

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND REGULATORY REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY REFORM

February 6, 1995 Hearing Room 357
1:00 P.M. Tapes 1 - 3

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Ken Strobeck, Chair
Rep. Sharon Wylie, Vice-Chair
Rep. Jerry Grisham
Rep. Bryan Johnston
Rep. Charles Starr

STAFF PRESENT:

Greg Moore, Committee Counsel
Kay C. Shaw, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

HB 2269 Public Hearing and Possible Work Session
HB 2293 Public Hearing and Possible Work Session

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 1, A

005 CHAIR STROBECK: Calls meeting to order at 1:30 pm. All members are
present. Introductory comments about the standard rules for all
committees, the ground rules for the Subcommittee and the ground rules for
the audience. Announces the change in the agenda order (i.e., HB 2293 will
be heard first).

 OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2293.

 GREG MOORE, Counsel, reviews the contents of HB 2293 (EXHIBIT A).

055 MS. GENOA INGRAM-READ, Oregon Association of Realtors: Submits prepared
testimony (EXHIBIT B). Testifies in support of HB 2293. Explains the
organizational structure, the statutory requirements, purpose of sanctions
and problems with the release of information to the public.

087 MS. READ: Continues with her prepared testimony. Expresses OAR's
support for HB 2293.

 REP. JOHNSTON: Is it correct this wouldn't in any way impact any actions
that are being taken by the Board (e.g., if a license is suspended and the
person's privileges to practice in the real estate profession remain

suspended during the interim of that appeal)?

MS. READ: Explains that OAR is not trying to overturn the sanction, but to protect a person's reputation from further damage until they have an opportunity to appeal the action.

REP. JOHNSTON: In other words, let's not put it before public before it is final.

MS. READ: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Clarifies that the bill does not seek to prevent such information from being disseminated, it simply stops the agency from affirmatively issuing a press release. Information would still be available to the press, but wouldn't be affirmatively sent out.

MS. READ: Explains the information is still open to the public on a real estate licensee if a file is open. Bill attempts to stop an affirmative action of mailing those out to the press and from publication in the ORNG until the individual has the opportunity to appeal.

CHAIR STROBECK: In how many cases does a licensee appeal, is found guilty and then goes through the appeal process whereby the decision is overturned?

MS. READ: Unable to answer the question; however, OEA's attorney Shaw tells her such cases have happened.

REP. JOHNSTON: Illustrates that the voter's approved Measure 4 (i.e., "Peg Jolin Law") that upon conviction removes a person from the Legislature who may later prove by the appeal process to not be guilty of the original offense. Suggests there exists in the current law this exact same thing.

135 MS. READ: Explains that if the bill is passed, the publication would cease. The process for a real estate licensee that would prohibit the licensee from conducting business would be unchanged.

142 MS. MORELLA LARSEN, Real Estate Commissioner, State Of Oregon Real Estate Agency: Submits prepared testimony (EXHIBIT C) and introduces STAN MAYFIELD, Manager of Special Programs. Explains Exhibit C and corrects that the issue is publication of a copy of the Hearings Officer's Final Order not any kind of a press release.

170 MS. LARSEN: Testifies in opposition to HB 2293. Refers to Exhibit B (page 4) for standard verbiage of Notice of Suspension/Revocation. Explains that the industry has the right to know the direction of the agency.

188 MS. LARSEN: Continues testimony, refers to Exhibit A (page 3), the Lake of Lakes Case Timeline, and states this is the only such case. Explains the OREA requirements/distribution for publication of the Oregon Real Estate News Journal and the Final Order is disseminated to the local newspaper the day after it is mailed to the licensee.

230 REP. JOHNSTON: Is it correct that in order for the licensee to be a "victim" and assuming the licensee is suspended, the licensee must be practicing without a license? Is it correct that other steps can be taken

against a licensee while practicing when suspended? In other words, it is not a result of failure to publish the information, it is a result of the licensee's failure to comply with the OREA's order to suspend or revoke.

MS. LARSEN: That is probably true; however, OREA sees it similar, because oftentimes the licensee doesn't cease.

267 MS. LARSEN: Continues testimony and explains prohibition of other licensee's sharing fees with someone who is unlicensed. Explains that in 11 years there have been 190 contested case hearings, 26 of which were appealed to the Oregon Court of Appeals, 2 are undecided, 1 remand (i.e., 100% track record with the Court of Appeals). Says licensee has the ability to file for a "stay of the order" that allows them to continue working. Testifies that if the bill becomes law, the agency is "muffled for an unknown period of time" since the appeals are unknown. The Oregon Real Estate Agency strongly opposes this bill, particularly in light of SB 94 and HB 2493. Introduces Mr. Mayfield.

MR. STAN MAYFIELD: Comments and explains the intent of the publication is to protect the consumer (i.e., let the current clients or customers know and also to promote awareness this licensee is unlicensed).

REP. GRISHAM: Are there sanctions for the licensee to continue to operate, buy, sell or represent real estate once suspended?

317 MR. MAYFIELD: Would be additional sanctions that could be imposed; however, an innocent consumer, and when funds are gone, it is difficult to recover the funds. Explains that OREA tries to let the consumers know in advance when licenses are no longer valid.

REP. GRISHAM: At what point does the licensee actually have to discontinue practicing real estate?

MR. MAYFIELD: Explains that it depends on the Commissioner's Order.

REP. GRISHAM: If OREA sends an order to cease/desist and OREA is prohibited from sending it to the newspapers to inform the public, would OREA notify the licensee and broker?

362 MR. MAYFIELD: Explains about the distribution list of those notified and the timeline of notifications.

CHAIR STROBECK: Did I hear you correctly that of the 190 hearings held, that only one of them has been overturned?

MS. LARSEN: Mentions there have been 190 contested cases in this 11-years period and one was remanded (i.e., one allegation was extracted and the order was reissued for the same sanction). Explains the case wasn't overturned, but merely one issue extracted -- no cases have been lost at the Oregon Court of Appeals during the 11-years period.

398 REP. KEVIN MANNIX (D- District 32/Salem): Testifies in support of HB 2293. Provides his rationale for introducing bills (i.e., the bill must have merit). Qualifies some of the language in the bill, because it could be misconstrued. Refers to lines 20 through 22 and states "It sounds like we're trying to muzzle the Commissioner and not allow the information to be

released at all which in effect would make this an exception to the Open Records Law." Suggests what should be the proper language and expresses

the concern is with an aggressive program of publicizing pending cases. Illustrates the Oregon State Bar's program.

TAPE 2, A

004 REP. KEVIN MANNIX: Continues to testify in support of HB 2293.

028 REP. MANNIX: Continues to testify in support of HB 2293 and relates the

problem is not of practicing and having license, but also about reputation in the community. Proposes the balance is not to issue press releases and put it all in the publication until it is final; however, do publish when it is final. Believes the Oregon Real Estate Agency has not "been deliberately trying to be mean and nasty . . . it's a very fine agency and it does a very good job," but there is a statutory mandate that went too far. Proposes modifying the mandate so it is clear that OREA should not publicize in their publication until charges are final nor press forward with press releases until the charges are final and OREA should always answer the inquiries of citizens/media to provide adequate/correct information.

070 REP. MANNIX: Continues to testify in support of HB 2293 and reads proposed language changes for lines 20 through 22. On line 20 after "or" insert "otherwise publicize" and on line 22 after "rendered" insert "; however, the commissioner shall release such information upon request".

REP. WYLIE: Do you know what the normal time frame is for resolution of an appeal?

REP. MANNIX: No, but anticipates it could be from 60 to 180 days. If any longer, then problems with the appeals process should be addressed.

REP. WYLIE: Requests a recall of Morella Larsen for further inquiry.

088 REP. MANNIX: Suggests adding a qualification/limitation, if appropriate, to say "until the decision of the commissioner has become final."

REP. JOHNSTON: Remarks that the suggested amendment goes pretty far toward what is workable. Clarifies that OREA has the authority to revoke/suspend.

Expresses the potential problem of inundating the agency with telephone calls for renewed requests for status.

110 REP. MANNIX: Agrees, however, he is of the opinion Realtors should understand about reputations without contacting the OREA.

131 CHAIR STROBECK: Is it correct that by using the phrase "or otherwise publicized" you would prohibit the publication of names even in the Oregon Real Estate's news and journals even if it was not mailed to the newspapers, etc.?

REP. MANNIX: Yes.

138 MS. LARSEN returns to respond to Rep. Wiley's questions.

REP. WYLIE: What is the normal time frame from the first time OREA hears of a complaint to when it is finally resolved?

MS. LARSEN: Explains the process whenever they receive a complaint.

REP. WYLIE: Requests clarification about the final order. Is that the first time the license could be suspended?

185 MS. LARSEN: Explains about stipulation process.

REP. WYLIE: How often does that happen?

MS. LARSEN: Explains that more people have stipulated to revocations in the last two years than previously.

REP. WYLIE: What is the minimum/maximum number of days to complete an investigation and go through an actual hearing?

MS. LARSEN: Explains each real estate transaction is unique and the time frame varies.

MR. MAYFIELD : Doubts OREA keeps statistics in that area, because of so much variation.

228 REP. WYLIE: What are the numbers of voluntary suspensions or voluntary relinquishing of licenses v. suspensions in the same period of time.

MR. MAYFIELD: Figures are available although not at hand now. Indicates when the suspension process began 10 years ago, almost 60% of cases were handled through the stipulation process. Current figures are in the range of 45-50% of cases are handled through the stipulation process.

248 CHAIR STROBECK: Requests more data about cases, date of first publication, when case was publicized, dates of exhausted appeals, etc. would be helpful.

MR. MAYFIELD: Unable to provide timeline figures; however, figures are available that show case resolution through the administrative process.

CHAIR STROBECK: Is it correct that you would have dates when each case was resolved/opened?

MR. MAYFIELD: Information is available in each file. It would require a manual search through each investigative file. There have been approximately a half dozen appeals over the past couple of years to review and know when the sanction would have been imposed/when appeal process was completed.

MS. LARSEN: Corrects the record. OREA has responsibility for a total of 24,000 licensees with 13 investigators; it is a challenge for the agency to manage over 300 open files regularly.

279 MR. MAYFIELD: Clarifies the term "press release."

303 REP. JOHNSTON: Refers to Exhibit A (page three). Is it a standard procedure or was something learned in the hearing that justified starting with a 10-day suspension and when the stipulation was refused there was a 30-day suspension?

MR. MAYFIELD: Explains it is not standard procedure.

MS. LARSEN: Adds that in the hearing the commissioner does not know what

was offered in a stipulation and decides based on hearing only.

REP. GRISHAM: Do you have comments, pro or con, about Rep. Mannix's proposed amendment?

MS. LARSEN: Expresses opposition to the idea that OREA shouldn't tell people there is an action. Explains the agency has not done something wrong, but rather the licensee did something wrong and is in noncompliance with the law.

361 MR. MAYFIELD: Says there are concerns with the language, because of problems in the context of stipulated orders. Explains that under the proposed language OREA would have to wait 60 days before publishing the order even if a party agreed to a 60-day suspension.

REP. GRISHAM: Requests the Committee be provided with the cost of mailing and processing to the agency of complying with the commissioner's orders mailed annually?

402 MR. MAYFIELD: Explains about savings and timing circumstances (i.e., question is whether OREA should mail out the order when it is beneficial to the public or wait until it is final).

MS. LARSEN: Agrees to provide the Attorney General's Letter of Advice for more clarification.

TAPE 1, B

010 GAIL RYDER, Government Affairs Director, Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association: Testifies in support of open meetings and open records. Testifies from prepared statement and submits (EXHIBIT D). Testifies to support for SB 94 before the Senate Judiciary Committee and a similarly drafted version that will be before the House Judiciary Committee. Explains the intent of SB 499 from last session was to provide a more uniform access policy for public records.

027 MS. RYDER: Continues presentation about HB 2293. Explains this bill is contrary to the goals set two years ago by the Public Records Advisory Council. Expresses continued support for the Public Records Advisory Council's conclusion that the records of all disciplinary hearings of all Oregon boards and commissions should be open to public scrutiny. Requests tabling HB 2293.

REP. GRISHAM: Has that opinion changed due to the amendment offered by Rep. Mannix?

MS. RYDER: No.

CLOSES THE PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2293.

OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2269.

088 GREG MOORE: Counsel: Reviews the contents and history of HB 2269 (EXHIBIT E).

MR. JAMES ANDREW LONG (resides in Rep. Starr's District, North Plains area): Testifies about a proposed amendment to allow Oregon Poison Control to have unblockable Caller ID (i.e., similar to enhanced 9-1-1 or 9-1-1) to

streamline their ability to respond to Oregonians who have ingested or come in contact with poisons, but who may have "blocked or Caller Id delivery." Submits (EXHIBIT D).

119 MR. LONG: Continues testimony and explains that he does not know what would be the cost.

MR. LONG: Explains his background with a 9-1-1 Committee and his reason for proposing attaching this amendment to the bill.

CHAIR STROBECK: Agrees it would be interesting to have the figures from the Poison Control Center to determine how many times this happens.

185 MR. LONG: Explains that as a result of 1991 legislation, the Oregon Poison Control is listed on the inside front cover of every phone book in the state.

195 DAVID YANDELL, Emergency Management Division, Department Of State Police: Testifies from a prepared statement in support of HB 2269 and submits (EXHIBIT E).

216 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying and explains the six elements of a package (page one).

249 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying. Explains the proposed extension of the sunset provision (i.e., element three on page 3).

270 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying. Explains the cellular telephone tax dispute (i.e., element four on page 3) and support for adopting statutory language that clarifies the cellular industry is not obligated to collect and contribute to 9-1-1 taxes (page 4).

310 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying by explaining the cellular industry's support for HB 2269 (page 4).

322 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying by explaining about the timeline for dispute resolution (page 4).

349 MR. YANDELL: Continues testifying. Explains there will be sizable expenditure of public dollar/employee time (page 4).

376 MR. YANDELL: Concludes testifying about the six elements of the consensus package and requests the opportunity to modify terminology's (page 6).

CHAIR STROBECK: Requests an explanation of the origin/purpose for 9-1-1.

MR. YANDELL: Explains the background about the creation of 9-1-1 (i.e., a mandate process for statewide 9-1-1 coverage).

TAPE 2, B

004 MR. YANDELL: Continues his explanation about the background of the statewide system. Explains the attempt to provide minimal state intervention and the encouragement of local government to develop systems that meet the minimal requirements in the statute.

022 MR. YANDELL: Continues his explanation, especially about his dispatcher background. Shares the frustration many citizens had when they would report emergency needs.

052 CHAIR STROBECK: Requests explanation about PSAPs.

MR. YANDELL: Explains that Public Safety Answering Points are broken into two categories (i.e., 60 primary Public Safety Answering Points and 30 Secondary Public Safety Answering Points). Primary PSAPs are the locations where 9-1-1 calls are first answered.

CHAIR STROBECK: If someone calls 9-1-1 in Polk County, who answers the telephone?

MR. YANDELL: Mid-Willamette Valley Communications in Salem via a contractual arrangement with the City of Salem and the Mid-Willamette Valley Communications system.

CHAIR STROBECK: Statewide, how many dollars are collected now on this percentage tax?

MR. YANDELL: Says the annual ballpark figure is approximately \$14 Million-\$15 Million and approximately \$5.2 Million is allocated for the implementation of enhanced 9-1-1 statewide service.

081 CHAIR STROBECK: Where does the balance of the funding to operate the center come from?

MR. YANDELL: Explains the balance comes from local government. Refers to and explains a series of pie charts (pages 7-11).

113 REP. JOHNSTON: In reviewing HB 2269 and coverage of cellular phones, is there something that says cellular phones are not subject to the tax from 1991 until such time as this becomes effective?

MR. YANDELL: No there is not, as the bill is currently written. Describes an issue that has been developing that was not incorporated into this bill.

REP JOHNSTON: So that dispute is in the courts somewhere?

MR. YANDELL: Yes, the dispute is on its way to the court.

REP. JOHNSTON: Do you have a position on how that dispute should be resolved?

MR. YANDELL: Explains support for the industry to move forward and the realities of entering several areas regarding new technology. Describes the Federal Communications Systems' recent issuance of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking regarding compatibility issues pertaining to 9-1-1.

133 REP. JOHNSTON: The application of the fee, as yet undetermined fee, is that a onetime fee or a monthly fee?

MR. YANDELL: It is a monthly fee that subscribers throughout the state pay

5% of their exchange access rate.

149 CHAIR STROBECK: Remarks that the original state involvement was intended as an aid to local governments to purchase equipment and that once

underway/equipment purchased, there would be efficiencies at the local government level the state would no longer need to continue this tax. What

is your interpretation of that? Is that true? What is the status of that?

MR. YANDELL: Explains he entered the project after the debates were already held. Disagreements exist about this being designed originally as temporary in nature. Submits that the appropriate time would be in the vicinity of the year 2000 when implementation for enhanced 9-1-1 is complete statewide.

109 CHAIR STROBECK: Where is the status of enhanced 9-1-1 now?

MR. YANDELL: Explains that 40% of the population is served today under enhanced 9-1-1. Counties with enhanced 9-1-1 in place are Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, Salem area, and Grants Pass (Josephine County). Enhanced plans are approved for Lane County. Deadline for submitting the statutorial final plans is July, 1995.

185 CHAIR STROBECK: How great a factor is having the enhanced 9-1-1 in terms of the ability to dispatch the emergency service necessary?

MR. YANDELL: Is it a critical aspect in terms of saving lives?

CHAIR STROBECK: Do you have any jurisdictional problems in any areas of the state with police, fire, etc. who dislike being part of the 9-1-1 dispatch system?

224 MR. YANDELL: Doesn't think so.

CHAIR STROBECK: They have all willingly participated in this process?

MR. YANDELL: Yes. There is a clear line between state control under 9-1-1 and local governmental control.

CHAIR STROBECK: Illustrates the situation involving the Philadelphia 9-1-1 operators. Are the 9-1-1 calls monitored? What about the training required of each dispatcher?

MR. YANDELL: Explains that Oregon is ahead of the service in many areas. Oregon adopted a mandatory Standards and Training Program for 9-1-1 call takers in 1991. Describes efforts with BPST staff to specifically discuss that issue and that Oregon's program attempts to instill a customer service profile among the call takers and to minimize the potential for problems that occurred in Philadelphia..

260 CHAIR STROBECK: What is the approximate cost for each 9-1-1 call received that results in a dispatch or an agency response ?

MR. YANDELL: Explains it is broken down based on the per capita tax and amounts to about. \$4.38 a call. Provides there were 1,955,909 calls which went through Oregon's 9-1-1 system in 1994.

CHAIR STROBECK: Why does Clackamas County have five different PSAPs locations and Polk County has none?

MR. YANDELL: Explains it is due to a variety of reasons. Believes it is a matter of service to the public. Remarks there is a strong sentiment amongst each Clackamas County community that reflects the level of service they want to provide their public.

CHAIR STROBECK: Have you looked at whether, if many services are delivered on a county-wide basis, that it would be better to have a single location for those calls to be received?

301 MR. YANDELL: Explains the issues with the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

CHAIR STROBECK: Clarifies that in other words if someone calls one answering location in Clackamas County, the dispatch may be to the Oregon City police officers as well as to the Clackamas County officers.

MR. YANDELL: That's correct. Illustrates Deschutes County service prior to the 9-1-1 mandate v. under 9-1-1 mandate. Additionally, illustrates that in Redmond no personnel was lost nor savings produced. In actuality there was an additional cost because of financial support to the county-wide service.

356 CHAIR STROBECK: Did you present this report to the Interim Revenue Committee (page 12)?

MR. YANDELL: Yes, to the House and Senate.

CHAIR STROBECK: Did you have an opportunity to go over it with them during the interim?

MR. YANDELL: Explains the Executive Summary and the Recommendations were reviewed with them.

MR. GRISHAM: Were there approximately two million calls per year?

MR. YANDELL: Yes, about two million calls per year and in 1993 the estimate was a little over 1.5 million.

REP. GRISHAM: Do you track or compare the numbers that result in dispatch/emergency services v. calls that ask for information that could be obtained elsewhere?

MR. YANDELL: We don't gather that information.

REP. GRISHAM: Do you know from comparative studies that have this system, what is the response time between 9-1-1 directed call and other forms of emergency service communication?

MR. YANDELL: No.

REP. GRISHAM: Is that something that could be provided to the Committee?

MR. YANDELL: Agrees to attempt to gather that data.

003 CHAIR STROBECK: Is Oregon one of seven? Why, since this idea first originated in 1968, is so much of the map (page 11) unfilled especially with so many densely populated states?

MR. YANDELL: Explains the display illustrates the states that are 100% completed.

CHAIR STROBECK: Will all of the country, in view of changing technology/satellites/emergency locators, be wired in by the turn of the century?

MR. YANDELL: Yes, the goal is that by the year 2000 virtually all of the country will be covered. Requests that at the appropriate time and once the Committee is ready to make a decision, that the Department of State Police receive authorization to have an amendment drafted that would reflect the proposed changes.

029 LARRY HATCH, Assistant Director, . Washington County Consolidated Communications Agency (aka Washington County 9-1-1) . Testifies in strong support of HB 2269. Explains the funding received in Washington County is about 24% of the operational budget and the rest of the costs are covered by the local jurisdictions. Explains problem if this money is lost because

of the sunset, there would be some hard decisions to make about the level of service provided.

051 MR. HATCH: Concludes testimony.

REP. JOHNSTON: Is your program entirely enhanced?

MR. HATCH: Yes, the entire county has enhanced 9-1-1.

REP. JOHNSTON: When did you make that change?

MR. HATCH: Believes the change was in February, 1992.

REP. JOHNSTON: Is that an equipment question?

MR. HATCH: Indicates it is ongoing support for line costs, equipment and maintenance of that equipment. Explains that during the budget process, they separate dispatch function from 9-1-1 function.

065 CHAIR STROBECK: How many dispatch (PSAP) centers are there in Washington County?

MR. HATCH: Two -- Washington County Consolidated Communications Agency and the City of Forest Grove.

CHAIR STROBECK: Why does the City of Forest Grove have one that is separate?

MR. HATCH: Explains why the City of Forest Grove is separate.

CHAIR STROBECK: Would it be effective to have a single location that would include Forest Grove or is their system working effectively?

083 MR. HATCH: Certainly we could handle the call volume generated by the citizens in Forest Grove.

CHAIR STROBECK: When a call comes in (e.g., fire call), how does your 9-1-1 operator actually dispatch the fire truck? Do they push a button or pick up another phone?

MR. HATCH: Explains the call taker determines whether the emergency is fire, medical or police; fire or medical calls are transferred within the room to dispatchers assigned to specifically handle those emergencies; when the call is ready to be dispatched, it is "tapped out" by another dispatcher who sends information over the air to the fire stations notifying of the call and the need to respond.

CHAIR STROBECK: Is "tapped out" done verbally or electronically?

MR. HATCH: Explains of current changes to convert from a system that sends digital information -- there is some voice and some silence when calls go out, because the call is sent digitally.

CHAIR STROBECK: Are all of the jurisdictions in Washington County working together cooperatively with the 9-1-1 project?

112 MR. HATCH: Yes, Washington County has a reputation for its intergovernmental cooperation in several areas. There is high level of cooperation in public safety and elsewhere.

HASINA E. CASSIM, Oregon Chapter of Associated Public Safety Communications Officers Inc. (APCO): Introductory comments, submits (Exhibit H) and testifies in support of HB 2269. Reads prepared statement. Explains that 9-1-1 service is an essential public service.

144 SALLY J. SMITH, Administrator, Columbia County Emergency Communications District: Testifies in support of HB 2269, submits (Exhibit I) and reads prepared statement. Testifies that passage of HB 2269 is "key" to maintaining and enhancing the quality of 9-1-1 service for which Oregon is known nationwide. Explains the proposed shift from percentage based to flat rate will stabilize revenues needed to provide local service.

167 MS. SMITH: Continues testifying. Explains that Oregon has a nationwide reputation for service, because of requirements for mandatory training, certification and certification maintenance program. Oregon's program is used as the model in developing a national certification standard.

CHAIR STROBECK: You are a member of the Board on Public Safety Standards & Training?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIR STROBECK: How do you get on that Board and who operates that Board?

MS. SMITH: Explains that Governor Roberts appointed her through a nomination process conducted through Oregon APCO.

CHAIR STROBECK: Is that part of the Office of Emergency Management or under what agency does it operate?

MS. SMITH: No. Explains the organizational structure of/funding for the Oregon Board on Public Safety Standards & Training (BPSST).

233 CHAIR STROBECK: Is dispatching the primary/only group for which BPSST sets standards and training?

MS. SMITH: Explains that standards are set for call taking and dispatching for telecommunications for both emergency medical and public safety telecommunications.

CHAIR STROBECK: Communication is the only area that you deal with insofar as safety standards/training?

MS. SMITH: No. BPSST is concerned with establishment and review of certification and maintenance standards for several public disciplines (i.e., police officers, corrections officers, parole/probation officers and fire accreditation).

CHAIR STROBECK: What are the educational requirements for a 9-1-1 call taker ?

257 MS. SMITH: Explains educational requirements for the first year of hire (i.e., 80 hours of basic academy and completion of a handbook).

CHAIR STROBECK: Are those people answering the phones while undergoing training?

MS. SMITH: Explains that is a local government control decision.

287 CHAIR STROBECK: Is it your professional agency (APCO) that conducts the academy and provides the standards?

MS. SMITH: Explains that APCO provides instructors to carry out the job tasks curriculum and the standards were set by the job task analysis as to curriculum.

CHAIR STROBECK: Are there any minimum schooling requirements, etc. for hiring of 9-1-1 personnel?

MS. SMITH: Explains that is determined locally. Common rule of thumb is high school graduation or GED.

CHAIR STROBECK: What is a typical work schedule ((i.e., typical hours, how long on the phone for a particular time?)

MS. SMITH: Varies according to local needs.

322 REP. JOHNSTON: Is Columbia County on basic service?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

REP. JOHNSTON: What is the cost for transition of Columbia County to enhanced service?

MS. SMITH: Explains the telephone companies and the State estimate the cost to be in the neighborhood of \$115,000 for initial startup. Ongoing costs would be about \$6,000 a month.

REP. JOHNSTON: Are you suggesting that by extending the sunset provisions

to the year 2001 there is some sentiment this tax may not be necessary after 2001?

MS. SMITH: Explains that the suggestion may be more intended as a reasonable timeframe to bring in enhanced 9-1-1 statewide.

352 REP. JOHNSTON: Explains that we seem to be implying this is somehow devoted to getting enhanced service and it is not really, the vast majority of the budget is simply for personnel. Remarks that if that is the purpose of the tax and if there should be a deadline for enhanced service, we should set the deadline. Issue is confusing because of the mixture.

FAX testimony received from PAT WORTMAN and BEN BOSWELL, Commissioners, Wallowa County Court, is hereby made a part of these Minutes (EXHIBIT J).

CHAIR STROBECK: DECLARES MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:50 PM.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Kay C. Shaw Greg Moore
Committee Assistant Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

- A - HB 2293, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff, 1 page
- B - HB 2293, prepared statement, Genoa Ingram-Read, 1 page
- C - HB 2293, prepared statement, Morella Larsen, 4 pages
- D - HB 2293, prepared statement, Gail Ryder, 1 page
- E - HB 2269, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, staff, 1 page
- F - HB 2269, prepared statement, James Andrew Long, 1 page
- G - HB 2269, prepared statement, David C. Yandell, 96 pages
- H - HB 2269, prepared statement, Hasina E. Cassim, 1 page
- I - HB 2269, prepared statement, Sally J. Smith, 1 page
- J - HB 2269, prepared statement, Pat Wortman and Ben Boswell, 1 page