

House Committee on Judiciary

Re: Supplement to Opposition to HB 2668

Dear Chair Kropf, Vice-Chairs Chotzen and Wallan, and Members of the Committee

In addition to the testimony I previously submitted, I would add that HB 2668 conflicts with ORS 146.177, which requires law enforcement agencies to specify the procedures for investigating missing persons in order to ensure that reported missing persons cases, particularly those involving minor children, are investigated as soon as possible, *utilizing all available resources*. Imposing cumbersome notification requirements and requiring volunteers to delay search efforts for 72 hours is not consistent with utilizing all available resources. The bill does not even contain an exception that permits a sheriff or other public body to authorize a private person to commence a search before the expiration of the 72 hour waiting period.

The bill would also appear to require, pursuant to ORS 181A.315, that Amber alerts make clear that private parties may not assist in the search for and safe recovery of a missing child until they comply with the disclosure and notice requirements of HB 2668. According to the plain language of the -2 amendment, recipients of an Amber alert message who meet the definition of a private search party will be precluded by law from timely participation in efforts to find a missing child.

Conclusory statements that families of missing persons have a pressing need to receive “transparent information” about persons who care enough about their communities to help locate missing (and often vulnerable) persons fail to reflect reality. Seriously, if a small child wanders away from a daycare facility, should the daycare workers be required to provide their identities and search plans to the parents and then wait 72-hours after notifying the sheriff before they begin to search for the child? What parents in such situations will want is prompt action, not bureaucratic impediments to protecting their children.

Thank you.