

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE

April 12, 1993 Hearing Room D 1:30 p.m. Tapes 65 - 66

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Rep. Bill Fisher

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

MEASURES CONSIDERED: Public Hearing and Work Session - HB 2210

Public Hearing - HB 2934 - HB 3526 - HB 3501

WITNESSES: PHIL WARD, Oregon Department of Agriculture LANA
BUTTERFIELD, Northwest Propane Association STEVE MacKINDER, Empire Gas
REP. DENNY JONES LAURA WYANT, Horse Council of Oregon JACK GRAHAM, Jory
Hill Stables BOBBY USHER, Bobby Usher Training Stables KATHY USHER,
Bobby Usher Training Stables JEANNETTE V. BARNES, J & B Ranch DON
SCHELLENBERG, Oregon Farm Bureau GREG WOLF, Oregon Land Conservation
and Development

Department (LCDC) TAM HERMENS, Deschutes Horse Council

[--- 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 ---]

DALE BLANTON, Policy Analyst, Oregon Land Conservation and
Development Department (LCDC) ART SCHLACK, Association of Oregon
Counties GARY HEER, Marion County Commissioner; Chair, Association of
Oregon Counties Land Use Steering Committee JEN TWINING, Alliance
for Responsible Land Use Planning in Deschutes County LARRY GEORGE,
Executive Director, Oregonians in Action KELLY ROSS, Oregon Association
of Realtors MEG CAMPBELL, Greenbelt Land Trust MARION MILLARD, Citizen
MARY KYLE McCURDY, 1,000 Friends of Oregon LIZ FRENKEL, Oregon Sierra
Club KEN BIERLY, Division of State Lands

TAPE 66, SIDE A

005 CHAIR REPINE: Calls meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. Let the record
show that the committee is currently operating as a sub of the
subcommittee.

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2210

011 KATHRYN VAN NATTA, Committee Administrator: Explains rescheduling

of HB 2210 from April 7 meeting. House Bill 2210 would modify the pipe size

for license fees on liquid petroleum gas meters, which are assessed by the Department of Agriculture. The fiscal impact analysis (EXHIBIT A) shows a net reduction of other fund revenues, and there is no revenue impact on state or local governments (EXHIBIT B).

029 CHAIR REPINE: Let the record show we are now in a full subcommittee, with five members in attendance.

031 PHIL WARD, Oregon Department of Agriculture: Presents written testimony in favor of HB 2210 (EXHIBIT C).

081 LANA BUTTERFIELD, Northwest Propane Gas Association: Presents written testimony in favor of HB 2210 (EXHIBIT D).

093 STEVE MACKINDER, Empire Gas: Testifies in support of HB 2210.

098 VICE-CHAIR DELL: CLOSSES PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2210

110 CHAIR REPINE: OPENS WORK SESSION ON HB 2210

115 MOTION: REP. LUKE moves HB 2210 to the FULL COMMITTEE on NATURAL RESOURCES with a DO PASS RECOMMENDATION.

120 CHAIR REPINE: Restates motion and calls for discussion. Hearing no opposition, the motion CARRIES. REP. DOMINY will lead discussion on the floor.

Additions to the record: HB 2210 Preliminary Staff Measure Summary (EXHIBIT E)

127 CLOSSES WORK SESSION ON HB 2210

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2934

155 VAN NATTA: House Bill 2934 is a member-sponsored bill for the Horse Council of Oregon, and expands the definition of "farm use" to include

the training and stabling of livestock. Explains how measure would affect current statutes.

160 REP. MARKHAM: Would this level the playing field in all counties?

163 VAN NATTA: Yes.

189 VAN NATTA: House Bill 2934 has no fiscal impact on state or local governments, but there is a revenue impact (EXHIBIT F).

183 REP. MARKHAM: Is this revenue impact due to the fact that the counties need to change their dealings with the LCDC?

185 VAN NATTA: I imagine the revenue impact is due to the

different definition, which would lead to a difference in assessment.

197 REP. DENNY JONES: Testifies in favor of HB 2934.

231 REP. DOMINY: How would you suggest we replace this loss in revenue?

235 REP. JONES: I do not see that there would be any revenue impact to the state of Oregon, unless horse trainers had to be licensed.

248 REP. LUKE: The revenue impact is only to local government.

249 VICE-CHAIR DELL: The revenue statement shows this bill will impact "state or local government."

261 REP. LUKE: In Deschutes County, riding arenas and stables are not a permitted use on EFU land, which may change tax assessments.

288 LAURA WYANT, Horse Council of Oregon: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT G) in favor of HB 2934. There is no announced opposition to

this bill.

364 JACK GRAHAM, Jory Hill Stables: Testifies in support of HB 2934. Describes difficulties in training and stabling horses under present

laws. TAPE 66, SIDE A

010 VICE-CHAIR DELL: Perhaps the conditional use process, which required you to pay \$12,000 for your permit, may be the loss in revenue referred to in the impact statement.

016 GRAHAM: This bill would only clarify conditions. New businesses would still have to go through the conditional use permit process, and

counties would have the opportunity to determine the conditions. There are twenty-two horse-boarding stables in Marion County, but only two are legal.

043 REP. HOSTICKA: Do you pay taxes based on farm-use assessment now?

045 GRAHAM: Marion County has allowed the tax deferral, but I'm not sure other counties would. Counties could determine that a horse-boarding

stable is ineligible for the tax deferral if it's a commercial operation like mine.

052 REP. HOSTICKA: If the county did not allow the tax deferral, what impact would that have on your taxes?

053 GRAHAM: Since I have only three acres involved in the boarding stable, it would be relatively insignificant.

058 BOBBY USHER, Bobby Usher Training Stables: Provides written

testimony (EXHIBIT H) in favor of HB 2934.

090 KATHY USHER, Bobby Usher Training Stables: We work seven days a week, and have had to raise cattle because the horse-training business was not self-sufficient. If we had to pay licenses, fees or any additional

taxes, we would not be able to maintain our business.

101 REP. LUKE: It surprises me that people are allowed to raise and train reindeer, but are not allowed to raise horses.

104 GRAHAM: That is also true of llamas, which are treated as "agriculture," whereas horses are not.

118 TAM HERMENS, Deschutes Horse Council: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT I) in support of HB 2934.

161 JEANETTE V. BARNES, J & B Ranch: Testifies in favor of HB 2934. We board six horses, but if we were not in a tax-deferral zone, we would be unable to do so. Polk County is re-interpreting a policy which has

maintained that horses are not livestock, but are only for pleasure, thereby excluding them from farm deferral.

201 CHAIR REPINE: Do you currently receive a deferral on your taxes?

203 BARNES: Yes, but only because it was set in place before we owned the property.

206 CHAIR REPINE: Should a reasonable threshold be established to differentiate boarding facilities from a party who only owns one horse

for recreational purposes?

212 BARNES: Whether you own one horse or twenty, all horses should be treated as "livestock."

239 DON SCHELLENBERG, Oregon Farm Bureau: Testifies in support of HB 2934. Counties can be more restrictive than the state on land-use planning

issues. While this bill would level the playing field and make it an outright use, counties could still say they didn't want it as an outright use, but as a conditional use. Encourages other witnesses to work with their counties to insure that county ordinances are no more restrictive than state laws and rules.

270 REP. LUKE: If counties decided to be more restrictive, would they need to hold a public hearing?

273 SCHELLENBERG: Yes.

278 REP. JOSI: If we include training and stabling to this bill on Page 3, Line 36 through 39, would that be applied to the \$10,000 threshold?

287 SCHELLENBERG: No. Because it is an outright use, they would not have to meet the qualifications for a dwelling.

317 REP. HOSTICKA: On Page 2, Line 29, it states that you could put a dwelling on real property used for farm use without an income test. If

somebody stables a horse, does that entitle them to a dwelling on property which they may not otherwise be entitled to?

327 VICE-CHAIR DELL: We should ask a representative from the Land Conservation and Development Department to respond to that question.

330 REP. MARKHAM: How did horses originally get categorized separately from "livestock"?

334 SCHELLENBERG: I suspect that land-use laws have caused the problem.

354 GREG WOLF, Land Conservation and Development Department: I believe the law was changed to make this distinction when marginal lands legislation was passed.

371 REP. DOMINY: Do you view this as a good or bad bill?

380 WOLF: We have not taken a position on this bill. However, the distinction between land use and whether or not a dwelling is authorized should be maintained.

384 REP. DOMINY: Besides devaluation of property, are there other fees or fines which may contribute to the fiscal impact of this bill?

390 WOLF: I understood there was fiscal impact on local government, and assume it is due to ordinance modification.

398 REP. DELL: The report we received was not a fiscal impact statement, but reflects a revenue impact. How would this bill impact revenue?

406 WOLF: I cannot comment on that.

407 REP. DELL: Requests explanation between HB 2934 and farm deferral.

411 DALE BLANTON, Policy Analyst, LCDC: To respond to your previous question, there may have been an assumption that some properties which

are disqualified from farm deferral could qualify, which may affect the revenue status for local government. Currently, statutes regarding non-marginal lands counties state that the boarding, breeding and training horses for profit is an authorized use. Although this language

is different, it does not change the "authorized use." I cannot see a change in deferral for those uses. Some counties may make a distinction in the size of operations, as far as whether or not they are commercial activities in conjunction with farm use, as opposed to the boarding, breeding and training of horses for profit, but that is a subtle distinction. It's a matter of how counties choose to regulate.

TAPE 65, SIDE B

007 REP. LUKE: If a farm given a farm deferral, it lowers their personal property taxes, but does not change the overall tax collection in the

county. It might change the rate, but not the overall amount of money the county collects.

015 REP. HOSTICKA: Will classifying this as a farm use not affect whether property is eligible for a dwelling?

018 WOLF: I believe that's true.

020 ART SCHLACK, Association of Oregon Counties: In general, counties distinguish between commercial stable operations and the boarding of

horses for a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use, and require conditional use permits. From a land-use standpoint, the issue is the question of intensity, public health and safety, and compatibility. When you are having shows, giving lessons, and bringing large numbers of people on a site for a commercial activity in conjunction with farm use, there are land-use issues that local governments address by establishing mitigation measures through the conditional use permit process. Some counties require public hearings with notice, whereas others conduct an administrative process, issuing an administrative decision with the right to appeal.

048 VICE-CHAIR DELL: Would counties still have the right to do that with this bill?

050 SCHLACK: The AOC planners will be discussing this issue later this week, so I cannot provide AOC's position on HB 2934 at this time.

Additions to the record: HB 2934 Preliminary Staff Measure Summary (EXHIBIT J)

055 VICE-CHAIR DELL: CLOSING PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2934 OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 3526

062 VAN NATTA: Explains HB 3526, which is sponsored by the Association of Oregon Counties, and will limit the LCDC's authority to appeal certain

types of land-use decisions, and also limits their ability to intervene and be made a party at LUBA (Land Use Board of Appeals).

Introduces meeting materials, including a revenue impact analysis (EXHIBIT K), which shows there is no revenue impact. There is no fiscal impact statement yet for this bill. Introduces letter from Keith Bartholomew of 1,000 Friends of Oregon dated April 12, 1993 (EXHIBIT L).

087 GARY HEER, Marion County Commissioner; Chair, Association of Oregon Counties Land Use Steering Committee: Testifies in support of HB 3526.

The real issue is empowering counties and authorizing them to conduct their own business.

109 ARTHUR SCHLACK, Association of Oregon Counties: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT M) in support of HB 3526.

159 REP. LUKE: Do you know how much money the counties spend in justifying their plans to the LCDC?

161 SCHLACK: No, but it is considerable when planners and attorneys are involved in the process. We can provide an estimate if you like.

163 REP. HOSTICKA: What's an example of a limited land-use decision?

167 SCHLACK: This bill is intended to address quasi-judicial land-use actions consistent with the comprehensive plan in implementing

ordinances, such as a conditional use permit, a dwelling for farm or forestland, or a land division. The basis for those decisions are embodied in the policies of the comprehensive plan, and the standards are set forth in the implementing ordinance, i.e., the zoning ordinance or land division regulations that have had exhaustive reviews. There is an opportunity for LCDC to review those before they are finally put into place. We are not talking about comprehensive plan amendments or amendments to ordinances.

186 REP. HOSTICKA: If a new group of commissioners was elected, and they were hostile to the original plan or to the whole land-use planning

effort, how would their actions be checked?

193 SCHLACK: Local land-use decisions would still be subject to

review within the community, and the ability to appeal those decisions.

197 HOSTICKA: Unless we pass another bill which currently is pending.

198 SCHLACK: Yes. The second way, which we feel is preferable, is an "enforcement order," which can be placed on local governments when

decisions or activities have been deemed to be inconsistent with the statewide planning program. LCDC would make the determination to implement an enforcement order.

215 REP. LUKE: Would this bill prevent local citizens from appealing to the LCDC?

216 SCHLACK: This will not affect the ability of a citizen or interest group to appeal a local land-use decision.

228 GREG WOLF, LCDC: Testifies in opposition to HB 3526. The term "individual land-use decisions" is unclear. It could include a variety

of land-use decisions when that term is litigated. Statewide, LCDC appealed eleven land-use decisions in 1991, and fourteen in 1992. The only other alternative we have is the enforcement process, which is rarely used because it is cumbersome. The department does not necessarily always try to prevent something from happening, but also appeals decisions when we believe development permits are being held up inappropriately. Also, the enforcement process does not engender trust between the state and local government, and for that reason, we have used it sparingly.

262 VICE-CHAIR DELL: Requests written testimony from witness.

265 CHAIR REPINE: You noted that the enforcement process is cumbersome. How can we help make this easier?

267 WOLF: Statutes define how the enforcement process works. The process could be streamlined, and we would be happy to help with that.

274 VICE-CHAIR DELL: What thresholds have been established to determine when to use the enforcement process?

276 WOLF: The standard for the use of the enforcement process is a pattern or practice of decision-making which violates the goals. "Pattern or

practice" may always be subject to debate. We filed five appeals in one county, which would constitute a "pattern."

290 REP. LUKE: Which county and what kind of pattern?

292 WOLF: In 1992, we filed five appeals in Coos County, and four appeals in Yamhill County. In Coos County, most of the appeals had to do with

how water services were extended outside of the urban growth boundary.

In Yamhill County, the appeals were all related to agricultural lands issues.

310 REP. LUKE: Are you saying that LCDC is involved in whether a city extends services to people outside the urban growth boundary?

314 WOLF: We get involved in the extension of services when we believe that an extension may create a land-use pattern that violates the goals.

334 REP. LUKE: What was the situation in Yamhill County?

335 WOLF: The issues were whether a dwelling or division were appropriate.

343 REP. LUKE: Were appeals filed by local groups which caused LCDC to become interested in these areas? 347 WOLF: We filed the appeals on our own. There was a pattern of interpretation there that would have caused a land-use problem in the

long run.

357 REP. LUKE: If you file an enforcement order, do you have to prove your case? When you file an appeal, the county has to prove its case. Is

that basically the difference?

360 DALE BLANTON, Policy Analyst, Land Conservation and Development Department: There is a substantial evidence test that local government

bears when it makes its land-use decisions. When we appeal those to

LUBA, we must show that we raised issues locally, participated in

proceedings, etc., and must show how the local action violated the

comprehensive plan. Ultimately, local government must have substantial

evidence to support its decision. For enforcement orders, it is a "good cause to believe" standard. We need to establish whether the commission has good cause to believe that local actions are violating the

comprehensive plan or land-use regulations.

404 REP. DELL: Is LCDC's burden of proof greater under the LUBA appeals process than with the enforcement order?

419 BLANTON: The primary difference is whether or not there is a neutral third party, such as LUBA, or whether the commission

is the

decision-maker, which is the way the enforcement process works.

425 REP. DELL: How many appeals have you won?

427 WOLF: We win most of our appeals.

432 REP. LUKE: Do you win because you're right or because it's easier for others to go along with you?

436 WOLF: We win because under the law, we're right.

440 CHAIR REPINE: Earlier you mentioned that the phrase "individual land-use decisions" was unclear.

441 WOLF: My point was that the term "individual" was not defined.

TAPE 66, SIDE B

028 JEN TWINING, Citizen, Alliance for Responsible Land Use Planning in Deschutes County (ARLU-DECO): Testifies in opposition to HB 3526. I

feel compelled to respond to the "trust" issue brought up by the AOC.

In the last year, we have initiated an enforcement order proceeding

against Deschutes County. We found hundreds of violations of their own

comprehensive plan. To prevent the lengthy and costly enforcement order procedure, the commission urged the county and ARLU-DECO to come to an

agreement, which we did. This bill precludes the one way LCDC has to

monitor counties without having to go through a costly and lengthy

enforcement order proceeding.

058 REP. LUKE: This bill does not eliminate the ability of an individual citizen to file a complaint with the LCDC and have a hearing.

068 TWINING: We do not believe it is the responsibility of citizens to monitor all individual applications and the decisions made on them. We

feel it is the LCDC's responsibility.

073 REP. LUKE: Are you suggesting LCDC monitor every land-use application?

074 TWINING: They may discover a pattern and appeal the process.

091 REP. DELL: What would happen if you could still appeal individual decisions? How might the balance be skewed to give the counties more

weight in interpreting their own ordinances?

098 WOLF: A better enforcement process could be developed. Recent

court cases may skew balance.

113 REP. LUKE: City and county commissioners are elected by people in their area. There is frustration with the presumption that a state plan

always supersedes local plans.

126 LARRY GEORGE, Executive Director, Oregonians in Action: Testifies) in favor of HB 3526. We recomend changing "individual land-use decision"

on Line 17 of Page 1 to "quasi-judicial land-use decisions,", which still allows LCDC to be involved in legislative land-use decisions.

156 REP. JOSI: Would you retain the word "individual" and add "quasi-judicial?"

155 GEORGE: I believe we would delete "individual" and substitute "quasi-judicial."

161 REP. JOSI: Would a decision by county commissioners or by planning commissioners be a quasi-judicial decision?

163 VICE-CHAIR DELL: Not all planning commission decisions are quasi-judicial, but the term "individual" is too unclear.

167 REP. JOSI: When would a decision by county commissions be defined as "quasi-judicial?"

183 DALE BLANTON, Policy Analyst, Land Conservation and Development Department: A quasi-judicial land-use decision affects one or few

properties, and is not done in the context of comprehensive planning.

There are better distinctions in the statutes than "quasi-judicial."

For instance, ORS Chapter 197.610 through 625 reflect the kinds of actions that amend comprehensive plans in land-use regulations that must be noticed by LCDC before they occur. Those kinds of actions would still authorize appeals by the LCDC. The more narrow implementation actions

they are talking about may fall within the definition of "permit," which is in both county and city statutes.

Addition to the record: HB 3526 Preliminary Staff Measure Summary (EXHIBIT N) 209 VICE-CHAIR DELL: CLOSES PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 3526

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 3501

218 VAN NATTA: House Bill 3501 deals with land-use inventories and is sponsored by Common Ground. Introduces meeting materials, including a

preliminary staff measure summary (EXHIBIT O) and a revenue impact statement (EXHIBIT P) which shows there is no revenue impact. There is

a fiscal impact, but we do not yet have the statement. Explains effect of bill on current statutes.

245 JOHN CHANDLER, Common Ground: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT Q) in support of HB 3501.

398 KELLY ROSS, Oregon Association of Realtors: Testifies in support of HB 3501. Describes problems which have occurred due to the avoidance of

the completion of Goal 5 by the City of Jacksonville.

TAPE 67, SIDE A (Note: Due to damage, Tapes 67 and 68 are unavailable. The remaining minutes have been compiled from notes taken during the meeting.)

008 CHAIR REPINE: Has Jacksonville not completed its Goal 5 process because it does not want development or because it will cost money to improve

services to citizens who live in undefined zones?

012 ROSS: Both.

014 MEG CAMPBELL, Greenbelt Land Trust: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT R) in opposition to HB 3501. A study done by the National Parks Service provides statistics regarding the increased value of land which is

adjacent to open spaces. Quality of life is the number one factor in corporate relocations.

071 REP. LUKE: How do they finance the greenway in Boulder, Colorado?

074 CAMPBELL: Through a usage tax. They acquire more than 2,000 acres per year and spend up to \$5,000,000 annually.

079 CHAIR REPINE: House Bill 3501 basically says that land should be identified for zoning, which also allows the opportunity to preserve

open, undeveloped areas.

136 REP. LUKE: The bill requires June 1994 as the deadline for inventory reporting. How much time would be reasonable for inventory reporting?

140 CAMPBELL: I don't know. Recommends input from city and county planners.

210 MARION MILLARD, Citizen: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT S) in opposition to HB 3501. 226 REP. LUKE: Has Redmond inventoried all its zones?

230 MILLARD: I do not know.

233 REP. LUKE: The committee has received a letter from the City of Eugene, which states that the June 1994 deadline will not give them sufficient

time. Yet they have already had ten years to develop a comprehensive plan.

245 MILLARD: Recommends June 1996 deadline.

257 REP. DELL: Reads into the record a letter from the City of Eugene dated April 12, 1993 (EXHIBIT T) in opposition to HB 3501.

280 JEN TWINING, Alliance for Responsible Land Use Planning in Deschutes County: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT U) in opposition to HB

3501.

370 REP. LUKE: How much time should cities have to complete their inventory?

376 TWINING: I believe that Bend has already completed an inventory. My point is that if some cities do not identify their inventory by the due date, it will increase urban sprawl.

390 REP. LUKE: How does this increase urban sprawl?

395 TWINING: House Bill 3501 provides no protection for areas which have not been inventoried by the due date.

TAPE 68, SIDE A

000 REP. LUKE: Bend is already extending urban services outside its urban growth boundary. How much more time would you recommend for this

process?

019 TWINING: There should be no fixed time unless these inventories are identified only as initial inventories.

025 REP. LUKE: Without inventories, there is no certainty. It's to everyone's advantage to have this certainty.

031 TWINING: I know there is a problem with inconsistent zoning outside of urban growth boundaries. This bill does not designate an inventory of

resources only within urban growth boundaries, but is very general.

069 MARY KYLE McCURDY, 1,000 Friends of Oregon: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT V) in opposition to HB 3501.

090 CHANDLER: Perhaps requiring an inventory only within urban growth boundaries would make the bill more acceptable.

106 REP. LUKE: In my area, very little industrial activity occurs outside the urban growth boundaries. Would you have a problem with this bill if it was revised to only include city urban growth boundaries?

116 CHANDLER: No.

126 LIZ FRENKEL, Oregon Sierra Club: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT W) in opposition to HB 3501.

147 CHAIR REPINE: Let the record show that the committee is now operating as a sub of the subcommittee.

188 DON SCHELLENBERG, Oregon Farm Bureau: As long as farmland is not affected by cities and urban growth boundaries, we do not have a problem with this bill.

210 REP. LUKE: Can you recommend a time period in which local governments should complete their inventories?

212 SCHELLENBERG: No.

214 CHAIR REPINE: Let the record show we are now in a full subcommittee.

237 GREG WOLF, LCDC: House Bill is more broad than intended, especially Section 2(2), which would adversely affect items like the Wetlands

Conservation Plan. Realizes bill's sponsors are frustrated by the slow pace of some local governments regarding the completion of Goal 5.

Recommends updating Goal 5 when periodic review occurs. Local governments should have the opportunity to update inventories, and this timeline presents a practical problem. LCDC would like to work with homebuilders to develop a bill which also identifies local governmental constraints.

272 CHAIR REPINE: Would you tie this in with the periodic review process?

276 WOLF: That would be one element. It should be an opportunity to open up the process and include new information.

304 CHAIR REPINE: If we tied this in with the periodic review process, how much time would be needed for inventory completion?

314 WOLF: That would depend upon the jurisdiction. In some cases, it may take as many as ten years.

321 KEN BIERLY, Division of State Lands: Presents written testimony (EXHIBIT X) in opposition to HB 3501.

402 VICE-CHAIR DELL: CLOSING PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 3501

405 CHAIR REPINE: From today's testimony it appears that HB 3501 will need amendments to make it more palatable. Requests bill sponsor John

Chandler of Common Ground to organize a work group with other witnesses in order to reach a compromise.

Adjourns meeting at 4:23 p.m.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Karen McCormac
Administrator

Kathryn Van Natta Assistant

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - HB 2210 Fiscal Analysis - Staff - 1 page B - HB 2210
Revenue Impact Analysis - Staff - 1 page C - HB 2210 Testimony -
Phil Ward - 2 pages D - HB 2210 Testimony - Lana Butterfield - 1
page E - HB 2210 Preliminary Staff Measure Summary - Staff - 1 page
F - HB 2934 Fiscal Impact Assessment and Notice of Possible
Revenue Impact - Staff - 2 pages G - HB 2934 Testimony - Laura
Wyant - 7 pages H - HB 2934 Testimony - Boby Usher - 1 page I -
HB 2934 Testimony - Tam Hermens - 9 pages J - HB 2934 Preliminary
Staff Measure Summary - 2 pages K - HB 3526 Revenue Impact Analysis
- Staff - 1 page L - HB 3526 Testimony - Keith Bartholomew - 1 page
M - HB 3526 Testimony - Arthur Schlack - 2 pages N - HB 3526
Preliminary Staff Measure Summary - Staff - 1 page O - HB 3501
Preliminary Staff Measure Summary - Staff - 1 page P - HB 3501
Revenue Impact Analysis - Staff - 1 page Q - HB 3501 Testimony -
John Chandler - 1 page R - HB 3501 Testimony - Meg Campbell - 1
page S - HB 3501 Testimony - Marion Millard - 2 pages T - HB
3501 Testimony - Linda Lunch - 1 page U - HB 3501 Testimony - Jen
Twining - 3 pages V - HB 3501 Testimony - Mary Kyle McCurdy - 1
page W - HB 3501 Testimony - Liz Frenkel - 1 page X - HB 3501
Testimony - Ken Bierly - 2 pages