

custodial parent and with the license holder. Reasonable efforts to verify do not require repeated attempts to contact the person who fails to respond to reasonable effort to communicate. I guess if this would become law reasonable efforts to contact the custodial parent and the license holder, what...what do...what are we speaking of? What is our intent? Are we talking about a certified letter? A telephone call? Perhaps both and keep some sort of reasonable record of those efforts to attempt (sic) that person?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, in my mind and perhaps this would differ in different people's minds, and I'm willing to leave it to the courts to decide what was reasonable in a particular instance, if there's a question on that matter, as we do with so many others. But if you write somebody a letter at their address I don't think it has to be certified. If you attempt to contact them orally, and certainly if you attempt to do both, that ought to be a reasonable effort to communicate. Now the reason that that language is in there is simply because a problem that's been referred to time and time again is that some of these people just stiff the system, they won't respond to anything, they won't answer any letters, they won't answer any phone calls, they're not attempting to communicate their problems or to communicate with the system. And so we try to build something in that encourages communication, in fact requires communication but doesn't make it absolute by tying things in knots and saying this is exactly what you have to do.

SENATOR BROMM: It's also true, is it not, that in any decree with child support, generally there's an order that requires the person paying child support to keep the clerk notified of their current address, that's an obligation on the part of the payor, to keep the current address and the records of the clerk of the district court, as I recall. Is that your understanding?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right, that's right.

SENATOR BROMM: So I think that also, if they comply with that, there should be no problem with making contact with them. The other area that I wanted to just touch base on a little bit, since people maybe haven't had a chance to read this yet in detail, is the issue of liability for an erroneous revocation. And I think the language for that, I believe, is on page 8, Section 20 of the proposed amendment. And if I...if that's the