

Senate Committee on Judiciary February 8, 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.

Measures Heard SB 133, PH SB 137, PH SB 102, PH HB 2199, PH

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

February 8, 1991 Hearing Room C 1:00 p.m. Tapes 23 - 25

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Joyce Cohen, Chair Sen. Peter Brockman Sen. Jeannette Hamby Sen. Dick Springer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Sen. Jim Hill, Vice-Chair Sen. Jim Bunn Sen. Bob Shoemaker

STAFF PRESENT: Ingrid Swenson, Committee Counsel Kate Wrightson, Committee Assistant

WITNESSES: Toni Peterson, Children's Services Division Jim Dyer, Citizen Len Munks, Juvenile Corrections Marlin Hutton, Juvenile Corrections Denis Dowd, Oregon Dept. of Corrections Ross Shepard, Oregon Criminal Defense Lawyers Association Lew Broadbent, McLaren School Mary Botkin, American Federation of State, Federal, & Municipal Employees Kathleen Haley, Psychiatric Security Review Board Dick Belsey, Oregon Health Sciences University Ray GrimSB o, Intermountain Forensic Lab Catherine Otto, Association for Oregon Medical Technology Stephen Erfurth, Oregon Medical Laboratories Jim Gardner, Lindsay Hart et al. Barbara Cavalier, Abbott Laboratories Russell Spencer, Oregon State Sheriffs Association Bob Keyser, Oregon Council of Police Associations Lon Roberts, Syntex Laboratories Art Keil, Oregon Health Division Chuck Brokopp, Oregon Health Division David Fidanque, ACLU of Oregon

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 23, SIDE A

003 CHAIR COHEN: Calls hearing to order at 1:20 p.m.

SB 133, CSD LIABILITY, PUBLIC HEARING

017 TONI PETERSON, CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIVISION: Testifies in favor of

SB 133 . Reviews intended purpose of bill. Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit A). -Submits proposed amendment (Exhibit B) which makes two changes: #1 - extends coverage to foster parents for damages caused by foster children ages 18-20. #2 - Allows 90 days to notify General Services after occurrence of claim and allows for expenses incurred as result of injury by a foster child. -Will submit further amendments, with proposed language changes.

049 CHAIR COHEN: Clarifies proposed amendments.

052 SEN. BROCKMAN: "Additional support to foster parents at minimal cost"? What does this mean, and how does it work now?

054 PETERSON: CSD pays an insurance premium for tort liability to the General Services Division. During the next biennium, there would be no increase in the premium.

058 SEN. BROCKMAN: It's not "minimal" cost, but "no additional" cost?

059 PETERSON: We anticipate that in future biennia there would likely be an increase.

062 CHAIR COHEN: We have a fiscal impact statement (Exhibit C).

066 JIM DYER, CITIZEN: Testifies in favor of SB 133. Foster parent in Marion County. The bill passed last session overlooked small number of children who need care and guidance; SB 133 would cover them. -90 day notification period is needed. Many foster parents don't know how to make the system work, and 60 days is too fast. -Bodily injury amendment is needed. Many foster children have come from families with substance abuse problems or violent situations. Their reaction to a real or imagined slight can be very violent. -Reference to damages is a clarification, and not really useful to foster parents. Lawyers might argue without the addition.

SB 102, PSRB REPORT DEADLINE, PUBLIC HEARING

123 KATHLEEN HALEY, PSYCHIATRIC SECURITY REVIEW BOARD: Requests that bill be withdrawn from hearing, due to concerns of the Attorney General's office.

130 CHAIR COHEN: Agrees and thanks Ms. Haley.

SB 137, ASSAULT ON POLICE/JUVENILE OFFICERS, PUBLIC HEARING

137 LEN MUNKS, CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIVISION: Assistant Director of Juvenile

Corrections. Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit D), which contains suggested amendments. -For PERS purposes, we are in this class already. -Fiscal impact: a small number of juveniles are assaulting personnel. Longer incarceration would be balanced by reduced numbers of assaults. There would be minimal impact.

207 SWENSON: Legislative Fiscal Office has now determined that there will be a fiscal impact of \$200,000 to \$300,000 as a result of reclassification from misdemeanor to felony.

212 MUNKS: Does that impact consider both juvenile and adult areas? We anticipated no impact in the juvenile area only.

215 SWENSON: I understand that it covered prison beds only, which includes the adult system.

216 CHAIR COHEN: We're looking at costs throughout the system.

217 MUNKS: The bill includes both adults and juveniles, but we did a fiscal impact study on juveniles only.

220 CHAIR COHEN: Who is covered by the amendment? We have a number of juvenile facilities, such as Parrott Creek Ranch. Are those people protected by this? I gather that they are not.

230 MUNKS: I understand that privately contracted juvenile facilities, such as Parrott Creek Ranch, are not included.

237 CHAIR COHEN: Is it relative whether or not officers at the detention facilities are classified with police officers by PERS?

244 MUNKS: It is not relative. I was trying to show that the people we're talking about are subject to assaultive behavior, as are their adult counterparts.

249 CHAIR COHEN: Then why wouldn't you include employees of privately contracted facilities, who do care for juvenile felons diverted to their programs?

254 MUNKS: I have no objection to including them. They didn't express a desire to be included, but maybe we didn't reach out well enough to them.

258 MARLIN HUTTON, JUVENILE CORRECTIONS: Although they don't have the concentration of serious offenders that we do, they do handle these kinds of juveniles.

259 CHAIR COHEN: If a penalty scheme is going to be changed, and your job is working with dangerous juveniles, then you probably should be included.

274 SEN. HAMBY: Do we know the percentage of people at such facilities?

278 CHAIR COHEN: We can find that information. -Calls committee's attention to Criminal Justice Council prison impact assessment (Exhibit E). CJC is required to review all prison bills, as statutory requirement.

292 SEN. SPRINGER: Are CJC able to look at all impacts? When a penalty changes, costs change for district attorneys, indigent rates for court-appointed counsel, reimbursement rates, more court appearances. The impacts are not just on those who might receive a felony sentence.

305 CHAIR COHEN: CJC, as far as I know, doesn't do that.

313 HUTTON: Much of that is true; however, we think that the institutions will not sustain much impact. Most of the offenders are already in jail for felonies.

321 CHAIR COHEN: It depends on how you charge them. Sen. Springer is merely pointing out the associated costs of such a change.

334 DENIS DOWD, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR INSTITUTIONS, OREGON DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS: Testifies in support of SB 137. This bill will enhance staff safety.

346 ROSS SHEPARD, OREGON CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYERS ASSOCIATION: Testifies in opposition to SB 137. -This violation is currently a Class A Misdemeanor, assault in the 4th degree with a minimum sentence of 7 days. Conviction can bring one year incarceration, or supervised probation of up to five years. Conditions of probation may include attendance in a mental health program, anger management, substance abuse rehabilitation, restitution, or community service. -If the penalty is changed to a Class C Felony, it would probably be #4 on sentencing guidelines. That level provides for a maximum of 60 days incarceration. -Penalty is actually greater now than if enhanced to Class C Felony. -Sen. Springer is right: cost to courts will rise. Felonies cost twice as much as misdemeanors. -Juvenile Corrections would like remand to be more likely. That desire is not helped by this bill; the judge hearing the remand request would look to dynamics of offense rather than its classification.

400 CHAIR COHEN: Do you have any suggestions on how to discourage those who tend to be abusive?

417 SHEPARD: It's a difficult question to answer, because it's idiosyncratic by county. -SB 137 wouldn't deal only with juveniles in corrections facilities, but would affect young people who had not yet been arrested for misdemeanors, or even traffic violations.

445 LEW BROADBENT, DETENTION UNIT, MCLAREN TRAINING SCHOOL: Testifies in support of SB 137. -Bill would hold students accountable for their behavior. Accountability is often not as specific as it should be. -We have no ability to charge students for an assault felony, and that gives other students the impression that they could assault staff without accountability. -Lack of consequences for serious behavior gets back into the community, because people haven't learned the effects of acting out. -McLaren workers support SB 137.

TAPE 24, SIDE A

037 CHAIR COHEN: Are there other ways to encourage students to stay within behavioral guidelines? Could you keep them longer?

044 BROADBENT: Some students are kept for long periods of time, for other reasons. Assaultive behavior doesn't add more time.

048 CHAIR COHEN: Can't you add to their time if they misbehave with assaultive behavior?

049 BROADBENT: It can be done; it's an Assault 4, generally, unless it's disabling. That is a misdemeanor.

055 CHAIR COHEN: That couldn't be added to the time which they are already serving?

056 BROADBENT: Most of them are already sentenced to age 21. You're not adjudicating anything in addition to that.

058 CHAIR COHEN: What if we could breach that barrier and keep someone past their 21st birthday?

059 BROADBENT: That might help; we want students to know that they will be held accountable.

061 CHAIR COHEN: Maybe it's more complicated than just charging them with a felony, but I'd like to see if we could keep them past 21.

066 BROADBENT: Some of the staff would like them to leave at 18. A Class C Felony is a remand charge, which might send the student to an adult prison.

078 CHAIR COHEN: It's a very serious problem.

079 BROADBENT: Yes, it is: we don't want it, but we've got it.

080 CHAIR COHEN: We need to find effective controls on behavior. Many people ask us to change the charge, but this message doesn't seem to make much of a difference. Are there other ways to do this that would have real consequences?

089 BROADBENT: Workers see that police officers and others get this coverage against assault, which seems to offer some recourse, and they don't.

098 MARY BOTKIN, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES: Testifies in favor of SB 137. -Represents juvenile probation and parole officers. Offenders who leave Hillcrest and McLaren are placed in our custody in the community. -SB 137 is one more step toward acknowledgement that handlers of juvenile offenders are an integral part of the juvenile justice system. -We have seen a change in clientele to more vicious and aggressive people. We need to convince juveniles that there will be a response to irresponsible actions. Kids who break the law should be treated like kids, but if it's a serious law, they need to learn that there is societal reaction against people who break the law.

#### BILL INTRODUCTION

130 CHAIR COHEN: Requests counsel to introduce new bills.

133 SWENSON: Introduces proposed bills. -LC 2773, at request of Oregon Trial Lawyers Association, would extend the statute of ultimate repose and product liability actions from eight to ten years, and provides that product liability acts can be commenced not later than two years after the death, injury, or damage occurs, but in no event later than ten years after the date on which the product was first purchased for use or consumption. -LC 1334, at request of Oregon Trial Lawyers Association, removes statute of ultimate repose for private product liability actions based on disease or injury resulting from product causing latent injury or disease. Applies to all causes of action except those reduced to judgment entered into the register of the court before the effective date of the act. -LC 2436, at request of Oregon Criminal Justice Council, modifies procedure for imposing probation in misdemeanor cases committed on or after November 1, 1989. -LC 2262, at request of Oregon Criminal Justice Council, modifies provisions dealing with pre-trial release of defendants. -LC 1526, at request of Oregon Criminal Justice Council, would require Oregon Criminal Justice Council staff to review sentencing forms for errors and return the form to the sentencing court if an error is found. Would provide that sentences under guidelines are mandatory except as allowed by rules of the State Sentencing Guidelines Board concerning departure sentences. Would repeal the sunset of the Council.

155 CHAIR COHEN: Asks if committee has objections to introduction of these bills as sponsored by the committee at the request of the requestors noted. -[QUOTE] "Hearing no objections, so ordered."

HB 2199, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS DRUG TESTING, PUBLIC HEARING

177 DICK BELSEY, OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY: Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit F). -Concerned about exempting Dept. of Corrections from some aspects of clinical laboratory licensing laws. State regulations have become stringent, because of the impact of false positive testing on people's lives. -Devices proposed by Dept. of Corrections can give accurate results when used by trained technicians; this may not be the case with Corrections staff who aren't medically trained. Results are thus fuzzy, because the variables are so large. Trained people get good results, and untrained people don't. Most instruments are designed with skill as a given. -Aging and wear, on agents and machines, are the most significant contributors to error. Because technicians are skilled, they do not contribute to random error. -Policies and procedures which insure reliability of test results are necessary. There is not always equivalent technology from kit to kit. -Test operators need to be included in risk management studies. Each operator and instrument should be checked out routinely in order to see if they meet minimum acceptance levels. -Variance is a fact of life, but you should have an acceptable range of variance. Unsupervised testing and technicians don't do very well. Both initial and ongoing proficiency tests are needed, because the operator needs to prove continued competence. Kits also need to be tested, since reagents and machines age. -Documentation necessary, especially in Dept. of Corrections situation. If technician must testify, results must be verifiable. -Not objecting to testing in the field, but assurance is needed that people are not wrongly penalized because of badly done tests.

416 DENIS DOWD, OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS: Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit G).

452 CHAIR COHEN: Dr. Belsey would probably disagree.

454 DOWD: Yes, he probably would. -Continues to summarize written testimony.

TAPE 23, SIDE B

031 SEN. HAMBY: If an inmate was removed to a secure section of an institution, from a nonsecure section, I would consider that disciplinary action.

036 DOWD: The inmate may certainly see it that way. Most facilities have a group of inmates who leave the institution on work-release or a similar program, and an inmate may be detained inside the prison pending confirmatory results.

042 SEN. HAMBY: I still think it's disciplinary. Would it be intolerable to do differently, and wait for results from the other test?

045 DOWD: We think that an inmate who tests positive knows what the results will be, and thus has little to lose by absconding. -Continues to summarize written testimony.

077 CHAIR COHEN: There is a provision which allows exemptions for drug testing, as I read it. Does the Attorney General believe that you cannot do field testing with respect to ORS 438.435?

084 DOWD: I'm going on the advice of legal counsel.

087 SWENSON: The Dept. of Corrections has given us copies of that opinion. -ORS 438.435 requires licensing even for initial testing. There is a special procedure available, but apparently the Dept. of Corrections does not qualify.

103 ART KEIL, OREGON HEALTH DIVISION: Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit H). -Health Division has some concerns about HB 2199. -Division has proposed 2 amendments (Exhibit I, Exhibit J) for consideration that may resolve this issue. -1987 Legislature passed legislation that before any person is deprived of employment or other benefits, positive test results must be confirmed by a clinical laboratory. That provision is still important.

164 SEN. HAMBY: I am confident that the Health Division would want only FDA-endorsed materials to be used.

168 KEIL: Yes. Many materials being promoted have received pre-market FDA approval but have not been extensively tested. We consider FDA approval in our review of products which might be used in Oregon.

179 SEN. HAMBY: You would be able to distinguish between pre-market and other approvals?

180 CHUCK BROKOPP, OREGON HEALTH DIVISION: Yes. We would consult FDA and get that information.

184 KEIL: Introduces additional written testimony from scientists unable to attend. -Peter H. Anderson, St. Vincent Hospital and Medical Center (Exhibit K) -Robert Velandar, Oregon Drug & Alcohol Information Center (Exhibit L)

198 RAY GRIMSB O, INTERMOUNTAIN FORENSIC LABORATORIES: Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit M) -Has scientific concerns. -HB 2199 does not address sending sample out for confirmation, and this may affect the integrity of the samples; it exempts Dept. of Corrections from any kind of control. -Technicians must appear in court with this data; thus, record-keeping is mandatory. -Fiscal impact: most testees are indigent and would need court-appointed attorneys; increased court appearances; parole officers would spend much of their time in court. -Would support bill if Health Division supervised test administration.

265 CATHERINE OTTO, ASSOCIATION FOR OREGON MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY: Testifies against HB 2199. Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit N). -Health Division needs to maintain supervisory control. -Supports Health Division amendments. -If "field test kits" are exempted, that opens the door for other technology being manufactured, and other kinds of tests. Field kits could be produced for other critical, non-substance, tests. This might allow exemptions which aren't envisioned now, by anyone.

314 SEN. SPRINGER: What kind of qualifications could be added without defeating the purpose of HB 2199?

320 CHAIR COHEN: I assume that would be training of personnel, short of training required for medical technologists.

323 OTTO: There is a training program now, but medical technologists are not doing the tests. The Health Division covers those people.

331 CHAIR COHEN: Requests Health Division witnesses to return.

346 BROKOPP: We are aware of this problem. -We do not intend to use medical technologists as testers. -We propose to set minimum educational criteria that testers would have to meet: for example, 4 - 8 hours of training on test procedures, as a minimum, before a non-laboratory person could perform tests. -Similar to requirements for field testers of cholesterol and other health screening procedures. -We can develop a compromise on qualifications. Key question: what is minimum level of training necessary?

373 SEN. SPRINGER: Are probation and parole persons already subject to Bureau of Police Standards training? Could this be developed independent of, or along with, the police training curriculum?

388 BROKOPP: That is exactly what we have in mind. -These standards would not have to be developed specifically by the Health Division. -We feel strongly that similar standards to those developed by the State Police need to be in place before non-laboratory people could do this testing.

399 KEIL: Our proposed amendment addresses Sen. Springer's question.

402 CHAIR COHEN: Refers to Health Division's proposed amendment. -With respect to the debate about "field test kits," do we want to say "testing in the field for drug and alcohol" or for "substance abuse"? -I'm asking you to expand your amendment so that other people don't get worried about questions of universality.

434 KEIL: We would be happy to work with counsel to address those concerns.

451 STEPHEN ERFURTH, OREGON MEDICAL LABORATORIES: Submits and summarizes written testimony (Exhibit O).

TAPE 24, SIDE B

103 LON ROBERTS, SYNTEX CORPORATION: Testifies in favor of amendments to HB 219 9, introduced by Jim Gardner. -Bill's language is proprietary. -Four corporations in Oregon have products which could be considered by Dept. of Corrections. -We want to ensure that all four have a chance to be used.

114 CHAIR COHEN: Syntex has such a product?

116 ROBERTS: Yes.

127 JIM GARDNER, LINDSAY HART, et al.: Submits proposed amendment to HB 219 9 (Exhibit P). Amendment would make three changes: -Would change proprietary term "field test kits" to "on site urine testing units." This would protect us, and allow competition. -Would add requirement that unit be approved or cleared by FDA. -Would respond to concerns that on-site testing might be permitted in settings other than the corrections facility.

155 BARBARA CAVALIER, ABBOTT LABORATORIES: Testifies in favor of



amendments to HB 2199. -Manufacturers feel that proprietary language would not serve the Dept. of Corrections economically; neither would it promote quality. -Equipment cleared by FDA is imperative. -Training requirements for personnel is a good idea, so that tests are administered correctly. We administer three days of testing on our products, not four hours. Nobody wants bad test results, especially us.

201 RUSSELL SPENCER, OREGON STATE SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION: Testifies in support of Gardner's amendment to HB 2199. -It is an essential component which ties in with HB 2597, which includes urine tests under the implied consent law. -We see a trend in Oregon toward driving under the influence of alcohol in conjunction with controlled substances. -Study by Oregon State Crime Laboratory, in conjunction with Oregon Traffic Safety, dated 1/17/90. Persons arrested for DUII, who had tested positively on the Intoxalyzer, were asked to voluntarily submit to urinalysis (for research purposes only). Samples were tested for opiates, amphetamines, barbiturates, benzodiazaphines, cocaine, and marijuana. In 262 samples, 91% were positive for controlled substances, in addition to alcohol. Of that 91%, 27% tested positive for two or more controlled substances. 9% were negative; of that 9%, two samples were from police officers involved in shootings, used as a control, and six were from injury accidents. All tests were followed by a confirmation test. A second analysis, of 100 samples, showed 82% positive for controlled substances in addition to alcohol, and 26% positive for multiple substances.

237 SEN. HAMBY: How accurate was your rate of confirmation?

239 SPENCER: I can't answer that right now. -We envision these field test kits being used at the station, not like the Intoxalyzer. We might use them in addition to the Intoxalyzer, even if that result is negative; we need to set standards of use. -We want to get these dangerous people off the road. -Submits table of national urine test regulations (Exhibit Q).

261 BOB KEYSER, OREGON COUNCIL OF POLICE ASSOCIATIONS: Testifies in favor of Gardner's amendments. -In favor of removing proprietary wording, which will increase competition; in favor of test use by other groups. -Training is an important factor. -There is an advantage to on-site testing. We need immediate results; now, it takes two weeks for us to get results, which allows time for a person to clean up and retest positive.

287 CHAIR COHEN: You would still have to confirm that positive result.

288 KEYSER: Yes, but it needs to happen more quickly. People would have a different attitude toward testing if they knew that results were immediate.

296 CHAIR COHEN: If a person had a positive result on a field test, would you do another test right away and send it for confirmation?

307 KEYSER: Yes. I'm not familiar with the equipment, but to my knowledge, the confirmatory test can be run using the same sample.

317 SEN. HAMBY: Would any disciplinary action be taken if a positive result was obtained from a person on parole or probation?

322 CHAIR COHEN: I'm inclined to leave this hooked up with ORS 438, which deals with drug testing specifically, because of that.

330 DAVID FIDANQUE, ACLU OF OREGON: Strongly supports keeping field testing under supervision of Health Division, and adamantly opposed to granting exemptions to current Health Division practice. -Field tests are unreliable. We should continue to ask what will happen to those who test positive on an initial screening. -It would be appropriate to make a distinction between released and currently incarcerated persons. -One test should not be sufficient for action, unless they admit they have been using controlled substances; most parolees will admit that. -You are aware of the stress on parole and probation services right now; case loads are very heavy. These people have an understandable desire to turn to technology for solutions. -People with prior substance abuse problems will probably slip back to their prior habits. The problem cannot be solved with technology alone, and we need to recognize that as we turn to technology for solutions. -Proper safeguards for accuracy are needed.

417 SEN. HAMBY: I have a concern about those people who are in the community, who might be using over-the-counter drugs, and would get a positive result. -Could we approach it as we do DUII tests, where a person has the choice to take the test or not? -What is the time period for a confirmation test: days or weeks? -If most people will admit to using, if they know a result will be positive, then perhaps disciplinary action could be taken at that time; I am concerned about disciplinary action on false positive results.

TAPE 25, SIDE A

009 CHAIR COHEN: The kind of language you are thinking of would probably not relate to this ORS chapter, but we ought to think about limitations which might be needed.

022 FIDANQUE: You should also ask what drugs are showing up in the results. -Marijuana stays in the body for a long time, and thus it shows up frequently in tests. You should know that if you think it's appropriate to send people back to state institutions for marijuana, which may actually have been from secondary inhalation or from use in the past. -That's a judgment call different from the usual assumption of crack or methamphetamine.

035 SEN. SPRINGER: Does HB 2199 deal with pre-trial supervision, if one of the conditions of supervision is to stay off drugs? Would we use these tests on those not yet adjudicated?

044 FIDANQUE: Jurisdictions in other states are doing that, though I am not aware of anyone in Oregon doing it. -We would be very concerned, on a constitutional level, about that. -We would be concerned if the language of this bill allowed for that.

049 CHAIR COHEN: During the interim, I received something from another state's Attorney General concerning this issue. -Requests counsel to locate this information.

064 CHAIR COHEN: Adjourns at 3:24 p.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony in support of SB 133- Toni Peterson - 3 pages  
B - Amendments to SB 133 - Toni Peterson - 1 page C - Fiscal  
Analysis of SB 133 - Staff - 1 page D - Testimony in support of SB  
137 - Len Munks - 2 pages E - Prison Impact Assessment for SB 137 -  
Staff - 1 page F- Testimony against HB 2199 - Dick Belsey - 36 pages  
G - Testimony in support of HB 2199 - Denis Dowd - 2 pages H -  
Testimony against HB 2199 - Art Keil - 3 pages I- Amendments to HB  
2199 - Art Keil - 1 page J - Amendments to HB 2199 - Art Keil - 1  
page K - Testimony against HB 2199 - Peter H. Anderson - 1 page  
L - Testimony against HB 2199 - Robert K. Velandar - 2 pages M -  
Testimony against HB 2199 - Raymond A. GrimSB o - 1 page N -  
Testimony against HB 2199 - Catherine Otto - 2 pages O - Testimony  
against HB 2199 - Stephen C. Erfurth - 5 pages P- Amendments to HB  
2199 - James N. Gardner - 1 page Q - Testimony in support of HB 2199  
- Russell Spencer - 4 pages R - Testimony in support of HB 2199 -  
Elyse Clawson - 1 page S- Testimony against HB 2199 - Shirley Welch  
- 2 pages