

WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
MANAGEMENT-LABOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
**Full MLAC Meeting**

March 8, 2019  
9 a.m. – 12 p.m.

***Committee Members Present:***

Alan Hartley  
Kathy Nishimoto, Duckwall Fruit  
Kimberly Wood, Perlo Construction  
Kevin Billman, United Food and Commercial Workers  
Ateusa Salemi, Oregon Nurses Association {via teleconference}  
Diana Winther, IBEW Local 48  
Jill Fullerton, Clackamas County Fire Department  
Lynn McNamara, City County Insurance

***Committee members excused:***

Aida Aranda, Oregon and Southern Idaho Labor-Employers Trust  
Tammy Bowers, May Trucking  
Cameron Smith, *Ex officio*

***Staff:***

Theresa Van Winkle, MLAC Committee Administrator  
Becka Hunt, Workers' Compensation Division

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>Opening</b> (0:00:00)	Diana Winther opened the meeting at 9:02 am.
<b>Meeting Minutes</b> (0:00:07)	Kathy Nishomoto noted that the minutes from the February 22, 2019 MLAC meeting had a few typos and submitted corrections. Diana Winther suggested waiting to approve the minutes.
<b>Department Updates</b> (0:00:47)	Theresa Van Winkle, Committee Administrator, provided the update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Theresa Van Winkle stated that there are no upcoming rulemaking hearings.</li></ul>

---

**2019  
Legislation  
Review  
(0:00:53)**

**[HB 3146](#)  
(0:00:55)**

Kimberly Wood gave a brief overview of [HB 3146](#), advising that it updates reference to inmates. There was no public testimony.

**[HB 3003](#)  
(0:01:54)**

David Castillo, Regional Operations Director from SAIFs Eugene Office, and David Barenberg [testified](#) on [HB 3003](#) and the [proposed -3 amendments](#) and states this bill is to allow the director the authority, when a private self-insured employer wants to enter the private competitive market for insurance, for the director to release the deposit. The deposit is sometimes in the millions of dollars and thus prohibits them from going to a carrier, so that they can buy a paid-up insurance company policy that will cover for the life of all of the claims they had when they were self-insured, going into the future. David Castillo shared an example of an Oregon retail chain that has been self-insured since 1977, and their single and most significant obstacle prohibiting them from going to SAIF is the deposit issue. They felt they would be held liable twice for that window of exposure if they would transfer into the volunteer market and still have that deposit held for 62 months.

**[HB 2413](#)  
(00:06:38)**

Lisa Broten and Kathy Wallace, both certified to preform evaluations and vocational assistance , representing the Oregon Chapter of the International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals, testified regarding [HB 2413](#). The amendment takes out a section of the proposed bill on page 3, line 8, deleting “Includes employer paid health benefits” clause. The remaining two proposals concern the change in eligibility criteria and payment of time loss for the entire length of an authorized training plan. Kathy Wallace discussed the definition of “suitable employment” in 656.340(6)(b), defined as employment that produces a weekly wage within 20% of what is currently paid for the worker’s regular employment, often referred to in their reports as, “can a worker achieve a wage of 80% of his adjusted wage income as time of injury.” They are proposing the wage be changed to 5%. Kathy Wallace read excerpts from Chairman Larry Hill from the House Labor Committee’s 1987 work session.

(00:15:20)

- Alan Hartley asked Kathy Wallace to read the part of the testimony. Kathy Wallace stated that she is just going through the sections where the Chairman Larry Hill discusses his reasoning. Alan Harley asked her if she was reading his entire statement and Kathy responded that she wasn’t Alan Hartley pointed out that the section went further to say that vocational assistance wouldn’t improve their ability significantly, clarifying that there was little more that they could do to get more than 80% of their previous

---

wages anyway had they not have skills that were transferable. Kathy explained that part of the evaluations was making sure they had the transferable skills to get that 80%. She believes that the 80% standard was picked somewhat randomly. Alan Hartley stated that it was picked because there was concern that you couldn't get more than 80% of wages if you didn't have transferable skills.

- (00:17:15) - Kathy Nishimoto asked if they had done studies on the 95%. Kathy Wallace advised that she had not, but contends that you can get a worker closer to 95% or the same wage. Kathy Nishimoto asked how many are getting there now. Kathy Wallace advised that the number went from 8,000 to 260. Kathy Nishimoto clarified her question to which Lisa Broten stated 85.7%. Alan Hartley asked how many reach 90%, to which Kathy Wallace responded that not everyone starts over in a brand new career and automatically get 90% of what they made. She gave an example of an electrician who is retraining to be a building inspector. She states he will not start out at \$33, but may start out at \$28, and he can get back to \$33. Kathy Nishimoto asked if the electrician went through vocational assistance and got there. Kathy Wallace replied that he had and clarified that a lot of people live paycheck to paycheck as it is, and the 80% isn't considered by them to be a suitable wage.
- (00:19:02) - Alan Hartley asked what percent of the people who go through vocational rehab now get to the 95% goal. Lisa Broten replied that 85.7% of the workers get back to a similar job and similar wage, or as close as possible according to a study done by the department.
- (00:19:32) - Kimberly Wood asked if Lisa Broten and Kathy Wallace could submit their studies, and they agreed.
- (00:21:00) - Kathy Wallace said that the other side of the issue is the cost of training the worker, and the current rules only require that the injured worker be trained for a job that earns as close to possible what they made before their injury if they meet the barrier of eligibility. Lisa Broten and Kathy Wallace believe that some of the division's money should be used to help injured workers get back to work. They cited some cases they have seen with workers who are injured to the point that they cannot do the job that they were originally trained for, but were taught to do other jobs, making the point that having resources available to get them significant training in another position would reduce the number of people relying on benefits.

- 
- (00:28:46) - Kevin Billman asked if the examples given previously all fit within that 85% to 95% rate or higher? Lisa Broten answered that she got her figured wrong, it is closer to 70%, that get close to their pre-injury wage. The 85% was people in training programs are in the field that they are actually trained in. Kevin Billman stated that he didn't hear any examples of those that wouldn't be able to get back over 95%, but obviously they are out there. Kathy Wallace stated that they end up over at other programs, like Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Services.
- (00:29:51) - Kevin Billman asked what percentage of people who could utilize the program, but aren't able to utilize it now, pointing out examples of who currently benefits but not those who do not. Lisa Broten answered a lot of workers do a claims disposition agreement, where they settle out of services, where they take money instead of services. There are studies that show this and she can provide them. Those that don't get back to their pre-injury wage and it's a lot lower if they take a settlement Kevin Billman advised that having that information would be helpful.
- (00:31:13) - Diana Winther asked if increasing the access to vocational rehabilitation, there would be less people doing the settlement? Kathy Wallace said that there was no way to know. Lisa Broten stated that she would think that because minimum wage is going up until 2022, that more people will be ineligible. Kathy said that when minimum wage was \$10 then more people qualified, now that the minimum wage is \$12, not a lot of people are eligible. Lisa Broten doesn't think there will be that big of a change in the amount of people becoming eligible.
- (00:32:32) - Lynn McNamara points out that the perception is that the number of injured workers have declined. She asked what percentage of people are above 80% versus how many injured workers and is there a correlation. Kathy Wallace and Lisa Broten advised that they don't know the figure, however there are return-to-work programs. Lynn McNamara states that she still struggles with why there is such a big jump between 80% and 95%.
- (00:33:32) - Kimberly Wood asks if the biggest concern is the minimum wage workers that are not eligible. Kathy Wallace said that she is because if someone made \$33 an hour, they would be found eligible. If they were an electrician, and they can't do anything else, but if they made \$14/\$15, they are ineligible, however they used to be when minimum wage was \$10.
-

---

(00:34:08)

- Kimberly Wood asks if they have considered proposing some language less than 95. % because it doesn't seem realistic. They could address if someone is within minimum wage, or a percent of their wage would be less than minimum wage, that person would qualify. Kimberly suggests that could catch individuals they have the concern for. Kimberly suggested that they could it at 80% and address minimum wage Kathy Wallace asked Kimberly Wood about how to change the language. Kimberly Wood answered you'd have to use the state minimum wage, or whatever the local minimum wage is. Kathy Wallace asked what if the 80% wage was 50 cents over minimum wage, would those be eligible? Kimberly Wood answered that if right now they have people who can't even make minimum wage, but this would offer a clear bright line for people that are not eligible.

Diana Winther asked if someone is making more than minimum wage, would 80% then put them at minimum wage rather than below? This would give a clear line, but there will be minimum wage increases. The idea that if 80% puts them below minimum wage, the qualifier is equal to minimum wage. Kimberly Wood says that this may open the door to reevaluating what could happen over the course of 21 months. Kimberly Wood says she hasn't heard convincing support for changing it to 95%. She agrees with Lynn McNamara that there are fewer workers today who are getting injured, employers are creating more opportunities for those injured workers, and so that is attributing to some of the decline.

(00:37:56)

- Diana Winther asked to see more studies about what was talked about. Lisa Broten cited a few more figures. Part of their job as vocational counselors as part of the rules, is make sure that when considering a formal training, training is limited to 16 months unless extended by an insurer. They have an occupational skills training program with PCC, Chemeketa, and they are able to usually get the workers back to work due over the course of the year that is the duration of the program. Kathy Wallace mentions that if you are going to do something for 16 months, you need to show that there is nothing else that is going to get that person as close as possible. They think that if the person does get to that point and goes into that plan, that they should be paid for time loss.

(00:42:19)

- Kimberly Wood asked insurers if the training program goes to 21 months and they are only obligated to pay 16, do they pay voluntarily the remainder and asks if they have data showing that they are choosing not to. Kathy Wallace answered it isn't tracked and the problem is that workers are self-sponsored (pay their own way) but many workers cannot do that.
-

- 
- (00:45:16) - Diana Winther asked people are meeting the requirements to demonstrate that the maximum of 21 months is appropriate under the current rules; there is just the discrepancy between time-loss coverage and training coverage. Kathy Wallace stated that the rules cover 16 months to 21 months, however many choose to pay.
- (00:46:22) - Kathy Nishimoto asked Jennifer Flood if she gets complaints from injured workers about not being able to go beyond the 16 months. Jennifer Flood said that there aren't a lot of workers who get the 21 months, but they call about the self-sponsored part of things. They are told to use their PPD payments for those first months, then they will pay them the last 16 months, instead of the first five. Kathy Wallace said some workers have already used up their PPD awards.
- (00:47:06) - Theresa Van Winkle asked if the retroactive applicability of the bill also covers claims that were closed when the bill takes effect. Kathy Wallace answered that if the spending limits haven't changed, then the new ones would apply.
- (00:49:37) - Ateusa Salemi asked Jennifer Flood if she gets complaints from workers that are ineligible due to income limits. Jennifer Flood responded that she doesn't receive many of those calls.
- (00:50:20) David Barenberg and Jenny Bates, SAIF Corporation, testified on [HB 2413](#). They gave some data suggesting that there may not be an issue. Jenny Bates pointed out that although the rule specifics that the insurer may approve up to a 21-month program, that DCBS can order them to. Data shows the amount of workers choosing to use the benefit is on the decline although the number of eligible workers remain the same year after year. For those that did complete a program, a few made at or above the 95% threshold, suggesting that training doesn't necessarily guarantee income and often workers are taking a big cut in pay to participate in training.
- (00:55:33) - Diana Winther reminded the committee that just because SAIF is so willing to do the 21 months, not everyone is. Her understanding is that although the department can order it, there is still the dispute process. She asked if SAIF objected to making that particular change. David Barenberg answered it is their current practice.
- (00:56:36) - Diana Winther asked if there is a concern about an increase in the percentage will mean fewer people would use the EAIP program? David Barenberg answered that they try to emphasize the quicker entry back to work because that is what has the greatest impact on the system. Jenny Bates added that nationwide laws that impacted
-

---

this as well, such as ADA, FMLA, reinstatement rights, etc. These have made it easier to bring workers back to work and keep them working.

- (00:58:49) - Kevin Billman asked between 2014 and 2019, there was a decline in utilization of vocational rehab. Jenny Bates stated that there isn't a significant reduction of eligible workers today meaning that the minimum wage increase didn't cause a downward trend. David Barenberg clarified that it isn't the eligibility.
- (00:59:48) - Lynn McNamara asked if the department has numbers, for the past 7 years, for the amount of injured workers using EAIP, the number of preferred workers, the number of eligible for vocational assistance, and the number taking advantage of it. David Barenberg added that he would like the number of workers who complete the program. Sally Coen stated that she would have to see what is available, as they don't have complete data for non-disabling claims.
- (01:00:37) - Jenny Bates said it was interesting that Jennifer Flood stated that her office doesn't get many calls regarding workers not being eligible for that 90% threshold. Diana Winther confirmed that those calls would go through the department and asked if that information could be added to the request, specifically how many appeals occur and what the results of those appeals are. Theresa Van Winkle clarified with Jennifer Flood that she keeps the numbers of complaints, and asked if she could provide similar numbers. Jennifer Flood responded that the Ombudsman data is not that specific topic. Lou Savage agreed to provide what statistics he could.
- (01:01:36) - Kimberly Wood said that as an employer, when someone reaches the level of vocational assistance, she considers whether or not she wants find a position permanently for an employee, because they are rare and she feels it is a good thing to do. Moving the bar to 95% would be too onerous.

**[HB 2418/SB 507](#)**

(01:04:04)

Karl Koenig, president of the Oregon State Firefighters Council, and Nelson Hall, attorney at Bennett, Hartman, Morris, & Kaplan, LLP, provided the [proposed amendments](#) to the presumption in [HB 2418/SB 507](#). Karl Koenig gave a statement that explained the amount of traumatic events and their impacts on public safety officers. Nelson Hall explained the narrower -3 amendments define specifically that only public employees, professional firefighters, and public safety personnel, not volunteers. The amendments specifically identify the diagnosed conditions with specific reference to the specific medical authority and apply only to

---

---

trauma stress related disorders Nelson states they changed the threshold of what event or events would give rise to the mental disorder, specifying that it could arise out of a single event. Absent a single event, there is now a threshold of 2 years of employment for a first responder, before the presumption would apply. There are also changes to who is qualified to diagnose, defining that it is diagnosable by only a psychiatrist or a psychologist that is licensed and certified, or a mental health nurse practitioner. The burden of proof will now be in material part which is the same in the cancer presumption.

- (01:20:04) - Kimberly Wood asked what stakeholders were consulted to get these changes. Nelson Hall responded that he personally has not been meeting with stakeholders. Kimberly Wood asked if he had reached out to special districts, counties, or insurers that work with these types of claims and worked with them to see where they stand on this? Nelson Hall answered by saying that Karl Koenig and others have been discussing the bill. He has heard some concern regarding in material part. Kimberly Wood asked if he spoken to others. Nelson Hall commented on the coalition bringing this bill Karl Koenig states that they are working with LC to get the right language and it was substantively changed as a result of just coming out of LC. Karl commented the bill is narrowed based off feedback given. Kimberly Wood noted that she does see a difference in this bill versus where it started.
- (01:26:20) - Lynn McNamara asked why nurse practitioners are included, especially with a presumption that would impact both an employee and employer. Nelson Hall responded that they are the front line of care and treatment, including diagnosing and get licenses from the state like a physician. If a first responder is examined and treated with their family doctor, the family doctor will probably make a referral to a psychologist or a nurse practitioner within that field.
- (01:30:40) - Diana Winther asked if a nurse practitioner needed a specific certificate to be a mental health nurse practitioner, separate from a normal nurse practitioner, which Nelson Hall confirmed.
- (01:30:58) - Lynn McNamara pointed out the phrase “including but not limited to,” in reference to the DSM, and asked what else is out there. Nelson Hall explained that the language was offered by someone outside the coalition, and was included as part of the drafting. He stated they can be take out without affecting the rest of the bill.
- (01:31:48) - Lynn McNamara asked how they weigh one major contributing cause versus the other. Nelson Hall advised that legal burden of proof, material contributing cause has been litigated, and it
-

---

becomes a forensic question. It is the duty of the judge or the claims adjustor to weigh those competing contributions as to which one is the major cause or the material cause. In material part means it has to exist and played a part that actually contributes.

- (01:36:37) - Alan Hartley clarified that if something was weighed as 1%, that would be enough. Nelson Hall confirmed, saying instead of picking a percentage, it is better to defer to the experts. Alan Hartley asked why the system would bear the cost for all of a person's life even though the contributor was small. Nelson Hall clarified that they are not talking about all of life, they are talking about a specifically diagnosed trauma disorder. Alan Hartley mentioned that there may be a trauma disorder that fell outside of work or from their past, and that was a large contributor to their current trauma, and now the system is going to bear the cost. Nelson Hall gave an example. Nelson Hall states that this a policy decision for an identified group of people and they will get the benefit of the doubt.
- (01:40:25) - Nelson Hall states that his goal is to get a presumption that will work and has offered a compromise that will meet the concerns that have been raised by the committee and will provide the first responders with a presumption.
- (01:40:54) - Kathy Nishimoto, in regards to the "84 months after termination" clause, asked how they got to 84 months. Nelson Hall said that it the same as the cancer presumption. They believe 84 months after they terminated employment as a professional was acceptable as opposed to no limit at all.
- (01:42:00) - Karl Koenig advised that he will get his testimony to the committee.
- (01:42:47) - Kimberly Wood asked what happens to firefighters that go to other states. Karl Koenig answered that it depends on the deployment. Nelson Hall adds that the Oregon workers' compensation law does recognize those that are temporarily out of state or loaned employees and there is coverage for them.
- (01:44:48) - Kimberly Wood asked why the system isn't currently working and pointed out that she doesn't believe that the burden of proof should shift to the employer if there is only 1% contribution as its not the case with any other type of claim. She states that she would like to find a resolution that figures out what's preventing these claims from being processed. Karl Koenig stated that when the claims process works, it works great, but when it doesn't it is very egregious. He gave an example of a first responder in
-

---

Eugene/Springfield firefighter. This is a small population filing claims, and it will stay small because of the stigma of filing. He knows that early treatment achieves great results.

- (01:52:45) - Kimberly Wood states that she still believes the major contributing cause is the proper system and requests evidence where the system has failed. Nelson Hall replied that the presumption only applies to firefighters, first responders, etc. He stated that big life events are not contributors to trauma based disorders and discusses the process under the bill.
- (02:00:27) - Kimberly Wood points out that the problem may lie with “clear and convincing evidence,” and instead of a presumption, she would like to find a way for these types of claims do not get turned away. Nelson Hall said 1% is in material part and is what MLAC and legislature blessed and approved for cancer presumption. Kimberly Wood said there are ways to prove that there is cancer through blood tests, x-rays, and other diagnostic tests, but that’s not the case with PTSD.
- (02:04:10) - Diana Winther asks if it is easy to diagnose as it is for cancer professionals. Nelson Hall said the diagnostics for PTSD are as objective and concrete as an x-ray due to a universally accepted criteria. For cancer, the diagnosis is easy to prove, but many argue with the cause of the cancer, which is why there is a presumption for cancer.
- (02:08:50) - Alan Hartley states the causation is the issue, and this isn’t just a trauma issue, but also includes stress. He states that these stresses are too prevalent in a general population to presume that they are only related to that work.

Kimberly Wood recesses the committee briefly.

- (02:11:32) Andrew Graham, workers’ compensation defense attorney, testified on [HB 2418/SB 507](#) on behalf of Special Districts Association of Oregon. Hasina Wittenberg, has provided [written testimony](#). Andrew Graham testified about his stance against the -3 amendment to SB 507, specifically the language related to material part and class and conditions. The presumption remains functionally not rebuttable and the class and conditions mentioned remains overbroad. Due to the definition, in material part can mean anything at all and that something that was an extremely minor contributor can count. With cancer, there are epidemiological studies that show where the cause lies. In mental disorder claims, there is no mechanism to determine cause and unlike cancer there is no epidemiological way to rule out a potential cause. The reality is that
-

---

experts will not be able to say that work wasn't a contributor, even an extremely minor contributor to the condition in question. Andrew Graham addressed Alan Hartley's previous question if 1% counted, and here it seems to mean that in material part means greater than 0%.

- (02:18:53) - Kimberly Wood asks if in material part was defined as great or of real importance, would that make the proposal more palatable to him. Andrew Graham answered yes, it would make it more workable, and he wouldn't be able to say at that point that its functionally not rebuttable.
- (02:19:27) - Alan Hartley asked if additional protection for first responders is a problem. Andrew Graham responded that he doesn't think special districts is experiencing the phenomenon where trauma claims are being denied. He gave an example of Umpqua Community College, where a number of stress claims came in following the shooting and all the first responder claims were accepted. Only an IT employee's claim was not covered.
- (02:20:40) - Diana Winther asked if those claims were accepted at the time of the claim or did they go to a hearing, to which Andrew Graham responded that his understanding is that it was accepted at the time the claim was filed and no litigation took place.
- (02:20:58) Andrew Graham addresses the classes of conditions and says the language is broad, and covers 5 disorders and diagnosis that are common, and 2 related to trauma, and 2 of them are only applicable to children. Adjustment disorder is a common condition, and any stressor can give rise to the disorder. He says "including but not limited to" becomes a catch-all.
- (02:26:29) - Kimberly Wood asks if the proposed language is limited to just PTSD and Acute Stress Disorder, would that gain special districts support? Andrew Graham replied that its likely that it would.
- (02:27:04) - Alan Hartley asked if it would gain support even with wording like "material part" is in place? Andrew Graham responded that it's a different piece.
- (2:27:08) - Andrew Graham says there isn't an exclusion for pre-existing issues, which is more problematic if common stress related disorders are included. He also states that under the list of who is covered in the current version of the bill, it is too wide including volunteers and part-timers who don't experience this stress day after day. He also said section 2 would have a retroactive application because the bill would apply to claims approved or pending on or after the effective date.
-

- 
- (02:32:24) David Barenberg, Elaine Schooler, and Annette Sjullie from SAIF Corp. testified on [HB 2418/SB 507](#). They spoke about how claims that include PTSD are handled, mentioning that the denied claims are because of pre-existing conditions and normal stressors such as bosses and co-workers. David Barenberg recommended that a medical mental health professional testify about how they handle these cases. The bill dictates that the presumption is functionally not rebuttable and doesn't specify if volunteers or part time employees, or privately employed fire fighters are included, or what is a medical emergency provider. The language is broad, especially with the "included but not limited to" clause.
- (02:47:32) - Diana Winther asked if there are cases that would have been accepted at face value or normally would you involve an IME. Annette Sjullie advised that there are several cases done without an IME, after an interview with a worker. She states that if there is no indication that there isn't any contribution, and there is a doctor who is making a diagnosis, she will accept a claim without an IME.
- (02:48:25) - Diana Winther asked how many are temporary versus permanently disabling. Annette Sjullie answered that she doesn't have experience with having any disabling claims. However, she does find that the quicker they get in for medical treatment, the better off they are.
- (02:49:07) - Diana Winther asked if a lot of claimants returning to their job pre-injury. Annette Sjullie said that she hasn't seen them come back to the job pre-injury, but has seen successful modifications.
- (02:50:33) Sam Hutchinson from City of Portland Fire and Police Disability Fund gave [testimony](#) regarding a specific part of the language in [HB 2418/SB 507](#). He states that under subsection 7d, it states that even though Portland is covered, you must still provide the same presumption bill to your members. He also commented on the confusion about what part of 656.802 applies to City of Portland Part 3 talks about administering claims per 656, however they administer claims per Portland's Charter. He would like that removed Sam believes these changes do not change the intent of the bill, but takes out some of the ambiguity.
- (02:54:01) Patrick Sieng, Association of Oregon Counties, and Scott Winkles, League for Oregon Cities testified on [HB 2418/SB 507](#). They do not believe the current system is broken given by past evidence that claims are being approved as they are being filed. They anticipate the financial impact would be about 30% of liability and 60% of losses, for example \$26,000 for the City of Springfield's workers' compensation costs. Scott Winkles
-

---

questioned how the VA fits into this bill, as Oregon has a higher percentage of veterans in their workforce. They stated they are in support of Senate Bills 423 and 424 which would greatly address the underlying issue of first responder wellness and wouldn't be as impactful financially. They recommended a work group to address the issues.

Kimberly Wood recessed the committee to attend a caucus meeting.

(03:03:04)

- [HB 3146](#) – Alan moved to support the bill, Kevin Billman seconded. All members present voted aye, Lynn McNamara, Tammy Bowers, and Aida Aranda excused.
- [HB 3003](#) – Diana Winther moved to support the bill with the -3 amendment, Kathy Nishimoto seconded. All members present voted aye, Lynn McNamara, Tammy Bowers, and Aida Aranda excused.
- [HB 2413](#) – Diana Winther suggested we hold off on taking action before seeing studies from the division. No vote taken.
- [HB 2418/SB 507](#) – Kimberly Wood advised that this will move into a subcommittee. Jill Fullerton and Kathy Nishimoto offered to be on the committee. Kevin Billman offered to co-chair.

---

**Meeting  
Adjourned**  
(0:00:00)

- Meeting adjourned at 12:52 PM.

\*These minutes include time stamps from the meeting audio found here:

<https://www.oregon.gov/dcbs/mlac/Pages/2019.aspx>

\*\*Referenced documents can be found on the MLAC Meeting Information page here:

<https://www.oregon.gov/dcbs/mlac/Pages/2019.aspx>