

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-fourth Session  
May 25, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Mark E. Amodei at 9:14 a.m. on Friday, May 25, 2007, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair  
Senator Maurice E. Washington, Vice Chair  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Valerie Wiener  
Senator Steven A. Horsford

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Dennis Nolan (Excused)  
Senator Terry Care (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford, Assembly District No. 6  
Assemblyman David R. Parks, Assembly District No. 41

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Linda J. Eissmann, Committee Policy Analyst  
Brad Wilkinson, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Gale Maynard, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Don Helling, Warden, Northern Nevada Correctional Center, Carson City,  
Department of Corrections  
Florence Jones  
Mark Woods, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 2

Joseph A. Turco, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Tonja Brown  
Rich Lamb  
Donald Hinton, The Spartacus Project of Nevada  
Pat Hines  
Larry D. Struve, Religious Alliance In Nevada

CHAIR AMODEI:

I call this meeting to order, and we will open with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 416.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 416 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes to provisions concerning the Department of Corrections. (BDR 16-190)

I had contact with The Honorable James W. Hardesty, Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court about A.B. 63 where we put the discretion language in for sentencing. Justice Hardesty indicated concern based on an application by the United States Supreme Court case which was *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). Mr. Wilkinson, please get copies of that case for our Committee members.

The rule of that case will require all discretion factors be submitted to the jury for factual findings. The concern was significant additional findings and presentations to the jury.

I recommend we leave the promulgation of those factors at an administrative level to the Advisory Commission on Sentencing in our attempt to make the process communicative and produce findings. It creates a consequence of increasing matters that must be put to the jury for a factual finding.

ASSEMBLYMAN DAVID R. PARKS (Assembly District No. 41):

A handout provided to the Committee on A.B. 416 goes through the bill by section (Exhibit C). This bill will become effective on July 1, and a provision creating a Policy Advisory Commission on Corrections expires by limitation on June 30, 2011.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 3

DON HELLING (Warden, Northern Nevada Correctional Center, Carson City, Department of Corrections):

I am here to state the Department's position that we are against A.B. 416. Areas pointed out in this bill are addressed in other areas in A.B. 508, section 2, subsection 4.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 508 (3rd Reprint)**: Makes various changes to provisions concerning the Advisory Commission on Sentencing. (BDR 14-1378)

CHAIR AMODEI:

Are you opposed to the Advisory Commission on Sentencing?

MR. HELLING:

Yes.

CHAIR AMODEI:

There are other sections in the bill.

MR. HELLING:

It is the sections in the bill that apply to the Department of Corrections.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Those are the ones you are opposed to, is this correct?

MR. HELLING:

Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Are your reasons for opposition because you have language in A.B. 508 and that prison policy already exists?

MR. HELLING:

The Board of State Prison Commissioners is in the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*, and that board will be responsible for oversight.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Mr. Wilkinson, can you look at both bills and see if there are differences in the provisions and what are the overlaps?

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 4

MR. HELLING:

There are many unclassified employees in Nevada and to have peer reviews only in the Department of Corrections seems unfair.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I am looking at a fiscal note ([Exhibit D](#)) on page 4 of \$7.9 million, is this correct? Does the amendment to the bill change the fiscal note?

MR. HELLING:

I am not aware of any fiscal note for the Department of Corrections. There would have to be additional staff and support services for the review committee to be established.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Do you know how many unclassified staff members are in the Department of Corrections?

MR. HELLING:

The number is 47, including myself.

SENATOR WIENER:

This may be a question for our legal staff. In sections 26 through 34 of A.B. 416, the enhancements are reduced but for which crimes would enhancements remain?

BRAD WILKINSON (Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel):

I did not compare the ones listed in the bill with the ones that remain.

SENATOR WIENER:

I am curious as to which enhancements would remain.

CHAIR AMODEI:

The enhancements you are referring to are the ones that change the—

SENATOR WIENER:

It is the enhancement penalty that changes certain crimes from a minimum of one year to a maximum of ten years. There is a bill I introduced about using a juvenile in the commission of a crime under vulnerable persons and enhancement was used.

CHAIR AMODEI:

What is proposed before us is to change the sentencing guidelines without any communicative discretion on the part of the sentencing judge. Is this correct?

SENATOR WIENER:

They also get a range.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I want to ask about legislative audits of the State Board of Parole Commissioners. Was there any discussion in this area?

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

Considerable discussions were relative to using the services of the Legislative Auditor. Most of those activities were intended to be developed through the Advisory Commission as to the specific items they would encounter and using the assistance of the Auditor.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Was there a discussion for including an audit of the performance of the Parole Board? We heard testimony from Justice Hardesty about another bill and the Parole Board will be involved in reviewing cases as there is a determination of discharge. Would having a Legislative Auditor who looks at the performance of the Board help in this transitional process of discharging?

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

The assistance of an audit would be beneficial. We approved funding of \$85,000 to assist the Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, in developing the tools needed for evaluation of efficiency of their operation and of parolees and probationers. Within the budget, there is funding and we had discussions with Dr. James Austin about the work currently being done for Parole and Probation. He is making recommendations and is well on the way to assessing what needs to be done. Many of the assessment tools they have are not being used.

Senator McGinness referenced a fiscal note in [Exhibit D](#) on page 4 dated April 11 for A.B. 416. It reflected a savings of \$7.9 million and not an expense. This was a projection as to implemented changes relative to enhanced sentences and other corrections and what we would save. This corresponds to the \$6 million

that the Fiscal Division has put into the budgets. Assembly Bill 416 has the potential of saving the state a significant amount of money.

CHAIR AMODEI:

I realize I am speaking out of turn on bills, but is that statement based on provisions in section 5 of A.B. 510 where good time credits are increased for good behavior and certain academic achievements?

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

Yes.

FLORENCE JONES:

I have been actively involved with the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study Sentencing and Pardons, and Parole and Probation and thank all those on the Subcommittee who worked tirelessly. I urge this Committee to support A.B. 416 even if it has a fiscal note. We need checks and balances in government and now we have our Department of Corrections (DOC) and our Parole and Probation Board without any checks and balances. The only oversight given is when the Governor reappoints them every four years. I thought they were under the Department of Public Safety auditors. I was told that it was just formality and there is no oversight.

We have a population inside the prisons where, in many cases, these inmates have few who care and are at the mercy of the system. We need the system to be accountable.

The money appropriated by this legislative body to the DOC is large, and we do not know how it is spent. We need responsible fiscal reporting for money allocated spent for projects identified that are timely and accurately completed, not by a contractor who was dismissed with work completed by the inmates and the job broke in four days. They are inmates, not plumbers or electricians. It is imperative that there be some type of control over the money we are pumping into the sewer known as the DOC.

The Parole Board was under the Open Meeting Law until 2001 when the manual was changed deleting the fact they were under the Nevada Open Meeting Law without the Legislature's permission or anything from the Nevada Supreme Court. If there are any groups of people who must be open, it is the Parole Board. I am concerned about sex offenders being processed back into our

communities. The Commission must be above reproach, and we cannot have it questioned.

Our State Board of Pardons Commissioners application process is also secret although our Pardons Board does work under the Open Meeting Law for their hearings. Assembly Bill 416 gives us a voice with an oversight committee. This oversight committee can be made up from some influential people. Don Ahern, who has been in contact with several people, is a successful businessman with ties to the prison system other than the fact he employs inmates. He sees a serious need and would like to chair a committee on a voluntary basis.

Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley has suggested some ways the Parole Board can operate more efficiently. If the Parole Board has already decided an inmate will be granted parole, instead of having a hearing, a letter is sent to that inmate telling him when he is scheduled to go home.

In May, the Parole Board saw 165 of the 750 pending cases. Many of those 750 should have been heard some time before. Why are we wasting our Parole Board's time to review cases that can be handled by the DOC? Let us save our Parole Board the exit mechanism for our system for the people who are going to the streets. I want our Parole Board to have the time to look at reports not 5 minutes before someone is coming before them. It concerns me that we might turn people out onto the streets who have not been properly screened.

I am familiar with the *Apprendi* case. With regards to enhancement, many are incarcerated. Former Chief Justice Robert E. Rose says we have created a quagmire on the enhancement issue. If you have a sentence of robbery for 15 years, you are automatically given another 15 years. If you were engaged in a crime where three people were involved, you may have three counts of robbery, you have three enhancements. These are the sentences of which I speak. The DOC should handle it paper-wise when you come up for review.

The enhancement that former Chief Justice Rose is speaking about would be to stop the doubling and go to a reasonable, discretionary sentencing judge. This alone will free up space in our prisons. We need to take action on A.B. 416. We have a block of inmates who are serving these enhanced sentences. Considering retroactive adjustments does not mean you have opened the floodgates. This allows the Parole Board the right to review these cases.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 8

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is there anyone else to speak on A.B. 416?

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Assemblyman Parks, in section 24, can you explain the waiver requirement for supervision for Categories D and E on page 9 of the bill?

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

This was a recommended change we had concluded through several discussions. It allows for greater discretion for those persons who qualify.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Mr. Wilkinson, in section 24, page 9, does this give discretion to the Division of Parole and Probation to allow those who were released on parole from a Category D or E felony to have the waiver for supervision? Is it based on the last conviction or are prior convictions considered by the Division of Parole and Probation?

MARK WOODS (Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):

It takes into account both current and past convictions. Anyone due for a mandatory release, usually Categories A and B, has to have enhanced supervision. Categories D and E are low-risk offenders who do not need enhanced supervision. The amendment allows us to supervise if it is deemed appropriate.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Are there definitions in statute for what is close supervision or criteria?

MR. WOODS:

Nothing in statute defines enhanced supervision. The Division of Parole and Probation has determined it to be an Intensive Supervision Unit (ISU) issue.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

There was testimony from Dr. Austin that contradicts. It was said that sometimes Categories D and E are more likely to commit an offense. For this category not to be supervised, it may be counterintuitive because the support is not available and they may re-offend. It was also stated that Category B and C offenders, who are considered dangerous, are dependent upon the conditions



under which the crime was committed and will probably not re-offend. How does this balance with this policy?

MR. WOODS:

It gives the Division of Parole and Probation the ability to supervise every individual at the appropriate level. We agree that Categories D and E could be dangerous, but we have the ability to override that individual and put them on an ISU level. You may get a Category E offender who had a conviction for a controlled substance and no priors; these individuals may not need supervision.

The way the amendment is worded, we can override and place the parolee on a higher or lower level based on their history.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I am uncomfortable with nothing in regulation on how a criterion is applied. I have heard that discretion is not applied the same way for everyone. If our intent is not clear or if there is no regulation, how do we know if one person is treated differently by nonsupervision based on an officer's discretion and another is held to a higher standard and supervised? I do not agree. Assemblymen Parks, was there discussion on criteria? Would you be open to crafting language that will set criteria?

MR. WOODS:

I am sure we will be willing to work on language, but the danger we face is creating an unknown consequence. We testified before the Assembly Select Committee on Corrections, Parole and Probation.

We are funded differently to supervise all Categories D and E at the enhanced, supervised ISU level. An ISU caseload is funded at 30 to 1, and the fiscal impact would be great. We can take some of the subjectiveness out of our process and come up with language.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I do not want to take away the discretion but set guidelines for how the decisions are made, especially with the amount of parolees being released. There has to be set parameters, and I am sure Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford has heard the same information from constituents. We can gladly help you with language; there have to be guidelines available.

MR. WOODS:

There is funding in the budget with our risk and needs tools. In working with different groups, the tool chosen will have that built into it.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I want language that requires the Division of Parole and Probation to develop a regulation that is set, communicated and followed. If it is not followed, there is a consequence.

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

We have heard testimony and received correspondence from our constituents. One of the frustrations based on the category of felony is not an indicator if an individual will re-offend. One of the statements made was that the person least likely to offend is a person charged with second degree murder or manslaughter. These individuals are most likely to put their lives in order.

Individuals guilty of a Category C, D or E felony may really be terrible but found guilty of a lesser crime. With the assessment tools at the Division of Parole and Probation, they will be able to evaluate the individual and determine if supervision is necessary.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

The Division of Parole and Probation must provide reasons in writing for denial to the prisoner and other requirements for the Parole Board to allow the prisoner considered for parole as representative and the victim to submit documents. There is more paperwork involved; did the Parole Board submit a fiscal note? I have concerns with section 25, subsection 2 where it may make the victim re-testify before the inmate and Parole Board.

ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS:

Section 25, subsection 2 concerned us also, but there are occasions where the Parole Commissioners were unduly and emotionally motivated by circumstances with data that may leave a negative impression.

JOSEPH A. TURCO (American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

I have read the bill carefully and based on my experience, this bill goes a long way on the recommendations of the Subcommittee from A.C.R. No. 17 of the 73rd Session and the proposals from Dr. Austin and Dr. Richard L. Siegel of the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.

This is a law and order bill that will save Nevada millions of dollars. A change is called for in our prison system. It has been noted that we cannot act surprised when the crisis reached unmanageable proportions. If I may quote our now-deceased and former President Ronald Regan, "Status quo, you know, is Latin for 'the mess we're in.'" I urge you to pass A.B. 416.

TONJA BROWN:

I am in favor of A.B. 416. I would like to add information on the Open Meeting Law. There have been inmates who should have appeared before the Parole Board but, due to medical conditions, were unable to appear and denied parole. If we had the Open Meeting Law, this situation could not happen.

It is my understanding that since 1996, family and loved ones have not been able to speak on behalf of the incarcerated, only the victims could speak; this needs to change.

RICH LAMB:

I am in support of A.B. 416 and A.B. 510 and have testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

**ASSEMBLY BILL 510 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes concerning credits earned by offenders and the incarceration and supervision of offenders.  
(BDR 16-1377)

DONALD HINTON (The Spartacus Project of Nevada):

Assembly Bill 416 and A.B. 510 are bills that will provide an avenue to help rebuild men and women who are incarcerated through fair play. Assemblymen Munford and Parks and Ms. Jones are to be complimented for the time and effort they put into these bills.

A couple of amendments to A.B. 416 address confiscation through the kangaroo courts and the Department of Corrections of the monies sent in by loved ones. I also requested an amendment for the Parole Board to suspend their \$30 to \$35 per month supervision fee and the \$21 gate money for a

person released from prison who does not have the time to get a job, find housing, put themselves into a situation where they can have a meal and pay \$35; this needs to be rescinded.

There has been some talk about the secrecy of how the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections operate. If you were to write to the prison system or the Parole Board asking for information on your loved one, you are not getting a response; no one is that busy. As far as Dorla M. Salling, Carson City, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners, Department of Public Safety, stating that \$3 million will be an extra expense on the part of the Parole Board is ludicrous. Assembly Bill 416 and A.B. 510 are cost-saving bills and need to be discussed. If Ms. Salling is a bad administrator, maybe she should be replaced with one who is fiscally responsible to the taxpayers of Nevada.

I am offended by many things the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections put out as fact; much of it is myth and it all relates to job security. It is time to make a change. The prison system in Nevada is a failed system. I want to know what my tax dollars are buying and what programs have been successful; are they being continued and has the federal government stopped funding? I do not see results for my dollar.

The test of a prison system is changing attitude, behavior and action of a man or woman incarcerated; there is no change. We have been lucky not to have some disappointed prisoners come back with violent acts against our government.

The Parole Board and the Department of Corrections make their own rules as to what happens to a prisoner once he is sent into the system. They make their own rules on what the judge has said to favor the direction they want. Those who testified today said everything that needs to be said on this bill. It should be passed, and it is overdue.

PAT HINES:

I have a copy of the fiscal note [Exhibit D](#). We should reconsider what Dr. Austin said about improving. The Division of Parole and Probation is willing to do more supervision, and money can be saved through the Department of Corrections budget despite the inflated fiscal note. It costs less money to supervise someone using Parole and Probation than it does within the prison system.

I have passed out a sheet ([Exhibit F](#)) with some added language in paragraph 2 that speaks to Parole Board hearings and its secrecy and what can be done to save money for the Parole Board.

It is hard to understand why, in this age of technology, the Parole Board does not have laptops; this would save them time and money. In bold letters, paragraph 2 of [Exhibit F](#) says "that the closed hearing should be ... ." There is a case where an inmate received the notice of his hearing—

CHAIR AMODEI:

I am sorry to interrupt, but we do have another bill to consider.

MS. HINES:

For years, the Parole Board has given its decision on a parole hearing 7 to 14 days later. The Parole Board is eagerly awaiting the implementation of new language which states that written notice should be given within ten days.

Getting back to a point, an inmate had a hearing but received another two years. His hearing was on May 8, and he received his results on May 22; this is good news.

In paragraph 3 of [Exhibit F](#) under recommendation, it says "Place the Board's standards and procedures as regulations ... ." Ms. Jones said that the Parole Board is reviewed upon reappointment every four years. Paragraph 3 will allow for monitoring and a place to report. Paragraph 3 continues to state "I believe the Legislative Commission process calls for ... ."

This seems to be the way most divisions in our government work, but not the Parole Board; I ask that you consider this. I am in favor of an advisory committee for the Department of Corrections. If the Nevada Board of Prison Commissioners would have time for public comment from people, some of these administrative regulation discrepancies would be cleared.

We could go to the Parole Commissioner and give some input 30 days prior to the hearing and after the hearing. There has to be some type of monitoring and supervision with the Parole Board.

SENATOR WIENER:

Senate Bill (S.B.) 367 does more fine-tuning with administrative regulations. Could we find out how many times the Division of Parole and Probation has brought regulations to the Legislative Commission for approval?

LARRY D. STRUVE (Religious Alliance In Nevada):

The Religious Alliance In Nevada (RAIN) has been interested in this issue; we support both A.B. 416, A.B. 508 and A.B. 510 ([Exhibit G](#)). These bills are trying to address a problem that raises concern to our faith communities.

Nevadans must keep 3 facts in mind: 97 percent of the 13,000 inmates in Nevada are going to be released—about 3,500 per year. Many are going to re-offend. The Director feels the recidivism rate is lower than what we have been told—about 27 percent—but nationally, the rate may be as high as 80 percent. As far as RAIN is concerned, 27 percent is a high enough rate to be concerned.

Within the next 10 years, we are going to spend \$1.9 billion to build prisons to accommodate inmates entering the prison system. My organization is concerned about a system that is not working and who we are letting out of prison.

How are they being prepared to reenter society? There is emphasis every Legislative Session on how to get tough on crime by increased sentences and keeping them away from society, but most of them are coming out. It is a matter of serious public policy as to what we are doing to prepare them.

The three bills [Exhibit G](#) discusses have provisions that return the ability to the judges to determine how much additional time needs to be added for certain types of crimes.

Former Justice Rose spoke before the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study Sentencing and Pardons, and Parole and Probation and said there are cases where unjust sentences have been given because the judge had no discretion on entering an order to double a sentence where the facts did not justify the sentence. This adds to the years a defendant serves, which in turn leads to overcrowding.

The advisory committee will oversee the prison, but if an Advisory Commission on Sentencing also does oversight, we might want to consider combining these agencies. My statement is [Exhibit G](#). This is my only opportunity to speak for these three bills that RAIN supports.

Ms. JONES:

How the Parole Board is working with their parole standards and regulations is important. In 1999, the Parole Board doubled their guideline on how much time an inmate would have to serve before being considered for parole. It went from looking at the actual time to an amount of time to serve by setting a top and bottom. The least amount was never used and most of time served is at the top number; this regulation has no oversight. The Parole Board has the authority to apply this under *Nevada Revised Statute 213* as created in *Nevada Administrative Code 213*; it is clogging our system.

I placed an amendment for A.B. 416 to upgrade the regulations and incorporate changes into law. Truth in sentencing was enacted and now we are stuck paying for a system that does not work. The peer review spoken of by Mr. Helling is imperative in the Department of Corrections; wardens and above must be reviewed. As it stands now, no one oversees them.

Technical violations are of concern. The \$35 per month a parolee is required to pay causes most of our technical violations. It is the reason 40 percent of the people return to our system; it costs \$8,000 to process a new inmate. Parolees who are out could neither get work nor enough money to pay rent, then when they do not appear for an appointment, it causes a violation.

I agree with Senator McGinness that the Parole Board reviews and retries a case each time by showing pictures. The Parole Board needs to be proactive with the parolee. In our Parole Board system, there are two divisions, a southern and northern. I have countless inmates who have been heard by the southern board of three members who agree to grant parole. The Parole Board in the north with four members often overrides the Parole Board in the south. We need consistency.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 16

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will recess the hearing on both A.B. 510 and A.B. 416 and put them on the following Monday.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARVEY J. MUNFORD (Assembly District No. 6):

I want to show my appreciation for taking the time to hear A.B. 416. I have had strong support on this bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:

I have some bills that require a concur or not concur. The first bill is S.B. 132.

**SENATE BILL 132 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes concerning the liability of landowners, lessees and occupants of land to persons using premises for recreational activities. (BDR 3-212)

This is a trails bill; our Committee voted out the version of the bill that was not what the proponents and the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association had worked out. It went to the Assembly and came back with amendments that are agreeable by the proponents.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 670 TO S.B. 132.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CARE AND NOLAN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR AMODEI:

The next bill up for a vote is S.B. 195. For the record, the proponents have indicated they are satisfied with the amendments to the bill.

**SENATE BILL 195 (2nd Reprint)**: Enacts provisions governing the operation and use of a recreation area. (BDR 40-492)

Amendment 787 made a word change in section 10 that says "provide warnings about dangerous conditions and potential hazards." The Assembly



added the word "known" to dangerous conditions and potential hazards. In another section of the bill they added the word "knowingly" where it now says:

Except as otherwise provided by law, an operator or an owner of a private property is not liable for the death or injury of a person or for damage to property caused and sustained by a person using a recreation area if the person knowingly enters an area which is located outside the recreation area.

What is the pleasure of the Committee?

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 787 TO S.B. 195.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CARE AND NOLAN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR AMODEI:

The next bill up is S.B. 129. This is a bill Senator Care has been working on; due to his absence today, I will hold this bill until further discussion with him.

[SENATE BILL 129 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes to provisions relating to guardianships. (BDR 13-1109)

CHAIR AMODEI:

The next bill on the agenda is S.B. 277.

[SENATE BILL 277 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Authorizes the court to assign certain offenders to a program of treatment for certain offenses. (BDR 43-888)

Senator Wiener indicated she looked at this bill and made a recommendation. If everyone is okay with her recommendation, we may take a vote.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 689 TO S.B. 277.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CARE AND NOLAN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR AMODEI:

The last bill to consider is S.B. 237.

**SENATE BILL 237 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises certain provisions governing permits to carry concealed firearms. (BDR 15-47)

I checked with Senator Warren B. Hardy II; he is fine with the amendment and a definition for revolver and one for semiautomatic. This was done so when a permit is issued, it differentiates between a permit for revolvers and semiautomatic firearms or for revolvers and one or more specific semiautomatic weapons.

Senator Hardy coordinated the language with law enforcement. It is my understanding that the sponsors of the bill are agreeable with the language. What is the pleasure of the Committee?

SENATOR WASHINGTON MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 887 TO S.B. 237.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CARE AND NOLAN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

MR. HINTON:

Regarding the insensitive comment made by prison director Howard Skolnik when he referred to the Nevada inmates as rats, he should be censored or replaced.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 25, 2007  
Page 19

CHAIR AMODEI:

Seeing nothing else to come before the Committee, we are adjourned at  
10:35 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Gale Maynard,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_