

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 2, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Mark E. Amodei at 9:41 a.m. on Monday, April 2, 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 Maurice E. Washington, Vice Chair
Senator Mike McGinness
Senator Dennis Nolan
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Terry Care
Senator Steven A. Horsford

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mary C. Walker, City of Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County
Graham Galloway, Nevada Trial Lawyers Association
Daniel Holler, Douglas County
Josh Hicks, General Counsel, Office of the Governor
William R. Uffelman, Nevada Bankers Association
Bruce King
Tim Crowley, The Nevada Subcontractors Association
Steve Holloway, Associated General Contractors Las Vegas Chapter
Keith L. Lee, State Contractors' Board
Don Springmeyer, Nevada Trial Lawyers Association

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 2

David F. Brown, State Contractors' Board

CHAIR AMODEI:

We call this meeting of the Senate Committee on Judiciary to order and start with Senate Bill (S.B.) 195.

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

MARY C. WALKER (City of Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County):

We have worked with the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association on an amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). Our major concern is for trail and water access facilities. This bill is modeled after the skateboard park liability laws which have been successful in delineating the government and users' responsibilities. Access to the trails is important and it is what we can provide to our citizens.

In Douglas County, access is not available through private property to recreational areas. This bill alleviates concerns by private property owners who fear liability issues if someone got hurt on their property. This bill makes it clear the liability is upon the user if they trespass and get hurt.

This bill is fair and balanced with the amendment.

GRAHAM GALLOWAY (Nevada Trial Lawyers Association):

With the changes made by Douglas County, we support this bill.

DANIEL HOLLER (Douglas County)

We concur with the amendments and request passage of the bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is there anyone else to testify on S.B. 195? We will close the hearing. What is the pleasure of the Committee?

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 195.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 3

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

SENATOR CARE:

I would like to abstain on the vote. I need more time to study the amendment, [Exhibit C](#).

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARE ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE. SENATORS NOLAN AND WASHINGTON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 542.

SENATE BILL 542: Revises provisions governing the homestead exemption.
(BDR 2-1364)

JOSH HICKS (General Counsel, Office of the Governor):

The concept of the bill is simple and raises the amount of the homestead exemption from \$350,000 to \$550,000. This concept has been in front of the Legislature for the past few sessions.

The exemption for homesteading is important and part of the Nevada Constitution in 1864. There is a quote from a 2001 Nevada Supreme Court case, *Besnlian v. Wilkinson*, 117 Nev. 519 (2001), with respect to the homestead exemption:

The purpose of the homestead law is to preserve the family home despite financial distress, insolvency or calamitous circumstances, and to strengthen family security and stability for the benefit of the family, its individual members, and the community and state in which the family resides.

The homestead exemption applies to a certain amount of equity in a home. There were exhibits handed out to the Committee which go through some numbers both in Clark County ([Exhibit D](#)) and Washoe County ([Exhibit E](#)).

[Exhibit D](#) shows Clark County homestead increases. In 2003, it went up 60 percent; 2005 saw a 75-percent increase; with an increase from \$350,000 to \$550,000, the percentage is 57 percent.

The chart shows single-family homes in Clark County; 17.1 percent are valued over \$350,000. Listed on the chart are home resale prices for average single-family homes and lastly, on page 1, is the percentage of homes homesteaded in Las Vegas, which is 53 percent. This means that over half are not covered by a homestead exemption.

If you turn to page 10 of [Exhibit D](#), there is a multiple listing service for districts, and on page 11 is an area map that breaks down home prices by district for 2006.

Looking at [Exhibit E](#) for Washoe County, the numbers are similar. It shows median sales prices for single-family homes but does not include Incline Village due to extreme property prices that would not have made this realistic. You can see between 1999 and 2006 the increase in prices for homes.

Lastly, on page 1 of [Exhibit E](#), only 32 percent of homes are homesteaded. We are on the edge of home values moving beyond the homestead exemption. These numbers are normally what homestead exemptions are based upon. In a couple of years, home values will increase and we are looking at this measure as proactive.

SENATOR CARE:

In the case you cited, do you know what the calamitous circumstances were?

MR. HICKS:

The quote was from another case, *Jackman v. Nance*, 109 Nev. 716 (1993). The particular case I cited, *Besnilian*, raised a legal question as to whether one spouse could transfer a homestead exemption without the consent of the other.

SENATOR CARE:

I have been a Senator since 1999 and the homestead exemption has been an issue. The idea is troubling that Nevada may become a haven for a judgment debtor due to calamitous circumstances. Judgment debtors are those who have committed fraud or some kind of breach of contract where a judgment was

placed on them and the case did not settle and now someone is trying to execute on the judgment.

Is it your position that everyone should be entitled to a homestead exemption equivalent to the projected price of a house regardless of the judgment against them and to record a homestead exemption?

MR. HICKS:

We do not advocate the use of homesteading for fraud. Under the bankruptcy law, there is a \$125,000 cap on the homestead exemption if it were done through fraud. The concern about people coming to Nevada to circumvent liabilities to engage in fraudulent practices will be there.

SENATOR CARE:

There is a 2003 case that says the homestead exemption does not apply if funds used to purchase a home were fraudulently obtained. There is also the case of the con man that already owns the house and does not use funds to purchase the house. He commits the act and gets a judgment but claims to be untouchable because of equity in the house. The question is, how much protection do you give?

CHAIR AMODEI:

Mr. Hicks, if the exemption is raised to the amount you are requesting, this means the equity is protected to that amount. Therefore, if you only have \$350,000 in equity and a medium priced home is worth \$400,000, you are only protected to that amount regardless if your valuables inside are worth more. Is this correct?

MR. HICKS:

Yes.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Do we have any data about the homeowners in Clark County who are using homesteading for fraudulent means? Are you aware of anything like this?

MR. HICKS:

I am not aware of any or how it could be tracked other than through court cases. In order to have homesteading, you file with the recorder's office.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 6

CHAIR AMODEI:

In S.B. 542, we are simply changing the money amount from \$350,000 to \$550,000 and all prior policies related to homesteading will not change. Is that correct?

MR. HICKS:

That is correct. Only the dollar amount is changing.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 542. I would like Legal Counsel to see if there is available data on the misuse of the homestead exemption to shelter assets in its existing amounts and structure.

WILLIAM R. UFFELMAN (Nevada Bankers Association):

If an individual has declared the homestead exemption and is seeking bank loans, you net out the homestead exemption from the assets of an individual. In reality, their assets are reduced by the amount of the homestead exemption. There is a financial downside to a person who has taken a homestead exemption.

CHAIR AMODEI:

When I get financing from a bank, is it routine to waive the homestead exemption so that the deed of trust goes in front of it?

MR. UFFELMAN:

If you look through the exclusions, you may have waived it; however you have the purchase money lien along with additional liens. If you go into a bank for a loan and have the homestead exemption against the house, your net worth is substantially less than what you think.

CHAIR AMODEI:

If there are no further questions or testimony, we will close the hearing on S.B. 542 and open the hearing on S.B. 553.

SENATE BILL 553: Makes various changes to provisions relating to construction. (BDR 3-960)

BRUCE KING:

I sit on the Nevada Subcontractors Association Board and I am not here to represent them. Chapter 40 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) regarding construction defects has been an ongoing issue. The 73rd Legislative Session passed legislation for the right to repair. With the legislation passed, we did not foresee the inability to get out of a lawsuit once a repair was made.

When we left in 2003, we assumed that when a homeowner sent a chapter 40 notice, we would make the repairs and that would be the end of it. We were wrong. Instead, we get a 20-or-more page document prepared by expert witnesses with a cover letter written by the law firm representing the homeowner.

The notice comes and the repairs are made but still we are in the process of making monetary settlements. The process has broken down and has made it a poor business decision to make a repair. If I make the repair, I am still looking at a lawsuit or I am on the hook for ten years in a warranty for the repairs.

SENATOR CARE:

An employee from my former law firm was involved in employment matters for a subcontractor and was slowly sucked into these matters. I need to know how you get third-party defendants. Why are improper parties named in these lawsuits? If there is no basis in naming someone as a defendant, how are they getting involved and what is the recourse?

MR. KING:

I am not clear on the legalities. These broad-based contracts that were signed in the past should not hold water. I should not be responsible for work I did not do. Attorneys are not willing to take these cases to the full legal process. Many of us, although named improperly, would rather settle than fight. We have never tested the law in Nevada, but who wants to run the risk? In the past several years, we have been able to abolish some of those broad-based contract terms.

We are proud of what we do. If the homeowner cannot get things fixed through normal channels, the legislation established the State Contractors' Board to provide public confidence in our industry. This bill will help fix issues and narrow the broad-based claims and eliminate people who do not belong in the process.

TIM CROWLEY (The Nevada Subcontractors Association):

We were able to submit some amendments ([Exhibit F](#)). Section 2 defines the Nevada Residential Construction Commission (NRCC). It is a new commission and will be housed within the State Contractors' Board and is designed to inspect and certify construction defects.

Section 3 clarifies that the NRCC will only involve itself with construction defects.

Section 4 specifies when the NRCC process will begin and does not replace the existing chapter 40 process. If the homeowner goes through the chapter 40 process and is satisfied, section 4 of the bill will not be triggered. However, if there is a dispute, you have this avenue to get the home repaired.

The first amendment in [Exhibit F](#) for section 4 included languages specifically stating an action or lawsuit cannot be filed until the inspector has had an opportunity to inspect and file a report.

Section 5 establishes a time line for this process to be completed. The homeowner has 30 days to file a complaint with the NRCC after a contractor elects not to fix a problem, there is no response from the contractor or within a year after a defect has been repaired and the homeowner is still not satisfied.

Section 7 states that if the case goes to court, the recommendations of the third-party inspector create a rebuttable presumption of the existence or nonexistence of a construction defect.

Section 8 states the new commission will maintain a list of available third-party inspectors. It gives the qualification of inspectors and requires them to go through continued education and training.

Section 9 specifies that a person is appointed to the case involving nonstructural defects within 15 days of receiving the claim and issues a report within 15 days.

Subsection 2 of section 10 was drafted incorrectly and we have submitted an amendment, [Exhibit F](#).

Section 11 establishes an appeal process. If you go through the inspection and get a report where either the contractor or homeowner is not satisfied with the report, an appeal can be filed within 15 days of receiving the report. There is a three-member panel of inspectors and it will issue its findings within 30 days. Both sections 10 and 11 can be used when filing a claim with the insurance provider and are the backbone of the bill.

There has to be a process where the contractor can fix the problem. We want to be able to fix issues that are legitimately defective and make it a quality home. The remainder of the bill deals with restructuring of the State Contractors' Board.

SENATOR CARE:

In section 3, page 3, line 4 it says "built by the person." Can it be an entity other than a person?

MR. CROWLEY:

Yes.

SENATOR CARE:

If the homeowner gets someone to do the initial report and does not like it, he does not have to disclose that report. He can get another opinion, is this correct?

MR. CROWLEY:

He can, but the bill provides that all privately conducted reports must be disclosed if you trigger the NRCC.

SENATOR CARE:

It says if he does not disclose one, he cannot use it later. If he gets one he does not like, he is under no duty to disclose it unless there is a trial requesting a discovery. But for purposes of the initial proceedings, he does not have to disclose this information.

MR. KING:

That is correct.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 10

SENATOR CARE:
Are you comfortable with this?

MR. KING:
Yes.

SENATOR CARE:
The recommendation by the third-party inspector is not going to be based upon a hearing, is this correct? The inspection is done and a recommendation is made.

MR. KING:
Yes.

SENATOR CARE:
In section 7, subsection 2, "A recommendation by a third-party inspector or a ruling by a review panel is not admissible." What about the initial reports? If the inspector asked the homeowner questions, can he give testimony to what the homeowner said?

MR. CROWLEY:
We have not thought that through.

SENATOR CARE:
There is nothing that prohibits the admissibility other than the recommendation.

CHAIR AMODEI:
We are setting up a sub-board within the State Contractors' Board to deal with these issues.

MR. CROWLEY:
That is correct.

CHAIR AMODEI:
I have been sensitive to the State Contractors' Board and as I review the bill, there are a few things relative to the construction-defect issue. There is a bill already out.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 11

MR. CROWLEY:
It is S.B. 181.

SENATE BILL 181: Revises provisions governing certain construction contracts.
(BDR 54-270)

CHAIR AMODEI:
How does this bill compare to S.B. 553?

MR. CROWLEY:
They both have different chapters. Senate Bill 181 deals with NRS 624 which regulates how contracts are provided between the owner, the prime contractor, the contractor and the subcontractor. This bill strives to outlaw contracts that force the subcontractor to indemnify the owner against all negligence. It makes everyone in the project responsible for only their work.

CHAIR AMODEI:
The jurisdiction over the State Contractors' Board as contained in this bill does not look extensive. Do you have any thoughts on rereferral to the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor for the Board sections of this bill?

MR. CROWLEY:
I know there is interest from the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor on reviewing the restructuring provisions of this bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:
Could you briefly pinpoint the Board's issues?

MR. CROWLEY:
Sections 1 through 11 provide a new entity within the State Contractors' Board that creates a third-party inspection process that weeds out frivolous lawsuits and deals solely with legitimate claims to be rectified.

SENATOR CARE:
Both the NRCC—the Construction Commission—and the Contractor Licensing Commission currently make up the State Contractors' Board, is this correct?

MR. CROWLEY:
That is correct.

SENATOR CARE:
Two members of the Construction Commission are also members of the Licensing Commission, is this correct?

MR. CROWLEY:
That is correct, but it is complex.

SENATOR CARE:
There is a provision in section 31, subsection 4, that mentions the Construction Commission can submit a recommendation to the Licensing Commission to take disciplinary action against the contractor or subcontractor.

It seems to me there are going to be members on the Construction Commission wearing two hats. At one point, they are resolving a claim and could use their position on the Construction Commission to say it was investigated, then submit the information to the Contractors' Board and be a member of that board. This is not independent of the Licensing Commission.

MR. KING:
This is correct. It is broadly written so the new entity can manage it to some extent. The Nevada Construction Authority has nine members with five sitting on the Construction Commission. There are seven members on the Licensing Commission. There may be members of one board sitting on other boards, but I do not anticipate this being a problem.

SENATOR CARE:
What I am concerned with is the independence of the Licensing Commission. At what point of the proceedings can you submit a complaint to the Licensing Commission? If later there is litigation and the subcontractor is absolved, there still could be an ongoing investigation by the Licensing Commission with a different conclusion. Is this correct?

MR. CROWLEY:

That is correct. I would like to expand on Mr. King's answer. The idea behind restructuring the State Contractors' Board is to have distinct commissions under the Construction Authority who have different missions.

The Licensing Commission holds contractors' licenses and has the ability to revoke licenses when things go poorly. The Residential Construction Commission has the sole duty of doing third-party inspections. We felt that it was important the Residential Construction Commission have the ability to issue a report to the Licensing Commission with issues that may arise. If at the end of this process you find a contractor is not doing repairs, a report is generated citing legitimate defects and contractors who are not participating in the process. There are really two objectives of this bill; we want to make sure homeowners get their homes back in order and we want the contractor and the construction industry to have few flaws. The Licensing Commission needs to have the ability to revoke licenses or punish in other ways.

What is the timing of that process and at what point does the Residential Commission send the report to the Licensing Commission? We have not thought through that issue.

SENATOR CARE:

It would be possible for a subcontractor to get a recommendation saying there is no defect, although the subcontractor does not play by the rules.

MR. CROWLEY:

That is fair to say. If there is no defect found at the end of this process but the homeowner feels there is something wrong, they have recourse and can still litigate.

SENATOR CARE:

As I understood your answer, the Licensing Commission is concerned whether the subcontractor is following the rules. In other words, not following the rules may not have caused the defect.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Mr. Chair, on sections dealing with restructuring of the State Contractors' Board which are usually dealt with in the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor, how would you like us to treat questions on this?

Senator Maggie Carlton is more adept about board and board structure.

CHAIR AMODEI:

That is a good question, and as I look through S.B. 553, for the most part, it is a board bill. I would like to make a move on the Senate Floor that this bill be rereferred to the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor. What are our choices on this, Mr. Wilkinson?

BRAD WILKINSON (Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel):

Mr. Chair, you could rerefer without recommendation.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Or, the Committee could recommend a do pass and rerefer?

MR. WILKINSON:

Yes.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I am not comfortable with taking action with a do pass or amend and do pass. There is much in here that is policy-related with major implications and relates to some of my other questions. What is the need for this type of major reform of the State Contractors' Board? Where are the problems? Has the State Contractors' Board been advised of this bill and what is their position as it relates to the creation of these layers under their control?

MR. CROWLEY:

A brief history of how this bill came about may be helpful. We envisioned this new entity to be a stand-alone commission. We realized there would be benefit by incorporating it within the State Contractors' Board and there would be a way to discipline contractors.

The second piece to this bill is the fee structure and building it into an existing board is worthwhile to pursue. Our goal is not changing the State Contractors' Board but to create a third-party entity that does construction-defect inspections. Their ability to assess fees on contractors, manage fees to new home construction and regulate contractors made it perfect.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

With this having a fee, what is the position of the Governor?

MR. CROWLEY:

Two of the fees are paid for by the industry; a fee paid for by the resident or homeowner to conduct the inspection costs \$150.00 an inspection. The \$150.00 will be reimbursed by the contractor if fault lies with the contractor. The inspection fee has not passed the guidelines established by the Governor.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Under section 10, subsection 5 on page 7, it mentions the contractor, subcontractor, supplier or design professional may be present at an inspection; what about the homeowner?

MR. CROWLEY:

It is our intent that the homeowner be present at the inspection and we can clarify this in the bill.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is it correct to say this bill came about because there are people using the existing statute to exercise the right to repair and repair successfully, but are still required to participate in litigation?

MR. KING:

Our industry needs help. In the first 11 months of 2006, I received 15 chapter 40 requests. Since December of 2006 until present, I have received 41 new chapter 40 requests. I am still working on the old policies; insurance has gone up substantially and each claim is \$25,000 to \$50,000 apiece. We need to get laws on the books to help focus on problem contractors.

SENATOR CARE:

Sections 2 through 11 establish the creation of a construction-defect screening panel. I understand some of this bill needs to go before the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor, but is there any way to dive into these sections and take a vote?

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 16

CHAIR AMODEI:

Mr. Wilkinson, can this Committee vote on this to be a joint referral and take it to the Senate Floor and advise them of what was done and have both Committees work on it at the same time?

MR. WILKINSON:

Yes.

SENATOR CARE:

In whatever form this is going to be sent to the Senate Floor and rereferred to the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor, it should be done with a recommendation of yes or no on sections 2 through 11 from this Committee. I do not know if it can be done.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Whatever we do, the Committees have until the deadline of April 13. I have spoken with Senator Townsend about this informally. I will talk to him again and see if we can work something out in a timely manner to process the bill.

MR. CROWLEY:

We recognize this is a complicated bill with complex components and appreciate any decision you make.

CHAIR AMODEI:

If there is anyone else left to testify on S.B. 553 you should be focusing on sections 2 through 11.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Regarding the issue of a third-party inspector, can you explain how that works and specifically how we ensure there is no conflict of interest?

MR. CROWLEY:

A lot of thought went into that issue and there are ways to structure the Residential Construction Commission to have in-house inspectors or third-party inspectors. The best way to do an unbiased inspection is to use third-party inspectors. The bill has a provision that limits inspections to 10 percent of their annual income. These inspectors cannot make this a full-time business.

There is also a waiver provision in the bill. The homeowner and the contractor have an opportunity to excuse that person from the process; it is a random selection of inspectors.

SENATOR CARE:

There is nothing in here about fair bidding. Your intent will be to resolve the language in order to lessen litigation.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is there anyone else to testify on S.B. 553?

STEVE HOLLOWAY (Association General Contractors Las Vegas Chapter):

I would like to go on record as supporting this bill, particularly the screening panel. We would much rather see chapter 40 eliminated completely.

KEITH L. LEE (State Contractors' Board):

We are here in opposition to S.B. 553. Ms. Margi A. Grein, Executive Officer of the State Contractors' Board, is in the process of preparing fiscal notes for this bill and that will be forwarded to the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

The Contractors' Board wants to be part of the solution, but we have to identify what the problem is in order to find the solution. I am not sure we have done this.

My understanding is that page 3 of the bill, lines 37 through 40, will remain the same. This means we have to follow chapter 40 before S.B. 553 can be used. What we are doing now is not working; how is placing another level of bureaucracy making the process better?

The genesis for a portion of the defects commission comes from Texas. In 2003, Texas adopted the Texas Residential Construction Commission and to my understanding there are 14 bills pending in the Texas legislature with no resolutions, seeking to modify or do away with their Commission.

To answer Senator Horsford's question, the State Contractors' Board has gone on record to oppose this bill.

I will turn the balance of my time over to David F. Brown, legal counsel for the State Contractors' Board, who can walk you through some of the issues we have with sections 1 through 11. Sections 12 through 71 will be considered in the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We have heard testimony on existing issues and the problems. The problem is contractors are fixing defects but getting no relief from the lawsuits and end up paying nuisance value to get out of lawsuits. Also, the insurance has gone up from \$2,500 to \$25,000 and more. The State Contractors' Board has primary jurisdiction in this area. Mr. Lee, to say you are not sure what the problem is, is not a good start. We can assume there is a problem because there is a bill and we are all aware of the insurance climate.

My question is, does the State Contractors' Board have any solution to the issues raised by the subcontractors?

MR. LEE:

There are problems and we have not identified what those problems are. I have heard that insurance companies are directing contractors not to exercise the right to repair as it will have some adverse impact in the future. I am not suggesting there is not a role for the State Contractors' Board or an independent agency. Senator Care raised concerns about due process between switching hats in the State Contractors' Board.

We need to identify if the right to repair is not working and if so, why is it not working. Mr. Crowley pointed to a bill that may go a long way in solving the problem of getting the subcontractor, who should not have been involved, out of the process and if a settlement has been made that should be the end.

I do not have an answer as to what role, if any, the State Contractors' Board should play or that of any other independent agency. Before we do anything, we need to identify the problems.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 19

CHAIR AMODEI:

It is late in the session. We are recessing the hearing on S.B. 553 and will reschedule. I want someone on the Board to answer these questions: Do you think there is a problem? What is the problem? What are the potential ideas? We will reschedule this for tomorrow's meeting.

DON SPRINGMEYER (Nevada Trial Lawyers Association):
I am here on S.B. 553.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is it possible you can testify tomorrow?

MR. SPRINGMEYER:

Either I or someone else will accommodate the needs of the Committee.

CHAIR AMODEI:

I apologize for you not testifying in the Grant Sawyer State Office Building.

MR. LEE:

Is it possible that Mr. Brown can testify from Las Vegas tomorrow on S.B. 553?

CHAIR AMODEI:

Yes.

DAVID F. BROWN (State Contractors' Board):

For the record, I will be back in Carson City tomorrow.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 2, 2007
Page 20

CHAIR AMODEI:

If there is nothing else to come before the Committee, we are adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gale Maynard,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair

DATE: _____