

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Third Session
May 17, 2005**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order at 8:27 a.m., on Tuesday, May 17, 2005. Chairman Bernie Anderson presided in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, and, via simultaneous videoconference, in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Bernie Anderson, Chairman
Mr. William Horne, Vice Chairman
Ms. Francis Allen
Mrs. Sharron Angle
Ms. Barbara Buckley
Mr. John C. Carpenter
Mr. Marcus Conklin
Ms. Susan Gerhardt
Mr. Brooks Holcomb
Mr. Garn Mabey
Mr. Mark Manendo
Mr. Harry Mortenson
Mr. John Ocegüera
Ms. Genie Ohrenschall

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst
Jane Oliver, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fritz Schlottman, Administrator, Offender Management Division,
Department of Corrections, State of Nevada
Greg Cox, Assistant Director, Operations Division, Department of
Corrections, State of Nevada
Jon Sasser, Legislative Advocate, representing the Washoe County Senior
Law Project

Chairman Anderson:

[Called the meeting to order and roll called.] This is a work session, so we are not taking formal testimony. Mr. Schlottman, could you give the Committee an update on the disturbance you had last Thursday or Friday?

Fritz Schlottman, Administrator, Offender Management Division, Department of Corrections, State of Nevada:

As you may have read in the paper or heard on the radio, Sunday morning at 11:01 a.m., we had a disturbance at the Nevada State Prison (NSP). Approximately 15 inmates engaged with 3 of our officers in a disturbance that was related to a search for contraband. Three of our officers were taken to Carson-Tahoe Hospital and have been released with minor injuries.

The inmates involved in the altercation have been transported to the Ely State Prison. We're in control of the prison, and the prison is secure. Our staff is safe right now. The inmates in question are from a disruptive group. Last night, they engaged in some flooding and burning in their cells. We anticipate that this is fairly minor, and we will be taking corrective action over the next few days.

Chairman Anderson:

The same inmates who were involved in the initial disturbance are the ones who were recently transferred up here from High Desert State Prison.

Fritz Schlottman:

Yes. These inmates were transferred a few months ago from the High Desert State Prison.

Chairman Anderson:

Are they the ones who caused the problem last night?

Fritz Schlottman:

Yes.

Chairman Anderson:

We hope the prison guards are okay and that the safety of the personnel and the other inmates at the prison is being looked after, relative to the isolation of the group of offenders to a particular cell block.

Greg Cox, Assistant Director, Operations Division, Department of Corrections, State of Nevada:

Yes. Units 9, 10 and 11 are still in lockdown, controlled-movement status. The rest of the facility is running normally. We've had them contained there since they came to NSP.

They are the same organization we had issues with down at the High Desert State Prison. This is the same security threat group. We've had them listed as a disruptive security threat group, and that allows us to do some things about what they can and can't do. We received that through the Attorney General's Office.

Operationally, it allows us to limit recreation, contact, visitation, phones, et cetera, and to control communications out of there. We have had some issues there that we've dealt with. The inmates we've had the problems with are at Ely State Prison. We've done a very good job of identifying the leader of this organization and who's doing what.

We'll continue to manage them. This is a group that the California, Arizona, and New Mexico Department of Corrections have had problems with. They are a very organized security threat group gang. We have seen an increase in their population over the last 18 months, and it's still increasing.

We are getting a lot of these gang members from Las Vegas, and initially, they were from California. They come from the California Department of Corrections. The management of this type of inmate is a little more sophisticated.

Chairman Anderson:

Have we picked up these inmates from Montana or Washington?

Greg Cox:

No. These are inmates who have committed crimes in the state of Nevada.

Chairman Anderson:

Moving them from High Desert State Prison to Ely State Prison—our usual means of security—has not been of any value?

Greg Cox:

Yes, it has been of value. In a wing at the High Desert State Prison, there would be 84 inmates. Here, there's a possibility of 24 inmates. It's more manageable for us.

Chairman Anderson:

Has this type of inmate become a larger percentage of our prison population, which increases the likelihood of them having control of a situation?

Greg Cox:

Yes and no. Operationally, we can limit their control and effect on the Department. We've had very good intelligence. We have a group of people who identify all of our gang members—not just this group, but all of them. We validated, which means going in and identifying all the gang members at all our facilities.

We're not having these problems elsewhere with this group. We have management tools that we use with them as a disruptive security threat group.

Assemblyman Horne:

You said the group is sophisticated and organized, but you moved them in a group of 15 inmates. Is there any reason why you didn't break up the group of 15 inmates?

Greg Cox:

We moved them to Ely State Prison, because that's our maximum security facility. Ely is designed to deal with individuals like that. They will be totally separated. Ely does not allow them to get together like that, and that's why they're there.

Chairman Anderson:

They're going to be moved from Nevada State Prison to Ely State Prison?

Greg Cox:

We've moved everybody out of this group that we've identified as a problem. Keep in mind, there are over 160 of them. We haven't had any problems with the other 145. We've identified their leadership and moved them to Ely.

Chairman Anderson:

Is this a racial gang?

Greg Cox:

You can't label them as a Hispanic gang, because there are whites and blacks in this gang. It's not a totally Hispanic organization.

Chairman Anderson:

I was thinking of the time we had the Aryan Warriors versus the black inmates in the early 1980s.

Let's turn our attention to the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). Let's begin with S.B. 28.

Senate Bill 28 (1st Reprint): Prohibits person from knowingly and intentionally capturing image of private area of another person under certain circumstances and prohibits person from knowingly distributing, disclosing, displaying, transmitting or publishing image captured under such circumstances. (BDR 15-8)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Referred to Work Session Document, [Exhibit B](#)]. Senate Bill 28 was reviewed in work session last week. This is the video voyeurism bill. There were a couple of amendments that were discussed.

The first amendment was to clarify that the person who is a defendant in a civil action has the same access to the confidential image as is currently provided in the bill for a defendant in a criminal action. This amendment was proposed on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada.

The second amendment addresses concerns raised during the work session last week with regard to the exception for law enforcement. Under the bill, there are some examples of the activities law enforcement may engage in with these images. The suggestion to address the concerns raised by some of the Committee members is to model this provision after the federal law, which is on page 4 ([Exhibit B](#)). Eliminate the examples and say, "This section does not prohibit any lawful law enforcement, correctional, or intelligence activities." That is the same as subsection (c) on page 4 ([Exhibit B](#)) under the federal law.

The third proposed amendment is regarding the Category E felony that is currently provided in the bill. The amendment proposes to lower the penalty to a

gross misdemeanor for the first offense and then return to the Category E felony for all subsequent offenses.

[Allison Combs, continued.] The copy of A.B. 190 on page 6 ([Exhibit B](#)) is a similar bill passed out of this Body already, and it is provided to address the question that was raised about the penalties under this bill. Those penalties are graduated, based upon the circumstances of the crime. They range from a misdemeanor to a Category B felony.

Chairman Anderson:

It would be difficult to prepare a defense if you don't know what they're talking about. Proposed conceptual amendment 1 is acceptable to me.

The second amendment is a concern raised by Mr. Carpenter and others. The existing language is fairly specific. The term "activities" follows the federal guidelines. I don't see a problem with this amendment, because you're giving law enforcement greater latitude in terms of what they need to do for their legal law enforcement activities.

The amendment to lower the penalty from Category E to gross misdemeanor for the first offense is consistent with the decision we made in A.B. 190.

All three of these amendments make sense to me.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

I don't have a problem with correctional activities, and I know that intelligence activities comes from the federal law, but intelligence by whom? If it's law enforcement, correctional, or the CIA [U.S. Central Intelligence Agency], that's fine, but there's no definition of "intelligence." Could I say, "I'm collecting intelligence"? We could take intelligence out, define who would be collecting intelligence, or say, "those authorized." It seems a little broad.

Chairman Anderson:

Intelligence activity, generally speaking, is ...

Assemblywoman Buckley:

It could say, "By an authorized law enforcement agency."

Chairman Anderson:

We need to clarify that this bill doesn't prohibit lawful law enforcement, correction, or intelligence activities, which is the current language on page 2 of S.B. 28, line 15, which says, "Any lawful law enforcement, correctional, or intelligence gathering activities."

[Chairman Anderson, continued.] For example, we just got finished listening to the personnel from the prison. If they were photographing people in prison and trying to gather information about the creation of gangs and groups that may be there, and they caught naked individuals, then they're going to need that information about why this part of the prison population needs to be watched.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

I don't have a problem with correctional activities because you have no reasonable expectation of privacy in prison, and they need that flexibility for searches and the like.

My problem is with intelligence activities. You make the point that lawful modifies intelligence activities as well. If "lawful" modifies intelligence activities, maybe that's enough. The question in my mind is, by whom?

Chairman Anderson:

Ms. Lang, do we need to clarify further? It seems that photographing and gathering material is an important part of law enforcement. You're trying to figure out what the intelligence group consists of.

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:

This language was taken directly out of the federal law, and perhaps, for the purposes of the state, law enforcement and correctional would cover what you're getting at here. We could remove intelligence and limit it to "any lawful law enforcement or correctional activities." Then you wouldn't need to get into who it is if all we're talking about is law enforcement and correctional activities.

Chairman Anderson:

Is there a reason why we put law enforcement first and correctional second?

Risa Lang:

It was modeled after the federal law, and that's how it was listed there. I don't think there was any reason for listing them in any particular order.

Chairman Anderson:

If the district attorney's office decides to do an intelligence operation and has to do it through the sheriff's office, or the district attorney's office has an investigatory branch—it may be doing investigative intelligence on a law enforcement agency—would this preclude them from doing that?

Risa Lang:

The prosecutors would be covered under subsection 6 of S.B. 28, which says that they can use it "as necessary for purposes of investigation and prosecution."

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

I'm concerned about the section we're deleting about displaying, transmitting, or publishing an image. I'm thinking about a situation where there was a Boy Scout meeting and some pictures came out of that. If law enforcement did not have the ability to take those pictures—blur what body parts were inappropriate—and they didn't have the ability to display those pictures to the adults who were there at that gathering, how would you identify the person who might have taken those pictures? I wouldn't want to do anything that would prohibit law enforcement from getting at the person who's responsible.

Chairman Anderson:

"Activities" is a broad statement and would include all of the events we're deleting, plus some. It is broadening, rather than limiting.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

So, we're going to leave it to the discretion of the investigating officers?

Chairman Anderson:

It sounds to me like we're leaving it up to the discretion of the officers.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

By taking this out, we're not going to prohibit them from doing that?

Chairman Anderson:

That is my understanding. Ms. Lang, am I correct here?

Risa Lang:

I think your reading is accurate, Mr. Anderson. There's nothing in here that would prohibit it, as long as it is a lawful law enforcement or correctional activity.

Chairman Anderson:

Are there any other observations from the Committee? The Chair will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 28 AS PROPOSED IN THE WORK SESSION
DOCUMENT:

- AMENDMENT NUMBER 1
- AMENDMENT NUMBER 2, LEAVING OUT THE WORD "INTELLIGENCE"
- AMENDMENT NUMBER 3

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANGLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Manendo and Ms. Ohrenschall were not present for the vote.)

Chairman Anderson:

Let's move to S.B. 173.

Senate Bill 173 (1st Reprint): Increases amount of homestead exemption and makes various changes relating to property which is exempt from execution by creditors. (BDR 10-616)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 173 provides exemptions, including the modification of the homestead exemption. There is a list on page 9 (Exhibit B) of things that are modified in the bill.

This bill was heard on May 12. There are four areas with proposed amendments. The first proposed amendment is to clarify the personal injury exception. The amendment on page 10 (Exhibit B) explains the purpose of doing this. The idea is to clarify and make it easy in the application of this change. Rather than payments in an amount not to exceed \$16,150, it would be 50 percent of the settlement proceeds, not including punitive damages.

The second proposed amendment is to increase the wage garnishment threshold amount. This was proposed by Jon Sasser during the hearing. Subsequently, Mr. Ernie Nielson provided some language and justification, on page 11 (Exhibit B), that would raise the exemption for weekly take-home pay from 30 to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage.

The third proposed amendment involves the homestead exemption. There were two options discussed during the hearing. The first relates to the stacking of homestead exemptions and proposes to revise Nevada's law to allow each judgment debtor to claim a homestead exemption. Currently, it's based on just the homestead. The second option proposes to increase the amount of the

homestead exemption to \$400,000 to mirror A.B. 365, which has already been passed by the Assembly.

[Allison Combs, continued.] The fourth proposed amendment was to reinstate language from the original version of S.B. 173 to allow an exemption for a small amount of assets. This one is frequently referred to as the "wild card" amendment. There is an explanation of this on page 13 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)).

Chairman Anderson:

I don't think we'll be successful with the Senate if we move with the wild card exemption, because they already removed it. It wouldn't be worth fighting with them about. There are too many issues in it that would prevent us from getting anywhere.

The first proposed amendment by Mr. [Philip] Goldstein, clarifying the personal injury exemption, might be acceptable.

The wage garnishment threshold from 30 to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage is a dramatic move with a 100 percent increase, although it's been some time coming. I think that's a number that we can modify.

I like the idea of stacking for the homestead exemption, but I don't think it's going to happen. We should make the amount consistent with A.B. 365, which Mr. Mortenson indicated was \$400,000.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

It makes sense to update the wage garnishment threshold. I could understand it better if I knew what 30 times is and what 60 times is. It looks like 30 times is \$10,712 per year, and 60 times would be \$21,424 a year for a family of four. I think it's for one person; is that right?

Chairman Anderson:

I think it's for one person, but it may be a family.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

If the one person is supporting 3 children then it would be a family of 4, so I guess it depends.

Chairman Anderson:

It would depend upon the new marriage.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

Or it could be the household composition. What's the minimum somebody should be able to keep when their wages are being garnished? Is it \$10,712, \$21,424, or is it somewhere in between? The 30 and 60 times the federal minimum wage doesn't accurately describe it as well as looking at the raw number.

Chairman Anderson:

The \$10,712 number is above the poverty level, but not by very much.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

It's hard to survive on \$10,712 a year, and it's hard to survive on \$21,424 a year.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's see if we can find Mr. Sasser and have him come to the Committee. Mr. Horne, I'm going to turn the Chair over to you.

Vice Chairman Horne:

Until Mr. Sasser is located, let's move to S.B. 272.

Senate Bill 272: Revises provisions governing confiscation and disposition of certain weapons. (BDR 15-321)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 272 was heard at the end of April. There was testimony on this bill from the Nevada Highway Patrol. It removes the exception for firearms forfeitable for certain controlled substances offenses from the procedures governing surrender of a firearm under the civil forfeiture statutes. It provides that all the forfeiture proceedings would fall under the criminal procedures and then go to civil proceeding. Ms. Lang was asked to visit with the sponsors of the bill for clarification of the intent of this legislation.

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:

I talked to Mr. Stan Olsen about this and asked him if he could explain it to me one more time. He explained to me that there are two separate proceedings, depending on whether or not it's a drug crime. Currently, under subsection 1, if it's a drug crime, it goes under the civil forfeiture procedure first. For other crimes, it goes as part of the criminal proceedings. They were trying to streamline and have every person charged with a crime go through the criminal proceedings.

[Risa Lang, continued.] On occasion, he said that the criminal proceedings may be dropped, or perhaps there was a plea bargain whereby somebody would give the source of the crime, and because of that, the person gets off and he doesn't actually get charged. They caught him with rock cocaine, so they want to keep his weapon, even though they're not going to charge him with anything at this point. Once the criminal proceedings are dropped, they go through the regular civil forfeiture proceedings, which allows for things attributable to a crime to be forfeited in that manner. They want to streamline so that all crimes are treated the same way, not treating the drug crimes separately. That is the intent.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

Do they mean where it's a subject of a successful forfeiture action, where they actually have proved it? It doesn't exactly say that.

Risa Lang:

What they're saying is if the criminal proceedings get dropped, they could then start civil proceedings. They would go through the regular forfeiture proceedings, where they would have to prove that during the civil forfeiture.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

The wording is, you have to return it "unless..." and then "upon demand" if they're acquitted, unless it's the subject of a forfeiture action. It doesn't really say, "Unless they win the forfeiture action," but I assume a judge would presume that you have to go to court and meet your burden of proof.

Risa Lang:

We could clarify that more if you feel that would be helpful. Instead of "the subject of," maybe it should be "unless the instrument or weapon is ... if the forfeiture proceeding is to be commenced, or will be commenced for the weapon."

I think it says "the subject of" right now, because it wouldn't have started yet—since it was part of the criminal proceeding—so they want to retain it until they start the forfeiture proceedings in the civil action.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

In the summary of the bill in front of us, on page 14 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)), it provides that a weapon surrendered to law enforcement is not required to be returned to the person from whom it was confiscated after the person is acquitted of the offense. I don't understand that, because if they're acquitted, what right do we have to keep that property?

Risa Lang:

What they were saying in their explanation to me is that, although they're acquitted—sometimes they may have committed the crime, but they entered into some kind of agreement with them—under the civil proceedings, you would still have to go through a whole burden of proof, and clear and convincing evidence, that the person committed the act and is subject to forfeiture of the instrument of the crime. It's a different burden of proof under the civil proceedings than it is under the criminal proceedings.

Vice Chairman Horne:

I was concerned during the hearing because of the administrative portion of it. The forfeitures are still taking place. There are two different hearings, and they're bifurcated. Would this bill put it all under criminal?

Risa Lang:

What they were saying was that anyone who's being charged with a crime, the forfeiture would take place during the criminal proceedings rather than having a separate civil proceeding for crimes that involve drugs, which, from my understanding, is happening right now. They have a separate way of dealing with it if it's a drug crime.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I don't understand it well enough to vote on it, so I don't have a good feel for it.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I don't understand it either. Are we looking at this like the O.J. Simpson trial, where he was acquitted, but then somebody filed a civil suit against him? I don't want to give them back their guns, but if they're acquitted, I don't know what right we have to keep them.

Vice Chairman Horne:

They want to say, "This was a bad guy," and while we weren't successful in convicting him—or they plea bargained down to a lesser offense—it would be a good idea that he doesn't get his weapon back. They still have to go through a hearing to do that, but they want to be able to do that. It wouldn't have an effect on a person who has a prior conviction of a felony, because they're not supposed to have the weapon anyway.

Risa Lang:

Right now, if you have a drug crime that falls under NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 453.301, it would go to the civil proceeding anyway. It would start and end there. Regardless of whether the person is convicted or not, they could still go through the civil proceedings. According to Mr. Todd Ellison, this would

allow them to treat all crimes the same and do it as part of the criminal proceeding, and not have to go through a civil proceeding if they go forward and charge them with the drug offense.

Vice Chairman Horne:

We've always treated drug crimes differently.

Risa Lang:

They always went through the civil proceeding, which would have been a different standard of proof, because you still have a due process where you go through and have to prove the facts of the case, but it's just through a different type of proceeding.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

The Legislature, for better or worse, has already passed all the forfeiture statutes, so right now, starting in NRS 179.1156 and following, "The following property is subject to seizures: any proceeds attributable to the commission or attempted commission of a felony," and they set forth the proceeding and how it works, and it talks about clear and convincing evidence. That's the law now. I think they use that if there is a plea bargain or the witnesses don't come forward. There are certain situations where they try to get the proceeds, whether it's the drug dealer's house or the guns. The question here is whether it should be clarified to say, "With regard to the particular seizure after acquittal."

Chairman Anderson:

Let's turn our attention to S.B. 347.

Senate Bill 347 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning personal identifying information. (BDR 15-15)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 347 was heard in early May. It involves identity theft. It makes multiple changes regarding the crime of identity theft and is set forth on page 15 of the Work Session Document (Exhibit B). It prohibits the establishment of a financial forgery laboratory and multiple other changes with regard to this crime.

There was testimony in support of the measure from the bill's sponsors, law enforcement, the State Task Force on Cyber Crime, the Nevada Bankers Association, and the Nevada Association of Realtors.

[Allison Combs, continued.] There were concerns expressed by some representatives of State entities with regard to the potential fiscal impact of the bill. There is a fiscal note on the bill, but no amendments have been suggested to address that particular concern.

The next page of the Work Session Document (page 16 of [Exhibit B](#)) contains a list of proposed conceptual amendments. The first amendment was proposed during the hearing by Ms. Lynn Chapman of Nevada Eagle Forum to require restitution for the crimes of public employees involved in identity theft and victimizing older or vulnerable persons. Currently, the court has discretion in that area.

The second proposed amendment is in regard to credit card issuers. Chris MacKenzie of the American Express Company provided the handout on page 17 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)) that clarifies that a credit card issuer, subject to the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999, is deemed to be in compliance with the notification requirements under the bill for credit card issuers.

The third proposed amendment is with regard to the definition of "personal information." There was a concern raised during the hearing about the definition of "personal information," which is on pages 10 and 11 of the bill. The suggestion from the sponsor of the bill is to strike the language, as you see there in the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)) on page 16, so that the term "personal information" would not include "publicly available information lawfully made available to the general public."

The fourth proposed amendment is in reference to a federal definition of "consumer reporting agency." Currently, the bill makes a reference to the federal law. The proposal on page 18 ([Exhibit B](#)) from Mr. James Jackson would provide a more detailed reference under the federal law.

The fifth proposed amendment will amend Section 27 to clarify that electronic transmissions don't include facsimiles or transmissions within a secure system that is not accessible to persons outside the business. In other words, it wouldn't apply to businesses that are communicating among their own employees. The second part of that would be to provide an effective date of October 1, 2008, to allow businesses to make the necessary changes in their systems.

The sixth amendment was proposed by the Washoe County School District regarding the recovery of damages by data collectors. It would allow a data collector to bring a civil action for damages against the person who unlawfully

entered the system or benefited from obtaining personal information. It would also allow a court, in any criminal proceeding related to the unlawful disclosure, to order the defendant to pay restitution for the cost of giving notice. You will find that amendment on page 19 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)).

[Allison Combs, continued.] On page 20 ([Exhibit B](#)), there is the definition of "vulnerable person," a concern raised by the Chairman with regard to the definition in the bill passed earlier by the Assembly, A.B. 267. Senate Bill 347 contains the definition that was originally in A.B. 267, which the Committee changed to make it narrower for the criminal context.

Chairman Anderson:

Most of the amendments seem acceptable to me. I'm not positive about amendment 1, but 2, 3, 4, and 5 are acceptable. I'm not positive that amendment 4 by Mr. Jackson is needed, but the bill drafter may think it's needed for clarification. This is about the consumer reporting agency, where we're going to add a "(p)."

This bill is the work of the Cyber Crime Task Force of Nevada, which carried out most of what the Attorney General's Office was looking for in updating this level of criminal activity.

Assemblyman Horne:

On the proposed conceptual amendment 2, "A credit card issuer that is subject to and complies with the notice provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999 shall be deemed to be in compliance with the notification requirements." We can have stricter notification requirements than the federal government, so that might be undoing the intent of the bill. I would like Legal's opinion on that.

Risa Lang:

The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999 has various notice provisions and seems to be a little more specific than what we have. I think the thought was that it would have them required under federal law and state law to do different things. The intent was that they only be required to follow one.

Assemblyman Horne:

If they followed that federal act, would they still be in compliance with what we need here?

Risa Lang:

It would still carry out the intent. I think we have one other place where we've done that in this bill, and I'm trying to find it.

Chairman Anderson:

There's a mention of it in (b) on page 13, line 4 of the bill, which says, "Is subject to and complies with the privacy and security provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, *United States Code*, Title 15, Section 6801." Obviously, amendment 2 is not necessary.

Risa Lang:

I think they apply to different folks. The one referred to on page 13 of the bill is for data collectors, and they wanted to have the same thing for the credit card issuers.

Chairman Anderson:

Mr. Horne, is that clarified for you?

Assemblyman Horne:

Yes.

Chairman Anderson:

I suggest amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 16 ([Exhibit B](#)). The question of "vulnerable person" comes forward once again. We should use the broadest possible definition for vulnerable person, in terms of trying to include somebody who needs a computer because of their status or an infirmity they may have.

I need help from bill drafting on which definition gives us the best protection, [S.B. 347](#) or [A.B. 267](#), in terms of the overall group.

Risa Lang:

The definition that's provided here is the same one that this Committee amended in [A.B. 267](#). The definition that has been added to [A.B. 267](#) is more specific about who it is, and it's probably a little easier to identify.

Chairman Anderson:

But without the age restriction.

Risa Lang

You probably wouldn't need the age restriction for this particular crime, since identity theft can affect a person of any age.

Chairman Anderson:

No age restriction, but include "suffers from a condition of physical or mental incapacitation because of developmental disability, organic brain damage, or mental illness, or has one or more physical or mental limitations that restrict the ability of the person to perform the normal activities of daily living."

[Chairman Anderson, continued.] The Chair will entertain an amend and do pass motion with amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6 on page 16 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). Also, an amended definition along the lines of A.B. 267 for “vulnerable persons” without the 18-year-old age limit, and amendment 4 on page 16 ([Exhibit B](#)), if the bill drafter feels it’s necessary.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 347 WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS FROM THE WORK SESSION DOCUMENT:

- AMENDMENT 2
- AMENDMENT 3
- AMENDMENT 4, IF THE BILL DRAFTER THINKS IT’S NECESSARY
- DEFINITION OF A “VULNERABLE PERSON” FROM ASSEMBLY BILL 267, WITHOUT THE 18-YEAR-OLD AGE LIMIT

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Ms. Buckley, Mr. Manendo, Mr. Mortenson, and Ms. Ohrenschall were not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 173 (1st Reprint): Increases amount of homestead exemption and makes various changes relating to property which is exempt from execution by creditors. (BDR 10-616)

Chairman Anderson:

Mr. Sasser, we have questions about S.B. 173. One of the questions was about the proposal to move the wage garnishment threshold amount to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage in proposed amendment number 2, on page 9 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)).

We’re trying to figure out what this truly means in terms of how it is going to help the person who’s supposed to be receiving benefits from garnishment. We see that it will clearly help the family member who’s going to have an increased amount of money at their disposal.

Ms. Buckley, would you ask Mr. Sasser your question?

Assemblywoman Buckley:

When you say 30 to 60, it sounds radical, like doubling a legislator's salary. I want to go back to what the real numbers were, because sometimes that tells a different story. Does 30 times the federal minimum hourly wage mean that a wage earner is at \$10,712? What would 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage be? Would it be double that, or is that a different number?

Jon Sasser, Legislative Advocate, representing the Washoe County Senior Law Project:

The reason the number 60 was chosen is that the poverty level for a family of 3 is \$16,090 per year. Sixty would be just under that, I think it's somewhere around \$15,900 per year. Fifty-two weeks per year, 40 hours per week at \$5.15 per hour is \$10,712 per year, and that's what the current amount is.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

What is 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage?

Jon Sasser:

I'm looking at Mr. Ernie Nielson's multipliers, and I remember it being approximately \$15,000. It was just under the poverty level for a family of three. I don't have that map with me.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

Allison Combs is saying it's \$16,068, according to the handout. That's the amount someone could keep to support their family without being garnished.

Jon Sasser:

Correct.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

I'm comfortable with the \$16,068. It seems to me that trying to keep \$16,068 to support a family is acceptable.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

My concern is that if we raise it too high, the word will get around to merchants. If somebody buys something, puts it on the payment plan, and doesn't pay it, and the merchant tries to garnish their wages and finds that the amount is so high they probably couldn't get anything, they're going to be reluctant to do it. I don't know who we're helping and who we're not. I understand the low amount for people to try to live. On the other hand, they need to obtain goods and services in order to live. The merchants can't garnish their wages, so it may be a situation where you have unintended consequences.

Jon Sasser:

In general, in the garnishment statute, you protect 75 percent of your earnings. It's only when you get down to people at the very bottom of the earnings pool that you find this absolute floor. It would be \$307 per week if you went to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage, as opposed to the \$154 per week that it is right now.

Current statute is less than the poverty level for a family of one, and you would be going to the poverty level for a family of 3 if you went to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

If Mr. Carpenter feels that we're moving too fast, maybe we just meet in the middle. To go from 30 times to 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage gives a little sticker shock, but when you look at the numbers, it's not much sticker shock. We could update it, but not go that far.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Where does the 75 percent come in at?

Jon Sasser:

Nevada's law is based on federal law at the present time. These are the floors under federal law, and we've incorporated them into our state law. If we went to 45 times the federal minimum hourly wage, it would go to \$236.75 per week.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I don't think he answered my question. Where does 75 percent come in?

Jon Sasser:

Under current federal law and state law, if you're being garnished, you get to protect 75 percent of your wages. With a floor—and we're talking about raising the floor—if somebody's wages were so low that 75 percent fell underneath the floor, then they would at least keep the floor. Today, the floor is roughly \$154 per week.

Chairman Anderson:

If you look in paragraph 11 on page 6 of the bill, beginning on line 44, current statute says, "Seventy-five percent of the take-home pay for any work week, unless the weekly take-home pay is less than 30 times the federal minimum hourly wage, in which case the entire amount may be exempt." If it's 75 percent or below the 30 times the federal minimum hourly wage, you get to keep it all.

[Chairman Anderson, continued.] Senate Bill 173 clarifies the pay period is the work week and hourly wage, and we're dealing with the 30 times the federal minimum hourly wage. That's the raw number Ms. Buckley wants us to look at instead of the percentage, because the raw number displays what it means in real terms for a real family, relative to the actual cost of living.

It's like all of us getting paid for 60 days, and then getting paid for 120 days.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I'm okay with the number 60, but if it helps this bill move along, I'll go for a lower number. It's a low number either way, in my opinion.

Chairman Anderson:

Mr. Sasser, did you suggest to the Senate the 60 number?

Jon Sasser:

Mr. Ernie Nielson testified in the Senate. I believe he suggested 60 or 45 times the federal minimum hourly wage, and they chose to adopt neither.

Chairman Anderson:

Do you think this issue will hinder the bill?

Jon Sasser:

I hope not.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's try for 50 times the federal minimum hourly wage. I'm not upset with the idea of 60 times the federal minimum hourly wage.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 173, WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS FROM
THE WORK SESSION DOCUMENT ([EXHIBIT B](#)):

- AMENDMENT 1
- AMENDMENT 2, WITH THE NUMBER BEING 50 TIMES THE FEDERAL MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE.
- AMENDMENT 3(B)

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Holcomb:

I want to pick up where Mr. Carpenter left off. In Section 5, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of the bill says, "The following property is exempt from execution: private libraries from \$1,500 to \$5,000 ..." and it expands property eligible for this exemption to "works of art, musical instrument, and jewelry." That's an increase of over 200 percent. What is the message we're sending? That is not the subsistence or livelihood; it's just a personal library.

Chairman Anderson:

Do you object to the bill as a whole?

Assemblyman Holcomb:

I question that particular exemption. Is it necessary? I could see raising the exemption from \$1,500 to \$2,500, but \$1,500 to \$5,000 is a substantial jump. The yard equipment and the household goods only go from \$10,000 to \$12,000, but libraries go from \$1,500 to \$5,000.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

It does say, "Private libraries, works of art, musical instruments, and jewelry." If someone has a ring that their mother gave them, it also includes that. I don't have a lot of sympathy for private libraries, but maybe it's because my books aren't worth anything. If your child has a violin, do they take the violin? I'm not married to it one way or the other. It could go a little lower, but I think there was more involved than this rich library. I think it was meant to cover your kid's musical instrument, heirlooms, or your wedding ring.

Assemblyman Holcomb:

I'm concerned about the message this would send to the creditors about exemptions for a lot of items, and they're going to be substantial. To go from \$1,500 to \$5,000 is substantial.

Assemblyman Horne:

When was the \$1,500 placed in the statute? If it was two years ago and it jumped to \$5,000, it would be significant, but if it was placed there in 1960, it may be long overdue.

Allison Combs:

I'll check that.

Chairman Anderson:

This is in Section 5 of the bill, on page 9. The \$1,500 limit was placed in the statute prior to 1997.

[Chairman Anderson, continued.] If I have a book collection and a watercolor or two, done by a famous Nevada artist, and my wife has her grandmother's ring, do I have to get rid of those?

Assemblyman Holcomb:

I have quite a collection of books myself. I would say, again, it's the message that you're communicating. It's not a necessity, like the house or your employment. If the Chair or the members are not bothered by it, that's your call. I'm personally bothered by it.

Chairman Anderson:

We have an amend and do pass motion by Ms. Buckley, seconded by Mr. Conklin. Is there any other discussion?

THE MOTION CARRIED, WITH ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER
VOTING NO.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's move forward in the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)) to S.B. 444.

Senate Bill 444 (1st Reprint): Requires Nevada Gaming Commission to adopt regulations authorizing gaming licensee to charge fee for admission to area in which gaming is conducted under certain circumstances. (BDR 41-1295)

Chairman Anderson:

I think S.B. 444 is ready to go. Unfortunately, it's the last one relative to other issues on gaming matters that are out in front of the Body.

Mr. Bob Faiss has a habit of doing this. In the last session, one of his students had a bill in front of us that was a simple bill, and the students were all expecting that it would pass. We ended up having to hold it because it was the last gaming bill.

I'm going to suggest that we hold this over until tomorrow, because there are concerns about other gaming issues that are out there. Rather than see those as Floor amendments, I prefer that we deal with them if they end up in this Committee.

[Chairman Anderson, continued.] I'm of the opinion that there are only a limited amount of things that we need to do with it. We have an amendment from Mr. Faiss on page 23 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). What is the pleasure of the Committee?

We'll move it to tomorrow.

[Senate Bill 452 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions pertaining to Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History. (BDR 14-612)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Senate Bill 452](#) involves the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History. It recreates an advisory committee and removes some technical references to the Highway Patrol Division.

There were two proposed conceptual amendments on page 24 ([Exhibit B](#)), relating to the composition of the new advisory committee. The first one is from the Administrative Office of the Courts and deals specifically with the justice or municipal court representative. The proposal was to allow the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to appoint a representative of the Judicial Branch rather than having the Department of Public Safety appoint the justice or municipal court representative.

The second proposal revises the membership as follows:

- Delete the representatives of individual law enforcement agencies, based upon population to some extent.
- Keep the Director of the Department of Public Safety and the legislative members.
- Add the Attorney General; Director of the Department of Corrections; Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts or his designee, who represents both court clerks and the courts; a representative of the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association; a representative of the Nevada District Attorneys Association; and a representative appointed by the Department of Public Safety who represents the noncriminal justice users of the system.

Number 1 and 2 are not necessarily mutually exclusive. If the Committee wants to have two representatives of the Judicial Branch, both could be adopted.

Vice Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

I like my proposed amendment ([Exhibit B](#)), for the record.

Assemblyman Anderson:

I was not here the day of the hearing. However, it seems to me the proposals that have your name attached to them are ones that have been discussed by us in advance. I think it would be helpful for the Criminal History Repository, which has had such a dyslectic past, to have this kind of input in a more formalized way. I think your amendments go a long way, and I'll be happy to support them.

Could Legal tell us how to blend amendment 1 and 2 together ([Exhibit B](#))? If we added a Judicial Branch representative, would that harm your position, Mr. Horne? We would add the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, or his designee, rather than a representative from the Judicial Branch appointed by the Chief Justice.

Vice Chairman Horne:

I don't think it harms my amendment at all, because it's about oversight and participation. It wouldn't be a problem.

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:

I think you could do either or both. As Allison Combs indicated, you could have a member who represents the Judicial Branch who's appointed by the Chief Justice in addition to the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, or you could just select one or the other—whatever you feel is more appropriate for the membership.

Vice Chairman Horne:

I don't have a feeling either way. If the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts or his designee is on there, the Judicial Branch would still be represented.

Assemblyman Conklin:

Since Mr. [Ron] Titus, which is who we're talking about in your amendment, has recommended the above language, why don't we give him his language, just give the courts one person, and roll that into your amendment?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 452 WITH THE AMENDMENTS IN THE WORK
SESSION DOCUMENT AS FOLLOWS:

- COMBINE AMENDMENT 1 WITH AMENDMENT 2.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's turn our attention to S.B. 489.

Senate Bill 489 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes to provisions concerning protection of consumers. (BDR 15-108)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 489 is on page 25 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). It relates to the protection of consumers and involves motor vehicles and leasing contracts. On May 11, there was testimony from the Office of the Attorney General that S.B. 489 is designed to provide enhancement to consumer protection, particularly after California signed a similar law.

There was a proposed amendment raised during the hearing to clarify that Section 1 does not apply to the lessee. Section 1 imposes criminal penalties for the unlawful subleasing of a motor vehicle. According to the testimony, this section is intended to target third parties who facilitate this unlawful subleasing. The proposal is to clarify that it would not apply to the person who is a party to the lease contract.

Ms. Risa Lang suggested some language to modify Section 1. The new language is in italics on page 25 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). Subsections 1(a) and (b) of Section 1 would be deleted. Those provided that it did not apply to a person who is a party to a lease contract and that written consent was obtained for the transfer from the motor vehicle lessor.

Chairman Anderson:

The Chair will entertain an amend and do pass motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 489 WITH THE AMENDMENTS IN THE WORK SESSION DOCUMENT ([EXHIBIT B](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's move to S.B. 423 (page 26 of [Exhibit B](#)).

Senate Bill 423: Revises provisions relating to certain meetings and hearings concerning prisoners and persons on parole and probation. (BDR 19-242)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 423 was heard last Thursday. It is a measure that revises the provisions relating to Parole and Probation hearings. The bill provides that these meetings are not subject to the Nevada Open Meeting Law of 1960. It stipulates that these meetings must be open to the public.

The testimony indicated that the bill will put into place how the boards have been operating subject to an Attorney General's Opinion; because they are quasi-judicial proceedings, they are not subject to the Open Meeting Law of 1960. The bill would codify the current practice involving the hearings.

There was a proposed amendment in response to testimony that the prisoner is not routinely provided notice. The amendment would specifically put into statute the requirement that the notice be provided.

Chairman Anderson:

For me personally, it goes against the anthem that somehow you're supposed to know when your process has been changed in some way. For example, if you're in prison and you have some sort of a criminal proceeding against you that the Parole and Probation Department is going to be taking up—or one of the other panels—it could lead to your further incarceration. Since they have you in their control, you would not be informed that this is about to take place.

The five-day notice requirement, which is what we expect to happen, should be provided. I was surprised to hear that it wasn't being provided. They have those people right there, or one would think they have them right there. What they're trying to do here is codify into law what their current practice is relative to the Open Meeting Law of 1960. I don't have a problem with the earlier part of the bill, but I did have a little concern about notification at least five days before. It didn't sound right.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I have a question about not being able to bring a cause of action. It concerns me when we tell a prisoner they can't bring a cause of action about what was said about them.

Chairman Anderson:

This is trying to get at the frivolous lawsuit question that the Attorney General's Office has been maintaining for some time is a big problem.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

A person who has a clemency application wouldn't get notice of when their clemency meeting is? It seems like you should get notice of when the hearing is.

Assemblywoman Allen:

The sentiment was that they give notice, but they don't want to be required to give notice.

Chairman Anderson:

The legal opinion is that the Attorney General's Office is pursuing something that is lame. Our concern is about their due process rights. This bill will go to the board.

Let's turn our attention to S.B. 432 (page 27 of [Exhibit B](#)).

Senate Bill 432 (1st Reprint): Revises exemption from execution of certain money, benefits, privileges or immunities accruing or growing out of life insurance. (BDR 2-1316)

Chairman Anderson:

Mr. Horne, I believe you had some questions about S.B. 432 when it first came forward. I don't know whether those concerns are still addressed here or not.

Assemblyman Horne:

My concern was the elimination of that \$1,000 cap. In testimony, it was stated that the figure was put in the statute in 1970 or 1971. Why not raise the number instead of getting rid of it? What's to prevent someone from placing \$5,000 in a policy for a long, extended period of time? Initially, they may not have done it to avoid creditors and perpetrate fraud. This is a good place to shelter money long term. Under this, that would all be protected. I thought it

was going too far. I don't have a problem with raising the \$1,000 to another number, but to eliminate it gives me heartburn.

Assemblyman Conklin:

A person who has \$100,000 in a life insurance policy knows exactly what they're doing with their money. If they're filing for bankruptcy, they shouldn't be allowed to use a life insurance policy as a shield. Maybe you could put a \$10,000 limit in there.

Chairman Anderson:

Am I to understand that this is a bill that you want to come back to the Floor, and you don't want to see it again in the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#))?

Assemblyman Conklin:

The bill has merit. If I'm a parent and I start a whole life insurance policy for my two young kids, and I lose my job and need to file for protection, and those policies have \$2,000 or \$3,000 in them because I've had them for some time, that's a legitimate cause. That's what part of the testimony was.

I'm concerned about a person who has a Hummer and a couple of Mercedes, and they happen to use life insurance policies as an investment vehicle. They know exactly what they're doing with their money. I don't think that it should be shielded in that sense. There's a reasonable amount here. Unfortunately, I don't know what reasonable amount we could put in. We could have a conversation with the Senate. The bill has merit; it just goes a little far.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I agree that the bill has merit. I would like to put it on the board, but not forever.

Chairman Anderson:

In other words, you'd like to see it in the Work Session Document.

Assemblyman Mabey:

Yes.

Chairman Anderson:

We'll keep it in the Work Session Document.

[Senate Bill 443 \(1st Reprint\):](#) Makes various changes to provisions relating to Department of Public Safety. (BDR 41-1295)

Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 443 on page 28 ([Exhibit B](#)) also deals with Parole and Probation. It eliminates the provision requiring the principal office of the Chief of Parole and Probation to be in Carson City. It also repeals provisions relating to the Committee for Public Safety Telecommunications Operators.

The testimony was that this was a housekeeping measure. There were some questions raised during the hearing regarding the history of the repealed sections. In the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)), it indicates that these sections were passed in 1999 in a measure sponsored by Senator Mark Amodei.

According to testimony, the bill was requested on behalf of Carson City to standardize training for responders and dispatchers. There was a question about whether or not there is a committee to examine communications systems and the interoperability of those systems.

The 2003 Legislative Session passed the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security and included, as one of its responsibilities, assessment and examination of the use of information systems used by response agencies. It would also determine the degree to which those systems are compatible and interoperable. The copy of that statute is provided on pages 29 and 30 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)).

There are no formal amendments to the bill.

Chairman Anderson:

It would appear that the issue was moved over to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. It's not that it's not being examined; it's just that this particular group has never been brought together. It was a major issue during the homeland security questions.

I mentioned this question to the Governor's Office, and they have not gotten back to me one way or another. I'm of the opinion that we can move forward with the bill as it's printed, unless somebody has heartburn about it.

Mr. Ocegüera, you have a firefighter's background. How do you feel about this uniform discussion to get everyone on the same page, using the same terminology? Do we have adequate protections in the existing homeland security discussion and the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security?

Assemblyman Ocegüera:

I think that this probably puts them all on the same page. This is what we've been trying to do for many years.

Chairman Anderson:

With the emphasis being homeland security, maybe they'll do it.

Are there any questions? What is the pleasure of the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 443.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Anderson:

Let's turn our attention to S.B. 445.

Senate Bill 445: Revises various provisions related to State Board of Pardons Commissioners. (BDR 16-659)

Chairman Anderson:

There is a mockup for S.B. 445 on page 33 of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit B](#)). I think we still have some issues here that we want to deal with concerning this bill. I don't want to take up S.B. 445.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I was wondering about proposed conceptual amendment 1(a), "Eliminates the requirement to present document as proof of restoration of civil rights." I didn't understand why they were eliminating that requirement.

Chairman Anderson:

This would be proposed conceptual amendment 1(a), to present documents as proof of restoration of civil rights. If we were to move with this, we probably would not want traffic laws and other kinds of misdemeanors to be part of your inability to get the restoration of your rights.

[Chairman Anderson asked the Committee members what bills they would like to see in the upcoming work session documents, and discussion ensued.]

[Chairman Anderson adjourned the meeting at 10:34 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jane Oliver
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: May 17, 2005

Time of Meeting: 8:27 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Meeting Agenda
S.B. 28 S.B. 173 S.B. 272 S.B. 347 S.B. 444 S.B. 452 S.B. 489 S.B. 423 S.B. 432 S.B. 443 S.B. 445	B	Allison Combs, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document