

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-fifth Session  
May 2, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Terry Care at 8:09 a.m. on Saturday, May 2, 2009, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 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 Terry Care, Chair  
Senator Valerie Wiener, Vice Chair  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Allison Copening  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Maurice E. Washington  
Senator Mark E. Amodei

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Assembly District No. 21

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Linda J. Eissmann, Committee Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Kathleen Swain, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Garrett Gordon, Olympia Group  
Judy Stokey, Director, Governmental Affairs, NV Energy  
George Flint, Wedding Chapels

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 2

CHAIR CARE:

We have our work session documents ([Exhibit C](#), original is on file in the Research Library). We will address Assembly Bill (A.B.) 233, [Exhibit C](#), page 17. I have a copy of a letter to Senator Wiener and others from Randy Brown, [Exhibit C](#), page 19. Mr. Brown testified on the bill. Senator Wiener raised this issue on personal identifying information.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 233 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes concerning scrap metal. (BDR 54-53)

SENATOR WIENER:

This issue is important to those who have been at the table as well as to the Committee. I provided new information. I would appreciate moving the bill to another work session so my colleagues will have ample opportunity to review the information so they are comfortable with the offerings. I encourage my colleagues to review the material I had Ms. Eissmann put into the work session document. If you have any concerns, please share them with me. I will work with the interested parties.

CHAIR CARE:

We will move A.B. 233 to the first work session next week, which will tentatively be Tuesday. We will address A.B. 129, [Exhibit C](#), page 1.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 129 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing common-interest communities. (BDR 10-34)

MS. EISSMANN:

Assembly Bill 129 was a common-interest community bill we heard last week. Angela Rock and Garrett Gordon provided an amendment during that hearing. They have since provided a revised amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 6. The Committee also asked staff to provide a comparison of a certain section regarding utility vehicles and a couple of other sections from A.B. 129 to Senate Bill (S.B.) 183 that this Committee heard earlier this Session. Mr. Wilkinson put that together. It is in the work session document, [Exhibit C](#), page 3.

**SENATE BILL 183 (1st Reprint)**: Revises various provisions governing common-interest communities. (BDR 10-70)

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 3

CHAIR CARE:

Regarding section 1 of A.B. 129, in section 4 of S.B. 183, is S.B. 183 still in first reprint in the Assembly?

Ms. EISSMANN:  
Yes.

CHAIR CARE:

Was there testimony that, while the language is in S.B. 183, it was going to be further addressed, or someone had decided A.B. 129 would be the vehicle for that language? Let the record reflect that Garrett Gordon is nodding in the affirmative.

There is no reason to discuss deleting section 1 of A.B. 129, even though that remains in section 4 of S.B. 183. We have the proposed amendment received yesterday from Ms. Stokey and Ms. Gallo. Please explain where we are on the amendment.

GARRETT GORDON (Olympia Group):

Olympia Group supports the amendment sponsored by NV Energy and Southwest Gas Corporation, [Exhibit C](#), page 8. Numbers 1 and 2 in the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 8, discuss the issue of removing the ability for these vehicles to park in the front of a common-interest community unit. The utility companies do not want to be discriminated against. When a unit owner may park in the community, his truck may be parked as well. Our issue was, in some of Olympia Group's communities, there is no parking in front of the unit for anyone. That would apply to the trucks. If parking was allowed in front of the unit, the trucks would be allowed to park in front of the unit.

Number 3 in the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 8, regarding emergency, it is important to clarify that public utilities' service vehicles are there for emergency response purposes. Numbers 4 and 5 in the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 8, relate to removing the express right to park in front of the unit.

Number 6 of the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 8 is an important point for Olympia Group. It says an association could have a mechanism to enforce whether these utility vehicles are emergency vehicles. This language would give them the right to send a letter to the utility company to confirm these utility vehicles are for emergencies.

Numbers 7, 8 and 9 of the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 9, come directly from Southwest Gas Corporation and NV Energy.

JUDY STOKEY (Director, Governmental Affairs, NV Energy):

In numbers 7, 8 and 9 of the amendment, we removed the definition of commercial motor vehicle because that is not addressed here. Emergency service vehicles are addressed.

CHAIR CARE:

We saw a photograph of a vehicle that was not quite 20,000 pounds. There would be vehicles smaller than this, correct? Is it possible for the vehicle to be parked inside the garage as opposed to the driveway?

MR. GORDON:

You are saying in the event parking is not required on the driveway, but inside the garage, that would apply also to these utility service vehicles?

CHAIR CARE:

Yes. They could only be parked outside the garage if they could not fit in the garage, the rules and regulations notwithstanding.

MR. GORDON:

Olympia Group would support that.

CHAIR CARE:

Does the homeowners' association (HOA) maintain driveways, as opposed to the unit owner? Do we need language that says nothing herein shall be construed to mean the unit owner is relieved of any duty to maintain the driveway? There was testimony that driveways are different from streets—what a driveway can withstand as opposed to a street.

MR. GORDON:

In Southern Highlands, the driveway is part of the home and part of the parcel. It is not a common element or area. That issue may be already addressed.

CHAIR CARE:

In that case, the unit owner already has a duty to maintain that driveway.

MR. GORDON:  
Correct.

CHAIR CARE:

If an association maintains the driveway, and this becomes law, I want to make sure we do not create a situation where the unit owner is relieved of any responsibility for damage to the driveway because of the service vehicle parked in the driveway.

SENATOR COPENING:

There may be situations where a community association owns a common area, such as a condominium. I do not know if that is addressed in this bill, if this just deals with single-family units or if we are talking about multifamily units as well.

CHAIR CARE:

We are talking about multifamily units as well.

SENATOR COPENING:

You were concerned about damage that might be incurred on a driveway. In a single-family unit, the homeowner is responsible for it. But in multifamily units, the responsibility would fall to a community association. I am throwing that out if you want to interject something to address whether the homeowner is responsible for any damages incurred.

CHAIR CARE:

Let me throw out a concept amendment. First of all, if the unit owner owns the driveway, the rules and regulations will mandate the driveway be kept up. If the association has the duty to maintain the driveway, maybe we need some language. There may be situations where the association maintains the driveway and it feels the driveway is damaged because the owner has parked his emergency response vehicle on the driveway. The owner may say he does not have to worry about it because there is a statute saying he can do that. Perhaps we can consider a concept amendment. Where the association maintains the driveway, it has recourse against the unit owner if there is damage to the driveway in the eyes of the HOA caused by the long-term parking of a heavy vehicle.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 6

BRADLEY A. WILKINSON (Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel):

Existing law already addresses that issue. If someone damages a common area, the person is already required to reimburse the association, generally speaking. Almost all the driveways are owned by the unit owner, although there may be some circumstances where it is otherwise.

CHAIR CARE:

We will not mess with section 1, even though that remains in S.B. 183. We have the amendment we just heard addressed, [Exhibit C](#), page 8. I wanted to add some language saying you may park in the driveway, but only if the vehicle cannot go inside the garage. It is true that people buy into associations thinking they are not going to see vehicles like this on the street or in the driveway.

SENATOR AMODEI:

My recollection from testimony was this was not like a company car. This is an on-call situation. The context was that an employee is not driving this vehicle and parking at home every day. There are people who store items in their garage, and do not park vehicles in their garage. We would be telling them they cannot store items in their garage because during the time they are on call, they have to put the service vehicle in their garage.

I like the language in the amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 8, in section 6, indicating the association may request whatever confirmation they want rather than the individual companies determining what each individual association may want.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 129 WITH THE AMENDMENT CONTAINED IN [EXHIBIT C](#), PAGE 8.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

CHAIR CARE:

We will address A.B. 204, [Exhibit C](#), page 10.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 204 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to common-interest communities. (BDR 10-920)

MS. EISSMANN:

At the hearing, Assemblywoman Spiegel proposed an amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 13. Since the hearing, Assemblywoman Spiegel provided a letter to this Committee, [Exhibit C](#), page 11. The letter relates to testimony provided by Bill Uffelman, who had an amendment to delete section 2 of the bill, [Exhibit C](#), page 16. Sandra Duncan from Dayton withdrew her amendment in favor of Assemblywoman Spiegel's amendment. Assemblywoman Spiegel provided an article today regarding foreclosures ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR CARE:

I was copied on correspondence regarding the effective date of this bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ELLEN B. SPIEGEL (Assembly District No. 21):

I was not sure if the proponent of the proposed amendment relating to the effective date was going to present it or if they wanted me to present it. Either way, I am fine with their proposed amendment, which is changing the effective date to January 1, 2010.

CHAIR CARE:

That would be January 1, 2010, as opposed to October 1.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

That would be the effective date just for section 1 of the bill.

SENATOR AMODEI:

We have a few bills dealing with foreclosure. I support the bill. Is there an objection to rolling it to the next work session? I have a question on how this fits with some of the other foreclosure bills. We can take a global approach to make sure we are consistent between what happens in a common-interest community for past-due fees or assessments and what we are doing on the foreclosure front for single-family dwellings. We need to make sure we have not created something that provides for different treatment in an association versus single-family dwellings out of an association.

CHAIR CARE:

We should get a matrix listing all the Senate bills we have had on common-interest communities and all the Assembly bills we have had, the ones we have heard testimony on and the ones we have yet to hear testimony on.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 8

MS. EISSMANN:

I can provide the Committee with floor statements that summarize the bills.

SENATOR AMODEI:

On the record, for Assemblywoman Spiegel, I support A.B. 204.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL:

Assembly Bill 204 only relates to fees that are due to associations by people who live in common-interest communities. People who do not live in common-interest communities by definition would not be part of an association and would not have assessments due to a common-interest community association.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I want to make sure that, to the extent this leads to someone potentially losing their home, we have thought about that, and where it is different than people out of an association, because it should be.

CHAIR CARE:

We will address A.B. 262, [Exhibit C](#), page 22.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 262 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes concerning the issuance of marriage licenses. (BDR 11-961)

MS. EISSMANN:

Nothing I know of has changed since the hearing. We have two written amendments. One was from Margaret Flint, [Exhibit C](#), page 26. The other one was from Shirley Parraguirre, [Exhibit C](#), page 28. I also added some comments Mr. Glover mentioned during the hearing, [Exhibit C](#), page 23. He said if the bill were to move, he had some suggestions regarding the requirement of regulations in counties that choose to participate, as well as tying licensing agents to the chapel where they are employed.

CHAIR CARE:

The Committee members received a letter from Amy Harvey, Washoe County Clerk, whose name was mentioned during the hearing. Someone from her office testified. I am not going to make the letter part of the record.



SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Because this is a pilot program implemented for two years and isolated in Washoe County, there was a tentative agreement, so Ms. Parraguirre's comments for Clark County, even though they have some relevance, are not applicable to this bill because it does not affect Clark County. The suggestions Mr. Glover made regarding clarifying the regulations for the counties that choose to participate sound good, but the bill is only applicable to Washoe County or counties less than 400,000. That is a good recommendation. Making sure the licensing agents of the chapel are employed by the chapel, is a good recommendation. The measure is worth a try. I would amend and do pass with Mr. Glover's two recommendations that it only applies to the counties that wish to participate and that the licensing agents must be employed by the chapel.

CHAIR CARE:

Does your amendment ponder the amendments proposed by Ms. Parraguirre? You are correct. The bill, at least the first seven sections, would not apply to Clark County, but other portions of it would. My recollection is that Ms. Parraguirre found a statute that is technically incorrect.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Is that the one dealing with the time?

CHAIR CARE:

Yes.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

In that case, we should make that technical correction.

CHAIR CARE:

Just that one? We would also have conflicting amendments about rejoining in marriage. There is the issue of whether you have to present any documentation to do that.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

I am not sure what she meant by rejoining in a marriage only under certain circumstances.

MS. EISSMANN:

I want to clarify that Ms. Flint, who is the sponsor of the bill, also had her own amendment, which dealt with rejoining in marriage and the information that could be unknown in the application. Both Ms. Flint and Ms. Parraguirre addressed those issues, although they addressed them differently. I am not clear if Senator Washington is contemplating Ms. Flint's amendment since it is her bill.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:  
Yes, I am.

CHAIR CARE:

The motion is amend and do pass, the amendment being the amendments offered by Ms. Flint and Mr. Glover and the amendment offered by Ms. Parraguirre confined only to the issue of the appropriate time.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:  
That is correct.

SENATOR WASHINGTON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 262, WITH THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MS. FLINT AND MR. GLOVER, AND THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PARRAGUIRRE CONFINED TO THE ISSUE OF THE APPROPRIATE TIME.

SENATOR AMODEI:

If this bill goes, can it be brought back even though the Committee has acted on it so we can see it before it goes to the floor?

MS. EISSMANN:

We could do a mock-up and hold this to another work session.

SENATOR WIENER:

This had a significant amount of attention from the parties directly involved. There are some differing opinions about what to include. I would like to see a mock-up. Ms. Parraguirre's concerns regarding rejoining in marriage have merit when there may not be a certificate available, so it would create documentation, not create duplicate documentation. These are vital statistics, and there are certain types of information that need to be included. There is a concern about

who should be handling vital statistics used by the State. They are important documents to protect.

CHAIR CARE:

We have a motion, with no second and two requests for a mock-up to be used at the next work session. Senator Washington, do you want me to ask for a second or are you agreeable to withdrawing the motion?

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Senator Amodei's request was to have the amendments drafted in the bill and bring it back to the Committee. I do not have a problem with that to make sure we answer the concerns of Senator Amodei and Senator Wiener. Before it hits the floor, let us make the motion, get the second and bring it back to the Committee.

SENATOR AMODEI SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

We should give this a shot. I hate to alienate the county clerks in the District I represent. I had an e-mail from a Humboldt County Commissioner saying they have been doing this for a long time, and it seems to work. It might work better in smaller counties than in larger ones. I agree with Senator Wiener that these are vital statistics. Mr. Glover's amendments and Ms. Parraguirre's amendments would help regarding the rejoining of marriages. They have certain circumstances and clarify that only social security numbers and information on the parents may be left unanswered. I will be opposing the motion.

CHAIR CARE:

If the motion fails, the bill is still alive. This will not indefinitely postpone the bill.

SENATOR PARKS:

I support this. Many concerns could be alleviated if the process done outside the clerk's office created a feed off the computer to provide a record to the clerk's office so they have tracking. If there was a system of assigning license numbers that could be audited, it would allay the fears of the county clerks.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 12

THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS CARE, COPENING, MCGINNESS AND WIENER VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CARE:

We will put this back on work session for Tuesday. We will have the mock-up so we can decipher the conflicting passages in the proposed amendments.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

What are we mocking up?

CHAIR CARE:

We have Committee members who want to compare the language in mock-up form with what has been offered.

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 262, WITH AMENDMENTS FROM MS. PARRAGUIRRE AND MR. GLOVER.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR CARE:

That takes out Ms. Flint's proposed amendments? We are talking about the amendments from Clark County and the amendments from Mr. Glover.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Her amendments are not very different from Ms. Parraguirre's.

SENATOR WIENER:

I am seconding the motion because those were the things I wanted to see, though I still prefer to see the language. Senator Parks just asked about tying in the data on the fees to the clerks' offices. Is that something he wants to include as well? If that is additional language, I will withdraw my second.

SENATOR PARKS:

That could be done absent statutory requirement. I am suggesting it would allay the concerns of many county clerks.

SENATOR WIENER:  
I will sustain my second.

GEORGE FLINT (Wedding Chapels):  
The procedure suggested by the Washoe County Clerk is to tie directly into their computer. They will have all the information automatically, sensitive and otherwise. The numbering will be consecutive with the numbers being issued at the courthouse. It will be tied into the courthouse with full technology just as if we were issuing it in the courthouse.

SENATOR AMODEI:  
The Flint amendment versus the Parraguirre amendment—I am not sure there is a lot of head to head in there. I am told they are similar. To the extent there is not a conflict, or the things that do not conflict with Ms. Parraguirre's amendment or the other stuff, it appears to be unopposed. Why would we not include those?

CHAIR CARE:  
The conflict is what documentation you must have if you rejoin in marriage. Both were agreeable on not supplying the social security number. There was some slight disagreement between the two beyond that.

MR. WILKINSON:  
They are rather similar, but they conflict in the language they use as to when people can be rejoined in marriage.

SENATOR AMODEI:  
To that extent, I have no problem deferring to the Parraguirre language. To the extent there are suggestions in the amendment that are not adverse to the other suggestions, why would they not be included in the amendment?

CHAIR CARE:  
They are similar, but there is slight conflicting language.

SENATOR AMODEI:  
For purposes of the mock-up, you would then defer to the Parraguirre language in the conflict situations.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 14

MR. WILKINSON:

They are similar, but they do directly conflict in the language. You would have to choose one or the other. I am not sure to what extent there is disagreement between the parties.

SENATOR WIENER:

I hear language from my colleague about mock-up. May I ask the maker of the motion about the intent? Is this to bring it back as a mock-up or is this to move it?

MS. EISSMANN:

Ms. Flint is mouthing from the audience that either amendment is okay with her. Perhaps if she is okay with Ms. Parraguirre's amendment, that may solve the problem.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARE ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CARE:

We will address A.B. 389, [Exhibit C](#), page 31. Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell brought this bill forward.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 389 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing the protection of personal identifying information. (BDR 52-772)

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 389.

SENATOR AMODEI SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR CARE:

When the State obtains an injunction, and the defendant violates the injunction order, he has committed a crime—a gross misdemeanor. Is that found elsewhere in statute?

MR. WILKINSON:

Yes. There are several sections of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* identical to that.

CHAIR CARE:

This means if this is being practiced now by a business rather than a person, there is nothing law enforcement or the Attorney General can do until the court issues an injunction. You cannot go into a store and say you are going to cite them. The State would have to file a petition for an injunction, get it issued and then take it to the business. Is that accurate?

MR. WILKINSON:

That is accurate.

CHAIR CARE:

So everyone understands, there will be a delay.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CARE:

We will address A.B. 432, [Exhibit C](#), page 35. We had amendments from Assemblywoman Debbie Smith for funding compensation for victims of crime to instead be credited to the Fund for Aid for Victims of Domestic Violence, [Exhibit C](#), page 36. Senator Washington requested an audit.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 432 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing alcoholic beverage awareness programs. (BDR 32-526)

MS. EISSMANN:

Senator Washington met with Assemblywoman Smith. The amendment from that meeting was to require an audit by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). In testimony, Assemblywoman Smith indicated fines have been charged, but it is unclear where the money has gone. Senator Washington's amendment would require an LCB audit to find that out. Assemblywoman Smith indicated she is supportive of that amendment. Her only concern is that she does not want it to generate a fiscal note. I contacted Paul Townsend at LCB audit and inquired if that would result in a fiscal note. He answered no. They would be able to handle the audit this interim with the resources they have. The only difference is they take such audits in legislation first, so this would delay one of their regularly scheduled audits.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 16

CHAIR CARE:

We had another amendment offered by Mr. Krueger, [Exhibit C](#), page 37. The passage would be October 1 because the Convenience Store Association would need time to prepare for this.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 432 WITH THE THREE AMENDMENTS IN THE WORK SESSION DOCUMENT REGARDING WHERE THE FINES GO, THE AUDIT AND MR. KRUEGER'S 90-DAY DELAY IN THE EFFECTIVE DATE.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CARE:

We will address A.B. 473, [Exhibit C](#), page 38.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 473**: Revises provisions relating to medical and dental services for prisoners. (BDR 16-1128)

Ms. EISSMANN:

This was on work session earlier in the week, and nothing has changed since then. The Committee wanted an opportunity to look over the estimated financial information Mr. Skolnik provided, [Exhibit C](#), pages 41 through 44, and testified to during the first work session. Also in play is the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada's amendment, [Exhibit C](#), page 39, requiring adoption of standards that are in compliance with the National Commission on Correctional Health Care.

CHAIR CARE:

It comes down to Director Skolnik saying the legislation is not needed as opposed to the proponents of the bill thinking it is needed. We have a fiscal note from Director Skolnik. This was done in some haste because I had asked for it.

Ms. EISSMANN:

I would clarify for the record it is not an official fiscal note. It is an estimate.



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 17

SENATOR COPENING:

To clarify, the fiscal note Mr. Skolnik brought was if we were to adopt Ms. Rowland's recommendation. Is that correct?

MR. WILKINSON:

Yes, that is correct. It was for the accreditation process if the amendment were adopted.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 473.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I am looking at the language in the bill regarding regulations, which govern training in medical emergency response in section 1, subsection 7. If we are not already doing this, it seems to me to be a common sense issue. Putting it into statute does no harm. The testimony was they are already doing this.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I agree with Senator Amodei.

SENATOR COPENING:

Something to keep in mind is if you look through the material Mr. Skolnik provided for us, there is nothing in the material that speaks of any kind of training. For that reason, it is not a bad idea to pass this so it would be in writing as part of their best practices.

SENATOR WIENER:

I support the motion and second because if this is a minimum standard that we should adopt, it should be in statute.

CHAIR CARE:

The testimony was that there is litigation, at least regarding one facility, the prison in Ely, not systemwide. It was extreme medical neglect. My question is whether this language invites additional litigation.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

If you want to hold this until the next work session, that is fine. I can withdraw my second.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 2, 2009  
Page 18

CHAIR CARE:

If Senator Washington has withdrawn the second, does someone else want to second Senator Copenig's motion?

THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CARE:

We will put this on work session on Tuesday. There being nothing further to come before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, we are adjourned at 9:07 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Kathleen Swain,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Terry Care, Chair

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