

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.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY CIVIL LAW AND JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

May 9, 1991Hearing Room 357 1:00 p.m.Tapes 97 - 100

MEMBERS PRESENT:Rep. Ray Baum, Chair Rep. Marie Bell Rep. Kelly Clark Rep. Jim Edmunson Rep. Rod Johnson Rep. Kevin Mannix Rep. Randy Miller

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Tom Brian

VISITING MEMBER: Rep. Del Parks Rep. Delna Jones

STAFF PRESENT: Greg Chaimov, Committee Counsel Jim Dole, Committee Counsel Mary Walling, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD: HB 2386 - Business Corporation Act Revisions HB 2266 - Revises the Rules for Will Contests HB 3222 - Prohibits Confidential Settlements HJR 60 - Repeals Mandatory Retirement for Judges HB 3552 - Supreme Court Library Fees HB 3217 - Increases Jury Fees and Mileage HB 3101 - Emergency Vehicle Liability Exemption HB 3427 - District Court Judgment Docketing

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 97, SIDE A

004 CHAIR BAUM: Opens Subcommittee on Civil Law and Judicial Administration at 1:10.

(Tape 97, Side A) HB 3222 - PROHIBITS CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENTS, PUBLIC HEARING Witness: Rep Del Parks, House District 53

007 GREG CHAIMOV: Provides summary of bill.

011 REP. DEL PARKS, HOUSE DISTRICT 31: Testifies in support of HB 3222.

>Bill is designed to let the public know when tort claims are filed

against bodies and the terms of the settlement when settled.

>Public has the right to know in those types of cases that allege misconduct in connection with the conduct of a municipal or government body. If the public body settles that claim, then the public has the right to know how their money is being spent.

>The bill applies only to tort claims and it only applies to settlements. If case is tried to conclusion, then it is a matter of public record. It does not apply to individual claims if they are not made against a public body and they are settled by the public official in some way.

054 REP. EDMUNSON: When a settlement is reached and a public body pays for it, doesn't it appear in the budget?

REP. PARKS: In some counties they have a risk management team within the court house and they are self insured. They work out of a fund and charge against it. That fund is replenished in the budget cycle.

083 REP. BELL: Does this affect settlements or agreements that are made before there is any kind of court case? Like termination of a job or something like that?

REP. PARKS: It doesn't affect cases that aren't in the court system. Almost all claims involving employment would not be covered by this bill, except those claims which have to do with sexual harrassment or on the job violations of a person's rights.

115 CHAIR BAUM: Does a lawsuit have to be pending under this bill?

REP. PARKS: It may be possible that it does not have to be pending. Under the notification statute in Oregon, the governing body has to be providing notification before a lawsuit is filed.

>Would prefer that bill includes all claims, whether filed or not.

156 REP. BELL: If not allowing person to settle confidentially, will that deter the settling? If all those cases were in court, and a person knew they could get a million dollars out of the city, there might be more suits against the public body.

REP. PARKS: Klamath Falls settled a claim for a relatively small amount of money and as a result of settling that claim, five other people filed a suit because they thought they might have a good case and they didn't know what the case was settled for. Could work either way.

>Fundamental issue is does the public have the right to know how their money was spent when there has been a claim of misconduct against a public official in performance of his duty.

(Tape 97, Side A) HB 2386 - BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT REVISIONS, WORK SESSION

245 MOTION: Rep. Edmunson moves to remove HB 2386 from the table.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, HB 2386 is open for work session.

257 GREG CHAIMOV: Provides summary of HB 2386. When bill was last before the committee it contained a number of policy choices including

limiting the liability of directors, limiting some minority shareholder rights, and prescribing some procedures in derivative lawsuits.

>The dispute over those policy decisions caused the bill to be tabled. The proponents have suggested HB 2386-1 amendments (EXHIBIT A) which are purely technical changes. All controversial matter has been removed.

275 ANDREW MORROW, JR., OREGON STATE BAR, BUSINESS LAW SECTION:
Testifies in support of HB 2386.

>A couple of sections of the bill deal strictly with corporations organized in Oregon which are investment companies. These are essentially mutual funds and other types of investment vehicles. One provision would permit those companies not to hold an annual meeting of shareholders unless it was required under the investment company act of 1940.

>Another provision would permit increases or decreases in the authorized shares of open end investment companies without a share holder vote. An open end company is a mutual fund in which the shares can be redeemed back at any time with the company. Those companies tend to expand substantially and this would expedite their activities.

>These two provisions have been adopted in other states and the people who represent those entities said they would like to have investment companies organized in Oregon have those provisions, rather than reincorporate in another state.

>There are some provisions that make some modifications to the authority that can be delegated by a board of directors to a committee of the board and two provisions that deal with revisions dealing with corporate mergers.

>The remaining sections are technical revisions to correct errors or to better express what was intended by the legislation as it was initially adopted.

334 REP. JOHNSON: Page 8, Section 12, (4), is still deleted. What is the purpose of deleting that language about what happens if a dissolved corporation is sued?

CHAIMOV: On page 10, Section 16, that new section replaces the old language.

350 MORROW: That language is essentially moved to a separate section to make it clear that it would be applicable both to a claim that is known and not properly dealt with in the dissolution procedures or an unknown claim that is not identified. It is unclear from the placement of that section in the present statute that it applies to both situations and this was intended to clarify that.

367 CHARLIES WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION: Testifies in support of the bill with the proposed amendments.

MOTION: Rep. Miller moves to adopt the HB 2386-1 amendments.

VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion is adopted.

MOTION: Rep. Miller moves HB 2386 as amended be sent to the full committee with a do pass recommendation.

VOTE: Motion passed with all members present voting aye. Rep. Brian, Clark, and Mannix excused.

(Tape 97, Side A) HB 2266 - REVISES THE RULES FOR WILL CONTESTS, WORK SESSION

419 GREG CHAIMOV: Provides summary of bill.

>HB 2266 has two parts. One part makes it easier to sue for breach of a contract to make a will. The second part fixes a constitutionally defective notice provision in the section of the statutes regarding will contests.

>The committee was not enthused about the possibility for making it easier for people to sue their relatives but was kindly disposed to the notice provisions. Mr. Deras' has put together HB 226 6-1 amendments (EXHIBIT B) which fixed the notice provision but deleted the portions about breach of a contract to make a will. There is one additional change requiring the deletion of a redundant section and that is labeled the additional amendment (EXHIBIT C).

TAPE 98, SIDE A

010 WARREN DERAS: Testifies in support of bill and explains amendments.

>The original motive behind this bill was an effort to soften the substantive requirements for a contract to make a will case. The committee was provided an outline which sets forth the various goals of the measure (EXHIBIT D).

MOTION: Rep. Edmunson moves that HB 2266-1 amendments and additional amendment be adopted.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, amendments are adopted.

MOTION: Rep. Edmunson moves that HB 2266 as amended be sent to the full committee.

VOTE: Motion passed with all members present voting aye. Rep. Brian, Clark, and Mannix excused.

(Tape 98, Side A) HJR 60 - REPEALS MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR JUDGES, PUBLIC HEARING Witnesses: Judge Mercedes Deiz Kingsley Kirk, State Judicial Court

CHAIMOV: Presents summary of HJR 60.

>In 1960 the voters amended the state constitution to require judges to retire at age 75. This resolution asks the voter whether they want to repeal that constitutional requirement.

097 JUDGE MERCEDES DEIZ: Submits summary and testifies in support of HJR 60 (EXHIBIT E).

204 REP. MILLER: What about legislation to limit terms for legislators? Once a judge is elected he usually remains in office.

JUDGE DEIZ: Used to be true, but is no longer true. Judges are being challenged. Last election, most judges in Multnomah County had a

challenge to being re-elected.

240 REP. MILLER: How about entry level age that a person must be to run for election?

>Discussion re mandatory age limits for entry level and retirement.

282 REP. MANNIX: Let electorate decide who they want for judges.

350 KINGSLEY KIRK, STATE JUDICIAL COURT: Testifies in support of HJR 60.

(Tape 98, Side A) HJR 60 - REPEALS MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR JUDGES, WORK SESSION

369 MOTION: Rep. Edmunson moves HJR 60 be adopted and sent to the full committee with a do pass recommendation

VOTE: Motion carried with all members present voting aye. Rep. Brian excused.

(Tape 98, Side A) HB 3222 - PROHIBITS CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENTS, REOPENS PUBLIC HEARING Witnesses: Steve Clark, Times Publications Les Zaitz, Keizer Times Judson Randall, Oregonian Valerie Salisbury, League of Oregon Cities Pamela Berry, City Attorney, Beaverton John Junkin, Oregon Association of Defence Counsel Karen Hafner, OSB A

389 JUDSON RANDALL, ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR, OREGONIAN: Submits testimony (EXHIBIT F) and testifies in support of HB 3222.

420 >This bill would go a long way towards preventing major disservices to taxpayers of many Oregon communities.

>The City of Portland has been fairly forthright in settlements of these kinds of claims covered by HB 3222. The surrounding communities have tried, sometimes successfully, to keep the public from knowing what they are up to.

>Gives example of situation in Gresham where information is being withheld from the public.

TAPE 97, SIDE B

023 STEVE CLARK, PUBLISHER, TIMES PUBLICATION: Testifies in support of HB 3222.

>Important that the public have knowledge of how their money is spent, but should also have knowledge of the outcome of actions which are deemed inappropriate by government agencies or by government employees.

045 LES ZAITZ, PUBLISHER, KEIZER TIMES: Testifies in support of HB 3222.

>The Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association supports HB 3222 as good public policy in the State of Oregon. It has the effect of opening the curtain on government conduct.

>It provides greater accountability for government actions.

>The sunshine effect on public conduct. It will have a preventative

benefit in that if public officials are aware that conduct that leads to settlements will no longer be private, they will be more sensitive to conduct that might lead to tort claims.

>Will save public money because if public agencies knew that the settlement will be public, there will be a reduction in so called easy settlements, where it has been easier to pay off somebody and have them go away than to fight it out.

>Could have the affect of preventing more frivolous claims because if public officials knowing that settlements are going to be public, they will take a tougher stand on those settlements. That will establish a higher threshold for people to successfully press claims against public agencies. People will be less inclined to file frivolous claims that require enormous amounts of public time and money to settle.

092 REP. EDMUNSON: A lawsuit against a public agency could be very politically embarrassing to the public officials, the city council members, county commissioners, etc. Is your point that a settlement might be reached to sort of avoid political embarrassment more than because of any risk or concern that the jury is going to find for the plaintiff.

098 ZAITZ: No, sometimes they are inclined to go ahead and settle a case even though they know that if they pursue the case into court and litigate it, they have a high probability of defeating the claim. They go ahead and settle to avoid the expense of long protracted litigation.

115 REP. BELL: Thought the purpose of the bill was to talk about wise use of spending. It seems that if can save \$5,000 by settling what might cost \$25,000 in the end, it is wise use.

>Discussion concerning the accuracy of reporting and the misconceptions that result from inaccurate or incomplete reporting.

271 REP. BELL: Not every citizen wants his name in the paper and wants to become a public figure. Don't believe the public needs to know about personal employment problems and how they are solved.

299 RANDALL: In cases of sexual abuse or something that is highly personal, the Oregonian is very cautious about using names.

>In cases where a person comes forward publicly, the Oregonian will use names.

>Discussion regarding privacy issue, and should all names be made public.

370 VALERIA SALISBURY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES: Submits testimony (EXHIBIT G) and testifies in opposition to HB 3222.

>Bill does three things: -Prohibits public bodies and officials from entering into a confidential settlement. -It requires those public bodies and officials to file with the court, terms of compromises and settlements. -It imposes a criminal sanction for failure to file that report or for entering into a prohibited settlement.

>The League of Oregon Cities opposes this bill. Complaints, lawsuits filed are public record. That information is available if someone wants to go to Court House and get the information.

>Many cities take the position that settlements once litigation is concluded are also public record and that information is available on request.

>The provision of this bill that would require one to go and file would impose an additional step on public bodies and public officials that doesn't exist on the average person.

>The issue of nuisance suits was discussed and it is a tricky question. If a public body chooses to settle five lawsuits at a cost of \$2500, rather than spend an average of \$25,000 in legal fees and costs to get a complete defense verdict, what is the better expenditure of public funds and the better accountability to the public interest?

465 >A reasonable way to resolve problem might be to empower a court to review a proposed confidential settlement and balance the individual equities involved with the public right to know.

TAPE 98, SIDE B

034 >Doesn't seem to be reason to impose criminal sanction on a public body or public official for this sort of action and League of Oregon Cities requests that that be addressed.

040 PAMELA BERRY, ATTORNEY, CITY OF BEAVERTON: Testifies in opposition to HB 322 2.

>Very concerned about criminal penalty that is proposed. Not well thought out.

>What is the bill trying to achieve? It already exists in the law. In the public record law when the litigation is concluded, the documents are subject to disclosure. There are some exemptions to public record law disclosure requirement but they are very limited.

053 REP. PARKS: What do you believe the criminal sanction is here that you keep talking about?

BERRY: There is potential for jail time and concern is that it could be imposed on even a simple oversight on the part of a clerk. Concerned with the wording.

062 JOHN JUNKKIN, OREGON ASSOCIATION OF DEFENSE COUNSEL: Testifies in opposition to HB 3222.

>The official misconduct in the second degree as it now exists requires that there be knowledge that you are violating the law that compels a public official to do something. There is no requirement that the person has to have knowledge or intent in this bill. A mere mistake could constitute a violation and, therefore, criminal sanctions.

BERRY: Agrees with the principle, but disagrees with the bill as worded. Concern is that it does not relate well to current statutes on the books. Creates more confusion than it solves.

>Discussion regarding the wording of the bill.

120 >Discussion regarding number of complaints that are settled by

confidential settlements. Does not occur often, usually at the request of the plaintiff.

JUNKIN: Not quite sure what this bill will cover. Thought the bill was only discussing litigation that was filed in a court of law. Apparently from earlier testimony, it would cover tort claims. That would present a real problem

>Agrees that as now written HB 3222 is confusing.

>Discussion regarding whether the bill covers more than litigation or if it includes tort claims. This is where the confusion lies in including tort claim notice. Will cause additional work and expense if they are included.

245 REP. BELL: Would this bill exclude court ordered confidential settlements?

BERRY: Not clear. I think its intent is to do that.

>Two specific problems with bill. -Section 1. (1) is not clear what actions it applies to. -Doesn't dovetail into existing public records law and would create more confusion.

294 CHAIR BAUM: Asks Rep. Edmunson to work with the newspaper publishers and others to try to work something out. The bill will be brought back at a later time.

306 KAREN HAFNER, OREGON SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition

to HB 3222.

>Our state has wonderful history of public records and public meetings law. Those laws provide for exceptions. There are times when actions taken by public bodies are considered to be appropriate and private. In those cases we believe that confidential settlements are appropriate.

367 DARYL GARRETTSSEN, ASSISTANT LEGAL COUNSEL, MARION COUNTY: Testifies in opposition to HB 3222.

>Bill would cause additional expense and changes in personnel policy.

>If bill does cover tort claims, whenever we fire an employee the union sends a backup tort claim notice that we violated the employees rights.

>Terminations are routinely settled by allowing the employee to resign, purging the personnel file, and basically agreeing to a neutral letter of recommendation that the employee worked here from x date to y date.

>If this bill passes and it covers tort claim notice we will have to change that practice.

Additional testimony (EXHIBIT H) for the record submitted by Sharon A. Rudnick.

Tape 98, Side B HB 3101 - EMERGENCY VEHICLE LIABILITY EXEMPTION, PUBLIC HEARING Witnesses: Daryl Garrettsen, Marion County Greg Smith, Oregon Trial Lawyers' Association Charlie Williamson, Oregon Trial

Lawyers' Association

398 GREG SMITH, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition to HB 3101.

TAPE 99, SIDE A

024 >Currently under the law police officers and other people who are involved in chases, have immunity for reasonable actions. The court will decide if there was reasonable action on the part of the police officer; they are already given immunity, it doesn't go to the jury.

>This bill is giving blanket immunity for actions of third persons any time a person in uniform turns on the overhead lights. There are situations where reasonableness is really a question. Refers to Lowrimore case.

>There needs to be a balance of public safety in considering this type of bill.

>Now people who are involved in these chases realize that they are going to be held to a reasonableness type standard. Have already given them exemption from having to follow speed limits and traffic control devices, but we ask that they act reasonably.

>If bill is passed, it is an invitation to encourage more unreasonable, reckless, high speed pursuits of people where the emergency nature is really not warranted.

102 CHARLIE WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition to HB 3101.

>In the Lowrimore case, there is no verdict. This is a case that went to the Court of Appeals. Nobody has yet decided if there is any liability here.

>The Court of Appeals said that in these sorts of cases there can be liability. What this bill would do is take it out and say there can never be liability in these cases.

>The state already has the tort claim limits; they already have the tort claims notices. They can have their standards generally introduced into evidence. There is lots of room for the defense to make a case here.

131 REP. BELL: On line 5 where it says "lawfully exercising the privileges granted" do you think that would be interpreted as following the policy for when to call off the chase. If the officer were violating the policy to call off the chase, would he be beyond his privileges granted.

WILLIAMSON: It allows them to go faster than the speed limit and disregard the traffic control devices. The police officer does not have to obey the rules of the road to chase somebody.

>Discussion of whether the city or police department could write out specific standards for officers to follow.

200 DARYL GARRETTSSEN, ASSISTANT LEGAL COUNSEL, MARION COUNTY: Testifies in support of HB 3101.

>The issue is whether want a policy to restrict police officers from apprehending individuals or want a policy to encourage police officers to apprehend law violators.

Tape 99, Side A HB 3101 - EMERGENCY VEHICLE LIABILITY EXEMPTION, WORK SESSION

219 REP. MANNIX: Under ORS 820.300, the officer or ambulance driver is not relieved from the duty to drive with due regard to the safety of all other persons. They are allowed to violate certain traffic safety laws. They have to have due regard for the safety of other persons.

239 >This bill puts the bad guy in the driver's seat. The word will get around that all a person has to do is drive recklessly in evading the officer and the officer can't pursue him because he knows he is driving recklessly and a third person might be harmed.

>If the officer doesn't chase to apprehend, there may be a lawsuit because officer didn't pursue suspect and apprehend him.

>Another possibility is someone else will be the victim of crime and will say the police should have chased him. It gets pretty ridiculous.

250 REP. JOHNSON: Have to rely on the police officers to have good judgment.

>Would not like to see the police officers right or power to give chase chilled down to nonexistence by fear of not only him losing control, but the other guy losing control.

>Discussion regarding types of vehicles and whether bill covers police, fire and emergency vehicles.

347 MOTION: Rep. Mannix moves that the bill be amended as shown in hand engrossed version (EXHIBIT I).

VOTE: Hearing no objection, motion passed.

MOTION: Rep. Mannix moves HB 3101 as amended to the full committee with a do pass recommendation.

REP. CLARK: Has trouble with certain aspects of the bill and will probably vote no on the bill. For purposes of avoiding delay, will give a courtesy vote so committee can move the bill.

VOTE: Motion carried with all members present voting aye. Rep. Brian, Edmunson, and Miller excused.

Tape 99, Side A HB 3427 - DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT DOCKETING, PUBLIC HEARING Witnesses: William Linden, Judicial Department

425 BILL LINDEN, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR: Submits testimony (EXHIBIT J) and testifies in opposition to HB 3427.

>The Judicial Department feels this bill is unnecessary; it may create real property title problems, and will create rather than save work for litigants and the courts.

>One of the problems with HB 3427 is there will be unsatisfied judgments.

Additional testimony (EXHIBIT K) in opposition to HB 3427 submitted by Kelly Ross, Oregon Land Title Association.

Tape 99, Side A HB 3427 - DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT DOCKETING, WORK SESSION

MOTION: Rep. Miller moves that HB 3427 be tabled. Hearing no objection, HB 3427 is tabled.

TAPE 100, SIDE A

HB 3217 - INCREASES JURY FEES AND MILEAGE, PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Rep. Delna Jones, House District 6 William Linden, Judicial Department

053 REP. JONES: The compensation rate presently in effect for serving on a jury is so small some people cannot afford to serve.

>Gives example of lady that is not employed outside of home, has three children, and lives in rural community. She would have to pay for child care and transportation.

>State has not changed its compensation rate since 1971 for the per diem. Is now \$10.00 per day. Since 1953 it has been eight cents per mile reimbursement for mileage.

>Legislators are reimbursed at a higher rate and everyone else that serves on commissions and boards is reimbursed at a higher rate.

>Washington State and Idaho State reimburse at \$.26 a mile. Legislative Fiscal (EXHIBIT L) indicated that each penny additional reimbursement would cost the state approximately \$75,000 per biennium.

121 REP. CLARK: Feels \$10 a day is a joke. Perhaps would be better to eliminate the per diem compensation and give additional reimbursement for mileage. Then could say that jury duty is a public service and citizens will not get paid, but will be paid a reasonable amount for expenses.

140 REP. JONES: Feels it really makes sense to reimburse for costs.

175 BILL LINDEN, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR: Testifies in support of HB 321 7.

>Most employers keep employee on salary while on jury duty. The employee then turns over the per diem check to employer. If the cycle for writing these small checks was broken, money could be saved.

>Juries in urban areas would probably be worse off under just reimbursement for mileage.

225 CHARLIE WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition to HB 3217.

>Would like to see jurors paid better and agrees with the bill, but does not want to see the litigants be assessed the cost of the jurors.

>Oregon Trial Lawyers Association does not have a position on this bill.

However, if you take Multnomah County, a huge number of people live within ten miles of the courthouse and those people would be cut in the amount of their reimbursement.

254 REP. BELL: If went strictly to a mileage reimbursement, this would completely disregard the very individual that Rep. Jones mentioned that needs child care and needs some kind of reimbursement in order to afford to serve as juror. The person living near the court house, who may get no mileage at all really ought to be compensated in some way so they could come and serve.

Tape 100, Side A HB 3552 - SUPREME COURT LIBRARY FEES, PUBLIC HEARING:
Witnesses: William Linden, Judicial Department Charlie
Williamson, Oregon Trial Lawyers' Association

270 GREG CHAIMOV: Provides summary of bill. HB 3552 was brought to us by the Committee on Ways and Means and has a subsequent referral to Ways and Means.

280 BILL LINDEN, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR: Testifies in support of HB 355 2.

>HB 3552 is one of a series of bills resulting from a list the Judicial Department gave the Ways and Means Committee in January that identified ways of saving general fund dollars within our appropriation.

>The rationale behind it is that the county law libraries are supported by fee surcharges, and the same could be done for the Supreme Court Law Library. The Supreme Court Library is a public library. It has public as well as agency employees who use it in addition to the supreme court law clerks.

>To cover the expense of operating the library in the biennium, the fee would have to be set at \$2.50 per civil case. That would generate around \$874,000 in the biennium.

309 CHARLIE WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition to HB 3552.

>The court system and the Supreme Court Library benefits the public in general, not just the litigants. The system is there and it deters bad conduct and deters criminal conduct. Most of the cost of the courts is really the criminal law. Why should civil litigants pay for everything in the Supreme Court Library. Simply unjust.

333 CHAIR BAUM: Adjourns meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Mary Walling Pat Zwick Assistant Office Manager

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Amendments to HB 2386 - Staff - 2 pages B - Amendments to HB 2266 - W. Deras - 3 pages C - Amendments to HB 2266 - W. Deras - 1 page D - Testimony on HB 2266 - W. Deras - 6 pages E - Testimony on HJR 60 - M.

Deiz - 2 pages F - Testimony on HB 3222 - J. Randall - 2 pages G -
Testimony on HB 3222 - V. Salisbury - 1 page H - Testimony on HB 3222 -
S. Rudnick - 1 page I - Amendment to HB 3101 - Staff - 1 page J -
Testimony on HB 3427 - W. Linden - 3 pages K - Testimony on HB 3427 - K.
Ross - 1 page L - Testimony on HB 3217 - Legislative Fiscal - 1 page