MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Seventy-Sixth Session March 30, 2011

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman William C. Horne at 8:10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 2011, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chair
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Steven Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Richard (Skip) Daly
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblyman Scott Hammond
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Kelly Kite
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John Oceguera, Clark County Assembly District No. 16 Senator James Settelmeyer, Capital Senatorial District

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst Nick Anthony, Committee Counsel Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary Michael Smith, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Ronald Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada

Michelle Jotz, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs

Lawrence Koepke, Owner, Nevada CCW Training LLC

Janine Hansen, Director, Nevada Families; and Nevada Eagle Forum

John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party

Sheila Ward, representing the Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee

Bob Irwin, Owner, The Gun Store, Las Vegas

Michael Murray, Private Citizen, Las Vegas

Glen Parshall, representing Bargain Pawn, Las Vegas

John Cahill, Private Citizen, Henderson

Julie Butler, Records Bureau Manager, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Steven Silva, Senior Law Enforcement Specialist, Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Division of Law Enforcement, Nevada Department of Wildlife

Ken Brown, Private Citizen, Fallon

Carol Howell, Private Citizen, Carson City

Chairman Horne:

[Roll called.] We have several bills this morning. <u>Assembly Bill 185</u>, Mr. Goedhart's bill, as well as Mr. Hickey's Assembly Bill 205, will be pulled at

their requests. The provisions of these two bills are contained in <u>Assembly Bill 282</u>. We will be hearing <u>Assembly Bill 282</u> and <u>Senate Bill 126</u>, which is also contained in <u>A.B. 282</u>. Throughout the hearing, I will be referencing the provisions in the other bills and the amendments to those bills.

First, some housekeeping before I forget. As you know, Monday we got a "butt load of bills" and we have a deadline on April 15. While we recognize that all of the bills are not going to make the deadline, we are going to do our best to hear as many as we can. Therefore, starting Tuesday of next week, we will begin 7:30 a.m. starts. We will also have a hearing next Saturday morning, April 9, to make sure we get it done.

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 282. Mr. Speaker please.

Assembly Bill 282: Revises various provisions concerning firearms. (BDR 15-962)

Assemblyman John Oceguera, Clark County Assembly District No. 16:

I am here today to present <u>A.B. 282</u>, which provides for revisions to Nevada's concealed carry weapons (CCW) laws (<u>Exhibit C</u>). This does a couple of things. It puts a number of bills in a neat and complete package. It is common sense legislation around concealed weapons permits. I believe this bill encompasses most of the common sense legislation and the ones that should be less controversial. The qualifications for the categories are in this bill, along with background checks, confidentiality, and State parks.

You heard a bill earlier by Assemblyman Bobzien about the qualifications on a semiautomatic or a nonspecific gun. I did not see the testimony, but did he show a video? There is a video in which a person lays out nine semiautomatic weapons on a table and shoots one shot from each one, then reloads, fires, and repeats for each of those weapons. Right now, if you have a Glock 26, a Glock 19, and another semiautomatic, for example, you would have to qualify with all of those even though they are virtually the same weapon. I think this would bring the law for semiautomatics in line with revolvers. You would not need to have a qualification for each one. That seems to make a lot of sense.

Background checks will also be conducted by the sheriff upon renewal of a concealed carry permit. Right now, you only have to do a check for the initial permit. This would require that you have a background check when you renew. That would bring us in line with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) requirements for CCW exemptions. I believe that is something we should do.

Under confidentiality, currently the permit applications are confidential. That lends itself that a concealed weapon would be confidential, but in 2010 a Nevada court case held that certain information on permits is not considered confidential. This bill will eliminate this exception to confidentiality by adding two things to the list of confidential items: the identity of the permittee and any records regarding the suspension, revocation, or restoration of a permit.

The last provision is being able to carry concealed weapons in a state park. The state parks will not adopt any regulations regarding the possession or discharge of firearms or the use of firearms—and here are the key words—in self-defense that contradicts state law, or are more restrictive than state law. So I believe you may have some State Parks folks coming here to say they want to amend this. I am not sure the reading of this is correct. We are not talking about firing a weapon in a state park; we are talking about only firing a weapon in self-defense. You are going to be carrying your weapon, but that does not mean you are going to be discharging it. The use of firearms should not be deemed illegal simply because the carrier is in the state park. From my point of view, where would I most likely want to have a weapon with me if I am in my camper with my family in a state park? I would probably want to have a weapon with me.

There is one amendment (Exhibit D). The original bill included a provision allowing 18- to 21-year-olds who are enlisted in the armed services to be eligible for concealed weapon permits, and I still firmly believe that provision is necessary to really appreciate the services of those young men and women in our armed forces. Unfortunately, these provisions need to be removed due to conflicts with other laws. If we left these provisions in this bill, we would forfeit our reciprocity with other states that honor our concealed weapons permits. In the long run, more concealed weapon owners would be hurt by that provision than would be helped. You have to be 21 years old to purchase handguns and ammunition. I believe those people who are between the ages of 18 and 21 would not be helped by this bill so I have submitted a proposed conceptual amendment.

In summary, I think <u>A.B. 282</u> is common sense qualification change that lowers the burden on permit holders, and is a procedure to ensure that all permit holders are qualified to have a permit renewed. It protects the identity of the permit holders, and it protects gun owners who carry in state parks.

Chairman Horne:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For clarification, the Division of State Parks' amendment is not a friendly amendment in your opinion and the amendment

that you are proposing is the removal of the armed forces provision. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Oceguera:

The State Parks did send me an email and I would like to hear their explanation. I think the "self-defense" is the key. We are not talking about discharging a weapon in a state park. I believe that is what they are concerned about, so I understand that concern. What we are saying is that you are just carrying and the only time you are going to discharge is in self-defense. You would not be just discharging the weapon; that is the difference. I would like to hear what they have to say, but as of now, the way the bill is written is good.

Chairman Horne:

If we identify that <u>Assembly Bill 143</u>, <u>Assembly Bill 205</u>, and <u>Assembly Bill 185</u> are all contained in <u>Senate Bill 126</u> as well, would you be amenable to amending names on your bill that are currently not there?

Assemblyman Oceguera:

Absolutely.

Chairman Horne:

Also, were you aware of the proposed amendment by the Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice, and the letter that they sent with an amendment (Exhibit E) asking to be able to subpoen the CCW records? They believe that the bill as written would prevent them from obtaining these records if they needed them, but we rejected that proposal for Assembly Bill 143 in this Committee. I did not know if you were aware that they were proposing that for yours as well.

Assemblyman Ocequera:

I was not aware of that.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I have a concealed carry now. I want to know if there is a retroactive feature to this bill for the people who already have one. Do I have to reapply and do everything again? Mine clearly lists revolvers, Walther P38, Glock 27, Glock 19, Ruger MKII, and Beretta 22. Do I have to take the course again, or for those of us who are already holders, is there a way to have it included in the bill?

Assemblyman Oceguera:

I believe the only thing this applies to is the renewal and then they would have to do the background check.

Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

This issue came up in the last session when we did the same thing with revolvers. What the sheriffs have done, and it is in our CCW procedures, if you have had three or four revolvers listed at that time it was fine. Any revolver was accepted until you renewed your application and then it was changed. It will be the same thing with the CCW. If this bill passes, you can carry any semiautomatic, and then we will change it to revolver and semiautomatic when you get your card renewed.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any other questions? I see none. Is there anyone else you want to testify or should I go down the list?

Assemblyman Ocequera:

There are a number of people who wish to testify so you can just go down the list.

Chairman Horne:

Also, I want to give Senator Settelmeyer an opportunity to speak. I do not know if he has read your bill and if he is satisfied that the provisions of his bill are in your bill.

Senator James Settelmeyer, Capital Senatorial District:

I have not had an opportunity to read over the bill. I know that the provisions of many of these bills have been melded into Mr. Oceguera's bill and I appreciate that very much. I would still like to see <u>Senate Bill 126</u> proceed in the off chance that there are any problems with the Speaker's bill so we can ensure the classification system is changed. I am sure Mr. Bobzien is also desirous of having his bill continue on in the Senate.

Chairman Horne:

I see no further questions. Those who are signed in in favor of the bill, please approach the table.

Frank Adams:

I am speaking on behalf of our association which includes the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office who are also with me today.

Listening to Mr. Oceguera's bill and the changes that he made to it has alleviated our concerns. The amendment eliminated the military provision and, although we do support our military, because of the tremendous burden and difficulty that would cause us, we support the amendment. With his

clarification as to the issue of discharge of weapons in the state parks, that also alleviated our concerns. As long as it is the intent of the Committee that this is what the discharge would be, only self-defense, I think we can be in support of this bill.

Ronald Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:

We rise in support of Mr. Speaker's bill, <u>A.B. 282</u>, with the changes that he put on the record. We are in support and share the same concerns over the military, but understand that it would impact too many other laws. We would need to have that portion of the bill go away. With that, we ask that you support <u>A.B. 282</u> with the amendments as proposed. Thank you.

Michelle Jotz, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs:

We support the Speaker's bill as amended, although we appreciate the armed services and all of their service, we are concerned about reciprocity as well. We support the bill as amended.

Lawrence Koepke, Owner, Nevada CCW Training, LLC:

I am here in support of this bill. I know that the other concealed weapons trainers and I all teach a comprehensive course that includes instruction on all types of semiautomatic weapons, how to operate them, clean them, and do dry-fire training with them. We teach them to become familiar with their weapons before they ever carry them and to carry them on a consistent basis so they know how to operate those weapons. The changes would be no problem with any of the carries.

I also want to testify on the confidentiality of the CCW names. I think it is crazy that we let these names out. This is a great way for criminals to find out who has guns and know where to go to get them. I think it is very important that we keep names confidential.

The last part, doing background checks with the renewal, brings us in line with the ATF. This will also help with revenue for our retailers who are hurting in this economic climate. I used to work in the industry when I was a manager in one of the local sporting goods stores and had people who would hold off buying guns so they could buy multiple guns at one time to cut down on the background check. This would eliminate the additional fee for the background check and give people a chance to buy guns as they have the money. It would increase revenue and the tax base.

Janine Hansen, Director, Nevada Families; and Nevada Eagle Forum:

We are here in support of this bill. We have been very pleased that after so many years we have so many bills. We certainly support this one. We are supportive of the revision for the state parks and particularly for self-defense. In the beginning of working on the CCW, confidentiality was ensured. We think there is great improvement on the qualifications for semiautomatics so we support the provisions of this bill.

I will read to you Article 1, section 11, subsection 1 of the *Nevada Constitution* which says, "Every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms for security and defense, for lawful hunting and recreational use and for other lawful purposes." We feel that Nevada's provision in our *Constitution* for the right to keep and bear arms is even better than the national one, and we are very thankful that the Legislature has seen fit to guarantee those rights in statute now in a way that they have never done before. We appreciate your efforts in this area very much.

John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party: All I want to do is say, "Me too."

Sheila Ward, representing the Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee:

I signed that I am in support of $\underline{A.B.\ 282}$, then I crossed it off since I did not know enough about it. However, since you invited the "me toos," I will say I am a "me too."

Bob Irwin, Owner, The Gun Store, Las Vegas:

I am here in support of the bill. All of the provisions are fine with me. They will make it a lot easier for our customers and easier for us.

Michael Murray, Private Citizen, Las Vegas:

I would like to thank the Legislature for putting these bills forward. It is going to be much simpler for us and our students. It is going to save money by not paying background check fees every time you purchase a firearm, and doing repetitive qualifications for one Glock after another, et cetera. It is nice to see the Legislature is responding to the will of the people, and there is a lot of support for this. I am in support of all of the firearm legislation that has been brought up.

Glen Parshall, representing Bargain Pawn, Las Vegas:

I speak in support of these bills and the very important changes that have been a long time coming. We appreciate your bringing them forward and give you full support.

John Cahill, Private Citizen, Henderson:

Basically, me too. One thing that has not been mentioned on the confidentiality issue is that the list that was put out identifying persons whose homes likely contain firearms is not a good idea. What also was not mentioned is that it is not a good idea to identify persons who are unarmed. If a woman gets a restraining order because she is being stalked, it serves a purpose, but I would not want to see a list out there where a stalker could determine that this person is likely unarmed because they do not have a permit. I think that is another good reason for confidentiality on the permit list.

The other changes have all been spoken to. In our nation, we have a great laboratory for the effects of these types of changes. It has been shown state after state, as the changes for CCWs for lawful citizens are made, that there is no negative impact. Also, on the guns in parks, the law was changed at the federal level. That was led by Speaker Reid and signed by President Obama and it has so far shown that guns in federal parks do not create a problem.

I am "me too" on all of this.

Chairman Horne:

We will move to opposition. I do not see anyone signed in for opposition. We will move to neutral.

Julie Butler, Records Bureau Manager, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety:

The Records Bureau is interested in section 2 of A.B. 282. As you know, under this section, the bill proposes to make the CCW renewal process the same as the initial application and the permittee would have to undergo another criminal history background investigation by the sheriff's office. Those are conducted by my office through fingerprint-based background checks. As Speaker Oceguera indicated, it is an attempt to get the Brady exemption back that the CCW holders used to enjoy.

As a bit of a history lesson, prior to 2005 if a person held a CCW permit he did not have to undergo a Brady check when he purchased a firearm from a federally licensed firearms dealer. In 2005, the ATF determined that Nevada's CCW statutes were insufficient to exempt the permit holders from the Brady process because the renewal process was not as stringent as the initial application process in that a background check was not conducted for the renewal. Due to the public outcry, our office and the Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association requested the ATF delay their ruling on our Brady exemption and let us address the issue in the 2007 Legislative Session. Assembly Bill No. 21 of the 74th Session was put forth to address that issue but it failed and,

consequently, the ATF finalized its ruling that our CCW permit holders do not qualify for an exemption from the Brady check. If this legislation is passed, there is no guarantee that the Brady exemption will automatically be reinstated. The ATF will have to review and approve the language from <u>A.B. 282</u> in order to get that exemption back. I have submitted this bill and others which would attempt to do this same thing, namely <u>Assembly Bill 205</u> and <u>Senate Bill 279</u>, to the ATF for their review and I will advise the Committee when I have additional information.

Chairman Horne:

Thank you. Do you have a general time frame of when you will have that?

Julie Butler:

I did contact a staff attorney with the ATF and told her your deadline was April 15 to move the bill from one house to the other, so she is aware of that. I will be in contact with her.

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

I signed in for, against, and neutral on this bill. We never have just one way we are looking at it.

Chairman Horne:

Let me help you. If you are not for a bill without amendments, you are against. If you are offering an amendment, you are not in favor of the bill.

Rebecca Gasca:

We wanted to be here to listen to some of the different positions. This is a large omnibus bill, and as you know, the ACLU of Nevada is one of the few affiliates in the nation to take a proactive position in support of the Second Amendment right to bear arms. This is a fairly new arena for us and we try to walk a careful line with this issue and wanted to make sure to listen to the Speaker's position regarding the bill.

We are heartened to see that the amendment has been presented to take out the portion regarding the members of armed services. From our perspective, it would create a special class of people who are allowed rights that others are not allowed, and that would be problematic. For example, police officers would not have qualified to enjoy the benefits that members of the armed services would have, and from our perspective that could have been problematic. We are glad that is no longer in the bill. When we read this, we thought the bill would eliminate the ability for the Administrator of the Division of State Parks to promulgate regulations regarding the carrying and discharge of weapons in

general. We were heartened to hear the Speaker's comments that this is only regarding self-defense. While the bill does not make that clear, we hope that the legislative intent is enough to satisfy the concerns of the general public. Not all parks are equal and some parks are more congested than others, but if this is only for self-defense and not touching on any other areas as we read, our concerns are nullified. We are in hearty support of the portion of this bill that would seek to make these records of CCWs private information and no longer public record.

Steven Silva, Senior Law Enforcement Specialist, Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

I appreciated the Speaker's comments as to the intent of this bill. You have our written comments (Exhibit F) so I will keep my oral comments very short. I think a one-word change, the word "or" to "and," in section 5, subsection 2, paragraph (c), subparagraph (1) where it says, "The possession or discharge of firearms" would completely solve our concerns and we would retain the ability to work with the Department of Wildlife to define and establish shooting zones within our parks where people can lawfully engage in hunting. Several of our parks are large enough, like Lahontan, Lake Tahoe, and Washoe Lake, for the sporting use of firearms. Outside the realm of self-defense is a major recreational activity and we would like to retain the ability to continue to have the shooting zones in our state parks.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions? I see none. You are suggesting that we change the "or" to an "and" as your proposed amendment.

Steven Silva:

That is correct. We feel that would make the intent that it relates to self-defense clearer and would satisfy all of our concerns.

Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Division of Law Enforcement, Nevada Department of Wildlife:

I am here to testify to the fact that we work with State Parks to establish safe and reasonable areas within the parks to legally hunt wildlife.

Chairman Horne:

So you are supportive of the change of the "or" to an "and" and that would be your recommendation as well?

Rob Buonamici:

Correct.

Chairman Horne:

I see no questions. Thank you. Is there anyone else who is neutral who has concerns? I see none so we will close the hearing on Hold on. Go ahead Mr. Hammond.

Assemblyman Hammond:

I am sorry. I have one more comment. In this bill, Mr. Oceguera has really incorporated all of the things that we have been talking about. He has put it all in one bill. There is one Senate bill that is going through the process and I was wondering if the Speaker would be amenable to including what is known as "campus carry" as part of this bill as well.

Assemblyman Ocequera:

I would think that it would make this bill cleaner if we leave that part out. I am not certain that that bill is going to get the support of all the members so I do not want to weigh this bill down with that bill. I personally would probably support it, however, in this process you want compromise and you want bills that can pass. That is why we left those provisions out.

Chairman Horne:

And that bill is not over here yet and we are working toward a deadline in getting this amended as well.

I see no other questions so I will close the hearing on <u>A.B. 282</u> and bring it back to Committee. It will be on a work session soon.

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 126.

<u>Senate Bill 126:</u> Revises certain provisions relating to permits to carry concealed firearms. (BDR 15-335)

Senator James Settelmeyer, Capital Senatorial District:

Senator Lee sends his regrets. He is working in Government Affairs on an issue with Mount Charleston to an over-packed room. He wishes he could have been here to help out on this bill.

<u>Senate Bill 126</u> seeks to simplify the classification on the concealed carry weapons process. As you heard in previous testimony, current Nevada law was changed many years back. I remember that Chairman Horne, Mr. Ohrenschall, and the Speaker all signed on to the bill we had four years ago trying to work towards this concept of simplifying the process by creating a semiautomatic and revolver category. Unfortunately at that time, in the spirit of compromise, we were only able to acquire the revolver portion. This bill seeks to go after the

portion of the semiautomatic that we have discussed. This change would affect over 49,000 Nevadans because that is the number of individuals currently in the State of Nevada who have a CCW permit. This is a fairly simple bill. If anyone has any questions I will gladly answer them.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions for Senator Settelmeyer? This bill has the same provisions and intent as <u>Assembly Bill 143</u>, which we have already processed in this Committee, and <u>A.B. 282</u> that we just heard. I see no questions. Is there anyone who you would like to have testify?

Senator Settelmeyer:

I believe there are many who would like to testify but we could speed up the process by asking them to just say "me too" or "repeat my testimony from the last bill."

Chairman Horne:

Thank you.

Ron Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:

We are going to say "me too" to <u>S.B. 126</u> and we ask for your support in this.

Michelle Jotz, Director of Governmental Affairs, Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs:

Me too.

Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association: On behalf of the sheriffs who have to administer this program, me too.

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

Me too.

Janine Hansen, Director, Nevada Families; and Nevada Eagle Forum: We support this bill as we did in the Senate.

John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party: I want to say a big me too.

Sheila Ward, representing the Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee:

Me too. I appreciate Senator Settelmeyer's comment that you never know what happens to a bill as it goes down the road.

Ken Brown, Private Citizen, Fallon:

I am a member of the Stillwater Firearms Association and we are in full support of the bill.

Carol Howell, Private Citizen, Carson City:

I, too, support this bill.

Bob Irwin, Owner, The Gun Store, Las Vegas:

Me too.

Glen Parshall, representing Bargain Pawn, Las Vegas:

Me too.

Chairman Horne:

Is there anyone else? Is there anyone opposed to <u>S.B. 126</u>? I think everyone is afraid to come opposed because they know everyone is packing.

Is there anyone in the neutral position? I see none. We will close the hearing on S.B. 126. Thank you Senator Settelmeyer.

We are going to move to <u>Assembly Bill 464</u>. Mr. Anthony will present the bill.

Assembly Bill 464: Ratifies certain technical corrections made to NRS and Statutes of Nevada. (BDR S-944)

Nick Anthony, Committee Counsel:

Assembly Bill 464 is the ratification bill that comes out of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) session. For the new members on this Committee, this is a bill that LCB puts together based on last session's events after we go through and codify all of the particular bills and fit them into the puzzle that we know as the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). Sometimes it becomes necessary to make a few minor technical changes so that all of the statutes read together. That is the purpose of this bill.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions about that? One thing that we do not do any more that we did in 2003 when I was a freshman, I had to handle this bill on the floor and they used it to haze me. I had to explain the provisions and why we had them.

Are there any questions? Does anyone want to testify in favor of the bill? Is there anyone opposed? Is there anyone in the neutral? I see none.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I want to take this opportunity to thank staff. This is the kind of work our staff does behind the scenes that makes this work, and makes this machine as efficient and effective as it is. I think they must have tiger blood to be able to stay up all night to get this done. I, for one, appreciate all they do in these bills.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

I think this is what they do during the summers and the off year. They do a great job.

Chairman Horne:

They do indeed.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 464 and take a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 464.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Frierson can handle this on the floor.

We are now going to move to the work session document.

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first bill is <u>Assembly Bill 195</u> sponsored by this Committee and heard on March 10, 2011.

Assembly Bill 195: Revises provisions governing the destruction and storage of court records. (BDR 19-550)

[Read from the work session document explaining the bill (Exhibit G).]

Chairman Horne:

The amendments take out the municipal courts and the justice courts?

Dave Ziegler:

It is my understanding that the amendment limits the main affect of the bill to the Supreme Court and the district courts. In discussion with Mr. McCormick

from the Administrative Office of the Courts, the main purpose of the change is to put into statute the ability of the courts to use electronic record keeping.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions? I see none.

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 195.

ASSEMBLYMAN SHERWOOD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Sherwood will handle this on the floor. Next bill, Mr. Ziegler.

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next bill is <u>Assembly Bill 244</u> sponsored by Assemblyman Segerblom and Assemblyman Ohrenschall, and heard by this Committee on March 18, 2011. It was presented by former Senator and Uniform Law Commissioner, Terry Care.

Assembly Bill 244: Enacts the Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act. (BDR 3-329)

[Read from the work session document explaining the bill (Exhibit H).]

There were no amendments recommended the day of the hearing.

Chairman Horne:

I know Mr. McArthur had concerns on whether we really needed this, but other than that I do not remember any opposition or proposed amendments.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Mr. McArthur can speak for himself, but Mr. Care and I talked with him and he may have something.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Yes, I have talked with the authors of the bill. I have some concerns, but I will support the bill, and I reserve the right to change my vote on the floor.

Chairman Horne:

Is there any other discussion? I see none. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 244.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Segerblom will handle this bill on the floor. That concludes our business for today. Is there any other business of the Committee? All exhibits on NELIS will be included in the record [(Exhibit I), (Exhibit J), (Exhibit K), (Exhibit L), (Exhibit M), (Exhibit N), (Exhibit O), (Exhibit P), (Exhibit O), and (Exhibit R)].

We are going to pick up the pace and have some early mornings and, unfortunately, next Saturday.

We are adjourned [at 9:05 a.m.].

	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:	
	Karyn Werner Committee Secretary	
APPROVED BY:		
Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chair	_	
DATE:		

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: March 30, 2011 Time of Meeting: 8:10 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	Α		Agenda
	В		Attendance Roster
AB 282	С	Assemblyman John Oceguera	PowerPoint presentation on Revisions to Nevada's concealed carry laws
AB 282	D	Assemblyman John Oceguera	Conceptual Amendment
AB 282	E	Assemblyman William Horne	Proposed amendment from the Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
AB 282	F	Steven Silva	Position statement from the Nevada Division of State Parks
AB 195	G	Dave Ziegler	Work session document
AB 244	Н	Dave Ziegler	Work session document
SB 126	I	Carolyn L. Herbertson	Letter dated March 28, 2011, from the National Rifle Association of America
SB 126	J	J.L. Rhodes	Letter dated March 26, 2011, from the Stillwater Firearms Association
AB 185	K	Carolyn L. Herbertson	Letter dated March 28, 2011, from the National Rifle Association of America
AB 185	L	J.L. Rhodes	Letter dated March 26, 2011, from the Stillwater Firearms Association
AB 205	M	Carolyn L. Herbertson	Letter dated March 28, 2011, from the National Rifle

			Association of America
AB	N	J.L. Rhodes	Letter dated
205			March 26, 2011, from
			the Stillwater Firearms
			Association
AB	0	Assemblyman Pat Hickey	Proposed Conceptual
205			Amendment
AB	Р	Carolyn L. Herbertson	Letter dated
282			March 28, 2011, from
			the National Rifle
			Association of America
AB	Q	J.L. Rhodes	Letter dated
282			March 26, 2011, from
			the Stillwater Firearms
			Association
AB	R	Lawrence Koepke	Undated letter from
282			Nevada CCW Training,
			LLC