

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY - CRIMINAL LAW

April 30, 1999 Hearing Room 357

8:00 a.m. Tapes 171 - 173

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Mannix, Chair

Rep. Prozanski, Vice-Chair

Rep. Bowman

Rep. Gianella

Rep. Hansen

Rep. Simmons

Rep. Sunseri

STAFF PRESENT: John Horton, Counsel

Patsy Wood, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

HB 3586 Work Session

HB 3378 Work Session

HB 3084 Work Session

HB 3110 Work Session

HB 3492 Work Session

HB 2744 Work Session

HB 3395 Work Session

HB 3044 Work Session

HB 2397 Work Session

HB 2562 Work Session

HJM 10 Work Session

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
TAPE 171, A		
007	Chair Mannix	Calls the meeting to order at 8:12 a.m.
<u>HB 3586 WORK SESSION</u>		
016	Rep. Lane Shetterly	State Representative, House District 34 HB 3586 allows a person sentenced to life imprisonment for murder to be eligible for parole after serving a mandatory minimum sentence. Discusses why ORS 163.115 (5)(a) is constitutionally flawed because it does not allow parole for a murder conviction when the statute for aggravated murder, a greater offense, does allow for parole.
046	Diane Rea	Director, Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision Testifies and submits written testimony in support of HB 3586 (EXHIBIT A). States that a review is to be held after 20 years of a minimum mandatory 25-year sentence has been served for murder, but the Board does not have a clear understanding of what is supposed to happen at that hearing. Discusses the amendments the Board is proposing that have been drafted as the ñ3 amendments (EXHIBIT B).
068	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3586-3 amendments dated 04/28/99.
073	Rep. Sunseri	Are you saying that someone convicted of murder and sentenced to a life sentence can be eligible for parole after serving their minimum mandatory sentence?
078	Rep. Shetterly	Yes.
078	Chair Mannix	This is a structural change to accommodate earlier sentences to make sure that they are properly processed in the system.
084	Rea	The court ruled that the "life" portion of the sentence is no longer valid. A life sentence for murder has to have a parole mechanism otherwise it is just a determinate sentence and that is inconsistent with the current statute.

090	Rep. Shetterly	That is correct. Discusses the discrepancy in statute between someone sentenced for aggravated murder being eligible for parole and a person sentenced for murder is not subject to parole.
111	Rep. Sunseri	Are we saying a person can't be sentenced for life without parole?
113	Chair Mannix	No. A person convicted of aggravated murder can be sentenced to life without parole, or life with a possibility of parole after 30 years. The murder statute says you can be sentenced to life imprisonment or a mandatory minimum of 25 years, there is no discussion of the possibility of parole. This legislation addresses the discrepancy that gives a longer sentence for the lesser crime of murder.
129	Dale Penn	Oregon District Attorney's Association The intent of the court is that there must be a stair-step approach for these crimes. Intentional murder receives a 25-year mandatory minimum sentence with parole authority. For aggravated murder you start with a 30-year mandatory minimum with the possibility of parole, or life imprisonment without parole or the death penalty.
143	Chair Mannix	All you get for murder now is 25 years, not the life with the possibility of parole.
149		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
152	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 3586 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
154	Chair Mannix	Should there be an emergency clause on HB 3586?
158	Rep. Prozanski	No.
163		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. REP. SHETTERLY will lead discussion on the floor.

166	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3586.
<u>HB 3378 WORK SESSION</u>		
175	Chair Mannix	HB 3378 requires all cemeteries in the state to register or obtain a certificate from the State Mortuary and Cemetery Board. Discusses the ñ6 amendments to HB 3378 (EXHIBIT C).
203	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3378-6 amendments dated 04/29/99 and that the measure be FURTHER AMENDED on page 2, line 26, by changing "Compile" to "Maintain", and by changing all references of "Pioneer Cemetery Advisory Committee" to "Pioneer Cemetery Commission".
		VOTE: 7-0
		Chair Mannix
		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
211	Chair Mannix	Explains the rationale behind establishing the Pioneer Cemetery Commission within the Parks and Recreation Department, and expanding the membership of the Commission to seven members. Discusses the need to be sensitive to the Native American burial sites throughout Oregon.
265	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 3378 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
		Chair Mannix
		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
		REP. MANNIX will lead discussion on the floor.
273	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3378.

HB 3084 WORK SESSION

289	Counsel Horton	HB 3084 allows a conditional discharge for first misdemeanor offense. Discusses the ñ1 amendments and the ñ2 amendments to HB 3084 (EXHIBITS D & E).
315	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3084-2 amendments dated 04/27/99.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
335	Rep. Sunseri	What kind of sentences could a judge administer for a misdemeanor?
341	Counsel Horton	A Class A misdemeanor can get up to one year in jail and/or a fine of up to \$5,000. Discusses lines 5 and 6 of HB 3084 that proceedings are deferred and the person is placed on probation at the motion of the district attorney.
350	Rep. Sunseri	A criticism of Measure 11 is that the district attorneyís are making too many of the decisions. Does this legislation just give more discretion to the district attorney?
358	Chair Mannix	Rather than district attorneyís moving forward with cases, this legislation allows them to take a step back and agree to this program of probation.
370	Rep. Bowman	Under current law the judge has the authority to set the sentence aside. But in this case, it sounds like a decision canít be made by the judge without the district attorneyís concurrence.
378	Counsel Horton	HB 3084 allows the district attorney instead of the judge to make the determination of a conditional discharge.
390	Chair Mannix	The judge has the power, but allows the district attorney to make the motion.
396	Rep. Sunseri	Does that invest the judgeís power in the district attorney?
398	Chair Mannix	No, because it is the judge who makes the final determination to grant or deny the motion.
402	Counsel Horton	Rep. Patridge would answer questions if necessary.

	Rep. Sunseri	
412	Chair Mannix	The judge makes the final determination on how to proceed with the case, but this legislation allows the district attorney to bring up the motion for probation earlier in the proceeding.
417	Rep. Sunseri	Can't the judge make a determination not to sentence already?
422	Counsel Horton	Currently, the person could be found guilty but given no sentence. Under this legislation, the judge, under direction of the district attorney, could put the person on probation without entering the judgement of guilt.
434	Chair Mannix	Recesses the work session on HB 3084.
TAPE 172, A		
<u>HB 3110 WORK SESSION</u>		
023	Counsel Horton	HB 3110 requires a mandatory 10-year minimum sentence for manufacturing various controlled substances. Introduces the 5 amendments that limit the controlled substance to methamphetamine and lower the mandatory minimum sentence depending upon certain circumstances (EXHIBIT F).
034	Rep. Prozanski	I am concerned about starting mandatory minimum sentencing for drug offenses. Discusses how prisons are becoming crowded with people incarcerated for non-violent drug offenses and that prisons are not equipped to handle inmates with drug dependencies.
051	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3110-5 amendments dated 04/28/99.
055	Rep. Hansen	I am more concerned with adopting a mandatory minimum tied to one specific drug. Discusses the problems when singling out a specific drug to target with legislation. Discusses the 3 amendments to HB 3110 (EXHIBIT G).
073	Rep. Sunseri	Methamphetamine labs are extremely dangerous and should be eliminated from neighborhoods.
085	Rep. Bowman	Discusses the inequity between the federal mandatory minimum for prosecution of methamphetamine at 100 grams and the state saying only 10 grams should receive a mandatory minimum sentence. Offenders would want to be tried in federal court rather than state court because the threshold for prosecution is higher in federal court.
099	Chair Mannix	VOTE: 4-3

		AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES.
105	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves HB 3110 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation and BE REFERRED to the committee on Ways and Means.
		VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES.
116	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3110.
<u>HB 3084 RECONVENES WORK SESSION</u>		
130	Rep. Rob Patridge	State Representative, House District 50 HB 3084 is necessary because there are judges in Oregon who will not agree to a deferred sentence because it is not within the statute. Discusses reasons why a district attorney's office would want to use a conditional discharge program.
159	Rep. Bowman	Did you say that judges are reluctant to use this opportunity because it does not specifically state in statute that they have the authority to do so?
164	Rep. Patridge	Yes.
167	Rep. Bowman	When a person is given a deferred sentence now, is that decision made by the judge or made by the judge only at the request of the district attorney?
180	Rep. Patridge	Only when the district attorney asks the judge to do that.
187	Rep. Prozanski	Could the judge decide not to sentence the person?

193	Rep. Patridge	The judge could decide not to sentence a person even if they are found guilty.
195	Rep. Prozanski	You're trying to put a program into statute where the district attorney allows someone to go into a program similar to diversion, but a guilty plea has to be filed prior to entering the program?
203	Rep. Patridge	Yes.
203	Rep. Prozanski	If they fail to comply with the conditions of the program, their guilty plea has already been received by the court, but has not been entered as a judgement?
208	Rep. Patridge	Yes.
209	Rep. Prozanski	The district attorney can bring the motion to defer forward, but that doesn't impinge on the judge's powers to make the final determination on deferral.
217	Rep. Patridge	That is correct. The judge can do whatever he wants. This is a way to move forward from the district attorney's standpoint.
220	Rep. Bowman	If the district attorney decides to ask the judge to set aside the sentence, why is the district attorney taking the case to trial in the first place?
228	Rep. Patridge	It is a way to allow district attorney's a choice in the charging and in the handling of cases.
247	Chair Mannix	Wouldn't the passage of this legislation encourage district attorney's to use this practice so more people would have fewer judgements of conviction because their case would be dismissed after they completed the diversion program?
252	Rep. Patridge	I don't know if this deferral practice would be done more by district attorneys, but it would be a way to formalize this process.
256	Chair Mannix	If this deferral process is put into statute, won't it give more people an escape clause from prosecution?
260	Rep. Patridge	Yes.
271	Rep. Prozanski	HB 3084 is trying to bring forth uniformity in the way these deferrals are handled throughout the state.
303	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3084-1 amendments dated 04/22/99.

		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
307	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 3084 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
	Chair Mannix	VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Hansen, Prozanski, Simmons, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Gianella, Sunseri
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES. REP. PATRIDGE will lead discussion on the floor.
323	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3084.
<u>HB 3492 WORK SESSION</u>		
339	Mark Gardner	Special Counsel to Attorney General HB 3492 prohibits a person under 18 years of age from purchasing tobacco products. Discusses "gray market" cigarettes that have been exported and then brought back into the United States for sale and the ñ5 amendments that address this problem (EXHIBIT H). Discusses an oversight in the legislation with the notice that should be going to the retailers and the timing for the state to go in and confiscate the illegal cigarettes.
413	Rep. Prozanski	Discusses buying cigarettes at a PX on a military base. Is there a concern that cigarettes might be coming from a military base back into the general population for resale?
TAPE 171, B		

002	Gardner	Those cigarettes shouldn't be a problem because those would be domestic cigarettes.
005	Rep. Prozanski	Are cigarettes sold on a military base shown on tobacco company's accounts as domestic cigarettes?
008	Gardner	I will look into that and if it is a problem, we can address that on the Senate side.
021	Chair Mannix	The five amendments replace the original version of HB 3492.
034	Mark Nelson	R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Testifies in support of HB 3492 and the five amendments.
048	Rep. Prozanski	I have amendments being drafted to HB 3492 that would prohibit the <i>attempt</i> to buy tobacco products by a minor.
061	Rep. Simmons	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 3492-5 amendments dated 04/28/99.
		VOTE: 7-0
		Chair Mannix Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
065	Rep. Simmons	MOTION: Moves HB 3492 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
		Chair Mannix Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. REP. SIMMONS will lead discussion on the floor.
069	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3492

HB 2744 WORK SESSION

072	Counsel Horton	HB 2744 requires county juvenile departments to enter specified information about youths into the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) utilized by counties and the state. Discusses the ñ 1 amendments to HB 2744 (EXHIBIT I).
085	Karen Brazeau	Deputy Director, Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) Testifies in support of HB 2744 and the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT I).
089	Chair Mannix	Should we assume that the counties will cooperate with any state statutes?
093	Brazeau	Yes.
099	Rep. Hansen	There are some technical problems with the coordination in the Multnomah County juvenile justice system. Would there be formatting problems with Y2K if Multnomah County moved ahead of the state system?
108	Brazeau	Multnomah County was planning to use the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) until a year ago when they decided to build their own data entry system. This new system is being built in conformance with the requirements of JJIS and HB 2744. We haven't figured out the technical transfer of the information, but we are confident that will be resolved.
118	Chair Mannix	Is Multnomah County objecting to the approach taken in this bill?
120	Brazeau	Multnomah County is very supportive of this approach.
122	Nancy Miller	State Court Administrator's Office Testifies in support of HB 2744 and the ñ1 amendments. The Judicial Department is working in cooperation with OYA in the development of JJIS, even though JJIS won't supplant our need for the juvenile Oregon Judicial Information Network (OJIN). We are trying to build links between those two systems to avoid duplicating data.
132	Rep. Sunseri	Could someone comment on the "confidentiality of information" on line 8 of page 1 of the ñ1 amendments?
135	Brazeau	JJIS is being developed as a shared database so there have to be rules governing who will have access to this information.
142	Rep. Sunseri	I am concerned that employees will not be able to help frustrated parents looking for information because the employee won't have access to that information.

154	Brazeau	We do not want to limit existing confidentiality laws in any way. The same confidentiality laws that govern dependent children have governed youth offenders, and there may be employees who do not know that those confidentiality laws have changed and are much more open than they used to be.
175	Rep. Bowman	When do you expect these systems to be fully integrated?
177	Brazeau	The timeline for JJIS linked with counties is by the end of the calendar year. The linking of these systems will allow every county juvenile department and the state to share information on juvenile offenders.
234	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2744-1 amendments dated 04/28/99.
		VOTE: 7-0
Chair Mannix		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
238	Rep. Simmons	MOTION: Moves HB 2744 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
Chair Mannix		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. REP. SIMMONS will lead discussion on the floor.
242	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2744.
<u>HB 3395 WORK SESSION</u>		
249	Counsel Horton	HB 3395 modifies the rules of evidence relating to hearsay.
260	Rep. Prozanski	Discusses his concern with HB 3395 having ramifications throughout the judicial system for years to come.

281	Rep. Bowman	I understand that there is an amendment being drafted for HB 3395 to apply only to domestic violence.
293	Dale Penn	Oregon District Attorney's Association We are proposing an amendment to narrow this legislation, but that will have to be referred to Legislative Counsel to draft into final form.
305	Rep. Prozanski	We should consider the time frame for reporting domestic violence and how it will be applied because 24 hours could be too much time allowing someone to not report immediately.
342	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3395.
<u>HB 3044 WORK SESSION</u>		
367	Brian DeLashmutt	Oregon Council of Police Associations Discusses the 11 amendments (EXHIBIT J) to HB 3044 that provides the process for an expedited hearing in certain circumstances when public safety personnel request HIV or hepatitis testing of source person.
422	Bradd Swank	State Court Administrator's Office HB 3044 creates a probable cause-type proceeding with the 11 amendments similar to a search warrant, because the police would be searching a person's body. This legislation can be used against people who may or may not be in custody. Page 2, line 19 of HB 3044 says "the court shall order the testing", but it does not state who will do the testing if the person is in custody.
TAPE 172, B		
024	Chair Mannix	Shouldn't the court exercise common sense at that point?
025	Swank	Discusses his concern with who is going to serve the papers when the court orders the testing.
035	Chair Mannix	Are the results to these tests made available to the prosecution?
036	Swank	No.
036	Chair Mannix	Then why do you keep saying it is similar to a search warrant because a search warrant implies that evidence is being gathered to be used against someone in a criminal case?

043	Swank	The reason I say it is similar to a search warrant is because you have an ex parte proceeding where the other party is not allowed to participate.
044	Chair Mannix	Then it is similar to a temporary restraining order.
046	Swank	You are ordering a search of the person's body. The constitutional provisions that apply to the state ordering a search would apply in both criminal and civil circumstances.
057	Chair Mannix	But this isn't the state seeking the evidence for a case. It is an individual wanting to know if they have been exposed to HIV.
059	Swank	But it is the state ordering the search of a person based on the application in an ex parte proceeding.
064	Chair Mannix	Do you have a better idea about how we can help these people?
065	Swank	I don't, but I'm trying to make you aware of this issue. The sheriff should do the serving of the notice.
075	Chair Mannix	Don't we have a generic statute that calls for the sheriff to serve orders of the court?
077	Swank	No, that is why I am raising the issue.
091	Rep. Bowman	Unless there is a violent situation, do law enforcement officers come into contact with bodily fluids on a daily basis like EMTs?
100	DeLashmutt	A police officer could be the first person at the scene of a traffic accident and be exposed to blood or other bodily fluids.
108	Rep. Bowman	Are we going to require anyone who comes into contact with bodily fluids to be tested for HIV?
122	DeLashmutt	Discusses that there are two filters in this bill. The first filter is the health-care provider. If someone believes they have been exposed to HIV, the health care provider can determine if the test needs to be run and preventative measures need to be taken. The second filter is the information given to the judge who can determine if exposure to bodily fluids occurred and the tests for HIV need to be run.
148	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 3044.
<u>HJM 10 WORK SESSION</u>		

160	Rep. Simmons	MOTION: Moves to RECONSIDER the vote by which "HJM 10 was sent to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation".
	Chair Mannix	VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES.
193	Rep. Simmons	MOTION: Moves to TABLE HJM 10 until Monday.
	Chair Mannix	VOTE: 3-4 AYE: 3 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri NAY: 4 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski, Mannix
	Chair Mannix	The motion FAILS.
208	Rep. MANNIX:	MOTION: Moves HJM 10 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski, Mannix NAY: 3 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES. REP. BOWMAN will lead discussion on the floor.
224	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HJM 10.

HB 2397 WORK SESSION

229	Counsel Horton	The ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT K) make HB 2397 a gut and stuff.
232	Chair Mannix	There were 900+ people who had their licenses revoked after certain legislation was passed and this bill would allow them to reapply for reinstatement of driving privileges. Do the ñ1 amendments include changes being proposed to SB 1207 this session?
267	Counsel Horton	Yes. The ñ1 amendments inserted into SB 1207 would be the new piece of legislation.
270	Chair Mannix	Pages 26 and 27 of the ñ1 amendments apply to the clemency portion of this legislation for a person to get their driver's license reinstated.
280	Rep. Prozanski	Discusses the impact on these 900+ people that had their reinstated licenses revoked.
305	Chair Mannix	I would suggest proceeding with only Section 11 & Section 12, the clemency program, of the ñ1 amendments.
314	Chair Mannix	MOTION: Moves to SUSPEND the rules for the purpose of adopting a conceptual amendment.
		VOTE: 7-0
		Chair Mannix Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
319	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT only Section 11 and Section 12 of the ñ1 amendments to HB 2397 dated 04/28/99.
326	Rep. Simmons	Is SB 1207 moving through the Senate?
328	Chair Mannix	Yes. Section 11 and Section 12 are consistent with SB 1207.
344		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.

346	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 2397 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. REP. MANNIX will lead discussion on the floor.
354	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2397.
<u>HB 2562 WORK SESSION</u>		
393	Counsel Horton	HB 2562 establishes additional mandatory periods of imprisonment for a person convicted of major crimes if the person has a previous conviction for major crimes, aggravated murder or murder. Discusses the changes made to HB 2562 by the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT L).
TAPE 173, A		
009	Rep. Prozanski	Does HB 2562 have a referral to Ways and Means?
010	Chair Mannix	Because the ñ1 amendments make this legislation a referral to the voters, it would not be referred to Ways and Means.
018	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2562-1 amendments dated 04/23/99.
020	Rep. Bowman	Will this bill be part of the special election or would the vote come at the next general election?
023	Chair Mannix	The next general election.
028	Chair Mannix	VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski

	Chair	The motion CARRIES.
038	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to the floor with a BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED recommendation and the SUBSEQUENT REFERRAL to the committee on Ways and Means BE RESCINDED.
040	Rep. Hansen	Even though this legislation is going to the general election, would there be a fiscal impact?
042	Chair Mannix	That would be added to the ballot cost.
046	Rep. Hansen	Doesn't each referral raise the cost of the election?
047	Chair Mannix	They normally would, but if you put something on the general election ballot, it does not go to Ways and Means. You can send it to Ways and Means if you want to, but then there cannot be a minority report.
059	Rep. Prozanski	Why has previous legislation dealing with repeat property offenders not been sufficient?
067	Chair Mannix	It doesn't get enough bad guys for long enough.
071		VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES. REP. MANNIX will lead discussion on the floor.
079	Rep. Prozanski	Serves notice of a possible minority report.
082	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2562.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Patsy Wood, Sarah Watson,

Administrative Support Office Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - HB 3586, written testimony submitted by Diane Rea, Parole Board, dated 4/27/99, 2 pgs.

B - HB 3856, -3 amendments (LC 4093), dated 4/28/99, Diane Rea, 3 pgs.

C - HB 3378, -6 amendments (LC 2070), dated 4/29/99, staff, 6 pgs.

D - HB 3084, -1 amendments (LC 2105), dated 4/22/99, staff, 1 pg.

E - HB 3084, -2 amendments (LC 2105), dated 4/27/99, staff, 2 pgs.

F - HB 3110, -5 amendments (LC 3120), dated 4/28/99, staff, 1 pg.

G - HB 3110, -3 amendments (LC 3120), dated 4/26/99, staff, 1 pg.

H - HB 3492, -5 amendments (LC 2168), dated 4/28/99, Mark Gardner, DOJ, 5 pgs

I - HB 2744, -1 amendments (LC 2818), dated 4/28/99, staff, 1 pg.

J - HB 3044, -1 amendments (LC 2728), dated 4/29/99, staff, 1 pg.

K - HB 2397, -1 amendments (LC 439), dated 4/28/99, staff, 27 pgs.

L - HB 2562, -1 amendments (LC 2501), dated 4/23/99, staff, 2 pgs.

M - HB 3110, written testimony submitted by Steve Dingle, Marion Co. District Attorney's Office, dated 4/26/99, 16 pgs.