

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

April 26, 1991Hearing Room E 1:00 p.m.Tapes 137 - 140

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

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Burton

VISITING MEMBER:Rep. Calouri Rep. Meek

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

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2985 (WRK) HB 3570 (WRK) HB 2602 (WRK) HB 2797 (PUB) HB 3301 (PUB) HB 3211 (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 137, SIDE A

07CHAIR PARKINSON: Calls the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m. Representative Burton absent due to illness. Representatives Repine and Watt not present and excused.

(Tape 137, Side A) WORK SESSION - HB 2985

20MOTION:REP. WHITTY moves HB 2985 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation, and that it be subsequently referred to the House Committee on Water Policy.

35VOTE:In a roll call vote, the motion carries with all members present voting AYE.

(Tape 137, Side A) WORK SESSION HB 3570 Witnesses:Burton Weast, Special Districts Association of Oregon Bill Moshofsky, Oregonians In Action Mark Turpel, Metropolitan Service District Jane Myers, OregonForest Industries Council Jon Chandler, Common Ground Charlie Hales, Metropolitan Homebuilders Association Blare Batson, 1000 Friends of Oregon Larry Trosi, Oregon Farm Bureau Lois Kenagy, Agriculture For

Oregon Roy Burns, Lane County Planning Director

30BURTON WEAST, SPECIAL DISTRICTS ASSOCIATION OF OREGON: Addresses issues of rural communities and urban fringe areas.

>Appreciates inclusion of rural communities in HB 3570.

48CHAIR PARKINSON: There has been a lot of objection recently to including an urban reserve provision in secondary lands bills.

(Rep. Watt arrives 1:23)

60WEAST: Section 20: Special districts have been concerned for many years that rural people have not been included in the land-use process.

>Rural lands typically have gone through the exceptions process, which, by definition, means they are exceptions to the rule. Concerned that considering rural communities as exceptions undermines planning for public services.

>One could argue that state goals and guidelines are written with assumption that everyone lives inside urban growth boundaries or incorporated areas.

104 CHAIR PARKINSON: Has been suggested this bill should include other criteria related to rural communities.

135 WEAST: Our intention was to develop something as broad as possible so rural communities would have as many options as possible. Need committee to provide a baseline. Adding rural communities to the planning process won't open the state to development.

158 REP. NAITO: Is HB 3570's definition of a rural community OK?

163 WEAST: It came out of Vida discussions, and we support it. Also, this existing rural communities are grandfathered.

192 BILL MOSHOFSKY, OREGONIANS IN ACTION: Support rural development provision. Need maximum flexibility.

215 MARK TURPEL, METRO: Testifies in support of urban reserve provision. (EXHIBIT A)

262 WEAST: Current land-use laws prohibit planners from oversizing service lines based on projected population outside urban growth boundaries, which makes coordination between land-use planning and public services problematic. Urban reserves address this problem.

300 CHAIR PARKINSON: Why can't Metro forge agreements with other metro-area governments so that the Legislature doesn't have to create urban reserve areas.

320 WEAST: There are two issues that apply to the metro area. One is that it has a boundary commission that has rules prohibiting extension of public service lines outside the urban growth boundary. The boundary commission also has rules about sizing of lines. The second issue is LCDC, which has a policy about land-use planning in areas that would be considered for urban reserves. Ultimately, it's the state policies that require 20-year boundaries that hinder intergovernmental agreements among the three metro counties in lieu of legislating urban reserve

areas.

339 CHAIR PARKINSON: Maybe the solution is to get rid of the boundary commission. Why don't the boundary commission and LCDC change their policies if they're not wise?

(Rep. Repine arrives 1:37)

340 WEAST: That's a question LCDC would have to answer. However, having the ability to extend the planning horizon from 20 to 50 years in rapidly growing urban areas is a useful tool to make the planning boundary consistent with urban services. Assume LCDC could change its goals if it chose. This issue came up in the Vida group, and that's why Metro is here supporting it.

358 CHAIR PARKINSON: Would there be public hearings before creating urban reserve areas so that the owners of property that would be placed in those areas would have an opportunity to comment on their fate?

363 WEAST: Yes. LCDC and Metro would develop the rules for establishing urban reserves.

368 CHAIR PARKINSON: And is there anything in this bill requiring mandatory notification of property owners who would be affected by creation of urban reserve areas?

375 WEAST: No.

TAPE 138, SIDE A

16CHAIR PARKINSON: Appears metro counties have great stake in land use planning, and it might behoove them to testify here.

22JANE MYERS, OREGON FOREST INDUSTRIES COUNCIL: Resubmits comments from HB 3560. Concerned that urban reserve provision would allow Metro to regulate forest practices in urban reserve areas.

46JON CHANDLER, COMMON GROUND: Reiterates support for urban reserve concept.

>Urban reserves could be applied statewide with good results.

>There is already a proliferation of rural residential exception areas which would be logical places for urban reserves.

>Large numbers of 5 to 10-acre hobby farms in rural residential areas will make it hard to develop these areas in an orderly fashion.

80CHARLIE HALES, METROPOLITAN HOMEBUILDERS ASSOCIATION: There are two tools in HB 3570 that deal with "out of control" growth in rural residential areas -- urban reserves and provisions on lines 28-30 of page 16 of the bill which allow LCDC to order the expansion of urban growth boundaries under some circumstances. There are portions of the area outside the Portland urban growth boundary where ordering expansion of the boundary might be appropriate.

119 REP. NORRIS: How well is development in Vancouver, where there isn't land-use planning, going? Is it better there than in Oregon where we have such tight control?

125 CHANDLER: No. "Your getting a hodgepodge of high-priced homes next to industrial uses. It's just not well done because it's not being planned."

135 HALES: So we have no control over Clark County, it's incumbent on us to make our system more flexible and work better. Clark County issues more building permits than any jurisdiction in Oregon, and it's going to continue to as long Oregon's land-use system is unrealistic, which it is in the case of rural residential exception areas.

140 REP. NORRIS: Is Vancouver a "relief valve" for Oregon' tight control over land use? Are people going over there to escape from our system?

142 HALES: Yes. Also, growth in the Vancouver area will cause long-term problems for the Portland-metro area, especially in terms of transportation.

148 CHANDLER: Why are we talking about urban reserves in a secondary lands bill? Need to talk about land outside urban growth boundaries that are neither prime farmland nor secondary land. Should have done this 15 years ago.

166 BLARE BATSON, 1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON: Testifies in support of consensus group provisions in HB 3560, which are the same as those in SB 91.

>Concerned about secondary lands designation criteria in HB 3560 and HB 357 0.

>House bills abdicate state responsibility by giving local governments authority to determine resource lands without objective tests.

>Any secondary lands bill needs provision so that any lands that can be managed as part of commercial farm or forest operations should be protected and that those that can't should be designated as secondary.

>All three secondary lands bills contain unnecessarily complicated and cumbersome designation and appeals processes. In HB 3560, secondary lands maps and regulations should be reviewed in one proceeding by LCDC, and anyone who participates in that proceeding should have the opportunity to appeal LCDC's decision to the Court of Appeals.

>Support increased protection on EFU lands provided under HB 3560. However, provisions for non-farm dwellings on farmland should be eliminated statewide to prevent abuses.

264 REP. SCHOON: There is a real problem defining designation criteria. What criteria would you propose for designating prime agricultural land?

295 BATSON: The only resource land that should be designated as secondary is that which is only usable for grazing. There are only about 5 million acres classified as cropland in the state, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. There are about 11.5 million acres of pasture and rangeland used for grazing. 1000 Friends' belief is that if criteria are based on the carrying capacity of land for livestock, and that the carrying capacity is set at a low threshold so that productivity is low on pastureland, cropland will be protected. There has been considerable debate and concern about what that threshold should be.

320 REP. SCHOON: County planners have testified here that small-scale farm and forest operations historically have been productive and should be allowed. How does your organization feel about this?

340 BATSON: It's a different view than 1000 Friends has of secondary lands. Every secondary lands proposal this session contains some lot-of-record provision. If have lot-of-record provision, probably will reach densities that are not appropriate for resource use. There are about 1 million acres of exclusive farm use and forest land in Oregon that have 20-acre minimum lot sizes or smaller set aside for small or part-time farm and forest operations. So, the current system already accommodates small-scale farming.

362 REP. SCHOON: Is it reasonable to restrict the ability to have a non-farm dwelling on primary resource lands and to loosen it up by permitting lots-of-record on secondary lands?

366 BATSON: We think so.

370 REP. REPINE: Where is the 11.5 million acres of range land you mentioned?

375 BATSON: It's a mixture of pasture and rangeland, mostly in Eastern and Southwestern Oregon.

383 REP. WHITTY: Does 1000 Friends have any flexibility, or is your position chiseled in stone?

388 BATSON: We have flexibility. But what do you mean specifically?

395 REP. WHITTY: Do people who don't share your perspective have to do all of the moving?

TAPE 137, SIDE B

00BATSON: If there are lands that can't be managed as part of a commercial operation, it is fair to open up those lands to additional development, if such development does not adversely impact adjacent farming or forestry operations, wildlife, air and water quality, etc.

04REP. WHITTY: "The restrictions you put on dwellings that are not urban and are non-farm, practically preclude them from ever existing."

10BATSON: There were almost 500 non-farm dwellings approved in Oregon last year.

11REP. WHITTY: "And you'd get rid of them all if you could, wouldn't you?"

13BATSON: If they violated the law.

15REP. WHITTY: SB 100 had its place, and if properly administered, there might not be a need for secondary lands legislation. There are some people from rural areas that don't believe the kind of urban densities organizations like 1000 Friends advocate "promote long life".

30REP. SCHOON: Recently read article promulgating idea that new urban areas should and will be established away from existing urban areas to stabilize densities in existing urban areas. Has 1000 Friends examined

that idea?

34REP. NORRIS: "Rashneesh Puram is for sale."

35BATSON: No we haven't considered that idea. Our understanding is that there is still a good deal of land within current urban growth boundaries. Support idea of urban reserves to handle additional growth.

45MOSHOFISKY: Have reservations about appropriateness of including urban reserves in a secondary lands bill.

>The urban reserve concept purports to give Metro authority to plan lands outside its jurisdiction.

>Prefer incremental intergovernmental approach to deal with future urban growth.

>Alternatives to urban reserves include: upzoning, which could force hobby farmers to pay higher taxes and creating pressure to subdivide or move; restrictions on rural residential developments to make sure infrastructure is installed to accommodate future development.

>Notion that every bit of space within urban growth boundaries must be filled before boundaries are expanded may be a flawed concept.

97REP. WHITTY: There aren't any natural barriers preventing expansion of the metro urban growth boundary.

114 CHAIR PARKINSON: In fairness to the metro area, it has four layers of government, and maybe it does need help.

120 MOSHOFISKY: It looks easy to expand growth boundaries in the metro area, but those boundaries are "iron curtains". New planning concepts that promote pedestrian-friendly activity centers should be in this bill and aren't. "We are cramming more and more people into one-third-hundredths of the state and it doesn't make sense. It's going to hurt livability in the long run . . . We say go slow; encourage don't mandate."

142 LARRY TROSI, OREGON FARM BUREAU: Comments on Section 13 right-to-farm and forest provisions. (EXHIBIT B)

203 REP. NORRIS: The top of page 14 provides that resource land shall continue to be protected after it is incorporated into an urban growth boundary until the ownership of that resource land changes. Wonder if tying that provision to ownership might not be a flaw, because that resource land could wind up in the middle of an urban area for a long time, and the owner could be sued because the neighbors don't like the smell of his operation.

214 TROSI: Agrees.

218 REP. NORRIS: Seems should get rid of "until the ownership of the land containing the resource activity changes".

220 REP. VANLEEUEWEN: Is Rep. Norris suggesting that language be amended so that protection continues until the use of land containing resource activity changes?

231 REP. NORRIS: "I don't think a change in ownership should trigger

the change in its (owner of resource land annexed within an urban growth boundary) susceptibility to law suits for continuing the same kinds of resource activities." Should put something in that says something to effect: "until changed to non-resource use." If somebody wants to "put in skunk works or 15 bowling alleys, and somebody wants to sue them, then so be it. Oh boy, I shouldn't have said that. I'm not comparing bowling alleys and skunk works."

290 LOIS KENAGY, AGRICULTURE FOR OREGON: The right-to-farm provision is important, but it is not the answer to all farming concerns.

328 ROY BURNS, LANE COUNTY PLANNING DIRECTOR: Appears this bill addresses resource activities on resource lands. There are other uses on resource lands, like aggregate mining, so need to consider other uses. If intend to have special standard for all resource activities, in addition to farm and forest, need to explicitly say so.

380 CHAIR PARKINSON: There should be special protection for sand and gravel operations in this bill. What you're saying is that it doesn't make sense to give farm and forest lands extra protection but not give the same protection to other resource activities?

390 BURNS: Alternatively, need to say other resource activities are going to be protected.

395 REP. NORRIS: Page 13, line 30 gives broad definition of resource activities protected under this bill, and specifically mentions aggregate mining.

407 MOSHOFSKY: Generally support right-to-farm and forest provisions. Page 14, line 25 indicates that prevailing parties in law suits challenging resource activity statutes receive attorney fees as part of settlement. One of the major motivations for resisting secondary lands is the perceived danger of incurring exorbitant attorney fees. Suggests limiting attorney fees awarded to the defendant (i.e., the farm or forest operator) as a deterrent to screen out frivolous cases. Limiting attorney fees in this way would strengthen the right-to-farm and forest provisions of the bill.

TAPE 138, SIDE B

25CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes work session on HB 3570 and recesses at 2:40. Reconvenes at 2:55 and opens work session on HB 2602.

(Tape 138, Side B) WORK SESSION - HB 2602

32KATHRYN VANNATTA, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: Reviews dash 1 (EXHIBIT D) and dash 2 (EXHIBIT E) amendments and the hand-engrossed version of the bill (EXHIBIT C).

69MOTION:REP. NORRIS moves amendments as contained in the hand-engrossed version of LC 207 dated 4/25/91 to HB 2602 (EXHIBIT C).

74VOTE:Hearing no objections, CHAIR PARKINSON so moves.

76CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes work session on HB 2602 and opens HB 3301.

(Tape 138, Side B) WORK SESSION - HB 3301 Witnesses:Rep. Calouri Dr. James Hager, Superintendent of Beaverton School District Kathleen Cobb, Beaverton Citizen Pam Edens, Beaverton Citizen Eleanore Hale, Beaverton

Citizen

89REP. CALOURI: Testifies in support of the measure, and introduces Dr. James Hager, Superintendent of the Beaverton School District.

105 DR. JAMES HAGER, SUPERINTENDENT OF BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT: Testifies in support of the measure. (EXHIBIT H)

209 CHAIR PARKINSON: Sounds like the urban growth boundary concept is creating problems for your district.

230 REP. WHITTY: Sounds like you're saying there isn't anywhere to build schools, so need to make schools priority in planning process as density increases.

260 REP. NORRIS: Aren't you addressing a money issue more than a land-use issue? That is, the Beaverton School District supports this bill because it can't get bond measures approved to build school facilities to keep up with growth?

270 HAGER: It's a chicken and egg issue.

285 REP. NAITO: Is your district looking at revenue reductions because of Measure 5?

290 HAGER: We are over the cap set under Measure 5, and will be growing 1,500 students next year. To accommodate Measure 5 and growth in the district's student body, the district is making cuts and reallocating funds.

300 KATHLEEN COBB, BEAVERTON CITIZEN: Testifies in support of the measure. Introduces testimony from Beaverton citizen Dan Maks. (EXHIBITS I AND J)

360 PAM EDENS, BEAVERTON CITIZEN: Testifies in support of the measure. (EXHIBIT K)

TAPE 139, SIDE A

25CHAIR PARKINSON: We're experiencing a housing shortage and our land-use laws encourage density. Also, there seems to be reluctance to pass school bond measures.

35EDENS: Regarding the inability of the Beaverton School District to pass needed bond measures, we're headed for a crisis. Regarding land-use law and school crowding, if HB 3301 had passed several years ago, Beaverton and other school districts in high growth areas would not have inadequate facilities to service their patrons. The counties, cities and school districts would have been working together to develop long-range plans. Dialogue about how to mobilize community resources to get schools built has been minimal.

56CHAIR PARKINSON: If bring halt to construction of affordable housing inside urban growth boundary, where are low-income families going to live?

70EDENS: Don't know?

80REP. REPINE: Has your school district exhausted all alternatives to new construction to accommodate expanding enrollments?

107 EDENS: This bill is not to stop growth in Washington County; it's to allow quality growth. In terms of alternatives, believe the school district has exhausted all alternatives.

133 REP. NORRIS: We're talking about public facilities plan that includes water, sewer, transportation and schools. How can we practically implement this?

144 EDENS: The problems exist whether this bill goes forward or not. There is a bill that would appropriate money from impact fee to schools.

180 ELEANORE HALE, BEAVERTON: Testifies in support of the measure. (EXHIBIT L) Footnotes that this is not an urban versus rural issue. Relates that Wyoming has law that requires developers to build elementary schools with subdivisions under theory that if developers get benefit, they should contribute to state.

345 REP. WATT: Resent implications that the entire state is failing to rise to the challenge of financing burgeoning school districts because school officials in Medford are willing to ask people for help and people are willing to give it. Encourages greater community spirit.

376 HALES: Cities simply feel no obligation to consider school needs in approving proposed development.

TAPE 140, SIDE A

14REP. WHITTY: Hard to comprehend your problem, given deterioration in and flight from schools in my district.

21CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes the public hearing on HB 3301 and opens a work session on HB 279 7.

(Tape 140, Side A) WORK SESSION - HB 2797 Witnesses:Charlie Hales, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland Jon Chandler, Common Ground

30CHARLIE HALES, HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PORTLAND: Reviews hand-engrossed bill, incorporating the dash 1 amendments (EXHIBIT M). Footnotes that there is no outright conflict between HB 3301 and HB 279 7. HB 2797 says only those public facilities acknowledged in comprehensive plans are subject to moratoria. HB 330 1, on the other hand, says: "go do plans for schools". The reason for line 25, page 2 of HB 279 7 is because the bill was originally written to deal with housing moratoria, not commercial or industrial. However, there is an undeclared moratorium on commercial development in at least one city in the state now, and that situation isn't addressed under current law.

60JON CHANDLER, COMMON GROUND: Testifies in support of the measure. Explains changes to current law that the measure would make. (EXHIBIT R) This is not an "anti-school bill" There is "a bit of a misconception here."

162 CHAIR PARKINSON: Thought you were working with League of Oregon Cities on compromise amendments.

177 CHANDLER: The only point of disagreement with the League was on the maximum length of moratoria.

180 CHAIR PARKINSON: Amazed that the League not represented here.

185 VANNATTA: A League lobbyist was here earlier and left.

191 REP. NORRIS: Don't see connection between this and HB 3301 with respect to schools because the definition of "public facilities" in HB 2797 doesn't include schools. Not saying there should be.

200 CHANDLER: HB 3301 amends the list of facilities that would be considered "public facilities". If both HB 3301 and HB 2797 pass, then public facilities plans would include water, sewer, transportation and schools. So, HB 3301 and HB 2797 are not inconsistent and could both be adopted without conflict.

210 REP. NORRIS: Still have problem requiring cities to correct problems, within 60 days, that cause need for moratoria. Many cities may not have any idea in 60 days how to correct the problem leading to a moratoria.

220 HALES: Remember, cities are supposed to already have public facilities plans.

228 REP. NORRIS: What if talking about expansion of capacity?

230 HALES: That's more incremental; cities are going to know that's coming and should not have to declare a moratorium, unless they can't get funding to follow through on their plans.

243 CHAIR PARKINSON: Looks like you have a little more work to do. Should be talking to schools, in addition to the League.

252 HALES: Have kept the League informed at every step of process, and as far as we know, they don't have a problem with the bill.

258 CHAIR PARKINSON: Have received letter indicating they do have a problem.

263 CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes work session on HB 2797 and opens public hearing on HB 3211.

(Tape 140, Side A) PUBLIC HEARING - HB 3211 Witnesses:Rep. Meek Bob Alexander, Forest Grove Chamber of Commerce Joe Hobson, Ontario Citizen Bland Herring, Newberg Citizen

290 REP. MEEK: Introduces and explains the measure.

>Bill intended to allow companies to take pollution prevention measures.

>Current law needs to be fine tuned.

>Proposal would add language to Section 1 so that credits could be extended for control measures at the source and nearby.

>Language is added to deal with surface water pollution associated with development.

350 REP. NORRIS: Is this another Tualatin River bill?

352 REP. MEEK: No. This is a statewide tax credit. It just happens

that surface water polluting in Washington County is exacerbating the Tualatin River problem.

360 REP. MEEK: Additional new language is control of water flow be diversion, retention, construction of treatment facilities, or the planting of vegetation to control, prevent, or reduce surface water contamination by water born pollutants. This means developers or other polluters would have to demonstrate that their proposal would impact surface water quality before they can qualify for this credit.

TAPE 139, SIDE B

04REP. MEEK: The issue is that the credits are available now. The federal regulations that Washington County is complying with now will be felt across the state.

22BOB ALEXANDER, FOREST GROVE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: Testifies in support of the measure. (EXHIBIT S)

>Forest Grove trying very hard to encourage development and increase tax base. Forest Grove schools are in safety net and are not crowded.

80CHAIR PARKINSON: Is Forest Grove part of the Unified Sewerage Agency and will Forest Grove be affected by the burden placed on USA to deal with the Tualatin River?

85ALEXANDER: Yes. 87CHAIR PARKINSON: Why are Forest Grove system development fees so high?

90ALEXANDER: They are designed to meet local needs. We have two fees. One is the systems development fee itself, which is intended to build retention facilities. The other is a maintenance fee, which applies equally to all residents in the county.

95CHAIR PARKINSON: Has development slowed in your area?

98ALEXANDER: It was never very fast.

100 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is there a correlation between high fees and slow development in your area?

103 ALEXANDER: The fees were implemented July 1, 1990, so it's too early to say.

104 REP. NORRIS: After listening to problems associated with rapid growth in Beaverton, it seems Forest Grove might be better off than it's high-growth neighbors.

108 ALEXANDER: We don't believe so. Property taxes more than \$20 per \$1,000 assessed value.

130 REP. MEEK: Some of the fees in Washington County have been voter approved to deal with growth. We didn't ask to be first on the list to deal with this problem.

154 CHAIR PARKINSON: Is your city/county tax rate under \$10 per \$1,000?

160 REP. MEEK: Most of the county will meet the \$10 per \$1,000 limit imposed on local government property taxes under Measure 5, but also have taxes for multiple special districts.

180 JOE HOBSON, ONTARIO: Testifies in favor of the measure (EXHIBIT T) and proposes amendments. (EXHIBIT U)

360 REP. NORRIS: Aren't you the inventor of this straw mulching machine?

362 HOBSON: Yes.

365 REP. NORRIS: When you testified that the reduction in total phosphorous loss achieved using your machine was 70 pounds per acre per year, do you mean the amount of pollution reduction was 70 percent?

372 HOBSON: Yes, 79 percent less phosphorous left the straw furrowed fields than the non-straw furrowed fields. New research shows that sediment and runoff from straw-furrowed soils has less phosphorous than non-straw furrowed soils, and "that has a lot of people scratching their heads, a lot of scientific people wondering what's going on."

400 CHAIR PARKINSON: Using this method, it looks like farmers would use much less fertilizer.

405 HOBSON: That's true.

407 CHAIR PARKINSON: Than it would pay for itself quickly, so why would it need a tax credit?

410 HOBSON: This is so new, many farmers aren't willing to take the risk to invest in it. A tax credit would get this jump started.

TAPE 140, SIDE B

10CHAIR PARKINSON: It seems farmers using this would have a competitive advantage and the word would spread.

16HOBSON: That isn't happening.

18BLAND HERRING, NEWBERG: Testifies in support of the measure.

>Has manually strawed strawberries and it's very laborious.

>Not worth it to straw fields manually, and Hobson's machine is too expensive. With public assistance to buy Hobson machine, however, would continue to straw.

50REP. NORRIS: Are you using grass straw or cereal straw?

54HERRING: Just cereal straw, because it doesn't create a weed-control problem.

74CHAIR PARKINSON: Closes public hearing on HB 3211 and adjourns at 5 p.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Andy Sloop Kathryn VanNatta Committee Assistant Committee
Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A -Testimony on HB 3570 - Mark Turpel, Metropolitan Service District
- 1 page B -Testimony on HB 3570 - Larry Trosi, Oregon Farm Bureau -
1 page C-Hand-engrossed HB 2602, Incorporating the Dash 1 and Dash 2
Amendments - Rep. Norris - 1 page D -Dash 1 Amendments to HB 2602 -
Rep. Norris - 1 page E -Dash 2 Amendments to HB 2602 - 1 page
F -Notice of No Fiscal Impact of HB 2602 - Legislative Fiscal Office
- 1 page G -Notice of No Revenue Impact of HB 2602 - Legislative
Revenue Office - 1 page H -Testimony on HB 3301 - Dr. James Hager,
Superintendent, Beaverton School District - 3 pages I -Testimony on
HB 3301 - Kathleen Cobb, Beaverton - 1 page J -Testimony on HB 3301 -
Dan Maks, Beaverton - 1 page K -Testimony on HB 3301 - Pam Edens,
Beaverton - 2 pages L -Testimony on HB 3301 - Eleanore Hale,
Beaverton - 4 pages M -Hand-engrossed HB 2797, Incorporating the Dash
1 Amendments - House Environment and Energy Committee - 3 pages
N -Dash 1 Amendments to HB 2797 - House Environment and Energy
Committee - 1 page O -Notice of No Revenue Impact - Legislative
Revenue Office - 1 page P -Preliminary Staff Measure Summary of HB
2797 - Committee Staff - 1 page Q -Fiscal Impact Analysis -
Legislative Revenue Office - 1 page R -Testimony on HB 2797 - Jon
Chandler, Common Ground - 2 pages S -Testimony on HB 3211 - Bob
Alexander, Forest Grove Chamber of Commerce - 1 page T -Testimony on
HB 3211 - Joe Hobson Sr. - 43 pages U -Proposed Amendments to HB 3211
- Joe Hobson Sr. - 1 page V -Hand-engrossed HB 3211, Incorporating
the Dash 1 Amendments - Bob Alexander, Forest Grove Chamber of Commerce
- 2 pages W -Dash 1 Amendments to HB 3211 - Bob Alexander, Forest
Grove Chamber of Commerce - 1 page X -Notice of Possible Revenue
Impact of HB 3211 - Legislative Revenue Office - 1 page Y -Letter In
Support of HB 3301 - Patnec Bashani, Beaverton - 1 page Z -Letter In
Support of HB 3301 - Marilyn and Charles Gallagher, Beaverton - 1 page
AA -Letter In Support of HB 3301 - Duane Basham, Beaverton - 1 page