

## CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

4000 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD, SUITE D-2  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303-4739  
(415) 494-1335



06/28/92

<b>DATE:</b> • July 9 & 10	<b>PLACE:</b> • San Diego
• July 9 (Thursday) 10:00 am - 5:00 pm	San Diego State Building 1350 Front Street
• July 10 (Friday) 9:00 am - 4:00 pm	Room B-107
<p><b>NOTE:</b> Changes may be made in this agenda, or the meeting may be rescheduled, on short notice. IF YOU PLAN TO ATTEND THE MEETING, PLEASE CALL (415) 494-1335 AND YOU WILL BE NOTIFIED OF LATE CHANGES.</p> <p>Individual items on this agenda are available for purchase at the prices indicated or to be determined. Prices include handling, shipping, and sales tax. Orders must be accompanied by a check in the proper amount made out to the "California Law Revision Commission".</p>	

**TENTATIVE AGENDA***for meeting of***CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION**Thursday, July 9, 1992

1. MINUTES OF MAY 21-22, 1992, COMMISSION MEETING (to be sent)
2. STUDY N-100 - ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION

Combined Draft of Statute  
Memorandum 92-37 (NS) (to be sent)

3. STUDY H-501 - QUIETING TITLE TO PERSONAL PROPERTY

Comments on Tentative Recommendation  
Memorandum 92-31 (NS) (sent 4/28/92) (\$5.50)

**NOTE.** Agenda item 3 will be considered on Friday, July 10, if time does not permit on Thursday, July 9.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Election of Officers for 1992-3  
Memorandum 92-41 (NS) (enclosed) (\$5.50)

Priorities and New Topic Suggestions  
Memorandum 92-14 (NS) (sent 2/28/92) (\$8.50)

Communications from Interested Persons

*NOTE. Agenda item 4 will be considered on Friday, July 10, if time does not permit on Thursday, July 9.*

-----  
Friday, July 10, 1992

5. 1992 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Memorandum 92-38 (NS) (to be sent)

6. STUDY F-1000.2 - FAMILY CODE MINOR SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS

Priorities for 1993 Legislative Session  
Memorandum 92-44 (SU) (to be sent)

7. STUDY F-521.1/L-521.1 - COMMUNITY PROPERTY IN JOINT TENANCY FORM

Comments on Policy Issues  
Memorandum 92-34 (NS) (to be sent)

8. STUDY L-608 - DEPOSIT OF ESTATE PLANNING DOCUMENTS WITH ATTORNEY

Results of State Bar Negotiations  
Memorandum 92-39 (RJM) (to be sent)

9. STUDY L-640.10 - LIVING TRUST INDUSTRY

Memorandum 92-25 (RJM) (to be sent)

10. STUDY L-1033.01 - HEIRSHIP PROCEEDING UNDER FORMER PROBATE CODE  
SECTIONS 1190-2

Memorandum 92-42 (RJM) (enclosed) (\$5.50)

11. STUDY L-401.10 - PAYMENT OF BENEFIT AWARDS TO MINORS

Memorandum 92-43 (RJM) (to be sent)

\$\$\$

MEETING SCHEDULE

<u>June 1992</u>	No Meeting	
<u>July 1992</u>		<u>San Diego</u>
July 9 (Thur.)	10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	
July 10 (Fri.)	9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	
<u>August 1992</u>	No Meeting	
<u>September 1992</u>		<u>Oakland</u>
Sep. 10 (Thur.)	10:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.	
Sep. 11 (Fri.)	9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	
<u>October 1992</u>	No Meeting	
<u>November 1992</u>		<u>Los Angeles</u>
Nov. 12 (Thur.)	10:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.	
Nov. 13 (Fri.)	9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	
<u>December 1992</u>	No Meeting	

MINUTES OF MEETING  
of  
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION  
JULY 9-10, 1992  
SAN DIEGO

A meeting of the California Law Revision Commission was held in San Diego on July 9 and 10, 1992.

Commission:

Present:	Edwin K. Marzec (July 9) Chairperson	Christine Byrd Daniel M. Kolkey
	Arthur K. Marshall Vice Chairperson	Forrest A. Plant Sanford Skaggs
Absent:	Bill Lockyer Senate Member	Bion M. Gregory Legislative Counsel
	Terry B. Friedman Assembly Member	Colin Wied

Staff:

Present:	Nathaniel Sterling	Stan Ulrich
Absent:	Pamela K. Mishey	Robert J. Murphy III

Consultants:

Michael Asimow, Administrative Law (July 9)  
Jerry Kasner, Community Property (July 10)

Other Persons:

M. Gayle Askren, Office of Administrative Hearings, San Diego (July 9)  
Joseph S. Avila, California Probate Referees' Association, Los Angeles  
William M. Chamberlain, California Energy Commission, Sacramento (July 9)  
Karl Engeman, Office of Administrative Hearings, Sacramento (July 9)  
Jeffrey Fine, California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, Sacramento (July 9)  
Melitta Fleck, State Bar Estate Planning, Trust and Probate Law Section, San Diego (July 10)  
John Huntington, California Attorney General, Los Angeles (July 9)  
Valerie J. Merritt, State Bar Estate Planning, Trust and Probate Law Section, Glendale (July 10)  
Alan Meth, Office of Administrative Hearings, San Diego (July 9)  
Ronald C. Pearson, Probate and Trust Law Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Los Angeles (July 10)  
Willard Shank, California Public Employment Relations Board, Sacramento (July 9)  
Gerald E. Voelker, Administrative Adjudications Division, Department of Social Services, Los Angeles (July 9)

MINUTES OF MAY 21-22, 1992, COMMISSION MEETING

The Minutes of the May 21-22, 1992, Commission meeting were approved as submitted by the staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Election of Officers

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-41 relating to election of Commission officers for 1992-93. The Commission by unanimous ballot elected Arthur K. Marshall as Chairperson and Sanford M. Skaggs as Vice Chairperson for one year terms commencing on September 1, 1992, and concluding on August 31, 1993.

Meeting Schedule

The November 12 and 13, 1992, meeting scheduled for Los Angeles was changed to October 29 and 30, 1992, in Sacramento.

1992-93 Budget

The Executive Secretary reported that the Commission is currently functioning without authority to make expenditures of state funds, since a budget for the 1992-93 fiscal year has not yet been adopted. The Executive Secretary indicated his intention that the Commission will continue to function normally on the assumption that the budget when adopted will approve interim expenditures as it has when this situation has arisen in the past.

The Executive Secretary indicated that the Commission's budget in the legislative process is currently relatively intact. The conference committee adopted the Commission's budget as proposed by the Governor, less an unallocated amount of \$7,000, corresponding to 50% of the Commission's travel allotment. However, the Legislature and Governor are still far apart, and circumstances affecting the Commission's budget could change.

The conference committee report would terminate funding for state advisory bodies on December 31, 1992. However, the Law Revision Commission is one of several agencies exempted from this provision in the current version of the conference committee report. Under the report, the Governor's budget for 1993-94 would be required to be accompanied by an evaluation by the Department of Finance as to the continued need for support of advisory bodies.

In addition, it is likely that the Commission, along with all other state agencies, will be receiving a substantial administratively-imposed budget cut reflecting reduced state revenues. The Commission has previously submitted plans for reductions of 5%, 10%, and 15%, should the need arise. It appears likely now that the reduction will be 15% or greater. This would affect the Commission's productivity, since it would lose its administrative assistant and the staff attorneys would spend some fraction of their time doing administrative work.

#### Priorities and New Topic Suggestions

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-14, relating to priorities and new topic suggestions, together with information from the Judicial Council concerning Code of Civil Procedure Section 170.6 provided by Commissioner Marshall at the meeting and attached to these Minutes as Exhibit 1.

The Commission adopted the priorities for the coming year set out at pages 11-12 of the memorandum.

The Commission decided not to request authority to study any new topics, with the exception of clarification of the law governing shareholder rights and corporate directors' responsibilities, and unfair and unlawful business practices. Specific issues include the demand and excuse aspects of a derivative action, the scope of the "business judgment" rule for directors' responsibility, definition of unfair and unlawful business practices, and res judicata effect on the public of a person purporting to act on behalf of the public.

1992 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-38. The Executive Secretary updated the memorandum with the report attached to these Minutes as Exhibit 2.

The Commission approved the amendments to AB 3328 (special needs trusts) attached to the memorandum, authorizing reimbursement to counties. The Commission's recommendation on special needs trusts should be revised before printing to include the amendments.

F-521.1 - COMMUNITY PROPERTY IN JOINT TENANCY FORM

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-34 and its First Supplement, analyzing comments on policy issues involved with community property in joint tenancy form. The Commission had a wide-ranging discussion of the various factors that impact treatment of community property in joint tenancy form, including the opinions expressed in the letters attached to the memoranda and by persons present at the meeting. Among the factors Commissioners felt to be significant were:

(1) Many married persons who take title as joint tenants in order to obtain a right of survivorship are unaware that this precludes their disposition of the property by will.

(2) Many married persons who take title as joint tenants in order to avoid probate are unaware that probate avoidance is also available for community property.

(3) The attributes of community property are consistent with what most people really want--equal management and control during marriage, equal division at dissolution, passage to the survivor at death without probate (unless a will provides otherwise), the ability to make a will as to the interest of the decedent, and favorable income tax treatment.

The Commission made the following decisions concerning community property in joint tenancy form:

(1) A new form of title (e.g. community property with right of survivorship) or new property rights (e.g. community property in joint tenancy form that is treated as community property but passes at death

by right of survivorship) should not be created. Existing title forms and property rights are sufficient and simply need to be used correctly.

(2) Community property should remain community property regardless of the form of title, unless a spouse has made a written agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation of the spouse's understanding that the character of the property is changed from community property to joint tenancy. This rule would apply to personal property as well as real property. In the case of real property, recordation of the instrument might be required.

(3) A professional advising the signer of a writing who fails to advise the signer of the possible adverse consequences of changing from community property to joint tenancy, including tax adverse tax consequences, should be liable for the adverse consequences. A form for taking title or making a written agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation of the character of the property would satisfy the duty of advice if it informs the signer of the adverse consequences of changing from community property. Statutory safe harbor forms should be enacted for ready use.

(4) The signing of a written agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation should be a transmutation of community property to separate property (true joint tenancy); failure to sign should leave the community character of the property unaffected.

(5) The form of agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation that the property is joint tenancy need not (and any statutory form should not) include the words "with right of survivorship", since that implies that joint tenancy must be used to achieve that result when in fact community property passes to the survivors absent a will. The form should contain the words "in joint tenancy and not as community property".

(6) The statutory safe harbor form should seek to educate the signer about the consequences of taking title "in joint tenancy and not as community property", including loss of ability to make a will affecting the joint tenant's interest in the property.

(7) The agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation constitutes an express written declaration within the meaning of the transmutation statute. However, the new requirement needs to be



properly integrated with the existing transmutation statute. The staff should examine the interrelation of this proposal with existing Civil Code Sections 5110.730 (transmutation) and 4800.1 (community property presumption at dissolution), and Probate Code Section 5305 (multiple party accounts).

(8) Once joint tenancy is created, it is "true" joint tenancy consisting of separate property. Severance of the joint tenancy creates tenancy in common property, not community property.

(9) The joint tenancy title agreement, acceptance, declaration, or confirmation requirement should be prospective only, and should have a one-year deferred operative date. The staff might consider allowing such an instrument to be signed for pre-existing titles to help avoid litigation of the issue in the future.

#### STUDY F-1000.2 - FAMILY CODE MINOR SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-44 concerning Family Code priorities for the 1993 legislative session and approved the general approach outlined in the memorandum. As to enforcement of child support by district attorneys, the staff is to carefully consider the relationship of the enforcement scheme to eligibility for AFDC, assignment of benefits, and cooperation requirements. These issues will need to be weighed in determining whether and to what extent it is appropriate to move the enforcement procedures to the Family Code.

The Commission also approved publication of the Family Code report, a preprint copy of which was examined at the meeting.

#### STUDY H-501 - QUIETING TITLE TO PERSONAL PROPERTY

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-31 relating to comments on the tentative recommendation on quieting title to personal property. Concern was expressed that statutory references to "occupancy" of property, while satisfactory for real property, do not work well for personal property. A number of solutions to this problem were

suggested at the meeting, including use of the phrase "occupancy or possession", defining "occupancy" to include possession, and constructing parallel statutes for occupancy of real property and possession of personal property. The staff was directed to consider these and other possible solutions, and to propose clarifying language for Commission consideration at the next meeting.

STUDY L-521.1 - COMMUNITY PROPERTY IN JOINT TENANCY FORM

See Study F-521.1, above.

STUDY L-640.10 - LIVING TRUST INDUSTRY

The Commission considered Memorandum 94-25 relating to the living trust industry. The Commission decided to take no action on this matter.

STUDY L-1033.01 - HEIRSHIP PROCEEDING UNDER  
FORMER PROBATE CODE SECTIONS 1190-2

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-42 and its First Supplement, relating to heirship proceedings under former Probate Code Sections 1190-2. The Commission decided to take no action on this matter.

STUDY N-100 - ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION

The Commission considered Memorandum 92-37 and the First through Fourth Supplements to it, concerning the combined draft of the administrative adjudication statute. The Commission completed review of pages 55-87 and of Section 642.420 (continuances), making the decisions noted below.

The Executive Secretary indicated he had agreed to participate in a panel discussion at the State Bar convention in October concerning the Commission's administrative law project. The Commission authorized the Executive Secretary to provide a copy of the most recent draft, clearly marked as a "staff draft", for distribution to attendees at the panel discussion. It is hoped that the panel discussion will generate some interest and additional involvement in the project, particularly from private practitioners.

§ 642.420. Continuances

The Commission discussed the issues involved in immediate judicial review of denial of a continuance. The Commission concluded that this matter should be resolved in the context of general principles governing judicial review of administrative decisions. The matter should be held for further discussion and resolution at that time.

§ 645.110. Application of chapter

The last sentence of the comment was revised to read, "Regulations adopted by an agency under authority of subdivision (b) could provide for additional discovery or could limit discovery or eliminate the right of discovery completely."

§ 645.130. Depositions

The existing procedure should be restored whereby application for an order to depose an out of state witness is made by the agency. Venue for the order should be either in Sacramento or the county where the proceeding is conducted. The Comment should cross-refer to the general provision extending times by 5 days for mailed notice in this section as well as in other sections where notice provisions exist.

§ 645.210-645.230. Discovery

These sections should include compliance times (see discussion below under "Compelling Discovery"), or at least a cross-reference in the Comments to compliance times.

§ 645.230. Discovery of statements, writings, and reports

The staff should examine subdivisions (b)(1)-(3) to see whether they might be streamlined and redundancies eliminated. If this is done, the Comment should note that the streamlining is not intended to repeal any authority for discovery that currently exists, and that authority is continued in the new provisions.

The Comment to subdivision (b)(5) should cross-refer to Section 648.420 (discretion of presiding officer to exclude evidence).

§ 645.240. Continuing duty to disclose

This section should be combined with Section 645.210 (time and manner of discovery).

§§ 645.310-645.380. Compelling Discovery

A number of concerns were expressed with these provisions, including, terminology (motion v. petition), times for complying (ambiguity of "30 days after the request was made and the party has failed to reply"), unnecessary use of orders to show cause, and a possible trap where an order is effective within 10 days but judicial review of the order is available within 15 days. The staff should make a revised draft that seeks to further simplify the procedures. The procedure should state clearly how much time a party has to respond, and after a party has failed to respond, how much time is allowed to start enforcement mechanisms. The draft should preserve the option for immediate judicial review of the discovery order, but should note that this matter has not been resolved pending the Commission's consideration of general provisions relating to interim judicial review.

§ 645.410. Subpoena authority

It should be made clear in this section that attorneys are authorized to issue subpoenas, as in civil actions. See Section 645.240. The concept that issuance of subpoenas is discretionary with the presiding officer after commencement of the hearing should be discontinued, and the procedure should parallel that in civil actions. This should include the new Code of Civil Procedure privacy protections, perhaps by incorporation by reference.

§ 645.420. Issuance of subpoena

The reference in this section to the "petition" should be clarified.

§ 645.440. Refusal to respond to subpoena

The reference in this section to "the contempt sanction" should be clarified--are other sanctions available? The staff should seek to prepare a contempt procedure that simplifies and expedites issuance of a contempt order either by the court or, if possible, by the agency or presiding officer. Where certification is to the court, the statute should provide alternate venue provisions, including the place of residence of the person against whom the sanction is sought. This might also be coordinated with the venue provisions for depositions, including Sacramento County, in a case where the location of the proceeding is not yet designated.

§ 646.210. Settlement

The provision authorizing settlement should be subject to any necessary agency approvals.

§ 646.220. Mandatory settlement conference

The second sentence of subdivision (a), requiring a separate settlement conference, was deleted.

§ 647.110. When conference hearing may be used

Subdivision (b)(4) was revised to authorize use of the conference hearing if the matter involves only "A disciplinary matter against an employee that does not involve discharge from employment, demotion, or suspension for more than 5 days."

The Comment to subdivision (b)(5) should note that a certificate holder is included within the meaning of "licensee". The staff might investigate the possibility of augmenting the defined terms with language including grammatical variations.

§ 647.120. Procedure for conference adjudicative hearing

Subdivision (b), precluding discovery in a conference hearing, was deleted.

Subdivision (c) should be revised to provide that the presiding officer "may" limit witnesses, and "shall" permit the parties and "may" permit others to offer comments. The Comment to the section should state that it is intended to permit agencies to allow public participation.

§ 647.130. Cross-examination

This section should be revised to provide that a conference hearing must be converted to a formal hearing if cross-examination will contribute substantially to proper determination of the matter, unless it appears that any delay, burden, or complication due to the cross-examination will be minimal. In subdivision (c), "property" should be "proper". The section number in the Comment should be corrected.

§ 647.220. ADR authorized

The second sentence of subdivision (a) was moved to the Comment.

Subdivision (b), providing for binding arbitration, was held pending research on whether this delegation of decision-making authority to a person other than the agency head would be legal.

The second sentence of subdivision (c) should be revised to provide that the arbitrator's decision is binding unless rejected within a specified time. The provisions governing civil arbitration should be paralleled.

§ 647.240. Confidentiality of ADR communications

This section should be limited to mediation, settlement, and nonbinding arbitration, and should not apply to binding arbitration. Subdivision (b), allowing admissibility on consent of all persons involved, should be revised to allow admissibility on consent of all parties. The words "to its disclosure" were deleted from subdivision (b).

§ 648.120. Consolidation and severance

The presiding officer, as well as the agency, should be authorized to make consolidation and severance decisions, but in case of a disagreement, the agency's decision should prevail.

§ 648.130. Default

The introductory language in subdivision (a) should provided that the failure to respond or appear is a default.

Subdivision (a)(2), allowing a statement by way of mitigation despite a default, was deleted in favor of the ability of an agency to reopen under subdivisions (b) and (c).

Subdivision (c) should be revised to allow an agency to vacate a default and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, including a hearing on the remedy based on a statement by way of mitigation.

The Comment should refer to the material in the Note to Section 613.220 concerning failure to receive mailed notice.

§ 648.140. Open hearings

Subdivision (a)(1) should be deleted. Subdivision (a)(3) should permit a hearing to closed in whole or in part, and might cross-refer to the civil standards for closing a hearing.

§ 648.150. Hearing by electronic means

Reference should be made in this section to observing exhibits in a hearing by electronic means.

§ 648.160. Report of proceedings

References in this section to phonographic reporting should be changed to stenographic reporting. The section should be revised to permit electronic recording where the presiding officer determines that there will be an adequate record of the proceeding.

§ 648.240. Provision for interpreter

A requirement of timely notice should be incorporated in this section (e.g., in advance of commencement of the hearing). The section should be limited to agencies listed in Section 648.230.

§ 648.250. Cost of interpreter

This section, and the other sections of this chapter, should not be subject to elimination by agency regulation.

§ 648.310. Burden of proof

The Comment should note that a license includes a certificate, and either the section or comment should note that all agencies may provide a different burden of proof by regulation.

§ 648.320. Presentation of testimony

A provision should be added to subdivision (a) that a party has the right to examine the exhibits of the other parties.

Subdivision (b) should be replaced by a procedure drawn from Evidence Code Section 776.

§ 648.330. Oral and written testimony

Subdivision (b) should be revised to refer to expediting the hearing "without claim of prejudice".

Subdivision (c) should provide an opportunity to compare an excerpt with the full text from which it is excerpted.

§ 648.340. Affidavits

The statute should make clear that references to affidavits include declarations under penalty of perjury. The notice period for an affidavit should be 15, rather than 30, days.

§ 648.450. Hearsay evidence and the residuum rule

The Commission deferred decision on selection of Alternative (b1) or (b2) for consideration in connection with judicial review generally.



APPROVED AS SUBMITTED \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED AS CORRECTED \_\_\_\_\_ (for  
corrections, see Minutes of next  
meeting)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Secretary

SENT BY: Xerox Telecopier 7021 ; 5-20-92 ; 9:14AM ;

9163245778-

912132298550:# 1

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

801 K STREET, SUITE 1800 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814  
TELEPHONE 916-445-7524/ATSS 8-485-7524  
FAX NO. 916-324-5778/ATSS 8-464-5778

TELECOPIER TRANSMITTAL

TO: Judge Marshall DATE: 5/20/92  
Calif. Law Revised Commission

FAX NO. 9-1-213-229-8550

FROM: Bob Mullen, Judicial Council

TOTAL PAGE(S) INCLUDING THIS PAGE 2

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Here is a draft amendment to CCL 170.6  
for your review.

CCP Section 170.6, suggested amendment:

. . . If the court in which the action is pending is authorized to have no more than one judge and the motion claims that the duly elected or appointed judge of that court is prejudiced, the motion shall be made before the expiration of 30 days from the date of the first appearance in the action of the party who is making the motion or whose attorney is making the motion. In no event shall such motion be made later than 10 days prior to the second appearance in the action of the party who is making the motion or whose attorney is making the motion. . . .

Legislative Program:

SB 1372 (Deddeh): Wage Garnishment, etc.  
SB 1455 (Mello): G & C Compensation etc.  
SB 1496 (Committee): Omnibus Probate Bill

AB 1719 (Horcher): Nonprobate Transfers of Comm. Prop.  
AB 1722 (Horcher): Powers of Appointment  
AB 2641 (Speier): Family Code Conforming Revisions  
AB 2650 (Speier): Family Code  
AB 3328 (Horcher): Special-Needs Trusts

SCR 66 (Committee): Continuing authority to study topics

BILL STATUS		SB 1372	SB 1455	SB 1496	AB 1719	AB 1722	AB 2641	AB 2650	AB 3328	SCR 66
Introduced		Feb 3	Feb 11	Feb 13	3/8/91	3/8/91	Feb 11	Feb 11	Feb 20	Feb 13
Last Amended		Mar 16	Jun 24	Mar 31	Apr 6	Jan 6	Jun 4	Jun 4	Jun 10	
First House	Policy Committee	Mar 24	May 5	Apr 21	Jan 27	Jan 23	Mar 25	Mar 25	Apr 1	Apr 7
	Fiscal Committee	Apr 1	----	----	----	----	----	Apr 22	Apr 22	Apr 22
	Passed House	Apr 9	May 22	Apr 30	Jan 30	Jan 28	May 12	Apr 30	Apr 30	Apr 30
Second House	Policy Committee	Jun 10	Jul 1	Jun 10	Mar 3	Mar 3	Jun 9	Jun 9	Jun 16	Jun 10
	Fiscal Committee	Jul 1	----	----	----	----	----	Jun 29		Jul 1
	Passed House	Jul 7	[Jul 9]	Jun 25	Apr 23	Mar 26	Jun 18	Jun 18	Jul 2	Jul 3
Concurrence		----		----	Apr 27	----	Jun 24	Jun 24	Jul 3	----
Governor	Received			Jun 29	Apr 28	Mar 31	Jun 29	Jun 29		----
	Approved				May 8	Apr 8				----
Chaptered by Secretary of State	Date				May 11	Apr 9				
	Ch. #				51	30				

• Unless otherwise noted, all dates are in 1992. [ ]: scheduled hearings. ----: not applicable.