

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.

Measures Heard Informational meeting No measures heard

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

January 21, 1991Hearing Room E 1:30 p.m.Tapes 8 - 11

MEMBERS PRESENT:Rep. Parkinson, Chair Rep. Whitty, Vice-Chair Rep. Burton Rep. Courtney Rep. Naito Rep. Norris Rep. Repine Rep. Van Leeuwen Rep. Watt

MEMBER EXCUSED: All members present

VISITING MEMBER:No visiting members

STAFF PRESENT: Kathryn Van Natta, Committee Administrator Andy Sloop, Committee Assistant

WITNESSES: Bill Blosser, Chair, Land Conservation and Development Commission Susan Brody, Director, Department of Land Conservation and Development Charles Hales, Home Builders of Metropolitan Portland Jon Chandler, Attorney, Common Ground Bill Moshofsky, Attorney, Oregonians In Action Burton West, Special Districts Association Kelly Ross, Oregon Association of Realtors Richard Angstrom, Managing Director, Oregon Concrete and Aggregate Producers Association Russ Nebon, Association of Oregon Counties

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 8, SIDE A

007 CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

INFORMATIONAL MEETING - INTRODUCTION OF LAND-USE AGENCIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

23BILL BLOSSER, CHAIR, LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION: Introduces LCDC and gives overview of commission. (EXHIBIT A)

>LCDC is in precarious position operating under direction of Legislature and Executive branches.

>Representation on current commission is balanced.

>Commission is action oriented and intends to move ahead on key issues.

68 SUSAN BRODY, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT: Gives agency overview. Presents report on DLCD mission, accomplishments, planning benefits, budget, and organization. (EXHIBIT A)

>LCDC and DLCD advised by Local Officials Advisory Committee (LOAC) and Citizens Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC). These have been refined recently to be more efficient and effective.

>Other input sources include local government, stakeholders and other state agencies. Local governments are the most important source of input. LCDC interacts with 277 local and county governments which make 10,000 to 15,000 land-use decisions annually. These entities submit about 3,600 plan amendments each year to DLCD. Because of this large volume, DLCD only processes the most important amendments.

>120-160 local decisions are appealed to LUBA annually. This is relatively small. About 40 percent of these are dismissed, 20 percent are sustained and 40 percent are reversed or sent back to the local level.

178 REP. BURTON: I'd really like to have some information about the time cycles on those remand and reverse cases.

180 BRODY: That is the area about which we have heard the most concern.

183 REP. NORRIS: Should I construe this, then, that LUBA doesn't agree with 80 percent of the local government decisions it hears?

185 BRODY: No, not necessarily. If a case is dismissed, it doesn't necessarily mean the finding is against local government. In fact, it may be that the appellant discovers he/she doesn't have adequate justification for the appeal.

200 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is there a time line on remands now?

204 BRODY: I don't believe there is a specific time line.

207 BLOSSER: Just to expand on the remand question, a remand does not overturn a local government decision, it just says local government needs to do more work dotting all of the letters with respect to the law.

208 CHAIR PARKINSON: There used to be horror stories about cases that bounced back and forth between local government and LUBA like a ping pong ball for years. I thought we put a time frame on LUBA.

210 BRODY: You are right. This continues to be an issue.

215 BRODY: Continues overview.

>More than 2,000 local planning commissioners.

>26 state agencies participate in the land-use process in some way. DLCD feels these agencies should be more involved.

>DLCD also deals with many federal agencies and has a voice with respect to federal planning issues.

272 REP. VAN LEEUWEN: I had not thought of you as an avenue for doing something with the Forest Practices Act. The endangered species in my

district is not the owl, it's the people. What can you do to help us?

280 BRODY: The main help we can be is in implementing the state's forest planning goal. LCDC has passed a revised administrative rule telling local governments what kinds of protections need to be kept in place and how much development can be allowed on private forest lands. The connection I would make to the issue you are raising is the extent to which we make sure private forest lands are kept available for commercial forestry operations. The strongest influence we have on federal matters is on the coast, because under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, federal actions have to be consistent with the state's coastal program. In other areas of the state, we get into more of an advisory and negotiation situation. However, I don't want to underplay how important those negotiations can be sometimes in reaching the results we want.

TAPE 9, SIDE A

16REP. VAN LEEUWEN: You made a statement a little while ago about how much money is budgeted to local government. Can you explain that?

20BRODY: Over the 18 years that Oregon's planning process has been in place, a little more than 50 percent of the total federal and state funds that have gone to the program's operation have been given out to local governments in the form of grants to help them perform the functions that are required by the program.

24REP. NORRIS: How far off the Oregon Coast does the state's land-use jurisdiction extend?

26BRODY: That is, of course, an issue. The thing which we will be focusing on is the territorial sea, or that portion of the ocean which is within Oregon's territory. The issue of oil and gas leasing, which takes place not only in the territory but beyond on the outer continental shelf, can be influenced by the policies we develop through our ocean plan because of a consistency provision. The ocean plan itself doesn't go beyond the state's territory, but we have an ability to influence some of those outer continental shelf decisions.

33REP. WHITTY That's the first time I've ever seen LCDC have anything to do with water. Do you have anything to do with rivers?

37BRODY: There're a lot of planning issues that occur along the banks of rivers and we do have a role to play in those issues. The Willamette Greenway is probably where this is most evident. We do end up reviewing land-use designations that local planners use along the banks of rivers, and so we have an important effect how private lands along most rivers are used. Obviously, where you have a wild and scenic river, then there are other rules and regulations that apply.

50REP. WHITTY: Then you interact with Water Resources and the Division of State Lands?

55BRODY: Yes.

60BRODY: Continues presentation.

93REP. WHITTY Under Strategic Objectives, and I don't want to get into this in any kind of depth, but on number 11, the identification of secondary resource lands, why was that written that way. Why couldn't that have been written: "The identification of 'prime resource lands'?"

100 BRODY: You can go at it from either direction - secondary or prime. Our direction from the Legislature in the past was to identify secondary

lands, and, in many ways, that still seems to us to be the best way to make the distinction.

108 BRODY: Reviews legislative agenda. (EXHIBIT A)

>Periodic Review overhaul.

>Appeals process revisions.

155 REP. WHITTY: When considering growth management at the local level, do you consider availability of water, sewer and other infrastructure and public facilities?

167 BRODY: Yes. That's part of the existing system. We review local plans, through the Periodic Review process, to insure adequate consideration and accommodation of infrastructure. We've done case studies of Portland, Medford and Brookings to try to learn how we can make our program work better for cities as they grow. We will be sharing the recommendations that come out of that with you this spring.

175 BRODY: Continues presentation.

205 REP. NORRIS: On regulatory reform, does that include maybe some enhanced flexibility and authority at the city and county levels?

210 BRODY: It could. There are situations where local planning systems may not be as efficient as they could be. I would like our department to work with local governments to design local systems that expedite the planning process. The local process also could be facilitated by helping local governments to hire hearings officers. Regulatory reform can include the question: Who should be making the decisions in certain circumstances. There are times when identifying state and local interests more clearly could make it possible for local governments to act with less state oversight.

231 REP. NORRIS: "May I go on record as saying that that probably should be part of it, to enhance local controls."

239 BRODY: Continues presentation.

283 REP. BURTON: Have there been proposals to use lottery funds for LCDC in the past?

285 BRODY: There was a proposal to fund the Urban Growth Management Study for this biennium, but that ended up being funded out of the grant side of our budget.

319 REP. BURTON Do you have an opinion if your proposed local grants meet the economic development test for use of lottery moneys?

322 BRODY: We believe they do in that they focuses on a new effort in urban growth management.

323 REP. BURTON: Who's "we". That makes me nervous. In other words, there is no test case or opinion from the Attorney General?

325 BRODY: No. No there isn't. We will do further follow up on this.

326 BLOSSER: That is a question that has been raised. My understanding is that it should be adequately answered before you all have to take any action on it.

331 BRODY: The new packages that are proposed in the Governor's recommended budget are all proposed to be funded either through lottery

funds or through other funds. No new general funds are proposed. We've talked some about what we hope to do under regulatory reform, dispute resolution and urban-growth management. Let me talk a little about the mineral and aggregate position we're proposing to fund. This is one of the most litigated issues in the state land-use program. There's a lot of work that needs to be done with local government to improve the planning process for these kinds of requests. We've gotten a head start on that through a loaned position from the Oregon Department of Transportation this year because mineral and aggregate is obviously critical to ODOT's highway program. We want to continue to work with local governments on planning and protecting mineral and aggregate resources and balancing that against other important values that local governments have. We have identified additions to the grant side of the budget, both for regulatory reform and for urban growth management. You know that under Measure 5, local governments are especially going to need some assistance in their planning function. That's one of the places where we expect them to be hardest hit. If we're going to be able to continue the partnership and make some progress on these issues, we need to supplement grant funds. Whereas in the past we gave out about 50 percent of our grant moneys to local governments, we're now at about 30 percent. If we cut back our general funds too much, we start to lose our federal funds, so there's a trade-off there that needs to be considered as well.

356 BRODY: Returns to budget summary (EXHIBIT A)

TAPE 8, SIDE B

007 REP. BURTON: You show 14 percent of your budget as other funds. What's the source of those other funds?

10BRODY: Those would be lottery funds, primarily.

12REP. BURTON: I want to go back to this mineral and aggregate issue. Who else in the state deals with mineral-rights issues? Of the 26 agencies that you work with in the planning process, are all those that have a mineral-aggregate interest already on board in the process?

017 BRODY: The key state agencies that play a role in those issues are being included in the planning process. We accomplish a great deal with a very, very small budget. All of the agencies with which we work agree on the need for us to have better staffing.

053 REP. REPINE: LCDC has been around for 18 years. When do you think LCDC will be fully established? We're still going through the dialogue on issues that have not been resolved for 18 years. Don't you think, from a management standpoint, there's something wrong?

62BRODY: No. I don't think this is a program that was meant to go away. We have made significant accomplishments. We've nearly completed our state agency coordination review. There will always be new planning issues where there is a state interest in what occurs at the local level. That says to me that there will be reasons for us to continue to do policy making and to work with the Legislature to make changes to the program as new issues arise and as our state experiences new problems. We have completed very much and there is more to do. There will always be planning issues that need to be resolved.

71REP. BURTON: It seems to me that the plan update process benefits just about everybody in the state. I hope that others who we hear from will speak to the value of the ongoing and dynamic land-use process.

81CHAIR PARKINSON: Are all local governments' plans 100 percent acknowledged?

83BRODY: No. Some have small portions that have not been acknowledged, primarily because there were court cases related to them. There are four or five jurisdictions out of the 277 that have some portions of their plans still unacknowledged.

94CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls for testimony of Homebuilders of Metropolitan Portland.

113 CHARLES HALES, HOMEBUILDERS OF METROPOLITAN PORTLAND: Introduces Association; presents the Association's interpretation of growth-management history and trends; and describes the Association's role in the planning process.

>Legislature and planning officials too often have been mesmerized by conflict between Oregonians In Action and 1000 Friends of Oregon.

>Before passage of SB 100 and implementation of the Metropolitan Housing Rule, the amount of developable land within the metropolitan urban growth boundary shrunk from barely enough to totally inadequate. This has eliminated market opportunities to develop affordable housing and has put immense pressure on the land-use planning process.

>Polarization on planning issues has created a fractious and expensive planning system.

>The Homebuilders Association has been and continues to strive for consensus on planning issues.

>The Homebuilders Association has been immersed in development of the planning process, but many key groups haven't.

>The Homebuilders Association has attempted to bring these groups into the process.

>This effort has led to the creation of a group called Common Ground.
(EXHIBIT B)

220 REP. WHITTY: When was Portland's urban growth boundary established?

221 HALES: 1980.

223 REP. WHITTY: And has that changed?

225 HALES: Only very little. That's one of the problems in the system. When the boundary was established, we were told that it was going to be used as a management tool. It has now become regarded by some in the process as holy writ, a line drawn in the dirt by the hand of God, as some would put it. And that isn't, of course, what it should be. Some people now believe that the best way to manage growth is to hold the line. It's not so simple as that. In fact, if you hold the line zealously, you will ultimately condemn the system to be ineffective.

227 REP. WHITTY It's kind of the Up-Instead-Of-Out theory?

230 HALES: Oh, the Up-Instead-Of-Out theory is a good theory, but there are limits to it. We've seen higher densities. We're building on about an 8,700 square foot lot now as opposed to about a 13,000 square foot lot before land-use planning. We can't make people live on a 4,400 square foot lot, but we can influence the taste of the market a little bit with regulation, not much, but a little bit.

238 CHAIR PARKINSON: Charlie, you're mostly representing the metropolitan area, inside the urban growth boundary.

240 HALES: You bet. We don't have any interests outside the urban growth boundary.

242 CHAIR PARKINSON: There's a huge growth boundary around Portland, so it could be that ring has been less tightly drawn than in other parts of the state.

245 HALE: That was the case initially. There has been a significant amount of growth. That ring represents about 0.3 percent of the state's land area and accommodates about 45 percent of the state's population and 50 percent of the Gross State Product.

248 CHAIR PARKINSON: Maybe you've had your growth because you've had so much land to develop.

252 REP. BURTON: Just a comment. I was a presiding officer of the Metropolitan Service District at the time the urban growth boundary was drawn. As I recall, there was nothing written in stone about the size of the boundary. The questions being raised about the size of it are valuable. I'll be interested to see how you propose to deal with that fringe patch.

271 HALES: Continues presentation.

>The ideal of an urban growth boundary is a clean line between urban and rural uses, and the avoidance of conflicts between those uses.

>Densities in the boundary are much higher than they were before plan acknowledgement. A much wider variety of housing clientele is being accommodated in Portland than in most cities because of acknowledgement.

>Having the city inside of the boundary and country farms outside obviously can't be fully achieved.

>The system has done a very good job of managing growth so far but improvements are needed.

>There are prevalent exceptions to generally good planning in Clackamas County outside the metro boundary.

>Most of the exception areas were parceled before plan acknowledgement and, therefore, they were lost to agriculture before the lines were ever drawn. The assumption at the time was: Let's draw the line based on need; let's not give any more land inside the UGB than will be needed for the next 25 years.

>If exception areas continue to develop as they have been, the only place to expand the boundary will be on to prime farm lands in Washington County outside the UGB.

385 REP. WHITTY: At least there is some land to expand on. There are a lot of municipalities like Coos Bay, where the urban growth boundary is the bay. There's no fringe. There's no expansion. There's no anything.

411 HALES: We've got a similar problem in the Portland-metropolitan area. To the east we've got the Columbia Gorge scenic area, to the north we have the river, and to the south we have this big band of exception areas. Unless we're careful, the only place we'll have to go is west on to prime farm lands.

415 CHAIR PARKINSON: Maybe that area is big enough now and we should be channeling energies into other parts of the state.

420 HALES: I've heard that argument and I don't believe it. Again, one-third of one percent of the state's land area is hardly big enough, compared to urban areas in other states and other countries, for our prime city. We can't force people to make location decisions by holding urban growth boundaries tight.

TAPE 9, SIDE B

010 HALES: Notes that a school is being built in an exception area outside West Linn that will serve students from inside the West Linn growth boundary.

>There are places where the boundary needs to be held and places where it needs to be amended. If we maintain the myth that the urban growth boundary is perfect, we're going to have some very strange and inappropriate development.

70CHAIR PARKINSON: I have a question that doesn't really have an answer. If we change the rules, don't we upset the people who bought property counting on protections under existing rules?

75HALE: I think we've done them a disservice because one of the things we didn't do in this system is zone areas for large lot residential and we didn't designate secondary lands. All we did was designate 750,000 acres of the state for exception areas. Most of the people who buy these five-acre lots don't want five acres, they just don't want 10,000 square feet. We talk to the realtors all the time, and these folks want a one-acre lot for a big house. They can't buy one acre inside the growth boundary, so they buy five or six outside, fence off an acre, buy a big lawn mower and leave the rest fallow. It's terrible land use, but we're sending them the wrong signals.

82CHAIR PARKINSON: Are we still making five-acre divisions?

83HALES: Yes.

88JOHN CHANDLER, ATTORNEY, COMMON GROUND: There are some rule changes that

can occur that wouldn't necessarily dramatically alter the expectations of the property owner. One of the problems with the current system is that inside the boundary is urban, outside the boundary is rural and exception areas are God knows what. One of the ideas that is being considered under Secondary Lands is the notion of an urban reserve that would allow building on five-acre lots outside the UGB in such a way that future development could occur. Reviews legislative agenda and policy positions.

>Overhaul Periodic Review.

>Expedite appeals process and eliminate remand from LUBA.

>Facilitate growth and infrastructure development in urban areas and address building- moratorium law.

>Believe in the state's land-use planning system. Think planning is good for Oregon and good for business, but would like to see better balance between preservation and the need for development.

168 CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls for testimony from Oregonians In Action.

170 BILL MOSHOFSKY, ATTORNEY, OREGONIANS IN ACTION: Reviews OIA history, policy positions and legislative agenda. (EXHIBIT C)

>OIA has been addressing land-use issues for two years.

>Developing a multi-faceted approach to the system based on belief that it is here to stay.

>Found there is a lack of understanding of how the system works until property owners want to do something that the system won't let them do.

>In the past, the only representation in the system was from preservationists.

>OIA supports land-use planning and reasonable regulation, but believes the system has become too complex and too restrictive.

>Growth-management problems in Portland should not be a barrier to providing relief to the rest of the state that doesn't face the same growth pressures.

354 MOSHOFSKY: Continues presentation of written testimony. Introduces written land-use horror stories (EXHIBIT D)

TAPE 10, SIDE A

20REP. BURTON: You state in your testimony that you feel compensation should be paid when down zoning thwarts investment-backed expectations of the landowner. Are you saying that government should pay for a speculative investment that for some reason is not achieved by an individual?

23MOSHOFSKY: The U.S. Supreme Court has embraced the concept of compensating when a landowner buys a piece of property based upon a land value that is largely dictated by zoning. What we would expect the state government to pay is the difference between the value of a piece of land at the time of purchase and the value after subsequent and unanticipated rezoning, assuming the latter value is less. The Oregon Supreme Court, so far, has said it doesn't follow that rule. We think Oregon ought to follow the U.S. Supreme Court.

29REP. BURTON: In the Supreme Court case, wasn't there a lack of due process in the intervening period, whereas in Oregon we have a planning process that has approval through the state. It's not without due process that those changes are made.

37MOSHOFSKY: We aren't proposing that every down zoning would be compensated. In fact, we think it's only an extension of the vested-rights situation in which someone has proceeded with a project, built part of the foundation and then government generally allows the project to proceed even when the area has been down zoned. We're saying: Where the purchase price was paid in reliance on a particular zoning, that person, in fact, has a vested right. If you don't have it that way, it would bring tremendous instability to land values. Any time you buy anything, you better start building immediately for fear that the government would come along and change the zone, and I don't think that's very healthy.

45REP. BURTON: I would agree, but I would hope that the process in our state guarantees some insurance against that.

49MOSHOFSKY: We have documented some horror stories where that has not occurred, and we think it injects a very unhealthy element in our land-use system. I'm not saying it was intended, but a member of the LCDC has said publicly that buyers buy property with the awareness that the rules can change and it's just a risk you take. There's some logic to that, but we think it's a very unhealthy concept in terms of property

values and stability, which zoning is supposed to bring.

59CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls for Burton Weast and Kelly Ross to testify.

61BURTON WEAST, SPECIAL DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION: Outlines role of special districts in the planning process and their land-use focus during 1991-92 biennium.

>Special districts are often involved in the planning process and play an important role.

>Major concern or objective is increased participation in the local planning process.

>Notes that there hasn't been a lot of service coordination among districts in the past.

>Periodic Review is special districts' primary voice in the planning process.

>Concerned that the current planning system doesn't deal adequately with rural development, but rather seems to anticipate development only in urban areas.

>The Metropolitan Service District is either the largest local government in Oregon or the only regional government in Oregon.

>SDA is looking forward to developing tools to help Metro address it's urban growth boundary concerns. Notes that as long as there is land within the metro urban growth boundary, Metro can't demonstrate a need to expand the metropolitan UGB, despite fact that the boundary is loose in Washington County but very tight in Clackamas County.

>SDA is also interested in solid waste and other issues that directly pertain to Metro.

135 CHAIR PARKINSON: Under the current system, couldn't Metro petition the Metropolitan Boundary Commission to change the boundary rule? And along with that question, couldn't Metro go to Clackamas and Multnomah counties and say we need some help in these fringe areas; could you please do some planning? The question is: Is there a need for state legislation?

136 WEAST: We have tried to work with local governments to do that, but part of the problem is that Metro is limited in terms of what it can do outside the boundary. Our authority, under the current law, stops right at the boundary, so we need some authority, that would have to come from the Legislature, that would allow us to plan outside the boundary.

142 CHAIR PARKINSON: Can't Clackamas County plan that area outside the boundary?

145 WEAST: Clackamas County currently does plan that area. The problem is that Metro is responsible for the boundary, not Clackamas County. The County plans the area outside the boundary and Metro has no responsibility or authority in that area.

154 KELLY ROSS, OREGON ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS: Outlines OAR history and future goals.

>Historically at odds with state about the land-use process. >Primary concern of realtors is certainty and predictability about an individual's property investment.

>OAR is working vigorously to establish a role in the local planning process, with goal of catching fuzzy standards and requirements before they get entrenched in the system.

>Will be proposing modifications that tighten the appeals process.

>Progress is being made on Secondary Lands issues. Secondary Lands has been one of OAR's focal points because the planning system hasn't recognized the need to be able to build on marginal farmland.

234 REP. NORRIS: What is the VITA group?

236 ROSS: A consensus group of key players in the Secondary Lands debate called by Senator Kitzhaber and LCDC Chairman Blosser. Continues outline.

>Current planning system is good because it spells out clearly how and where destination resorts can be developed.

260 REP. WHITTY: There are whole cities on the coast that are destination resorts. In fact, I think the entire coast is a destination resort.

270 ROSS: Continues outline.

>Need to diversify planning standards to reflect diversity of the state.

284 DICK ANGSTROM, MANAGING DIRECTOR, OREGON CONCRETE AND AGGREGATE ASSOCIATION: Outlines history and future of the concrete and aggregate industry, as well as legislative agenda.

>Three or four years ago, this entire industry ran into a stone wall because mining companies couldn't site anywhere in the state.

>Existing reserves are being depleted very fast.

>If the supply isn't expanded, there will be a dramatic increase in the price of concrete and aggregate.

>This industry never paid attention to the land-use process until it found it couldn't site new operations.

>Concrete and aggregate companies lose, appeal and subsequently lose 90 percent or more of their development proposals, making the industry the number one group for land-use appeals in the state.

>The main reason for this industry's woes is that state goals say that development shall have no adverse impacts and must be consistent with the surrounding area in which it is proposed. Every mining operation has some impact.

>The industry has done a lot of public education about the aggregate industry and aggregate mining.

>Periodic Review is an essential input mechanism for the industry.

>60 percent of aggregate is used to build public projects like roads.

>OCAA plans to support LCDC budget.

>OCAA wants LUBA to make decisions based on evidentiary information.

>Want stronger controls on land partitioning in terms of restrictions on people to complain about resource uses on resource lands.

415 CHAIR PARKINSON: Invites cities and counties to testify.

TAPE 11, SIDE A

12RUSS NEBON, ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES: Outlines county land-use planning role and concerns.

>Counties depend on state agencies for technical support.

>There seems to be a temptation for LCDC to delve into minutia, and this raises questions about what should be addressed locally instead of at the state level.

>Support concept of Secondary Lands to make system more equitable. Hope the Legislature will support LCDC in this effort while maintaining pressure to complete it.

80CHAIR PARKINSON: Interrupts testimony and adjourns meeting at 3:58 p.m. so Republican committee members can attend 4 p.m. caucus meeting.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Andy Sloop Kathryn VanNatta Assistant Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A -Report from the Department of Land Conservation and Development to the House Committee on Environment and Energy presented by Susan Brody, Director, Department of Land Conservation and Development - 44 pages
B -Common Ground Introduction for the House Committee on Environment and Energy presented by Jon Chandler, Attorney, Common Ground - 1 page
C -Statement of Frank L. Nimms and Bill Moshofsky to the House Environment and Energy Committee on behalf of Oregonians In Action - 4 pages
D -Oregonians In Action Land Use Horror Stories presented by Bill Moshofsky, Attorney, Oregonians In Action - 6 pages