

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 ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

March 06, 1991Hearing Room E 1:00 p.m.Tapes 65 - 68

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

STAFF PRESENT: Kathryn VanNatta, Committee Administrator Andy Sloop, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2175 (PUB)

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 65, SIDE A

07CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Opens public hearing on HB 217 5. Enters documents for the record, including: memo to Steve Greenwood, DEQ, dated February 26 (EXHIBIT A); and written testimony from the Department of Energy (EXHIBIT B). Notes that representatives Whitty, Burton, Repine and Naito are absent and excused.

(Tape 65, Side A) HB 2175 - PUBLIC HEARING Witnesses:John Loewy, Department of Environmental Quality Jerry Emison, Environmental Protection Agency Wendy Simms, Department of Environmental Quality Steve Greenwood, Department of Environmental Quality John Kowalczyk, Department of Environmental Quality Sandra Bishop, League of Women Voters

024 JOHN LOEWY, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: Testifies in support of the measure. (EXHIBIT C)

(Representatives Repine, Naito and Whitty arrive at 1:07)

90JERRY EMISON, DEPUTY REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY: Explains federal mandates for state compliance with federal Clean Air Act amendments of 1990.

>The permit program is the key procedural reform of the Clean Air Act. It clarifies emission standards needed to comply with the Act and to meet air quality objectives.

>The permit program will be the principle mechanism for achieving reductions in industry emissions.

>Cities in "non-attainment areas" will be required to make sustained progress to reduce emissions.

>The Act tailors emission requirements on a source-by-source basis.

>The air toxics section of the Act requires industries to install "maximum achievable control technology." This process also will be controlled via permits.

>The Clean Air Act permit program is designed in the same fashion as the federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program for water pollution permitting. In other words, it is designed to enhance state ability to enforce the Act. It does this by requiring states to develop monitoring and enforcement programs and requiring air pollution sources to obtain operating permits.

>Under the Act, EPA is required to develop and implement permit programs in states that fail to comply with the permitting mandate of the Act.

(Rep. Burton arrives 1:17)

168 REP. WHITTY: "If we don't do it, they're going to do it?"

170 EMISON: Yes.

172 REP. WHITTY: Then who's going to enforce it? If we do it, we have to take the blame if people don't like it.

180 EMISON: It's clear that if states don't do this, EPA will. The EPA intends for states do it. When the EPA administered the air quality program in Idaho, nobody was happy.

207 REP. COURTNEY: I'm confused by the word "industry".

212 EMISON: "Major sources" must be permitted. Major sources emit more than 100 tons per year into the atmosphere. The permit program is valuable for several reasons:

>Provides certainty about requirements.

>Provides ready vehicle for non-attainment provisions.

251 EMISON: The EPA must devise requirements within one year of enactment, then states have two years to submit implementation programs. After states submit implementation programs, the EPA then has one year to respond. If states don't submit program proposals, the EPA is authorized to levy sanctions, including withholding federal highway funds and state pollution control grants.

282 REP. WHITTY: The comprehensive emission fee summary sheet (EXHIBIT D) says the balance of fee revenues remaining after funding air quality improvements would be pooled to fund priority air quality projects. I

saw a bill yesterday that would encourage the use of alternative vehicle fuels through a tax credit. Such a program would lower vehicle emissions. I suppose the EPA doesn't allow flexibility in the use of Clean Air Act fee funds for this type of measure.

313 EMISON: This is not EPA regulations. Statutes require that fee funds go to programs that address the particular sources identified in the Act. There was a huge debate in Congress during which industry agreed to endorse the permit program with the stipulation that permit and fee funds be used only for air quality protection. That is why Congress structured this the way it is.

332 REP. WHITTY: This summary sheet (EXHIBIT D) also says that the 20 percent of revenue that is not committed to a particular pollution source category would go back to priority projects. I wonder, since we're charging these fees, if those fees could be used to promote grain alcohol fuel for vehicles?

353 LOEWY: That is the concept of the bill and would be part of DEQ's program.

369 REP. VAN LEEUWEN: How many states do not have clean air acts and how many states have not been working at it like Oregon has?

379 EMISON: There are few states that have permit programs that meet all requirements under statute.

389 REP. VAN LEEUWEN: So, the fact that we've been permitting and monitoring almost everything wouldn't count in our effort to comply with the Act?

395 EMISON: We would have to compare existing programs with congressional standards.

TAPE 66, SIDE A

03REP. BURTON: I'm trying to sort how much discretion the state has with respect to fees. What is the minimum the state could do and how much is discretionary?

14EMISON: The minimum the state could do is establish a permitting program that covers major stationary sources of emission.

22REP. BURTON: How many sources like that do we have in this state?

24LOEWY: About 150.

25REP. BURTON: Is that strictly industrial, or does that include forest lands, etc.?

29EMISON: Industrial.

30REP. BURTON: So, states are required to impose a minimum fee sufficient to do what?

33EMISON: States have to levy fees to sustain a program that covers major stationary sources of pollution.

44REP. BURTON: So the fee could be reduced after reaching attainment if program expenses declined?

48EMISON: If program could be scaled back, then a reduced fee could be possible. However, it's unlikely standards could be maintained if fees were reduced. States should look at this as something that will be around for awhile.

59REP. BURTON: Calling it an "air emission fee gives me the impression that we're selling an air shed."

91REP. COURTNEY: So, we have until November 1993 to submit our program to the EPA? Would that be to the regional office or to Washington D.C. office?

98EMISON: Probably to the regional office.

101 REP. COURTNEY: Technically, because we have until 1993, we could do nothing this session. Let's say we did that. Could DEQ submit a plan of it's own to you and could you act on that plan?

116 EMISON: If the state presents a program that the Attorney General says is sound and can be implemented, I believe the EPA would move forward on it.

128 REP. COURTNEY: If we submit our plan early, are you going to give us a break?

144 EMISON: We would prefer to move state programs along as fast as we can. From our standpoint, there is a real disincentive to wait until the very last minute.

179 REP. REPINE: If I understand this correctly, if we design our program to meet the minimum federal standards set forth in the Act, then items such as field burning and slash burning would be outside of this?

185 EMISON: Yes.

188 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is the state currently issuing air quality permits for industrial sources?

194 LOEWY: Yes.

195 CHAIR PARKINSON: How many?

197 WENDY SIMMS, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: About 1,200.

208 CHAIR PARKINSON: How does scenic visibility figure into this?

213 EMISON: The Clean Air Act doesn't change existing requirements.

254 REP. BURTON: Why did Congress choose to mandate an emission fee only for industrial sources, which happen to be one of the smallest of all sources? Why didn't Congress develop fees for cars?

273 EMISON: Congress' intention with the Act was to accomplish two things: clarify pollution control requirements, which it believes the permit program will do; and two, ensure that states have adequate funding to administer the Act at the state level, which Congress believes the \$25 per ton industrial fee will accomplish. Congress opted to use the \$25 per ton fee that EPA recommended because Congress didn't want to shoulder one source of pollution with the burden of financing

the entire program.

302 REP. BURTON: So, Mr. Loewy, HB 2175 is anticipated to take the revenue from the \$25 per ton fee and apportion it according to the source categories in this state?

309 LOEWY: It would apply a \$25 per ton fee evenly across all the sources.

313 REP. BURTON: Evenly, or by a percentage weight?

318 LOEWY: I'd like to defer to Mr. Kowalczyk on that question. Perhaps it would be helpful to clarify that this permit proposal is one component of what the state must do. The state also needs to bring areas of the state into attainment with federal standards.

328 CHAIR PARKINSON: How are DEQ emission fees determined now?

337 SIMMS: Fees right now are based on authority from a 1971 statute. They are proportionate to the cost of permitting and field inspections. We have implemented that using a table so that each pollution source pays fees in proportion to DEQ's efforts to deal with the effects of pollution from each source.

356 CHAIR PARKINSON: Do you have the authority now so that you could license polluters -- these 150 major stationary sources -- on the basis of pollutants discharged?

363 SIMMS: We don't have that authority now; fees have to be based on work load.

370 REP. NAITO: How did you determine the \$25 fee?

380 EMISON: We costed out our best estimate of what it would take to run the permit program. We designed the permit program, figured out how much each component would cost, and added them all up. Those numbers were developed after extensive dialogue with numerous states that have been operating programs akin to each of the components of the permitting program outlined under the Act.

400 REP. NAITO: So it is conceivable that we could fund the program entirely from a fee greater than \$25 a ton levied on a single industry?
TAPE 65, SIDE B

31LOEWY: HB 2175 goes beyond the requirements of the federal program. The federal requirements really are only included in that section of 2175 that addresses industrial emissions. Auto emissions and field burning are not federal mandates.

38EMISON: To answer your question, Rep. Naito, it is conceivable but highly unlikely that the requirements of the Act would be satisfied by charging a small segment of polluters a very large fee. The point here is that you need to raise enough money to fund your permitting program from the people to whom you're giving the permits. The presumption is, that will require about a \$25 per ton fee. There are a lot of other things that need to be done to administer an air program than just issue permits.

42REP. NAITO: So, really, it's a policy question that we will have to answer at the state level?

44EMISON: Yes.

47REP. WATT: Would it be correct to assume that the 1,200 permits issued today through DEQ would continue in addition the fees being proposed here?

50LOEWY: Yes.

58REP. BURTON: From EPA's perspective, has the rebate method been effective in other states, or could bureaucracy be reduced?

66EMISON: I don't know.

67REP. NORRIS: How comfortable are we with available technology to measure emissions?

76EMISON: Our ability to measure emissions -- particularly from large, stationary sources -- is an area that has been developed over many years. While measuring techniques can always be improved, we are not proposing anything that hasn't been tried before.

87REP. NORRIS: Have the results obtained using this technology ever been challenged?

89EMISON: Yes, and our rules have, for the most part, stood.

100 REP. REPINE: Suppose we had a clean coal plant that didn't have to go through the permit process until 1996 in this state, would these fees become effective prior to submission of that permit request?

104 EMISON: I don't know the details of the draft permitting regulations well enough to answer that question.

151 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is it fair to say that the \$25-per-ton fee on stationary sources was sparked by acid rain in the east?

157 EMISON: No. The fee is intended to support the program. All general industrial emission sources are involved in this.

194 REP. WHITTY: You're aware of other states' compliance legislation. How does our's compare?

203 EMISON: Most states have tailored their conforming legislation to meet their particular needs, not just to comply with the federal regulations.

228 REP. REPINE: Do states that are going beyond the minimum federal requirements have air quality programs that are as good as Oregon's?

242 EMISON: Most think they have good programs. The index has moved, so all states are adjusting up.

295 REP. VAN LEEUWEN: You're talking as though you're starting a program from scratch, which doesn't seem to be the case with this state. This may alter the state's trade balance negatively because many industries won't be able to meet these standards.

322 EMISON: We think this is a deal for the American people.

>This program costs less per person than American consumers spend on alcohol and tobacco each year.

>HB 2175 goes a long way toward responding to the Clean Air Act requirements.

>Urges state to submit an air-quality program proposal to the EPA as soon as possible. Because the Legislature only meets every two years, waiting would force the DEQ to put a package together very quickly.

>If Congress appropriates what Bush has asked for, EPA grants to states for air quality will go up 70 percent from 1989 levels.

390 CHAIR PARKINSON: Breaks at 2:30. Reconvenes as subcommittee at 2:42.

TAPE 66, SIDE B

00STEVE GREENWOOD, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: Gives over view of what is required under the Act and what is proposed under HB 2175. (EXHIBIT C)

>The \$25 fee will need to be enforced whether the state charges it or not.

>DEQ proposing emission fees on all sources, not just major stationary sources.

>HB 2175 recognizes that pollution sources are not all equal.

>DEQ proposing a \$25-per-ton weighted average fee based on the health hazards of various emissions.

73CHAIR PARKINSON: Notes that the full committee has returned from the break.

74REP. BURTON: On this averaging, you said carbon dioxide is excluded. If you exclude that, the average fee per ton for all emissions is \$31. If the EPA imposes the \$25 fee, and you're putting on an average, then you're going to include something that the federal government doesn't require, which is the carbon dioxide.

80GREENWOOD: The ratio of fees that you see is based on the federal standards which reflect the fact that a ton of one pollutant does not have the same health impacts as a ton of another pollutant.

89REP. BURTON: How did you get the \$25 a ton?

94JOHN KOWALCZYK, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: The Clean Air Act defines the cost of the industrial program as \$25 per ton of industrial pollutant, not including carbon dioxide. That will amount to a \$3 million cost to industries in this state. The state is free to collect those fees in any way it wants. We're just proposing collecting these fees in a different way than the EPA proposes, but the total revenue collected by our method and by the EPA method would be the same. We're just proposing a more equitable method.

113 GREENWOOD: The \$25 is an average. How we come up with that revenue is up to the state. Industrial fees would be used for industrial

monitoring and attainment efforts. Fees on other sources would be used for "affirmative" programs to reduce emissions from those sources.

136 CHAIR PARKINSON: What is an affirmative program?

139 GREENWOOD: Support for different kinds of auto fuels, for example, or conversion of non-certified wood stoves to certified stoves or other kinds of indoor heating with lower emissions.

149 REP. NORRIS: Is there any component of the \$25 fee that would be used to improve air or is it all just for police action?

156 SIMMS: The \$25 reduces emissions in two ways: as a market disincentive to pollute and through affirmative air-quality improvement programs funded from the fee revenues.

267 REP. REPINE: Would the fees proposed under HB 2175 be in addition to existing fees?

276 SIMMS: We would want to continue existing fees for the "state-only" sources, the sources that are on state air permits that are not required to be a part of the federal program. With regard to the 150 major stationary sources, the emission fee would replace the existing fee. So, there would not be a double charge on those sources.

304 REP. WHITTY: In Section 4 on industrial emissions, are you proposing to base these fees on actual or permitted emissions? And what is the refund that may be applied for? And what is the penalty if a polluter exceeds permitted emissions?

325 SIMMS: Refers to attachment 7 (EXHIBIT C). The first bar on the left on that chart shows the \$3 million that would be collected if we charged exactly according to the scheme in the Clean Air Act on our permitted emissions. The permitted amount is specified in the permits that we issue to each facility.

380 REP. WHITTY: And what happens if a mill is on strike and is down for four months?

383 SIMMS: That's where we go to the middle bar on that chart, which is what is proposed under HB 2175. One other thing before moving to that middle bar; the reason the first bar is permitted is the presumption of the Clean Air Act that the fees would be charged on potential to emit, or, in essence, permitted emissions. The EPA standards, due next month, are expected to be based on a definition for the potential of facilities to emit that takes into account pollution controls that might be in place at a facility.

402 REP. WHITTY: Could you explain the refund on line 13, page 3 and Section 4, subsection 3 on penalties?

TAPE 67, SIDE A

08SIMMS: In that middle bar (EXHIBIT C), some of those fees are higher than the \$25. If we were to charge that weighted \$25 per ton, we would generate, based on permit emissions, more revenue than the Clean Air Act requires. However, that would be charging everybody for the maximum allowable emissions under their permits. Because that's more than would be required to operate the program, and more than would be required to get EPA approval, we determine what the cost of the program is and make

that difference available to industries that demonstrate they had lower emissions than they were permitted for. So, we're proposing making any difference between permitted and actual emissions available to industries to fund pollution control improvements.

32REP. NAITO: If you take historical emissions into account in setting the permitted usage, then would new industries be at a disadvantage with respect to the rebate?

38SIMMS: There are provisions for siting new plants and giving them permitted emission levels. Regulations are more stringent if a facility is located in a place that doesn't meet air-quality standards.

60SIMMS: Reviews proposed industrial emission fee structure and permit program costs. (EXHIBIT C)

>Fee index tied to CPI.

207 REP. REPINE: On that chart (ATTACHMENT 7, EXHIBIT C). On the top of that, you identify existing costs. I assume that identifies permit fees on those 1,200 industry sources statewide?

215 SIMMS: That's the cost right now. The fees are less than that. They are \$160,000 per year. So, fees are actually supporting a small portion of the program. The difference is made up from state general fund and federal dollars. 225 REP. REPINE: Assuming that the fees are correct, wouldn't it be fair not to set revenues from those fees aside in this report? That somehow those \$160,000 be identified as a form of revenue? In reality, shouldn't the CAA that you show at the bottom of this report be less those \$160,000, or are those mysteriously disappearing somewhere?

243 GREENWOOD: That \$160,000 worth of fees goes away under this program.

249 REP. REPINE: But don't those fees stay for the other 1,050 sources? They should be on here.

256 SIMMS: The intent of this chart was to show the level of fees that would be required to support the program. The \$160,000 per year that I cited is only the portion of our fee revenues that is collected from the affected sources here. All together, our industrial air permit fees are about \$400,000. We are proposing an increase in those fees that would continue to apply to those other sources that don't fall into this program. In Section 4, the EPA has told us that we need to clarify the language we are using with respect to covering the cost of the program through fees. We should be getting back to you soon on that.

300 REP. BURTON: I still have a question about how that \$25 fee is determined. If the feds excluded carbon monoxide, why are we including it?

320 GREENWOOD: If we were not charging for carbon monoxide emissions, we would be charging more than the \$25 per ton required by the EPA. The federal law dealt specifically with industrial sources, and, for the most part, carbon monoxide is emitted primarily by non-industrial sources.

331 REP. BURTON: Refers to attachment 4 (EXHIBIT C) You have apportioned part of that \$25- per-ton fee to non-industrial pollution

sources. How did you arrive at that \$3 for auto emissions when you already have carbon monoxide included in the \$25 average?

376 KOWALCZYK: We need to separate the industrial fees from all the other fees. The industrial fees go back to DEQ to run the compliance program. All the other fees are proposed to go back to the sources that are paying those fees to aid them in reducing their emissions.

383 REP. BURTON: So the fees you list on this chart are not required, but you would argue that they are needed to comply with the CAA?

390 KOWALCZYK: We would not argue that all the fees are required, but we would argue that we are required to clean up the emissions from all these sources.

399 REP. BURTON: So, HB 2175 is not simply an act to comply with the CAA, but rather that is DEQ's comprehensive clean air act?

TAPE 68, SIDE A

04KOWALCZYK: That's correct.

17REP. BURTON: Why didn't the feds apportion their industrial fee across all sources like DEQ seems to have opted to do?

26KOWALCZYK: Historically, the Clean Air Act has regulated industrial sources. That has been very burdensome for us. The Act is still geared toward industry. The EPA is saying it wants uniformity, but it gives states latitude to deal with other air quality issues. You'll be facing a choice between regulatory or fee programs.

52REP. REPINE: There seems to be a discrepancy of \$100,000 for industry permit costs on this chart (ATTACHMENT 6, EXHIBIT C).

60SIMMS: You have a sharp eye. I believe that is a rounding difference.

64REP. REPINE: Is this (ATTACHMENT 6, EXHIBIT C) not the minimum federal mandated program?

66SIMMS: That's the Title V program mandated by the Clean Air Act.

82REP. COURTNEY: On attachment 4 (EXHIBIT C), would every vehicle in Oregon be assessed \$3 to implement this program?

94KOWALCZYK: It depends on how the vehicle fee is applied. We're saying that at \$25 a ton, that would equal \$3 per car, for \$8 million a year. We have not proposed a specific fee collection mechanism. In all cases, we're trying to structure fees so that they reflect emissions.

99REP. COURTNEY: Let's go to wood stoves. How is that going to work?

106 KOWALCZYK: With wood stoves, we think the most administratively expedient way to apply the fee is as the wood comes off of the land.

115 REP. COURTNEY: I don't know how practical that is. A lot of wood could get through that way. But how about field burning? Is the \$4 fee you have mentioned with respect to field burning per acre?

121 KOWALCZYK: The actual fee would be related to emissions. That

works out to about \$4 per acre on average.

127 REP. WHITTY: Would funding for affirmative programs be allocated by source category?

139 KOWALCZYK: Basically, yes.

142 REP. WHITTY: How clean can a polluter be? Would these fees end or continue indefinitely?

160 GREENWOOD: To the extent that emissions fall, and that's our goal, revenue is going to decline accordingly and the need for that revenue is going to decline accordingly.

172 SIMMS: It's crucial to differentiate industrial sources from other sources. The CAA requirements will remain in place without regard to changes in industrial emissions. We will continue to be required to implement the provisions of that permit program, and provide whatever funding is necessary to do that, off of the industrial emissions fee. If industrial emissions are reduced so much that we don't need to have as much of an industrial program, within whatever latitude is in the CAA, then maybe we could stay with the \$25-per-ton index. If industrial emissions are significantly reduced, but the requirements for the program, under the CAA, are not reduced, then there could be an increase in the \$25 basis.

192 REP. WHITTY: So the federal government is going to control this thing, not how successful the program is in Oregon?

196 SIMMS: There is the federal overlay on the industrial portion.

200 REP. VAN LEEUWEN: For many years there has been a fee schedule on field burning. Hasn't the field burning program been carrying it's own weight?

208 GREENWOOD: That's essentially correct, although several parts of the program, like research on alternatives to field burning has not had funding in recent years.

237 KOWALCZYK: Reviews non-industrial requirements and fees under Clean Air Act and HB 217 5.

>State has choice to control non-industrial emissions through regulation or market disincentives.

>DEQ considering extending \$25 average fee to non-industrial sources to provide greater equity. Revenues under this plan would be applied to programs to reduce non-industrial pollution.

302 KOWALCZYK: Explains attachment 8 (EXHIBIT C) on statewide wood stove emissions.

356 KOWALCZYK: Reviews motor vehicle emissions (PAGE 17, EXHIBIT C).

380 REP. WHITTY: We travel all over the place, and just because there is an emission problem in one part of the state doesn't mean you should monitor cars only in problem areas. Emission control efforts should focus on the age of vehicles because older cars tend to be the smokiest.

400 KOWALCZYK: That is an option. The state also could buy the worst

polluting vehicles to get them off the road. Reviews other options (PAGE 18, EXHIBIT C).

TAPE 67, SIDE B

31KOWALCZYK: HB 2175 does not include a specific motor vehicle fee proposal because of legal problems related to Measure 5 and Highway Trust Fund limits. We will propose an amendment to the bill in time to establish an auto emissions fee collection mechanism. We've talked about these fees being on new vehicles only or on all vehicles through registration.

35REP. BURTON: Would the funds that HB 2175 would create be segregated?

40KOWALCZYK: The common account that is proposed in the bill, which would be 20 percent from each of these source categories, would be pooled and then used to address the highest priority problems. This pool would be tapped if there weren't enough money in one of the source-category funds to address source-specific problems.

50GREENWOOD: We are not proposing to fund regulatory programs with fee revenue. We're interested in market-based incentives.

76KOWALCZYK: Reviews forest slash burning (PAGE 21, EXHIBIT C). Refers to attachment 11.

>There is trend toward reducing slash burning, but this trend is not as great in Oregon as it is in Washington.

103 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is there a correlation between acreage burned and emissions on this chart? (ATTACHMENT 11, EXHIBIT C)

105 KOWALCZYK: Yes. When, you reduce acreage, you reduce emissions. It is also possible to reduce emissions without reducing acreage by employing better burning practices.

110 REP. REPINE: On attachment 11 (EXHIBIT C), you indicate 86,000 acres of forestland was slash burned in 1988. But on attachment 4 (EXHIBIT C), you say the \$16 fee per acre of slash burning proposed under HB 2175 would generate \$3.6 million. That rate, however, would require 225,000 acres to generate \$3.6 million. What is the correct acreage figure?

115 KOWALCZYK: The chart on attachment 11 reflects slash burning in western Oregon only, which is the only section of the state in which slash burning is regulated now. The fees we are proposing would apply statewide, so they would apply to another 80,000 to 100,000 acres in eastern Oregon.

127 REP. REPINE: Then is the Washington chart also for a small portion of the burning that goes on in that state?

133 KOWALCZYK: That is also for the western part of that state.

149 KOWALCZYK: Reviews field burning provisions (PAGE 24, EXHIBIT C)

181 CHAIR PARKINSON: Asks DEQ to continue proposal presentation at the next scheduled hearing.

194 SANDRA BISHOP, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS: Testifies in support of the

measure. (EXHIBIT E)

209 CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes the public hearing on HB 2175 and adjourns at 4:22.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Andy Sloop Kathryn VanNatta Committee Assistant Committee
Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A -Department of Environmental Quality Interoffice Memorandum
Regarding Clean Air Act Regulatory Deadlines - Steve Greenwood,
Department of Environmental Quality - 10 pages B-Testimony on HB
2175 - Oregon Department of Energy - 1 page C -Testimony on HB 2175 -
Department of Environmental Quality - 41 pages D-HB 2175
Comprehensive Air Emission Fee - Department of Environmental Quality - 2
pages E -Testimony on HB 2175 - League of Women Voters of Oregon - 1
page F -Testimony on HB 2175 - Alan Henderson - 3 pages G -ORS
Chapter 468 on Pollution Control - Committee Staff - 23 pages
H -Oregon Laws Chapter 920 on Slash Burning - Committee Staff - 3
pages