

House Committee on Legislative Rules & Reapportionment Subcommittee on  
Reapportionment March 26, 1991 - Page

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize  
statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation  
marks

report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the  
proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RULES AND REAPPORTIONMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT

March 26, 1991 Room 350 8:00 a.m. Tapes 19 - 22

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Greg Walden, Chair Rep. Peter Courtney,  
Vice-Chair Rep. Ray Baum Rep. Margaret Carter Rep. Bill Markham Rep. Tom  
Mason Rep. Randy Miller

VISITING MEMBER: Rep. Ron Cease

STAFF PRESENT: Adrienne Sexton, Committee Administrator Carol  
Wilder, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2001 - PUBLIC HEARING

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 19, SIDE A

040 CHAIR WALDEN: Calls the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

HB 2001 - PUBLIC HEARING

052 DON CLARK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PORTLAND HOUSING AUTHORITY: - Calls on two congressmen who have substantial interest in Multnomah County as they try to move an urban agenda, particularly with Housing and Urban Development Department. - Willamette River has been and should remain the dividing line in Multnomah County. - Need more than one congressman with substantial interest in the affairs of the urban center.

082 DOUG ROSENBERG, CITIZEN, TILLAMOOK: - Concerned about redistricting and its effect on the economy of Tillamook and detrimental effects on influence in Washington regarding railroad. - Port of Tillamook has tried to salvage rail service into Tillamook. - Railroad runs 90 miles from Tillamook into Hillsboro. - Lots of support for the railroad in Washington County. Do not want to lose this support between Washington and Tillamook Counties for the railroad.

124 REP. MARKHAM: The miracle is having to pull \$3,000,000 out of here to get your railroad going, not Washington, D.C.

127 ROSENBERG: Six state agencies have worked with us on this project, so we're most of the way there, but we're only starting the \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 rehabilitation plan. Without that support in Washington, that's the only source of the funds for rehab. There's three or four different programs. If we don't get these funds over the next three to five years, the railroad absolutely will not survive. It's like most little branch lines in the last two decades; it's been ignored for maintenance, which means that we're going through two of the toughest canyons in the country and without that money it just simply won't be in operation. Would like to see the district stay intact. If we get into a district in Tillamook that includes Salem, Corvallis, and east Clackamas County, the 2 to 3,000 voters in our poor district won't have the influence that they have today.

142 CHAIR WALDEN: How does that differ from your influence with the voters in Portland?

145 ROSENBERG: I don't know except that we've seen that Congressman AuCoin has been very influential whenever we've need him. To some extent we're tied to Portland, and Congressman Wyden has been supportive.

151 CHAIR WALDEN: But you're not asking us to draw a plan that would protect Congressman AuCoin, are you?

153 ROSENBERG: I don't think the person matters as keeping the needs of the district unified.

155 JOHN MOHR, CITIZEN, NEWPORT: - Is concerned that the proposed boundaries as drawn may not represent the economic or transportation interests of our community. - Community is drawn primarily along lines of the Lane County border north along Highways 101 and 18. - Do not have level of commonality with Marion and Clackamas Counties that we have with Multnomah, Washington, Columbia, Clatsop, and Tillamook Counties. - Want to retain that identity because it would provide a greater uniformity of economic interests if we're allowed to do that.

180 CHAIR WALDEN: What kind of linkage do you have to Benton County?

182 MOHR: In Benton County we have the linkage through Oregon State

University, but primarily our economies differ in that we have a fishing and tourism economy and they are more agricultural. The level of relationship between our county and Benton County versus Washington County can best be exemplified in the traffic counts that you find between Highway 20 and Highway 18. Highway 18 is by far is the highest traffic count of any non-interstate highway in the state and that runs from the Tigard area down into Lincoln City and south into Newport.

202 CHAIR WALDEN: Can you describe the route? Does it go through Yamhill County or over to Tillamook?

205 MOHR: I believe 18 does cut through Yamhill County.

208 CHAIR WALDEN: How would changing these lines affect that tourism flow?

209 MOHR: Our primary tourism flow is on Highway 18 into the Newport and Lincoln City areas. The traffic on Highway 20 is a much larger component of truck traffic as a percentage although I believe that truck traffic probably is greater on 18 into the coast than over 20.

217 CHAIR WALDEN: But how would changing these lines affect that flow of either truck traffic or tourism? Do you think fewer people would be coming down to your area then?

220 MOHR: I don't know that fewer people would be coming to our area but I think that it's important that there be more of a common mindset amongst our congressional people in representing their area. I think there is less divergence of opinion from the northern coastal counties and along Columbia County and into Portland than over through the primarily rural sectors of Marion and Clackamas Counties.

232 CHAIR WALDEN: One of the things that we've looked at in terms of the redistricting lines are communities of interest. Are you saying that the Lincoln County community around Newport and the surrounding area has more in common with downtown Portland than they do in the rural areas around Marion and Polk Counties?

235 MOHR: I think so. Our community is primarily tourism and fishing economy based and the business linkages with our fishing community are quite strong with the Portland area in terms of the trading companies and the fresh markets located in the Portland metropolitan area. The primary sources of our tourism comes from the Portland metropolitan area.

245 CHAIR WALDEN: Where in the Portland metropolitan area are those located?

246 MOHR: The trading companies are located primarily west of the Willamette and out into the Beaverton area.

253 REP. BAUM: You're here representing the Port of Newport?

255 MOHR: I work for the Port of Newport. As of yet I don't have any specific authorization to represent them directly.

258 CHAIR WALDEN: So the record shouldn't say that you're representing the Port of Newport?

260 MOHR: I'm employed by the Port of Newport.

261 REP. BAUM: Are you here on your own behalf or representing the Port?

262 MOHR: I have not had the opportunity to present this to the Commission as of yet so I guess at this point you could say I'm representing myself.

265 CHAIR WALDEN: Would you like me to change that on here (witness sign-up sheet)?

266 MOHR: Please do.

267 REP. BAUM: The reason I asked those questions is I realize that this plan was recently drawn up last week or so and I'm a rural legislator and I look at communities of interest like the Walden Plan map. I notice that under the proposal there Mr. Kopetski's district would encompass Newport, that's correct?

273 MOHR: That's correct.

274 REP. BAUM: Based on the community of interest you would be placed in the same district with what could be characterized as largely rural areas?

276 MOHR: That's correct.

277 REP. BAUM: Which are dependent upon everything from agriculture to timber to dairy products, which are very much in common with what Newport and its county also relies on?

280 MOHR: I don't think that's an accurate depiction.

282 REP. BAUM: You don't have any dairy or forestry?

283 MOHR: We have a small amount of dairy and limited forest activity. Currently the primary income producers in our community from earned income is approximately 27% from fishing, 16% from tourism.

288 REP. BAUM: But wouldn't that be the same commonality you would share as far as fisheries? Under the Walden Plan all the ports on the coast would be covered under the same proposal. You would be in common with those fishery ports.

290 MOHR: I misunderstood. I thought you were saying we would have it in common with the dairy and...

293 REP. BAUM: I know there are some cheese and dairy products being manufactured in Tillamook and places like that are renown.

295 MOHR: Not in Lincoln County, though.

296 REP. BAUM: No, but they're sharing that with the rest of the coastal counties. I appreciate your point of view on the issue that you want to be part of Portland but as a rural legislator I can't imagine that being an interest of rural areas to be dominated by suburban or metropolitan areas.

300 MOHR: Experience has shown that we have had excellent representation. My primary concern has to be with the commonality of interests with the Portland area and the lines of transportation, that

we have the primary transportation corridors in the Portland metropolitan area.

307 REP. MILLER: You mentioned the chief revenue producers were fishing and tourism. If I got your figures right that added up to about 40%. What was the other 60%?

310 MOHR: Primarily transfer payments and investments make up the majority of it. There is a timber component but it's relatively small in comparison with the balance. There's a small agriculture component.

318 REP. MILLER: Smaller than 14%?

319 MOHR: I believe so.

320 REP. BAUM: Would you characterize the county as a metropolitan county?

322 MOHR: No.

323 REP. BAUM: Would you characterize it as a suburban county?

324 MOHR: No.

325 REP. BAUM: It probably would be more characterized as a rural county?

326 MOHR: I think it probably falls into more of a tourism community.

327 REP. BAUM: But I mean that's a rural setting.

328 MOHR: I suppose you could say that.

335 LINDA PETERS, CITIZEN, WASHINGTON COUNTY: - A key feature of well-managed growth is the interlocking nature of planning for farm and forest land, natural areas, open spaces around an urban growth boundary and the development within that boundary of the types of urban densities and livable communities that we would like to see. - A community of interest is not the same thing as identity of demographic or economic characteristics. The community of interest exists when the interrelated planning for two areas can result in benefit to both of those areas. - In the case of western Washington County, our fate is linked with downtown Portland, the developments in the Sunset Corridor, mass transit, model communities, etc. - Need to continue to draw a congressional district so that a single representative understands the needs of the urban core, the surrounding suburbs, and the rural natural areas that surround the suburbs. - The representative who serves a complex of these districts that are economically and politically interlinked can represent that complex of interests adequately at the national level and be continually in touch with those interests. - If you draw the line where you have a suburban district, that representative primarily sees a narrower focus of the suburban interests and is not as likely to make the linkages which need to be made if the planning is going to be successful. - Keep the boundaries of the congressional district the same as present so they include downtown Portland and the boundary line is at the river.

415 CHAIR WALDEN: I think you make some very valid points about the interlocking nature of economic, political, and transit areas. Isn't that basically what you have with the Metropolitan Service District?

420 PETERS: The Metropolitan Service District has been a key factor in being able to bring all of these together. It doesn't represent us in Congress, however.

427 CHAIR WALDEN: I understand that, but what I'm saying is that in your discussion about the planning that goes on for future growth, mass transit, etc., it seems to me that that's what you have achieved both by local votes and statewide votes to create the Metropolitan Service District so you could achieve that. That's what we tried to follow in the Walden Plan, follow that boundary in Clackamas County, including it in Washington County, the urban part of Multnomah County, and the rural parts of Columbia County and Washington County so you have that blend that you're seeking. Isn't that what we've achieved there?

442 PETERS: My understanding is that the plan cuts out downtown Portland and leaves northwest Portland as the only part of urban Portland that would be included in the new district, is that right?

445 CHAIR WALDEN: It goes clear to Burnside into downtown Portland.

447 PETERS: That's a piece but that's not the entirety of the financial community, etc.

449 CHAIR WALDEN: But wouldn't you characterize that as urban? That part of Multnomah County?

TAPE 20, SIDE A

002 PETERS: Certainly, that part is urban. I'm not arguing that.

004 CHAIR WALDEN: So we have included urban.

006 PETERS: You've included some token urban. You've got a little bulge in there.

008 CHAIR WALDEN: Why do you say token? What do you mean by that?

009 PETERS: I mean you haven't included the whole of westside Portland in the district. You haven't included the business center.

010 REP. CEASE: I think both you and previous witness have talked quite substantially about the economic interests of some of the coast areas with Washington County and into Portland. Would it be fair to say in reference to that community of interest you're not really suggesting that a particular piece of it dominates another piece of it and that doesn't suggest that that's a metropolitan group of interests. It's just a very substantial interlocked group of economic interests.

025 PETERS: That's correct.

026 REP. CEASE: In reference to the Metropolitan Service District, two big pieces of that are the urbanized portions of Washington County and urbanized portions of Clackamas County which would be in one of these districts. Would it be fair to say that the connection between those two suburban areas is probably not terribly substantial. The connection really is that each suburban area is through the center, the Portland area. What is the economic connection or any other kind of connection between the Washington side and the Clackamas side of this suburban part

of the greater metropolitan area?

032 PETERS: I don't know that I'm equipped to answer that. There's clearly some. What's fairly evident at this point is that some of the economic linkage is sort of competitive for the same kinds of development and that's one of the things that we're trying to mitigate through the cooperative planning.

040 REP. CEASE: Wouldn't it be fair to say though in reference to that, that the spokes really come out from the Portland area, one into Washington County, and the other into Clackamas. Obviously, over time that's been reinforced by the freeway going south. But the reason they're all in the metropolitan area is because they're connected really through the larger center part, aren't they?

050 PETERS: Right, and the development and relationships really at this point are primarily radial.

052 REP. CEASE: What would be your view if we say that because areas are part of a suburban area, what does that mean in terms of common interest? Does that suggest anything to you by itself in terms of common interest?

055 PETERS: I can understand the case that's made, that because these areas are all suburban and are all near Portland they have a lot in common. They could be represented together. I'm saying as the counter argument to that--Yes, of course, but they won't be as well represented as suburban areas as they will be if they are represented as an integral part of a complex of urban, suburban and rural areas.

062 REP. CEASE: You had indicated earlier that in many ways those interests between the two counties, Washington and Clackamas, were in a large measure competitive. Is that correct?

065 PETERS: I don't want to draw that out too much, but there is that element.

067 CHAIR WALDEN: What you're saying then is the gray district in the revised Mason Plan fails your test because it has no urban, isn't that correct?

070 PETERS: I'm talking the principles that I think should be involved in redrawing the districts more than I am speaking to Plan A or Plan B.

080 CHAIR WALDEN: Given that principle which we may disagree on, in reference to this plan I think you're speaking in favor of, wouldn't your argument for Washington County also apply for Clackamas County?

082 PETERS: That district ought to include some of the critical urban core to which they are related? Yes, it should.

095 DON LINDLY, CITIZEN, LINCOLN COUNTY: Submits and summarizes written testimony in favor of the Mason Plan (EXHIBIT A) because it is consistent with Lincoln County's common interests with northwest Oregon counties.

138 REP. BAUM: You live in Tillamook County?

139 LINDLY: No, I live in Newport.

140 REP. BAUM: So you're from the same area. You talked economic connections and community of interest, and touriSMas being a reason. The previous witness talked about transportation links that go towards the metropolitan area. You do have a port that ships things out too through the ocean. I live in a rural district in northeast Oregon and all my grain is shipped down through the Port of Portland by rail, but I don't view that as being a common interest. I appreciate that point of view but once we get beyond what I would refer to as a transportation argument which I share with you too because we go down the Gorge and down the Columbia by rail or by barge. That's where all the wood products, etc., go to the Port. Once you cast that argument aside, isn't the main concern that has brought you here today the fact that Rep. AuCoin is a member of the Appropriations Committee with a lot of seniority and you like to have that pull available for your county?

160 REP. CARTER: I think that's misleading the witness. I think he's talking about transportation links in terms of the person who's representing them, not Mr. AuCoin himself, but the person who represents that particular office. I have noticed this line of questioning all along with all of these witnesses and we're trying to make them think that we're talking about an individual. That's misleading.

167 CHAIR WALDEN: A number of the witnesses who have come before us have specifically mentioned by name a particular member of Congress. A member of Congress, according to press reports, specifically requested people to come and testify before this committee. They have done so and I think it is a legitimate question.

172 REP. CARTER: In theory I agree with you, but they don't have the level of sophistication that many of us do. They know that the person who is presently serving that position is a Mr. AuCoin, is a Mr. Wyden, is a Mr. Kopetski. I think they're talking about lines of demarcation here today. That's real important for us to expect some of that.

176 CHAIR WALDEN: I would concur with you, Rep. Carter, except that I also know that witnesses before have made specific discussion about the importance of particular members and we have not stopped them from making that testimony. The witness doesn't have to answer if the witness doesn't want to.

185 REP. CARTER: I agree, but we obviously see that there's a little intimidation in terms of that and I would expect a little decorum.

187 CHAIR WALDEN: I don't believe Rep. Baum was trying to intimidate the witness.

189 REP. CARTER: I don't think so either, I just mean the whole way we question. This is not just a criticiSMon Rep. Baum. It's on the whole line of questioning. All of us, including Rep. Cease a few minutes ago.

190 REP. BAUM: I don't want to belabor the point but unfortunately, and I think Rep. Cease and everyone realizes, there's going to be a person or persons looking at what we do here and we have an obligation to make sure for the record that witnesses's biases are displayed. I believe that if we were looking inside these people's minds out here that many of these witnesses are here to try to build a case for maintaining the fact that we all like to have people representing us who have power, who can deliver the goods for the district. I just want to make sure, because a lot of these folks are testifying from areas that are very similar to my own. I have ports, and rural districts, but I realize what



an advantage it is to have a Les AuCoin v. a Mike Kopetski. I would like to make sure that the record hears that there is some bias in this regard and we're trying to strain to justify community of interest when what they are really after is to keep Les AuCoin as their congressperson. The next question to this witness would be, who contacted you to testify. He doesn't have to answer that, but that would clearly state the course.

217 LINDLY: I would like to make it clear that I'm not here lobbying for Les AuCoin. I thought I made it perfectly clear that the community of interest that I'm here representing is that one that the state has recognized in the Regional Strategies Program for economic development. We are a part of the Regional Strategies Program with Washington County, the city of Portland, the Port of Portland, Columbia County, Clatsop County, and Tillamook County. That's the point that I'm here to make.

230 REP. BAUM: Who contacted you to testify?

232 LINDLY: I talked to Mr. MoHR from the Port of Newport yesterday.

233 REP. BAUM: Do you know who contacted him?

234 LINDLY: No.

235 REP. MILLER: Many times I've said on this committee, and hopefully we will continue to do that, and that's focus on what are the right lines as opposed to individuals. I think in terms of what we have all recognized, and I'm not talking about this particular witness, somewhat an encouraged parade of testimony encouraged by particular people who have interests in making sure that these boundaries come out in what they believe is the right fashion. I think that was disclosed rather early. What I'm really struck by is kind of a total lack of confidence expressed in the current delegation that they have a sense of worth. It's as if I've heard testimony today that says because I live in Lake Oswego the boundaries are so difficult I probably shouldn't attempt to go to Lincoln City. It's not in the district. No way to get there. Nobody has any sense of what's going on at the coast if you live that far inland. Frankly, I find that ludicrous in a lot of this testimony, be it prompted or whatever, it's really gone astray. I do appreciate quite frankly, even though it was very confusing, the witness from Washington County who somewhat concluded that diversity made sense even though that somehow concluded diversity and community of interest were one and the same. It was confusing but at least she focused on what should be our guide for designing lines as opposed to protecting individuals that currently hold jobs.

265 REP. CEASE: Since my name was brought up, I just want to say that we are all guilty of leading the witnesses, and I would hope the audience learns as much from this committee this morning as we're supposed to learn from the audience. If you want to talk about values, that's very clear on both sides. Maybe what we really ought to do is figure out what they have to say without leading them too much. That might be helpful.

273 REP. COURTNEY: The war has obviously begun. I want to apologize to you because in the three sessions I've been in the Legislature and all the committees, I don't recall witnesses ever being roughed up as much as the witnesses are being roughed up by this whole discussion we're having. I'm sure that if we have a problem with a certain congressional district out in eastern Oregon, we probably would be visited by

individuals of another party than I am and I would hope that the members of my party would be more respectful of those witnesses than I've seen some of the conduct thus far. I have to apologize to you, but you are a politician so you are fair game like I am. The one thing I said about reapportionment is if you touch one House in my district I will kill you. What you're seeing here is people on a death march, and I'm afraid that you have walked right into it. I feel that all of the people that are going to testify or have testified, you are in harm's way, there is no question about it. I want to go back to a point that you made. Regarding regional strategies, would you tell me what you meant by regional strategies in that statement you made.

292 LINDLY: My involvement as a representative of our county is with the Oregon Tourism Alliance who has facilitated the regional strategy of tourism for Lincoln, Tillamook, Clatsop, Columbia, Washington, Yamhill Counties, Port of Portland, and the city of Portland, and the Metropolitan Service District in a common direction of promotion of tourism. It has worked very well in my brief exposure to OTA and the regional strategies concept. I know that Lincoln County has benefitted from our participation with the other counties from a financial standpoint and from potential future projects that simply develop the relationship we have with Washington County and with the Port of Portland, etc. There are potentially future projects that will also be developed from an economic development standpoint.

320 REP. COURTNEY: How long has this concept or organization been underway?

325 LINDLY: It's fairly recent, the last two or three years.

326 REP. COURTNEY: Where did the idea come from? Was it something the people on the coast put together or the private sector?

330 LINDLY: The direction has been from the Legislature.

332 REP. COURTNEY: What was it based on, would there be certain benefits accrued? Can you tell us anything more about what your understanding was, who mandated it, where it came from, what were the benefits, etc.?

337 LINDLY: My understanding is that where there exists economic common interests that the counties would partner up into a united direction for the mutual benefit of all concerned.

341 REP. COURTNEY: Was it a legislative mandate or a legislative program or from the Governor's office?

344 LINDLY: That's correct.

348 CHAIR WALDEN: Mr. Mohr, could you please come back and respond to Rep. Baum's question so we can be closed with that issue?

352 REP. BAUM: I realize you're here on your own.

353 MOHR: Yes.

355 REP. BAUM: I would be interested to know if anybody from Rep. AuCoin's or any congressional office, Bob Smith's included, contacted you about testimony here today.

357 MOHR: My interest in redistricting has been longstanding and I have followed this for some time. I talked with a member of Rep. AuCoin's office simply because of my interest. My interest actually was begun back in December at a presentation that was made by Rep. Courtney to a group that I belong to, the Council for Economic Development in Oregon, regarding some of the primary issues that would be of concern in this legislative session. That brought about my interest, and I have been following this committee. I think if you'll check your record I have provided written testimony to this committee previously. Probably the longest discussion I've had regarding the redistricting was with Senator Brenneman.

372 REP. BAUM: Just for the record, you weren't contacted by Rep. AuCoin's office.

374 MOHR: No, I was not contacted by Rep. AuCoin's office. I called Rep. AuCoin's office.

375 REP. CARTER: Did you say you had talked to Senator Brenneman regarding this?

376 MOHR: Yes, I have.

377 REP. CARTER: Is Mr. Brenneman your senator?

378 MOHR: Yes, Mr. Brenneman is our senator.

379 REP. CARTER: Is Mr. Brenneman a Republican or a Democrat?

380 MOHR: Republican.

382 REP. COURTNEY: Do you want to explain the context of that speech I made?

385 MOHR: Rep. Courtney was a speaker to the Council for Economic Development in Oregon at a presentation that was made at Willamette University in which he indicated that the redistricting would be one of the key issues of this legislative session.

393 REP. COURTNEY: Could you talk a little more about what Commissioner Lindly talked about in terms of regional strategies? Are you familiar with that?

396 MOHR: Yes, I am.

397 REP. COURTNEY: Could you tell us a little bit about your understanding of the region and where it came from, what are the geographic boundaries of the region, any benefits?

398 MOHR: The regional strategy, as I recall, was something that Governor Goldschmidt proposed in part of his original election bid and this was something that was carried through the Legislature to provide for regional strategies programs as part of the Lottery Fund distribution. Our county was invited to pick a regional strategy. I was involved with 35 or 40 other people representing different economic sectors within our county to choose a regional strategy. Once that regional strategy was chosen, which was tourism, at that point the decision was made to participate with the Oregon TouriSMAlliance.

415 REP. COURTNEY: What was the region?

416 MOHR: Lincoln County.

417 REP. COURTNEY: Was it part of another region or just Lincoln County?

418 MOHR: Each county developed its own regional strategy. Then it had the opportunity to parlay that with other counties to form a region.

419 REP. COURTNEY: Did Lincoln County parlay with other counties.

420 MOHR: Yes, it did. It joined the Oregon TouriSMAlliance, and that was about seven counties.

422 CHAIR WALDEN: Isn't it really a nine-county alliance?

423 MOHR: I'm not certain how many counties are in it.

424 CHAIR WALDEN: Didn't it really build out of the Convention Center? The governor at that time, Governor Goldschmidt, had decided to go ahead and fund the Convention Center.

427 REP. CARTER: As former chair of the committee, regional strategies were designed to bring about an economic opportunity for counties to be able to come together and decide upon a strategy for themselves in terms of what they wanted to do to develop economic opportunity for them. Many counties within a particular community of counties got together and made those decisions. I don't have off the top of my head the particular counties that joined together to do that, but a reasonable question would be to see if he would be disconnected from any relationships with the counties that he formerly had.

445 CHAIR WALDEN: Would you be, if we changed the congressional lines, somehow forced to separate from those other counties?

447 MOHR: I'm not entirely familiar with what counties they are, but we would certainly be dislocated from the city of Portland, as I understand it, through this formation, and Portland has been a key player. A lot of our efforts in promoting have been directed back through Portland to get the people coming into Portland to go out into these outlying counties.

450 CHAIR WALDEN: How would this plan dislocate you from Portland and your state regional strategy program?

452 MOHR: Dislocation, I think, was your word on that. We're talking about keeping the regions of interest together. If we're not part of the Portland area the possibility is there that we won't have that kind of representation.

459 CHAIR WALDEN: Is Yamhill County part of that?

460 MOHR: I don't know.

461 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you know, Rep. Carter?

462 REP. CARTER: I think Yamhill, Polk, and Marion move together along with the regional strategies for the Convention Center.

464 CHAIR WALDEN: Where was Clackamas County in that?

465 REP. CARTER: Clackamas, Washington, and those counties are all together.

466 CHAIR WALDEN: But for this TouriSMAlliance, is Clackamas County part of that?

467 REP. CARTER: I'm not sure of that.

468 CHAIR WALDEN: But it is looped together for the Convention Center?

469 REP. CARTER: Yes.

TAPE 19, SIDE B

038 REP. CEASE: It seems to me that no congressional lines are going to disrupt communities of interest. I think the real key as you look at how we determine those lines, one of the mandates or requirements is that we view those lines and what's inside those lines in reference to communities of interest so that the congressman can more adequately and effectively represent those people in that district. It isn't going to disrupt a community of interest because you have a line here or there, is it?

050 MOHR: I can't adequately answer that question.

051 REP. CEASE: Wherever those lines might be, your connection with the greater Portland area in reference to touriSMpresumably will remain, will it not?

053 MOHR: Yes.

055 ED WHELAN, CITIZEN, NEWPORT: Interest in reapportionment was whetted by a story in last Friday's Oregonian. I also went to the Newport Chamber meeting at Otter Crest where Senator Brenneman was making a report to the business community. Out of that came an area that I think has been neglected and that's a community of interest vital to the economic well-being of Lincoln, Tillamook, Clatsop, Columbia, and Multnomah Counties. That is simply water and the practical use of the waters that border those particular counties. This is an interest that I've had personally. All of our congressmen have exercised considerable influence on appropriations for the Corps of Engineers which are the vital economic stabilizing influence in these particular places because channel maintenance, jetty repair maintenance and enhancement, and the grain that Rep. Baum grows in Union and Wallowa Counties couldn't get to the sea if it wasn't for the maintenance of the 40-foot channel from the Broadway Bridge to the confluence of the Columbia River to the Pacific Ocean. These are extremely important communities of interest. It's diffused now with the 4th District and the 1st District because of the interest of the southernmost ports and it's been a very fine working relationship for a number of years regardless of the politics of it when the appropriations for the Corps are being sought at the Washington level.

I was a member of this body back in the 50's and 60's, a former member of the Port of Portland Commission, a former member of the Dock Commission of the city of Portland, and was the first director of the Department of Economic Development and was responsible for creation of the Ports Division that now is within that particular agency. My

lifelong interest has been with the port development and activity and the vital link with the federal level as far as Corps of Engineers appropriations are concerned. If you diffuse this even further with the plan on the right, I don't care which plan, I'm just trying to keep this community of interest together. I think it's something that's been neglected. They talk about roads, etc., but the most vital link is access to water.

110 CHAIR WALDEN: You make a very good point. When we held the hearing at Taft High School in Lincoln City, we had very few witnesses. The only representative of river communities was the fellow from the Port of Astoria. His comment was similar to yours in that he said do not create a district that simply linked the entire coast, that in fact they benefitted from drawing the line at the Lane-Lincoln boundaries.

117 WHELAN: It's a natural geographic spot.

118 CHAIR WALDEN: And not to link up all the ports with one member so that you have various members able to focus and concentrate on various ports. That's what we tried to take into account. We also heard in the Portland hearing a request that Portland have two members. One of the reasons was the Port of Portland and the need there. Under both plans, we would.

127 WHELAN: It's an important consideration because most of the dock activity is downstream from Portland. Now there is very little activity other than for barge activity above the Steel Bridge.

130 CHAIR WALDEN: At least on the Walden Plan we attempted to give, I think for the first time, all five members of our delegation some ports to be involved in. We do the upriver and we do Portland with two members downriver.

134 WHELAN: But I fear that you would diffuse the influence of that body, our congressional delegation, in dealing with the Corps unless you have one primary spokesman with the coordination responsibility for those activities and the one person in the Senate.

138 REP. MILLER: I was struck by your suggesting that one person is better off having several ports. We heard testimony with respect to the universities--let's have one university per congressperson insofar as we could spread out the responsibility.

143 WHELAN: I don't pretend to know anything about the universities so I couldn't even comment on it.

145 REP. MILLER: I'm just wondering about the principle of whether or not you want one person to represent multiple ports. It seems to conflict, in my view, with what we've heard with respect to having one university per congressperson. So I guess we'll have to decide.

150 WHELAN: I saw that this particular area had not been addressed, at least in anything I had read or heard, so I wanted to make sure the committee was considering that today and in future deliberations.

155 CHAIR WALDEN: In my presentation last Thursday, I spent quite a bit of time talking about the ports.

157 WHELAN: That particular subject had been neglected to be picked up in the news stories that I had access to.

158 CHAIR WALDEN: We've got some debate there too with the news media.

160 REP. CEASE: Would you explain your comment that the line between Lincoln County and south was a natural geographic line.

162 WHELAN: I think you've got about 250 miles of Columbia River waterfront and 150 miles of coastal frontage; it's about a halfway split on the Oregon coast. It's about 150 miles south from the Lane-Lincoln County line to the California border. You've got about the same distance. So that's why I say it's sort of a natural geographic split. I don't have any great knowledge of why that is, but you've got what used to be Route F coming from Eugene to Florence. Most of the traffic coming through the Florence area comes through that way.

180 REP. CEASE: Am I understanding that south of Lincoln County the interest flows south and east, but not north?

182 WHELAN: Pretty much. If you look at the tourist and recreation development in the Florence area, their real market is Eugene and the valley; whereas when you get into Newport and north, it all flows out of Washington and Multnomah Counties primarily through Highway 18.

187 REP. CEASE: Recognizing these district lines have changed because of population shifts, but in terms of the general issue of communities of interest, what would you say is wrong with the current 1st Congressional District lines?

193 WHELAN: I have tried to confine my comments today to that area that I do consider myself somewhat knowledgeable. I'm still doing consulting work for those three Columbia River ports through my former association with PGE. I like the way it's operating now and it's very easy if you have a problem involving one of those ports to call one congressman's office and in most cases get an immediate solution to your difficulty.

214 REP. CEASE: But looking at those congressmen that have been there prior to the current one, were they dealing with roughly the same things of interest in communities? Were the districts very similar?

220 WHELAN: They haven't changed much. I can remember when all of Multnomah County was the Third District. Either in 1971 or 1981 the boundary was moved to I-405 and then later to include all of the northwest side of Portland.

226 REP. CEASE: So it would be fair to say that in those earlier plans and districts that Washington County was basically with a number of those coastal communities.

230 WHELAN: It's always been there. I can't ever remember when Washington County wasn't in the 1st District.

232 REP. CEASE: So it didn't make any difference whether it was a Republican or Democratic representative; essentially, that was the way it was put together?

234 WHELAN: At least in my experience in dealing with them in areas that I've addressed today.

237 REP. MASON, DISTRICT #11: Submits and summarizes written testimony (EXHIBIT B) regarding the Walden Congressional Redistricting Plan and reintroducing the Mason Plan with minor changes.

298 (Regarding "unreasonable splitting of Multnomah County, leaving as it does only 2.6% of the county's population in the suburban district and abrogating a two-and-a-half decade long tradition of splitting the city at the Willamette, looks more like a line of convenience than a line designed to follow communities of interest..")

CHAIR WALDEN: What percent does yours put in the other district?

299 REP. MASON: I couldn't tell you exactly, but I would say it would be somewhere around 60,000 individuals for the west side which would be approximately 10%.

305 CHAIR WALDEN: So your plan is 7.4% greater than our plan? And 10% would not be token, in your mind?

306 REP. MASON: No, it would not.

(From the audience) JOAN MOORE, CONGRESSMAN'S WYDEN'S OFFICE: 90,000.

309 REP. MASON: 90,000 people. (Continues testimony.)

343 (Regarding the overlaying "of state legislative lines and congressional lines. To my knowledge this has been tried in only three states and has been unsuccessful in all cases.")

REP. MILLER: Who determined the success or lack of success?

347 REP. MASON: That's a subjective determination.

348 REP. MILLER: That's yours?

349 REP. MASON: Yes.

350 REP. CEASE: What sources do you have that indicated that three states have done this?

352 REP. MASON: I was informed by some of the congressional staff people that this has been attempted in three states and they were able to do it, but apparently their information is that it just didn't work that well. We could go into this some more, and that might be an interesting topic. The overlaying of congressional and legislative lines is very unusual. (Continues testimony.)

367 (Regarding, "there are some indicators we look for in any redistricting plan that demonstrate whether the plan is free of political consideration. One is the location of the incumbent's residence. Another is party registration. Finally, we look to see if the districts are moved more than the minimum necessary to meet numerical equality.")

CHAIR WALDEN: You talk about there being some indicators that we look for in redistricting. I'm confused that the information I've read has not indicated some of this. Is this a policy decision or a legal standard we are supposed to meet?



370 REP. MASON: I don't think we will determine what's a legal standard until we get to a legal forum. What is law is to be determined by a court.

377 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you know as we've adopted rules and all we've said regarding the hierarchy that we have to follow, like the contiguousness of the districts, etc., are you adding these three things to that list, or are they already on it?

382 REP. MASON: I would say those three things are implicit in the list as it is because as we know reapportionment cannot be done to protect an incumbent. We also know that reapportionment cannot be done to attack any incumbent. What I'm about to describe to you comes under that category, so indeed this would be in the category of proper consideration. (Continues discussion.)

395 REP. MILLER: With respect to the residence issue, a member of Congress does not need to live in the district they represent, is that correct?

398 REP. MASON: That's absolutely correct.

399 REP. MILLER: Is it correct also that Rep. Wyden does not live in the district he represents?

400 REP. MASON: That I do not know. I also might point out for the record that even though you're allowed to live outside your district, it has become an unfortunate political issue in prior elections in this state.

404 CHAIR WALDEN: I thought Les AuCoin lived in Forest Grove.

407 REP. MASON: I was told by his staff that the March 21st Plan puts him out of his district.

410 CHAIR WALDEN: Could somebody tell me where he lives? I think that's important to your testimony because the point you're making is that the residence is now out of the 1st District under our plan.

412 REP. MASON: He lives near PSU and PSU under your proposal would be in the 3rd Congressional District.

415 CHAIR WALDEN: I had heard for years that Forest Grove was his residence.

418 REP. MASON: An apartment near Portland State, which is now in the 1st Congressional District.

420 REP. CEASE: Representative Wyden has a legal residence in the 3rd District and owns a home in my legislative district. I believe that's his legal residence, but I don't know that for a fact. But he does have a legal residence in the 3rd District. On the legal question, you don't have to live in the district. There are cases where congressmen have not lived in that district. These days, I would say, it would be very difficult to be elected to Congress if you don't live in the district.

427 REP. MASON: Continues testimony.

035 REP. MILLER: You characterize that potentially 500,000 people would be displaced. Could you hazard a guess as to how many of those 500,000 could identify their own congressional district?

037 REP. MASON: I don't know how many could identify their own congressional district by number, but I suspect a great number of them could identify they were in a congressional district, per se. It's actually probably fairly high on the first. (Continues testimony.)

I would like to point out to you some of the very minor changes that occurred between our March 12 version and our March 26 version. The minor changes would be in the area of the southwest of Corvallis. Population has been transferred from the 5th Congressional District to the 4th Congressional District. We adopted your line between Josephine and Jackson Counties. We found the Merlin-Galice Highway. In the Portland area, there have been two minor changes. There has been some transfer of population between the 5th and 3rd along the edge of the Milwaukie boundary. There's been a return to almost the original 1st Congressional District boundaries in the Dunthorpe area, so that neck has been narrowed slightly. To achieve the minimal deviation, I must say that one census block in Multnomah County now extends into the 3rd Congressional District in the Dunthorpe area.

073 CHAIR WALDEN: Rep. Mason, I appreciate your comments. Just so you know, and for the record, I did no registration check on any of the districts and so I would take issue with your comment about my motives behind the plan and take somewhat offense to it, frankly, because those were not considered. This is the first time I have seen any registration figures. I would be curious if you did this same work on the other districts and could tell us what the voter registration, Republican and Democratic shifts, are in the other four.

082 REP. MASON: No, I cannot do that.

085 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you think they are affected by your plan one way or another?

088 REP. MASON: I doubt it. Our plan was designed to have minimal disruption. It is our view that with some exceptions the current redistricting was done fairly well by the 1981 Legislature and that those lines did not need to be disturbed substantially. The one thing we made up in 1981 was the infamous Linn County finger that was removed, and beyond that we did not find a great deal with 1981 that we disliked.

097 CHAIR WALDEN: I understand that, but back to my question, when you say there's been minimal disruption in party registration in the other districts you've drawn, what do you mean by "minimal"? Can you give me a number?

100 REP. MASON: It would be very hard to do that. I would be very much interested in the figures. In writing our plan, we did not have party figures in front of us, and as we both know, perhaps to our chagrin, the computer system does not contain voter registration figures and it does not contain precincts. Both you and I are very glad that it doesn't because I don't think we would ever get out of the room if it did.

110 CHAIR WALDEN: You also talked about following some respected lines for the boundary between Multnomah and Washington Counties and how important it is when you're drawing those boundaries to follow respected

lines. What's the respected line that separates Yamhill County from itself?

114 REP. MASON: If you're referring to my plan, I think the Yamhill County line was drawn to a great extent to make up population. As you can see, it's the top part of Yamhill County that remains in the 1st. The lower part goes into the 5th as does the lower part of Polk. Had we had our druthers, I think if there hadn't been the population pressure we might have been able to go farther into northern Yamhill County. That could have been one of the boundaries that was purely population-driven. I can't recall any specifics. Some of these census blocks are not exactly what we would like. I can't understand some of the shapes of the census blocks. There's nothing worse than a census block that has 500 people in it and it's about two miles long. You can't get around it.

135 CHAIR WALDEN: My only concern is I'm troubled by the argument that on the one hand we have to follow some respected lines and on the other hand it's O.K. not to, to just follow the census blocks.

140 REP. MASON: You're going to have to make that choice sometimes. I think that northern line in the 5th Congressional District in Yamhill County I would assume goes through a relatively rural portion of Yamhill County, especially the western half of that border goes through a relatively rural portion. When you get out into the rural areas to pick up population, you have to go a long way.

155 MIKE RAGSDALE, CITIZEN: I will relate to experiences I've had, both as a member of this body in the House and the Senate and as a member and presiding officer of the Metropolitan Service District. I want to talk about significant communities of interest from my personal perspective, joining the House in 1973. I carried a controversial bill regarding the expansion of the Port of Portland to cover the suburban areas. Prior to 1973 the Port covered Multnomah County only. In that session Washington and Clackamas Counties were added. There was a popular vote within the boundaries of metro and the voters approved that in 1978. I was a member of the citizens' committee in the campaign for the Convention Center which was approved regionally. More recently we've had a regional vote on light rail and a statewide vote when the Metropolitan Service District was granted Home Rule authority. We've had a number of legislative acts and a number of voter approvals indicating that the Portland metropolitan area is a community of interest and that community of interest is not confined to the Portland city limits. There's been a lot of historical competition between the suburban areas and the central city. As presiding officer of Metro, I was involved as Metro made its very significant transition. Metro solved the solid waste collection problem for the metropolitan area during my tenure. Metro also took great strides in improving the transportation system in the region. I would like to reference the Transportation 2000 Plan (EXHIBIT C) that talked about the community of interest in the Portland metropolitan area.

There's a very distinct, legally recognized, politically recognized community of interest in the Portland metropolitan area. MSD is the only elected regional government in America. It's a very unique situation and it's very distinctly identified as a region. When I was a presiding officer of Metro, I was also the Chairman of JPACT which is a joint policy advisory committee on transportation. That is not a purely legal body; it was recognized in the Metro ordinances but the makeup of JPACT has been very compromised. Finally after JPACT had existed for a

number of years, we passed an ordinance to codify the existence of JPACT. That is a body of elected officials that review and determine the transportation strategies for the region and we are the only metropolitan area in the United States that has such a body. That's regional cooperation. I'm demonstrating for you that the metropolitan area is a community of interest.

243 An erroneous statement has been developing the strength of becoming a myth and that is that there is no community of interest between Washington and Clackamas Counties. This document (Transportation 2000 Plan) was developed for the Legislature's and voters' consideration as a regional document. The map that is in here talks about a regional transportation system and absolutely ignores political boundaries. One of the strongest advocates of this plan was Clackamas County Commissioner Ed Lindquist. He recognized that Washington and Clackamas Counties had a very common interest in solving suburban transportation problems. It's important to demonstrate that Clackamas and Washington Counties have a distinct, continuing and historical community of interest. Major metropolitan areas in the U.S. have historically developed in the easiest-to-build land. This happened in the Portland metropolitan area. We began the development in the flat floodplain on the confluence of the Columbia and the Willamette rivers. That's the old community and that's the grid system community. All suburban communities then as they have grown have developed a different system and it makes it very hard to service with transit. In Washington and Clackamas Counties, topography had a lot to do with the fact that the area was not developed with the grid system. They developed with cul de sacs and winding roads because as suburban development occurred that was the desire of the people. That creates a different characteristic as it relates to transportation services. That transit system that works in the grid system does not work in suburbia. When I was with JPACT there was a common interest with Clackamas and Washington Counties in trying to address the difference for suburbia for resolving transportation issues. That's also an important congressional issue. The U.S. Congress currently is renewing the National Surface Transportation Act. There are three components in the resolution of that issue: rural, urban, and suburban. I think it's critical that the state of Oregon try to address their congressional districting so that we can have a suburban representation to debate that particular issue. This is critical not only for the Portland metropolitan suburban area, which is Washington and Clackamas Counties, but also for all suburban areas that the suburban solution be equitably dealt with in the Congress. That's a specific community of interest. At the congressional level the suburban issues are issues that relate to major metropolitan areas and Portland suburbs are the only qualifier for that criteria in this state. Suburban issues are different from urban and rural issues.

330 Plan 2 (the Walden Plan) addresses what I am talking about, the commonality of interests in the suburban area. The drafters of this plan have been prudent; to get the appropriate population, they expanded into the area that they did because that is the rural part of Washington County and it goes up a suburban developing corridor of Highway 30 into the adjacent county.

Even in the private sector, Washington and Clackamas Counties are tied together.

I was a founding member of the Oregon TouriSMAlliance and understand that activity extremely well if you have any questions about it. The

Oregon TouriSMAlliance has worked well and it's worked well irrespective of political or congressional boundaries. It currently is in three congressional districts and was created totally unrelated to any federal activity or federal legislation. I believe that whatever solution you come up with regarding congressional boundaries, you'll have no impact at all on the Oregon TouriSMAlliance.

382 CHAIR WALDEN: What are the counties involved in that?

383 RAGSDALE: There are 12 partners in the Oregon TouriSMAlliance; 9 of them are counties. Clackamas, Washington, Multnomah, Tillamook, Columbia, Lincoln, Clatsop, and Yamhill Counties. I've forgotten a county. In addition to that, the Port of Portland, Metro, and the City of Portland are members.

391 CHAIR WALDEN: There are three members of Congress representing that alliance?

392 RAGSDALE: That's correct. I believe the 1st, 3rd, and 5th Districts all represent portions of that Oregon TouriSMAlliance.

395 CHAIR WALDEN: Under either plan, they would still have three members representing them.

397 RAGSDALE: I believe that would be the case, but it's a non-Congressional issue. It's Oregon Lottery money and it's local partnerships. It has nothing to do with the Congressional district boundaries.

400 CHAIR WALDEN: So you don't think it would be adversely affected no matter what we do.

402 RAGSDALE: No, I think any plan that you adopt would not. The issues with the Oregon TouriSMAlliance would be the legislative approval on the continuation of Lottery allocations and regional strategies and the Governor's role in leadership and addressing regional strategies as opposed to any congressional issues.

407 REP. CEASE: You've talked specifically about Metro as a community of interest. Since it's too big for one congressional district, how could it be effectively divided up? As you look at the metropolitan area as a community of interest, wouldn't it be fair to say that it doesn't operate in isolation from the rest of the state? Not all roads in this state lead to Portland, but a great many of them do since it's the economic center. Would it be fair to say when you get down to having to determine what we mean by community of interest, what kinds of communities of interest you are talking about, because indeed there are many of them, a lot of them are economic. There is indeed a substantial community of interest between Washington and Clackamas Counties. Comment a little further on your sense of community of interest between those two counties. As I look at the Metro votes that we've had, the voting of Clackamas County frequently was a larger No than it was in the other two counties. Almost invariably on any of those votes, Washington and Multnomah Counties would probably be voting Yes and Clackamas County would be voting No. What is your perception of that difference between those counties?

442 RAGSDALE: My perception is that it is not a county differential; it happens that the demographic differentials on the vote patterns add up that Washington County is more supportive than Clackamas County. It is

more urban and more rural. The rural precincts in Washington and Clackamas Counties tend to vote against metro issues. It happens to be that there are more rural precincts in Clackamas County than there are in Washington County, although Clackamas County has been carrying some of the Metro issues. I don't think it says that Clackamas County has one attitude and Washington has another. I think it is urban or suburban people that relate to those urban solutions; they have one attitude and the rural people have a different attitude.

TAPE 21, SIDE A

003 REP. CEASE: If you talk about the community of interest in Metro between those three counties, you should take Multnomah County out of it and then you're left in two suburban counties. Are you telling us that the community of interest between those two suburban counties is greater than the community of interest that the people in those counties have with their hinterland? Is that community of interest between those people and economic and other interests in Washington and Clackamas Counties stronger in reference to each other than it is in either case in the hinterland of Washington or Clackamas Counties?

018 RAGSDALE: Is there a stronger community of interest between Beaverton and Lake Oswego than there is Lake Oswego and a rural Clackamas County?

022 REP. CEASE: Say Oregon City, which is the county seat and some of those other suburban cities.

025 RAGSDALE: I would say unequivocally, both politically and from a business standpoint, that the linkages between the suburban centers are stronger between the suburban centers than they are to the suburban and non-suburban, whatever the county boundaries. The Light Rail ballot measure that passed in the region included Washington and Clackamas County funds because both communities have a common interest in light rail transit solutions for their problems. Clackamas and Washington Counties have very much a commonality of interest versus a disparate interest with the more rural parts of those counties. The urban growth boundary of Metro is generally a good delineator of where those interests start to dissipate.

050 REP. CEASE: Then including rural parts of Washington County or Columbia County other than for population reasons doesn't make much sense either?

052 RAGSDALE: There is less commonality of interest for Vernonia and Beaverton than there is for Beaverton and Oregon City or Gladstone.

055 REP. CEASE: In the Clackamas County case, you essentially have Metro as the southern boundary so you have only the urbanized portions of Clackamas County in the one proposal, but you have all of Washington County and all of Columbia County. So there's essentially two different principles.

060 RAGSDALE: If I could sit down with a pencil and didn't have to consider one-man, one-vote, I could draw a different one from either one of those and I would draw a suburban district but it wouldn't have enough population in it. I see your problem as far as it relates to community of interest. In my mind, you could as successfully go into rural Clackamas County as into this area. There is a commonality of

interest as it relates to some development along the Highway 30 corridor. St. Helens petitioned Metro to be the host for a garbage burner one time because they wanted to be more involved. Metro turned that down, but the elected officials wanted to be more involved with Metro and the Portland metropolitan area so there are some commonalities of interest. But they are not as strong as within the suburban growth area. There they are very absolute.

075 REP. CEASE: I hope that over time the Metro area becomes more effective as a government and as a community of interest. It's the relationship between those parts; they're both supportive and competitive. Would you view the community of interest between Clackamas and Washington Counties as being a relatively recent event in time or has that situation been very long-term and somehow the people that drew those lines didn't pay much attention to those interests, or what's happened that makes a difference all of a sudden?

090 RAGSDALE: From my vantage point, there's always been a community of interest between the common area. The boundary between Washington County and Clackamas County has never made sense. It has never reflected community of interest, in my mind. Kruse Way is in both counties and is a very dynamic separate community in and of its own. As you go down I-5, it splits the counties in those communities. As it relates to those portions of those counties, that's always been a silly line; it has not reflected community of interest. As it relates to moving away from those lines, I suspect there's been a historic commonality of interest but I don't know about community of interest because as you go back into history you became more agrarian. The Tualatin basin was an agrarian unit. The Willamette River doesn't make sense to Washington County people as a boundary. The Portland hills make sense as a boundary to Washington County because they don't feel they're part of the city of Portland. Geographic considerations were very absolute until you started to break past those geographic considerations with technological growth. Now what you have is much better transportation and communication linkages.

At 10:00 the committee takes a short break.

135 ED TENNY, ADMINISTRATOR, PORTLAND WATER BUREAU: There is a perception that water is a very local issue. The primary decisions being made to affect water are neither local nor neighborhood decisions but are being made here and in Washington, D.C.

Submits and summarizes written testimony (EXHIBIT D) in favor of designing congressional boundaries which include all aspects of metropolitan Portland in each district to further mutual cooperation and minimize parochialism.

178 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you serve both residents in Clackamas and Washington Counties?

179 ED TENNY: We do, the majority of our outside customers at this time are in Washington County but we have customers in all three counties and we deal closely with the cities and water purveyors in all three counties.

- Water Bureau is trying to deal with both growth and the issue of additional supplies to keep up with growth and with water quality. - Key to ability to supply water supply problems and maintain water quality is ability to pull people together throughout that region on basis of need

for water and low water rates. - Our decisions regarding water supply are being made as much in Washington, D.C., as they are in City Hall. - Do not want one congressman representing the bulk of the city of Portland and someone else representing the bulk of the suburban area. - The problem of water in Portland is regional in nature.

262 CHAIR WALDEN: Which plan provides for only one representative for Multnomah County?

264 TENNY: I recognize that both of them have some Portland representation, but the plan on the left has a pretty minimal representation--minimal in numbers and not very representative of the city at large. A good portion of it is almost semi-rural, way up in the northwest hills. Frankly, I think that one would have to suppose over a period of years that somebody representing that district and the concerns of the central city would have relatively marginal concern in that district. My impression is that the Mason Plan left the line pretty much as it is in the city. That seems to us to be a good line and a line that has guaranteed us the strong interest in the whole metropolitan area by both of the congressional representatives.

283 CHAIR WALDEN: I guess I'm a little concerned because on the one hand you talk about a regional basis, a mutual dependency, and then you express concern about a lack of coordination and the individual political egos that might play into this. It seems to me that under the Mason plan you would end up with three members of Congress representing your area and therefore you would be dividing it. Why would that bring them together on your issue versus one where you have basically two members?

292 TENNY: My primary concern is simply that we not get into a situation where congressional representatives who have a significant representational responsibility in the metropolitan area as a whole don't have reasonable vested interests in both the city and the suburban area. That's really my goal. I think we've had that kind of balance and I'm fearful of losing that kind of balance.

298 JIM HUNTZICKER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, OREGON GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: I am speaking on behalf of Oregon Graduate Institute. We are in favor of retaining in the 1st Congressional District that part of Multnomah County west of the Willamette River and particularly the city of Portland part west of the Willamette River as well as Washington County. In this region there are three research universities which are vital to the well-being of both the state and the Portland metropolitan area. These include Portland State University, Oregon Health Sciences University, and Oregon Graduate Institute. In recent years, these institutions have begun to identify common goals and to work together to enhance services they provide to both the state and the region. As we three institutions seek to add new programs which will enhance our ability to serve the state and the region, we will have to continue to look to the federal government as we have in the past for that incremental support which we need to grow those programs and to achieve the desired synergy. Particularly in this era of post Proposition 5 or implementing Proposition 5 there simply won't be the state resources to do those things out on the margin which are so important for economic development and growth, which can really contribute to the intellectual and technological infrastructure of the region which is so important for that growth. This type of federal support which we have received in recent years has been vital to this type of growth--the Oregon Advanced Computing Institute, the proposed



joint Graduate Schools of Engineering, the Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education. All of these things in some way or another leverage off federal support.

350 I think one of the reasons we've been so successful in getting that type of support is because of the fact that we have a strong congressional delegation and particularly because the three Portland-area institutions are all in the same district and can be represented effectively by one congressperson.

350 CHAIR WALDEN: You seem to be the only one from Higher Education that's come before us and said that it's more effective to have a group of institutions represented by one member.

355 HUNTZICKER: Obviously you can't do that throughout the whole state because we're simply too far apart geographically. But in the Portland metropolitan area you have higher ed institutions--one private and two public--which have a commonality of interests and needs. Because of our geographic proximity, there is a strong driving force for partnering and working together. For example, our faculty teach courses at Portland State University. There are PSU faculty who teach our courses. We intermingle our research programs. We expect to be doing that with the Oregon Health Sciences University. It's simply a pragmatic concern on my part. We can be better represented in a district that encompasses those three institutions.

370 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you have linkages to Oregon State University at all?

372 HUNTZICKER: Sure we do, but the linkages are more difficult because it's an hour and forty-five minute drive between the two institutions. Certainly as we begin to implement EDNET that should get better, but just the simple fact that people-to-people sorts of interactions are more effective than over the telephone or by electronic mail mean it helps a lot when we have this proximity.

380 REP. MILLER: Should I assume then that it would be maybe appropriate to put Oregon and Oregon State universities in one district so that they would have enhanced representation?

382 HUNTZICKER: I can't speak to that. I'm only speaking about the interests of the three urban universities in this state.

384 REP. MILLER: That would seem to be consistent with what you've said.

386 HUNTZICKER: That's not a point I'm making.

387 REP. MILLER: Would you suggest that wouldn't make sense?

388 HUNTZICKER: No, I have no position on that point.

389 REP. CEASE: Mr. Chair, I think the point that others were making was that they wanted a major institution in separate congressional districts. Would it be fair to say that in the Portland area the increasing cooperation between the various institutions with the center of that being the large state university? Without that, the situation would be substantially different. The center of that cooperative effort on the part of institutions in the Portland area is Portland State University.

394 HUNTZICKER: Each institution brings its own particular strengths to the table. I look more at it as a triangular type of synergy than one radiating out from any particular institution. I feel that particularly over the last decade the three institutions certainly have been well served in our congressional district. They are learning how to work together and they are going to need significantly enhanced federal support to do their missions in the coming years and we feel that's best accomplished by being in the same district.

411 CHAIR WALDEN: Do either of the plans split those apart?

412 HUNTZICKER: What we want to see is the downtown Portland area which includes Portland State and Oregon Health Sciences University in the same district as Washington County and it's my understanding that the Mason Plan best achieves that.

415 CHAIR WALDEN: I don't know the downtown geography. Perhaps you or others or maybe Representative Carter could speak to that, the location of Portland State University.

422 HUNTZICKER: I believe that's excluded in the one on the right.

427 CHAIR WALDEN: I would assume since it is south of Burnside and still in Multnomah County it would be in the blue district. You don't think that two members of Congress, the yellow and the blue districts, could work jointly?

428 HUNTZICKER: I'm just saying that it's optimum if we're all together. I'm not saying that it couldn't work if it were split. But I'm interested in an optimum solution for this particular constituency and that's what I think it is.

430 CHAIR WALDEN: We've had a lot of testimony and you're the only one that's said it's optimum to combine universities, so we've put a lot of work on both plans into providing for separate representation for major universities.

437 HUNTZICKER: Separate representation in terms of Oregon State and U of O--I don't have any problem with that at all.

439 CHAIR WALDEN: PSU was also mentioned.

440 HUNTZICKER: I understand, but I haven't heard much about the Health Sciences University or the Graduate Institute in that regard. It's simply a matter of the fact that we're close together and work easily together and that's why I think it makes sense in this case. With regard to the earlier question from Rep. Miller, U of O and OSU have different missions and whether they're together or not I don't think is that important. I think it's more important for our institutions to be together than it is for them.

TAPE 22, SIDE A

001 REP. MARKHAM: Is the mission of PSU the same as your mission?

003 HUNTZICKER: Portland State is an urban university which is supposed to, among other things, serve the needs of a growing urban area. Part

of that mission involves delivery of educational and research services in science and engineering, which is specifically our mission. We have found that we can leverage off each other by working together and do so very effectively in a number of fields including such fields as computer science and engineering, electrical engineering, chemistry, biology, those areas which are vital to technological infrastructure in an urban area.

011 REP. CARTER: I think the scope and mission of any institution is going to be a consideration. I can see where those three institutions make sense in that particular sense, not only in terms of geographic proximity but in terms of that phase of their mission. It would be easy to draw an analogy between the three distinct universities having their own representation rather than to divide these three universities as part of that mission as one and the same.

033 REP. MILLER: I continue to be amazed at the anxiety about the change that's likely to take place. I think we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that perhaps among the greatest supporters of higher education is someone who has perhaps the most interests competing for recognition and that's the senior senator, Mark Hatfield. He manages to balance those and clearly commands a lot of financial help for education in this state and I don't know why we don't have similar confidence in the congressional delegation.

043 HUNTZICKER: Of course the senator has a statewide mission.

045 REP. MILLER: But whoever we elect to Congress will have some statewide perspective.

047 HUNTZICKER: Certainly, I share your feeling exactly. All I'm urging is what I consider to be the optimal solution for the interests of these three institutions, particularly my own institution. I'm only speaking for my own institution, not the other two. But we see a common mission and a common service that we should provide to the state and we feel that we will be best served by what I've advocated.

053 CHAIR WALDEN: Where physically are you located?

054 HUNTZICKER: We are located about 15 miles west of Portland just south of Sunset Highway between Beaverton and Hillsboro. We're a 20-minute drive from either Portland State or the Health Sciences University right down Sunset Highway into Portland.

065 REP. CARTER: Rep. Miller raised the point about people feeling the anxiety of the potential change. I really do have anxiety. What I see is the potential for a yuppie district and I don't see poor districts or poor areas like North and Northeast Portland being able to have to compete with a yuppie district.

070 CHAIR WALDEN: What are you recommending, Rep. Carter, splitting Multnomah County in separate sections?

072 REP. CARTER: I don't have a recommendation at this particular point. I have stayed away from lines intentionally.

077 CHAIR WALDEN: You might help us if you participated in the lines.

080 REP. CARTER: I don't want to deal with the politics. I want to do what is best for the state. I do not see just having a yuppie district

as being what is best for the state.

085 CHAIR WALDEN: There's another issue which none of the witnesses has testified to and that's the dilution of minority strength by the Mason Plan versus the Walden Plan and the splitting of a group of minorities in that area. It gets diluted by three districts under the Mason Plan. That bothers me. I think that's in the interests of the state and far and above any political considerations.

097 REP. CARTER: When the Hispanic Commission came, I think that the one thing she said on the record is that they don't consider themselves a minority in the same sense that people of the African-American community do. They simply vote conservatively and would not have problems with being a part of a yuppie district in terms of their voting strength. So that would not be a consideration.

101 CHAIR WALDEN: I think you've made the argument for my plan over the Mason Plan because his plan would link the Hispanic community that you spoke of with the African-American community. It's my plan that links it with the suburban district. That's one of the things we ran into, watching very carefully, based on the testimony that we've received regarding the minority populations, both Asian and Hispanic.

115 JERRY DOVE, TILLAMOOK COUNTY COMMISSIONER: Let me explain to you how I learned about this situation. I spent all last week in Washington, D.C. I went back there looking for federal funds for Tillamook County. I came back and saw in the newspaper an article about this big change. I called Representative Tim Josi and Senator John Brenneman and asked what I could do. They suggested I drop by and tell this committee what I think.

The eastern boundary of Tillamook County is a mere twenty miles from the urban growth boundary of Portland or thirty miles by the way the crow flies from downtown Tillamook. Corvallis is sixty miles from the outermost southeast boundary of Tillamook County or ninety-two miles from downtown Tillamook. The Clackamas County boundary is at the closest point sixty-seven-and-a-half miles from the Tillamook County boundary. The Multnomah and Washington County residents commute to Tillamook County on a regular basis and approximately 29 percent of the homes in Tillamook County are owned by Washington and Multnomah County residents.

I would like to endorse Mr. Rosenberg's testimony earlier from Tillamook on the railroad. One of the things I was doing in Washington, D.C., was looking for federal funds to finish paying off the railroad. If in fact we make this change I will feel that my week in Washington was to no avail.

160 CHAIR WALDEN: What kind of timeline are you on for those funds; is that in this budget cycle?

162 DOVE: I believe it is.

163 CHAIR WALDEN: Do you know that this plan wouldn't take effect until 199 2?

164 DOVE: I wasn't sure when it would take effect. That's just one of the things. Many of the projects we have going in Tillamook County right now are dealing with grants, all tying Tillamook into Multnomah

and Washington Counties, and tying into the Convention Center. We talked earlier today of the OTA regional strategies. I could name up to \$1,000,000 worth of grants that Tillamook has obtained in this past year tying Tillamook to the Convention Center.

170 CHAIR WALDEN: Are those state or federal grants?

171 DOVE: Both. In the proposing of the grants, we've stated especially on the federal grants that we can receive OTA money if we can get the federal grants tying the two together. The projects we discussed when we were in Washington, D.C., numbered about seven, will tie Tillamook to Washington and Multnomah Counties. As a representative of Tillamook County Board of Commissioners, we endorse the Mason Plan.

187 HANS RADTKE, ECONOMIST, YACHATS: I am an economist by profession and I was asked by Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association to tell you something about the economies of the coast. Submits for the record, "The Economic Landscape of the Oregon Coast" (EXHIBIT E).

Many times we expect that the rural areas are very agricultural based and that's really not so for Lincoln and Clatsop Counties. Agriculture makes up less than 1% in Lincoln County and a little over 1% in Clatsop County. The reason why we think so much of agriculture in Tillamook County where it makes up 15% is because that's all dairy. Farming of dairy cows is quite different from row crop farming in Marion County. Dairy in Tillamook County is so closely tied in with the Portland area; it's not just producing milk in Tillamook County, but it's also getting the right butterfat content, shipping part of it to the Portland area and part of it's shipped back in order to get the right mixture between ice cream and cheese, etc. So agriculture is very closely tied in with the Portland area.

220 Regarding fishing, if you're going to have fishing you'd better have some dredging and the maintenance dredging is an important part to all of the coastal area. There again, that ties in so closely with the Portland area because that's where your distributors are. Although about 90 percent of the fish products go down south to Los Angeles and San Francisco to market. The distributors and the processors are in the Portland area so whatever drives the coastal area comes from the Portland area. Also, what happens to salmon is a lot of times determined in the Portland area. The conflict between residential and commercial areas is very important to the whole coastal area. What happens in Portland will determine what happens on the coast.

242 Third, tourism. We usually think of people just going out and spending money. The retirement community's transfer payments make up at least 50 percent of the total income in those areas. Second homes are also very important. Development to bring in more tourists to the coastal communities in August would not help us. Our roads are maxed out in August. What we really need is help in the winter months and that's where the tourists from Portland come in and are such an influence in that area of northern Lincoln, Tillamook, and Clatsop Counties. The rest of the tourists may come in from California up Highway 101. Sometimes, I think that has some negative effect on our communities. If you ask the motel owners and businesses, most of their business in the winter months will come out of the Portland metropolitan area.

271 CHAIR WALDEN: The thing that I'm not clear on today is that no matter whose map you look at, if you figure 20 percent of the state's

population is in each of the colored areas, what I'm hearing is that at least in the Mason Plan that 20 percent just hates the coast because they never go over there. I haven't heard anybody yet say that they like going to the coast; that the only people that go there are from Portland and Washington County.

277 RADTKE: That's where they all go. That's where our business is from.

279 CHAIR WALDEN: Portland and Washington County? Not Clackamas and Marion Counties?

281 RADTKE: No, the whole metropolitan area. I don't want to divide it up. All I'm saying is that the Portland area drives what's going on at the coast.

283 CHAIR WALDEN: You're referring to the whole regional tri-county area?

284 RADTKE: I'm saying down south is not quite as important.

285 CHAIR WALDEN: There isn't near the population. That's driven by the numbers, not by the boundaries.

287 REP. MILLER: I appreciate the information we've been provided. Would you expect under each plan, what you've told us will change?

289 RADTKE: If I understand this correctly, one of the plans would really tie the Lincoln County area with Benton and Marion Counties. Am I correct in that?

295 CHAIR WALDEN: Yes, people from Corvallis, I thought, tend to go to Newport and down the Alsea Highway.

297 REP. MILLER: If we adopted the Walden Plan, do you expect tourists will no longer come from the places they're coming from, that you no longer will have any association with the city of Portland, the world basically stops?

302 RADTKE: I didn't say that.

305 REP. MILLER: I'm trying to see how it fits with the proposals.

307 RADTKE: All I'm saying is if you're trying to find some commonality of interest, it's very important to tie the coastal areas in with the metropolitan area. That's what drives the coast. If Portland does well economically, the northern coast will do well.

310 CHAIR WALDEN: A sort of trickle-down theory.

312 RADTKE: Sure. That's why I think many people may not agree with me but I think the Portland Convention Center will probably have a greater effect on the coast than a lot of other projects we build on the coast.

317 CHAIR WALDEN: Where is the aquarium?

318 RADTKE: South Beach just south of Newport and south of the Yaquina River.

320 CHAIR WALDEN: Isn't the Science Center there? Out of what university is that tied?

321 RADTKE: The Marine Science Center is tied to Oregon State University and has a payroll of about \$5,000,000 in that area. That has a very large impact on Newport. It's not just Oregon State University; it's also EPA which has headquarters there. Also the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. So it's not just Oregon State; it's also these other people that are there.

332 CHAIR WALDEN: So there is some value in continuing that linkage between Oregon State and the Science Center?

335 RADTKE: I think the biggest value of the Marine Science Center was that Senator Mark Hatfield had a house in Newport.

337 CHAIR WALDEN: I don't want to ascribe motives to anyone on what they're doing or not doing. My question is, isn't the linkage really between the Marine Science Center and OSU?

339 RADTKE: Part of it. I'm also saying the EPA center is there.

340 CHAIR WALDEN: But I'm talking about universities in Oregon. So it's OSU and the Science Center.

341 RADTKE: Yes.

342 CHAIR WALDEN: Under the Mason Plan those two would be put in separate congressional districts. Under the Walden Plan, they are not separated. Correct?

345 RADTKE: Yes.

346 CHAIR WALDEN: So either plan separates a university from one of its satellites. I don't mean to denigrate the Graduate Center or the Marine Science Center. Both plans because of the geography of the state do end up separating.

350 RADTKE: I guess about a third of the discussion has been the influence of the universities on boundaries. I don't think that's the only thing that drives the economies of the state.

353 CHAIR WALDEN: It's really not that important of an issue then?

354 RADTKE: Of course it's important, but there are other things too.

355 CHAIR WALDEN: What you're saying is consider other things as we go about this process.

362 BOB GOLDSTEIN: The computer is not capable of doing what I require to arrive at one of the congressional districts. The differentiation between the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Multnomah County are not clearly delineated. Because I have a different type of plan than both of the ones that have been submitted, I would like to leave with the committee my 1st Congressional District which contains 11 counties with no intrusion of county lines, beginning with Malheur County in the southeast corner, running across the southern border all the way to the coast, giving the representative there a statewide view from Idaho right to the coast. The 11 counties include Crook, Deschutes, and Coos, which would give that southern district a port on

the ocean, and Douglas County. There was a small deviation.

The 2nd District would be just north of the 1st Congressional District. It would start in Baker County and runs all the way to the ocean and includes 9 counties, including Linn, Lane, Lincoln, Benton and Polk. There's a deviation of 3,158 out of 571,000. I don't believe that's an objectionable factor nor would the court look upon that if the court were called into play as being something that would be an outrage to citizens and to the state.

The remaining northern stripe would begin in the northeast Willowa County, come across and excluding the tri-county area completely, running to the coast through Marion, Yamhill, Tillamook, Clatsop, and Columbia. In those 13 counties, there's a deviation of 42,000. The amount that would be required would have to come from the tri-county areas. I believe that should be acquired from those areas in eastern Clackamas County where there are no basic cities.

Submits map of proposed congressional district boundaries (EXHIBIT F).

The only work left are the reductions that would be needed in regard to Washington and Clackamas Counties. The only problem we have there is there is not enough definition in the data that's available in the computer to show the unincorporated versus the incorporated areas. I would like to reserve that tri-county problem.

TAPE 21, SIDE B

052 CHAIR WALDEN: We had some questions about percent of economic income from various regions along the coast. The book that Mr. Radtke provided us with delineates that more closely. These are 1987 figures. In Clatsop County 12.8% was timber, 8% was tourism, agriculture was 9%, fishing 20.5%, and the rest is transfer payments, etc. In Lincoln County, tourism is 12%, timber 10.4%, agriculture .5%, fishing 16.4%. In Tillamook County tourism was 4.2%, timber 12.5%, agriculture 12.2%, fishing 4.8%. They were slightly different than perhaps we thought.

Closes public hearing. Next meeting will be Thursday at 8:00 a.m.

Adjourns meeting at 11:07 a.m.

Submitted by:      Reviewed by:

Carol Wilder      Adrienne Sexton Assistant      Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG:

A            -Testimony on HB 2001 - Don Lindly, Lincoln County Commissioner - 1 page. B -Testimony on HB 2001 - Rep. Tom Mason - 6 pages. C -"Transportation 2000 Plan" - Mike Ragsdale - 35 pages. D            -Testimony on HB 2001 - Ed Tenny, Administrator, Portland Water Bureau - 4 pages. E



- "The Economic Landscape of the Oregon Coast" - Hans Radtke - 23 pages.  
F - Proposed Congressional District Boundaries - Bob Goldstein - 1 page.