Approved: 4-7-95
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tim Emert at 10:00 a.m. on February 27, 1995 in Room 514--S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Martin (excused)
Senator Oleen (excused)
Senator Rock (excused)
Senator Moran (excused)

Committee staff present: Michael Heim, Legislative Research Department
Jerry Donaldson, Legislative Research Department
Gordon Self, Revisor of Statutes
Janice Brasher, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Attorney General Carla Stovall
Kathleen A. Taylor, Kansas Bankers Association
Nancy Lindberg, Office of the Attorney General
Jim Clark, County and District Attorneys' Association

Others attending: See attached list

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.,and introduced Attorney General Carla Stovall.

SB 241--Life imprisonment sentence for persistent sex offender

Attorney General, Carla Stovall explained that **SB 241** was a persistent offender bill that would require life imprisonment without parole for those convicted of sexually violent offenses. General Stovall referred to a bill on the House side that supports two strikes for violent crimes, and stated that she supports that concept. General Stovall then referred to the sex predator bill passed last year, stating that bill gave the opportunity to lock up sex predators for life. General Stovall continued that **SB 241** is much quicker, cleaner, easier and less expensive. General Stovall contended that **SB 241** helps to address the impact on victims in terms of physical and psychological effects of the sex predator crimes. General Stovall then referred to her experience in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program with her little sister who had been sexually abused. General Stovall stated that her little sister's life is a testimony to the long term damages incurred by victim of sexual abuse. General Stovall related that between 1991 and 1992, Kansas saw a 69% increase of confirmed cases of child sexual abuse. Statistics tell us, continued General Stovall, that 70% to 90% of the offenders are known to their victims, and that 30% to 50% of the men who abuse are family members. General Stovall concluded by stating that **SB 241** provides a simple and easy way of handling sex predator acts, and that on page 4 the crimes are listed.(Attachment 1)

Discussion followed concerning the short term and long term fiscal impact, and the language pertaining to the grid level for this offense. The Attorney General addressed the recidivism rate of this type of crime.

SB 35--Garnishment of funds held by a financial institution

Referring to the agenda, the Chair addressed **SB 35**, dealing with garnishments. The Chair stated that **SB 35** was passed out of Financial Institution and Insurance Committee (FI&I,) and placed on the Calendar. Senator Rock had expressed some concerns with the Chairman of FI&I. The bill was then pulled off the Calendar and referred to this Committee. Senator Rock stated that he is okay with the bill as it has been explained to him.

The Chair called on Kathy Taylor, Kansas Bankers Association, to explain **SB 35**. Ms Taylor explained that

currently the law is silent in respect to joint tenancy in garnishment proceedings. Referring to subsection (f), Ms Taylor stated that this bill addresses joint tenancy as already covered by case law. Ms Taylor further explained that the last line was added to exclude the garnishor, along with the garnishee from liability to the joint owners if the ownership of funds is later proven not to be the defendant's. Ms Taylor contented that when a bank receives a garnishment order, there are no specific guidelines as to how much of the account to freeze in the case of joint accounts This bill would codify the process by allowing the garnishee to withhold the entire amount sought by the garnishment. The court could later decide the defendant's proportionate share.(Attachment 2)

Senator Bond reported on the subcommittee hearing on **SB 35** and stated that Elwaine Pomeroy appeared on behalf of collectors requesting to be included as the bank in terms of subsequent liability as written in subsection (f).

Motion made by Senator Feleciano, second by Senator Vancrum, to take paragraph (f) on page 2 back to its original language, and to report **SB 35** favorably. Motion carried.

SB 177--Enhanced penalties for repeated acts of battery.

The Chair directed the Committee's attention to **SB 177**, stating that this bill deals with repeated abuse/repeated battery sentencing guidelines. Referring to the fiscal note, Senator Parkinson addressed concerns regarding the impact this bill might have on future increases in the prison population and the possibility of building another prison. Statements were made concerning repeat offenders, who as a result of this bill,would be incarcerated for a longer period of time and thus curtailing the revolving door practice.

Motion made by Senator Petty, second by Senator Parkinson to request an interim study for **SB 177** and **S B 241** concerning all sentencing guidelines. Motion carried.

SB 130--Juvenile offender restitution may be enforced pursuant to code of civil procedure.

SB 142--Criminal restitution enforced pursuant to the code of civil procedure.

The Chair referred to **SB 130**, restitution by juveniles and to **SB 142**, restitution by adults which were requested by Jim Clark.

Mr. Clark explained that both bills would allow for restitution to be paid, after the conclusion of court supervision. Mr. Clark stated that the supervision period is so short in terms of the offenders ability to pay, that currently very little restitution is collected. Mr. Clark continued by stating that these bills allow for the victim to pursue restitution. Mr. Clark, addressed concerns of the insurance companies to subrogate by stating that the language was rewritten in both bills to allow for subrogation by insurance companies.(Attachment 3)
Discussion followed regarding the issue of parental liability in juvenile restitution cases.

Since **SB 130** only speaks to the offender, not the parents, the Chair suggested that the civil liability for parents be raised to $5,000 rather than $1,000 in a separate bill. The Chair summarized the bills by stating that they call for a restitution order that has the effect of a judgment, but is not a judgment to avoid res judicata issues. The Chair asked Mr. Clark for an update of **HB 2012** Mr. Clark responded by stating that **HB 2012** deals with a revamping of the restitution language. Mr. Clark stated that late Friday **HB 2012** passed out of the House Judiciary although it has not been picked up on today's Calendar.

The Chair stated that both **SB 130** and **SB 142** will be blessed.

SB 200--Administration of juvenile detention facilities fund.

The Chair opened discussion on **SB 200**, and referred to Senator Harris's subcommittee report. The Chair continued by stating that this is a bill that changes the jurisdiction of funds for juvenile detention facilities from SRS to the Attorney General's Office. The Chair referred to page 2 line 12 as the principle thrust of the bill

Senator Harris reported that according to testimony during the subcommittee hearing, the level of frustration expressed by the conferees was high concerning SRS payment of funds. (Attachment 4)

Nancy Lindberg of the Attorney General's office stated that the problem was that the SRS was not getting the money out to the facilities. Discrepancies occurred in SRS's determination of "licensed beds" and "approved beds."

Senator Oleen addressed the Committee regarding quarterly payments based on a rebate on the number of beds available and the number of beds being used. Senator Oleen suggested putting the guidelines in place to require that payments are made quarterly, and putting a cap on administrative funds.

Motion made by Senator Bond, second by Senator Martin to move the bill favorably as amended by the subcommittee defining the bed occupancy issue, and placing a cap on administrative cost.

Ms Lindberg stated that the problem occurring with SRS is that they will only pay for SRS approved beds, and that often a facility will have more licensed beds than SRS approved beds.

The Chair questioned the criteria for the distribution of money being limited to the occupancy of beds regardless of other circumstances.

Ms Lindberg commented that the criteria is the number of beds. Discussion followed regarding other criteria to be used for the distribution of funds.

Motion and second withdrawn.

Motion made by Senator Bond, second by Senator Vancrum to amend SB 200 by deleting all after "criteria" on page 1 line 42 and line 43, plus amending to adopt subcommittee report and move the bill out favorably as amended. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 7, 1995, or on call of the Chair.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: 2-27-95

NAME	REPRESENTING
Nancy Lindberg	AG Office
Kay Farley	OJA
Jeremy Kohn	KSC
Ronald Kasper	KDOT
Jim Clark	KCDAA
Helen Stephens	KPOA/KSA

State of Kansas
Office of the Attorney General
2ND FLOOR, KANSAS JUDICIAL CENTER, TOPEKA 66612-1597

CARLA J. STOVALL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MAIN PHONE: (913) 296-2215
CONSUMER PROTECTION: 296-3751
FAX: 296-6296

TESTIMONY OF
ATTORNEY GENERAL CARLA STOVALL
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 27, 1995

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today to testify in support of SB 241 which this committee introduced at my request. The bill would define as persistent offenders those twice convicted of sexually violent offenses and would sentence them to life without parole. These are the most frightening of the predators in our communities and I believe this bill is imperative to stop their release back into our communities to hurt our law-abiding citizens again and again.

The trauma that comes from sexual abuse is lifelong. The physical injury that comes at the time of the abuse can be dramatic. The psychological injury can be even more debilitating. My little sister in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program had been sexually abused as a youngster. But she was adopted when she was 10 years old by a wonderful, stable family. But the abuse she suffered early in her life was an obstacle that neither she nor her adoptive family, nor her myriad of social workers and counselors could ever overcome.

She acted out in the most predictable ways of sexually abused children--the negative behavior increasing as she aged. It began with being truant from school and lying to her parents. It progressed to include running away from home, being committed to an adolescent psychiatric unit followed by extended stay in residential custody. She then had a miscarriage, was arrested for a criminal charge and jailed, became pregnant, placed the baby with neighbors while she traveled the country. She later regained custody of her infant and now is the welfare mother of two young

Senate Judiciary
2-27-95
Attachment 1

children. They are now living in the same unstable, transient kind of home in which she herself was abused when she was a child.

Serving out the remainder of life in prison for the perpetrator of crimes against children cannot compare to the prison to which they have sentenced their victims. My young friend and, more importantly her children unless a miracle occurs, are sentenced to a life of hell because a man twenty years ago allowed himself to be sexually active with a five year old girl.

I know the outcry will be in fear of the need for more bed space if we lock up these offenders for their lives. More beds cost more money. I know that. But, I submit to you, the economic cost is nothing compared to the human cost the victims are paying now. And society is not escaping without financial cost now either. The cost of crime, financial assistance, health costs, are just harder to measure -- but they are there.

Let's be proactive and save our children. I respectfully ask you to pass Senate Bill 241.

The KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION
A Full Service Banking Association

February 20, 1995

To: Senate Committee on Judiciary

From: Kathy Taylor, Kansas Bankers Association

Re: SB 35: Garnishment of funds in financial institutions

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to come to the committee in support of the revised version of **SB 35**. This bill amends KSA 61-2013 with a technical amendment, and makes several amendments to KSA 60-726. As all interested parties appear to be in agreement regarding the proposed changes, with the exception of one amendment, this testimony will focus on that amendment.

Joint tenancy and multiple garnishments (new subsection (f)). Institutions are faced with a dilemma when they receive an order of garnishment on a joint tenancy account. The law regarding joint tenancy accounts states that each joint tenant has access to all the funds. The IRS requires the institution to freeze the entire joint account, even when only one owner has been levied against.

The solution presented in subsection (f) tells the institution what to do in that case...it is procedural in nature. If passed, the law would direct the institution to freeze the entire amount of the garnishment, report the amount frozen on the garnishment form and return that information to the court. It is at that later time that the court must decide what portion of the account may actually be the defendant's. According to the Kansas Supreme Court in the Walnut Valley v. Stovall case, the court would then presume that a proportionate share is the defendant's. That presumption would be reflected on the Order of Payment that is sent to the institution, and the institution would then carry out the order of the court by remitting that share of the account.

We have not tried to change the substantive law as it was set out by the Kansas Supreme Court. Rather, we are just trying to resolve a procedural problem that occurs on a daily basis. Resolving the problem in this way is consistent with banking law, with the IRS rules, and it still allows the court to apply the case law as it is stated for Kansas. In addition, it resolves the problem of how to process multiple garnishment orders on the same joint account.

It is our belief that the financial institution should not be the entity that is deciding how the funds are divided. An institution is merely a conduit, as keeper of the funds, for attaining the funds. It does not benefit whatsoever from the attachment of these funds.

Office of Executive Vice President • 1500 Merchants National Building
Eighth and Jackson • Topeka, Kansas 66612 • (913) 232-3444
FAX (913) 232-3484

Senate Judiciary
Attach. 2 2-27-95

EXPLANATION OF SENATE BILL 35

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to explain, in detail, the purpose and effect of Senate Bill 35. We are surprised that there is opposition to the section which establishes a garnishee's procedure when a individual depositor is garnished and the garnishee is holding an account jointly owned by the garnished individual and another person. We believe the opposition arises from misperceptions of the bill's intent. Explanation follows:

In 1978, the Kansas Supreme Court, in *Walnut Valley State Bank v. Stovall,** held that a garnishment severs a joint tenancy (both owners own both ***all*** the funds) and converts ownership to tenancy in common (each owner owns a ***specific portion*** of the funds). Under the *Walnut Valley* ruling, ***equal ownership*** is generally assumed (if there are two owners, each will own one-half). ***But*** . . . *Walnut Valley* permits the parties to argue (to the court) that the garnished individual owns more or less than one-half. For example, the non-garnished account owner may argue that he/she owns 100% of the funds (and the garnished individual owns 0%), thereby defeating the garnishment. Conversely, the garnished creditor might argue that the garnished individual owns a full 100% (instead of only one-half), giving the creditor all the funds in the account instead of one-half of the funds.

We have no quarrel with the *Walnut Valley* case. It creates a law which in infinitely sensible, equitable and workable. But, understand that the who-owns-how-much issue is ***determined by the court*** days or even weeks ***after*** the garnishee gets the garnishment order! The garnishee ***cannot wait*** for a court to apply the *Walnut Valley* rules--it must freeze some or all of the joint account ***immediately***. For years, we have recommended that garnishee banks utilize the *Walnut Valley* assumption and hold only one-half of the account. But realistically, garnishees using that one-half presumption are at risk. If the court later determines (under the *Walnut Valley* rule) that the garnished individual owns 100% of the funds, the garnishee is only holding half enough--the other half is gone. And nothing in current statutory law would protect a garnishee from liability in this situation.

We feel that the problem can easily be resolved by a ***procedural*** (not substantive!) change under which a garnishee would be required to ***temporarily hold 100%*** of the funds in a joint account. Once the court determines the actual ownership proportion under the *Walnut Valley* guidelines, the bank is notified. If the garnished individual owns 100%, the garnishee would have the amount available to satisfy the garnishment. If the garnished individual owns less than 100%, the garnishee would send the required amount to the court and ***retum the ungamished portion to the joint account***. Simple. This procedural technique would protect the garnishee from liability (because it would always have enough to satisfy the garnishment) and would assure garnishing creditors that funds would be available to satisfy the garnishment regardless of the court's ownership determination pursuant to the *Walnut Valley* guidelines. Finally, we would note that the proposed "temporarily-freeze-100%" rule is consistent with IRS levy requirements.

Anne E. Lolley, Staff Attorney
Kansas Bankers Association

* 233 Kan. 459 (1987)

What we have prescribed by this amendment is merely procedural, so that we do not attempt to reach the issue of ownership of the funds. Therefore, the final sentence of subsection (f) is added as protection to the financial institution for complying with another party's order of garnishment.

There will always be instances where the garnishment order reaches a joint account and the funds are truly not the defendant's, but are the other joint owner's. This possibility exists now. As the court in the Walnut Valley case states, the burden of proof that an account is held other than equally lies with the party asserting such claim. The court further states that persons wishing to avoid the effect of this rule may maintain their property separately. We have not changed the rule by our amendment.

Thank you again and I hope that you will act favorably on **SB 35** as amended.

state has been suspended or revoked prior thereto. If any juvenile offender shall violate any of the conditions imposed under this subsection, such juvenile offender's driver's license or privilege to operate a motor vehicle on the highways of this state shall be revoked for a period as determined by the court in which such juvenile offender is convicted of violating such conditions.

(d) Whenever a juvenile offender is placed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) or (2), the court, unless it finds compelling circumstances which would render a plan of restitution unworkable, shall order the juvenile offender to make restitution to persons who sustained loss by reason of the offense. The restitution shall be made either by payment of an amount fixed by the court or by working for the persons in order to compensate for the loss. ~~*The amount of restitution shall be signed by the sentencing judge as an entry of judgment, pursuant to K.S.A. 60-258 and amendments thereto, and enforced pursuant to the code of civil procedure under chapter 60 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated.*~~ If the court finds compelling circumstances which would render a plan of restitution unworkable, the court may order the juvenile offender to perform charitable or social service for organizations performing services for the community.

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit a court's authority to order a juvenile offender to make restitution or perform charitable or social service under circumstances other than those specified by this subsection or when placement is made pursuant to subsection (a)(3) or (4).

A judgment issued hereunder shall continue to be in effect pursuant to K.S.A. 60-2403 and amendments thereto, even if at the time of issuing such judgment the juvenile offender was a minor.

(e) In addition to or in lieu of any other order authorized by this section, the court may order a juvenile offender to pay a fine not exceeding $250 for each offense. In determining whether to impose a fine and the amount to be imposed, the court shall consider the following:

(1) Imposition of a fine is most appropriate in cases where the juvenile offender has derived pecuniary gain from the offense.

(2) The amount of the fine should be directly related to the seriousness of the juvenile offender's offense and the juvenile offender's ability to pay.

(3) Payment of a fine may be required in a lump sum or installments.

(4) Imposition of a restitution order is preferable to imposition of a fine.

(5) The juvenile offender's duty of payment should be limited in duration and in no event should the time necessary for payment exceed the maximum term which would be authorized if the offense had been committed by an adult.

(f) In addition to or in lieu of any other order authorized by this

I.

An order of restitution may be enforced by the state, or by the victim, in the same manner as a judgment in a civil action. The amount of the unpaid restitution bears interest in accordance with K.S.A. 16-204, and amendments thereto, and, when properly recorded, becomes a lien on real estate owned by the juvenile offender.

(Taken from HB 2012, Sec. 1 (c)(3), page 2.)

II.

An order of restitution will not bar any subsequent civil proceedings, but the amount of restitution paid shall be set off against any subsequent independent civil recovery.

(From HB 2012, Sec. 1 (h), page 3.

Senate Judiciary
1-27-95
Attachment 3

3-2

(2) avoid such persons or places of disreputable or harmful character, as directed by the court, court services officer or community correctional services officer;

(3) report to the court services officer or community correctional services officer as directed;

(4) permit the court services officer or community correctional services officer to visit the defendant at home or elsewhere;

(5) work faithfully at suitable employment insofar as possible;

(6) remain within the state unless the court grants permission to leave;

(7) pay a fine or costs, applicable to the offense, in one or several sums and in the manner as directed by the court;

(8) support the defendant's dependents;

(9) reside in a residential facility located in the community and participate in educational, counseling, work and other correctional or rehabilitative programs;

(10) perform community or public service work for local governmental agencies, private corporations organized not for profit, or charitable or social service organizations performing services for the community;

(11) perform services under a system of day fines whereby the defendant is required to satisfy fines, costs or reparation or restitution obligations by performing services for a period of days determined by the court on the basis of ability to pay, standard of living, support obligations and other factors;

(12) participate in a house arrest program pursuant to K.S.A. 21-4603b, and amendments thereto; or

(13) in felony cases, except for violations of K.S.A. 8-1567 and amendments thereto, be confined in a county jail not to exceed 30 days, which need not be served consecutively.

(d) In addition to any other conditions of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program, the court shall order the defendant to comply with each of the following conditions:

(1) Make reparation or restitution to the aggrieved party for the damage or loss caused by the defendant's crime, in an amount and manner determined by the court and to the person specified by the court, unless the court finds compelling circumstances which would render a plan of restitution unworkable. ~~*The amount of such reparation or restitution shall be signed by the sentencing judge on an entry of judgment, pursuant to K.S.A. 60-258 and amendments thereto, and enforced pursuant to the code of civil procedure under chapter 60 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated and amendments thereto*~~;

I.

An order of restitution may be enforced by the state, or by the victim, in the same manner as a judgment in a civil action. The amount of the unpaid restitution bears interest in accordance with K.S.A. 16-204, and amendments thereto, and when properly recorded, becomes a lien on real estate owned by the defendant.
(HB 2012, Sec. 1(c)(3), page 2)

II

An order of restitution will not bar any subsequent civil procceedings, but the amount of restitution paid shall be set off against any subsequent independent civil recovery.
(HB 2012, Sec. 1(h), page 3)

3-3

(2) pay the probation or community correctional services fee pursuant to K.S.A. 21-4610a, and amendments thereto; and

(3) reimburse the state general fund for all or a part of the expenditures by the state board of indigents' defense services to provide counsel and other defense services to the defendant. In determining the amount and method of payment of such sum, the court shall take account of the financial resources of the defendant and the nature of the burden that payment of such sum will impose. A defendant who has been required to pay such sum and who is not willfully in default in the payment thereof may at any time petition the court which sentenced the defendant to waive payment of such sum or of any unpaid portion thereof. If it appears to the satisfaction of the court that payment of the amount due will impose manifest hardship on the defendant or the defendant's immediate family, the court may waive payment of all or part of the amount due or modify the method of payment.

Sec. 2. K.S.A. 1994 Supp. 22-3718 is hereby amended to read as follows: 22-3718. An inmate who has served the inmate's maximum term or terms, less such work and good behavior credits as have been earned, shall, upon release, be subject to such written rules and conditions as the Kansas parole board may impose, until the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which the inmate was sentenced or until the inmate is otherwise discharged. If the court which sentenced an inmate specified at the time of sentencing the amount and the recipient of any restitution ordered as a condition of release pursuant to this section, the parole board shall order as a condition of release that the inmate pay restitution in the amount and manner provided in the journal entry unless the board finds compelling circumstances which would render a plan of restitution unworkable. ~~*The amount of such restitution shall be signed by the sentencing judge as an entry of judgment, pursuant to K.S.A. 60-258 and amendments thereto, and enforced pursuant to the code of civil procedure under chapter 60 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated and amendments thereto.* If~~ the inmate was sentenced before July 1, 1986, and the court did not specify at the time of sentencing the amount and the recipient of any restitution ordered as a condition of release, the parole board shall order as a condition of release that the inmate make restitution for the damage or loss caused by the inmate's crime in an amount and manner determined by the board unless the board finds compelling circumstances which would render a plan of restitution unworkable. If the inmate was sentenced on or after July 1, 1986, and the court did not specify at the time of sentencing the amount and the recipient of any restitution ordered as a condition of release pursuant to this section, the parole board shall not order restitution as a condition of release unless the board finds compelling circumstances which justify such an order. Prior to the release

State of Kansas
Office of the Attorney General
2ND FLOOR, KANSAS JUDICIAL CENTER, TOPEKA 66612-1597

CARLA J. STOVALL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MAIN PHONE: (913) 296-2215
CONSUMER PROTECTION: 296-3751
FAX: 296-6296

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Mike Harris, Chair
Senate Judiciary Subcommittee

From: Attorney General Carla J. Stovall

Re: 1995 Senate Bill 200

Date: February 24, 1995

I appreciate this opportunity to address this bill and the issue of the costs of administering the Juvenile Detention Facilities Fund. As you know, juvenile justice is a high priority of mine and I would be pleased to assume the responsibility for administering this fund. As pointed out by your committee, it is necessary to be cognizant of the costs of such increased responsibilities. Further, it is appropriate that the special revenue funds being administered bear the cost of such administration, not the general fund.

It would be extremely helpful as we add more and more grant fund administration to this office that we be allowed to recover some of our costs, and as a result of this bill, I would like to see at least additional clerical staff hired, or perhaps a redistribution of administrative responsibilities to address the additional workload. I would expect a net increase of one FTE to be of assistance, plus operating expenses.

It was asked what 2 percent of the moneys generated to the Juvenile Detention Facilities Fund would net. The fund receives money from two sources: 5% of the money credited to the Gaming Revenues Fund, effective July 1, 1995, pursuant to K.S.A. 1994 Supp. 79-4803. This is unchanged by 1995 Senate Bill 200; and 5.12% of docket fees paid to the district courts. The amount of money credited to the Gaming Revenues Fund is capped at $50 million, pursuant to K.S.A. 79-4801, and recently such cap has been reached. Thus, I assume the Juvenile Detention Facilities Fund will receive 5% of $50 million from that source in Fiscal Year 1996, for a total of $2.5 million. The Office of Judicial Administrator projects some over $12 million in docket fees to be collected in Fiscal Year 1996, which would net $612,400 to the Juvenile Detention Facilities Fund. Total of the two sources is estimated to be some over $3.1 million in revenue to the fund in Fiscal Year 1996. Each percent allowed for administration would net $31,000, with 2% netting approximately $62,000.

Senate Judiciary
2-27-95
Attachment 4