MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Seventy-Fourth Session
February 13, 2007

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Bernie Anderson at 8:02 a.m., on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Bernie Anderson, Chairman
Mr. William Horne, Vice Chair
Ms. Francis Allen
Mr. John C. Carpenter
Mr. Ty Cobb
Mr. Marcus Conklin
Ms. Susan Gerhardt
Mr. Ed Goedhart
Dr. Garn Mabey
Mr. Mark Manendo
Mr. Harry Mortenson
Mr. John Oceguera
Mr. James Ohrenschall
Mr. Tick Segerblom

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer M. Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Danielle Mayabb, Committee Secretary
Matt Mowbray, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ross Miller, Secretary of State, State of Nevada
Scott Anderson, Deputy, Commercial Recordings Division, Secretary of State's Office
Gina Spaulding, Executive Director, Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design, and Residential Design
The Honorable T. Arthur Ritchie Jr., District Judge, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District, Clark County
Eric M. Fish, Legislative Counsel, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws
Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
Thomas J. Ray, General Counsel, University of Nevada School of Medicine, Reno, Nevada
John A. McDonald, M.D., Ph.D., Vice President of Health Sciences and Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine, Reno, Nevada
Lawrence P. Matheis, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association
Dan Musgrove, Associate Administrator, External Relations, University Medical Center, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chairman Anderson:
[Meeting called to order. Roll called.] We had agreed that we would do these bills in order to fit the Secretary of State's schedule. Mr. Secretary, we will open with Assembly Bill 25.

Assembly Bill 25: Makes various changes to provisions governing business associations. (BDR 7-544)

Ross Miller, Secretary of State, State of Nevada:
With the help of the Legislature the last few sessions, we have been able to standardize and modernize our process over at the Commercial Recordings Division. We currently bring in about $89 million in revenue through that division. That puts us second per capita in number of filings behind Delaware.

We were out there last week trying to figure out what we do wrong and what they do right. I do not think the gap is as far as we thought when we went out there. This bill would help standardize and streamline a lot of our processes and fee structures, and hopefully make things even more efficient. With that brief introduction, I would like to turn it over to Scott Anderson to present testimony on the bill.

Scott Anderson, Deputy, Commercial Recordings Division, Secretary of State's Office:
[Read from prepared testimony, (Exhibit C)].

Chairman Anderson:
So, you are asking us to hold the bill because you want to develop an amendment that is going to come in relative to other kinds of action, giving you other kinds of authority in regulation? Is that what you are looking for?

Scott Anderson:
Currently, there is no provision in law to give our customers any type of remedy in the case of a fraudulent filing or an erroneous filing. We send them to their attorneys, or they try to figure it out on their own—how they might remedy some case of fraud in the filing of documents against their entity. There are a number of states that have some sort of administrative procedure, including interrogatories and an administrative hearing process, that we might be able to offer our customers in certain circumstances without having to send them through a costly and lengthy legal process.

Assemblyman Horne:
In section 3, in the filing of a statement of denial, you included a fee of $75. Is that because other jurisdictions have done it, and you are just coming in line? It was not there before.

Scott Anderson:
That fee is based upon the same fee that is charged for an officer resignation. Currently, corporations have a fee if a customer tells us that they are not an officer of this corporation, and someone filed this without their knowledge. We give them the opportunity to get their name off of the record, or at least notify the public that they are not an officer. That is for an officer resignation. The administrative process that we talked about might change this a little bit because that would give them another avenue to get this on the record. However, this does coincide with the other fees in the corporation statutes.

Assemblyman Horne:
In an officer resignation—situations where someone has been identified as an officer when they are not—they are charged a fee. This is different than that?

Scott Anderson:
It is different only in the matter that they are denying that they were ever a party to the statement of partnership authority. It is similar to a person who might deny they were ever an officer of a corporation, so we gave it the same fee. The reason that we charge a fee for this is that we have a number of people who come in and, though they really were officers of the corporation say, because of some dispute, that they are no longer or they never were an officer of the corporation. To keep those people from frivolously filing an officer resignation, we do have this fee attached to it.

Chairman Anderson:
Because you have gone to a meeting of an organization, and they decide to put you on their board of directors without your knowledge, you then have to pay the $75 to get your name removed from their official filing?

Scott Anderson:
That is correct.

Chairman Anderson:
That is an interesting scenario.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
It does seem unfair that as the victim, you are now a second victim in that you have to pay to un-victimize yourself. What happens if you die? Are you going to charge the corpse $75?

Scott Anderson:
In the case of the death of an officer, that would be changed through the annual list of officers, and there would be no need for a resignation. That would be filed by the corporation on behalf of the officer.

Chairman Anderson:
Would this also include nonprofits? Nonprofits come and go very rapidly; their boards of directors often change. So, it would be taken care of when they file their annual?

Scott Anderson:
Yes, that is generally how it is accomplished if there is a change in board members. That change is noted in the annual list of officers.

Chairman Anderson:
And if they do not, and if you want to get your name off that board, then you have to pay the $75.

Scott Anderson:
I believe that there might be a lesser fee for the nonprofit organizations. I do not know what that fee is, but, yes, they would have to pay a fee to get their name off of the record.

Chairman Anderson:
And you notify every member of the board when they come on? Is there some certification that they are knowledgeable that they have been on the board?

Scott Anderson:
There is not.

Chairman Anderson:
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of or in opposition to A.B. 25? [There was no one]. I am closing the hearing on A.B. 25. We will turn our attention to Assembly Bill 26.

Assembly Bill 26: Revises certain provisions governing the filing of certain organizing documents for corporations and other business entities. (BDR 7-549)

Gina Spaulding, Executive Director, Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design, and Residential Design:
I am here today in support of A.B. 26. I have provided an informational paper for you (Exhibit D). During the course of an investigation in August 2005, our enforcement staff found a loophole in Nevada law that allowed people who are not registered pursuant to Chapter 623 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to form private corporations, put out business cards, and open up shop to write architectural services. We did not realize that that loophole existed. The enforcement case was resolved; however, we felt that it was necessary to put forward a bill draft that would close the loophole by requiring the Secretary of State to verify licensure pursuant to Chapter 623 of NRS for all private corporations, foreign corporations, limited liability companies, limited liability partnerships, and limited partnerships, as well as any of those using the

identifying terms relating to architecture, registered interior design, and residential design.

The Board, in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public, supports the passage of this bill to close that loophole that currently exists. The loophole allows businesses that are not licensed by this Board to potentially mislead the public by implying that they are able and licensed to offer services of architecture, registered interior design, and residential design.

I did speak with Scott Anderson regarding this bill; he is aware of it. They are not in opposition to this bill. The language of this bill currently exists for professional engineers, accountants, banking, and common-interest communities.

Chairman Anderson:
Ms. Spaulding, I have to disclose. I have a family member who does have a degree in interior design.

How long has your Board been in existence?

Gina Spaulding:
Our Board has been in existence since 1949. We have regulated registered interior designers since 1995.

Chairman Anderson:
What percentage of people who offer themselves as designers—either residential or interior—are currently registered with your Board?

Gina Spaulding:
If I could just make a distinction—our Board regulates only registered interior designers. We do not have any type of proprietary interest over the words "interior design" as it stands alone. We are interested in registered interior designers. To answer your question, we currently have about 175 registered interior designers, licensed in the State of Nevada.

Chairman Anderson:
So, if you go into a furniture store and it says "interior design," you are not looking for those folks?

Gina Spaulding:
Not at all.

Chairman Anderson:
Those people who are selling furniture or paint stores or others who have interior design areas—that is not what you are trying to get at?

Gina Spaulding:
No. They are not regulated by our Board at all.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
What about a person who has, for example, worked as an interior designer for many years, has even lectured at UNLV in courses in design, but has no degree or has not gone to your organization and attempted to be registered? What happens if they want to become registered? Do you give them a test?

Gina Spaulding:
There is a national test that is available for interior designers. The bar is very high. You would have to have an accredited degree in interior design, pass the national test, have two years of work experience, and then apply to our Board.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
What about passing the national test without the degree?

Gina Spaulding:
You can actually still apply and take the national test without a degree; they currently do not require it. However, I do believe that their standards are going to change in 2008.

Chairman Anderson:
I would draw the attention of the members of the Committee to page 5 of the bill, section 2, subsection 6. This regulates the area of the Secretary of State's Office. Your concern is how the Secretary of State is going to monitor these particular people who put themselves out as architects, residential designers, and such. It is only within the name of the corporation that you are concerned with.

Gina Spaulding:
That is correct. We also are concerned about the regulated practice to make sure that they are indeed licensed. This loophole has already been closed for professional corporations and how we work with the Secretary of State in that regard. They will require the registrant to get a certificate of good standing from our Board, which we will provide. Then they are able to complete their articles of incorporation and their process with the Secretary of State. We suspect this may be similar.

Chairman Anderson:
I see that the Secretary of State's Office is neutral on this, but let me give you standing here to speak.

Scott Anderson:
We want to go on the record that we are not opposed to A.B. 26. This process is very similar to what we do for the State Board of Engineers and State Board Accountants, as well as insurance and banking divisions. We require that there is certain proof of licensure within the State of Nevada before we will accept new articles of incorporation containing these names. We are not in opposition to this bill.

Chairman Anderson:
We will have your letter (Exhibit E) officially admitted into the record for the day. Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on A.B. 26? [There was no one]. I will close the hearing on A.B. 26.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 26.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
I am very much against licensing interior decorators because I think an interior decorator is an artist. It is like saying, "Picasso, you cannot paint unless you get a license to paint" or "Renoir, you cannot paint until you get a license to paint." Architects I can understand because if they design a building and it collapses, you have a big problem. They should be licensed to ensure they have their criteria or education to design a building. Licensing artists is unconstitutional. It is a method of expression, and I would not vote for this bill.

Chairman Anderson:
I would call your attention again to line 24 of page 5, where we are talking about registered interior designers. I think it is the term "registered" in conjunction with "interior designer" that we are looking at here: somebody who puts themselves out as possessing and meeting the registration and certification area, rather than somebody who may consider themselves to be an interior designer or a Picasso.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
I do not understand the difference. You are limited if you are not registered in this respect. We have just opened these wonderful facilities in the South—the

home furnishing marts. I do not know their rules. Would they require that you be registered if you were to get a permit to operate in there or not?

Chairman Anderson:
I understand your concern.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (ASSEMBLYMEN MORTENSON AND OHRENSCHALL VOTED NO.)

Chairman Anderson:
This is the first bill I have assigned. Ms. Allen, would you mind taking A.B. 26 on behalf of the Committee to a presentation?

Assemblywoman Allen:
No problem.

Chairman Anderson:
Let us turn our attention to the next bill, Assembly Bill 15.

Assembly Bill 15: Enacts the Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act. (BDR 11-732)

Assemblyman Horne:
[Read from prepared statement, (Exhibit F)].

Chairman Anderson:
Let us go to Judge Ritchie in the South.

The Honorable T. Arthur Ritchie, District Judge, Family Division, Eighth Judicial District, Clark County:
I have provided written testimony to the Committee (Exhibit G). This bill addresses a painful and difficult issue facing our families, which is child abduction. Being in the civil division for eight years, I can tell you that this is a frequent issue that comes before us almost on a weekly basis. Some of these disputes are short-lived and sort themselves out, and others result in the abduction of children, which creates tremendous harm and inflicts damage on our children.

One of the most important things about this bill is that it offers an additional tool. In Nevada, there is a particular need for abduction prevention. As you know, many of our citizens come to Nevada from other states. When they find themselves at odds in their relationships, they often leave Nevada with their

children. This is how it comes to the civil division of the family court. Families that are going through custody disputes and divorce proceedings are at the highest risk for potential abduction.

In preparation for this testimony, I reviewed materials on the website of the Uniform Law Commissioners and also the annual report of the United States Attorney General. That review shows that this is not only a Nevada problem, but a national problem. The Nevada State Children's Advocate for Missing and Exploited Children received more than 8,000 reports of missing children last year. Nationally, information provided by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children shows that 260,000 were abducted in 1999 and more than three quarters of them by family members.

The legislative committees that review legislation in the Eighth and Second Judicial Districts have expressed a position of support for this bill. I offer this testimony to highlight the Court's concern over child abduction, especially by parents or others acting for them.

This Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act (UCAPA) was established by the Uniform Law Commissioners this past year. Our system is particularly good in dealing with orders that are already in place. Chapter 125A of NRS adopts the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Enforcement Act (UCCJEA). One half of all abductions related to children occur before court orders are entered, however. This UCAPA complements the UCCJEA in that it allows courts, like mine, to protect children from abduction until that protection is in place.

The UCAPA offers judges, attorneys, and citizens, representing themselves in proper person, guidelines to follow in child custody proceedings. It will help judges assess the risk of abduction. The focus of this Act is assessing risk by specifically asking judges to consider factors and enter orders that are appropriate if those children are at risk for abduction. This is a useful tool. Anytime a uniform law can be offered that would allow remedies for cases in which there is a threat of abduction, it should be carefully and seriously considered.

The bill allows for an abduction prevention order after a court reviews a standardized list of factors that have been determined to predict abduction. The list of factors the court considers includes whether or not there has been a threat of, or a previous abduction of, a child. In protective order applications and in civil domestic cases, this is a recurring and common theme. It is very difficult sometimes to know whether or not these threats are done with intent to act on them. The court also considers whether there has been domestic

violence, a refusal to follow previous custody orders, or strong family and cultural ties to other states or countries.

I have only touched on the highlights of the Uniform Act. I would like to draw your attention to two other statutes in Chapter 125 of NRS which deal with these similar themes. In my written testimony, I have cited NRS 125.510 subsection 8 and NRS 125.470 subsections 2 and 4. District court judges already have discretion under the existing Nevada law to address the risk of parental abduction, but it does not get into specific risk assessment as the Uniform Act does. The UCAPA does a good job of educating judges on what to consider.

The Uniform Act enhances Nevada law. I have cited the specific provisions—NRS 125.470 and NRS 125.510—and I bring that up to say that A.B. 15 needs to be reviewed and reconciled to be sure there are no conflicts with the existing Nevada law if this Uniform Act is enacted.

I do not believe that this bill has fiscal impact. As I said, this is already a daily occurrence. The UCAPA was approved just last year and is already before several states: Connecticut, Kansas, South Dakota, and Nevada. Last week, this was passed in Nebraska. The press release from the Uniform Law Commissioners is attached to my testimony.

In closing, as a district court judge and a father of four boys, I implore you to support this bill. The courts have a duty to protect our most cherished asset—our children. The thought of losing a child to abduction touches me deeply, and I cannot even imagine the sense of powerlessness experienced by affected loved ones and parents. Unfortunately, in the past eight years, I have had to witness this personally. One of the things that people think is that children will be safe with a parent and that this does not victimize families. When children are taken by their parents, they are often taken out of their schools and routines; they suffer from educational and nutritional neglect. They are alienated from the other parent. The damage that can be done, even from short periods of keeping a child from another parent, is tremendous.

This Act empowers the district court judges to do even more to help reduce the risk of this horrific event. Even more, it gives us a tool to do something when that risk is apparent.

Chairman Anderson:
Thank you for the amount of time that you spend dealing with the most difficult of all problems in the judicial process. The family court judges have to deal with the ongoing issue of child placement and the balancing act between the rights

of parents and the rights of children. They deserve more accolades, and I appreciate what you are doing. I want the record to reflect that.

I note that the concerns you raise are ones that our Legislative Counsel Bureau's Legal Division deals with on a regular basis.

Eric M. Fish, Legislative Counsel, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws:
We are an organization consisting of judges, legislators, lawyers, and professors around the country. Our organization gets together and forms uniform laws in areas that would best be suited for uniform laws, most notably the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) for business organizations, the Uniform Probate Act, and now we are going into family law. Assemblyman Horne has provided you with folders that I sent to him last week, which provide more details than I will speak to (Exhibit H).

Chairman Anderson:
Do you wish them to be part of the record?

Eric Fish:
If you would like.

Chairman Anderson:
Please make the comments made by the judge and the information within the folder part of the record for today.

Eric Fish:
Over 200,000 abductions occur a year. The term "abduction" used in this context does not mean a child being taken from one family member to another and being kept there. What it means is that there is a violation of a standing custody order. One thousand of those violations are international in nature—that is, a child is either in another country or has a parent who is attempting to take them to another country. These violations all have the ability to get on the national news, but most of them do not since 78 percent of them are done by family members. These are not the abductions you will see in states like Missouri, where there was just a child taken from a playground. These involve a parent taking a child as a pawn in a custody dispute. Some organizations and advocates in the field have stated that this is child abuse. We have not taken a position on that, but I would like you to know that this is something that other organizations have said.

The current law in Nevada is the UCCJEA. This covers jurisdictional issues and any post-decree violations of custody orders. The UCAPA supplements this bill

by adding pre-decree and other international standards to child abduction prevention.

A study was convened three years ago by our organization to study child abduction. The members included members of legislatures, judges, family court judges, Linda Elrod, who is the editor of the *Family Law Quarterly* at Washburn University, and Bruce Boyer, who is a member of the American Bar Association (ABA) Center for Children and the Law.

Other states are viewing this law favorably. It was passed in Nebraska last week. Kansas, Connecticut, South Dakota, the Virgin Islands, and Utah are also looking at the bill. Two weeks ago in Kansas, we ran into some concerns relative to domestic violence. I will get to those at the end of my testimony.

I want to lay out how UCAPA works in its most basic form. It does cover pre-decree and post-decree custody cases. This means all cases where a child has a potential to be abducted are covered by this bill. It allows judges, district attorneys, but more likely parents on their own volition, to petition a judge for a protective order. This petition is something that is very easy and does not force someone like the judge to go through any extra legwork. The state of California has a similar bill on the books. Their petition is a one-page checklist that you provide to a judge, who will then look at the factors himself. The petition will likely include things such as where the child is located, if there is a custody order already in effect, and where the child may be taken to. A judge will look at the factors and see if such things as bank accounts have been liquidated, if there have been threats made, or if there is a potential that the child may be taken to a foreign country. Foreign country cases are very unique because, unless the country is a signatory to the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction, more than likely a child taken to that country will not be returned to the parent in the United States. Therefore, prevention is the key.

After viewing the petition, the judge has many options. Using the standard of civil law, which is a preponderance of the evidence, a judge will look at the factors and weigh whether a custody protection order should be given. This includes taking a child's passport or issuing a warrant for a child to be taken into custody by officials if there is an exact threat of the child being taken out of state.

I would like to refer now to the domestic violence provisions that the Vice Chair and the judge spoke of. Section 208 of the UCCJEA has been incorporated into the commentary of section 9 of the UCAPA draft that is in your folders; this is section 19 of the bill. I would like to quote the sections on domestic violence:

> Domestic violence victims should not be charged with unjustifiable conduct for conduct that occurred in the process of fleeing domestic violence, even if their conduct is technically illegal. An inquiry must be made whether the flight was justified under the circumstances of the case.

These comments reflect that, in the bill, there are provisions for the risk factors, which include threatening to take a child out of state, liquidating assets, and moving a child from one school to another. These are similar to what victims of domestic violence go through to escape predators or violent individuals. These comments direct judges to look at these circumstances and, in fact, waive the actions of the victim to allow them to escape domestic violence.

In Kansas, we faced similar concerns. As a result, Kansas amended its criminal code and published the commentary on this section 19 of the bill to include the sections I just read. We feel that this is an easy way to allay the fears of the domestic violence community here in Nevada.

Chairman Anderson:
Section 19 does raise some levels of concern. Generally, this seems to a strong piece of legislation, and we applaud the Uniform Commission for making the suggestion. Nevada has a different process than Kansas. We do not generally do preambles or statements unless we think that there is going to be some big question. I think it is important that we develop a legislative record of what the intent is here.

What happens in real life when somebody is in an abusive relationship and tries to protect themselves and their family from the violence that may be directed toward them and the children, and they run away? They have not yet started the process, but they will be starting the process. Will there be an opportunity to use this to reach back? Presumably they are hiding.

Eric Fish:
There is the fear that a perpetrator of domestic violence will use this Act and the provisions of section 19 to reach out and try to find the child or get back at his victim. The way the law is set up in the model draft, and in the proposed draft here in Nevada, is that a victim of domestic violence can flee, and they are protected to flee. The risk factors that are in the bill must be looked at by a judge. The judge must also weigh the concerns of a possible domestic violence situation. There is a bit of inquiry by a judge into the possibility of domestic violence before he issues an order.

Chairman Anderson:
Oftentimes, the non-custodian has greater financial resources available to him and sometimes greater influence. They may be known in the community to be somebody of worth and value. These matters are not necessarily subject to an economic stratum. What happens then? Are we creating an opportunity for somebody who has the economic wherewithal to take advantage of their position in the community to influence the court?

Eric Fish:
There is that fear. However, I refer you to the California system, which has a similar bill to what has been proposed today. It only has one sheet of paper that needs to be given to a judge. Therefore, if a victim of domestic violence does not have the ability to get a lawyer, they can fill out this paper and give it to the judge. That allays some financial concerns.

Also, if I understand your question correctly—would this be a situation where a judge would be influenced by an individual of the community? That is something that we have not looked at. I am happy to discuss it with a member of the domestic violence community and see how they would respond to it as well. If any judge looks at the bill and its intent, he will be likely to look at all the factors involved and not just at the person who is involved.

Chairman Anderson:
That remains one of my concerns about the bill.

Assemblyman Cobb:
Are there any material differences between A.B. 15, as introduced, and the UCAPA?

Eric Fish:
There are not.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
I do not understand where the protection is in regard to the domestic violence situation. Can you explain that again?

Eric Fish:
In the commentary, the bill refers back to the UCCJEA, which has provisions on domestic violence. The judge must make an inquiry into whether there is a domestic violence situation occurring. In that situation, a judge will then have to put that as a factor into his decision. If there has been prior domestic violence, a judge will be aware of that through registries that exist or through

any law enforcement records that may be out there. He may also speak to the individual himself to get a better handle on the situation before he offers his decision.

Chairman Anderson:
When you make reference to the dialogue within the text of the bill. . .

Eric Fish:
That is the model bill. The commentary is not part of the bill that is A.B. 15.

Chairman Anderson:
So, we do not have that in front of us?

Eric Fish:
It is provided in the folders.

Chairman Anderson:
The dialogue will become part of the record for potential appeal, but the judge and the average person is going to be concerned, rightfully so. The advocates, in particular, are going to be concerned because they are going to read this carefully. They want to provide for people who come seeking their aid the best advice they can give them. Since they are going to deal with this on a regular basis, how are they to know that dialogue is part of the process? How are those protected here in the law?

Eric Fish:
Since Nevada does not publish any commentary or preambles, we could amend section 2 of section 19 in the bill to further allay those fears with the commentary that is in the model bill. Section 2 states that "the court shall consider any evidence that the respondent believed, in good faith, that the conduct was necessary to avoid imminent harm." That section could be amended to include the part I quoted from the UCCJEA regarding domestic violence and fleeing domestic violence.

Chairman Anderson:
We will ask Legal and Research to take a look at that.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
Can you please direct me to what page of the UCAPA the commentary is on?

Eric Fish:
On page 14, the second full paragraph.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Do you know if Nebraska adopted this in its entirety, or did they have any amendments made to it?

Eric Fish:
Nebraska did adopt it as presented in A.B. 15. The only state that made changes is Kansas, and that was to its criminal code. It did publish the commentary regarding domestic violence provisions.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Does this impact the way someone in Nevada could have a child brought back from another state?

Eric Fish:
It does not. It is consistent with the UCCJEA, which involves the return of a child if under a prior custody order.

Chairman Anderson:
Let us turn to Ms. Meuschke.

Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence:
My testimony is being handed out (Exhibit I), and I have also attached a copy of the UCAPA (Exhibit J). Those pink tabs show all the places where there is reference to domestic violence in commentary in the Act.

[Read from prepared testimony, (Exhibit I)].

Chairman Anderson:
Madame Secretary, in creating Ms. Meuschke's record, please indicate that—even though it is redundant relative to the fact that we are going to have a second copy in our notes—because of the importance of this particular piece, I want to make sure that the tagging gets put somewhere within the record. Although, I do not think we will be able to use the pretty pink tabs. If you would prepare a cover sheet making reference to the particular pages that she wishes to emphasize, so that we make sure that, in creating the record, it does reflect those highlights. I would ask that my remarks, relative to this, be verbatim within the record.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
Will you go into a little more detail about what you think should happen here?

Sue Meuschke:
We have looked at this bill and tried to figure out how we could amend it to address our concerns. We are at a loss other than to ask that the comments that are included within the Uniform Act be printed within the statute. The comments give direction about how to use the legislation to protect victims of domestic violence. Certainly, the national conference understood that this bill could have some serious impact on victims of domestic violence. What we are asking is that those comments be published within the Act itself, so that there is no confusion about the intent or the steps that judges are to take to address the issue of domestic violence.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
Just for clarification, you do see this as a positive step? Am I hearing you correctly?

Sue Meuschke:
We are not taking a supportive or oppositional position on this bill. Certainly, we would want to prevent child abduction. We are not opposing this. When we pass legislation, too often we understand the unintended consequences too late. So, we wanted to be here in a proactive way, to say "yes, we understand why you want to do this, but these are the things that could happen as a result, so how do we figure out together ways to overcome those concerns?"

Chairman Anderson:
I am to understand, then, that the only way we are going to know the unintended consequences is if we actually put the bill into place and then we see where the fallout is. We could sit here and read the pieces of paper forever, and we would still have the same levels of concern. If we are concerned about child abduction, this may be one of the tools that will allow the judge to raise it to a higher level of concern in the judiciary, so they are following a uniform system. At the same time, every time we put another board in the corral, we make it more difficult for somebody to move.

I am closing the hearing on A.B. 15.

Vice Chair Horne:
[Takes the gavel for the hearing on Assembly Bill 18]. I am going to open the hearing on A.B. 18.

Assembly Bill 18: Expands the confidentiality provisions pertaining to certain review committees to include certain committees of institutions of the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR 4-276)

Thomas J. Ray, General Counsel, University of Nevada School of Medicine:
We are here asking your support for A.B. 18, which is an amendment to NRS 49.117. This particular section of Chapter 49 of NRS deals with the privilege sections of the evidence code in the NRS. The statute itself has been in place since 1995 and presently affords a privilege to virtually every entity that provides medical services and patient care to individuals. We are asking to be included—the clinical practices of the School of Medicine. It would also include the clinical practice of the UNLV School of Dentistry in that privilege.

As you are aware, there are a number of privileges in the evidence code. For example, there are attorney-client, doctor-patient, and husband-wife privileges. This particular privilege is what is referred to as a "review committee." The statute defines a review committee as "an organized committee of a medical entity that has a responsibility of evaluating and improving the quality of care rendered by the organization." The intent of this committee is basically to critically evaluate and analyze the care and treatment provided by that organization with the goal of improving patient care, reducing risk, and minimizing cost. As for the Medical School, we have the additional importance of providing training and education to physicians.

It is important to stress the fact that this is an existing privilege that is provided to all medical providers. This is not something new that we are requesting. The medical entities that currently have this privilege afforded to them are—and these are the definitions contained in the statute—a hospital; an ambulatory surgical center; a health maintenance organization; an organization that provides emergency medical services under Chapter 450B, which includes ambulances and firefighting agencies; a peer review committee of the medical or dental society; a medical review committee of a county or district board of health; surgical centers; obstetric centers; independent centers for emergency medical care; an agency to provide nursing in the home; a facility for intermediate care; a facility for skilled nursing; a facility for hospice care; a psychiatric hospital; a facility for the treatment of irreversible renal disease; a rural clinic; a nursing pool; a facility for modified medical detoxification; a facility for refractive surgery; a mobile unit; and a community triage center. These are the medical providers that have this privilege available to them. We are simply asking that the statute be amended to include the clinical practices of the Dental School and the Medical School, so we can critically evaluate and analyze our policies, practices, and systems to provide the best care and training, as well as to minimize risks and costs.

John A. McDonald, M.D., Ph.D., Vice President of Health Sciences and Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine:
The intent of this protection is really to allow medical professionals to provide scrutiny of systems issues. The basic notion here is. . .

Vice Chair Horne:
Dr. McDonald, I apologize. I want to interrupt you briefly in order to allow one of our members, Mr. Cobb, to make a disclosure.

Assemblyman Cobb:
Mr. Chairman, I need to disclose that my wife is employed by an entity that is affected by this bill. I will be voting on this matter because the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in my situation would not be materially affected by my interest because it does not affect my wife's employer any differently than anyone else in the group.

Vice Chair Horne:
Any other disclosures from the Committee? [There were none]. Proceed, Dr. McDonald.

John McDonald:
The intent of this protection is improvement of very complex systems of providing medical care. It is not to shelter individual physicians or providers; the medical record is still an open document subject to scrutiny. It is rather to allow us to discuss and deliberate every aspect of a system of a patient's care that affects how we perform care. We work in one of the most complex and regulated environments in the world. Most of the outcomes that are not as perfect as we wish they would be are not individual acts of omission or commission, they are really system failures. Without having an open discussion about every aspect of the medical care environment, there is no way to improve the system. That is the overall intent of this protection.

It is every patient's right, we believe within the Medical School, to receive immediate notification if we think we have made an error or something untoward has happened. That is a reasonable procedure to follow. The intent of this is not to protect physicians or other caregivers from any kind of act of omission. It is really to improve the systems in which we provide care.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
Can you elaborate a little bit on the safeguards that are in place if there was some type of mistake along the way?

John McDonald:
There are a number of safeguards, in particular, within the medical educational environment. There are many pairs of eyes that are taking care of the patient, all the way from medical students to residents to licensed physicians. We operate by the same codes and standards that all health care providers do. All of our physicians are licensed physicians. We are all responsible to the same rules and regulations of any other health care providing organization. In the hospital we are bound by medical staff guidelines, hospital rules and procedures, so there is a panoply of checks and balances in place to protect patients. It is not the absence of rules and regulations; it is, in fact, the complexity of the system that, most of the time, leads to misadventures. All of us in the medical care industry acknowledge that these occur. Our job is to reduce them to the minimum number possible.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
So, could you give me a little more specific answer? If a student made a mistake and there were consequences to the patient, you are saying that the patient would be notified? How does that take place?

Thomas Ray:
If there was an adverse outcome that resulted in a claim, the patient is entitled to everything that relates to that patient—all records and reports. If there was a proceeding, that patient's attorney would be able to take depositions and do whatever. What is separate from that situation is that, if the Medical School impaneled the review committee to analyze this, things that were said in that review committee would be separate. The intent is to have candid disclosure to make improvements to correct the situation. It would be difficult for a doctor to say "resident so-and-so did this and this is wrong; he should have done that" if the doctor is going to be subject to disclosure of what was said in that committee. There is not going to be that frank, open discussion needed to make improvements. That patient is entitled to every record that pertains to that individual patient.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
What worries me is that we are adding more protection to students. If, in the course of this quality improvement, something is uncovered that maybe the patient was not aware, will some notification be given to the patient?

John McDonald:
Students are never independently caring for patients or performing procedures. Everything that they do is done under very close supervision. The most a student would be doing is a physical examination on a patient. They are not typically performing procedures; if they were, it would be under very strict

supervision with a resident physician and an attending physician, if appropriate. The chances of a student actually being involved in a situation like that are very small. They cannot write orders by themselves. They cannot render medical care, in other words. I do not know that I was specific enough in my answer.

We are talking about two separate issues here. If something happens to a patient that is an error—if the wrong medicine is administered, for example—the patient has the right to know that the wrong medicine was given. The Veteran's Administration, for example, has a bill of rights that they give to a patient when they are admitted to the hospital. Part of that bill of rights says that if an error occurs in your medical treatment, you have the right to have that error disclosed to you immediately. That is our standard operating procedure in the School of Medicine.

This is a somewhat different issue that we are discussing. We are discussing the ability to look at an episode of care or totality of care, or any combination thereof, in a closed forum and to dissect it from every possible perspective to try and understand if there is a remediable cause or something that could have been done differently. It might be something as simple as—or complex, perhaps—a patient in an intensive care unit. This is a hypothetical example. There might be a patient in an intensive care unit who is being monitored closely, but, for some reason, the monitor does not alert the nurses when the pulse falls below a dangerously low rate. That situation has to be investigated, and it has to be investigated in a form that enables you to get information from all different sources—equipment manufacturers, nursing staff, physicians—and then dissect the incident and find the root cause. That process is protected because, otherwise, these investigations simply will not occur because of the danger of disclosure and liability risks. It is a balancing act that society really has to perform. You have to perform the benefits versus the risks. The benefits of these review panels are huge, and I would argue that the risks are exceedingly small to nil.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
Can you explain to me how this confidentiality actually helps the man out in the street? Do you do anything with this, or do you just have a get-together and nothing ever happens?

John McDonald:
No. It would be an exercise in futility if we were not to act on any information gained from this. The action could vary from no action—if it is discovered that there was really no issue that needs to be addressed, which is the most common outcome—to changes in procedures or changes in equipment. It could even involve further education of individuals who might be involved in the

incident that we are discussing. It might be a generic discussion about a range of activities. It might not even include one specific patient. It could be, "what do our outcome measures look like for this particular operation?" or "are we up to national standards?" If we are not, then we need to look at what we are doing and make absolutely sure that we are doing it correctly, by the book, and following all the known procedures and precautions that are involved.

So, there is not a one-size-fits-all sort of discussion. This kind of discussion would always be followed by corrective action, if appropriate.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
So, you do not use these peer reviews to hide things, which we hear about all the time?

John McDonald:
The intent of this is not to hide information from anyone. The intent of this is a self-improvement exercise. If you wanted to think about it in a personal context, perhaps you could think about it like—and this is not a perfect analogy—it might be similar to going to a pastor. There are things that you might talk about with your pastor that are very private and very personal and that might help you as a person, but that would not necessarily be helpful if you were to talk to others about it. That is not a good analogy, but it is probably as close as I can come in terms of what we are trying to accomplish here.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:
I have a disclosure to make. I attend the Boyd School of Law at UNLV, but I do not believe this will affect me differently than any other student. Many people try to do research before they go to a hospital, go to a clinic, or see a doctor. Under the current state of the law, if a sentinel event happens at a university institution—if a nosocomial infection happens—are those statistics public record? Under the new proposed legislation, would they still be public record, so that people could make informed choices about their health care?

John McDonald:
That is an excellent question. Sentinel events are reportable. This would be reported through the standard reporting mechanism of the hospital, not necessary directly through the School of Medicine. This bill would not change that situation, to my knowledge.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:
So, the public's right to know would not be abridged?

John McDonald:
No.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
You keep using the phrase "you have a right to know." If something happens to you or there is a mistake made, you may not know that a mistake was made. You may have the right to know, but will they disclose it to you or do you have to ask? In other words, when a mistake is made, do you disclose that to the patient? Or do you wait for the patient to say, "Hey, was a mistake made?"

John McDonald:
No. The patient should not have to wait.

Assemblyman Mortenson:
Should?

John McDonald:
The patient will not wait. The patient would be told if an error occurred without asking.

Vice Chair Horne:
An error may have occurred and you disclose this to the patient, but, in these review committees, you discuss how this error may have come about in procedures that took place, which led up to the error occurring. Is that correct?

John McDonald:
That is an excellent explanation. A good example might be an emergency situation. Let us say a patient comes into the emergency room, a nurse takes a syringe of medication, administers it to the patient or gives it to the physician, and it is administered. It turns out, after the medication is given, the syringe contained the wrong medicine. The patient would be informed that he was given the wrong medicine and had an adverse outcome. The investigation might then ask why the patient got the wrong medicine: Was it because the two syringes were similar sizes and colors, with small labels, put side by side on the shelf, even though they are very different medications, and are filed alphabetically. That is an actual case, though not in this State.

Assemblyman Anderson:
When I look at page 2, line 8: "or any affiliated organizations." Are we extending this to a broader group? You have quite a few groups that allow your students to come in. Are we giving them some level of immunity that they have not previously held?

Thomas Ray:
No, they are not. The School of Medicine has a clinical practice component to it, and they have a nonprofit organization that holds the lease to the facility. The affiliated organization is MEDSchool Associates North and MEDSchool Associates South.

Assemblyman Anderson:
I think that we are all painfully aware, unfortunately—not of a practice at your facility, but of other facilities that have responsibility for reviewing medical procedures and outcomes—that the disclosure or the thoroughness of how that information is given to the public has become something of an issue. I am thinking of the child-death circumstance, in particular. This does not change the practice that is common in the medical schools throughout the nation in terms of the dialogue. This does raise the issue of not allowing an opportunity for somebody to take the record from here and use it somewhere else. Is that correct?

Thomas Ray:
You are correct.

Assemblyman Anderson:
What happens when a member of this group, then, is subpoenaed in a medical case and discloses information that he acquired at one of these meetings. Do they personally become liable for it, or does this become a basis for action from the person who is affected?

Let us say that Mr. Horne points out the errors of Mr. Anderson. Mr. Carpenter, who is there at the discussion, is subpoenaed. He says Horne was upset with Anderson because he did not put the right needle in.

Thomas Ray:
For example, if Horne was subpoenaed to testify as the attending physician, and the claim involved a resident who was present, pursuant to that subpoena, he would be under oath and could be asked what he observed or things of that nature. He would have to answer those questions. The only privilege would be if he appeared before a review committee and what he told the review committee. That is the part that would be privileged. He would be under oath and compelled to tell, in the deposition, what he saw when the event occurred.

Assemblyman Anderson:
Mr. Carpenter acquired the information not from personal observation but through the interaction at the review committee. He would not be able to disclose that information because he had not personally observed it. Someone should bring forth that question at trial.

Thomas Ray:
If he was to be an expert witness for the plaintiff, he could, based upon his review of the record, express an opinion. The only limitation would be the individual would not be compelled to disclose what he told the review committee.

Vice Chair Horne:
However, just like any other privilege, it can be destroyed. Sometimes that happens when people communicate outside the realm of the privilege.

Thomas Ray:
Yes, that is correct.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Right now, if I was treated at UMC and something happened, and that treatment was evaluated by the peer review committee, that would be privileged?

Thomas Ray:
You are correct. UMC has the review committee privilege, as we speak.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
The change would be if I am treated by a University of Nevada medical student and it was reviewed, then it would be privileged also.

Thomas Ray:
That is correct. Presently, UMC comes within the statute and has a review committee. Their committee information is privileged. If this privilege was extended to the Medical School, if they had a review committee and reviewed the matter, then that would be privileged.

Assemblyman Carpenter:
Is this going to help get any more doctors in rural Nevada?

John McDonald:
We are working hard to get more doctors in rural Nevada. Everything that we do to improve the quality of our programs and improve our reputation increases our ability to attract position candidates from a broad spectrum of life. We are starting rural residencies in Fallon, and we have an active rural rotation program that we are also planning to expand. If you believe a rising tide lifts all boats, then this would be part of the rising tide of making us more competitive.

Assemblyman Cobb:
The purpose here, in this language change, is not to provide an immunity or protection to an individual who is accused of a wrongdoing, but instead to keep confidential an internal proceeding designed only for the edification of your institution. Is that correct?

John McDonald:
That is correct.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
Can you elaborate on how this going to save money?

John McDonald:
Everything we do to improve quality and procedure ultimately results in reduced cost. The reason I make that claim is that systems that fail create huge expense. We heard an earlier example of a nosocomial infection involving, let us say a methicillin resistant organism. These are the kinds of system issues that consume incredible amounts of money in the health care budget. If you have been hospitalized, you realize how complex the environment is; you realize that a very small thing, like developing a urinary tract infection because you have a catheter in after a surgical procedure, can prolong your hospital visit, increase morbidity, and cause cost. Everything that we do is designed to drive the best quality at the lowest cost for the patient. That is what we are trying to accomplish with these procedures. We are trying to make sure we do the right thing, not more or less than is indicated—use the right drug, use the right procedure, and follow all the standard protocols for treating patients. All of that collectively drives down costs.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:
This also limits liability as well?

Thomas Ray:
The goal is that if you improve patient care, you shorten hospital stays, shorten medical expense, and it is better for the patient. You will not have claims in the

future because you fixed a situation so no liability expense. Your malpractice insurance premium would go down. For all of those reasons, it is win-win for everybody.

Assemblyman Mabey:
I agree with the intent of the bill and support it strongly. If anything, at the UMC where you have medical students, residents, and attending physicians, the care is maybe even better; you have more people watching. When there is a mistake made, there is no reason why the patient cannot sue and get compensation. The creation of this will just allow the student, the resident, and the attending physicians to meet. It makes sense to pass this bill. This bill will only help and not hurt.

Lawrence P. Matheis, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association:
I am not a physician. We do support this. This is a continuation of something that this Committee dealt with in your last session. We had created a trauma system in southern Nevada that no longer was based in a single facility. You had to account for how to get a committee together that is not really a facility-based committee that can look at the quality issues and how to do system improvement. That was how section 1, subsection 3 was added by the group.

As time goes on—and as the health care system creates more complexity in more settings in which there are necessary improvement activities—you are going to see this kind of proposal, as in the School of Medicine. The hospital setting has been the place where these issues are discussed peer to peer. As Dean McDonald indicated, the training of the residents and the faculty practices are now in multiple settings, not always in the same facility or hospital. We see them in the Nevada Cancer Institute, the Alzheimer's Center, and others. They are going to be acting as part of the University community, but not necessarily exclusively as part of one of the covered entities. It makes sense in terms of where the complexity of the system has taken things.

Assemblyman Anderson:
Your contention is that you see this as extending to the Cancer Institute and these other groups the ability to have similar discussions within the confines of this bill. So, we are broadening it to other kinds of medical providers away from the university setting?

Lawrence Matheis:
I do not think it does that. The university residents and faculty, wherever they may be, will now be able to have the peer-to-peer review. As time goes on, as we see new settings in which services are provided, as with the Trauma Center, I would not be surprised if there will be discussions about whether to expand it.

This is really about the University of Nevada School of Medicine and their programs, wherever those programs may be.

Assemblyman Anderson:
Is this potentially a nose underneath the tent? Are we opening a window that is going to be opened in the future to other kinds of groups that have a similar process within their staff, and they want to keep it out of public view?

Lawrence Matheis:
I do not think so. As we discussed two years ago, health care is not getting less complex. You will need to deal with those case by case.

Assemblyman Anderson:
I am mindful of Mr. Mortenson's and Mr. Carpenter's questions about how this is going to improve things for the average consumer. The assurance was given to Mr. Mortenson that a patient who is affected would be told. I am concerned if we are stepping into a new area here, and I want to make sure we do so cautiously. It is becoming such a complex medical world.

Lawrence Matheis:
I think that it is simply a recognition of what complexity does. These started as tumor boards in hospitals a number of years ago. They were to encourage doctors, who were all community doctors, to talk about what they learned from the cases that they were dealing with and to share openly. As the systems get more complex, the discussions have to go on in more settings.

Dan Musgrove, Associate Administrator, External Relations, University Medical Center:
To sum up, what you discussed today is the importance of what a real residency program does and that it must have the principle of self-evaluation and peer review. What you are doing here today is giving them that ability. Looking at a hospital setting like UMC, using the example Assemblyman Segerblom or Assemblyman Mabey talked about—the fact that there needs to be cooperation between the two entities—there might actually be a chilling effect if the residents with University of Nevada School of Medicine did not have the same protection to have that peer review. There might not be an ability for the two organizations to sit down and actually look at the issue and review it as a combined entity, so they can go forward and correct those mistakes. The residents, without this protection, might not have that freedom to openly discuss things, where as the doctors at UMC would. We would be in support of this going forward.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Does the $50,000 cap apply to the medical school?

Thomas Ray:
Yes, the cap applies.

Vice Chair Horne:
Any other questions on the bill? [There were none]. We are going to close the hearing on A.B. 18 and turn the gavel back over to the Chairman.

Chairman Anderson:
The Committee needs to be aware of the fact that it will have in its possession eight potential bill draft requests (BDR). I have received two already. I would suggest that they be drafted at the request of the Committee. The first deals with the regulating of private, professional guardians in Nevada. Several people have brought to my attention a problem that exists with guardians who are appointed under the current statute. The regulations of private, professional guardians of Nevada, which were expanded in this, need to be clarified to alleviate some problems that they are having. I would ask for a bill draft adding a new chapter to NRS 159.0595 that would deal with the licensing and requirements. Until we see it in language, we probably will not know if we like it or not.

> ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA MOVED THAT A BILL BE DRAFTED REGARDING PRIVATE AND PROFESSIONAL GUARDIANS.
>
> ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The second request that I have is one dealing with common-interest communities. It has six components to it. It is from a group in southern Nevada. It is relative to proposed changes in definitions and limited liability companies (LLC), community associations, an attempt to clarify home owners' associations operations, how candidates of the board are elected, and some other problems that have been raised by some of the home owners.

> ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA MOVED THAT A BILL BE DRAFTED REGARDING COMMON-INTEREST COMMUNITIES.
>
> ASSEMBLYWOMAN GERHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We saw A.B. 30 the other day.

Assembly Bill 30: Revises certain provisions governing the distribution of proceeds from certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-558)

We were going to take action, but we did not have everybody here. This is the bill dealing with the Department of Public Safety name change. A couple of you had some concerns about the bill. If there is a comfort level, we will proceed.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 30.

ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (ASSEMBLYMAN MABEY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Are there any other issues that members of the Committee would like to bring forward? [There were none.] Any comment from the public? [There was none.] We are adjourned [at 10:27 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Danielle Mayabb
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: February 13, 2007 Time of Meeting: 8:00 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A	**********	Agenda
	B	**********	Attendance Roster
AB 25	C	Scott Anderson, Secretary of State's Office	Letter and testimony
AB 26	D	Gina Spaulding, Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design & Residential Design	Information sheet
AB 26	E	Scott Anderson, Secretary of State's Office	Letter
AB 15	F	Assemblyman William C. Horne	Testimony on AB 15
AB 15	G	T. Arthur Ritchie, Presiding Judge, Family Division, Eight Judicial District	Testimony on AB 15
AB 15	H	Eric Fish, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws	Testimony and copy of the Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act
AB 15	I	Susan Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Testimony on AB 15
AB 15	J	Susan Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Notated copy of the Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act