

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
February 11, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 9:03 a.m. on Monday, February 11, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chair
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Justin C. Jones
Senator Greg Brower
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Mark Hutchison

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mindy Martini, Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Counsel
Lynn Hendricks, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Heather D. Procter, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety
John McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court
Keith Munro, Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Ben Graham, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court
Jennifer P. Togliatti, District Judge, Department 9, Eighth Judicial District
Kristin Erickson, Nevada District Attorneys Association

Chair Segerblom:

We have several bill draft requests (BDRs) to introduce.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 16-241: Revises provisions governing parole. (Later introduced as S.B. 104.)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 59-168: Enacts the Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act. (Later introduced as S.B. 105.)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 14-509: Revises provisions relating to judicial administration. (Later introduced as S.B. 106.)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 5-519: Restricts the use of solitary confinement on persons in confinement. (Later introduced as S.B. 107.)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 5-518: Revises provisions governing juvenile justice. (Later introduced as S.B. 108.)

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 16-241, BDR 59-168, BDR 14-509, BDR 5-519 AND BDR 5-518.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 30.

SENATE BILL 30: Revises provisions governing the dissemination of records of criminal history by an agency of criminal justice. (BDR 14-400)

Heather D. Procter (Senior Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):

I have written testimony explaining the history and purpose of S.B. 30 ([Exhibit C](#)). In addition, we have a minor amendment to the bill ([Exhibit D](#)). We met with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), which had submitted

a fiscal note on the bill. With the proposed amendment in [Exhibit D](#), the AOC has agreed to withdraw the fiscal note.

Chair Segerblom:

The bill sounds reasonable. If you want to study why an incident occurred, you need to know the criminal history of both the victim and the perpetrator.

Ms. Procter:

Absolutely.

Senator Hutchison:

This sounds good to me. If we are going to look into the facets of a type of criminal activity, we need to have the records and data available.

Julie Butler (Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety):

The Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History supports [S.B. 30](#). As the Attorney General's (AG's) domestic fatality review team only meets twice a year, the operational and fiscal impact of providing Nevada criminal history information to the team is expected to be minimal.

John McCormick (Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court):

With the amendatory language in [Exhibit D](#), the AOC withdraws the fiscal note attached to this bill.

Chair Segerblom:

I have received a letter from the AG's Office explaining its support for the bill ([Exhibit E](#)).

I will close the hearing on [S.B. 30](#) and open the hearing on [S.B. 27](#) and [S.B. 57](#).

[SENATE BILL 27](#): Clarifies the authority of the Attorney General to appear in civil actions to defend state judicial officers who are sued for certain acts or omissions related to their public duties or employment. (BDR 3-219)

[SENATE BILL 57](#): Revises provisions relating to legal representation of certain persons by the Attorney General or the chief legal officer of a political subdivision of this State in certain civil actions. (BDR 3-389)

Keith Munro (Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):

I have a letter from the AG explaining our support for S.B. 27 ([Exhibit F](#)). One of the many duties of the AG's Office is to provide legal representation to employees when they are sued for performing job-related duties. We represent thousands of State employees across Nevada. The Legislature decides which employees will be represented by us, and this information is set forth in statute. Recently, an issue arose about the authority of the AG's Office to represent members of the Nevada Supreme Court and district court judges when they are sued in their official capacity. As far back as anyone can remember, the AG's Office has provided this representation to the State officers. We brought S.B. 27 to make that very clear in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

We are aware of S.B. 57, which is broader than S.B. 27. We have an amendment to merge S.B. 57 into S.B. 27 ([Exhibit G](#)).

There is a vacuum as to who represents court staff and others; is it the AG or the appropriate district attorney? Are court staff county employees or State employees? Traditionally, whoever provides the funding for the position provides legal representation. We brought this legislation so those issues could be resolved and set forth our position in S.B. 27. We believe the legislative process is the best forum for reaching a resolution. Our Office is happy to undertake any duties the Legislature asks us to. Whom we are to represent and what the funding mechanism for that representation is to be should be set out in statute.

Chair Segerblom:

Would you explain how [Exhibit G](#) merges the two bills?

Mr. McCormick:

We are neutral on S.B. 57, which was proposed by the Nevada Supreme Court. We have been working with the Court and would be fine if the language of that bill were put into S.B. 27.

Ben Graham (Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court):

I would like to offer some background on these two bills. Over the years, legislation has been brought forward to offer protection and guidance to county clerks, who occasionally receive liens of hundreds of thousands of dollars filed against public officials by disgruntled individuals. In the last couple of years, litigation has been brought against public officials, and it might be appropriate to call that litigation vindictive and frivolous. At the 76th Legislative Session,

I noticed a sign at the entrance that I had not seen before; it said that anyone planning to serve a subpoena or other papers to a Legislator or anyone else in the building should contact the Legislative Police.

There has rarely been any difficulty with regard to the actual judicial officers. However, what brought this matter to our attention was the people who sued not only judicial officers or Legislators but also their dead spouses and grandchildren. This litigation required some response. We came close to a resolution last Session. I do not see that there will be many of these cases, but we are asking the Legislature to take a look at the issue just in case there are. In almost all instances, the procedure is going to be short: a motion to dismiss because of the irrelevancy and the frivolity of the suit.

We worked with the judiciary and the Eighth Judicial District on the language in [Exhibit G](#), which brings the language from S.B. 57 into S.B. 27 and also addresses the funding issue. Some other issues arose over the weekend that will require some additional work on the amendment to come up with language that will benefit everyone.

The AOC's concern is that when you get a subpoena, it gives you a specific number of days to reply. The official whose grandchildren or spouse is sued needs to respond in a timely manner, which cannot happen if he or she has to get permission from the county commission or the city council as to whether the official attorney will represent them. That is why we are asking that this legislation be enacted.

I will not go through every section of the amended language of S.B. 27. The bill makes it clear who will be represented and who will provide that representation. It also covers Legislators, so if your mother and grandmother get sued because someone is mad at you for something you did in your official capacity, they would be represented by the AG's Office.

Senator Ford:

I have a question about section 6 of S.B. 57. Can you tell me the difference between subsection 1, which is part of NRS 41.0337, and subsection 2, which is added by this bill? The language seems identical to me.

Mr. Munro:

The distinction is that subsection 2 of section 6 lists those named as defendants in an action solely because of an alleged act or omission.

Senator Ford:

It seems to me that if you are sued under subsection 1 of section 6 based on a tort that arises out of your act or omission within the scope of the duties of employment, that suit would already be subsumed under subsection 1, and thus there is no need for subsection 2. Can you show me the difference or give me an example where subsection 2 would apply?

Nick Anthony (Counsel):

I believe section 6, subsection 1 refers to actions against present or former judicial officers, officers or employees, immune contractors or Legislators because of their acts or omissions. Subsection 2 is an action against another person who is named as a defendant because of the acts or omissions of a present or former judicial officer, officer or employee, immune contractor or Legislator. It is a little bit broader. It could reach to that person who is a spouse or sibling or to someone else besides the actual judicial officer or the like.

Senator Ford:

I will take it under advisement. I am still not clear about the difference.

Chair Segerblom:

My understanding is that subsection 1 of section 6 applies to the actions or omissions of the public official, and subsection 2 expands it to relatives and others. My question is if my children get sued, how do you decide whether they are being sued because of my role as a Legislator or for some other reason?

Mr. Munro:

That would be determined as a part of the review process when the request for representation was considered. I agree with Mr. Anthony's summary of the difference between subsection 1 and subsection 2 of section 6.

Senator Brower:

Section 6 of S.B. 57 says, "No tort action ... may be brought ... unless the State or appropriate political subdivision is named a party defendant under NRS 41.031." That sounds like an immunity provision. It seems to be saying

that certain types of persons cannot be sued unless the State is also sued, which does not really mean anything.

Mr. Graham:

This provision says if someone brings an action against an officer or a family member because of an official act, the State needs to be included as a defendant. This is because the obligation to defend the officer would fall to the AG under current law. It does not say that the officers cannot be sued, just that the governmental entity under whose jurisdiction they act must also be named.

Senator Brower:

The point of the two bills, as I understood it, was to provide a defense for individuals sued. Where is that in the bill? The provisions we just discussed only create a minor hurdle.

Mr. Graham:

I would like to defer that question until we hear the testimony of the Chief District Judge of the Eighth Judicial District, since she and her family were subjected to this type of lawsuit.

Senator Brower:

What I was looking for in this bill was a change to the statute to make it absolutely clear that the AG will defend an expanded group of people.

Senator Jones:

That is in section 8 of S.B. 57.

Senator Brower:

Mr. Graham, you used the terms "complaint" and "subpoena," and the Committee knows the difference between them. Does S.B. 57 cover subpoenas as well as summonses and complaints?

Mr. Graham:

I added subpoenas because a person who was subpoenaed as a witness for the defense might need some direction as to how to respond to questions.

Senator Brower:

Does this bill cover subpoenas?

Mr. Graham:

Not directly, no.

Senator Brower:

So would the AG's Office be obligated to defend a witness who was subpoenaed?

Mr. Graham:

I would think not, unless he or she was involved as a party. I defer to Mr. Munro on that.

Mr. Munro:

Chapter 41 of the NRS only states that representation will be provided when the specified employees are sued.

Senator Brower:

Does the AG's Office generally represent these categories of persons who are subpoenaed as witnesses in litigation?

Mr. Munro:

Generally, no. We brought the bill to show whom we think we are supposed to represent. Clearer lines need to be drawn with respect to who is entitled to representation. We are amenable to working with this Committee and the Nevada Supreme Court on this bill.

Senator Brower:

I did not know Legislators were included in this section of the NRS. Legislators are normally represented in litigation by employees of the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). Can you give me an idea of how many times the AG has represented a Legislator in litigation in the last few years?

Mr. Munro:

The only case I can recall involved former Senator Dina Titus.

Senator Brower:

Without belaboring it, can you give us an idea what sort of litigation that was?

Mr. Munro:

It had to do with a piece of legislation that made its way through the Legislature. She was sued as a result of having been part of that process. The AG defended her and the law in question.

Senator Brower:

Was the LCB involved as counsel of record as well?

Mr. Munro:

The LCB might have filed an amicus curiae brief. Other than that, I do not believe it was involved.

Senator Jones:

With regard to section 11 of S.B. 57, this relates to circumstances in which the official attorney at the AG's Office does not provide for defense of a person who is named. Section 8 mandates that the official attorney shall provide for the defense. I see the exceptions in section 11, such as when a suit is brought in a court outside of Nevada. Are there any other circumstances in which the official attorney can refuse to provide representation?

Mr. Munro:

Part of what has driven these bills has been our economy and the change by the money committees in adopting the priorities of government, where agencies have been required to make clearer what their duties are and how they are funded. For many years, we worked cooperatively with these issues. Now that issues with funding and authority have been pressed upon us by our finances, we have looked at the issues more closely. Normally, if people were sued for acts within their official capacity related to something they did as part of their jobs, there has been representation. If they did something outside their jobs, there has not been representation.

Senator Jones:

Who makes that initial determination? Is it the AG who makes the initial determination of whether the action was within the course and scope of the person's work?

Mr. Munro:

For cases that fall within our jurisdiction, we require a request for representation, saying something like, "I would like to be represented, and this is why I think I am entitled to representation."

Senator Jones:

Do you automatically accept those requests?

Mr. Munro:

No. We read the requests and make a determination. We do accept most of them, however.

Senator Jones:

Are there established criteria as to when you will represent and when you will not?

Mr. Munro:

Yes. The broad overview is whether the acts were within the scope of the person's duty.

Senator Jones:

If a judge later determines the AG should have represented a judicial officer and did not, there is a provision in S.B. 57 that allows for the person to be reimbursed. Section 11, subsection 2, paragraph (a) says, "These expenses must be paid, upon approval by the State Board of Examiners, from the Reserve for Statutory Contingency Account." If a court determines the AG should have represented someone, are we not vesting the State Board of Examiners with too much discretion in determining whether those expenses should be paid?

Mr. Munro:

The State Board of Examiners constitutionally has the ability to consider claims against the State. In the early 1990s, the AG's Office did not represent someone who retained personal counsel and was able to prevail in court. The person sought relief pursuant to this provision, and the ruling was that the person was entitled to reimbursement. That was paid by the State Board of Examiners.

Senator Jones:

What if the State Board of Examiners had not approved that payment?

Mr. Munro:

There would have to have been some legal basis for denying the claim. A lot of these cases are judged by the totality of the circumstances. If there was a judicial ruling, I cannot imagine why the Board of Examiners would not agree and comply. This language is an attempt by the Legislature to make sure the statute conforms to the constitutional provision allowing the State Board of Examiners to judge claims.

Jennifer P. Togliatti (District Judge, Department 9, Eighth Judicial District):

I would like to give the Committee some historical context to S.B. 57. There have been several instances in which particularly vexatious litigants have sued nonemployees with ties to a judicial officer solely for the acts or omissions committed by the judicial officer while acting in an official capacity. For example, an individual who was dissatisfied with the proceedings in family court sued 54 people on that basis. Those 54 people included the Mayor of Las Vegas and grandchildren of Nevada Supreme Court Justices.

The effect of a vexatious litigant's conduct in that regard is not limited to family members. With the Internet and the ability to do research, the kind of harassment we are talking about can result in the litigant finding relationships of any kind, such as people who own property together and have no biological relationship. In this case, a judge made a decision one litigant did not like, and 54 people got sued.

If a litigant avoids paying filing fees by declaring in forma pauperis status, a screening of the litigation can be required under the Nevada Supreme Court case *Jordan v. State ex rel. Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety*, 121 Nev. 44, 110 P.3d 30 (2005). This is one way to curb vexatious litigants. However, if a person pays the filing fee in each and every case, there is no prescreening mechanism. That person has a right to file lawsuits, pay the fee, have it served and then go forward with litigation.

That is the genesis of this bill. The day I filed for office, I signed up to be the subject of lawsuits, complaints and whatever disgruntled litigants feel is the appropriate avenue to attack the decisions I make. But there is no public policy protecting my associates, friends and family. This bill is intended to protect others who might not be as well-situated to address a situation like this. If my spouse gets sued, I am in a situation to handle that, but a lot of public officers may not be. In some of the 54 suits mentioned, the defendants filed

homeowner's insurance claims to pay for representation. The attorney needs to file a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, which is Rule 12(b)(5) of the *Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure* (NRCP), or a motion to dismiss based on judicial immunity. That is all we are talking about.

This bill is not intended to be used by nonemployees to demand representation for any purpose other than to defend against an action caused by the acts or omissions of an employee acting in an official capacity.

Senator Ford:

The civil procedure rules that can deal with such cases do not generally require a factual interpretation of the complaint. I do not necessarily disagree with what you are requesting, but I would like to know if NRCP 12(b)(5) would allow you to make a factual determination as to whether or not the judicial officer was performing acts within the scope of his or her responsibility. That would generally be a question of fact as opposed to an NRCP 12(b)(5) motion.

District Judge Togliatti:

The motion to dismiss presumes all the facts in the complaint are true. If those facts are taken as true, is there grounds for a claim? In the instance I gave you with the 54 defendants, every suit was based on the same facts: the challenge to the conduct of a particular family court judge in a particular case. Assuming those facts to be true, would the grandchild of a Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court be liable? The answer obviously is no.

These matters are usually considered in the context of the vexatious litigant. They are obvious on their face. The 54 cases all complained about the same conduct. If it is not clear that that conduct was a public duty—for example, were someone to slip in the icy driveway of a judicial officer's home and sue the officer's spouse—clearly this suit does not meet the standard of the statute. It is not related to the public duties or employment of the judicial office, and it is not solely because of the alleged act of the officer participating in public duties.

Senator Ford:

But determining whether the actions were within the employee's scope of responsibility would normally be a question of fact. You have to make that determination before you can say whether this person has a leg to stand on. Is that not right?

District Judge Togliatti:

In the situation I described, the complaint on its face detailed acts of a judicial officer in his or her official capacity. I am struggling to imagine a circumstance in which a grandchild of a judicial officer says the action of the suit was not a judicial act and disputes the facts if it is in fact the result of a judicial decision. When there is a question, the AG's Office is entitled to undertake that examination.

If there is a dispute between the judicial officer and the AG as to whether it was a duty of the Office, that is what a declaratory relief action is for; it requests a judicial determination as to who is correct. You still have that same circumstance the way the law is written now if you only include public officers and judicial officers. This bill is just a matter of protection for those who may be the almost random victims of vexatious litigants because of their relationships. It is an equity situation for these people who are not protected.

Senator Ford:

I too have a hard time thinking of an example; however, my concern is that an example may exist. The bottom line for me is whether this is a belt-and-suspenders scenario. It sounds to me that we already have a rule of procedure that allows for the disposition of cases in this circumstance under NRCP 12(b)(5). Do we need this measure when we already have this in statute?

Chair Segerblom:

This just clarifies who pays to file the NRCP 12(b)(5) motion.

District Judge Togliatti:

Yes. There have been numerous persons in the circumstance I detailed that had to pay hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars to appear, file the motion, have it scheduled if it gets continued, and so on. You know what we are dealing with when it comes to getting a dismissal.

Senator Hutchison:

How many lawyers are currently in the AG's Office?

Mr. Munro:

It ebbs and flows, but currently there are about 135.

Senator Hutchison:

Is it safe to say that if the AG's Office were a law firm, it would be the biggest law firm in Nevada?

Mr. Munro:

I do not know, but it would probably be the law firm with the largest portfolio of legal matters by a long shot.

Senator Hutchison:

The AG's Office handles more litigation than any law firm in the State. Is that right?

Mr. Munro:

We handle quite a bit, yes.

Senator Hutchison:

Given that, why is it not a conflict of interest to have the AG represent the judges before whom they practice across the State? If I was the opposing counsel on some matter involving a judge, I would then have to go in front of the judiciary who is represented by the AG's Office. Why is that not a troubling conflict of interest? The judiciary is different from every other governmental body.

Mr. Munro:

The precedent is that for as long as anybody can remember, Legislators have asked the Office of the AG to step forward and provide representation.

Senator Hutchison:

But is it right?

Mr. Munro:

That is a decision for this Committee to make. The Nevada Supreme Court has touched on this situation in *Cannon v. Taylor*, 88 Nev. 89, 493 P.2d 1313 (1972). The court said the Nevada AG's Office is a different animal from a regular law firm and needs to make efforts to provide conflict-free representation. The amended version of the bill in [Exhibit G](#) allows us to determine if we can find someone within the Office to provide that representation and allows us to contract with someone to provide representation to reach that end.

Senator Hutchison:

I do not have a solution for this issue. If I were representing a judge, I would expect opposing counsel to ask these same questions.

District Judge Togliatti:

I agree with Mr. Munro that the AG has always represented judges as it relates to our judicial function. If I get sued by an inmate, which happens several times a year, for something I have done in his or her case, the AG's Office undertakes the representation.

It might somewhat quell your concerns to know that the AG's Office does not always represent the court. For example, we have matters proceeding in the Nevada Supreme Court with an employee association that has sued the court to declare certain rights. The AG does not represent in that case; we retained private counsel. Presumably, the AG is not representing us because that is not something that occurred as a result of our judicial function. In a federal lawsuit by a particular employee, the AG is not representing the court in the Nevada Supreme Court when we are being sued by an association because those matters are not as a result of our day-to-day functioning as judges.

Senator Hutchison:

Is a decision always made as to whether the courts and the judges are being sued in their official capacity?

District Judge Togliatti:

Yes. The Eighth Judicial District Court has been sued on numerous occasions related to labor matters, for example, and the AG's Office does not represent us in those matters. When it comes to the day-to-day functions associated with, perhaps, issuing a warrant for someone's arrest or someone being arrested on a warrant, the AG represents the judge. However, the AG's Office has said no because it deems an action not to be as a result of the duties of the judge. When that happens, we make arrangements to secure counsel outside of the AG's Office.

Senator Hutchison:

I would like to continue this conversation about the conflict of interest issue at some point.

Chair Segerblom:

You can raise it when we consider this bill in work session, and we will consider any amendments you propose to clarify the issue.

Senator Brower:

To follow up on Senator Ford's point, these things are often messy. They may seem like frivolous suits, but that does not mean they are easy to get rid of. In light of that reality, the question is should people innocently roped into these suits have to fend for themselves and pay for their defense, or should the AG provide that defense? That is the point of this bill.

Mr. Graham:

Yes. There have only been one or two cases like this over the last several years. But in one of them, 54 people got sued. The point of the bill is to protect people from this type of action and give them someone they can go to.

Senator Brower:

The point is not to have those defendants bear the burden of the defense. Is that right?

Mr. Munro:

Yes. I would concur with your statement.

Chair Segerblom:

I would like to have the work session on these bills fairly soon if you can figure out how you want S.B. 27 and S.B. 57 to merge.

Mr. Munro:

Mr. Graham and I have been discussing this issue for some time. We will also include the representative of the Nevada District Attorneys Association in those discussions.

Kristin Erickson (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

Counties represent county employees in litigation. This bill would expand representation to include family members, spouses, coproperty owners and others. Although we support the concept of defending people who are sued in frivolous lawsuits, the Nevada District Attorneys Association does have some concerns regarding the funding mechanism of such representation. We are

certainly willing to work with the sponsors of the bill to come up with a mutually agreeable solution.

Chair Segerblom:

My understanding is that if the district judge is sued, the AG steps in. But if a justice of the peace is sued, the district attorney steps in. Is that right?

Ms. Erickson:

That is correct.

Chair Segerblom:

Your concern is that if a justice of the peace or his or her family are sued, the expense would fall to you.

Ms. Erickson:

Yes.

Chair Segerblom:

Do you want us to put a funding mechanism in to reimburse you?

Ms. Erickson:

That is one of the options we are exploring. It is certainly a huge concern for the rural counties.

Chair Segerblom:

Do you step in if a justice of the peace is sued?

Ms. Erickson:

Yes.

Chair Segerblom:

So the problem is the expansion of representation to include family members.

Ms. Erickson:

Yes.

Senator Ford:

For clarification, you only object to the fiscal aspect of this bill. The policy does not present a problem. Is that right?

Ms. Erickson:

There are some concerns as to how far we should go to represent people if they are tangentially involved. There is some concern that perhaps we should not be representing these people, and perhaps district attorneys should have some say in whom we represent.

Senator Ford:

I would like to see the analysis on how you determine how far you should go. Please keep me informed.

Ms. Erickson:

I will.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 11, 2013
Page 19

Chair Segerblom:

Is there any public comment today? Hearing none, I will adjourn this meeting at 10 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lynn Hendricks,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 30	C	1	Heather D. Procter	Written testimony
S.B. 30	D	1	Heather D. Procter	Proposed Amendment to SB 30
S.B. 30	E	2	Senator Tick Segerblom	Letter from Catherine Cortez Masto re: SB 30
S.B. 27	F	3	Keith Munro	Letter from Catherine Cortez Masto re: SB 27
S.B. 27, S.B. 57	G	4	Keith Munro	Compromise Amendment to SB 27