

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 1, 2013**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Jason Frierson at 8:14 a.m. on Friday, March 1, 2013, 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. 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 Jason Frierson, Chairman
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Andrew Martin
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15

Minutes ID: 340



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Linda Whimple, Committee Secretary
Gariety Pruitt, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

John T. Jones, Jr., representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association
Steve Yeager, representing the Clark County Public Defender's Office
Caleb S. Cage, Executive Director, Nevada Office of Veterans Services
Linda Bell, Judge, Eighth Judicial District
Bruce Arkell, representing the Personal Care Association of Nevada
Matthew Sharp, representing the Nevada Justice Association
Peter Morris, Owner, BrightStar Care, Reno, Nevada

Chairman Frierson:

[The roll was taken. The Chairman reminded Committee members, witnesses, and members of the audience of Committee rules and protocol.] We have two measures for today: Assembly Bill 84 and Assembly Bill 132. We will go in order, and I will open the hearing on A.B. 84. Welcome, Assemblyman Anderson.

Assembly Bill 84: Requires certain district courts to establish an appropriate program for the treatment of certain offenders who are veterans or members of the military. (BDR 14-124)

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15:

I have watched the veterans court progress as an idea since I served as an intern during the 2009 Legislative Session, when the State enacted it into law. The idea of the court, and all specialty courts, is to provide nontraditional courts designed to ensure an inexpensive, speedy, and accurate determination of justice for a subset of the population with particular needs. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit C](#)).] Before I go into the bill, I want to give you some background on the court, so you have some context of what it does and its effectiveness.

The veterans court in Nevada was created by a statute approved by the 2009 Legislature, Assembly Bill No. 187 of the 75th Session. The program targets treatment of justice-involved veterans. The first veterans court docket was held on October 14, 2009, in Washoe County at the district court level,

and Clark County has recently started at the district court level. In addition to the district courts, the Las Vegas Justice Court has a calendar, as well as the Henderson Municipal Court.

Eligibility criteria are written in the statute. To get into court, the defendant must be a veteran or a member of the military who appears to suffer from mental illness, alcohol or drug abuse, or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). The defendant's issue must also appear to be related to military service or readjustment to civilian life, and it has to appear that they would benefit from an assignment to an appropriate treatment program.

I would also like to talk about how the concept works on a day-to-day basis with implementation. Generally, in terms of jurisdiction, this is nonspecific, but the idea is to have the public defender's office, the district attorney, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, the Nevada Office of Veterans Services, the vet centers, the Division of Parole and Probation, specialty court staff, and other community services and providers meet and discuss how to help each defendant. It seems more of a collaborative process than the traditional court process where you have people opposing each other pretty fiercely. It is meant to help the defendant and get them back on track.

I want to discuss some observations of the veterans court compared to other specialty courts. The charges tend to be more violent, as you might expect from a subset that has served in the military, but also the participants are more compliant, as something you might also expect from people in the military. They are a bit more amiable to following orders. Participants have more complex medical needs. Participants get more services, housing, medical, mental health, substance abuse, and assistance with accessing veterans benefits. Many of these come from outside the state. This is a huge difference because there are a lot of treatment programs that can bring dollars into the state, help our folks by not spending money to keep them in jail, and not spending money on billable hours for our district attorney, public defender, et cetera. Additionally, there are also higher rates of completion.

There are some violent tinges that exist in many crimes that involve veterans. I would argue that some of these situations do not involve violence, but seem violent just by the nature of the offense. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit C](#)).]

For example, I have heard reports of veterans not being able to get into the court because they had previously been involuntarily committed to a mental institution but legally possessed a weapon previously. However, because of the involuntary commitment proceeding, their previously legal possession had turned into a crime. This amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) would try to set a standard for

what violent is. The amendment's key provision is a "reasonable apprehension of bodily harm." To break this down, it means that they are scared. Someone is scared. The victim is scared. A weapon at a house could be used to scare someone, but in my example it would not be used to scare someone. It is simply possessing a weapon that was not being used to frighten in a violent manner. If the possession were used to scare someone, then it might qualify as an apprehension. In my opinion, this gets more at the intent of "violence." Just simply having a gun is not necessarily violent.

This is not a comprehensive example, but it is useful in explaining what an apprehension is, and certainly there are others in the room who can explain it a lot better. As much as I like to think I know what I am talking about when it comes to legal things, I am just not quite to the level of many in this room. With that, I would be happy to take questions and ask the public defender and district attorney to come up to help me answer them.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Why does this bill require Clark County to implement it instead of giving Clark County the option? I know that in Washoe County veterans courts work very well. We utilize it from Douglas County to Washoe County, because Douglas County cannot afford the cost. I am wondering why this requires it. Also, is this not an unfunded mandate down to Clark County? Are there any offsetting costs, for instance from the Department of Corrections it could go over to Clark County to help pay for it?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I am pushing an appropriation to pay for the additional court costs. I would also note that technically Clark County is already complying with this language. This is to ensure that the program keeps going and that is exactly why there is also an appropriation going. We can certainly talk about taking that language out later if we do get that appropriation through. This is just to make sure this program keeps going, is successful, and continues to help veterans.

I would also note that there have been some cost savings already realized in Washoe County's district court. In Washoe County, they do not even have a district attorney that comes to the court process. There is less jail time and less time spent in proceedings, because most veterans are going to be doing programs outside of the justice system; so it is a cost saver. I think that attempted to answer the first question. Would you remind me what the second question was?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

The first question was, why is it required? Why should Clark County not be able to make up their own mind on this?

Assemblyman Anderson:

Just to make sure the program keeps going and is effective. I would note that technically they already are complying with the language, so it would not require anything additional in what they are doing.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

I think Nevada has had great success with our therapeutic courts and trying to provide a diversion program for our veterans who get into trouble with the law. I was lucky enough to get to serve on a study committee, looking at a model veterans court act for the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and they are looking at many states, including Nevada's veterans courts as a model. Thank you for bringing this bill.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.]

John T. Jones, Jr., representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association:

The Nevada District Attorneys Association supports this bill. Additionally, Washoe County has had a veterans court for a period of time. Clark County is beginning to get theirs off the ground. We are here to offer our support.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any questions for Mr. Jones? [There were none.]

Steve Yeager, representing the Clark County Public Defender's Office:

I am also here to offer support for this bill. Obviously, it is a huge benefit when we have defendants get into diversionary programs, especially those who have honorably served our country. I have had some clients who have been in this program, and they really benefitted from the structure of the program versus the more traditional path that criminal defendants sometimes take.

I would like to thank Assemblyman Anderson for bringing us in on this and being able to work with him and Mr. Jones on the amendment. The idea behind the amendment is just to step back and really take a look at the facts and circumstances of each individual case to determine whether it is, in fact, a crime of violence. When we are looking at it, the idea would be that the court would consider what the intent was and what they were trying to do. As the example Assemblyman Anderson gave, if someone merely had a weapon, was not doing anything with it, and was not threatening anyone, the hope would be

that it would not qualify as a violent offense, and therefore potentially make it easier for the veteran to get into the court and take advantage of those programs.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any questions for Mr. Yeager? [There were none.] Will those here to testify in support of A.B. 84 come forward at this time?

Caleb S. Cage, Executive Director, Nevada Office of Veterans Services:

I would like to give an overview of our role along with the veterans court, especially in Washoe County. We have been involved with the veterans court programs, especially in Washoe County, since it was created in 2009. We have seen many successes as veterans go through this program and continue into our other programs and other opportunities throughout the state. We have one veterans service officer who sits in on the staffing meetings. He sits as a general advisor, and attends to assess what resources might be available as well.

Through Assemblyman Anderson, we have worked with the Clark County court system as well. Assemblyman Anderson sits on our Veterans Services Commission and he has made this a topic for us and is constantly bringing it back up to make sure we are addressing it as well. This has been a national best-practice around the country and is growing in popularity and support, and I think people are seeing great returns on it.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

There is very little more important to me than our veterans, and I know this program works. I am worried about shuttling unfunded mandates down to a county, which the requirement aspect of this does. Is there any federal funding available to help the county, so the state does not have to come up with it?

Caleb Cage:

I really cannot speak to the specific policy and the funding aspects of this; just our role in it. I will say that the federal Department of Veterans Affairs has veteran court liaisons through the hospital program to the Veterans Health Administration program that actually work with the state and local governments.

Chairman Frierson:

I would remind the Committee that while it is tangentially our concern, we are dealing with the policy side of it, and any financials would end up going to a money committee.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I have worked with the Washoe County liaison and they do really, really good work. Thank you for that.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City to testify in support of A.B. 84? Is there anyone in Las Vegas to testify in support of A.B. 84? [There was no one.]

Thank you, Judge Bell, for taking time over the week to discuss this matter with both Mr. Anderson and me. I think it would provide some beneficial insight to the Committee if you would give an overview of the specialty courts, as far as your involvement goes, and how they function in Clark County.

Linda Bell, Judge, Eighth Judicial District:

My current assignment is to be in charge of all of the adult criminal division specialty courts: DUI court, drug court, veterans court, and mental health court. To give you a little history of the veterans treatment court in Clark County, when *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 176A.280 was passed in 2009, we responded immediately and started a veterans division of our drug court program. We had a veterans drug court until September of 2012, when we started a stand-alone veterans treatment court, which has allowed us to provide additional services to veterans with issues such as post-traumatic stress syndrome. I currently have about 40 who are in the program and it includes veterans who have issues other than substance abuse issues such as PTSD, although many of the veterans that we have in our program do suffer from substance abuse problems. We are able to coordinate with providers in the community to ensure that the veterans get the services they need to be successful and productive members of our community. We have done this without funding. My staff, who are already completely overworked, have very graciously decided that we were just going to get this done because we think it is so important. We have every intention of continuing with this very important program.

With respect to the amendment to this bill, that is a policy consideration that generally the court would not take a position on. I certainly do not have any particular concerns about it. I am happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

My question has to do with the amendment and the prohibition in NRS 176A.290, subsection 2. Do you have many veterans who are defendants that might want to participate in your therapeutic veterans court and find they are prohibited because of the prohibition on the entry in subsection 2?

Judge Bell:

I am not sure I can answer that question because generally we see the people after there has been an agreement. The statute requires that the prosecutor agrees to send the person to veterans court if there is a crime involving violence. Generally those decisions are made before the cases get to me. We do have a fairly broad range of offenses. I certainly think it would not hurt to have a little more clarity on that issue, but I am not aware of any particular situation where someone has been denied the opportunity to go to the veterans treatment court because of funds.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any other questions for Judge Bell? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City in opposition to A.B. 84? Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 84? [There was no one.] Is there anyone to testify in a neutral position on A.B. 84, both in Carson City and Las Vegas? [There was no one.]

Chairman Frierson:

Mr. Anderson, if you would like to come back up and give us your closing remarks. We appreciate your bringing this piece of legislation forward.

Assemblyman Anderson:

Thank you to the Committee. Thank you for opening up your schedules to talk about this and being engaged today. I would like to respond to Assemblyman Ohrenschall's question. I know personally of at least a few, and that is what got my idea going, and I started reaching out to the district attorney and the public defender. They worked together on this amendment so we could provide a better standard for those practicing to have uniform standards because we do not want to get into a situation where we have people with the same offenses having different outcomes. Every judge is different in the nonspecialty departments. This is to clarify the standard and get more at the intent. This is really a term of art, the "reasonable apprehension" language. That is something that most people who practice have learned. I cannot speak for every law student, but I am pretty sure every law student has learned that standard, both in a tort law context and criminal law context. This is something that will provide a lot more clarity and make sure that we are having the full effect of this great program that already has had amazing results.

Chairman Frierson:

It seems to me that a part of the effort in this and other specialty court programs is to provide an opportunity to address mental health. Because of experiences while serving, this is an opportunity to address some mental health concerns in a way that does not quite criminalize it.

Assemblyman Anderson:

That is exactly correct. I do not want to belabor the point in this Committee that there are a lot of folks coming home with a lot of mental issues. It is important that we get them connected with the federal benefits. When we have people come into the court system, we get a twofer. We are bringing in federal benefits to get them well, we are saving jail money, we are not putting them in jail, and we are not putting the public at risk by not doing that. People are generally more compliant when they get structure and treatment. You bring all this together, you save a lot of money, and you bring in more money. The whole reason our state veterans office exists is to connect veterans with the federal benefits and get through that red tape. This is another way to ensure as more and more folks are transitioning back from the front that we have services that are capable of absorbing them back into the population and ensuring that all people who served their country are honored for that and get a fair shake. It really does benefit society, because you are not having to spend money to lock up folks that are coming home and who just need a little help.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

Thank you very much for this bill. You did a great job with the presentation.

Chairman Frierson:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 84 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 132.

Assembly Bill 132: Provides certain immunity from tort liability to persons employed by an agency to provide personal care services in the home. (BDR 3-151)

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Clark County Assembly District No. 18:

In June 2012, I attended a legislative forum which was put on by the Nevada Senior Corps Association that brought many of the providers serving seniors and the disabled to the table with legislators to discuss issues that providers are facing. [Continued to read from text ([Exhibit E](#)).]

One that caught my interest was the dilemma that personal care agencies and their caregivers face. The Division of Health requires caregivers to obtain basic first aid training and cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). While this is a good requirement, it exposes the personal care agency and the caregiver to potential lawsuits because the Good Samaritan Law does not cover people while they are employed.

Several years ago, the Legislature recognized the issue with schoolteachers having to perform CPR while employed, and provided them with coverage under the Good Samaritan Law.

This bill extends that coverage to personal care attendants. I have Bruce Arkell with me here today, and he is representing the Personal Care Association of Nevada. He will be available to answer any specific questions you may have.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any questions for Mr. Carrillo?

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

One thing that I have noticed, both in my old district and the new district after redistricting, is the graying of my constituents. Are you finding many of your constituents needing personal care assistance, whether in their own home or living in an assisted living situation?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

The district that I represent is an older area, and there is a good mix from young to elderly people in the community. That seems to be the precedent. We know that the baby boomers are starting to retire and get up in years, and that is definitely a situation that is going to be more common than not. Yes, there is definitely an increase, and I think this is something that we need to ensure. At the end of the day, we want to make sure that the community is safe. It is not so much because of the fact that people are not allowed to provide this care, it is just if they are ever in that situation. I would like to refer to Mr. Arkell for a lot of the specifics for that.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

I think anything that might assist people in being able to stay in their home, if they can get people who can do this and make them less fearful, I think that is a very positive thing. It is very timely.

Chairman Frierson:

I have a few questions, but first I would like to hear from Mr. Arkell and the amendment that he has proposed.

Bruce Arkell, representing the Personal Care Association of Nevada:

For the past couple of years, the Nevada Senior Corps Association and the personal care agencies, through a committee that was created called the Personal Care Assistance Advisory Committee, pulled together personal care agencies and all of the divisions in the state that deal with them—the funders, Medicaid to a great extent; the regulators, which would be the Health Division; and the Aging and Disability Services Division, which is also involved in both regulation and funding of these kinds of programs.

They got together to talk about what the issues are that they are facing, and the intent was to simplify and clarify the rules for regulations and laws that govern those that provide care to seniors and persons with disabilities. One issue that comes up all the time is the issue where personal caregivers are required to take first aid training and CPR training. They are also told that they are nonmedical people and cannot use it. That is probably an overreach on the part of the agencies that administer this. The last time I talked about this with the Division of Health, I asked, "Why do you not clarify this?" They said it was the intent that they can use it. I said, "Well, intent does not go very far for someone who is out in the field. They need to know what the rules are." The deputy attorney general who worked with the regulators basically said that the laws are unsettled on this, and the solution is to just have a lawsuit and get it resolved. That is one way to do it, I suppose, but we do not believe it is the most effective.

The Good Samaritan Law does not cover persons while they are employed, such as caregivers. It deals with volunteers, or people who come upon an accident and then deal with it. When A.B. 132 was drafted, there is a section in the Good Samaritan Law that essentially covers schoolteachers when they are employed. We thought that was a really easy way to do it. We will just do the same thing for caregivers. That is the way the bill is drafted. The problem did not come out until after people started looking at it. A concern that was brought up, expressed by the Nevada Justice Association, among others, was that the statute was really broad. The issue here is with caregivers that are regulated by a state agency. At their suggestion and working with them on the language, we have moved it under the statute that regulates the caregivers. The language is basically the same as A.B. 132. We want to narrow it up to only deal with caregivers. We do not want anyone to misunderstand what this is all about. Assembly Bill 132 moves it under the Health Division ([Exhibit F](#)).

To a great extent, the issue is with the regulators, not with the public. By putting it here, we make it clear to everyone that this applies to them, and they are covered if they do have to utilize their first aid or CPR training on the senior or disabled person they are taking care of. Fundamentally, that is what this bill does and what it is about.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

It sounds to me that you are saying that under current law it seems there is less liability for home health care if they allow their patients to die rather than give them CPR.

Bruce Arkell:

I am not sure that is truly the case, and I think that is where the dilemma comes. If they are standing there, they have had the training, and someone needs a Heimlich maneuver and they do not do it, my guess is that their neck is stuck out pretty far because they do have the training. That is an example of what the issue is. When they get their training and approvals, they are told to be personal care attendants; that they are nonmedical. Nonmedical means you do not touch people. They are specifically trained, and it just opens up, in their mind, "What am I supposed to do?"

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Do you know of instances, even anecdotally, where people have been dying because the attendants have been reluctant?

Bruce Arkell:

I do not know. One of the personal care providers is here and he is going to follow in the general testimony about the impact it has on his agency and his caregivers. He would be the better one to answer that kind of a question.

Matthew Sharp, representing the Nevada Justice Association:

When we were presented with the bill, my first reaction was, "I cannot imagine a lawyer who would sue a personal caregiver for performing CPR." I can see someone suing if you have the training and do not provide the care. In light of that, our goal is to facilitate and encourage the caregivers to provide CPR in accordance with the training. That is basically the root of the amendment. The reason that we want to put it in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 449 is as Mr. Arkell stated. It really makes more sense being there because that is the chapter that governs personal caregivers. The reason we want to make sure that emergency care is consistent with the intent of the bill is to make sure that the caregivers are able to provide care, CPR, and care consistent with their first aid training. We want to make sure that is the case; we do not want some rogue agency or some rogue personal caregiver saying, "I have noticed that I am taking care of a person who is dehydrated, and now that they cannot move, I have an emergency situation." There are a lot of complexities in what goes on with caring for the elderly. I think we have reached a productive solution.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will now invite those who are here to testify in support of A.B. 132 to come forward.

Peter Morris, Owner, BrightStar Care, Reno, Nevada:

We are a personal care agency, and this directly affects us. As an owner, this bill is a wonderful opportunity to get clarity and remove ambiguity for our

operations. As has already been said, the challenge is that my caregivers are required to have CPR and first aid training, but it is gray at best as to whether or not they are actually allowed to use it in an emergency. We do speak about this a lot in our meetings, and I am not aware of anyone who has died as a result. I am aware that there was one agency where the client went down, the caregiver called 911, the emergency services asked "Do you have CPR training; can you start?" She did not because she was in a quandary. Fortunately, they got there and everything was okay. That was the closest shave we have had.

To be honest, we all live in a little bit of fear about what does one do. We know that in those circumstances when a client does go down, seconds really do count. These caregivers, while they are specifically trained to certain requirements under the regulations, they are still relatively low-skilled, and critical-thinking skills are eased out of them. Their job is not to think critically about any situation; it is to act. If we can have this clarity and lack of ambiguity, they know that they are trained and if they call 911 and they are told to begin CPR, there are no issues or concerns. I think that is really going to be very good for everyone, including, most importantly, the clients to whom we are providing those care services and those families of those clients who are looking to us to do whatever we can for their loved one. It would definitely help me with this amendment if it was all under NRS Chapter 449, because obviously that is the bible by which I operate, and not have to worry about thinking where else it might appear.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I see the value in putting in something like this. Being an educator, I know that I would feel very uncomfortable if I could not go and provide the first aid that any child would need at the moment. Along the same vein, I want to know the opposite side of it. You have said how the caregivers are hesitant possibly to render this first aid. Have you heard of any cases where family members might have disagreed with the rendering of the first aid and how that puts the care provider in a different position? I would like to know if there were any legal ramifications that a care provider has faced.

Peter Morris:

I am not aware of any that the caregiver has raised. You do raise an interesting point. Typically the discussion I have is with the family who we are looking to bring on service, and we talk about the things we are allowed to do, the things we are not allowed to do. We talk about the training and capabilities of our caregivers, and it does come up more than from time to time, actually fairly regularly, where when it gets to CPR and first aid, they arise in different ways. "If my parent has an issue, caregivers can get on that, right?" As an owner, I feel a little awkward about it. I say, "Well, they have CPR training." The first

job is to call 911 and then do whatever the emergency services tell them. But it creates an ambiguity, and we definitely get the looks of concern from the family members about it, "Well, are you or are you not?" I live in dread of that situation where my caregiver did not give CPR because they were not sure, something happens, then it is not just the caregiver that is being sued, I am being sued. Or they do give the care and something happens, then it is, "Well, yes they were CPR-certified, but you are not actually allowed to do that. You did that, something bad happened, we are going to sue you again." Either way, I feel like I am in a lose-lose situation.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in Carson City to testify in support of A.B. 132? Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of A.B. 132? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.]

As this proposes to change the bill into an entirely different statute, we may have to maneuver somewhat to make sure that we do it right. I want to make sure that if we are going to move this measure that we do it in the proper way.

Mr. Carrillo, would you like to give closing comments?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

After attending this legislative forum that Mr. Arkell had invited a few legislators to, I realized that as we get older, there just is not any reason why anyone should hesitate to assure that someone's life is going to keep going, or stop and worry about something like if they are going to get sued, or if they are going to lose everything they have worked so hard for. It is a thankless job at the end of the day, but it is necessary and provides care to our loved ones. A lot of people lose all sight of that and they look at the bottom line. "Who is responsible? Who is going to pay for the loss of my loved one?" Unfortunately, I do not have my parents in this world anymore, so anyone who can extend the parents' lives of anyone else, by all means I give them a lot of credit for that. Anyone who can help us do that—I am looking at everyone in this committee room—and make it happen, it would be much appreciated.

Chairman Frierson:

I am going to close the hearing on A.B. 132. Is there any public comment, either in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was none.] There are no BDR introductions today.

I have decided to form a subcommittee to deal with legislation around homeowners' associations. The subcommittee will consist of Assemblywoman Cohen, Assemblyman Martin, Assemblyman Carrillo, Assemblyman Duncan, and Assemblywoman Fiore. It will be chaired by Assemblywoman Cohen. We will get some of those bills distributed to the subcommittee members and have bills scheduled to be heard by the subcommittee and vet those issues that way, so we can get as much in that process as possible before we come back to the Committee. The Assembly Committee on Judiciary is adjourned for today [at 9:06 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Whimple
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: March 1, 2013

Time of Meeting: 8:14 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 84	C	Assemblyman Elliot Anderson	Testimony
A.B. 84	D	Assemblyman Elliot Anderson	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 132	E	Assemblyman Richard Carrillo	Testimony
A.B. 132	F	Bruce Arkell	Proposed Amendment