

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Seventy-Sixth Session  
April 4, 2011**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair April Mastroluca at 1:39 p.m. on Monday, April 4, 2011, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman April Mastroluca, Chair  
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson  
Assemblyman Steven Brooks  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores  
Assemblyman Jason Frierson  
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea  
Assemblyman John Hambrick  
Assemblyman Scott Hammond  
Assemblyman Pete Livermore  
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood  
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly  
District No. 24  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Clark County Assembly District No. 11

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst  
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel  
Mitzi Nelson, Committee Secretary  
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Laurie Crehan, Ed.D., Quality of Life Regional Liaison, Pacific Region,  
State Liaison Office, Military Community and Family Policy, Office  
of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, U.S. Department of  
Defense  
P. Michael Murphy, Coroner, Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical  
Examiner  
Lisa A. Gianoli, representing Washoe County

**Chair Mastroluca:**

[Roll was called.] Today we will be hearing two bills, Assembly Bill 295 and Assembly Bill 319. We will start with A.B. 295.

**Assembly Bill 295:** Revises provisions governing the disposition of the human remains of certain deceased military personnel. (BDR 40-1073)

**Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24:**

Thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 295, which relates to human remains. The bill authorizes certain persons who are "... designated by a member of the armed forces of the United States, a reserve component thereof or the National Guard . . . to order the burial or cremation of the human remains of the member upon his or her death." This bill deals with compliance to the process followed by the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD). I have Laurie Crehan here today, who is the DOD State Liaison Officer based out of San Diego, and I will allow her to present the proposed legislation.

**Laurie Crehan, Ed.D., Quality of Life Regional Liaison, Pacific Region, State Liaison Office, Military Community and Family Policy, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, U.S. Department of Defense:**

The DOD State Liaison Office operates under the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Community and Family Policy. Our mission is to be a resource for state policymakers as they deal with quality of life issues for military families. Assembly Bill 295 is simply a DOD request to recognize in state statute the approach that service members are required by federal law to follow under *United States Code*, Title 10, Section 1482 in designating a person to direct the disposition of a service member's remains. [Ms. Crehan continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) regarding use of the U.S. Department of Defense Record of Emergency Data, DD Form 93, as the primary designation of the person who will direct the disposition of the remains of a service member.]

Before the hearing, I was speaking with Michael Murphy of the Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner (CCOCME), who raised a few questions that I would like to clarify for the Committee. For example, he was concerned that a former spouse might be listed on the DD Form 93 and the form might never be changed to reflect the divorce and subsequent remarriage of the service member, which might create a conflict. This instance would not create a conflict for a number of reasons. First, the only people who can be designated on the DD Form 93 are spouses and blood relatives. In the event none of those people exist, a person is named *in loco parentis*. It would not be authorized for a former spouse to be named. In addition, the form includes important additional information, such as beneficiary designations. When a service member remarries and applies for someone to be a dependent, the form has to be updated and signed. While it is unlikely that the hypothetical situation raised would occur, if it did, the former spouse would not be an authorized designee.

An additional question was raised referring to specific language in the bill. Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) reads, "was a member of the Armed Forces" and it was felt that it might be more appropriate to say "is a member of the Armed Forces." To further clarify, the DD Form 93 only applies to people who are on active duty. While the form does not apply to anyone who has left the service, the current language might sound confusing. I am assuming that it says "was" because the person to whom it refers would be deceased. He was a member of the Armed Forces, but he is not right now. I think we will need to refer to legal counsel. Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

First, I would like to thank Assemblyman Bobzien for bringing this legislation forward. I would also like to place my experiences with the DD Form 93 on the record. I was involved with multiple deployments when I was in the U.S. Marine Corps; we were constantly updating this record—over and over and over. It is a document that is kept very current. The administrative personnel inside an infantry battalion are very thorough about keeping this record. The testimony was correct in indicating that this is a document that is very important to the military. I think the bill is a good concept, because really when it comes down to keeping track of the wishes of individual service members, the DD Form 93 Record of Emergency Data is the most important document.

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

I would like to be clear that I understand this correctly. The bill states that “The following persons, in the following order of priority, may order the burial of human remains of a deceased person.” That being said, section (a) would still have priority over a DD Form 93. Is that correct?

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Can you give me some clarification as to where you are looking in the bill?

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

I am looking at section 1, subsection 1, on page 2 of the bill where you are amending it. You have added proposed language in paragraph (b), which would make the added language in that section second in priority. My question is could there be a conflict if a person who filled out his DD Form 93 had, at some other time, also executed a notarized affidavit pursuant to section 1, subsection 5? In that instance, the DD Form 93 would not have priority.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

That is a great question. I do not have the answer for it. Could we have legal counsel step in to provide an answer?

**Chair Mastroluca:**

I also wanted to clarify that when Assemblywoman Flores said, “the amended language,” she is referring to the new language that is being proposed for the bill, not a new amendment. There was some confusion amongst the members on that regard. Assemblywoman Flores, did you have another question?

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

I took a will, trusts, and estates class and spent an entire semester reading disputes on these types of issues. It brought to mind that these things need to be clear in terms of what people think is going to happen once they have passed away.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

The question is how does the qualifier, "if the decedent was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States" figure into the order of operations?

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

I would assume that section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) would take precedence over section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a). However, that is a good question that would need to be clarified.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Ms. Lang, could you help us out?

**Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:**

I do believe that this section designates an order of priority. So if the person fell under both of the sections, paragraph (a) would prevail.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

I think your members have uncovered an issue with the bill and I think we would need to look at an amendment to make sure that the wording of paragraph (b) comes before that of paragraph (a). That was, in fact, the intent of the legislation.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

Are you saying that the Armed Forces should come before spouses and children?

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

A person on active duty who has filled out the DD Form 93 would most likely never dream that there are other documents that might constrain his choices. The idea is to make the DD Form 93 the only document that will be executed at the time of your death if you are a member of the Armed Forces. Of course, the service member will indicate their desired designee on that form, such as a spouse or child.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Can you tell us how many other states have made this change in their law?

**Laurie Crehan:**

I do not have that information with me, but I know that there are currently approximately 15 states that are considering similar legislation this year and about 18 states that passed the legislation last year. This is something we have only been working on the last two years.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Were there other states where the legislation did not pass or where the form changed?

**Laurie Crehan:**

The form does not change. That is part of the issue. Service members are required to fill out this form.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

I did not mean the form itself. I meant the language that you are proposing to add. Did the language change?

**Laurie Crehan:**

That would defeat the purpose. Our purpose is to prevent litigation and confusion when there might be a conflict between documents. Service members are required to complete the form, naming a spouse or other family member. They cannot name just anyone or their friends over their spouse. This is the form used by the military. The military goes to the person named on the document and only that person is allowed to make decisions regarding disposition of the body. The form already takes precedence over state law, but legislation would prevent confusion with state law. If DD Form 93 is not inserted into state statute, then conflicting documents might open up the possibility of litigation. We would like to clarify that there is only one document to be consulted regarding the disposition of remains for service members.

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

If we were to have the DD Form 93 take precedence and it only allows spouses or blood relatives to be named as designees, what happens if a service member does not want to elect his spouse or a blood relative? What if he wants his best friend to dispose of his remains? Does he have that option?

**Laurie Crehan:**

One of the reasons Congress passed this bill and created the form was so that service members would fill this form out right before they are deployed. Forty percent of service members who are deployed are under 25 years of age. Some of these services members were naming their buddies. Then, in the unfortunate event that they did die, the name on the form was very seldom truly the best choice. Their buddies may no longer be in a position to carry out the disposition of the body or they may have lost contact with the service member. Obviously, the parents of the service member also might be quite upset that someone else has now been placed in charge of the burial of their son or daughter. Part of the reason for the restriction was to limit this type of confusion. That being said, there is another place on the form where service members can make remarks. If they are in a relationship or have good friends they would like to participate in the disposition of their remains, they can stipulate that person in addition to the person they named as their official designee. I have been told the DOD will take these remarks into serious consideration. For instance, a person who is required to name an elderly parent who cannot fully carry out his wishes can explain this concern and name others to assist.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

I do not believe that section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a) will be much of an issue for most members of the military who are 25 years old or under. Most will not have created a will. Most people who write wills have more of a traditional, developed family, with children and a stable relationship. I would defer to Ms. Crehan on that issue.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Thank you, Assemblyman Anderson, for walking us through and giving us a context on the issue. I am happy to work with the Committee and others who are interested in this bill. We need to answer the question does the language in paragraph (b) need to go before that of paragraph (a)? Certainly it should go before paragraph (c). I feel like I am channeling a math teacher this afternoon. Frankly, at this point I am open to suggestions about the best way to go forward. I think we may be well served to check how similar bills have been worded in other states, to make sure we are in a similar situation. The worst outcome would be one where Nevada had a different way of handling this issue than other states. Certainly, when you have a unit deployed that includes young soldiers from various parts of the country, they should all have the same understanding of how this form actually would play out. Perhaps we can visit this issue after the hearing and come back to you with a solution during a work session.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Legal counsel has pointed out that adding the words "at the time of death" in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), might help with the question previously raised regarding the use of "was" versus "is" in that section. In other words, the language would be amended to read, "If the decedent was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at the time of death . . ."

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

For clarification, I believe if the language used in paragraph (b) is moved to the position of paragraph (a), it would still have rank over the spouse, son, parent, and others.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

I am in favor of putting in the phrase, "at time of death." I do like paragraph (b) where it is.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any other questions? Assemblyman Bobzien, how would you like to proceed?

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

I think we can hear from others here to testify on A.B. 295. I just confirmed with Ms. Crehan that this legislation was reviewed by DOD counsel and no issues were brought forth. I think we should pursue an amendment to add the term "at the time of death." I also think an additional check to see how this legislation has been drafted in other states would be important. In addition we should decide what the order should be in section 1, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) through (c). My argument would be that we need to be consistent with the verbiage used in the statutes of other states. I would not want the wording of the statute to put Nevada personnel who are deployed in a weird position.

**P. Michael Murphy, Coroner, Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner:**

I am speaking in support of A.B. 295. The Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner (CCOCME) had one minor concern which you have already referenced regarding adding the verbiage "at the time of death" to section 1, subsection 1. I will give an example to illustrate our reason for that concern. For instance, a member of the military who served in Vietnam may have filled out the DD Form 93 at that time. Since then, he has divorced and remarried. I recognize that the DOD says the term "was" would not apply to a former member of the military. However, as someone who has to apply these rules on a fairly regular basis, I believe that some people would pull the statute



out and say, "This statute says you must do what the DD Form 93 says." There may be some questioning involved. Issues involving the death of a loved one can become very emotional and, in some cases, very litigious. In the meantime, the coroner's office must store his remains and try to get families to work together.

While I am not an attorney, as someone who has to interpret this statute, I would tell you that regardless of the order used in section 1, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) through (c), the coroner's office would normally use the most recent document available that contained the most current date. We would always default to the most recent wishes of the military personnel, even if they had another affidavit in place. For instance, if an affidavit surfaced that had been filled out at age 18 which designated a different person, but a DD Form 93 was also in place dated closer to the person's death, we would default to the DD Form 93. That form would contain the military member's most current wish. If that interpretation is wrong, then we would need to fix some of the language in the bill to make sure that the DD Form 93 is the primary document for a person who dies while in the service of his country. The rest of the statute falls within what we already do for degree of consanguinity, which determines the person responsible. I will answer any questions.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

What if a person is deployed, fills out the form, and then changes his mind? In many cases the military is able to get some sort of legal service to write up a new affidavit or a new will. Would it suffice with your office if the military member was not able to change his DD Form 93 but he swore out an affidavit or wrote a letter that was somehow able to be notarized? I am trying to anticipate any instances where a person would be deployed and then change his mind but cannot change his DD Form 93.

**Michael Murphy:**

At that point, our goal would be to try to get all parties involved together to see if this issue can be settled before we recommend they pursue any legal process. I would hope that the military member would be advised to change his DD Form 93, which is the easiest form to change in this particular scenario. This would do what the military member needed to accomplish versus creating another legal document that might be seen as in conflict. However, I believe if the DD Form 93 is in place and we have state statute naming it first in degree of consanguinity, then I think any affidavit subsequent to that would not take precedence. Again, I am not an attorney. We would have to have our

legal department research that issue. I can tell you that we have had situations arise, military or otherwise, where there is a dispute over what will happen with a person's remains. In those instances, we try to get the parties together without involving extended family members. Generally speaking, we can usually reach a settlement.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any other questions? Is there anyone else who would like to speak on A.B. 295, either for, against, or neutral? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 295 and move on to Assembly Bill 319, which will be presented by Assemblywoman Diaz.

**Assembly Bill 319: Revises provisions governing the final disposition of human remains. (BDR 40-775)**

**Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Clark County Assembly District No. 11:**

I would like to thank you for hearing A.B. 319 today, which deals with provisions governing the final disposition of human remains. I realize this is not a lively topic, but it is one that many of us must eventually face. I would like to give you some background to explain why I am proposing this legislation. Recently, one of my husband's colleagues unexpectedly passed away. His family members could not be located. He was from Cuba, where most of his family still lives. The community felt that his loss was a great one. We wanted to provide his final services as a community. However, we were unable to claim his remains because statute follows the degree of consanguinity. As currently stated in statute, there must be an affidavit on record giving a designated person the authority to cremate or bury a person's remains. Many times, people do not plan appropriately because they do not anticipate their own premature death. I felt it appropriate to modify the existing statute to reflect this issue.

The initial bill draft was less concise, so I have worked with Mr. Murphy on a proposed amendment (Exhibit D). The bill will not affect the degree of consanguinity; we will still continue to follow that. As outlined in the amendment on page 2, the coroner will exhaust all avenues to contact family members of the deceased for 30 days, in the order of degree of consanguinity listed in section 1, subsections (a) through (h). In the event that no one can be located or will come forward to assume the responsibility for the remains, then that ability would be given to any person 18 years of age or older who is willing to accept legal or financial responsibility for the body in order to give that person his final farewell, either by cremation or burial.

We also felt that it is important to state that assuming this responsibility would not affect the standing of the legal next of kin for purposes of settlement of the estate. So, just because a person steps forward and provides the funeral services for a friend, it does not mean that person would have a stake in the estate of the deceased. Further, the person who steps up to the plate and is willing to provide funeral services will be required to fill out an affidavit stating that he is unaware of anyone else who can assume that responsibility. He will also state how long he has known the deceased.

I did look into statistics from the Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner (CCOCME). There were a little more than 1,000 people who were cremated from 2008 through 2010 by Clark County because next of kin could not be located. There were no more than 50 burials each year, as well. This is a financial burden on the counties. In the event that next of kin cannot be located, the county must pay for cremation or burial. Each cremation costs approximately \$400 and each burial costs approximately \$1,200. Mr. Murphy stated that all the money budgeted for that purpose this year, \$330,000, has almost already been expended. I am hoping that this bill will not only allow the people affected by this circumstance to retain their dignity in death, but that we can also relieve some of the financial responsibility that ultimately falls upon the counties. I would be glad to answer any questions.

**Assemblyman Hambrick:**

On page 2, line 7 of the amendment, it appears as if there may be a typo. Does (i) come before (h)? I am not sure how that will affect the verbiage.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

I actually had a conversation regarding this issue with legal counsel. I would ask the Committee to look at this as a conceptual amendment. There are quite a few errors that do not fit the way the statute is written. This amendment will be rewritten anyway. We will make sure that we work with the sponsor to get the correct language.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Thank you for that clarification.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

If this bill is passed, would the bill have a retroactive element? Could a person go back and claim the body?

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

I would like to pass that question to Mr. Murphy, because that is more his jurisdiction. To be quite honest, I would like to see something to that effect be

included. If the person coming forward would be willing to reimburse the county for the expense of the cremation or burial, I would be okay with it. However, I do not know what that process would entail on the county's end, so I would not want to speak on his behalf.

**P. Michael Murphy, Coroner, Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner:**

I do not believe the bill has a retroactive clause that would allow that, as written. I think it would be from the date of inception forward. I think you would have to add that language. I would like it to be able to do that, but I think you would have to add that specific language.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there other questions?

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

First, I would like to point out that the "h" on page 2, line 8, to which Assemblyman Hambrick referred, is actually part of the sentence above, where it says, "Any person specified in paragraphs (a) to (h) . . . ." It is not starting another section.

I am glad you brought this legislation forward. At my place of employment, a coworker recently passed away and we knew he had been estranged from his family for decades. We wondered what would happen. His family ultimately did step forward, but we were concerned that he would be left with no one. We did not want that to happen, but we had no connection to him other than the fact that we worked with him every day. I think in this day and age, with people being as transient as they are, especially in Nevada, there are a lot of people who have a circle of friends, but who do not necessarily have next of kin.

**Assemblyman Livermore:**

A couple of weeks ago we had a discussion in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs regarding public administrators. Where do they come into this? Are they part of this discussion? Are they involved in finding the appropriate responsible party to make the arrangements?

**Michael Murphy:**

The public administrator is excluded from this because it deals with the disposition of the remains of the individual only. It allows friends of the deceased to provide funeral arrangements, rather than the government. The public administrator issues are directly related to the individual's estate. There is nothing included in this provision that would affect that. In fact, it

specifically does not affect that. Those people defined by the degrees of consanguinity still have the right to the individual's estate.

**Assemblyman Livermore:**

I agree with you; I could not find it either. I wanted to have it on record that there is a separation between how the remains will be disposed of and who manages the estate.

**Michael Murphy:**

I believe that is exactly the purpose of the way the bill was written.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

How long have you been the Clark County Coroner?

**Michael Murphy:**

I have been coroner for just a little less than nine years.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

How often do you see this type of situation occur, where there is no one to bury the individual and the county has to pay to do that?

**Michael Murphy:**

It will affect about 1 to 2 percent of the approximately 14,000 deaths that the CCOCME deals with each year. We are talking about a few hundred or less. Certainly, this will not solve all the problems, but it will be an additional tool in our belt. Most of the funds used for burial and cremation are currently required because the next of kin does not have the financial wherewithal to pay for services, not because we are unable to locate a legal next of kin to accept responsibility. In this case, the county still has to step in. However, this legislation might encourage indigent family members to allow friends to assist in that process. Most importantly, it would allow friends of the deceased individual to accept responsibility, rather than the county having to do it, if no family is available.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

What happens after the \$300,000 budget for this issue is exhausted by the county? How does the county deal with these individuals then?

**Michael Murphy:**

I do not deal with budgets, but I do not believe that this is something that can go unfunded. I would assume that it would have to be funded, because it has to be done. My guess is that services would be cut in another area.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Would it be normal practice for the county to do an exhaustive search to locate a family member, if one was not apparent at the time of death?

**Michael Murphy:**

Yes, it is our practice to do exactly that. We have investigators on staff whose goal, by statute, is to identify the deceased person and notify the legal next of kin. We will utilize a vast majority of resources in an attempt to do that. It is our goal to do that in a timely manner.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

The proposed language of the amendment refers to having "known the person for a period of time." That wording is a little vague. Is "a period of time" 30 days, 5 years, or, at the risk of sounding rude, just someone willing to pay for the burial?

**Michael Murphy:**

I think that language came about as a result of language used in an affidavit in reference to an individual who gets divorced in Nevada. In that situation, they bring in someone to state he has known that person for a period of time, which I think is actually six months. Additionally, CCOCME does identifications where an individual will come in to identify a decedent. Sometimes that party is not legal next of kin. The affidavit we use also asks if he knows of the person and if he has known the person for a period of time. We have him designate the amount of time. However, this bill does not provide a requirement for any period of time.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Because you currently already perform an exhaustive search, you do not anticipate any additional costs for the county. It would appear that it might save the county a small amount of money, since people other than next of kin would have the opportunity to lay someone to rest.

**Michael Murphy:**

That is correct. We see this bill as having no fiscally negative impact to the county. In some instances, it might have a small positive impact.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Is there any concern about someone coming back a year later saying, "I was out of the country. No one told me. Now, all of a sudden, I find out that my family member has been cremated when he wanted to be buried?" Do you deal with that already as the responsible party when no one claims the deceased?

**Michael Murphy:**

I think you have touched upon two important issues. There is a possibility that someone is going to come back to us at a later time and say, "You did not find me," or "I was unavailable and now you have disposed of my loved one in a manner in which I did not think was appropriate." One of the reasons for asking that an affidavit be signed is to document that the person who stepped forward has assumed the responsibility for that decision. We feel the affidavit may give us the opportunity to explain to the legal next of kin that friends of the deceased were able to make what they considered to be appropriate arrangements. In my mind, this is providing a better service than the very minimal service that the county would provide. I think that is important to remember. Currently, if we cannot find a legal next of kin within the 30-day period, the remains are declared unclaimed and the county has to deal with them. I do not see the proposed legislation as a negative for the family, the decedent, or the local government.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any other questions? Is there anyone else who would like to speak on A.B. 319?

**Lisa A. Gianoli, representing Washoe County:**

I would like to get it on the record that Washoe County also supports this legislation. I spoke with Mr. Murphy earlier this week and for all the reasons that have already been stated, I think it would be a good practice to have in law. It will give another avenue for the medical examiner—in our case, we have a medical examiner, rather than a coroner—to deal with unclaimed remains. Thank you.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

Are there any questions? I do not see any. Is there anyone else who is for, against, or neutral to A.B. 319? Assemblywoman Diaz, do you have any final statements?

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Thank you for your time. We will continue to be thinking about the possibility of making the statute retroactive. I do not know that we would want to do that, but I will continue a dialogue with Mr. Murphy regarding that idea.

**Chair Mastroluca:**

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 319. Is there anyone here for public comment? With nothing else to come before the Committee, this meeting is adjourned [at 2:30 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Mitzi Nelson  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman April Mastroluca, Chair

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



**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Health and Human Services

**Date:** April 4, 2011

**Time of Meeting:** 1:39 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 295	C	Laurie Crehan	Testimony
A.B. 319	D	Assemblywoman Diaz	Proposed Amendment