DOGAMI), a revenue

impact analysis, and a Senate Vote Sheet (EXHIBIT A).

Senate Bill 190 declares a state policy of reclamation of mining lands. It passed the Senate with a 24 - 2 vote.

031 DON HULL, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI): Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT B) in support of SB 190.

060 REP. FISHER: Is there a downside to this bill?

063 HULL: There is no hidden intent in this bill.

066 REP. DELL: The old policy statement discusses the important economic contribution which mining makes. The new policy only discusses

protecting the environment and permitting mining operations. Does that reflect how you see your department's policy?

074 HULL: Some of the language that would be deleted by the bill is actually added back in. That original policy is approximately 23 years

old. We think a more balanced policy is appropriate.

086 REP. DELL: I was reading the older version of the bill; I see now that the A-Engrossed version contains more balanced language.

089 CHAIR REPINE: What do "reclamation practices" constitute?

091 HULL: It's a wide spectrum of activities which restore the unavoidable impacts of mining. Through reclamation, those lands are left in a

condition which makes them suitable for other post-mining activities, such as forestry or farming.

104 CHAIR REPINE: On Line 23 of the A-Engrossed bill, you substituted a set of statutes.

118 HULL: That citation change simply corrects what I felt was originally a drafting error, which referred to a section of mining regulatory law

relating to so-called chemical-process mining, i.e., large-scale gold mining. We hadn't properly referred to the section of law which governs reclamation of aggregate and other mines, not including the chemical-process mines.

130 REP. DOMINY: Why does this bill use the word "may" so often?

134 HULL: We didn't introduce the bill, but support the amended version from the Senate.

155 TOM BARROWS, Northwest Mining Association: We support the A-Engrossed version of the bill. Terry Drever from the Eastern Oregon Mining

Association has faxed a letter (EXHIBIT C) in support of the A-Engrossed version of SB 190.

164 RICHARD ANGSTROM, Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association: Testifies in support of SB 190. Recommends deletion of word "voluntary" on Page 2, Lines 21 and 24 of SB 190 A-Engrossed. Suggests more

encouragement by DOGAMI of better reclamation practices.

194 CHAIR REPINE: Staff will have amendments drafted to eliminate the word "voluntary" from Page 2, Lines 21 and 24. This bill is also scheduled

for this Wednesday.

CLOSES PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 190 A-ENGROSSED

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1005

202 VAN NATTA: Senate Bill 1005 is at the request of the Northwest Mining Association and passed the Senate with a 29 - 0 vote. This bill would

make state mining recording requirements parallel to federal mining requirements, and has no fiscal or revenue impact (EXHIBIT D).

222 TOM BARROWS, Northwest Mining Association: Testifies in support of SB 1005. This bill was introduced at our request to clear up a potential

double requirement for miners in Oregon. Historically, miners have had to perform \$100 of labor each year on a claim to maintain that claim. Last year, Congress decided it would be better if miners sent the \$100 to the federal government rather than perform the work. State statutes still refer to work performed, resulting in double requirements.

237 REP. FISHER: Can miners substitute labor for the \$100 payment?

239 BARROWS: I believe the \$100 payment is a requirement on federal lands. Defers to Don Hull of DOGAMI.

254 I hope to have an amendment ready by Wednesday's meeting which would add an emergency clause to the bill. Also, because the Bureau of Land

Management is using the term "rental fee" rather than "holding fee," we have requested the substitution of "fee" for "holding fee."

268 REP. FISHER: Are the federal and state filing dates the same?

270 BARROWS: I don't believe there is a date reference in the bill.

286 VAN NATTA: Reads into the record a letter from the Terry Drever of the Eastern Oregon Mining Association dated June 14, 1993 in support

of SB

1005 (EXHIBIT E).

Additions to the record: SB 1005 Staff Measure Summary and Senate Vote Sheet (EXHIBIT F) 295 CHAIR REPINE: CLOSSES PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 1005

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 5

304 VAN NATTA: Senate Bill 5 is at the request of the Division of State Lands. It was already in a public hearing on May 5, and is scheduled

for a work session this Wednesday.

This bill eliminates the Division of State Land's authority to grant mineral extraction claims on state lands. The Division of State Lands has never adopted rules to enforce their authority. There is no fiscal or revenue impact, and the bill passed the Senate with a 29 - 0 vote (EXHIBIT G).

334 STEVE PURCHASE, Assistant Director, Division of State Lands: Testifies in support of SB 5. No one has filed a mining claim on state lands due

to the other mechanisms already in place.

Addition to the record: SB 5 Staff Measure Summary (EXHIBIT H)

381 CHAIR REPINE: CLOSSES PUBLIC HEARING ON SB 5

OPENS WORK SESSION ON SB 64 A-ENGROSSED

385 VAN NATTA: Senate Bill 64 is at the request of the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries. This bill passed the Senate with a 20 - 6 vote (EXHIBIT I), and deals with civil penalties for unpermitted

mining. It has been through the Judiciary Committee when it was in the Senate. There is a minimal fiscal impact and no revenue impact for SB 64 A-Engrossed (EXHIBIT J).

438 REP. FISHER: Why is this not related to a chemical-process mine? Are they handled differently?

460 GARY LYNCH, Mineland Reclamation Land Administrator, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries: Civil penalty authority currently

exists for chemical-process mines, and greater penalty provisions apply.

487 REP. FISHER: Is heap leach performed by a small operator considered a chemical?

TAPE 145, SIDE A

040 LYNCH: If you're heap leaching, you're no longer considered "small" if your operation is more than 5,000 cubic yards.

044 CHAIR REPINE: Why is this bill being proposed?

051 LYNCH: Over the last couple of years, violations have increased. We currently have a \$1,000 one-time penalty which is almost a disincentive. This bill authorizes three separate penalties for certain violations.

080 CHAIR REPINE: Requests explanation of indeterminate revenue from bill.

082 DON HULL, Director, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries: We don't foresee a large volume of civil penalties levied, but anticipate

that this will have more of a deterrent effect.

100 CHAIR REPINE: What sort of operations will this bill affect?

101 HULL: Aggregate operations, sand and gravel pits, stone quarries, and metal mines other than the so-called chemical-process mines.

103 REP. LUKE: If an aggregate miner is working slightly out of their area, will he be charged \$10,000 per day until he has restored the area, or

until he has ceased mining?

107 HULL: Penalties would be scaled to the severity of the violation. It would be important to have clear administrative rules before we

implement the authority given by this bill. Only serious impacts on the environment or on human health and safety would require the larger penalty amounts. Stepping one foot out of bounds for one day would certainly not incur a \$10,000 per day penalty. The bill also gives our governing board a fair amount of latitude in insuring that fines would be commensurate with the severity of the violation.

121 REP. LUKE: Does the fine stop when production has ceased or when the site is restored?

125 LYNCH: Once a violator has submitted a plan to correct the action or has stopped the activity, the penalty would stop.

161 REP. FISHER: Refers to mining violation which occurred in 1992 near Roseburg. What type of fines would be charged for that incident?

173 HULL: The bill contains fine print which grants a warning to violators. I would think there would be sufficient time for a violator to fix a

problem before a fine would be imposed.

190 LYNCH: I believe you're referring to the Beaver State case, in which the agency sided with the operator that there was not a violation at

that site.

199 REP. FISHER: The incident only got ugly because of outside influences.

204 Is there a limit to the penalty amount which can be imposed for one incident?

212 LYNCH: Not that I'm aware of. If someone continues to operate without a permit, however, the agency may need to obtain a restraining order to stop them.

225 REP. DELL: Requests specifics of penalty process.

253 HULL: The penalty notice would contain the mine operator's appeal rights, and would specify that any decision imposed by the governing

board is subject to appeal of the Court of Appeals. We would also let them know which penalty the agency was recommending to the governing board, and the nature of the violation would be specified.

272 REP. DELL: So a violator would not necessarily know what their fine is?

274 LYNCH: We would specify the range of the penalty which would be charged for non-compliance.

The first step would always be a warning unless there was irreparable harm to the environment or a threat to public health and safety.

315 REP. FISHER: What retroactive penalties would apply?

325 LYNCH: Some of these cases will be subjective, such as determining whether a violator acted willfully, etc.

371 REP. FISHER: Would you be adverse to the addition of a cap for penalties?

384 HULL: Requests time to consider request.

TAPE 144, SIDE B

024 REP. MARKHAM: Is the penalty for a heap leach violation \$50,000 per day?

025 HULL: That's the maximum amount.

031 CHAIR REPINE: How many times has that penalty been imposed?

032 HULL: Never.

036 VAN NATTA: Reads into the record a letter from Terry Drever of the Eastern Oregon Mining Association dated June 14, 1993 requesting

specific amendments (EXHIBIT K) to SB 64.

054 REP. MARKHAM: The leeway requested in those proposed amendments is what DOGAMI believes they already do.

070 RICHARD ANGSTROM, Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association: Testifies in support of SB 64.

100 REP. HOSTICKA: If someone is operating illegally, how much could they gross in one day?

102 ANGSTROM: Probably \$6,000 per day.

175 CHAIR REPINE: Requests Rep. Fisher to draft amendments which would impose a cap on penalty amounts.

186 REP. DOMINY: Suggests that Chair Repine determine whether there will be committee support for amendments. 195 CHAIR REPINE: What would you think of those amendments?

196 REP. DOMINY: I would be opposed.

197 REP. BAUM: What would the amendments do?

201 REP. FISHER: They would impose a maximum total amount for any one violation.

206 REP. DOMINY: The reason for the daily penalty is to insure that the violation stops. The penalty should be imposed for every day in which

the violation occurs. I would be opposed to a cap.

215 REP. DELL: I understand the reason for the cap, but I would oppose it also.

223 REP. LUKE: I don't see much reason for a cap. If the agency gets carried away, we could come back next session and impose a cap.

228 REP. MARKHAM: I have no comment.

235 CHAIR REPINE: I also think that having a cap would lessen deterrence.

241 REP. FISHER: If the agency involved were OSHA and not DOGAMI, I think the committee would have a different reaction.

245 MOTION: REP. LUKE: Moves SB 64 A-ENGROSSED to the FULL COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES with a DO PASS RECOMMENDATION.

248 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

250 VOTE: REPS. BAUM, DELL, DOMINY, FISHER, HOSTICKA, LUKE, MARKHAM and CHAIR REPINE vote AYE. REP. PETERSON is EXCUSED.

257 CHAIR REPINE: The motion CARRIES.

Additions to the record: SB 64 Staff Measure Summary and Senate Amendments to SB 64 (EXHIBIT

L)

CLOSES WORK SESSION ON SB 64 A-ENGROSSED

OPENS WORK SESSION ON SB 65 A-ENGROSSED

268 VAN NATTA: Senate Bill 65 A-Engrossed also comes from DOGAMI, and is a "housekeeping" bill for the agency. This bill was in a public hearing

on May 5. There is a fiscal impact for DOGAMI, but there is no revenue impact (EXHIBIT M). It passed the Senate on a 29 - 1 vote (EXHIBIT N).

301 DON HULL, Director, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries: The savings in the fiscal impact is due to a lab closure.

313 CHAIR REPINE: Is that closure anticipated in your budget?

314 HULL: Yes. It has been reviewed by both the Senate Ways and Means and the House Appropriations committees.

316 REP. DOMINY: What did the lab do?

318 HULL: It has done different types of analytical work in support of our field programs. Historically, most of the lab work has been directed

toward the evaluation of mineral resources in Oregon. In recent years, most of it has been industrial minerals. A small part of the lab goes to support a regulatory program and earthquake hazard studies.

340 REP. DOMINY: How will that work be performed without the lab?

342 HULL: We would privatize that work and/or contract with university-based labs which are already in place. We've always

privatized a certain amount of our very specialized labwork.

355 REP. DOMINY: Where is the savings?

358 HULL: We'll do much less labwork. A lottery-funded initiative would support some of those contracted activities.

367 REP. DOMINY: How will DOGAMI handle labwork for things like heap-leach mining?

377 HULL: The 1991 legislation for heap-leach mining contains provisions for cost recovery of any of our expenditures or any aspect of the

regulatory process. That program is fully-funded in that the law allows

us to recover those costs from the applicant and/or the mine operator.

389 REP. FISHER: In Section 3(5) of the bill, it establishes a lab. Are you discarding one lab to gain another?

394 HULL: No. We tried to prioritize all our activities. One category contains items we "shall" do. The other area lists activities which we

"may" do.

432 MOTION: REP. BAUM: Moves SB 65 A-ENGROSSED to the FULL COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES with a DO PASS RECOMMENDATION.

437 CHAIR BAUM: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

VOTE: REPS. BAUM, DELL, DOMINY, FISHER, HOSTICKA, LUKE and CHAIR REPINE vote AYE. REPS. MARKHAM and PETERSON are EXCUSED.

450 CHAIR BAUM: The motion CARRIES. REP. HOSTICKA will lead discussion on the floor.

Additions to the record: SB 65 A-Engrossed Staff Measure Summary and Senate Amendments to SB

65 (EXHIBIT O)

453 CLOSES WORK SESSION ON SB 65 A-ENGROSSED

OPENS WORK SESSION ON HB 2595

457 VAN NATTA: In your packets today are the -1 amendments from the Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association (EXHIBIT P). House Bill

2595 deals with appeals to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), which have also been addressed in HB 2020 and HB 3661.

069 CHAIR BAUM: We have also been handed two pages which amend the amendments.

071 VAN NATTA: Yes. The handwritten addition to Page 3 eliminates the filing fee for the Department of Land Conservation and Development,

cites or counties. The hand-written addition to Page 10 states than an "applicant shall have the final opportunity to rebut evidence in the record" (EXHIBIT Q).

090 RICHARD ANGSTROM, Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association: Testifies in support of HB 2595 -1 amendments.

The \$1,250 filing fee on Page 3, Line 9 of the -1 amendments is an arbitrary amount. We want that money to be used to help fund the LUBA budget, help LCDC with dispute resolution or help with the Dispute

Resolution Commission. We have suggested that DLCD, cities and counties be exempt from the fee.

Page 8 of the -1 amendments addresses the need for clear and objective statements from LUBA as a part of their remands. This also encourages them to use dispute resolution.

People who object to development do not have the same burden of proof as developers. Lines 28 and 29 on Page 10 allow us to have the "last shot."

177 PAUL RIVERNECK, Land-Use Attorney: Testifies in favor of HB 2595 and the -1 amendments. Describes difficulties of the LUBA process for developers.

262 REP. HOSTICKA: Is the \$1,250 filing fee adjustable?

265 RIVERNECK: No. You would have to have \$1,250 in cash to appeal.

282 REP. HOSTICKA: The fee would preclude people who have a legitimate basis for appeal, but who don't have the \$1,250.

285 RIVERNECK: I tell my aggregate mining clients to reserve \$125,000 to \$150,000 for a gravel pit siting. If someone comes to me regarding a

LUBA appeal, I tell them we'll need between \$7,500 to \$15,000 to go through the process.

298 REP. DELL: Don't you think that \$1,250 is an undue burden for someone who is only trying to put a house on their five acres of land?

305 RIVERNECK: If someone is willing to take things all the way up to the Oregon Supreme Court, it will probably cost a total of \$50,000.

373 REP. DELL: How are you defining "alternative dispute resolution" on Page 8, Line 19 of the -1 amendments?

395 RIVERNECK: I think what the drafters had in mind was the mechanism used by DLCD, such as an inhouse mediation unit.

417 REP. DELL: How can we make sure this requirement can be met?

421 ANGSTROM: We support using the Dispute Resolution Commission if that service is available. 476 REP. DELL: The language needs to be clarified.

497 RIVERNECK: This is a prime example of how rule-making could further clarify and elaborate specific steps.

047 PHILLIP FELL, League of Oregon Cities: The league has no formal position on the fee increase. We are especially supportive of the changes on

Page 8, Subsection 14, regarding land use decision remands. You may want to add language at the end of Subsection 15 which suggests that parties should not be liable for any offers or discussion made during mediation. Should mediation fail, parties should not be held to alternatives discussed during mediation should the appeal again move forward.

072 ANGSTROM: We would agree with that.

074 FELL: The applicant should have the final opportunity to rebut since they have the burden of proof, so we're in support of the changes on

Page 10, Lines 28 and 29 of the -1 amendments.

090 GREG WOLF, Deputy Director, Department of Land Conservation and Development: This committee recently passed a bill which requires that

LUBA provide a statement to parties involved in a dispute that mediation information or assistance may be obtained from DLCD. Similar language could be used in these amendments. Rather than requiring dispute resolution, other states are requiring parties to "convene in a meeting" to explore with an experienced mediator whether dispute resolution is viable.

114 REP. DELL: Can they get together at that stage and decide to arbitrate?

119 WOLF: No. The intent is mediation, not arbitration.

Also, a third-party mediator may not be necessary if the parties are already close to an agreement.

135 REP. DOMINY: How do you feel about the \$1,250 filing fee? 142 WOLF: This would probably deter frivolous appeals. But I'm not sure how this would impact the process.

154 REP. DOMINY: Does this hurt or help LCDC in the appeals process?

157 WOLF: The portion regarding mediation would help.

166 MOTION: REP. DELL: Moves to AMEND the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, on Page 8, Line 18 by striking "attempted" and inserting "attempt" and on Line 19 by striking "alternative dispute resolution" and inserting "mediation."

Also, AMENDS the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS by striking "present evidence in the form of rebuttal" on Page 10, Lines 28 and 29 and

inserting

"to rebut evidence in the record."

Finally, AMENDS the intent of the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS by adding to Page 3, Line 10 that any kind of filing fees or deposits shall not apply to DLCD, cities or counties.

209 REP. LUKE: Should state agencies be included?

210 REP. DELL: Why don't we just say "state agencies and local jurisdictions"?

214 VAN NATTA: Is it your intent to exempt local neighborhood districts?

220 REP. DELL: No.

221 VAN NATTA: I would recommend language which states, "state agencies, cities or county governments as defined under an ORS."

227 REP. DELL: My intent is to exempt state agencies, cities, counties and special districts such as transportation districts, etc.

242 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion. Hearing no objection, the motion CARRIES.

248 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA: Moves to change the fee on Page 3, Line 9 of the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, from \$1,250 to \$125.

266 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

267 REP. DELL: I'm not sure \$125 is sufficient.

274 REP. HOSTICKA: Withdraws motion.

275 MOTION: REP. DOMINY: Moves to change the fee on Page 3, Line 9 of the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, from \$1,250 to

\$750. 281 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

286 VOTE: REPS. DOMINY, MARKHAM and CHAIR REPINE vote AYE. REPS. DELL, FISHER, HOSTICKA and LUKE vote NO. REPS. BAUM and PETERSON are

EXCUSED.

294 CHAIR REPINE: The motion FAILS.

302 MOTION: REP. HOSTICKA: Moves to change the fee on Page 3, Line 9 of the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, from \$1,250 to

\$500.

304 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

306 VOTE: REPS. DELL and HOSTICKA vote AYE. REPS. DOMINY, FISHER,

LUKE, MARKHAM and CHAIR REPINE vote NO. REPS. BAUM and PETERSON are

EXCUSED.

312 CHAIR REPINE: The motion FAILS.

318 REP. HOSTICKA: If determining a new filing fee prevents us from passing the bill, I would move to strike any reference regarding the fee from

the bill.

319 REP. LUKE: Let's leave the fee at \$1,250, but require that the fee be reimbursed to the prevailing party.

323 CHAIR REPINE: I would like to resolve this issue. If we can't resolve it, I will close the work session.

332 REP. LUKE: I would vote in favor of the \$750 fee to save the bill.

333 CHAIR REPINE: We've already tried that figure once, but it didn't get enough votes.

346 REP. DELL: It's clear that some committee members want a lower number, whereas others want a higher one. Usually that is resolved by moving

towards the middle.

362 MOTION: REP. DELL: Moves to change the fee on Page 3, Line 9 of the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, from \$1,250 to \$750.

363 CHAIR BAUM: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

364 VOTE: REPS. DELL, DOMINY, HOSTICKA, LUKE and CHAIR REPINE vote AYE. REPS. FISHER and MARKHAM vote NO. REPS. BAUM and PETERSON are

EXCUSED.

365 CHAIR BAUM: The motion CARRIES.

382 MOTION: REP. LUKE: Moves the HB 2595 -1 AMENDMENTS (LC 1481), dated 6-11-93, AS AMENDED, to HB 2595.

382 VOTE: REPS. DELL, DOMINY, HOSTICKA, LUKE, MARKHAM and CHAIR REPINE vote AYE. REP. FISHER votes NO. REPS. BAUM and PETERSON are

EXCUSED.

397 CHAIR BAUM: The motion CARRIES.

399 MOTION: REP. LUKE: Moves HB 2595 AS AMENDED to the FULL COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES with a DO PASS RECOMMENDATION.

403 CHAIR BAUM: Restates motion and calls for discussion.

404 VOTE: REPS. DELL, DOMINY, FISHER, HOSTICKA, LUKE, MARKHAM and CHAIR BAUM vote AYE.

406 CHAIR BAUM: The motion CARRIES. REP. DELL will lead discussion on the floor.

CLOSES WORK SESSION ON HB 2595

Adjourns meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Karen McCormac
Administrator

Kathryn Van Natta Committee Clerk Committee

EXHIBIT LOG: A - Senate Amendments to SB 190, SB 190 Staff Measure Summary, SB 190 Fiscal Analysis, SB 190 Revenue Impact Analysis, and SB 190 Senate Vote Sheet - Staff - 6 pages B - SB 190 Testimony - Don Hull - 1 page C - SB 190 Testimony - Terry Drever - 1 page D - SB 1005 Fiscal Impact Assessment and Revenue Impact Analysis - Staff - 2 pages E - SB 1005 Testimony - Terry Drever - 1 page F - SB 1005 Staff Measure Summary, Senate Vote Sheet - Staff - 2 pages G - SB 5 Fiscal Impact Assessment, Revenue Impact Analysis, and Senate Vote Sheet - Staff - 2 pages H - SB 5 Staff Measure Summary - Staff - 1 page I - SB 64 A-Engrossed Senate Vote Sheet - Staff - 1 page J - SB 64 Fiscal Analysis and Revenue Impact Analysis - Staff - 2 pages K - SB 64 Testimony - Terry Drever - 1 page L - SB 64 A-Engrossed Staff Measure Summary and Senate Amendments to SB 64 - Staff - 2 pages M - SB 65 Fiscal Analysis and Revenue Impact Analysis - Staff - 2 pages N - SB 65 Senate Vote Sheet - Staff - 1 page O - SB 65 A-Engrossed Staff Measure Summary and Senate Amendments to SB 65 - Staff - 2 pages P - Proposed -1 Amendments to HB 2595 (LC 1481), 6-11-93 - Staff - 11 pages Q - Handwritten Amendments to HB 2595 - Staff - 2 pages