

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.

Measures Heard SB 385 (WRK) SB 387 (WRK) SB 388 (WRK) SB 399 (WRK) SB 400 (WRK) SB 391 (PUB) SB 392 (PUB) SB 394 (PUB) SB 395 (PUB) SB 404 (PUB) SB 403 (PUB)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

February 1, 1991Hearing Room C 1:10 p.m.Tapes 16 - 18

MEMBERS PRESENT:SEN. JOYCE COHEN, CHAIR SEN. JIM HILL, VICE-CHAIR
SEN. PETER BROCKMAN SEN. JIM BUNN SEN. JEANNETTE HAMBY SEN. BOB
SHOEMAKER SEN. DICK SPRINGER

STAFF PRESENT: BILL TAYLOR, COMMITTEE COUNSEL MARK THORBURN,
COMMITTEE ASSISTANT

WITNESSES: WILLIAM LINDEN, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

CHARLES WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYER ASSOCIATION

EMILY CEDARLEAF, MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING COUNCIL

TERRY SCOTT, OREGON COLLECTORS ASSOCIATION

JIM MARKEE, OREGON COLLECTORS ASSOCIATION

PAUL SNIDER, ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES

VALERIE SALISB URY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES

EUGENE ORGAN, OREGON DISABILITIES COMMISSION

CARL GARNER, OREGON DISABILITIES COMMISSION

PAUL CONNOLLY, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE

TIM ALEXANDER, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE

JUDY TAYLOR, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE

GARY HUNTER, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE

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 16, SIDE A

004 CHAIR COHEN: Calls meeting to order at 1:10 PM. Invites Bill Taylor to begin bill introductions.

013 BILL TAYLOR, COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Identifies and summarizes the following

bills: LC 2185 from the Law Improvement Committee, LC 1337 from the Oregon Trial Lawyers Association, LC 2613 from the Oregon Banker's Association, LC 158 from the City of Lake Oswego, and LC 2626 from the Oregon Banker's Association.

036 MOTION: SEB. HILL moves that the bills be introduced on the floor as committee bills.

038 CHAIR COHEN: Asks for objections; hearing none, it's so ordered.

SB 385

040 CHAIR COHEN: Brings up and explains SB 385.

043 MOTION: SEN. SHOEMAKER moved SB 385 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

055 VOTE: Motion passes unanimously; Sen. Bunn excused.

SB 387

059 CHAIR COHEN: Let's move to SB 387.

060 BILL TAYLOR: SB 387 permits a respondent to appear in court in a domestic relations suit and then waive all future court appearances in an annulment, dissolution, or separation proceeding. There have been no amendments.

068 MOTION: SEN. HILL moved SB 387 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

073 VOTE: Motion passes unanimously; Sen. Bunn excused.

SB 388

077 CHAIR COHEN: Let's move to SB 388.

078 BILL TAYLOR: SB 388 increases the statutory rate of interest on child support judgments to 13%. There have been no amendments.

085 MOTION: SEN. HAMBY moved SB 388 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

087 VOTE: Motion passes unanimously; Sen. Bunn excused.

SB 399

091 CHAIR COHEN: On to SB 399.

092 BILL TAYLOR: SB 399 allows for the appointment of a receiver to run and maintain real properties subject to forfeiture proceedings during those proceedings unless certain conditions are met. There are no amendments to the bill.

105 MOTION: SEN. HILL moved SB 399 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

108 VOTE: Motion passes unanimously; Sen. Bunn excused.

SB 400

113 CHAIR COHEN: SB 400.

114 BILL TAYLOR: Points out that Section 4 on page 3, subsection 1, has a blank that needs to be filled in with the effective date of the Act.

128 CHAIR COHEN: Is the bill already clear enough for people to know what the effective date is?

134 SEN. SHOEMAKER: When they codify the bill, do they substitute the actual effective date for the words "the effective date of this Act" when they put it into the Oregon Revised Statutes?

138 SEN. BROCKMAN: Don't lines 7 and 8 on page three of section five take care of that blank?

145 SEN. SHOEMAKER: I think you're right.

151 CHAIR COHEN: Why not just fill in January 1, 1992 up above to make it clear and send flag to Legislative Counsel to see what they want us to do?

159 SEN. HILL: Why did we have October 1st there at one point?

160 BILL TAYLOR: That was the effective date of the original of last session's bill.

163 CHAIR COHEN: October 1st was the effective date of that bill and now we're proposing to change that.

167 SEN. SHOEMAKER: If we go with anything other than January 1, 1992, we'd have in internal inconsistency in the bill.

172 MOTION: CHAIR COHEN moved to amend SB 400 by filling in the blank in section four on line one on page three with "January 1, 1992" and, if there's no need to have it there, let Legislative Counsel get back to us.

178 SEN. BROCKMAN: Would have this bill have come to us so soon if someone weren't anxious to have this happen? Are we cutting the effective date back too far?

183 CHAIR COHEN: Let's check back with the Real Estate Section of the Bar to see if the dates are what they requested and will inform them, if amendment passes, that we've chosen January 1, 1992 and if they have a problem with that, we will not send it to the floor.

194 SEN. HAMBY: Another option is to change section 5 to be in sync with the October 1, 1991.

199 CHAIR COHEN: We'll check with the Bar and see.

205 SEN. HAMBY: This bill did pass last year. This is just an extension.

207 BILL TAYLOR: A similar bill passed last session. This bill is basically a technical correction to the bill. Their trying to set a date certain as to when the new changes take effect.

213 CHAIR COHEN: Calls for objections to the amendment. Hearing none,

so ordered.

216 MOTION: SEN. HILL moved SB 400 to the floor with the amendment with a 'do pass' recommendation.

221 VOTE: Motion passes unanimously; Sen. Bunn excused.

SB 392

250 TIM ALEXANDER, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE: Purpose of SB 392 is to try to establish state-wide standards as well as local committees in each judicial district to examine and improve court security. Court personnel are very visible and easy targets for a number of angry people who are brought together in a very tense and stressful situation in a courtroom to litigate their disputes. Oregon not dealing with that security situation. Judges have become masters of conciliation, but their walking on eggshells because there is little security backup. Oregon does poorly in comparison with other states.

326 GARY HUNTER, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE: Relates own experience as court reporter where he witnessed a murder inside a courtroom. Personal attention drawn on security since then; has found tremendous lack of coordination between the courts and sheriffs' offices and there needs to be a comprehensive plan.

360 WILLIAM LINDEN, STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR: The bill provides mechanism for courts and counties to get their act together. Requires planning be done involving the board of commissioners, the courts, the sheriff, the district attorney, and local bar association. Primary problem is whose going to be responsible for it and who will pay. The bill contains a clause saying "subject to available funding" in terms of how the plan will be implemented. At the very least, have to get these planning processes in place and then work on the money side; lack of money not good reason to start planning. (Exhibits A and B)

395 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Will there be funding necessary for the study?

397 LINDEN: No. We plan to devote some of our internal resources to assisting these planning groups. Have already gone through this process in Douglas County, so we have method in place for getting this sort of plan developed and I'm not asking for additional resources to provide that kind of technical assistance. The real funding problems come when you talk about personnel to provide that kind of security and electronic systems.

409 SEN. HILL: Your written testimony says there were 30 bombings in Oregon?

416 LINDEN: Not sure what time span the data covers. There was a bombing in Grants Pass last year and bomb threats are common occurrence. I'll find out what time span that covers.

428 SEN. HAMBY: If there is no additional cost, then why the recommended referral to Ways and Means?

438 LINDEN: The thinking behind it is that this is a funding issue. The bill can be described in such a way that there is no immediate financial effect and they can release it.

447 CHAIR COHEN: We also have agreement with Ways and Means that the bills we send down there we track along and we'll work with them to figure that out.

468 PAUL CONNOLLY, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE: Says that the bill will

ensure that lawyers are not subject to security problems in the courtroom.

TAPE 17, SIDE A

015 JUDY TAYLOR, COURT SECURITY COMMITTEE: Already have a court security committee in Multnomah County. Mentions shooting in courtroom in 1979 before committee established. Urges that the bill be favorably considered.

027 CHAIR COHEN: The bill will offer platform for people who make suggestions to whomever who has the authority to negotiate with others to make sure there's better coordination?

031 JUDY TAYLOR: Yes.

036 PAUL SNIDER, ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES: Problems in this area are funding and ambiguity in existing laws as to who has responsibility for what. This bill does not address these problems. The AOC recommends the creation of a task force during the interim to deal with questions of funding and what kind of facilities are necessary and what kind of standards should be imposed. Until we resolve greater issue of finances, the problems will continue as to who has the responsibility for what aspect of the facilities in the court system. Like to see ambiguities resolved.

071 CHAIR COHEN: Can't you all get together and come up with something?

072 SNIDER: I think we can.

073 CHAIR COHEN: Core of suggestions as to how to handle problem may come from the local groups mentioned by Judy Taylor and this would give you better base to build on than a task force.

SB 395

096 LINDEN: The bill is designed to clarify a few remaining statutory ambiguities regarding court judgments. Paraphrases written testimony (Exhibit C).

SB 404

168 LINDEN: The bill would do away with the civil action data reporting system. Paraphrases written testimony. (Exhibit D) Also mentions that a significant number of attorneys do not feel that the information being requested is appropriate because it deals with certain issues of client confidentiality and fee arrangements. No where near 100% compliance and no way to enforce compliance short of contempt proceedings. Will hang on to data already collected in case need arises, but prefers to focus time and energy on other matters. (Exhibits E and F).

214 SEN. HILL: What of interest came out of collecting the data?

216 LINDEN: Nothing interesting and useful in making decisions; just interesting.

224 SEN. HILL: No conclusions that you could share with us?

227 LINDEN: Nothing surprising in the data and because getting 50% or less reporting, would be hesitant in drawing any conclusions. One thing that is evident is that astronomically high awards in civil cases are rare.

235 CHAIR COHEN: For when we get into questions of auto accidents and what the settlements are and what the allegations are when you take it to court or make a settlement, the average amount of recovery is \$28,000 among those reported.

243 LINDEN: There is good data in report, but it's not being used and we have enough and it's fresh enough that we can stop collecting it and still have some statistics that could be useful if the issues reappear.

246 CHAIR COHEN: Commends the committee to take a look at the report and know that we're getting 50% reporting. Discusses original intent behind the reporting. The data collecting may be irrelevant to Linden's duties, but for policy persons, this is that this committee needs to look at and see before people come before us.

269 SEN. SPRINGER: Thinks the data is necessary.

283 CHAIR COHEN: The committee has an obligation to look at the data.

294 CHARLES WILLIAMSON, OREGON TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION: We do not oppose the bill; not anxious to make lawyers do work that they don't want to do. There are glitches in the system. E.g., the plaintiffs' attorneys and the defendants' attorneys are not reporting the same figures as noneconomic and economic damages. At one point, defense lawyers were not complying, claiming that they were not covered by the bill. Attorneys are willing to file, but need mechanism to remind them. Actual cases that go into court system are less than 10% of all the cases that are settled; proposes making the insurance companies' claims records into public records to see basic information so you'd have data from all cases and not just those that go to court. Would get much better data that way.

SB 394

353 LINDEN: The bill deals with a variety of court administration and management issues. Paraphrases written testimony. (Exhibit G) Also notes that it is his office's belief that the 1989 legislature intended the dispute resolution surcharge to apply to landlord/tenant cases, but Multnomah County does not collect the surcharge; this bill would make it clear that the surcharge is to be collected.

441 EMILY CEDARLEAF: MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING COUNCIL: 80% of all FED's never go beyond the first appearance. There is two step filing fee; one when you pay the FED filing and then a second if it goes to a second appearance or trial. Opposed to putting a surcharge on all FED's just because some go into dispute settlement. Recommends that the statute clearly state that the surcharge does not apply to landlord/tenant matters.

TAPE 16, SIDE B

036 CHAIR COHEN: How do they pay the dispute resolution services if Multnomah County does not collect the money?

039 CEDARLEAF: The only county that is actively doing dispute resolution in FED's is Multnomah County.

040 CHAIR COHEN: Then why wouldn't you support a fee for that?

041 CEDARLEAF: The other counties aren't doing dispute resolution. We're getting surcharged in some counties for things we don't get and, in the one county where we do get it, we don't get charged.

046 CHAIR COHEN: Is that because the charge in Multnomah County would come on the second filing if there is a second filing?

048 CEDARLEAF: Yes.

055 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Present law requires surcharge to be used to establish community dispute resolution programs; that suggests the building of a fund and then establish the dispute resolution in all the counties, including FED cases.

061 CEDARLEAF: In the last session, we were under the strong impression that it did not include FED filing fees. In essence, the surcharge raises the filing fees in FED cases; should raise the filing fees than call it a surcharge which causes chaos.

068 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Section 4 does not exempt FED cases.

069 CEDARLEAF: We understood, at that time, that Section 3, did not include it.

071 CHAIR COHEN: The cold reading of the statute is that they are eligible and should be paying a surcharge.

075 LINDEN: My reading of the current statute is that it is clearly not exempted. Also my understanding that was not what the advocates of the bill in 1989 intended, but that is what resulted.

082 CHAIR COHEN: Then if Multnomah County clearly followed the law, then they'd be charging as well.

084 LINDEN: That's correct.

085 CHAIR COHEN: Even at the first appearance.

086 LINDEN: Yes.

- We don't have an interest in whether the legislature should collect the surcharge in these cases; we're just trying to make it clear that, at least from the way we read the law, Multnomah County should be collecting that fee.

092 CHAIR COHEN: Then it's not a question of at what point they should collect the fee, at the first filing or the second filing, but the first filing would have triggered the charge if Multnomah County had followed the law.

093 LINDEN: That's correct.

095 SEN. SHOEMAKER: In Multnomah County, the dispute resolution procedure does work to reduce FED actions?

098 CEDARLEAF: At times it works for the benefit of both; many times for the detriment of the landlord.

101 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Do you think it's a good program?

102 CEDARLEAF: Yes, as long as the dispute settlement people are actively trained in landlord-tenant law.

103 SEN. SHOEMAKER: If that be true, then it would seem to follow that it's a good program in other counties as well and then a surcharge in all counties would be appropriate.

107 CEDARLEAF: If there were an encouragement to push them into the

process faster, I'd be happier than letting them sit there and accumulating the money and not offering dispute resolution on landlord-tenant matters. We're now getting the indication that it is not going to happen for a long time.

122 CHAIR COHEN: Why isn't any of the dispute resolution folks aren't here.

124 BILL TAYLOR: I'll call them.

SB 391

130 LINDEN: The bill deals with interpreter services for the hearing impaired and non- English speaking parties who find themselves in our court system. Paraphrases written testimony (Exhibit H) and discusses federal mandates (Exhibits H and I).

184 SEN. HILL: Refers to letter from Attorney General's office to Linda Zuckerman. (Exhibit J) The letter refers to federal funds; what federal funds?

193 LINDEN: The letter was in response to a question we posed to the Attorney General about whether receiving federal funds brought us into any particular problems with federal statutes requiring recipients to do certain things. The Judicial Department does not have any federally funded projects, but don't have to be federal fund recipient to have the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act apply.

204 SEN. SHOEMAKER: If the funding is in the governor's budget, then why the emergency clause?

211 LINDEN: Don't know if there is a compelling reason for the emergency clause; would like to look at it a bit.

223 SEN. HILL: How much money are we talking about?

224 LINDEN: For 1991-93, expect to spend \$900,000 on these services; would rise to \$1.1 million for 1993-95.

252 VALERIE SALISB URY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES: There is real question about the extent of the federal mandate. We're not sure of exactly what services are to be provided for the hearing and speech impaired and whether there can be repayment based on ability to pay.

- Requests point of clarification: Under SB 391, there is a mandate that, in all civil and criminal cases in municipal court, the interpreter services be provided. Section 1 (3) (b), payment for those services is to be made by the city subject to the approval of the governing body of the city. Appears to connote some discretion or ability to determine under what circumstances payment would be made. Not sure about the intent of the language. There is comparable language in section 2 for non-English interpreters. There is also similar language about payment by the county.

287 CHAIR COHEN: So you're questioning the "subject to" language in terms of allowing them discretion? Is that your interpretation Bill?

292 BILL TAYLOR: Yes, and we've talked before.

293 SALISB URY: It appears to be a mandate with a discretionary payment provision. Not sure how we should do that.

297 CHAIR COHEN: We'll try to sort that out with the drafters of the bill and with Legislative Counsel.

299 BILL TAYLOR: I've talked with Kingsley Click (Deputy State Court Administrator) and maybe the State Court Administrator's office could clarify what they think it means.

303 SALISB URY: Opposed to unfunded mandates to the extent the requirements are not mandated by the federal government now; we request state funding if the mandate is to be imposed by the state. In smaller cities, the impact of the interpreter requirements will be financially significant in light of Ballot Measure 5.

318 CHAIR COHEN: Have you provided the committee your numbers?

324 SALISB URY: We provided that to Legislative Fiscal.

325 CHAIR COHEN: So it came through Legislative Fiscal and not through us. And we have Legislative Fiscal's report indicating no impact on state or local revenues.

329 SALISB URY: On revenues, no impact.

334 CHAIR COHEN: You need to work with them to make sure that there is an impact. I don't see impact statement in our files; this bill is headed to Ways and Means and they may not send it to us if they know its coming down there; they may review it in its entirety.

- Asks Linden to address the possible discretion of the city council or county commission.

353 LINDEN: The way I read the language in section 1 is that it provides that cities, counties, and the state are going to have to make decisions about what is fair compensation for interpreters services.

359 CHAIR COHEN: It's not a debate about what you have to provide, but what is fair compensation.

362 LINDEN: That's how I construe it. And that's also the section where I suggest we be allowed to contract for services because, in some jurisdictions, the best way to do it.

369 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Do I read this letter to say that, presently, there is no federal mandate that would apply to state courts?

376 LINDEN: It's the January, 1992 date that we're most concerned with.

381 CHAIR COHEN: What happens to the cities that federal fund recipients? Or is it just the city courts?

384 LINDEN: Cities and counties are clearly covered under the 1990 Act. Not sure what the fiscal implications are.

402 EUGENE ORGAN, OREGON DISABILITIES COMMISSION: Support the intent of SB 391. Feels that Oregon has been out of compliance with federal law for some time. Under the 1990 Act, it's very clear that all state and local governments must provide all services to people with disabilities without any discrimination. It also applies to many private sector enterprises. No doubt that interpreters must be provided for the deaf in court situations and other situations. Has brochures on the Americans with Disabilities Act.

027 - For the hearing impaired, we've introduced legislation that is before the House Judiciary Committee which would do very similar kinds of things and also add assistive communication devices for the hard of hearing.

039 CARL GARNER, OREGON DISABILITIES COMMISSION: There is certainly some question about how things have been handled in Oregon for years, specifically as to the area of contested cases. There is also some question as to whether section 504 already does apply to the state court system due to all cases prosecuted by the district attorney are recipients of federal funds. Americans with Disabilities Act eliminates any doubt. Have submitted amendments for committee's consideration regarding assistive communication devices. Propose in legislation that there be such devices purchased and placed within each of the counties and then they work out how to move the devices from location to location to minimize the fiscal impact. The \$900,000 is not all new money, but the majority of that is already within the State Court Administrator's budget. (Exhibits K and L)

078 CHAIR COHEN: You believe that your amendment is required as well as the section 504 rules?

080 GARNER: That's correct.

081 CHAIR COHEN: And there's some dispute with the people who have sponsored this bill?

083 GARNER: That's correct and we've discussed it with the Kingsley Click; the greatest fear we all have is the fiscal impact. They don't oppose the amendment in principal; the main concern is the fiscal impact.

090 CHAIR COHEN: Carefully document for us and get to Bill Taylor examples of the 504 rule that you think covers the need for devices as a federal mandate right now so we can make the choice whether to include it or not before we send it to Ways and Means.

096 GARNER: Would be delighted to.

SB 403

105 LINDEN: SB 403 is an attempt to provide consistency in the way filing fees are charged in small claims cases. Paraphrases written testimony. (Exhibit M) Says that another look at the phrase "single transaction or occurrence" in bill is needed. Have had discussions with the Oregon Collectors Association and will try to narrow any disagreements with them before the work session; however, there are public policy issues about whether multiple filings should be allowed to avoid jurisdictional limits that need to be addressed.

173 JAMES MARKEE, OREGON COLLECTORS ASSOCIATION: Line 8, page 1, of the bill takes about paying a fee for each verified claim; that needs clarification. Collection agencies work differently than most individuals; e.g., if we have six bad checks against an individual that may be lumped together in one claim, do we pay a filing fee for each check for just one fee?

195 SEN. SHOEMAKER: Doesn't second sentence in lines 14 - 15 of page 1 provide a definition of the word "claim" that would apply to the earlier subsection of that same section requiring a filing fee for each verified claim?

205 MARKEE: It may. A verified claim in the collections industry means

a debt arising from one transaction.

- Lines 13 through 16 refer to "single transaction or occurrence." Not sure what that means. By contract, a collection may be prevented from lumping one claims that has been assigned to it with others from the same incident from different creditors; that may cause a problem with this wording. Could also argue that each claim from a different creditor is a separate occurrence.

- A problem certainly arises if there is a debt from one creditor that exceeds the \$2500 jurisdictional limit and somebody is splitting that debt and suing for past due payments on one claim and for the balance on another; if we can use this bill to prohibit that, then in favor of the bill.

244 TERRY SCOTT, OREGON COLLECTORS ASSOCIATION: Describes the problem of uniformity in the small claims forms used by the different counties. Wants the State Court Administrator to be responsible for the forms.

- Believes that if collection agency has multiple verified claims against single debtor, then will have to pay multiple filing fees if claims lumped into one small claims suit.

- Courts interpret "single occurrence" as a single happening out of which a multitude of things might arise. Will statutorily prohibit landlords from seeking damages in small claims after evicting tenant through an FED.

343 MARKEE: Have not talked with William Linden about the small claims forms and don't want to garbage up the bill with something Linden does not want to do.

350 CHAIR COHEN: And we can deal with that in another bill; just let us know.

355 CEDARLEAF: In many landlord-tenant cases, a landlord will file a small claims action for rent while the tenant is still in the unit without going through the FED. Questions arises, if the tenancy continues, whether the landlord can file an FED or file again in small claims for rent later arising and not paid.

368 CHAIR COHEN: We may have to use different definitions for landlord-tenant matters.

380 CEDARLEAF: Would like to combine in small claims the process of getting an order for possession with the process of getting money from tenant.

388 CHAIR COHEN: That a different issue and you ought to talk to Bill Taylor about drafting a bill for that.

392 CEDARLEAF: Under the Notice to Defendant on page two, and on line 33 of page two, urge that you add that if the defendant has paid the claim, then they must provide proof of payment to the court.

416 CHAIR COHEN: What do we have now?.

417 CEDARLEAF: The requirement is to pay it to the court. The bill changes that to paying directly to the plaintiff with a notice to the court by the defendant that they've made the payment.

424 CHAIR COHEN: But it's the person to whom the debt is owed that files with the court that the debt has been paid.

435 CEDARLEAF: Then that's my misunderstanding.

TAPE 18, SIDE A

002 CHAIR COHEN: I thought that's what Bill Linden said; we need a clarification.

005 SEN. SHOEMAKER: I think the bill says the plaintiff sends the notice.

006 CEDARLEAF: Somebody has to notify the court that its been paid; if it's not, then it's clouding up credit reports that may infringe on the tenant's right to get housing or other credit.

011 SEN. SHOEMAKER: It is the defendant.

013 CHAIR COHEN: We ask that you all get together to work on this before the work session and work with Bill Taylor with the understanding that we're going to have a bill with more explicit language. If you come to impasses on policy, we'll deal with them here. We'll have Bill Taylor draft a variety of amendments that the committee can consider and chose from.

- Adjourns meeting at 3:03 pm.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Mark Thorburn
Committee Counsel

Bill Taylor Committee Assistant

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony on SB 392 - William Linden - 3 pages
B - Report on Security in Douglas County - William Linden - 88
pages C - Testimony on SB 395 - William Linden - 8 pages
D - Testimony on SB 404 - William Linden - 3 pages
E - Letter Concerning SB 404 - William Linden - 2 pages
F - 1989 ORS 18.425 Report - William Linden - 48 pages
G - Testimony on SB 394 - William Linden - 8 pages
H - Testimony on SB 391 - William Linden - 4 pages I- Copy
of 29 USC 794 RE: SB 391 - Bill Taylor - 2 pages J - Series of
Letters and Report RE: SB 391 - William Linden - 18 pages
K - Testimony on SB 391 - Carl Garner - 2 pages L - Proposed
Amendments to SB 391 - Carl Garner - 1 page M - Testimony on SB
403 - William Linden - 5 pages Senate Judiciary Committee January 20,
1991 - Page

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.