MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Seventy-fourth Session
February 13, 2007

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Mark E. Amodei at 8:34 a.m. on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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 Mike McGinness
Senator Dennis Nolan
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Terry Care
Senator Steven A. Horsford

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Vice Chair (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Linda J. Eissmann, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel
Lora Nay, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

The Honorable Nancy M. Saitta, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court
Joan E. Neuffer, Staff Attorney, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court
Mike Sprinkle, Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
Daniel Prince, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County

Mark Woods, Acting Deputy Chief, General Services Bureau, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety
Pamela Scott, The Howard Hughes Corporation
Douglas Manookian, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety
Adam Page, Lieutenant, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety
Karen Dennison, Lake at Las Vegas Joint Venture
Helen Wise, Community Association Management Executive Officers, Incorporated
William G. Rogers, Dayton Township Justice Court, Lyon County

CHAIR AMODEI:
We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 34.

SENATE BILL 34: Makes various changes to provisions concerning protective orders. (BDR 15-656)

THE HONORABLE NANCY M. SAITTA (Justice, Nevada Supreme Court):
Senate Bill 34 is a cleanup bill relating to stalking and harassment violations of temporary protective orders (TPO). As a statewide judiciary, we have completed standardizing all forms relating to stalking and harassment harm to minors and stalking and harassment in the workplace. We will all use the same forms which should make enforcement and recognition of those orders a simpler task. We reached this important point with hard work and efforts of not only judges and our Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), but also various members of every stakeholder in this area including victims' advocates, our Nevada State Repository and interested others.

We are requesting changes to clean up the sanction or punishment component of two sections in our codes by enhancing the penalty for committing a felony under the supervision of a TPO and providing justice courts authority to take action in certain matters relating to stalking and harassment.

With me is Joan Neuffer, our staff attorney from the AOC. Ms. Neuffer will succinctly explain how enhancement for domestic violence orders work with respect to stalking and harassing.

JOAN E. NEUFFER (Staff Attorney, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court):
The first section of S.B. 34 concerns attachment of additional penalties for violation of a protective order. If there is a violation of an order for protection of a child, those additional penalties would accrue if the person commits a felony while violating the order. This needs to be addressed because *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 33.400 and NRS 200.0591 already have enforcement. This is a similar reconciliation.

Section 2 concerns jurisdiction. The justice courts have jurisdiction based on population to issue domestic violence protective orders. The 2005, 73rd Legislative Session made a slight change allowing rural justice courts to address domestic violence issues. The language in subsection 1, paragraph (m), subparagraph (3) was, "If a party to the action is a party in another action pending in the district court in which such an order may be granted by ... the district court." That district court would divest the justice court of jurisdiction to address domestic violence issues. Senate Bill 34 changes the language of subparagraph (3) to allow the justice courts in rural areas to hold on to those protection orders.

The language in section 2 subsection 3 was problematic as actions were not clearly defined. The term "pending" was also not clearly defined. Another problem occurred when the justice court needed to act. There was confusion about whether there was a district court action and how to find information about it.

Section 2 in S.B. 34 allows the justice court in rural areas to hold on to domestic violence orders only and is not divested jurisdiction unless the district court issues an order telling the justice court we are going to decide this issue. In this way, S.B. 34 clears up some confusion about whether the justice court in rural areas can act. It is a technical cleanup to make clear how a justice court acts in domestic violence orders.

MIKE SPRINKLE (Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence):
The Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence is in favor of this bill. Section 1 is not a concern to us; however, section 2 clears up ambiguity with previous law. Our concern is to obtain a protective order as simply as possible for those who need it.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 34.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 34.

SENATOR McGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR WASHINGTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR AMODEI:
We will open the hearing on S.B. 32.

SENATE BILL 32: Makes various changes concerning the detention of certain delinquent children who violate parole. (BDR 5-597)

DANIEL PRINCE (Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):
I present my prepared written testimony for the bill requested by the Division (**Exhibit C**).

SABRA SMITH-NEWBY (Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County):
We were opposed to this bill as written, but will support it with the amendment.

CHAIR AMODEI:
What amendment?

MS. SMITH-NEWBY:
The former speaker said they would not request a change in subsection 1 and support the proposed change in subsection 2.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 32.

SENATOR NOLAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 32.

SENATOR McGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR AMODEI:
The amendment, as indicated by the witnesses, would eliminate any change in section 1, subsection 1.

BRAD WILKINSON (Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel):
The amendment desires to remove the mandatory language in subsection 1, so there would be no change. The only change will be in subsection 2.

CHAIR AMODEI:
Are we voting on section 1, subsection 2?

MR. WILKINSON:
Correct.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
Would only individuals aged 18 to 21 be placed in a facility for the detention of adults?

MR. PRINCE:
The amendment would provide youths who are 18—but still under the supervision of the Youth Parole Bureau of the Division of Child and Family Services until the age 21—and have violated the terms of their parole could be placed in an adult jail. Most youths on youth parole supervision are under 18, but some who turned 18 remain because of special circumstances, and in some cases, existing statute related to sex offenders.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
You said, "in some cases" a youth who is 18 to 21 could be held in an adult facility.

MR. PRINCE:
Under existing statutory language, they cannot; statute only includes probation violators. Those are youths who have not yet gone to an institution and have been released under the supervision of the Youth Parole Bureau. We would like to correct that by allowing those offenders—released from institutions under the supervision of the Youth Parole Bureau who turned 18—and violated the terms

of their supervision to be placed in an adult jail. We prefer they have the same sanctions as probation violators, but not in a facility for children.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
Is that in certain circumstances for certain offenses?

MR. PRINCE:
It is. If a juvenile court judge sentences a young person for correctional placement and they are close to 18, they will be in that placement while they are 18 for some period of time. They may be there for 6 or 7 months and turn 18 in the facility. We want to supervise those young people when they come out of the facilities and provide the adequate level of community protection and rehabilitative services even though they turned 18. That would be one subset of the group; the other would be sex offenders who, by statute, the Division retains jurisdiction until they turn 21.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
I need to make sure there are parameters for whom we are talking about.

SENATOR NOLAN:
We are talking about people convicted of committing a felony, who have been sentenced, served time in an institution, have been released on parole and violated the terms of their parole. These people are 18 and no longer minors. This amendment is a permissive allowing a judge the ability to return them to an adult detention facility, but judges have a whole array of sentencing options before them. Am I correct?

MR. PRINCE:
That is correct. Offenders could be sanctioned in other ways, but this allows for a jail sentence.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We presently have a motion and a second to amend and do pass which we will delay until the end of this meeting. For all other purposes, we will close the hearing on S.B. 32.

We will open the hearing on S.B. 33.

SENATE BILL 33: Requires the manager of a gated community to provide to parole and probation officers the code or device which allows entry to the community. (BDR 16-560)

MARK WOODS (Acting Deputy Chief, General Services Bureau, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):
It is the responsibility of the Division of Parole and Probation to supervise offenders within the community. One tool used by the Division to determine whether an offender is in compliance with their supervision is the unannounced home contact. During these home contacts, an officer observes whether an offender is complying with the rules of supervision. For example, an officer may or may not find a residence clean and free of drugs and drug paraphernalia, weapons or pornography. This is what officers are up against. It is important when dealing with offenders convicted of a crime against children. The unannounced home contact allows the offender little time to hide wrongdoing from the officer.

When an offender lives in a gated community, officers must identify themselves long before they stand at an offender's door. This gives the offender time to hide evidence of wrongdoing. There are also cases in which an offender can see the officer at the gate via camera and refuse to respond to the buzzer, leaving the officer to believe nobody is at home.

The Division of Parole and Probation contends one of the best deterrents to illegal activity is to have the offender believe their officer will show up at their front door at any given time. There are consequences if caught with indicia of wrongdoing.

The Division hopes you will support this bill request.

SENATOR CARE:
The bill addresses submission of a written request. I gather there would be one written request for as many visits as needed and not a request for each visit, is that correct?

MR. WOODS:
That is correct, sir. The officer shall prove to the manager of the gated community that an offender resides or works there. The manager would give us

access via code or key. Once the offender moves or ceases working there, the officer's responsibility is to return that access information.

SENATOR CARE:
Is the unannounced house visit something you do only on a random basis or because you have some suspicion the parolee is violating the terms?

MR. WOODS:
We do both on all offenders except those under minimum supervision. We do the unannounced home contact on a regular basis, sometimes monthly, sometimes weekly. If we suspect an offender is violating probation or has something going on via a family member, friend or other source, we make another unannounced contact.

SENATOR CARE:
What do you do now? Let us suppose you get a phone call saying so-and-so has drugs in the house and you want to go in right now. What do you do in a gated community?

MR. WOODS:
We have to get permission from the manager. We trust in them not to advise the offender we are on our way. Many times, the manager takes us to the apartment or door.

SENATOR CARE:
Do you submit the written request as soon as you learn the parolee is living in a gated community or apartment? I assume you would not.

MR. WOODS:
As soon as the parolee or probationer advises us they have moved or work there, we go for the request.

PAMELA SCOTT (The Howard Hughes Corporation):
I am here to support the bill. Many gated communities would not deny a parole officer rights through the gate. My concern is the bill does not differentiate between apartment communities and common interest communities.

I have offered an amendment (**Exhibit D**) adding executive boards and community managers as defined in NRS 116 and *Nevada Administrative*

Code 116. My amendment to section 1, subsection 3, paragraphs (a) and (b) adds executive boards and community managers to this portion of the bill.

I also offered an additional paragraph (c) to section 1, subsection 1. Mr. Woods indicated officers would provide proof to the manager the parolee or probationer lives or works in their community which would mean identifying that person. I added section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c) to say they needed to provide that information to the manager, which raises another question not addressed in this amendment and deserves discussion by the Committee.

I assume you are looking for confidentiality on the part of the executive board, community manager or manager of the apartment complex, as the case may be. These boards and managers need to know who is living there, but I have concerns. Do they need to keep the offender's identity confidential or do they have a duty to the membership to release that information?

My amendment to section 1, subsection 3 of this bill concerns definitions. An amendment to paragraph (a) modifies the definition of a gated community to be consistent with other portions of NRS. The amendment to the definition in paragraph (b) of subsection 3 brings in the executive board and community manager having a certificate under the Real Estate Division.

SENATOR WIENER:
In the definition of a gated community, gated access, restricted or controlled by a person or device, this presents the credentialing, getting permission and presuming someone is available. I live in a gated community with 24-hour guards. One family member lives in a gated community that has no one. There are those communities where officers need an access code to enter. Would you relinquish the code as soon as the person no longer resides there?

MR. WOODS:
That is correct.

SENATOR CARE:
Access codes change, and there can be access codes for each residence as opposed to a code for the main gate. I have gone to some gated communities and have to use a directory to dial a specific number. If I make that call, the resident knows I am on the way. If someone is in a guardhouse until a certain hour and the person I am going to visit has given them my name, then it is not

a problem. But as Senator Wiener pointed out, someone is not always in the guardhouse. Circumstances vary depending upon the type of community.

MR. WOODS:
Sergeant Doug Manookian is with us and understands these situations. I understand Las Vegas law enforcement has access to gated communities.

DOUGLAS MANOOKIAN (Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):
This is not an issue in the daytime where gated communities have guards or, in many cases, the gates are open. In the evening, there may be no one available. The gate or master code device is not direct to individual apartments. Entrance is gained advising the offender we are coming.

We often wait for someone to open the gate and sneak in behind them; otherwise, we cannot get in. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) has authority to enter under the North Las Vegas Municipal Code Book Fences and walls code. They use electronic devices on cars to open the gates. Due to cost, we requested communities be required to give us the master code or device to open their gate, allowing access when no one is available.

This is important if we get information in the evening someone is doing something wrong and we need to get into that area.

ADAM PAGE (Lieutenant, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):
I am here to support this bill, support Sergeant Manookian and Major Woods, and answer questions you may have.

KAREN DENNISON (Lake at Las Vegas Joint Venture):
I represent Lake at Las Vegas Joint Venture, which is the master developer of Lake Las Vegas. We are in support of the bill amended as proposed by The Howard Hughes Corporation. Initial contact should be made with the executive board, which is a matter of record in the Secretary of State's Office, so they are easily located for common interest communities. Gated apartments have separate managers. We are in support of the amendment which modifies the definition of gated community so it is clear a gated community is one with a gate with restricted access.

SENATOR NOLAN:
I am happy Parole and Probation brought this bill forward. I live in a guarded, gated community. In the seven years I lived there, we had the FBI in, a crack house and people selling and producing dope in this upper middle-class neighborhood. I have had this discussion with Lieutenant Olsen of Metro. It is common knowledge wrongdoers seek gated communities for protection. Guards and gates give them some security from law enforcement who do not regularly patrol those streets. I support what you are doing regarding the amendment.

I also live in a common interest community with an executive board. Your Department should not have to go through an executive board. I am fine with officers contacting the manager or the contracted management firm, but to have an executive board make a decision on an individual creates a concern about confidentiality. People who are on parole do have some rights. These people served their time, are being monitored and trying to set their lives straight by meeting the terms of their parole. They do not need the entire neighborhood to realize they live in the community unless they are a sex offender. We already have laws to address that situation.

I am looking forward to additional testimony. With regard to the amendment, I would like to strike executive board and leave their management, the manager or a manager for a common interest community.

SENATOR CARE:
You may find homeowners associations (HOA) that do not have property managers. They are small enough they only have a board. Depending on how a board or an HOA operates, we may want to explore language or related tort which grants immunity from invasion of privacy. An HOA may have several hundred members and this information may come out, depending on how that HOA is run. If disclosure is inadvertent in the ordinary course of business, the HOA should not have exposure if a name is divulged.

MR. MANOOKIAN:
I also have issues concerning confidentiality. If someone were to request information on an offender, we are limited to what we can give. Having to testify in front of an executive board or a homeowners association does not address what we need because their meetings include multiple people, and they are often scheduled once a month. If a parolee is released, we take him home and the homeowners association meeting was yesterday and not scheduled for

another month, we have to wait 30 days. I am not sure what is required. It may be what the homeowners association, or the executive board wants, but it does not address or answer supervision of the offender, which is what we are trying to do without making it public knowledge.

HELEN WISE (Community Association Management Executive Officers, Incorporated):
Community Association Management Executive Officers, Incorporated (CAMEO) is proposing an amendment to S.B. 33, section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (b) on lines 20-22 concerning the definition of a manager. We recommend you amend the definition of a manager of the gated community by adding the following sentence, "For the purpose of this regulation as it applies to a common interest community regulated under NRS 116, the executive board shall be the 'manager of the gated community'" (**Exhibit E**). As drafted, this bill assumes every gated community has a manager. This is not the case. Common interest communities may self-manage wherein members of the board or other volunteers carry out duties typically fulfilled by a professional community manager. In addition, the association acting through its executive board may assign responsibility for compliance with this law to other persons or entities, such as a security company or their manager. Amending the definition of a manager of the gated community as recommended would address issues arising under NRS 116 without complicating the language of the bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:
Some of the more senior members of the Committee suggested—rather than get into a rewrite of NRS 116—as a condition of parole or probation that the offender provide information or device that opens gates and either the offender pays or the association builds that into its dues. We want officers to have the access they want. Nothing was suggested about code changes and who is responsible to provide updates. It is a lot of paperwork, coordination and phone calls to perform your duties in a reasonable fashion. Has there been discussion on an offender's responsibility to provide the code?

MR. WOODS:
We could make that part of their special condition; they must provide us with a code or key and make arrangements with the manager or association. If the association refuses to allow them to do that, they would have to move.

CHAIR AMODEI:
Nobody here thinks because offenders live in gated communities they should get special status as far as official visits. That is not on the table. The question is how to get reasonable access in the manner you need. Looking at the amendments, definitions and gated versus what the other language means, we need to hire extra staff for you to handle the paperwork.

SENATOR WIENER:
Enforcing this in the way any other technical violation is handled by putting the burden on the person who wants the privilege of living in a gated community makes sense.

MR. WOODS:
After this discussion, yes, it does.

CHAIR AMODEI:
Mr. Wilkinson, you will get together with those who have proposed amendments, Mr. Woods and his colleagues from Metro, and Parole and Probation to look at an alternative that imposes an affirmative requirement upon the offender. It is not our issue if the offender has problems with the association where he or she lives. I am hesitant to embark upon changing the statute to require a lot of coordination, especially in view of your workload.

I do not know whether that puts the burden on the offender or if there is an electronic answer. There is a cost which we will look at to determine whether it is reasonable to assess or assign those costs. If Metro has some magic box that allows access to gates in their neighborhood or any other ones, we can see if it is a viable alternative. We also need to check with Washoe County.

MR. MANOOKIAN:
I have done research on the electronic device attached to Metro vehicles. It runs approximately $120 per vehicle and allows them entry into all gated communities.

CHAIR AMODEI:
How many vehicles does Parole and Probation have in Clark County?

MR. MANOOKIAN:
Over 100.

MS. SCOTT:
On behalf of The Howard Hughes Corporation, we have no problem working with anybody on this. If a parolee is a resident of a gated community, he has clickers and the ability to purchase extra clickers. He has access cards or master codes, so it is doable to provide those as a condition of probation.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We have concentrated on the issue in Clark County, but somebody needs to ensure Washoe County and the rurals are included. I assume if it is an issue to lean on technology, that technology is universal. If the technology is not available, we need a plan B that is fail-safe.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 33 and open the hearing on S.B. 36.

SENATE BILL 36: Authorizes the board of county commissioners to include longevity pay in the compensation of justices of the peace. (BDR 1-269)

WILLIAM G. ROGERS (Dayton Township Justice Court, Lyon County):
Senate Bill 36 proposes to undo a 1980s Attorney General's opinion which created controversy whether counties could or should grant longevity for justices of the peace. Various counties are all over the board in following that opinion. The overwhelming majority grant longevity despite the Attorney General's opinion because it is clearly wrong not to. Senate Bill 36 proposes longevity be included in wages for justices of the peace set by county commissioners. We are not attempting to change anything else.

In addition, on page 2, line 18 of the proposed amendment, I am asking to change "may" to "shall." Two counties do not grant longevity: White Pine County and Lyon County. Until last year, Lyon County granted longevity and then decided otherwise. County commissioners still set wages; however, we acknowledge justices of the peace who served and have been reelected should have a guaranteed increase as all other county-elected officials.

Clark County provided me with a proposed amendment (**Exhibit F**) we support. It is in conformity with NRS 245.044 which is the general statute for all county officers.

MS. SMITH-NEWBY:
Clark County provides longevity pay to justices of the peace in accordance with NRS 245.044. The only difference in our amendment and the language in the bill is the longevity time frame from four years to six years because the term of a justice of the peace was changed to six years. We would like longevity pay to change to six years starting after the first term.

SENATOR CARE:
What is the argument for longevity pay? Is it because there are counties that cannot get anybody to run or a justice will not run for reelection because they would be better off going into private practice? Do we set the salaries for district court judges? Do they receive $130,000 and the Nevada Supreme Court justices $150,000 with no longevity provision? What is your argument where in one jurisdiction you have justice court judges making different salaries?

JUDGE ROGERS:
The argument in favor is the same as the argument for other county officials. Under existing law, a county commissioner, district attorney, county assessor, sheriff or other county official receives longevity pay, except for justices of the peace. The theory is experience improves performance. The goal is to acknowledge a higher level of performance and keep people. There is a 20-percent limit, and longevity pay does not begin until after 6 years.

There are four or five of us affected. The Clark County people do not care if the words "shall" or "may" are used because they get longevity. It is those of us in Lyon and White Pine Counties who do not get longevity.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We have a request for two amendments to the bill. One changes "may" to "shall" in line 18 of page 2, and the other adds an amendment after longevity on line 18 (**Exhibit F**).

SENATOR MCGINNESS:
Are you included in the salary bill like everybody else? Does the county commission set your salary?

JUDGE ROGERS:
Under the current scheme, our salaries are set by the county commissioners.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:
Is every county different?

JUDGE ROGERS:
Some happen to be the same, but every county is set individually by county commissioners. There are even variations from court to court within a county. There is little uniformity. We are not asking to have that changed. We are leaving discretion to local county commissioners. We are requesting uniform longevity for all county officials.

SENATOR CARE:
Language in the proposed amendment on line 18 changes "shall" to "may," so that means county commissioners are mandated to provide longevity pay. They would have discretion over the amount. As to existing law for other county offices, is there discretionary or mandatory language that allows for longevity pay?

JUDGE ROGERS:
The language in existing law as it relates to other county officials in NRS 245.044 is mandatory. It is not discretionary as it relates to all other county officials who receive automatic longevity pay after four years. The proposed amendment provides mandatory longevity pay not begin until six years for justices of the peace, which is their term of office.

SENATOR WIENER:
Are district court judges included in any of those categories?

JUDGE ROGERS:
No, many district court judges cover multiple counties. Wages are paid by the state and set by the Legislature. The lower court judges have wages set and paid by counties.

SENATOR WIENER:
Municipal judges are in the cities. Do they get longevity pay?

JUDGE ROGERS:
Salaries for municipal judges are set by the city council. Most of them get longevity, but I do not want to represent that to you because I am not sure

what transpires with municipal court judges. They function under chapter 5 of NRS as opposed to chapter 4.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 36.

We will return to S.B. 32. We had a motion to amend and do pass. Senator Horsford had some concerns.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
Thank you for allowing time for me to get with Mr. Prince and to clarify. Based on his explanation, there is administrative due process prior to this happening. I am comfortable with the limited scope of kids who fall within this category, and I support the bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:
The amendment was to eliminate section 1, subsection 1, and amend subsection 2.

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

* * * * *

We have bill draft requests. The first is Bill Draft Request (BDR) 3-1 that the Committee requested last session.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 3-1: Makes various changes concerning legal representation of state agencies, officers and employees. (Later introduced as **Senate Bill 89**.)

This one relates to legal representation, requiring the Attorney General to maintain and report certain information concerning decisions regarding legal representation in tort actions involving state agencies, officers and employees revising certain provisions.

It came up in context with the Colorado River Commission of Nevada with Enron. We had a hearing on what was happening.

SENATOR CARE:
The hearing also concerned a member of the State Board of Pharmacy.

CHAIR AMODEI:
This is the bill draft generated from that.

SENATOR McGINNESS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 3-1.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

* * * * *

Voting to introduce a bill does not obligate any Committee member to support the bill, it merely gets it into the process.

The second is BDR 10-461.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 10-461: Adopts the Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act. (Later introduced as **Senate Bill 88**.)

SENATOR CARE MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 10-461.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS NOLEN AND WASHINGTON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR AMODEI:
The meeting is adjourned at 9:37 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Lora Nay,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair

DATE: _____