

House Committee on Business and Consumer Affairs February 12, 1991 -
Page

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.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

February 12, 1991
P.M.

Hearing Room F 1:30
Tapes 26 - 28

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. John Schoon, Chair Rep. Hedy L. Rijken,
Vice-Chair Rep. Jerry Barnes Rep. Lisa Naito Rep. Carolyn Oakley Rep.
Beverly Stein Rep. Greg Walden

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Connolly, Committee Administrator Annetta
Mullins, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2222 WS HB 2627 WS HB 2277 PH HB
2279 PH HB 2435 PH

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 26, SIDE A

007 VICE CHAIR RIJKEN, acting as Chair, calls the meeting to order at
1:34 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF MEASURES

010 MARVIN FJORBEC, Pacific Gas Transmission Company: We are seeking
introduction of LC 2761 as a committee bill at the request of Pacific
Gas Transmission Company (EXHIBIT A). This measure is required to
facilitate the construction of the largest private construction project
in the history of Oregon, a \$1.5 billion pipeline through seven counties
that will allow doubling of natural gas to the state. It allows a
wrap-up workers compensation policy which will allow the pipeline to be
covered by a single policy for all contractors and subcontractors no
matter for whom they work. It is needed so as to not run afoul of the
state's fictitious grouping statute. This idea has come up twice
before, both times approved by this committee, once in 1979 and in
1981. The bill authorizes the Insurance Division, with certain
safeguards to issue a wrap-up compensation policy. The draft has been
improved by the Insurance Division which will support the legislation.

035 MOTION: REP. OAKLEY moves that the committee introduce LC 2761 as a
committee bill at the request of Pacific Gas Transmission Company.

037 VOTE; CHAIR RIJKEN, hearing no objection to the motion, declares
the motion PASSED.

039 CHAIR RIJKEN opens the work session on HB 2222.

HB 2222 - MODIFIES ELIGIBILITY, FUNDING AND "SUNSET" DATE FOR SPECIAL
ASSISTANCE TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS.

044 CHAIR RIJKEN: We have proposed amendments HB 2222-1 (EXHIBIT B).

051 TERRY CONNOLLY, Administrator: The HB 2222-1 amendments were brought to the committee by Pat Fawcett.

057 MOTION: REP. STEIN moves that the proposed amendments, HB 2222-1, to HB 222 2 BE ADOPTED.

059 VOTE: CHAIR RIJKEN, hearing no objection to the motion, declares the motion PASSED.

063 MOTION: REP. BARNES moves that HB 2222, as amended, be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation and that the bill be referred to the House Revenue Committee.

071 VOTE: In a roll call vote, all members vote AYE.

CHAIR RIJKEN declares the motion PASSED.

082 CHAIR RIJKEN opens the work session on HB 2627.

HB 2627 - FINDS THAT FEDERAL LAW REQUIRES RESPONSIBILITY FOR CERTIFYING, LICENSING, SUPERVISING AND DISCIPLINING REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BE DELEGATED TO STATE ENTITY INDEPENDENT FROM AGENCY REGULATING REAL ESTATE LICENSEES. Witnesses: Ken Sherman, Jr., Oregon Bankers Association

089 KEN SHERMAN, Jr., Oregon Bankers Association, submits and reviews a section-by-section analysis of HB 2627 prepared by the Oregon Bankers Association (EXHIBIT C).

124 REP. SCHOON: Would a loan made by a state chartered bank, insured by FDIC, fall under the law?

133 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

133 REP. SCHOON: Would a national bank making any mortgage over \$50,000?

134 MR. SHERMAN: The amount, as I understand it, is still somewhat in dispute. Most of the federal agencies have set a \$50,000 threshold and said any loans below that didn't require one of these appraisals. I think the Fed still has a \$100,000 threshold; there is some question about what the Fed is going to do, whether they will come down to the standards established by the other agencies. With that caveat, yes.

141 REP. SCHOON: What about a home equity loan?

141 MR. SHERMAN: Any loan which crosses the threshold is generally going to be required to have the appraisal if we are talking about more than a \$50,000 or a \$100,000 figure; if a federally related transaction is involved, an appraisal will be required.

145 REP. SCHOON: What about a loan financed by a mortgage company that might be sold on secondary market?

149 MR. SHERMAN: We are talking only about loans made by institutions that take federally insured deposits. A mortgage company is not a deposit-taking institution and it would not be a federally related transaction.

153 REP. SCHOON: What about the State of Oregon where we are using, at least partially, federal moneys for providing low income loans, etc.

155 MR. SHERMAN: It is not the source of the loan funds that trigger the appraisal requirement. It is the question of whether the institution making the loan takes deposits that are federally insured. That is the triggering event under FIRREA.

160 MR. SHERMAN continues reviewing his statement explaining Sections 3 through 6 of the bill.

250 REP. SCHOON: We don't like open-ended fees. Has anybody worked on establishing the costs and setting the fees?

255 MR. SHERMAN: That has not been formally addressed. When this bill was first presented we did have some figures in the blanks. Those are set as maximum figures; the fees can be set by the board at any level up to those numbers, whatever they turn out to be. This bill will go through the Ways and Means process and the Secretary of State will be asked to make some projections about the number of people to be licensed and the cost of setting up the mechanism. I don't think that has been accomplished at this point.

266 REP. SCHOON: In Section 6, what is the significance of the "Uniform Certification Examination" and who is the "Appraisal Qualification Board."

271 MR. SHERMAN: The language is taken from the federal act. The Appraisal Qualification Board is part of something called the Appraisal Foundation, which is a non-profit corporation organized under the law of Illinois and which was delegated the responsibility by the United States Congress to develop the standards for the testing, licensing and certification of appraisers. It is a rather unique arrangement. Normally, Congress will either make the standards itself or give the authority to some governmental body. Here they have given the authority to the Appraisal Foundation. The Appraisal Qualification Board specifically is mentioned in the federal statute.

286 MR. SHERMAN continues with his prepared statement reviewing Sections 7 and 8 of the bill.

310 REP. SCHOON: Is reciprocity an issue?

310 MR. SHERMAN: Indirectly it is because all state statutes are going to have to contain the functional equivalent of this language. We will have reciprocity, at least in some form.

315 MR. SHERMAN continues reviewing his statement beginning with Section 9 of the bill.

416 REP. SCHOON: Is the test available now?

419 MR. SHERMAN: No, as far as I know work is still on-going with the Appraisal Foundation. I don't think it is going to be as simple as taking something off the shelf and using it. I think some developmental work will be required through the Administrative Rule process by the board.

449 MOTION: REP. SCHOON moves that HB 2627, as amended (EXHIBIT D) be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

462 VOTE: In a roll call vote, all members vote AYE.

470 CHAIR RIJKEN declares the motion PASSED.

TAPE 27, SIDE A

034 CHAIR SCHOON opens the public hearing on HB 2277, HB 2279 and HB 2435, explains these are fee bills and advises that Ways and Means offered to send this committee a list of what they have tentatively scheduled for approval/disapproval or switching from fees to General Funds with regard to these measures. I chose not to take it since I didn't want it tainting our actions. We will deal with these bill and make our own recommendations to Ways and Means.

HB 2277 - INCREASES LICENSE FEES TO ENGAGE IN FOOD AND BEVERAGE PROCESSING, SALES, STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION. Witnesses: Bruce Andrews, Oregon Dept. of Agriculture Jim Black, Food and Dairy Division Ron Chase, Skylane Farms Laura Hansen, Chris' Poultry Farms Reginald Keddie, Edelweiss Farms Roger Martin, United Grocers Jack Munro, Association of Oregon Food Industries Molly Murphy, Oregon Poultry Council

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HB 2277 is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT E).

044 BRUCE ANDREWS, Oregon Department of Agriculture, introduces Jim Black of the Food and Dairy Division. HB 2277, HB 2279 and HB 2435 are three of our more popular bill. These bills were garnered due to the additional requirement for revenue as the budget process was being developed. The General Fund portions of some of our programs were removed, about \$6.4 million. That provided us with the opportunity to go back and raise \$5.4 million in other fund substitutions for these programs. Two other companion pieces of legislation will be working their way through the House Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee.

HB 2277 refers to our food processing and food and dairy license bill. It attempts to pull in \$3.725 million in fees to run the program as 100 percent other funded. Mr. Black will go through the proposal.

060 JIM BLACK, Administrator, Food and Dairy Division submits and reviews a prepared statement giving a brief overview of the Food and Dairy Division and provisions of HB 2277 (EXHIBIT F).

091 REP. OAKLEY: When were the fees last increased?

091 MR. BLACK: The fees were increased the last two years in a row. We had some General Fund shift last biennium. In addition to that the impacts of the job value came in, plus when we switched from a basic flat fee mechanism to a sliding-scale fee based on gross annual sales, we had limited survey information and under estimated the amount of revenue we were going to generate through the original increase. We therefore had to raise them again at the beginning of our last fiscal year.

118 MR. BLACK continues with presentation of his statement.

150 REP. NAITO: Can you address the concern that two licenses could be required?

158 MR. BLACK: We have an interagency agreement with the Health Division regarding food service facilities. It is divided according to predominance gross annual sales. A frozen dessert license is required under our dairy law for freezing and selling of soft serves. To that extent there is some overlap of licensure. Those fees are not garnered in this bill.

181 REP. BARNES: Are these fees and charges intended to replace all the General Fund shifts?

184 MR. ANDREWS: The proposed fees would take away all the General Funds and fund the program out of Other Funds. There are no program enhancements; these are replacement fees.

189 CHAIR SCHOON turns the gavel to REP. STEIN for the remainder of the meeting.

193 REP. WALDEN: Is there any thought given to consolidating licenses rather than the piecemeal approach?

210 MR. BLACK: There probably has not been. We have nine statutes to enforce and they all have different requirements. We think we have a reasonable assignment geographically. We only have four people covering two-thirds of the land mass of the state. That reflects the number of facilities and the far reaches of the state which they must travel. We think we do a very good job and we try to economize where ever we can. If our people have a significant amount of work away from their assigned station, they try to get the work done by staying over night.

231 MR. ANDREWS: Within the food safety aspect of the program, we have registered sanitarians who do all the inspections. Measurement and Standards Division will check accuracy of scales. But the sanitarians have different skills than a person who checks meters or a weights and

measurement standards specialist or the various specialties. We have not combined that training.

251 REP. WALDEN: What about the one-license or permit idea?

251 MR. ANDREWS: We are working on trying to combine them and I think this year we will have one license application form. That has been a goal of ours for sometime to simplify the paperwork.

261 REP. BARNES: Are you permitted by statute to contract your functions to the counties?

266 MR. ANDREWS: That discussions comes up about every biennium. The counties that want to be involved want to use it as a funding resource. In the more rural areas it is very cost inefficient.

286 REP. OAKLEY: Dairies are meeting with hard times and then I look at the fee increase to the dairies.

293 MR. ANDREWS: We have not proposed a fee increase for them.

298 REP. OAKLEY: How many times do you inspect per year?

303 MR. BLACK: That fee is on the processors and we have to inspect quarterly under the Interstate Milk Shippers program.

295 REP. RIJKEN: Does the proposed fee cover the quarterly inspections?

316 MR. BLACK: It will come closer than it does today.

381 CHAIR STEIN: Is the \$3.7 million a General Fund subsidy that was being made toward these inspections?

384 MR. BLACK: Yes.

385 CHAIR STEIN: How much was being captured by fees in the past?

385 MR. ANDREWS: The program was 40 percent Other Funds and 60 percent General Fund.

390 CHAIR STEIN: The costs of inspections now will be fully borne by those who benefit from having the state inspect, except to the extent the public benefits from safety.

394 MR. BLACK: That is correct.

397 REP. WALDEN: I think one of the issues at the heart of this matter is whether there is an overriding compelling reason that the consumer contributes to the General Fund and benefits from this inspection process is relieved of any threat. I haven't heard justification from the department as to the overriding need for this kind of shift from the General Fund.

398 MR. ANDREWS: What the Food and Dairy Division does is in the public's best interest. It is a philosophy of who is going to pay for it. It is a program that is essential to the well being of not only the industry, but for consumer confidence.

TAPE 26, SIDE B

008 REP. BARNES: Have you gone through the what if's; what would you do if you have a 10, 12 or 15 percent cut and relating that to the impact on public health and safety?

014 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. Our budget shows a real drop in General Fund shift and other fund shifts. We would like to have come to you to broaden the program.

023 REP. OAKLEY: What would happen if you didn't get your fee increases?

026 MR. ANDREWS: We would have to find other funds to back fill or cut the program in half.

046 RON CHASE, Skylane Farms, submits and reads a prepared statement in opposition to Section 9 of HB 2277 (EXHIBIT G).

065 REP. NAITO: What do they look at when they inspect eggs?

068 MR. CHASE: They are grading them by imperfections--whether there are too many cracked eggs, interior problems, weights--they are making sure we are fulfilling the standards.

081 LAURA HANSEN, Chris Poultry Farms: I represent a small company in the egg production industry. I am asking that you vote no on this because of competition, the fluctuating market and the economy makes it very difficult for small companies to survive as it is and with an added fee, survival is very difficult. We feel HB 2277 is totally unfair.

091 REGINALD KEDDIE, Edelweiss Farms, submits and reads a prepared statement in opposition to Sections 8 and 9 of HB 2277 (EXHIBIT H).

143 CHAIR STEIN: What is the benefit to you or your industry from having inspections?

MR. KIDDIE: Nothing. As an honest businessman I would do my best to provide the highest quality product. I don't gain anything from the inspection service. We have an internal quality control inspection which we do ourselves and we have the same standards put out by USDA which we have to meet.

156 CHAIR STEIN: Are there any federal standards or inspection which the producers have to conform to?

157 MR. CHASE: We sell to the USDA standards. As I understand it, the inspector who represents the State of Oregon comes with a federal hat on once every quarter. The other times he represents the State of Oregon.

166 ROGER MARTIN, United Grocers: United Grocers is a co-op in Oregon and is made up of 300 plus individual, privately owned grocery stores. We are adamantly opposed to HB 2277. The department had General Funds because the function they describe is, more than anything else, a public protection, consumer protection function. The program is not for the benefit of grocers, food industry or egg producers; it is for the benefit of the general public. Historically, this has been funded partially through General Funds. In the fiscal crisis in 1982 we established the fee schedule between \$25 and \$250. Now we are being asked to change the upper end to \$5,000. The department should reduce or consider eliminating some of the functions.

241 There are redundant functions. The Department of Justice has in the Attorney General's office, a consumer protection and fraud division. If someone is trying to cheat the public, the Justice Department will bring action against them.

The Ways and Means Committee is waiting for a message from this committee and I would appreciate your not sending the bill and let's debate the function of the Department of Agriculture and how we are going to fund it, but don't do it by this extremely high increase in fees beyond any ability of them to demonstrate a need.

271 JACK MUNRO, Association of Oregon Food Industries, Inc.: OFI is a trade association of some 430 corporate members who do business at over 1,000 locations in Oregon. That includes chain stores like Safeway, Fred Meyer, IGA's, Thriftways and other independently owned markets. You have before you a suggestion that is directed toward raising statutory ceilings and that is necessitated by the extraction of General Fund moneys that has traditionally funded the Food and Dairy Division program and other programs in the Department of Agriculture and to back fill that with fee generated money.

We are an easy mark so let's not use the word tax, let's just extract money by raising fees. If you look at the budget generally, we are not talking taxes this session, but we are talking \$160 million of new fee increases of which \$3.7 million are Food and Dairy Division related increases.

He submits and reviews three exhibits relating to license fees (EXHIBIT I).

366 We don't need these programs to be in business. They are programs for the benefit of the public. If that is the case, then the public ought to participate in the cost of the programs and it ought to occur with General Fund money. Some of that General Fund money is contributed by the business people. I have to second Roger's comment about not giving this bill the traditional cursory examination and shipping it to Ways and Means. I think there are a series of significant policy issues that ought to be discussed more broadly than in Ways and Means and I think that needs to be done in this committee.

398 REP. NAITO: I have heard the retail profit in food is about one percent. Do you feel that is accurate?

399 MR. MUNRO: That is an accurate figure.

408 REP. NAITO: Part of my concern is that eventually these costs get passed on. It looks like one aspect of this will be increased prices in basic food items. Would you see the cost being passed on?

419 MR. MUNRO: You are right and it will vary from operator to operator.

TAPE 27, SIDE B

013 MOLLY MURPHY, Oregon Poultry Council: Oregon Poultry Council represents the entire poultry industry in Oregon, including broilers processors and producers, turkey processors and producers and egg processors and producers. There are two areas that directly affect the poultry industry. One fee Food and Dairy is asking to raise is food establishments. That affects the broiler and turkey processors; that is four establishments in Oregon. There is also a request to raise the statutory limitation on the egg sale fee which effects the egg production people. The egg sale situation is quite serious. The average egg processing company pays upward of \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year currently. If this limitation is raised, it will be doubled.

As a member of the industry and consumer, I am vitally interested in a successful food inspection program in Oregon for the purpose of providing a safe and truthfully identified food. In the poultry, meat and egg industry there is a concern of whether or not the present system is actually doing that at any fee. I believe it is not. I don't believe the sampling methods used neither at the retail level or at the processing level or at the farm production level are statistically valid in numbers or in quality to honestly provide for this mission. I would urge this committee, rather than just take this as a yes or no issue, to instruct the Food and Dairy Division to get with the poultry, meat and egg people and reorganize, restructure the inspection system to accomplish something for the consumer.

The Oregon Poultry Council feels that poultry, meat and egg products should be considered separately from other foods. A lot of that has to do with our relationship with the United States Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration. Our turkey and broiler processors are under continuous inspections. They have at least one full-time federal inspector in their facilities at all times of production. They don't need anything more and FDA doesn't need to come in and do anything more. They may not be coming in and doing anything more in many cases, yet they are still charging. There is a duplication of efforts. Maybe there is not a duplication of efforts, but they are charging for them. The question is whether the consumer is getting

anything out of that and what is justifying the fees and increases? The same is true for the one egg processor.

110 REP. BARNES: Do you know what the role of the U. S. Department of Agriculture is as it relates to inspection of meat and poultry processing? Are we doing something that looks nice but is not necessary since the federal government is required to do what our state agencies are doing?

MS. MURPHY: There is some cooperative agreement between USDA and OSDA in not duplicating efforts but it is not in the fee schedules.

124 REP. BARNES: Are the Oregon Department of Agriculture inspectors acting as agents of the federal government, and if so should the federal government be reimbursing us for doing some of their job?

139 MS. MURPHY: I believe that is what the cooperative agreement is.

147 CHAIR STEIN: What kind of up-to-date practices do we need to adopt?

151 MS. MURPHY: A lot of it has to do with efficiency. Machines have been designed, procedures adapted to use fewer people and to be able to move larger volumes of product. Because of that, the sampling method is difficult and would have to be re-evaluated.

196 CHAIR STEIN closes the public hearing on HB 2277 and declares the meeting in recess at 3:14 p.m.

200 CHAIR STEIN reconvenes the meeting at 3:38 p.m. and opens the public hearing on HB 2279.

TAPE 27, SIDE B HB 2279 - ADDS RETAIN CHECKOUT SCANNERS TO STATUTES RELATING TO WEIGHING AND MEASURING DEVICES. Witnesses: Bruce Andrews, Oregon Department of Agriculture Ken Simila, Administrator, Measurement Standards Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture Cindy Ziel, United Grocers Jack Munro, Association of Oregon Food Industries

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT J).

204 BRUCE ANDREWS, Oregon Department of Agriculture, introduces Ken Simila, Measurement Standards Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture. HB 2279 seeks to raise \$525,000 for the Measurement and Standards program. The total program is \$2,220,364 as proposed in the Governor's budget. This money would replace the twenty percent General Fund that comprised the program up to this point. It would remove all General Fund for the program.

219 KEN SIMILA, Administrator, Measurement Standards Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture, submits and reviews a program activity sheet and funding history (EXHIBIT K).

279 Issues discussed: Enforcement procedures. Remote readout locations and fees.

TAPE 28, SIDE A

Frequency of inaccuracies and testing of digital readouts. Business scanners proposed to be licensed. Proposed license fee for this biennium would be \$60. Scanners are not currently being checked.

153 MR. ANDREWS: The functions of the Measurement Standards Division that were funded by General Fund up to this date had primarily a consumer advocacy role. In order to back fill that General Fund, the connection used was the instrument that checked it out. It has no connection other than that. It is a handy revenue source.

160 CHAIR STEIN: Have General Funds been used for packaged products checking and am I to understand that device examinations would be through the fees.

169 MR. SIMILA: That is correct.

170 CHAIR STEIN: Where does the funding for the investigation of methods of sale and operator practices come from?

171 MR. SIMILA: That is also General Fund. However, complaints on a gas station, some of the license fees that we have received to do the basic examination of that equipment also goes into the investigation. Miscellaneous consumer complaints that aren't related to license devices would be under General Fund.

178 CHAIR STEIN: How much money are we talking about for packaged product checking?

180 MR. SIMILA: It is about three-fourths of the \$525,000.

183 CHAIR STEIN: If we didn't accept this fee increase, we would continue to have device examination, but not packaged product checking.

185 MR. ANDREWS: Yes.

185 CHAIR STEIN: And we would have some investigation of those complaints tied to device examination type activities?

187 MR. SIMILA: Yes.

184 CINDY ZIEL, United Grocers, submits and reads a prepared statement in opposition to HB 227 9 (EXHIBIT L).

248 JACK MUNRO, Association of Oregon Food Industries: Rep. Walden was getting at the nexus of the measure when he said it is a new fee for a device which can't be calibrated and won't be inspected. It is an optical reader and computer. The Unlawful Trade Practices Act provides remedies to the consumers. A non-inspection program by the Department of Agriculture isn't going to resolve the problem.

When I look at the measuring device chart on their proposal, you could double the existing fee on gas pumps, which can be calibrated and is something they test, and raise the money they are talking about needing.

Director Andrews fairly and correctly stated the issue; it isn't the need for regulatory oversight, it is money.

307 CHAIR STEIN closes the public hearing on HB 2279 and opens hearing on HB 243 5.

TAPE 28, SIDE A HB 2435 - INCREASES VARIOUS LICENSE FEES FOR PRODUCE DEALERS

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HB 2435 is hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT M).

306 MR. ANDREWS, Oregon Department of Agriculture, introduces Robert Hawkes,

Administrator, Commodity Inspection Program. HB 2435 is the seed and produce wholesale- retail peddler licenses. It is divided into two parts. The other part will be dealt with in the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. Under the produce license, the Department is seeking \$39,946 in total fund shift to back fill General Fund moneys lost to the program. Mr. Hawkes will explain how we intend to do this.

340 ROBERT HAWKES, Administrator, Commodity Inspection Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture, submits and reads a prepared statement in support of HB 243 5 (EXHIBIT N).

410 REP. WALDEN: What is the produce vehicle license fee?

411 MR. HAWKES: Wholesale produce dealers are required to have a tag to identify the truck as a produce dealer.

420 REP. WALDEN: Under which class would roadside fruit stands fall.

422 MR. HAWKES: If they are marketing their own produce they aren't required to be licensed. If they are marketing someone else's produce, they are under the peddler license.

433 REP. BARNES: Is there a definition of "produce?"

441 MR. HAWKES: This is strictly for fresh fruits and vegetables.

473 CHAIR STEIN declares the meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Reviewed by,

Annetta Mullins
Assistant

Terry Connolly
Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A -Introductions, LC 2761, Marvin Fjordbeck B -HB 2222, proposed amendments HB 2222-1, Pat Fawcett C -HB 2627, prepared statement, Ken Sherman, Jr. D -HB 2627, LC 2627-1 and hand engrossed pages of bill, staff E -HB 2277, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary F -HB 2277, prepared statement, Jim Black G -HB 2277, prepared statement, Ron Chase H -HB 2277, prepared statement, Reginald Keddie I -HB 2277, history, fees and license schedules, Jack Munro J -HB 2279, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff K -HB 2279, program activity summary and proposed fees, Ken Simila L -HB 2279, prepared statement, Cindy Ziel M -HB 2435, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff N - HB 2435, prepared statement, Robert Hawkes