

Measures Heard HB 2187 (VVS) HB 2083 (PH/WS) HB 2079 (PH/WS) HB 2049 (PH/WS) HB 2051 (PH/WS) HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FAMILY JUSTICE

January 25, 1991 Hearing Room 357 3:00 p.m. Tapes 8 - 9
MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Kelly Clark, Chair Rep. Judy Bauman Rep. Marie Bell Rep. Jim Edmunson Rep. Kevin Mannix Rep. Tom Mason Rep. Del Parks Rep. Ron Sunseri STAFF PRESENT: Holly Robinson, Committee Counsel Jeff Steve, Committee Assistant

WITNESSES: Dean Barr, State of Oregon, Employment Division (HB 2083) John A. Ellis, Department of Justice (HB 2083) Larry R. Foster, M.D., Department of Human Resources, Health Division (HB 2079) Gary L. Oxman, M.D., Multnomah County, Department of Human Services, Health Department (2079) Barbara Orazio, Board of Examiners of Nursing Home Administrators (HB 2049 and HB 2051) Jim Gardner, Oregon Health Care Associates (HB 2049) . ,

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 12, SIDE A (Refer to Full Committee Meeting tape, 1/25/91) (Full Committee adjourned for Family Justice Subcommittee to go into WS on HB 218 7)

FAMILY JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE: HB 2187

212 CHAIR CLARK: Summarizes HB 2187. This is a bill to bring Oregon Student Records Law House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 2

into compliance with federal law for the purposes of funding. Everything up to line 37 on page 2 of the Bill is basically mandated by the federal government. The last sentence of the Bill was inserted in an attempt to prevent the Oregon Student Lobby from opposing the Bill.

231 MOTION, REP. SUNSERI: Move that after the word "student" on line 38 we insert "under 21 years of age." Parents who are providing education for these children deserve to have access to those records up to that age. 363VOTE: 5-2

Aye: Bauman, Bell, Mannix, Parks, Sunseri No: Mason, Clark

Motion passes. Sunseri's amendment is added to HB 2187.

373 REP. BAUMAN: I suggest that we move with a conceptual amendment that the State Board may authorize disclosure of information to any person financially responsible for any student.

390 REP. PARKS: Moves HB 2187 to full committee with a "do pass."

402 REP. MANNIX: Thinks "under" should be changed to "over" 21 years.

404 REP. SUNSERI: Meant to say "over." TAPE 13, SIDE A

054 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves to amend HB 2187 to delete the words from the Sunseri Motion and insert instead "21 years of age or older" after the words "dependent student." 062REP. BAUMAN: Votes no on

Mannix Amendment. 070 VOTE: No objection but for Rep. Bauman. Mannix Amendment passes. 073 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves HB 2187 as amended to Full Committee with a "do pass" recommendation. 077 REP. BAUMAN: I think there are some circumstances where parents of dependent students are not the one's paying the bill. The student may be dependent without being dependent on the parent. In fact, there are some parents who's interest and involvement for children even younger than that is not necessarily positive. Therefore, I will be opposing the bill.

081 VOTE: 6-1

Aye: Bell, Mannix, Mason, Parks, Sunseri, Clark No: Bauman

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 January 25, 1991 - Page 3

Motion passes. HB 2187 as amended passes to full committee with a "do pass" recommendation. Rep. Mannix to carry.

082 CHAIR CLARK: Adjourns Family Justice Subcommittee.

FAMILY JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE: REGULAR MEETING

TAPE 8, SIDE A

004 REP. CLARK: Calls meeting to order. We will be taking testimony on HB 2083.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2083

014 ROBINSON: Summarizes HB 2083. Removes the 25% limitation on collection of unemployment compensation benefits from the unemployment compensation statutes, deletes the provision allowing the Employment Division to be a trustee for child support collected, and specifies that withholding of child support can only result from orders being enforced by the Title IV-D agency, which is Adult and Family Services.

031 DEAN BARR, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR HEARINGS, OREGON EMPLOYMENT DIVISION: EXHIBIT A -Each year the Secretary of Labor certifies that the unemployment compensation law in Oregon conforms with the requirements of the underlying federal law. In April of last year, the Department of Labor notified the Employment Division that its statutes authorizing withholding of child support from unemployment benefits did not comply with federal law. Specifically, the Department found that ORS 657.780 and 657.855 require the following amendments in order to conform to federal law. -Must specifically designate the state IV-D agents as the payee of support obligations deducted from unemployment benefits. -Must provide for voluntary withholding of benefits for child support payments or the withholding of benefits pursuant to an agreement between the unemployment claimant and the Support and Enforcement Division. -ORS 657.855 should not by reference to ORS 25.050 or 416.455 or otherwise allow withholding of interest and other charges. Withholding of such charges is prohibited under federal regulations. -The amount of weekly unemployment benefits that may be deducted for child support should not be limited to 25%. -These matters have been addressed in HB 2083 and SB 220. 069 REP. CLARK: One of the things you are telling us we tried to do which was to limit the

withholding for child support purposes can't be done in the Unemployment statutes, but can be done in the Support and Enforcement statutes. This doesn't make much sense to me.

078 JOHN ELLIS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: EXHIBIT B -The Department of Justice has filed a similar corollary legislation to make the necessary changes in the child support statutes which happen to be Chapter 25 and Chapter 416 .

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize rtatementr made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the procoadin8., please refer to the tapes. . . . House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 4 WORK SESSION ON HB 2083

089 MOTION, REP. BAUMAN: Moves HB 2083 to Full Committee with a "do pass" recommendation. 099 VOTE: 7-0

Aye: Bauman, Bell, Mannix, Mason, Parks, Sunseri, Clark No: 0 Excused: Edmunson . Motion passes. HB 2083 moves to Full Committee with a "do pass" recommendation. Rep. Bauman to carry.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2079

115 ROBINSON: Summarizes HB 2079. There are procedures in the statutes that allow the Health Division to obtain orders to confine individuals when they are found to be contagious. The Health Division is proposing to extend the length of time that that would be allowed based upon substantial medical evidence.

121 LARRY R. FOSTER, M.D., OREGON HEALTH DIVISION: EXHIBIT C. -The law as written creates problems for implementing quarantine for tuberculosis (TB) patients. Quarantine would be used only for diseases such as TB which can be spread in a public place to persons who are unknowing of the fact that they may be exposed. It would not apply to diseases such as AIDS. -The existing law states that a person may be quarantined no longer than 60 days. This is a problem for TB because with a 60 day treatment of a TB patient you can render the person non infectious, but there is a very high likelihood that the person would become infectious again. -The Department proposes to extend the time to 180 days which is the recommended treatment time for TB. -The Department would like to make it explicit that a person who fails to follow the court ordered public health measure may be held in contempt of court which would permit the authorities to confine the individual in a jail if necessary. - The ACLU does not oppose this legislation.

160 REP. CLARK: Is the provision that subjects a person to contempt of court a new provision?

162 FOSTER: Correct.

169 REP. MANNIX: There is a process in the law for finding a person in contempt, but this proposed provision makes it clear that when a person disobeys the court order the statute allows the detention of that person.

177 FOSTER: What the language is intended to do is to make it explicit that if the person fails to follow the court order, they may be held in contempt and provided the opportunity to go through the standard

procedures allowed by other laws for contempt proceedings. _ These
elinube contain rnatcrials which paraphrasc and/or rummarize rtatements
mede during tthis sess~on Only text enclosed in quotation nurlcs report ~
epeakertr exact words For complete contentr of the procoedingr, please
refer to the taper House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page
5

183 REP. CLARK: If I understand, someone will go in front of the court
and ask for the quarantine order. If the person wants more than the
standard 60 days quarantine then they have to provide substantial
medical evidence that the condition cannot be rendered non-infectious
within the 60 days. Is that correct?

188 FOSTER: The burden would be upon the health officer who is bringing
the issue to the judge to provide substantial evidence.

192 ROBINSON: How many times have you had to use this court ordered
quarantine procedure and are there many people running around with TB?

193 FOSTER: There are quite a few TB patients, most of whom cooperate
with the health authorities. I believe that only one person has been
subjected to this quarantine since the 1987 law was passed. It would be
a rare event.

207 REP. BAUMAN: It appears to me that this bill is very broad and it
does not apply only to TB.

211 FOSTER: It is not specifically limited to TB. We chose language
that would apply to any disease such as TB. Practically, the law would
apply mostly to TB.

220 REP. BAUMAN: Would this impact an AIDS patient?

223 FOSTER: It is our intention that this law would not apply to AIDS
patients. The distinction that the Department makes is that TB is a
disease that the public can be unknowingly exposed. On the other hand,
HIV is a disease which is transmitted only by sexual contact or blood
contact such as the use of needles, a knowing behavior.

243 REP. BAUMAN: Could you help us tighten up the language to exclude
AIDS patients or people with non-infectious diseases?

251 RFP. CLARK: This law establishes that the least restrictive
alternative is being used to protect the public. The safety is already
in the law. I don't know if we can do more than that.

255 REP. BAUMAN: The language is not clear that it addresses only TB.
There is another obvious health problem that is also transmitted
unknowingly, albeit through engaging in risky behavior.

279 REP. MANNIX: The language of the "current" law takes care of this.
It states that one has to have an "infectious" agent of a communicable
disease which is designated a reportable disease by the Division. The
health officials then have to go before a judge and prove that the
person poses a substantial risk to public health, not private health,
that the person is uncooperative, and that the least restrictive
alternative is used.

306 FOSTER: This bill is not limited to TB. I would be reluctant to say
in the law that TB is the only disease to which the law would apply,

because it would inappropriately tie the hands of the public health and the court systems.

318 REP. CLARK: What else comes to mind that might arise?

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report the speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the Tapes. House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 6

320 FOSTER: For the contempt proceedings, a disease which might come into play would be diphtheria.

330 REP. CLARK: How rare is diphtheria?

331 FOSTER: Extremely rare here in Oregon.

334 REP. BAUMAN: Would you say that this bill would not impact AIDS?

338 FOSTER: That would be my representation. At the same time, I cannot rule out the possibility of using this law to quarantine a person who is flagrantly going about exposing themselves to the public.

352 REP. CLARK: It is the function of this committee that we tailor the laws as narrowly as possible. Would the Health Division not support the bill if this Committee saw fit to specify that the bill covers only TB?

368 FOSTER: No. I would still support the bill.

375 REP. PARKS: I can't think of any other disease that the change would apply? You only have the power under the 60 day quarantine procedure for diseases that you can take care of.

381 FOSTER: Most of the other diseases that are infectious can be treated and rendered noninfectious in less than 60 days. Right now, under current technology it takes 180 days to treat TB. 404 GARY OXMAN, MD., MULTNOMAH COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT: EXHIBIT D -These changes will allow us as health officers to have a tool that we can use to control TB in this state. These types of measures are rarely used, but they are potentially important tools in two ways: -They can be used to restrict the behavior of individuals who do not comply with the rules -They can be used as a threat to push people over the line into actually cooperating with what they should be doing under normal self-interest and legal and ethical imperatives. The law would mainly be used for controlling TB.

TAPE 9, SIDE A

020 OXMAN: We have had an increase in TB cases in recent years. More disturbing we have had an increase in resistant TB. This TB cannot be cured by the drugs that are normally used for TB. This form of TB generally occurs when individuals receive an intermittent course of therapy. They start on therapy and then discontinue the treatment. What happens is that the germs adapt to the presence of the antibiotic and become resistant to that drug. Resistant TB can last up to 23 years if continual treatment is used. What I would suggest is, something that health authorities in South Carolina have used for years. The Department would seek a court order for an individual simply to be ordered to take medication on an outpatient basis under strict supervision by the TB

clinic.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize Ina :ments made during thir seacion. Only text enclosed in quotation Irks report a speaker's exact words, Por complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 7

-In conclusion, the changes would: -Result in less restrictive health measures -Lower cost

082 REP. BAUMAN: My concern is that there is a growing community of people affected with HIV. I don't know who they are when I am out in public. You may know who they are because they might come into your clinics. What I am attempting to do in this line of questioning is to make sure that no alienation occurs of people testing positive for HIV. In order to achieve that, it might be wise to include, as an intent of the bill, that this law would not apply to those having AIDS.

116 OXMAN: My intent is that the law would not be used for other than casually transmissible diseases. If the Committee were to restrict the use of this procedure, I ask that it be a general, rather than a specific restriction. For example, the Committee could adopt language which states, "restricted to casually transmissible disease, ." Then, give the Department authority to specify those diseases by rule.

139 REP. BAUMAN: On its face there is nothing in the bill that suggests the intent of the Department that it not be used for restricting the rights of AIDS patients. If it's clear, there is no need to go into legislative history.

146 REP. MANNIX: Do you have any idea how many new diseases are being uncovered every year by the Center For Disease Control located in Atlanta? 148 OXMAN: The number in this country is very small. It would be a few per year and at very low frequency. Speaking to Rep. Bauman's question, it is extremely difficult to prove that somebody is infectious and a threat to the public health. It would be essentially impossible to convince the court that a person testing positive for HIV would be a health threat to the public.

165 REP. MANNIX: Isn't it fair to say that in the U.S. different communities in different states from time to time experience a recurrence of an epidemic type disease through surprise and inadvertence? Next week we might see an epidemic on our hands.

174 OXMAN: We could be in that position, but it is unlikely.

188 REP. BELL: Perhaps we could change the wording from "is rendered non-infectious" to "is rendered not a threat to public health." That would take care of the first part of the bill. Secondly, I think the section that subjects persons who disobey court orders should apply across the board to others such as AIDS patients.

199 REP. MANNIX: I understand that the 1987 legislature reworked this area of the law substantially and carefully worded its content. Is that fare to say? 207OXMAN: That is fare to say. I would further add that a great deal of the work that was done on the revision of this bill came from individuals who were concerned about HIV infection and was done in the context of the HIV Policy Committee sponsored by the State Health Division.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during the HB 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 January 25, 1991 - Page 8

211 REP. MANNIX: I am very reluctant to change this statute unless we bring all those people back together to address the issue. Have those people had a chance to comment on the bill? 217 OXMAN: Yes. Ted Falk was one of the primary drafters of that legislation back in 1987. (See testimony of Theodore C. Falk Exhibit E) Mr. Falk does not see these amendments as damaging to that law and the principles behind it.

229 REP. CLARK: I ask Rep. Bell to work with Counsel and Drs. Oxman and Foster in coming up with proposed language that we could consider next week concerning the breadth of the bill. Closes public hearing HB 2079.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2049

252 ROBINSON: Summarizes HB 2049. Expands authority of Board of Examiners of Nursing Home Administrators in disciplinary matters involving nursing home administrators. HB 2049 proposes to change the grounds upon which one can be sanctioned and to give the members of the Board additional authority in terms of conducting investigatory proceedings. 259 BARBARA ORAZIO, EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF NURSING HOME ADMINISTRATORS: EXHIBIT F. -Reads from Exhibit F. 350

REP. BELL: On page 2, lines 1-3 regarding the suspension or revocation [refers to page 2, lines 14-16 in Exhibit F] I wonder if that includes past history or does that need to be recognized. 364 ORAZIO: You are asking that if a person was to apply in Oregon, but perhaps did not reveal that information [concerning suspension or revocation] on their application at the time that that would be grounds for suspension or revocation, because they sign the application under penalty of perjury. 366 ROBINSON: We are presently pulling together information about who has subpoena power among the State Licensing Boards in Oregon.

379 REP. CLARK: Does page 1, line 21 [refers to page 1, line 23 of Exhibit F] which refers to "habitual or excessive use of intoxicants, drugs or controlled substances" cover any use of drugs or controlled substances and habitual use of intoxicants? Also, if on Super Bowl Sunday a couple of people get together and have three or four beers and wobble on down the hall way and go to sleep, is that excessive use of intoxicants? 384 ORAZIO: This would apply to situations where the administrator would be drinking on the job to the point where it would interfere with their ability to perform.

TAPE 8, SIDE B

020 REP. EDMUNSON: With respect to sanctions brought against an administrator for discharge of an employee based "primarily" on the employee's attempt to comply or aid in the compliance of the rules, why did you say "primarily?" That seems like a large loop hole. This allows the House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 9

administrator to raise, the defense that the reason for discharging the employee was not "primarily" because the employee was attempting to comply with rules, i.e. by complaining to the Board of the administrator's performance.

033 ORAZIO: You would get into a real mess trying to determine if the

primary reason that the administrators let an employee go was because the employee complained to the Board or because they were not performing their duties.

035 REP. EDMUNSON: To the extent that you're not concerned whether the employee is performing their duties or not, it should be that if there is any retaliation made, on the part of the administrator that reflects on their fitness to administer a home, then the Board should bring sanctions. Would you agree with that?

039 ORAZIO: Yes.

040 REP. EDMUNSON: Would you have any problem with eliminating "primarily" and including other language that would close the loophole such as, "materially based upon?"

043 ORAZIO: We would also look at the performance of the employee to determine whether or not to impose sanctions.

046 JDM GARDNER, OREGON HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION -The Association supports HB 2049. I do have a couple of suggestions. -Line 31, I would suggest after the word "penalty" the words "imposed against the administrator" be inserted. This is to safe guard against bringing sanctions against the administrator for the acts of an out-of-state owner who fails to pay a penalty. 060 REP. EDMUNSON: Do really think that's a problem? It is the licentiate's license and conduct which is at issue, not the owner's. 062 GARDNER: I think it is desirable for purposes of clarity so the individual is not subject to potential threat. 064 REP. EDMUNSON: We are not establishing any respondeat superior here. 068 GARDNER: I think it appropriate to delete the word "primarily" in line 29. Line 21 is a bit vague and the committee may want to clarify it. 073 REP. MANNIX: Taking a look at the nursing code, which has been mod)ified in recent years, they have a phrase that is a good substitute. It reads, "Use of any controlled substance or intoxicating liquor to an extent or in a manner dangerous or injurious to the licensee or others or to an extent that such use impairs the ability to conduct safely the practice for which the licensee is licensed." How does that sound? 080 GARDNER: That is a bit better, because it avoids the ambiguity that drug might include a prescription drug.

These minutes coach matcriab which paraphrallc and/or - mmarlzc sta :mcnts made dwin. this sculon. Only text cneloYcd in quotation marlcs report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceeding, plcasc refer to the tapcs. House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 10

WORK SESSION ON HB 2049

086 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves to amend the bill in three ways: 1) Line 21, subsection Fe-Delete the language in the proposed bill and insert instead language found in ORS 678.111(1)(e). "Use of any controlled substance or intoxicating liquor to an extent or in a manner dangerous or injurious to the licensee or others or to an extent that such use impairs the ability to conduct safely the practice for which the licensee is licensed." 2) Line 29, delete the word "primarily." 3) Line 31, insert the phrase "imposed against the administrator" after the word "penalty." 108 VOTE: 8-0

Aye: Bauman, Bell, Edmunson, Mannix, Mason, Parks, Sunseri, Clark No: 0

Motion passes.

109 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves to full committee with "do pass.
recommendation. 110 VOTE: 8-0

Aye: Bauman, Bell, Edmunson, Mannix, Mason, Parks, Sunseri, Clark No: 0

Motion passes. HB 2049 moves to Full Committee with a "do pass"
recommendation. Rep. Mason to carry.

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2051

138 ROBINSON: Summarizes HB 2051. Amends the reporting statutes to
more clearly define the authority of the Board of Examiners of Nursing
Home Administrators (Board) in regard to reported violations of
unsanitary or other unsatisfactory conditions and provides for
confidentiality of a complaint and/or investigation until the
investigation is completed or until x days after the complaint is filed.
Also allows disclosure of the existence and nature of a complaint to the
subject of the complaint. 150 ORAZIO: Section 1, subsection 1, lines
6-10 of the Bill were changed to more clearly define the authority of
the Board in regard to reported violations of unsanitary or other
unsatisfactory conditions. Reports of these conditions are referred to
the local Senior and Disabled Services Division Agency. If the complaint
appears to be one which would violate the Board's laws or regulations
then depending on the complaint it may be referred to Senior and
Disabled Services Medicaid Fraud or submitted to the Board's
Investigative Committee. -Section 1, subsection 2, line 11 was inserted
by the Office of Legislative Counsel. It is acceptable to us. -Section
1, subsection 3, line 13 was again recommended by the Assistant Attorney
General. This statute provides for the confidentiality of a complaint
and or investigation during the period of investigation. This statute
not only gives added protection to witnesses who request House Committee
on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 11

anonymity, but also insures that an administrator will not be tried by
the media while the investigation is proceeding. -Section 1, subsection
4, line 17 is acceptable. 186 RFP. CLARK: Do you have a suggestion to
the magical number? 187 ORAZIO: At least 90 days. 190 REP. MANNIX:
Section 2 bothers me. The original language states, "Information
acquired by the Board pursuant to subsection 1 of this section is
confidential and shall not be subject to public disclosure." The change
would state, "On y if the Board acquired the information before the
effective date of this act is it confidential and not subject to
disclosure." Does that mean that anything that is hereafter acquired is
subject to disclosure? For now on, we are not promising that the
information is going to be confidential except for 90 days or during the
investigation whichever occurs first. 207 REP. MASON: Would you rather
have 180 days? 210 ORAZIO: I will accept 180 days if you're willing to
support that. 233 REP. EDMUNSON: Who benefits from this legislation?
Who has the privilege? Isn't it so that the person against whom the
complaint is filed be allowed to compel disclosure? 242 REP. CLARK:
Does a person against whom a complaint is filed have immediate access to
that complaint? 243 ORAZIO: I cannot answer that since no one has ever
asked to see the file. 245 REP. CLARK: Rep. Edmunson raises a good
point. 257 REP. PARKS: If you don't have an opportunity to investigate
for six months because you don't know about it, your defense may be
gone. 265 REP. PARKS: Isn't this the kind of nondisclosure that people
object to the Ethics Commission about? 272 REP. MANNIX: The real

objection is, right now any person can anonymously file a complaint with the Ethics Commission and the fact that the complaint has been filed and an investigation has been carried out is publicly disclosed by the Ethics Commission. The proposal now is that the Ethics Commission should not disclose except to the person against whom the complaint is filed.

278 REP. BELL: If I were the child of a parent in a home and someone had a complaint filed against them I would want it brought to my attention right away, not 180 days later. 288 REP. MASON: Under current law, the information concerning the complaint is completely confidential. What the bill does is open it up.

There m nutec contain materialr which paraphrare and/or summarize astements made during thir resrion Only text enclosed ~ quotation marh report a speaker's exact words Por complete contents of the proceedi gs, please refer to the tape. House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 12

WORK SESSION ON HB 2051 320 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves to amend bill at lines 14 and 15 as follows: After the words "shall not be subject to public disclosure" delete the words "during the period of the investigation" and substitute instead "until the investigation is completed or until 180 days after the complaint is filed." The reason is, I thought you needed an "event" in terms of the investigation. "During the investigation" is ethereal. "Completion of the investigation" and "180 days" is something to focus on. 340 VOTE: No objection. Motion passes. 356 MOTION, REP. EDMUNSON: Moves to amend the bill at the end of subsection 3 to read "the Board shall upon request disclose the existence and nature of the complaint to any person against whom the complaint is made." Such persons should have the opportunity find that information out. 389 REP. PARKS: Does the person have to request disclosure or do they have to be not)fied whether they have a complaint filed against them? 394 REP. EDMUNSON: No. I intended it to be that the person must make an affirmative request. There does not have to be notice to a person against whom the complaint is filed. 402 ROBINSON: Does the discloser of the complaint apply to "any person who asks" or only to "the person who is subject to the investigation?" 404 REP. EDMUNSON: To the person who is the subject of the investigation. 418 REP. BAUMAN: Could you explain the importance of the difference between "upon request" and having a notice provision? 421 REP. EDMUNSON: Fundamentally, I would prefer that everything be disclosed. My purpose in this amendment is to make it the least restrictive as possible.

TAPE 9, SIDE B 008 REP. BAUMAN: You don't mind that it is a well kept secret?

012 REP. EDMUNSON: I don't see the harm there. What I want to take care of is the prevention of rumors.

024 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: I strongly support Rep. Edmunson's proposal. On the other hand, there is a strong argument for nondisclosure of this information when an investigation is proceeding on suspicion of crime related activities by the administrator. Makes a friendly amendment to read "the Board shall upon request of the person who is the subject of the complaint disclose the existence and nature of the complaint to such person." 039 VOTE: No objection. Motion passes. House Committee on Judiciary January 25, 1991 - Page 13

043 MOTION, REP. MANNIX: Moves HB 2051 as amended to Full Committee with a ~do pass" recommendation. 049 VOTE: 8-0

Aye: Bauman, Bell, Edmunson, Mannix, Mason, Parks, Sunseri, Clark No: 0

Motion passes. HB 2051 as amended moves to Full Committee with a "do pass" recommendation. Rep. Parks to carry.

061 REP. CLARK: Adjourns Family Subcommittee at 4:30.

Submitted by: Assistant David Harrell, Office Manager Reviewed by: J. Kennedy Steve,

EXHIBIT LOG:

A Testimony on HB 2083, Dean Barr, 1 pages B Testimony on HB 2083,
John A. Ellis, 1 page C Testimony on HB 2079, Laurence R. Foster,
M.D., 3 pages D Testimony on HB 2079, Gary L. Oxman, M.D., 4 pages
E Testimony on HB 2049, Theodore C. Falk, 3 pages F Testimony on
HB 2049, Barbara Orazio, 4 pages

These minutes contain nuteriale which paraphrase and/or rumnarize
"temente made during thir seuion Only text enclosed in quotation marb
report a peaker's exact words For complete contents of the proceedin,ge,
plea~e refer to the tapes