

Conference Committees on SB 1000 & HB 2001 June 27, 1991 Page CONFERENCE  
COMMITTEES ON SB 1000 & HB 2001

June 27, 1991Hearing Room 50 8:30 p.m. Tapes 1 - 2

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sen. Glenn Otto, Chair  
Brenneman  
Springer  
Tom Mason

HOUSE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Greg Walden, Chair Sen. John  
Rep. Ray Baum Sen. Dick  
Rep. Peter Courtney Rep. Randy Miller Rep.

SENATE STAFF:

Gail Ryder, Senior Comm. Adm.  
John Houser, Comm. Adm.  
Green, Comm. Ass't. Julie Muñoz, Comm. Ass't.

HOUSE STAFF:

Adrienne Sexton, Comm. Adm.  
Carol Wilder, Comm. Ass't. Joan

MEASURES CONSIDERED:

SB 1000 - Relating to redistricting  
HB 2001 - Relating to congressional redistricting

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION:

TAPE 1, SIDE A

004 CHAIR OTTO: Called the meeting to order at 9:25: p.m. "The committees on Redistricting will come to order. The Senate Committee and the House Committee. And this will be a work session tonight. We'll take testimony only from legislative members tonight. The public will have a chance in the future to testify. And with Rep. Walden and myself, we've decided that we'll have our staff people explain, very briefly, the maps and identify them, where they come from. I think they've worked out amongst themselves who's going to do Congressional maps and who's going to do the Legislative maps. So Gail and Adrienne, have at it. Identify yourself for the tape please."

(TAPE 1, SIDE A)

WORK SESSION

SB 1000 RELATING TO REDISTRICTING AND HB 2001 RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

018 RYDER: "Alright, Gail Ryder with the Senate Redistricting Committee. This is quite an interesting microphone. On this side of the room you have all of the legislative plans, (Refers to members left). The first legislative plan that was presented was the one you see down here, there are four or five maps, this is the Senate Committee Legislative Plan, (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 5/21/91, oversize exhibit B). It is a non-coterminous plan that has . . . The primary differences in it from other plans, I think, are that there, it is non- coterminous and that there are thirteen legislative districts in Multnomah County. Some of the others have twelve districts. The plan (Oversize exhibit A) above it is the Minority Plan that was voted on yesterday in the House that was submitted by Rep. Mason. It is a twelve legislative districts in Multnomah County with six and a half in Washington County and six and a half in Clackamas County. There are..., in the Senate Plan there is one district that goes away, it is District 38, which is the helicopter district that goes along the mountains. In this plan (indicating oversize exhibit A) there are two districts that go away and that would be Rep. Katz's district, District 10 in Multnomah County and Rep. Hayden's district, District 38 along the mountains. And in place of those there is a new district in Clackamas County here and a new district in Washington County, over here. Those are the two legislative plans that came from the Senate. The two congressional would be this one, which is identical to the Minority Plan which was presented on the House side by Rep. Mason, (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 4/18/91, oversize exhibit D, the Sen. Comm Congressional map). It's a zero deviation, zero population plan. This is the second plan (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 6/19/91, oversize exhibit A, 2 maps) which was presented through Senate, House bill, no Senate bill, no HB 2001, yesterday, which is an amendment to that. Basically the change in it occurs in Yamhill County where there's, you can see on this one (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 5/21/91, oversize exhibit B) there's an area here and an area here that's splits for District 1. In this one it is all concentrated in this area of Yamhill County. There

is also some change around the Lake Oswego area. The map you see down here (Oversize exhibit B, 1 map, Proposed Conf. Congressional 6/27) is a further amendment that Rep. Mason, I believe, is going to be proposing today. So that is what the Senate has.

057 SEXTON: "Thank you chairpersons, and both committees. For the record, Adrienne Sexton. I've been administrator for the subcommittee on Reapportionment for the House. We have a rather simplistic approach here. We've got the original HB 2001, (reference Senate Redistricting minutes for 4/18/91, oversized exhibit E) as it came out of the House Chamber back in April. Five congressional districts, Oregon was not entitled to any additional seats this redistricting cycle. Generally speaking the districts consist of District 2, which is all of eastern Oregon. And the achievement of the zero deviation, or nearly so, was brought, brought the district to the west in the southern portion of the state, and as nearly as possible, county lines were not broken, so all of Jackson County was included in District 2 and the sufficient population was picked up in the balance of Josephine County. District 4 took the southern coastal and came up the central Willamette Valley. District 5 was formed by going from the Cascade crest, which was generally speaking a dividing line that has been adhered to in the past and was chosen to be a determining factor for division between the east and the west again. So that again you're as near a zero deviation population for District 5, took in the coast went up to Tillamook and Clatsop counties. District 1, all of Columbia, all of Washington Counties, a western portion of Multnomah, west of the Willamette River and north of the downtown area and a portion of Clackamas County, again to achieve the population equity. And then the balance of Multnomah County comprising District 3. The basis of the plan, as presented by the House was to seek a coterminous concept, not only between the house and senate districts ultimately, but to wholly contain within each of the congressional districts twelve house seats and thus six senate seats. The House also presented a legislative plan on which is identified on the other side House Seat 6/15 (reference House Reapportionment minutes for 6/18/91, oversized exhibits C, E, F, G and minutes for 6/24/91, oversized exhibit B), and we have a series of the regions of the state. Multnomah County, wholly twelve districts within the Portland/metropolitan area. The north part of the state bridging Clatsop and Columbia Counties as a district going down into half of Tillamook and into Washington, again a coastal type of district. Going down the coast creating two new districts to accommodate the increased population in Clackamas and Washington Counties. Eastern Oregon very similar to the proposal from the Senate. Some minor variations, but generally within the same outline or silhouette as congressional District 2 in both of the congressional plan versions. The mid-portion of the state in the mid-Willamette Valley, the difference between the two, the House and the Senate plans for the legislative districts is that the, instead of compressing House District 38, it was, while it was compressed to go into only two counties, House District 40 was merged with portions of 44 and 43 to create, or to remove, excuse me, one district from that area to accommodate the increased population up north. And then the southern portion of the state is similar to the Senate plan in terms of again achieving the population equity necessary. The difference between District 54 for instance though, is that instead of picking up the necessary population in the upper portion of Jackson county it is in the southern portion near Ashland. (reference House Reapportionment minutes for 6/18/91, oversized exhibits C, E, F, G and minutes for 6/24/91, oversized exhibit B). Those are the primary differences. I think Gail has covered all of the other congressional issues of the two plans."

125 OTTO: "Any questions of members of the committee? Any questions from legislators? Bob you had some comments."

(TAPE 1, SIDE A)

WORK SESSION

SB 1000 RELATING TO REDISTRICTING

Witnesses: Bob Shoemaker, Oregon State Senator, District 3

129 BOB SHOEMAKER, OREGON STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT 3: "Yes. (Unintelligible). Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the committee, I'm Bob Shoemaker, State Senator, District 3. And I haven't really had the time to study the House Plans in detail. I've done my best, taking a look at them, as they affect my particular district and the two house districts that comprise it. So my comments really are addressed to that more than the plans in their, in whole. I would like to speak in support of the Senate Plan which was very carefully worked out to be as least

disruptive as possible of existing house and senate districts. And (unintelligible) in District 3 there was really very little reason for very much disruption. (Unintelligible) so the island was lost and that is certainly understandable in light of the, not so much population changes there, but the fact that there was greater population throughout the state, there had to be some shrinkage within the district. But it's a very stable district on both, in the Washington and Multnomah County portions and maintaining it as a district seemed to be appropriate. It's not a district that is in a great deal of flux. One of the important things, I think, about the Senate Plan, and particularly as it relates to Senate District 3, but also as it realties to the other districts in the Portland metropolitan area, is that the districts do cross county lines. And I think particular on the metropolitan area it is important that they do that. The metropolitan area, although it is, does not have a single government and there is none planned. There is Metro which handles certain functions on a regional basis, it certainly is a community of interest in a broad sense, and I think it is very important when you've got that kind of a metropolitan community of interest that your legislative representatives help provide a bridge between what still remain to much somewhat Balkanized states within the metropolitan area. I think having your representatives and senators representing more than one of those counties helps to break down those barriers so that over time the metropolitan area will have a metropolitan perspective on issues that need to be resolved, both here and there. Not only are we able to represent the metropolitan area, as opposed to Multnomah County or Washington County or Clackamas County, but are down here that also helps in local matters that the legislative delegation is able to understand and speak to the issues that cross those county lines. The Senate Plan does that well and it's a shame to lose that, which is where I think we're headed with the, either one of the House Plans. So I would urge this committee to stay with the Senate Plan, as much as you possibly can. Regarding the House plans, and recognizing that there are two that have come over, I, you know, I'm very disappointed at the elimination of District 10. That's a district that's been a very solid stable part of the area and does have a community of interest of essentially downtown, urban, city dwellers. And to divide those up into the contiguous districts, I think is inappropriate and unnecessary and certainly wouldn't be done if it were not for the fact that the sitting Representative were, had announced that she is not planning to run for the election. I am not sure that's a sufficient reason to eliminate a district. As between the two, I noticed tonight in looking at the maps that the Minority Plan essentially has what is now the remnant of District 10, a Washington County district, with a dip of Multnomah County in it. In that, in, my residence is within the district, but at the fringe of it. And it really, personally, it no longer leaves me a very logical person to represent that district. I'm not living in the broad community of interest that that district would now represent, which is suburban Washington County, since I live urban Multnomah County. It's true that I could continue to provide a bridge and I would do that, but I'm really not part of that Washington County suburban community of interest. The Majority Plan, on the other hand, is, does have the remnants of District 10 substantially within Multnomah County."

226 OTTO: "When you say, Bob, when you say the Majority Plan; the Majority Republican Plan?"

228 SHOEMAKER: "The Majority Republican Plan, right. As between the two, and as it relates to District 3 and District 10, it actually, I think is a better plan in that it does have that district, whatever you may call it primarily in Multnomah County, District 10 I'm talking about. At least if I read the map correctly it does. And it does include essentially all of northwest Portland, which is a strong community of interest and downtown, rather than just a remnant of that hooked onto, what is essentially, a suburban Washington County district. As regards the couplings, and I don't know whether this is possible in the scheme of things, but if that were to be the district, well if that were your decision its coupling is most logical with District 11. In other words, if it is the decision of the body to respect county lines, you decide that is the way we ought to do this is to have districts within counties and not crossing county lines except where its absolutely necessary, and if the same be true of senate districts, then it would make better sense, if your going to go with the House Plan to couple Districts 10 and 11 as District 3, because their both west side Portland/Multnomah County districts, with community of interest that has been there for many, many, many years. So those are my comments for whatever they, value they may have."

261 OTTO: "Any questions of Sen. Shoemaker?"

263 SHOEMAKER: "Thank you very much for your attention. And good luck and what is a very difficult assignment."

264 OTTO: "Your welcome. Any other legislators have comments?"

(TAPE 1, SIDE A)

WORK SESSION

HB 2001 RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Witnesses: Tom Mason, Oregon State Representative, District 11

267 MASON: "I might have a comment on the congressional, if you want me to describe it for you, I can do that for you here."

269 OTTO: "Alright."

269 MASON: "Mr. Chairman, for the record, Tom Mason, State Representative, District 11. You'll note here, a congressional plan which I have somewhat presumptuously labeled Proposed Conference Congressional 6/27, (Refers to oversize exhibit B, 1 map). It is a variation on the initial Minority Plan out of the Senate, which became the Majority Plan out of the House, and both of those plans were continuations of present, start with the present shapes of the districts. The proposed plan, titled Proposed Conference Congressional 6/27, tries to answer some of the concerns vis a vis, 3rd Congressional District (CD) and what is known as the Lake Oswego/West Linn extension. The initial Minority Plan in the Senate Plan had an extension all the way down to Wilsonville. This proposed . . . , question."

291 WALDEN: "I don't mean to interrupt, but you said the Minority Plan in the Senate, did you mean the . . . ?"

292 MASON: "Minority Plan in the House and the Majority Plan in the Senate."

293 MASON: "Okay."

293 MASON: "Had it, (unintelligible) going all the way down to Wilsonville. You'll note that on the (unintelligible) map right in front of us. To address that we have backed off the 3rd CD from Wilsonville about up to 205. Maybe I best get out here with the mike. About up to 205 which is right here and then extended the 3rd CD into Dunthorpe to widen the neck and to make up the population, after you subtract population from the 3rd CD. We've taken the 3rd CD over into northwest Portland and then continued down here in the hills, left most of downtown in the 1st CD. The other two factors here are that the Lincoln County is also placed in the 5th CD and all of Yamhill County is placed in the 1st CD. This is put forth as a possible compromise. I know that the Majority Party in the House side would like to have this totally cleared out here. The Majority Party on the Senate side and our Congressional delegation would like to keep the 1st CD totally on the west side of Portland. So what you have here is somewhat of a backing off of the Lake Oswego/Clackamas County extension of the 3rd CD and indeed the 3rd CD does come over to the west side. Again this is just put forth as a possible compromise. This has been discussed with the Congressional delegation, I'm always loathe to speak for the Congressional delegation, but I think they can, they are in accordance with this. Like I said, if we wanted to one of the Congressional delegations would like to get on the speaker phone, but let's not tempt him."

332 COURTNEY: "Can I ask a question?"

334 UNKNOWN: "Rep. Courtney."

334 COURTNEY: "I want to know the House Minority Congressional Plan, is it the same or is it different from the Senate Majority Congressional Plan?"

338 MASON: "I can answer that, differs somewhat, it differs somewhat. You came into Dunthorpe slightly . . . maybe Gail can answer you better."

342 RYDER: "Rep. Courtney, are you talking about the original Senate Majority Congressional Plan or the amended version that you just voted on, you just received?"

345 COURTNEY: "One that came."

345 RYDER: "That you just refused to concur on? The first version that came over was identical to the Minority Plan, the second is an amended version of that."

349 MASON: "That comes into Dunthorpe, backs a little bit off the northwest corner of Oswego and changes the lines somewhat in Yamhill County, is that right? It's right. Those three things."

354 COURTNEY: "So I understand how this went. We went over with the Congressional Plan in the Senate. The Senate then took what we did and put their stamp of approval (unintelligible) put their finger prints all over it, right? Is that correct?"

360 RYDER: "Replaced it with the House Minority Congressional Plan."

361 COURTNEY: "Then what happened?"

363 RYDER: "Then the two, the legislative and the congressional were merged in the senate bill and that version which was your Minority Report was sent back to you."

365 COURTNEY: "Which we didn't concur on?"

366 RYDER: "That was sent back to you in the senate bill, SB 1000. Then last week we amended your house bill and sent over this amended version of your Minority Plan."

370 COURTNEY: "Okay. Can I get some background as to why that was done, the amendment was added. What was the politics or whatever you want to call it of that situation? Where did that amendment come from, of Dunthorpe? Just curious, is that. . ."

376 RYDER: "That amendment was suggested by Sen. Bradbury. The June 18 Congressional Map (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 6/19/91, oversize exhibit A, 2 maps) which changes some of the drawing in Yamhill County to consolidate the compactness and it also makes the 3rd CD around Lake Oswego more compact, by widening the neck."

385 MASON: "If I might, if you look at this in detail there's a little (unintelligible) northwest corner of Oswego and also expand the neck. Basically the same thing as this . . ."

388 RYDER: "It's this (reference Sen. Redistricting minutes for 6/19/91, oversize exhibit A, 2 maps)".

388 MASON: "Yeah, it's that there."

389 COURTNEY: "Can I ask one more question Mr. Chair?"

390 UNKNOWN: "Go ahead Rep. Mason, Rep. . . ."

391 COURTNEY: "Does the Congressional delegation support your amendment. (unintelligible) Representative that you talked with Les AuCoin, (unintelligible). Curious to know what you mean by the Congressional delegation (unintelligible)."

395 MASON: "Well I'm (unintelligible)..., the lead person back there so far has been Congressman Kopetski and again they speak for themselves, but I think they can live with this. I don't want to make any commitments. Congressmen are very sensitive people. They're . . ."

401 COURTNEY: "Very what?"

402 MASON: "Sensitive people, . . . But I think they can live with this Rep. Courtney. They have a few representatives here too, although they like to talk."

408 COURTNEY: "Thank you Mr. Chair."

410 OTTO: "Any other questions? Senator Walden, Representative Walden."

411 WALDEN: "I was just curious about, I think it was Ms. Ryder's comment about compactness. You expanded the neck that goes down through Lake Oswego down around Wilsonville or whatever to make the district more, the 3rd District, which is the blue one on this plan, more compact?"

419 RYDER: "3rd and the 1st."

422 WALDEN: "How does it make the 3rd more compact?"

423 MASON: "Mr. Chairman, may I make the comment (unintelligible) I think something needs to be clarified. Sen. Shoemaker (unintelligible) called this District 10, misread this map."

431 COURTNEY: "We're talking about (unintelligible)."

433 WALDEN: "Yes it was."

436 General conversation from many parties at once.

439 WALDEN: "Or was he looking at the June 19 A Alternative, where it is green?"

441 MASON: "Well the difference is that in ours this 11,000 people in Multnomah County pass to Washington County. In this plan the 11,000 or so people (unintelligible). He misread this, this is two different colors, this is yellow, light yellow and lighter yellow."

448 WALDEN: "Can you point out where his home is?"

449 MASON: "Right here on the border, this is your version."

450 WALDEN: "Right, because he indicated that in that district he was describing he lived on the fringe. I assumed he did understand the split in the colors. Cause otherwise, had he not understood that, he would have thought that plan put him in the middle north, middle of the Portland district."

461 OTTO: "Gail informs me that we're having difficulty in picking all of this conversation up on the tape, cause you're not using a walking microphone."

464 MASON: "We'll sit down."

465 RYDER: "One at a time."

467 OTTO: "And one at a time, yes. Rep. Mason, you have more for us?"

469 MASON: "Well Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether we should start with legislative or start with congressional."

471 OTTO: "I don't care which we start with, but just stay with one or the other."

473 MASON: "I've made my comment on legislative and I've presented my congressional. I think that might be a place to start now."

485 OTTO: "Rep. Walden and I talked earlier about when this meeting would adjourn tonight and we both agreed it should stop at 10:00, don't go beyond 10:00 p.m. We've been at it all day..."

493 SPRINGER: "Long day tomorrow."

493 OTTO: "...be a long day tomorrow. I guess the question is when can we start in the morning? Sen. Walden what do you think?"

496 WALDEN: "Well my understanding is the House is suppose to go in at 8:00. I would anticipate that we'll probably have a recess at some point in there."

TAPE 2, SIDE A

042 WALDEN: "Probably okay, probably in the early afternoon when we usually recess (unintelligible)."

043 UNKNOWN: "Well, but I think tomorrow that we may be on and off the floor more. We probably could meet sometime in the morning."

046 OTTO: "We should know by 9:00 in the morning?"

047 UNKNOWN: "We should, yes, we should know not long after 8:00 frankly."

047 RYDER: "Mr. Chair, if I might suggest, maybe we could schedule the meeting for 9:00 so that we could get within the one hour, and then whenever you actually meet we could update it on (unintelligible) so that you don't have to wait the extra hour."

050 OTTO: "Alright you'll post the . . ."

051 RYDER: "We'll post a notice for 9:00 a.m. in this room . . . then if you can't make it until after that . . ."

052 WALDEN: "So it will be in this room?"

052 RYDER: "We're leaving this set up for this purpose."

053 OTTO: "Is there anything else to bring before the body this evening. If not we're adjourned."

054 Meeting adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Verbatim Transcription By:

Reviewed By:

Joan Green  
Assistant  
Administrator

Gail Ryder  
Senior

EXHIBIT LOG

A - Oversize exhibit of "Leg. Metro June 19 A Alternative", Mason, 1  
maps B - Oversize exhibit of "Proposed Conf. Congressional 6/27", Mason,  
1 map