## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

## **SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAW**

January 21, 1997 Hearing Room 357

1:00 pm Tapes 4-6

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** 

Rep. JOHN MINNIS, Chair

Rep. JOANN BOWMAN, Vice-Chair

**Rep. PETER COURTNEY** 

**Rep. FLOYD PROZANSKI** 

**Rep. LANE SHETTERLY** 

**Rep. RON SUNSERI** 

**Rep. LARRY WELLS** 

**MEMBER EXCUSED:** 

**STAFF PRESENT:** 

SCOTT LUMSDEN, Counsel

**BRIAN HIGGINS, Administrative Support** 

**MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:** 

Public Hearing HB 2091

HB 2168

HB 2226

HB 2240

HB 2242

HB 2263

HB 2276

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 4, A                  |                |  |
|                            |                |  |
| <u>HB 2091 -</u><br>PUBLIC |                |  |
| HEARING                    |                |  |
| <u>OPENED</u>              |                |  |
|                            |                |  |
| 009                        | Janis Eliot    | Administrator for the Childcare Division of the Oregon<br>Employment Department Submits written testimony in<br>favor of HB 2091 [EXHIBIT A]. Discusses issue of<br>childcare personnel working in various agencies and that   |
|                            |                | applications will be from individual, not from employer.   |
|                            |                |  |
| 090                        | Chair Minnis   | Asks for clarification of "three year issue."  |
|                            |                |  |
| 102                        | Eliot          | Responds, defining the three year issue.   |
|                            |                |  |
| 108                        | Rep. Prozanski | Asks for clarification of employee request of verifications.   |
| 111                        |                |  |
| 111                        | Eliot          | Responds.  |
| 128                        | Rep. Prozanski | Inquires about the cost entailed to agency or employer.  |
| 120                        |                | Inquires about the cost entance to agency of employer.   |
| 131                        | Eliot          | Explains that a fee of \$3.00 would be imposed for those in<br>certified facilities, presumably paid by the employee,<br>although the employer could volunteer to pay, but the<br>difference is that the responsibility for getting the work<br>done necessary to have the clearance would be the<br>employee's. |
|                            |                |  |
| 144                        | Eliot          | Discusses the problem that if employee's history is revealed, employer is notified of problem without details.   |
|                            |                |  |
| 153                        | Rep. Prozanski | Asks if employee would have to obtain verification more<br>than once if continuously employed. Inquires on how one<br>can verify if someone has left the state.  |
|                            |                |  |
|                            |                | Responds and comments that they currently operate on the   |

| 155 | Eliot          | employee's word concerning whether or not they have left<br>the state.  |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 163 | Rep. Bowman    | Asks why the provider (company) should not pay the fee<br>due to level of wages for employee.   |
| 165 | Eliot          | Responds and comments on the need to better coordinate<br>fee schedules, even though she believes the current fee is<br>not a burden.   |
| 196 | Rep. Bowman    | Asks why the burden should not be on the provider.  |
| 200 | Eliot          | Responds and comments on the need to separate fees from the philosophy of childcare as a profession.  |
| 230 | Chair Minnis   | Asks for clarification on the problem that is being addressed.  |
| 234 | Eliot          | Responds that there is a public concern for safety of<br>children and there is a lack of regulation in the field of<br>childcare. Feels the base for childcare should not simply be<br>a criminal background check. |
| 242 | Chair Minnis   | Clarifies that the reasoning for doing background checks is to eliminate people who would be harmful to children.   |
| 252 | Rep. Shetterly | Asks if the commencement of employment may not coincide with verification.  |
| 256 | Eliot          | Responds and notes that they have not yet figured out the most efficient way to handle the problem.   |
| 291 | Rep. Wells     | Relays example of constituent about time required to complete all of the necessities.   |
| 310 | Eliot          | Responds and comments that last summer was affected by SB 1078, but they have gotten through the problem. This bill will reduce workload.   |
| 381 | Chair Minnis   | Asks how the agency relate to SCF.  |

| 383  | Eliot          | Responds   |
|--|----------------|--|
| 395  | Chair Minnis   | Asks why there would be a need to renew the registry every two years.  |
| TAPE 5, A  |                |  |
| 010  | Eliot          | Responds and discussion follows.   |
| 019  | Chair Minnis   | Asks why this needs to be done over and over, becoming redundant.  |
| 022  | Rep. Shetterly | Asks if out-of-state information would be collected and<br>expresses concern over the period of time someone may be<br>ou of work while waiting for renewal. |
| 025  | Eliot          | Responds and discussion follows  |
| 054  | Rep. Prozanski | Asks what the criteria would be that would cause someone to be ineligible for employment.  |
| 056  | Eliot          | Comments that she would like to come back to do informational presentation.  |
| 067  | Tom Barrows    | Represents Oregon YMCAs Expresses concern with specific portions of the bill that deal with the probationary period.   |
| 090  | Chair Minnis   | Comments that he would like to see clearer language within the bill.   |
| HB 2091 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED<br>HB 2276 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING |                |  |

| <u>OPENED</u> |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| 115           | Rep. Corcoran and<br>John Holleman from<br>Oregon Independent<br>Miners | Would like to see a class C felony. There is a lot of mining<br>in his district. Would like, at some point, to submit<br>testimony from an officer from fish and game. |
| 165           | Holleman  | Submits written testimony in support of HB 2276<br>[EXHIBIT B].  |
| 195           | Rep. Wells  | Asks whether current trespass laws are strong enough or if this simply addresses loss of minerals.   |
| 198           | Holleman  | Responds.  |
| 237           | Rep. Corcoran   | Comments on the need for specific mining laws.   |
| 256           | Rep. Sunseri  | Asks if any claims are on real property and whether property rights laws cover such.   |
| 258           | Holleman  | Responds and explains that there are no mineral trespass<br>laws though damage to equipment would be covered under<br>existing law.                                    |
| 264           | Rep. Shetterly  | Comments on the sense that this should be covered by existing law but would like to refer to legislative counsel first.  |
| 279           | Rep. Prozanski  | Suggets focus on three areas: criminal mischief, criminal trespass and theft.  |
| 283           | Holleman  | Comments that in 1971, Oregon's mineral trespass laws were repealed.   |
| 288           | Rep. Shetterly  | Comments that in 1971 substantial adoptions on criminal code were made.  |
| 306           | Chair Minnis  | States that he would like to have counsel do some research<br>on why this was changed and to obtain information from<br>Trooper Hageford to see what his opinon is.    |

| HB 2276 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED |                                |   |
|--|--------------------------------|---|
| HB 2168 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>OPENED |                                |   |
| 370                                      | Barry S. Kast                  | Administrator of the Mental Health and Developmental<br>Disablilities Service Division Submits written testimony in<br>support of HB 2168 [EXHIBIT C].                    |
| 377                                      | Rep. Courtney                  | Asks who can obtain a patient, who has committed<br>"multiple murders," once they have escaped.   |
| 392                                      | Stabley F. Mazur<br>Hart, Ph.D | Superintendant Responds.  |
| <u>TAPE 4, B</u>                         |                                |   |
| 013                                      | Rep. Courtney                  | Asks on what basis someone is out of state.   |
| 015                                      | Mazur Hart                     | Responds and cites an example of an incident in Arizona.  |
| 022                                      | Rep. Prozanski                 | Expresses difficulty understanding need for this legislation.<br>Questions the need to set up a separate process which takes<br>away from the current check and balances. |
| 026                                      | Kast                           | Responds and comments that the purpose is for timeliness<br>and the need to get people back into custody.   |
| 046                                      | Rep. Prozanski                 | Questions why something can't be worked out to accomplish the same thing under current law.   |
| 048                                      | Mazur Hart                     | Responds  |
| 067                                      | Chair Minnis                   | Comments on probable cause and differences in state   |

|     |                | jurisdictions.  |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 081 | Rep. Prozanski | Inquires about the duty to go through same process.   |
| 084 | Kast           | Responds and comments that theYouth Authority Chapter 4.2915 has authority to issue warrants.   |
| 090 | Rep. Courtney  | Asks if the justice department requested this be done.  |
| 092 | Mazur Hart     | Responds and comments that the reasoning came from<br>working with the State Police and trying to return people in<br>a timely manner.    |
| 113 | Kast           | Comments that the PSRB has the authority to issue<br>warrants only for released patients, rather than those who<br>have escaped.          |
| 121 | Rep. Courtney  | Comments that he introduced legislation in 1983.  |
| 132 | Rep. Sunseri   | Expresses that he is reluctant to pass around police powers<br>and asks how long it has taken to obtain a warrant to return<br>a patient. |
| 143 | Mazur Hart     | Responds that one instance took 3-4 days.   |
| 149 | Rep. Shetterly | Comments that this would be handing over judcial powers.  |
| 159 | Rep. Courtney  | Asks if at the moment of the escape if they have the authority to "jump on it" immediately.   |
| 162 | Kast           | Responds with regard to procedure and discussion continues.   |
|     |                | Comments on the straddling of 2 principles: public safety and obligation to the patients.   |
| 180 | Rep. Courtney  | Expresses desire for counsel to accompany testifiers in order to help clarify technicalities.   |
|     |                | OCDLA Comments that the members have already raised many of the issues she planned on raising. Would like to                              |

| 222                                      | Ingrid Swensen  | discuss standards such as probable cause. Clarification of escapes vs. non-escapes  |
|--|-----------------|---|
| 268                                      | Chair Minnis    | Asks if probable cause is relevant and discussion follows.  |
| HB 2168 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED |                 |   |
| HB 2226 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>OPENED |                 | - 1(  |
| 273                                      | Beverlee Venell | Grant Manager for the Criminal Justice Service Division of<br>the Oregon State Police Submits written testimony for HB<br>2226 [EXHIBIT D]. |
| 318                                      | Chair Minnis    | Asks why the bill is being heard.   |
| 320                                      | Venell          | Responds and comments that she is unclear, as it entails day-to-day operations.   |
| 326                                      | Rep. Prozanski  | Asks if someone requested Venell to testify?  |
| 327                                      | Venell          | Responds, "no."   |
| 329                                      | Rep. Shetterly  | Asks why legislative authority is needed.   |
| 333                                      | Chair Minnis    | Asks if Ways and Means would have a problem.  |
| 342                                      | Rep. Prozanski  | Comments that he is fearful of precident setting.   |
| 348                                      | Rep. Wells      | Comments on the need for matching funds and questions<br>whether or not matching funds apply here.  |
| 356                                      | Venell          | Responds and notes that very few situations do not require matching funds.  |

| 372   | Rep. Bowman        | Asks if approving this request to will get 25% matching funds needed for the application.   |
|---|--------------------|---|
| 380   | Venell             | Responds.   |
| 388   | Chair Minnis       | Comments that he believes the Department of State Police does not have a strong stance on this bill.  |
| 402   | Major Lee Erickson | Operations Bureau Commander of the Oregon State Police<br>Comments on the strong partnership between the<br>department and the legislature when conducting such<br>applications.  |
| HB 2226 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED<br>HB 2240 - |                    |   |
| PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>OPENED<br>Tape 5, B              |                    |   |
| 009   | Kelly Taylor       | Department of Transportation Written testimony submitted<br>by Sandy Wood, Department of Transportation for HB<br>2240 [EXHIBIT E].   |
| 035   | Ingrid Swensen     | Oregon Criminal Defense Lawyer's Association in support<br>of bill and disusses the purpose of the bill: to allow a<br>person who has been arrested for but not convicted of a<br>traffic offense to have the fact of that arrest expunged. |
| 057   | Rep. Shetterly     | Asks how a DUII diversion is reflected on the record now.   |
| 058   | Swensen            | Responds.   |
| 062   | Taylor             | Answers that part of the entry on the driving record is the date they entered diversion and the date of arrest.   |
|   |                    | Asks if the record shows if they went into the diversion  |

| 064  | Rep. Prozanski | DIVR then prosecutors would know by looking if they were eligible for that program. |
|--|----------------|---|
| 067  | Taylor         | Responds that is correct and that the word "diversion" stays<br>on for 10 years.    |
| 071  | Rep. Shetterly | Asks if it is possible to amend this to exclude arrests on diversion.               |
| 074  | Taylor         | Responds that she would like to clarify the language.                               |
| HB 2240 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED<br>HB 2263 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>OPENED |                |   |
|  |                | Deputy State Court Administrator Submits written                                    |
| 100  | Doug Bray      | testimony in favor of HB 2263 [EXHIBIT F].  |
| 158  | Rep. Sunseri   | Expresses conern about position of judgment in terms of lender.                     |
| 166  | Bray           | Responds that duty belongs to registered owners.                                    |
| 180  | Rep. Sunseri   | Asks how the lending institution deals with title on car.                           |
| 187  | Bray           | Responds that judgment is the registered owner's.                                   |
| 200  | Rep. Sunseri   | Asks for clarification on effect on lenders of automobiles.                         |
| 203  | Bray           | Responds.   |
| 200  |                |   |

| 222 | Bray           | Comments that the language was taken from current<br>procedures and that he agrees circumstances are different<br>for parking infractions.  |
|-----|----------------|---|
| 233 | Rep. Bowman    | Asks for clarification of inter-county processes.   |
| 239 | Bray           | Responds that she would still need to go through the process.   |
| 245 | Rep. Bowman    | Asks when the process kicks in.   |
| 248 | Bray           | Answers that the fine does double once only, and the notice<br>would kick in within 15 days of citation giving you options<br>to appear. After 60 days, the court could enter judgement<br>against the owner. |
| 266 | Rep. Bowman    | Asks why just Multnomah county.   |
| 268 | Bray           | Responds that it has the only state court involved with parking tickets.  |
| 273 | Rep. Shetterly | Speculates that judgment could be transcribed to another county.  |
| 280 | Bray           | Comments that the court can take any collection action desired.   |
| 299 | Rep.Sunseri    | Asks for clarification between money judgment vs. lien.   |
| 303 | Bray           | Responds that the lien only applies if it is a money judgment.  |
| 322 | Chair Minnis   | Asks for clarification on history of pilot program and if there is a sunset.  |
| 325 | Bray           | Responds that there is no sunset on program.  |
| 333 | Chair Minnis   | Asks if it is profitable.   |

| 335  | Bray          | Responds that he is not sure but comments that this legislation is a key piece.  |
|--|---------------|--|
| 340  | Chair Minnis  | Asks what the population is in Marion Co.  |
| 342  | Rep. Courtney | Comments that "parking fines is dangerous stuff."  |
| 367  | Bray          | Responds that this bill would do less towing. Comments that towing is a very intrusive process.  |
| 383  | Chair Minnis  | Asks if the bill changes any procedures on noted legislation.  |
| 390  | Bray          | Responds that it does not change existing procedures but compliments them.   |
| 400  | Frank Brawner | Oregon Banker's Association Expresses concerns: nothing<br>in bill limits it to automobiles and feels it could start going<br>against real property. |
| TAPE 6, A  |               |  |
| 018  | Chair Minnis  | Comments that Bray should consult the Oregon Banker's Association.   |
| HB 2263 -<br>PUBLIC<br>HEARING<br>CLOSED<br>MEETING<br>ADJOURNED AT<br>2:55 P.M. |               |  |

Transcribed By, Reviewed By,

LISA FRITZ, SCOTT LUMSDEN,

Administrative Support Counsel

## EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A HB 2091, Letter to Representatives and Background Information, Janis Eliot, 7 pp.
- B HB 2276, Written testimony and Support Letters, John Holleman, 5 pp.
- C HB 2168, Written testimony, Barry S. Kast, 1 p.
- D HB 2226, Written testimony, Beverlee Venell, 2 pp.
- E HB 2240, Written testimony, Sandy Wood, 1 p.
- F HB 2263, Written testimony, Douglas M. Bray, 3 pp.