

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

DATE: June 4, 1993 TAPES: 175 - 176 PLACE: Hearing Room C TIME: 8:00 AM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Senator Ron Cease, Chair Senator Jim Bunn,
Vice-Chair Senator Joyce Cohen Senator Shirley Gold Senator Bob Kintigh
Senator Bob Shoemaker Senator Gordon Smith STAFF PRESENT: Peter
Green, Administrator Chris Warner, Research Associate Pamella Andersen,
Clerk

MEASURES HEARD: SB 1016 SB 1011 HB 2147 HB 2211 SJM19 SB 1 036

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. . TAPE 175, SIDE A

005 CHAIR CEASE: Calls the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. - Opens the
public hearing on SJM19.

PUBLIC HEARING ON SJM19 - EXHIBIT A WITNESSES: Senator Bill Dwyer,
District 21 Wallace Rutledge, Department of Forestry

016 SENATOR DWYER: Offers testimony in support of SJM19 as its sponsor.
- This program allows the state and federal government to put
unproductive land back into production.

029 WALLACE RUTLEDGE: (introduces EXHIBIT A) Offers testimony in
support of SJM19. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June
4, 1993 Page 2

- Notes why the memorial and its provisions are necessary. - The
memorial urges the President and Congress to extend the Forest Incentive
Program for ten more years. - Offers history on the Forest Incentive
Program.

062 CHAIR CEASE: Closes the public hearing on SJM19. - Opens the work
session on SJM19.

WORK SESSION ON SJM19

MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves SJM19 be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS
recommendation. VOTE: CHAIR CEASE: In a roll call vote, all members
present vote AYE. Senators Bunn and Smith are EXCUSED.

067 CHAIR CEASE: The motion CARRIES. Senator Dwyer will lead discussion
on the Floor.

CHAIR CEASE: Closes the work session on SJM19. - Opens the public
hearing on HB 2147.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2147 (no exhibits were submitted)

074 ADMIN. WARNER: This bill was brought forward by the Land Use Board
of Appeals. - The bill changes the procedures relative to notification
requirements on LUBA decisions.

CHAIR CEASE: Closes the public hearing on HB 2147. - Opens the work
session on HB 2147.

WORK SESSION ON HB 2147

MOTION: CHAIR CEASE: Moves that HB 2147 be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation. VOTE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE. Senators Bunn and Smith are EXCUSED.

091 CHAIR CEASE: The motion CARRIES. Senator Shoemaker will lead discussion on the Floor.

CHAIR CEASE: Closes the work session on HB 2147. - Opens the public hearing on HB 2211.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 3

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2211 - EXHIBIT B

WITNESSES: Chuck Craig, Department of Agriculture Rep. Liz Van Leeuwen, District 37 Dave Nelson, Oregon Seed Council Kevin Downing, Department of Environmental Quality Bob Danko, Department of Environmental Quality Diana Godwin, Regional Disposal Company

104 CHUCK CRAIG: (introduces EXHIBIT B) Offers testimony in support of HB 221 1, explaining the provisions of the bill. - The bill was originally requested by the Department of Agriculture to make adjustments in the 1991 field burning law. 121 - Discusses the major provisions of the bill.

144 REP. LIZ VAN LEEUWEN: (introduces EXHIBIT Q) Offers testimony in support of HB 2211. - Notes the -A5 amendment (Exhibit Q) she has proposed and its purpose. - We hope this simplifies the process.

174 DAVE NELSON: Offers testimony in support of HB 2211. - We support the amendments offered by Rep. Van Leeuwen. SEN. KINTIGH: If you bale the straw, are you assessed the regular fee? REP. VAN LEEUWEN: There are different fees. - Reviews the specifics of open burning. - There is a fee for removing the straw and propane flaming. 198 - If the straw is removed and put in piles or bales and burned, you pay a fee.

SEN. KINTIGH: That fee is in addition to that for propaning? (Rep. Van Leeuwen responds, yes.) - If you sold it or gave it away you would not a pay a fee?

REP. VAN LEEUWEN: You would not pay the fee for burning the piles of bales as long as they are removed from the field and gone. - Notes the impact of the weather. - Relates personal experience giving straw to a straw exporter. 216 - Rain ruins the quality of the straw, making it unsalable. - Even when we go to propane, we have to go in and clean off by some innovative method, any remaining straw - This addresses that so the full \$2 per acre fee is not required to meet DEQ standards.

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. . Senate Agriculture and Natural

SEN. SMITH: Joins the meeting.

255 SEN. COHEN: What happens to the person to whom the straw has been transferred ? - If they move it across the street and ultimately burn it, do they pay the fee? - We should have some mechanism to collect the fee from them.

REP. VAN LEEUWEN: That is what this amendment does.

269 KEVIN DOWNING: Offers testimony in support of HB 2211. - We intended to offer amendments, today, relative to the department's authority to regulate fourth party open burning. - Those are still in process. CHAIR CEASE: Bring that to the work session next week. - Closes the public hearing on HB 2211. - Opens the work session on SB 1036.

WORK SESSION ON SB 1036

293 ADMIN. GREEN: (introduces EXHIBIT R) Notes the -2 amendments which include those proposed by Mike Dewey for Oregon Waste Systems and those proposed by DEQ. 317 Reads into the record a letter from Oregon Waste Systems, Inc. (introduces EXHIBIT L).

CHAIR CEASE: Indicate the significance of that in terms of the issue of the bill.

ADMIN. GREEN: There is a current possibility of appealing the Oregon Supreme Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court in the next 45 days. - The decision said the \$2.25 surcharge on waste brought in to the state is constitutional. - The letter says the out-of-state waste surcharge is found to be unconstitutional, that it would pay \$.85 of the \$2.25 as does in-state waste.

345 CHAIR CEASE: We don't know if they will appeal that court case. - If they don't, the Supreme Court decision would stand and the total fee being paid would stand. - If they appeal it, and the federal court would rule in their favor, they would still pay the \$.85 portion.

SEN. BUNN: Joins the meeting.

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. Senate Agricultura and Naturd Rosourcos June 4 1993 Page 5

CHAIR CEASE: There is a proposed amendment to the bill. - Even though the statement was made this is not a competitive issue between two companies, it remains so. - I think the bill has merit if it is made clear that we are going to have the same level playing field for waste coming in and going out.

381 ADMIN. GREEN: The DEQ amendment calls for information to be provided to the DEQ so they know where waste is going. 393 BOB DANKO: Offers testimony in support of SB 1036. - Reviews the -2 amendments. CHAIR CEASE: What about the issue of contingency? - What happens to the rest of the fee, beyond the \$.85 if the combination wins in court?

420 DANKO: We haven't received anything yet. - If we don't prevail in

the court cases, we will not receive the back money.

CHAIR CEASE: What happens to the company sending waste out-of-state if they win in court?

-- DANKO: This bill has both the \$.85 and \$.13 in it. - The waste coming from out-of-state would pay the \$.85 no matter how the court case ends. CHAIR CEASE: I don't want to end up in a situation where people sending waste out-of-state pay \$.85 and those paying for waste remaining in-state pay more.

446 DANKO: Clarifies the \$.13 is assessed on all waste and isn't in question. TAPE 176, SIDE A

025 MIKE DEWEY: There is no basis for the \$.85 to be challenged legally.

CHAIR CEASE: If the \$.85 should go up at some point, [QUOTE] would the state hear on the \$.85 would apply if the fee went up for everybody? 037 DEWEY: Stated for the record that would be true.

SEN. COHEN: We will hopefully have everyone who is putting garbage in their can paying for the recycling efforts.

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. Senate Agricultura and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 6

MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves to ADOPT the SB 1036-2 amendments dated 6-393. VOTE: CHAIR CEASE: Hearing no objection the amendments are ADOPTED. All members are present.

050 MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves that SB 1036 AS AMENDED, be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation. SEN. BUNN: It is horrible policy to encourage Oregon garbage to stay in Oregon and open our arms for out-of-state garbage. - We are creating problems for ourselves in the future. - If you have to pay a fee to send garbage across the border SEN. COHEN: You have to pay to reduce for recycling purposes. SEN. BUNN: In reality, we are increasing the cost for Oregonians to ship the garbage out-of-state. - We are anet importer of garbage and this increases that problem. - Eighty percent of Oregonians do not like us importing garbage. - This is the wrong way to deal with it. 072 DIANA GODWIN: The central issue is whether or not this bill creates a level playing field for people generating and disposing of garbage. - Oregonians pay a substantially higher host fee if they choose to send their garbage out-of-state. - Notes the Klickitat County host fee. - Klickitat County mandates their landfill not accept waste for any jurisdiction that does not have a waste reduction and recycling program. - Those costs are already being paid at the local level.

092 SEN. COHEN: Do you rebate to the cities or counties a proportional amount of what it costs them to reduce their waste?

GODWIN: I don't believe so, but we do offer very reasonable disposal costs and assume all liability for their waste in the future.

1 13 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Presents his analysis of the \$.85 and \$.13

charges and their propose. (Chair Cease affirms the accuracy of his understanding.) - If the revenues collected from the fees are being spent in-state, where the waste goes should be irrelevant. - The level playing field can be addressed by the taxes and charges within the local areas.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 7

SEN. COHEN: I don't care where it goes; everybody should pay the fee.

SEN. SHOEMAKER: We don't need to be concerned about filling up Gilliam County; it is limitless in its ability to receive waste.

143 SEN. SMITH: When courts examine challenges to interstate commerce laws they look for reasons. - Any attempt on our part to level playing fields or impose restraints of trade is wrong and may be unconstitutional.

SEN. BUNN: If you carry this logic out further, you drop the out-of-state charge and increase the Oregon charge. - Leveling the playing field is the whole reason we have this bill. - This bill is sponsored by a company that wants us to help them import garbage.

CHAIR CEASE: That is a major piece; you are right on the motivation; however, there are other factors. - Relates his personal desire to deal with garbage on a regional basis.

180 VOTE: In a roll call vote, Senators Cohen, Gold, Kintigh, Shoemaker, Smith and Cease vote AYE. Senator Bunn votes NO.

CHAIR CEASE: The motion CARRIES. Senator Smith will lead discussion on the Floor. - Closes the work session on SB 1036. - Opens the work session on SB 1011.

WORK SESSION ON SB 1011

199 CHAIR CEASE: Notes the article from the Plastics News in the members packets (introduces EXHIBIT P).

215 ADMIN. GREEN: Reads into the record a letter from Arthur Ayre of the Economic Development Department (introduces EXHIBIT 0).

CHAIR CEASE: If this activity were to be transferred from the Marketing Council to the Department of Environmental Quality, we wouldn't be talking about any amount to be running that council, would we? - The council would simply provide recommendations?

\ 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

ADMIN. GREEN: That's correct. - This money is not going to market development so much as to fund staffing and the work that leads to market development.

255 JACK BROWN: (James River Corporation) Offers testimony in support of SB 1 011. - Reiterates for the record the agreement by the three commodity chairs made with the council members to raise between \$30,000 to \$50,000 annually to fund the contract support services for the ORMDC. - This is a total annual amount. - The divisions have supported and funded their own staff and research and preparation of our reports, which ran \$25,000 for the paper division. - We intend to continue to provide our own staff and fund our own research. - We have other projects underway with other entities and expect those to be transferrable to Oregon.

309 KIRSTEN RITCHIE: (Western States Glass Recycling Program) (introduces EXHIBIT C) Offers testimony in support of SB 1011. - We are in general accord with the proposed amendments to the bill as they relate to the funding, staffing and responsibilities of the RMDC. - Elaborates on particular provisions they support.

CHAIR CEASE: What is your sense about having this operational activity transferred to the Economic Development Department? RITCHIE: I am very comfortable with that at this point in time. - The link between economic development and recycling market development is good. 333 - List reasons why they are optimistic about the future of glass recycling in Oregon. - We believe the role of the council should be primarily one of information dissemination at this time. - Reviews the costs for this, noting they support the previously recommended staffing level. 356 - We are prepared to provide in-kind resources to both the council and the glass division in performing the duties described in SB 66 and expanded by these amendments.

SEN. GOLD: Joins the meeting. RITCHIE: We prefer project-specific funding be sought on a project-by-project basis from appropriate public and private funding sources.

Those 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. - Senate Agricultura and Natural R - ourcas June 4, 1993 Paga 9

367 TED HUGHES: (American Plastics Council, Oregon Plastics Industry) Offers testimony in support of SB 1011. - References past testimony of Rich Gage relative to agreement on funding levels. - The move to the Economic Development Department makes a lot of sense. - Market and economic development go hand-in-hand.

390 CHAIR CEASE: Discusses the deficit created for funding per biennium.

HUGHES: The plastic industry will provide the logistic support the

Economic Development Department needs, as will the paper industry.

SEN. COHEN: The Economic Development Department has been greedy on their side. - \$180,000 is excessive; it shouldn't take that much. - I am not excited about moving this into the department, but I think they can make it work that way.

TAPE 175, SIDE B

024 SUSAN SCHNEIDER: (City of Portland) Introduces Lissa West.

025 LISSA WEST: (City of Portland) Offers testimony in support of SB 1011. - Focuses testimony on the proposed amendments to the existence of the Oregon Recycling Markets Development Council and its funding needs. - The city just passed an ordinance allowing the collection of scrap paper for all residential curbside customers, based on commitments from the market. - A postcard was recently sent to all residential customers, asking them about additional services they wish. - Response indicated the public wants to have more opportunity to recycle plastics. - In addition, the city is looking more at commercial and multi-family recycling programs to meet their recycling goal. - Commercial and multi-family recycling research indicates a need to expand the commercial recycling program to smaller businesses. - We are limited only by the market for recyclables. - Funding is the key; an adequate funding mechanism must be established. - It would be fair to place a portion of the funding on the industries themselves, as they benefit from the money they put into the account.

079 CHAIR CEASE: For the record, there are a number of pieces to this discussion. - ODOE spoke before on amending the energy tax credit, which has gone to Revenue Committee.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 10

- I believe we have a proposed amendment to make that credit more amenable to the plastics side of things.

097 DEBBIE GORHAM: (Metro) (introduces EXHIBITS E and F) Offers testimony in support of SB 1011, specifically section 25. - We support provisions stipulating staff support to the council and administration of the Markets Development Fund by the Economic Development Department. - We believe \$180,000 to fund 1.5 positions is reasonable. - We also support voluntary funding. - Metro passed a resolution stating it is really necessary to support this kind of activity and that it should not be born on direct taxes or tip fees. 115 - Relates the results of the Metro recycling level survey.

CHAIR CEASE: You are indicating voluntary contribution levels of \$25,000 to \$40,000 for each of the industry groups, rather than as a total? (Ms. Gorham responds affirmatively.)

137 JOEL ARIO: (OSPIRG) Offers testimony in support of SB 1011. - We are generally supportive of the changes discussed today. - We share the concern that the basic impetus for market development remain with the private sector and the government's role be more limited --' to setting standards or expectations.

CHAIR CEASE: For the record, with respect to state government, we are talking about aid in leveraging and coordinating and helping, not doing the marketing.

ARIO: That is precisely our position, too.

151 ADMIN. GREEN: Reads letter by Cheryl Perrin, Chair of the Recycling Market Council, related to the -1 amendments. - Notes the options for handling fee administration costs offered by the Department of Revenue (introduces EXHIBIT M).

CHAIR CEASE: Closes the work session on SB 1011. - Opens the work session on SB 1016.

WORK SESSION ON SB 1016

182 CHAIR CEASE: We have SB 1016 on the agenda for Monday and intend to finish it then.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 11

SEN. COHEN: We have two areas where further wordsmithing has been completed. - (introduces EXHIBIT G) Notes the "Cosgrove" amendment on geothermal.

205 PAUL COSGROVE: (Anadarko Petroleum Corporation) The language in the proposed amendments contains the principles~ the committee adopted the previous evening, addressing the duplication and the potential for inconsistency. - Reviews the proposed amendments.

222 MIKE GRAINEY: (Oregon Department of Energy) We believe both of those changes are good. MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves to ADOPT the SB 1016 amendments submitted by Paul Cosgrove dated 6-4-93 as a substitute to the amendments adopted the previous evening.

SEN. KINTIGH: Do you feel this would reduce the fee you charge applicants?

GRAINEY: It well may. - Relates a situation a few years ago where a joint process was implemented, saving \$1 million in expenses. VOTE: CHAIR CEASE: Hearing no objection the amendments are ADOPTED. All members are present.

263 LLOYD MARETT: (introduces EXHIBIT S) On page 32, line 25, of the -A4 amendments following the word "council," strike the period and add "including implementation of the energy policy of the state contained in ORS 469.010, 469.060, 469.190 and 469.310." - On page 35, line 6, following "010" insert "469.060." - On page 36, line 16, following "010" insert "469.060." - On page 36, line 14, change the lead-in language to read, "except for coal, or nuclear generating plants." CHAIR CEASE: That ties the bill down on the CO2 question to the policies already adopted by the state. 307 MEG REEVES: The addition of the reference to ORS 469.060 is because that statute requires the state to have an energy

plan and notes what should be considered in that plan. - It is also a direction to the council to take that plan into account.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 12

MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves to ADOPT the SB 1016 amendments submitted by Lloyd Marbet. VOTE: CHAIR CEASE: Hearing no objection the amendments are ADOPTED. All members are present.

SEN. COHEN: This is the snarly issue of stays and the terms of such.

336 REP. GRATTAN KERANS: (District 20) Introduces Dan Meek. 340 DANIEL MEEK: (introduces EXHIBIT N) Corrects some statements made the previous evening relative to charging the costs of uncompleted plans to ratepayers. - Mentions Ballot Measure 9 (1978) which prohibits utilities from including in the rate base the cost of projects not presently providing service. - PP&L's position is that measure does not prohibit charging the full cost of any project to ratepayers whether or not it is ever completed or operated. - The Attorney General's position is you can charge both the cost of the project and the profit as long as the project operates for any period of time. - In Option 3, a project could be built and operated during the period of time simultaneous to the Supreme Court review. 382 - The position of environmental protection and ratepayer groups is existing law should remain. - We could live with Option 2, which requires the utility or project applicant to make some showing of harm to it in order to lift the stay.

SEN. SMITH: How do the utility accounting books reflect that? - Ultimately these things are passed on.

MEEK: When a utility begins constructing a plant, the cost is allocated to an account called "allowance for funds used during construction." - This typically accumulates in a fund to which the Public Utility Commission applies an interest rate. - Mentions prudence reviews conducted by the PUC. - The Oregon PUC has never ruled that a utility's spending has been imprudent.

423 SEN. SMITH: You have just confirmed what I sense. - No matter how you craft an initiative, ultimately this will be passed on to the consumer. MEEK: That is not necessarily the case. - Gives example of Ballot Measure 9.

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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 13

SEN. SMITH: Doesn't the fund created initially come from ratepayers?

MEEK: Investor-owned utilities have two sources of funds: ratepayer revenue and stock holders. TAPE 176, SIDE B

044 SEN. DICK SPRINGER: (District 6) Offers testimony in opposition to SB 101 6. - Notes his past experience with energy issues. - I wish this had been worked through during the interim. - I am concerned about anything that is going to create an energy farm in Oregon to export produced power to California or Utah without any benefit to Oregon. - I clearly support Option 1 of the stay provisions; the status quo. - The minimum protection to the public is found in Option 2, if Option 1 is not possible.

070 SEN. COHEN: I am sympathetic with Option 1, I don't understand why one would support Option 2, but I would be willing to move to Option 3.

CHAIR CEASE: Option 3 is the automatic six month stay, removable on petition. - That is the approach in the gola mining bill.

SEN. KINTIGH: After the six months, that's it? CHAIR CEASE: It can be renewed upon petition if it is shown there has been irreparable harm to the resources.

SEN. SHOEMAKER: Have we heard from the Supreme Court on Option 3? - Are they in the practice of extending stays?

SEN. COHEN: They have not had a goldmining standard, and they are in the process of dealing with these issues whenever they are brought to them. - I don't know that there is any qualitative difference between extending or imposing a stay.

089 SEN. SHOEMAKER: So they are now prepared to deal with the issues of stays?

SEN. COHEN: Supposedly some form of the stay issue would happen or not in the APA.

These minutes contain materisls 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. Senate Agriculturo and Natural Resources Juno 4, 1993 Pago 14

SEN. SMITH: The Supreme Court is judging the certificate and the criteria to be applied in extending the stay which first would be colorable claim of error. What standards does the Supreme Court look to to extend the stay? Irreparable harm to the resource? - Are they in the position of a fact-finding body?

116 CHAIR CEASE: We have 5 options. - The environmental groups would like Option 1.

REEVES: Describes situation she could see happening under Option 3.

135 GAIL ACHTERMAN: Under current statute, the Supreme Court has not previously considered stays, as all cases were automatically stayed. - Discusses the chemical mining statute of last session which contains the Option 3 language, putting the issue of stays before the Supreme Court.

161 - Option 3 is our next least-preferred option to Option 1. - We don't think it is particularly workable at all. - We would prefer Options 5, 4 or even 2.

SEN. COHEN: We ought to look at Option 2 and review it. - I would rather have the court lifting stays than the Siting Council.

SEN. SMITH: For the record, I oppose a process that has an automatic stay which guarantees an automatic appeal. - It guarantees greater cost passed on to ratepayers.

200 ACHTERMAN: If the committee chooses either Options 2, 4 or 5, the bill will not fall apart. - We would strongly support Sen. Smith's request. - We would not want to compromise on Option 2, just because we can live with it, instead of Option 3. - Option 4 is preferable.

221 MOTION: SEN. SMITH: Moves Option 4 for SB 1016 be approved. VOTE: In a roll call vote, Senators Kintigh and Smith vote AYE. Senators Cohen, Gold, Shoemaker and Cease vote NO. Senator Bunn is EXCUSED. CHAIR CEASE: The motion FAILS.

232 ACHTERMAN: Option 2 from the June 1st copy, line 2, delete the word "council. and insert the word "Supreme Court." - Replace "enforcement of n with "stay the order."

Those 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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources June 4, 1993 Page 15

MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves Option 2 for SB 1016 be approved including the above noted language changes. VOTE: In a roll call vote, Senators Cohen, Gold, Shoemaker and Cease vote AYE. Senators Kintigh and Smith vote NO. Senator Bunn is EXCUSED.

CHAIR CEASE: The motion CARRIES. - Please indicate for the record whether each party intends to keep this bill intact in the other chamber. (Gail Achterman responds, "Yes.")

276 SEN. SMITH: I would like to say for the record I hope you try to amend this portion over in the House because I find it unacceptable. CHAIR CEASE: I have already informed the Governor's staff that if the bill becomes unglued, I would recommend a veto.

282 LLOYD MARBET: I oppose Option 2 and support Option 1.

292 ACHTERMAN: For the utility industry group, we will support the bill in this form on the House side.

GRAINEY: On behalf of the department and the Governor's Office, we will support the bill, as well.

305 LIZ FRENKEL: (Sierra Club) I was not prepared for Option 2, but I will abide by (inaudible).

314 MARBET: Except for the stay provisions, I can live with the bill.

CHAIR CEASE: I think we can live with this bill. - The compromise was not my choice or that of others, but it is a pretty good bill. MOTION: SEN. COHEN: Moves that SB 1016 AS AMENDED in concept form, be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation. VOTE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE.

CHAIR CEASE: The motion CARRIES. Senator Cohen will lead discussion on the Floor.

SEN. COHEN: Thanks everyone for their work.

360 CHAIR CEASE: Closes the work session on SB 1016. - Adjourns the meeting at 9:58 a.m.

These minutes contain rnaterrida which paraphrase and/or summarize amendments 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. Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources - ourcoa Juno 4,1 993 Page 1 8

Submitted by: Reviewed by Pamella Andersen Peter Green
Clerk Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A Testimony on SJM19 - Wallace Rutledge - 2 pages B Testimony on
HB 2211 - Chuck Craig - 2 pages C Testimony on SB 1011 - Kirsten
Ritchie - 1 page D Testimony on SB 1011 - Lissa West - 2 pages
E Testimony on SB 1011 - Debbie Gorham - 1 page FMetro's 1992
Recycling Level Survey Results - Debbie Gorham - 12 pages S~3 to t
G Proposed Amendments to SB 1016 - Paul Cosgrove - 1 page
H Testimony on SB 1016 - Jane Cummins - 1 page I Testimony on SB
1016 - Art Schlack - 1 page J Testimony on SB 1011 - Art Schlack - 1
page K Testimony on SB 1011 - Rip Gage - 3 pages L Letter on SB
1036 - Doug Coenen - 1 page M Testimony on SB 1011 - Steve Little - 2
pages N Testimony on SB 1016 - Daniel Meek - 3 pages O Testimony
on SB 1011 - Arthur Ayre - 1 page P Plastics News Article: P&G Exit
Speaks Volumes on APC - DEQ - 1 page se~ lc~1 Q Proposed Amendments
HB 2211-A i - Rep. Liz Van Leeuwen - 1 page R Proposed Amendments SB
1036-2 - Staff - 2 pages S Proposed Amendments SB 1016-4A - Lloyd
Marbet - 46 pages - Information Packet- Committee Staff

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.