FILED
JUN 25 1986
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

209

STATE OF IOWA,	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	Filed June 25, 1986
vs.	)	6-122 85-1148
ALAN F. MAURER,	)	
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Muscatine County (No. 57546), James A. Weaver, Judge.

Defendant appeals his conviction of operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated or drugged in violation of Iowa Code section 321.281 (1985). **AFFIRMED.**

David Scieszinski, Wilton, for defendant-appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General; Pamela Greenman Dahl, Assistant Attorney General; and Bruce Ingham, Assistant County Attorney, for plaintiff-appellee.

Heard by Oxberger, C.J., Donielson, and Schlegel, JJ.

OXBERGER, C.J.

210

Defendant appeals his conviction of operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated or drugged in violation of Iowa Code section 321.281 (1985). We affirm.

The minutes of testimony revealed that police officer Brian Hammer would testify, in part, that defendant "failed a field sobriety test administered by Hammer and refused to take further tests, telling Hammer that Hammer was stupid and to arrest him."

At trial, defendant objected to the arresting officer's testimony regarding the field sobriety test as going beyond the scope of the minutes of testimony. The court overruled the objection by concluding that the minutes sufficiently alerted defendant of testimony regarding the field sobriety test. The arresting officer proceeded to describe the administration of the test. The officer also explained his training for the test and he provided data as to the reliability of the test.

According to Iowa Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(3), at the time of the filing of the trial information, the prosecuting attorney must file minutes of the testimony for each witness expected to testify at trial. The minutes are to include a "full and fair statement of the witness's expected testimony." Iowa R. Crim. P. 5(3). The minutes are not expected to disclose every detail of the witnesses' testimony; they need only be sufficient "to alert defendant generally to the source and nature of the evidence against him." State v. Walker, 281 N.W.2d 612, 614 (Iowa 1979); State v. Lord, 341 N.W.2d 741 742 (Iowa 1983).

Also, minutes of testimony are not intended to be a substitute for discovery. Lord, 341 N.W.2d 741, 743. They merely put the defendant on notice of the necessity of further investigation of the witness's testimony. Id. at 743.

The minutes filed by the State disclosed that Officer Hammer would testify that the defendant "failed a field sobriety test administered by Hammer and refused to take further tests." The defendant asserts that Officer Hammer went beyond the scope of the minutes when he testified:

> 1. That he administered a new test known as the horizontal gaze nystagmus test.
> 2. That he received extensive training to qualify himself to administer the test.
> 3. Officer Hammer testified extensively about the manner in which the test is administered.
> 4. Officer Hammer testified to his observation during training as to the correlation between an individual's performance based on this test and the blood alcohol of an individual.
> 5. Officer Hammer testified to the reliability of this test based on actual laboratory tests which he observed and national standards known to him.

We believe the minute of Officer Hammer's expected testimony was adequate to alert the defendant that Officer Hammer might elaborate on the sobriety test given. The discussion about the type of test given, the officers' qualifications to give the test, the procedures followed in administering the test, and the accuracy of the test were all within the scope of the minute. Therefore, the defendant was adequately notified as to the source and nature of the evidence against him.

The trial court did not err in admitting Officer Hammer's testimony over the objections of the defendant.

AFFIRMED.