

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER

May 13, 1993 Hearing Room D 1:00 p.m. Tapes 91 - 94

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Chuck Norris, Chair Rep. Carl Hosticka
Rep. Tim Josi Rep. Bill Markham Rep. Nancy Peterson Rep. Bob Repine Rep.
Liz VanLeeuwen

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Ray Baum

VISITING MEMBER: Rep. Tom Brian

STAFF PRESENT: Catherine Fitch, Committee Administrator Pat
Zwick, Committee Coordinator Sue Nichol, Committee Clerk

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2995 - Work Session HB 2107 -
Public Hearing and Work Session HB 2153 - Public Hearing and Work
Session

WITNESSES: Reed Marbut, Water Resources Department Martha
Pagel, Water Resources Department Doug Meyers, Water Watch Ken Bierly,
Division of State Lands Ves Garner, Oregon Association of
Conservation Districts Glen Stonebrink, Agricultural Stabilization and
Conservation Service Larry Trosi, Oregon Farm Bureau Jan Boettcher,
Oregon Water Resources Congress Liz Frenkel, Oregon Chapter of Sierra
Club, Pacific Rivers Council Tom Paul, Water Resources Department Ray
Wilkeson, Oregon Forest Industries Council Dee Bridges, Boise Cascade
Curt Copenhagen, Longview Fibre Kevin Hanway, Special Districts
Association

[--- 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 91, SIDE A

005 CHAIR NORRIS: Calls the meeting to order at 1:13.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2995

010 CATHERINE FITCH, Committee Administrator: HB 2995 deals with
an exemption in certain groundwater areas for use of water for
drip

irrigation systems. Water Resources Department has submitted amendments
which affect the single and industrial use exemption limits (Exhibit A).

025 REED MARBUT, Water Resources Department: We think we have
solved the problem for Mr. Funk (the original bill requestor) under
the current

law. We do not oppose the amendments. We've not had time to adequately review the language.

044 MARTHA PAGEL, Water Resources Department: The amendments would reduce the amount of water which would be allowed as an exempt use for domestic uses, and increase the amount of water allowed as an exempt use for

group domestic, single industrial or commercial use.

054 We have had a lot of concern about the current exemption of up to 15,000 gallons per day for single domestic use. That was more than any single

domestic user really needed. This would be a net trade off.

075 REP. REPINE: Would anyone be caught in the decrease in single domestic use exemption?

083 PAGEL: It's not intended that this would affect any existing users, it would be future exempt.

084 REP. MARKHAM: What you have is a trade-off, and hopefully you'll even save water.

086 PAGEL: My thinking was that it would reduce the amount of water used. It might not, in fact, save water because single domestic users may not be using up to 15,000 gallons per day.

096 CHAIR NORRIS: In the amendments, we have eliminated any reference to drip irrigation systems. Is there any way we can encourage people to

use drip irrigation systems since they are more efficient?

102 MARBUT: We could include that kind of language in our administrative rules.

114 These exempt uses for commercial use do envision that kind of efficient water use.

124 REP. TOM BRIAN, District 9: Thanks the committee and Water Resources Department for work done on this issue.

130 DOUG MYERS, Water Watch: Is opposed to the amendment in subsection (f), increasing the exemption for group domestic, single industrial or

commercial uses to 15,000 gallons, especially without any applications or permits.

155 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves to adopt hand engrossed by staff HB 299 5-2 amendments (LC 2903) dated 5/12/93.

164 CHAIR NORRIS: Repeats motion.

165 VOTE: CHAIR NORRIS: Hearing no objection, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

168 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves HB 2995, as amended, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

169 CHAIR NORRIS: Repeats motion.

170 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REP. BAUM is EXCUSED.

186 CHAIR NORRIS: The motion CARRIES.

180 CHAIR NORRIS: Closes work session on 2995.

190 A work session on HB 3358 will not be held today.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2107

208 PAT ZWICK, Committee Coordinator: HB 2107 proposes a new process for establishing water rights for wetland restoration and enhancement

projects. Amendments have been submitted by Water Resources Department (Exhibit B). Testimony has been submitted by Jim Myron from Oregon Trout (Exhibit C).

230 KEN BIERLY, Division of State Lands: Reads testimony in favor of HB 2107 (Exhibit D).

258 MARTHA PAGEL, Water Resources Department: I believe consensus has been reached by our work group members. The bill now sets out a process in

which projects for wetland restoration, watershed enhancement and stormwater management may qualify for this special process. Explains the process for application and acceptance of these projects.

315 CHAIR NORRIS: This program would be voluntary?

319 PAGEL: Yes.

320 CHAIR NORRIS: Would I have time to object?

325 PAGEL: Yes.

336 PAGEL: Explains amendments in detail.

358 REP. MARKHAM: What kind of projects for stormwater would this permit?

364 PAGEL: Explains possible uses of stormwater.

TAPE 92, SIDE A

044 REP. JOSI: How much is the fee?

047 PAGEL: It varies with the project. The fee is already

determined by statute. I think that the average fee would be about \$100 to \$200.

061 CHAIR NORRIS: Is it implied in subsection 2 that reservoirs would be less than 9.2 acre-feet of water and less than 10 feet high?

065 PAGEL: I believe that is what was intended, but I notice that it is not explicit there. As it's written, it would appear that it would allow

any number, regardless of size.

072 CHAIR NORRIS: It appears something may have been left out of subsection 2.

074 PAGEL: I believe you may have caught an omission.

079 In response to a question from Rep. VanLeeuwen, Subsection 2 is designed for reservoirs that are smaller than 9.2 acre-feet or with a dam that is less than 10 feet high. You can register up to 10 of them as long as

they're below those size requirements. If they are above those size requirements, they require an individual application for each one of them.

158 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: What does "or the public interest" mean on page 4, line 5?

167 PAGEL: We want to insure that these projects do not injure other users.

175 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: I want an example of what is public interest.

181 PAGEL: We are using "public interest" as it is defined in statute and rules. There is a checklist that describes this. I will supply a copy

of that to you.

207 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: I want to know if the providing of food and fiber is included in the consideration of public interest?

219 PAGEL: We do include language on consideration of maximum economic use of the water as well as other considerations.

233 REP. REPINE: Would these permits be routinely objected to like other types of water permits have been?

240 PAGEL: We hope to avoid this by the provision in line 18, page 5, where we determine whether the objections warrant further review. On Page 6,

it says if there are these bona-fide comments, we move directly into application processing. The receipt of comment doesn't stop the process, it just moves it along to the next step.

288 CHAIR NORRIS: Do you feel this provides adequate protection for people who feel they might be injured? 298 PAGEL: Yes.

307 REP. VanLEEuwEN: Section 8 says the person can go ahead with the construction without the permit. What if the permit is denied?

319 PAGEL: There is some risk, but we've tried to build in enough up front review so these potential problems can be identified before registration takes place.

342 REP. VanLEEuwEN: How long will the application process take?

347 PAGEL: Because of the separation of this process, these applications would not be included in the backlog.

360 REP. MARKHAM: On page 4, line 6, how would you feel if we wrote into the bill, "the Department of Economic Development?"

378 PAGEL: That would be fine.

385 VES GARNER, Oregon Association of Conservation Districts: Asks for continued support of this bill. This bill will expedite the permitting

process, minimize the landowner cost and will encourage wetland and restoration projects.

Tape 91, SIDE B

009 CHAIR NORRIS: Do you see this as any threat to the agricultural community?

012 GARNER: No, I believe there are benefits to everyone.

015 CHAIR NORRIS: Are the districts pretty much committed to the environmental movement in helping the streams and riparian zones?

016 GARNER: Yes. The districts are composed of elected board members.

020 REP. VanLEEuwEN: Will these projects result in additional federal money?

043 KEN BIERLY, Division of State Lands: The Wetland Reserve Program is a U.S. Department of Agriculture program that would pay for conversion of agricultural lands to wetlands. It is a pilot program.

052 GLEN STONEBRINK, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: The incentive may be similar to CRP. It was implemented in several

states. I think this would be a favorable bill for this program.

066 REP. VanLEEuwEN: Do I have to allow free public access if I were to implement a wetlands project under this program?

072 STONEBRINK: No. You would have to allow access by U.S. Department of Agriculture people to insure that you are in compliance.

077 CHAIR NORRIS: Is that 1/2 million acres a national goal?

080 STONEBRINK: Yes.

081 REP. JOSI: Can you water your cows with land under this program?

084 STONEBRINK: As far as ASCS is concerned, yes.

085 DOUG MYERS, Water Watch: Is in favor of HB 2107 with the proposed amendments as long as it is considered as a package with HB 2153.

105 LARRY TROSI, Oregon Farm Bureau: Proposes amendment (Exhibit E) which would add a sentence at the end of Section 3 to insure that existing

water rights are not injured and that the use is consistent with appropriate water use plans for the area.

152 CHAIR NORRIS: Section 3 is pointing to the person who may be making an application to register, who may not have any idea as to what other

existing water rights would or would not be injured. I think that

obligation should probably rest with the Department in the consideration of the registration.

158 TROSI: That's why we suggested this language, so they do consider that when they look at the registration.

160 CHAIR NORRIS: Do you feel the provision on page 4, line 3 is inadequate?

166 TROSI: The area of concern is having to do with the construction of stormwater quality and quantity projects. That is why we are suggesting this safeguard.

185 CHAIR NORRIS: Can we safely assume that every area has an appropriate water use plan?

191 TROSI: I couldn't answer that question.

193 JAN BOETTCHER, Oregon Water Resources Congress: Supports this bill and HB 2153.

202 LIZ FRENKEL, Oregon Chapter of Sierra Club and Pacific Rivers Council: Supports this bill and HB 2153.

210 PAGEL: We haven't considered the issue about whether the use is consistent with appropriate water use plans for the area. My question

is that I don't know what such water use plans would be. I believe Mr.

Trosi would be okay with deleting that part of the amendment.

224 REP. JOSI: Does Mr. Trosi's amendment add anything?

228 PAGEL: We felt that was well covered in the original amendment.

235 REP. JOSI: Would his amendment add some redundancy?

238 PAGEL: It is my understanding that this bill would not allow us to issue a new water right that would injure existing water rights.

254 In response from a question from Rep. VanLeeuwen, before approving the registration we would have to determine that it wouldn't harm other

water users.

264 CHAIR NORRIS: Closes public hearing on HB 2107.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2107

282 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves to adopt the amendment from the Farm Bureau adding the words "providing existing water rights are not injured" in Section 3, page 1, line 22.

283 VOTE: CHAIR NORRIS: Hearing no objection, the AMENDMENT is ADOPTED.

290 MOTION: REP. MARKHAM: Moves that the language "Department of Economic Development" be added to line 7, page 4, after "Division of State Lands."

295 VOTE: REP. NORRIS: Hearing no objections, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

300 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves HB 2107-3 amendments, as amended, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

302 CHAIR NORRIS: Restates motion.

310 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REP. BAUM is EXCUSED.

315 CHAIR NORRIS: Closes work session on 2107.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2153

355 REP. MARKHAM: Did we get acceptance in the work group meeting?

360 PAGEL: I did ask if everyone agreed at the working group and no one objected. Some may object now after they've thought about it overnight.

381 HB 2153 was originally developed to try to address the issue of existing ponds and reservoirs that have been created throughout the state that do not currently have water rights or permits but require those permits.

We are not trying to create new requirements for a permit for something that is currently exempt. This bill says that any existing pond that does not have an existing water right will receive some benefits under

HB 2153.

400 Reservoirs that are less than 9.2 acre-feet, off-channel would be subject to outright exemption.

425 For existing ponds or reservoirs that are over 9.2 acre-feet, or have a dam 10 feet or higher, we have provided a process whereby they may give notice and apply for a water right and they will not be penalized

because they have this existing pond.

Tape 92, SIDE B

025 REP. JOSI: What would be the cost of the application process?

028 TOM PAUL, Water Resources Department: The cost would vary depending upon the size. The fee for reservoirs under 5 acre-feet is \$50. If it

is greater than 5 acre-feet, the minimum is \$300.

035 REP. JOSI: You can have a number of ponds in a drainage area. What is a drainage area?

037 PAUL: We have not defined drainage area. We will be doing that by administrative rule.

047 REP. JOSI: Can you give me an example of a subbasin?

049 PAUL: A tributary stream to the Nestucca River, for example.

050 REP. JOSI: How many ponds per subbasin would be allowed?

051 PAUL: We don't have any limits right now. It would depend on capacity of that stream.

053 PAGEL: On one registration you can include 10 ponds.

057 REP. JOSI: So you can have up to 10 ponds on one registration, and one registration per subbasin?

058 PAUL: The application has the following limitation: up to 10 reservoirs that have dams less than 10 feet or store less than 9.2

acre-feet may be submitted on a single application if those ten are within one of these subbasin areas.

063 REP. JOSI: Asks if the cost is per application or per pond.

064 PAUL: It would be the cost per application.

071 REP. MARKHAM: How do you define subbasin?

072 PAUL: It would be defined by administrative rule. It would depend on how the water master does the regulation.

086 PAGEL: For a single owner, on contiguous property, in almost all cases that contiguous property is going to be within a single drainage basin.

094 REP. JOSI: What if you have 5 ponds in a subbasin and another 5 in another subbasin. Would you make one application?

099 PAGEL: If it's within one drainage basin, single owner, contiguous property, it could all be put on one application.

112 REP. JOSI: I'm concerned that some of these tributaries are pretty small.

110 PAUL: If it's a single ownership and a private individual, I don't think we'll question whether it's one or two drainages. The bill does

allow fire protection districts to cover a broader area.

118 REP. JOSI: What is an emergency fire fighting pond?

121 PAGEL: A water right or registration is not needed for use of water for emergency purposes. If a pond or reservoir is built for this purpose, a water right must be applied for.

138 REP. VanLEEuwEN: You said regarding an emergency pond, that after the emergency was over you'd have to drain the pond?

140 PAGEL: I think we were discussing the concept of a limited license. We were saying it's an outright exemption, under this bill, to use water

for an emergency. You could, under a limited license, build a temporary pond. If you wanted the pond for an ongoing use, then you must apply

for a water right.

162 Certain types of ponds are exempt, purpose doesn't matter.

177 REP. REPINE: Would the concerns of the fire chief, who testified earlier, be addressed in this bill?

179 PAUL: One way or another, his concerns will be dealt with.

187 PAGEL: Gives detailed explanation of the amendments (Exhibit F) which gives exemptions from a water right for certain uses and gives other

provisions for limited licenses to be issued for additional uses.

225 REP. VanLEEuwEN: Are the ponds under a limited license ponds those that we set up and then we drain?

229 PAGEL: Yes, those covered by a limited license can only be used on a temporary basis.

253 REP. MARKHAM: Was the thought to cover a forestry season instead of a limited number of days?

257 PAGEL: I think we were trying to cover a season during which they

would be doing slash burning.

270 REP. MARKHAM: My concern is that after that time period you could easily have a fire out there.

271 PAGEL: If it's an emergency, they can use the water. 282 REP. VanLEEUWEN: This is a limited license with a longer extension of time. After one year, I have to destroy the pond?

293 PAGEL: This is intended for someone who is going to be working in an area for a season. They will log it out and then move on so they don't

need a permanent water right.

300 REP. JOSI: This just applies to future ponds.

303 PAGEL: Continues to explain amendments.

393 REP. JOSI: It sounds like this language would satisfy the farmers that were in here who had a swale that would be off-channel.

395 PAGEL: I think so.

TAPE 93, SIDE A

008 CHAIR NORRIS: I think the key is "continually contains moving water."

011 PAGEL: Yes, seasonally or continuously.

031 REP. PETERSON: What happens if someone is unfamiliar with the law and they don't get their pond under 9.2 acre-feet registered?

036 PAGEL: It would be in violation of the law and we would give them notice that says that they are not allowed to store water under these

circumstances. They would have to stop using that water.

042 REP. PETERSON: They wouldn't automatically become exempt unless they go through the process?

044 PAGEL: Correct. We're expecting to go through a great deal of public notice.

047 REP. MARKHAM: You must make it by that cut-off date, or you must reapply?

048 PAGEL: Correct.

052 REP. MARKHAM: On Page 1, Line 9, you've got 5 acre feet and 10 feet high, then later you have 9.2 acre-feet, is that a misrepresentation?

053 PAGEL: Line 15, page 1 is existing law, and I don't know why they chose 5 acre-feet.

057 PAUL: That goes back to a limited license. The possibility of someone even building up to the 5 acre-feet for a limited license is

pretty

remote.

061 PAGEL: For consistency's sake, we might have changed it, but we decided not to.

066 Continues testimony.

075 CHAIR NORRIS: Will the map required on page 4, line 3 require a certified water right examiner?

078 PAGEL: No, not if it's under 9.2 acre-feet and less than 10 feet high.

133 PAUL: Regarding lines 21 - 36 on page 7, fire districts were concerned that their ponds would be subject to forfeiture. This clarifies that

they would not be subject to forfeiture.

153 PAGEL: Continues explanation of amendments.

168 REP. MARKHAM: That is a dam of over 10 feet?

170 PAUL: That is any dam covered by this bill.

180 REP. MARKHAM: Can you regulate these dams in response to dam safety requirements?

183 PAUL: Our authority to enforce dam safety comes from other statutes.

190 PAGEL: Continues with explanation of Section 9.

214 REP. MARKHAM: If it's less than 10 feet, is the Commission going to come in and tell how the dam must be made?

217 PAUL: This is just dealing with the map, not the construction.

230 REP. VanLEEUWEN: For the new reservoirs, you don't need to have the map if they're less than 9.2 acre-feet. Why does the bill jump then to

requirements for the map?

233 PAGEL: We are trying to simplify the process in the future. We are saying you must have a map with your application, but it doesn't have to be prepared by a Certified Water Rights Examiner.

259 PAUL: Right now, an applicant is required to submit two maps prepared by a Certified Water Rights Examiner. This is eliminating the

requirement for a map by a Certified Water Rights Examiner to accompany the application.

271 CHAIR NORRIS: We're talking just under 30 million gallons of water.

279 GLEN STONEBRINK, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Reads testimony in support of HB 2153 as it would be a first step

towards making good sense with water utilization (Exhibit G).

367 REP. PETERSON: What does "futile call" mean?

374 STONEBRINK: Gives explanation of "futile call" in relation to stock ponds. Tape 94, SIDE A

008 REP. PETERSON: You don't believe there is any beneficial use for fish and recreation to Oregon?

013 STONEBRINK: No, what I've seen in the last seven years of drought is that priority is given to so-called beneficial use of water. I'm saying that agriculture has taken a back seat to every other use.

029 VES GARNER, Oregon Association of Conservation Districts: Testifies in favor of HB 2153. This bill provides a much faster process to legalize

the existing ponds and it minimizes the cost to the landowner to establish a water right to a new pond.

044 DOUG MYERS, Water Watch: We won't oppose this bill.

050 REP. MARKHAM: Why is there a linkage of these two bills?

056 MYERS: In HB 2153, we are making some concessions. We support the other one. We wanted to make sure this one doesn't come out with the

other one staying in.

060 RICHARD KOSESAN, Water for Life: Has concerns about what would constitute "off-channel."

090 REP. MARKHAM: I have the same question.

097 PAGEL: We were trying to describe two situations in order to give maximum flexibility to landowners. The first situation would be

following through a defined channel. The concern that was raised by some of the ranchers and agricultural interests is that any time that you create a reservoir or pond, you create the situation where a channel might develop over time. In the first place, we were trying to say if it doesn't flow in a defined channel but would otherwise flow off your property, it's okay to interrupt that and make a pond. If a defined channel exists because it's seeking your pond, that's okay too.

114 REP. HOSTICKA: The way I read the language "which do not divert water from another source" is that you can't call an off channel pond

one

which is not located in a channel but you have a canal running from some stream into that off channel pond. Is that the intention?

120 PAGEL: Yes.

129 KOSESAN: Another question we had was concerning the diversion of water from a flowing stream to facilitate getting livestock out of the

immediate riparian area. Our hope was that this could be facilitated through rules.

141 RAY WILKESON, Oregon Forest Industries Council: Introduces Dee Bridges and Curt Copenhagen.

149 DEE BRIDGES, Boise Cascade: We're in agreement with 90% of the bill. We need to have a number of pump chances. If we can get the existence

of the storage exempted and the use of the water for emergency fire suppression exempted, that would address my concern.

180 CHAIR NORRIS: I think section 3 addresses that.

184 CURT COPENHAGEN, Longview Fibre: The question we have is, are the private timber lands ponds, that are for emergency fire fighting use,

exempt from applying, mapping, or any fees?

216 CHAIR NORRIS: The ones that now exist would be covered under this as exemptions and those that you have to build in the future would be

covered by a permit.

221 COPENHAGEN: We're still not clear on this point.

226 PAGEL: Pump chances do not require a water right. Taking the water out of the stream does require a water right or limited license.

Maintaining that pool does not. The act of taking water to fight fire for an emergency does not require a water right. If a person wants to create a reservoir for fighting fire in the future, that does require a water right, except for the pump chances.

257 REP. MARKHAM: Can a pumper take that water and fill his truck from a pool without getting a water right?

263 PAGEL: No, that can be done with a limited license.

267 REP. MARKHAM: How long does that take?

270 PAGEL: It takes about two weeks.

281 The breaching issue comes into play if the pond that you have created has been done under a limited license. When the license expires, you

either have to breach it or otherwise drain it. You can renew it, or

apply again, or you can apply for a permanent water right if you need it for ongoing activity.

319 BRIDGES: I am unclear about how these limited licenses are going to work. I would feel more comfortable if we went into rule-making with

some kind of legislative direction.

328 KEVIN HANWAY, Special Districts Association: Supports the bill.

340 CHAIR NORRIS: Closes work session on HB 2153.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2153

346 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves the -3 amendments to HB 2153.

349 CHAIR NORRIS: Repeats the motion.

354 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: Why does the Department need to register all these ponds? I have a problem with that. Some of these have probably been in

existence before there was any law.

376 CHAIR NORRIS: This gives those people the assurance that their ponds are legal.

378 REP. VanLEEUEWEN: How many more staff are they going to need to do this?

384 PAGEL: We feel we can handle this within our existing structure.

394 VOTE: CHAIR NORRIS: Hearing no objection, the AMENDMENTS are ADOPTED.

404 MOTION: REP. VanLEEUEWEN: Moves that those people who have the pre-existing ponds be grandfathered in without all of the work that it requires.

420 CHAIR NORRIS: Repeats the motion.

440 VOTE: On a roll call vote, REPS. HOSTICKA, JOSI, PETERSON, REPINE and CHAIR NORRIS vote NAY. REPS. MARKHAM and VanLEEUEWEN vote AYE.

REP. BAUM is EXCUSED.

467 CHAIR NORRIS: The motion FAILS.

Tape 93, SIDE B

020 MOTION: REP. JOSI: Moves HB 2153, as amended, to the full committee with a DO PASS recommendation.

025 CHAIR NORRIS: Repeats the motion.

028 VOTE: On a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. REP. BAUM is EXCUSED.

031 CHAIR NORRIS: The motion CARRIES.

032 Closes work session on HB 2153.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00.

Also submitted for the record: - Testimony from Jim Myron, Oregon Trout, in opposition to the -3 amendments to HB 2153 (Exhibit H).

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Sue Nichol
Administrator

Catherine Fitch Clerk

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - HB 2995 - Hand engrossed HB 2995-2 amendments (LC 2903) - Staff - 3 pages
B - HB 2107 - Hand engrossed HB 2107-3 amendments (LC 951-2) - Staff - 6 pages
C - HB 2107, 2153 - Testimony - Jim Myron - 1 page
D - HB 2107 - Testimony and information - Ken Bierly - 3 pages
E - HB 2107 - Suggested amendment - Larry Trosi - 1 page
F - HB 2153 - Hand engrossed HB 2153-3 amendments (LC 951) - Martha Pagel - 8 pages
G - HB 2153 - Testimony - Glen Stonebrink - 2 pages
H - HB 2153 - Testimony - Jim Myron - 1 page