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Proposal 482 has been reviewed by the Environmental Center during a public hearing on August 7 for the Public Health and Welfare; Labor and Industry Committee. Our opinion on this proposal have not substantially changed so we are submitting to this committee our earlier review, RL:0295.
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Proposal No. 482 would revise certain provisions in the Constitution relating to conservation and development of resources; in essence shifting the placements of the provisions and strengthening them somewhat.

Conservation and development of natural beauty, and objects and places of historical or cultural interest would be deleted as a power of the State under Article VIII. However, 1) Provision for public sightliness would be made a duty as well as a power of the State under Article VIII; 2) Conservation of objects and places of historic interest would be made a duty as well as a power of the State under Article X; and 3) The responsibility placed in Article X on the Legislature to promote conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources of the State, would be transformed to a power and duty of the State to conserve and protect the natural resources.

The latter amendment is introduced as a replacement to Section 1 of Article X. The combination of conservation, development, and utilization in the present Section 1 seems to overemphasize development and use since conservation in itself means a wise balance of preservation and use. The proposed Section 1, which clearly includes protection from unreasonable development as well as development and utilization, would be a desirable substitute.