

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
February 19, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 9:01 a.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 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
Lindsay Wheeler, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Quentin Byrne, Officer, Department of Corrections
A.G. Burnett, Chair, State Gaming Control Board
Heather Procter, Office of the Attorney General
John McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts
William O. Voy, District Judge, Department A, Eighth Judicial District Court
Melissa A. Saragosa, Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4, Clark County
Ben Graham, Administrative Office of the Courts
John Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association
Regan Comis, M + R Strategic Services

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 19, 2013
Page 2

Carey Stewart, Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services;
President, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators.

Frank Cervantes, Division Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services

Jo Lee Wickes, Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Washoe County District Attorney

Chris Frey, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Chair Segerblom:

We will now start the work session with Senate Bill (S.B.) 32. Mindy Martini, Policy Analyst, will now go through the bills under consideration ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATE BILL 32: Revises various provisions relating to the Department of Corrections and the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety. (BDR 16-317)

Mindy Martini (Policy Analyst):

I will now read from the bill description ([Exhibit D](#)) regarding S.B. 32.

Senator Brower:

Do we have a copy of the amendment?

Ms. Martini:

It was a verbal amendment. The summary is at the bottom of [Exhibit D](#).

Chair Segerblom:

The intent of the amendment is based upon comments made by the Director of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The Director felt offenders should not be able to serve residential confinement in another state. I feel being able to do so would be beneficial to the inmate.

Quentin Byrne (Officer, Department of Corrections):

The DOC does not move inmates to other states to be closer to their families. The DOC moves inmates to other states when the inmate creates a significant security problem or needs protection. We move inmates who are well-known and need protection, for example: politicians, attorneys or law enforcement agents.

Senator Brower:

The DOC does not support the Chair's amendment?

Mr. Byrne:

No.

Chair Segerblom:

Why can an inmate serve in a facility in another state, but not residential confinement?

Mr. Byrne:

An inmate is placed in residential confinement locally to stay with his or her family. The DOC has several other programs that are narrowly tailored. By placing an inmate from Nevada into residential confinement in another state, we lose control over how that inmate is supervised by that state's equivalent of Nevada's Division of Parole and Probation.

Chair Segerblom:

Would the DOC have the right to approve or disapprove the transfer of an inmate to a residential confinement in another state if it is determined the confinement would be satisfactory to the DOC? I am not comfortable with the Director's comments regarding a blanket moratorium by the DOC. If there is some rationale as to the prohibition or if Senator Brower objects, I will withdraw my amendment.

Senator Brower:

I do not have a specific objection. I defer to the Director for the rationale.

Chair Segerblom:

I withdraw my amendment. I will take a motion to approve S.B. 32.

SENATOR JONES MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 32.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will move to S.B. 9.

SENATE BILL 9: Makes various changes relating to the regulation of gaming.
(BDR 41-328)

Ms. Martini:

I will now read from the bill description ([Exhibit E](#)). The amendment adds interactive gaming to the exception that losses may be deducted under certain circumstances.

Chair Segerblom:

Can you explain the intent of the amendment?

A.G. Burnett (Chair, State Gaming Control Board):

The intent is to capture any net profit an interactive gaming operator licensee receives as a result of having an online poker tournament, should those tournaments be held at a physical location. Slot and poker tournaments are not taxable events. The casinos take a loss. The casinos operate those tournaments to bring in people and give away a lot of items to individuals who win those tournaments. The intent of this bill is to preclude an online entity from failing to pay taxes pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statute 463.745*. The intent is to tax the net profits on what a licensee receives. For example, if a person pays \$50 to enter an online tournament, we only want to tax the \$50 as net income to the operator, regardless of what is paid out to a winner.

Chair Segerblom:

I will take a motion to approve S.B. 9.

SENATOR HUTCHISON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED S.B. 9.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will move to S.B. 17.

SENATE BILL 17: Revises the deadlines by which certain gaming licensees are required to file financial reports and pay certain fees. (BDR 41-332)

Ms. Martini:

I will now read from the bill description ([Exhibit F](#)). This bill will allow the Board to publish revenue numbers earlier which would be consistent with other states.

Chair Segerblom:

I will take a motion to approve S.B. 17.

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 17.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will move to 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)

Ms. Martini:

I will now read from the bill description of S.B. 30 ([Exhibit G](#)). The Attorney General's statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, which met in 2012, determined that access to criminal history of the perpetrator was necessary to conduct an effective fatality review. One amendment in [Exhibit G](#) eliminates the fiscal note of \$20,000 for the IT contract because the Administrative Office of the Courts indicates that requested information may be in a paper or electronic format.

Chair Segerblom:

Does the fiscal note come off with the amendment, or does it need to go to the Senate Committee on Finance to remove the fiscal note?

Ms. Martini:

I believe the fiscal note stays with the bill.

Heather Procter (Office of the Attorney General):

The amendment eliminates the fiscal note.

Chair Segerblom:

I will take a motion to approve S.B. 30.

SENATOR JONES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 30.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will move to S.B. 38.

SENATE BILL 38: Revises provisions governing the dissemination by the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History of information relating to certain offenses. (BDR 14-343)

Ms. Martini:

I will now read from the description of the bill ([Exhibit H](#)). The amendment from the Department of Public Safety changes the effective date from July 1 to October 1.

Chair Segerblom:

I will take a motion to approve S.B. 38.

SENATOR FORD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 38.

SENATOR HUTCHISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will move to S.B. 71.

SENATE BILL 71: Revises provisions governing sentencing of certain criminal offenders and determining eligibility of certain prisoners for parole. (BDR 14-447)

Ms. Martini:

I will now read from the bill description ([Exhibit I](#)).

Chair Segerblom:

I recall testimony from someone who wanted the ability of the victims to confront the perpetrator at each parole hearing. There were objections to this bill. The inmates advocate, Tonja Brown, offered an amendment on page 2 of [Exhibit I](#).

Senator Brower:

This bill was considered by the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. I sit on the Commission. Without the proposed amendment, I feel the bill gets to the intent. I appreciate the intent behind the amendment and objection. I think the bill in the current form is what was contemplated and should be passed as drafted.

Chair Segerblom:

During the 2011 Session this measure, S.B. No. 265 of the 76th Session, was not passed due to a fiscal note. I will take a motion to approve S.B. 71.

SENATOR BROWER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 71.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

The work session is closed and we will now move onto S.B. 106.

SENATE BILL 106: Revises various provisions relating to judicial administration.
(BDR 14-509)

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

Page 4, section 5 of the proposed amendment to S.B. 106 (Exhibit J) is being withdrawn. It is not necessary to achieve the intent of the bill.

William O. Voy (District Judge, Department A, Eighth Judicial District):

The juvenile court has jurisdiction over a child before he or she reaches 18 years of age if the child commits a delinquent act. The court's jurisdiction lasts until the child turns 21. When a child owes restitution and is put on probation, the child may be unable to pay restitution. The child may fail to pay. The court's jurisdiction is exhausted when the child reaches 21. The ability to enforce the restitution still owed is exhausted as well at that time. The child is no longer held accountable for those fees. The victim no longer has any recourse to collect fees owed. Additional fines and fees owed by the parents of the child also terminate at age 21. The court is writing off hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees. This bill would collect restitution fees as any other civil judgment. The bill allows the juvenile court to waive community service hours previously imposed in exchange for a monetary contribution to the "restitution fund" for victims of juvenile crime who otherwise would not be compensated. The lack of compensation for victims is due largely to the extinguishing of the court's jurisdiction at age 21.

Additionally, the court is restricted to convert community service to a fine. If an individual is unable to complete community service, this bill provides a restitution fund in which the individual would be able to contribute.

Financial obligations owed to entities can be enforced through collection agencies. In Clark County, the average obligation to be paid by a parent of a juvenile is approximately \$600 for each child sent to a youth camp. An order of \$600 is not attractive to a collection agency. If the orders of judgment are converted to a civil judgment, it becomes more attractive to a collection agency. A fiscal note attached to this bill, saves the taxpayers money in allowing these

obligations to be enforced. The intent of S.B. 106 is to allow for the collection on these fines and fees.

Chair Segerblom:

Was this bill similar to a past bill?

District Judge Voy:

Yes, S.B. No. 26 of the 76th Session was passed out of this Committee, in 2011. Assemblyman William C. Horne and I did not see eye to eye on this bill. It did not pass out of the Assembly.

Melissa A. Saragosa (Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4, Clark County):

I am offering an amendment with approval of the bill's sponsor. The amendment relates to section 1, subsection 4. It would authorize counties and courts to utilize the funds collected from fees for additional staff necessary for the collection program. It also would allow for counties to use funds to assist the self help centers. The Las Vegas Justice Court projects that for this fiscal year, \$8.6 million will be collected from these fines. The additional staff would expand the collection efforts. The court would be able to expand into other fee areas. The court collects on traffic fines. This bill would allow for the expansion into collecting criminal fines.

The Civil Law Self Help Center program is the single most successful operation between the public and the court. It serves approximately 48,000 Clark County customers per year. Of those 48,000 customers, 78 percent are justice court customers. It is a great service to our community, and this bill would allow for the continuation of these services.

Chair Segerblom:

Does Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada support this bill?

Judge Saragosa:

Yes.

Senator Ford:

What is the sponsor's position regarding the amendment?

Ben Graham (Administrative Office of the Courts):

The amendment does not affect the bill and gives the justice court flexibility.

Chair Segerblom:

The sponsor has worked with the justice court regarding the amendment and supports it.

Senator Brower:

Could there be a situation where the court orders community service, but the defendant could choose to pay a fine or contribute to the restitution fund instead?

District Judge Voy:

No. It is not a matter of choice. It is the discretion of the court. This bill allows the court to have the flexibility to impose this alternative. This type of situation does not happen very often. I have only seen this happen three or four times a year out of thousands of cases. It gives the court the ability to allow the individual to make a financial contribution if the individual is unable to complete community service.

Senator Brower:

This bill only allows for judicial discretion?

District Judge Voy:

Yes. The individual does not get to make that choice. It is entirely up to the judge.

Chair Segerblom:

This is not a case of a rich child buying justice?

District Judge Voy:

No. A parent would not be able to come in and offer to pay. It is the court's discretion to allow the payment.

Senator Hutchison:

Have you tried to enlist collection agencies to enforce these fines with a court order? I understand it is because the collection agencies will not take a court order. Do they need a civil judgment in order to collect?

District Judge Voy:

Yes. In 2005, the court attempted to collect on these court orders. The agencies said they would not enforce the orders. The collection agencies need a civil judgment.

Senator Hutchison:

Are there collection agencies that will collect on the smaller fees? Are the collection agencies reluctant to collect on the fees because they are court orders or is it because the fees are small in nature? If the fines can be converted to civil judgments, do you believe the agencies will be more inclined to collect?

District Judge Voy:

Yes. Collection agencies collect on traffic fines, which are smaller. We have contacted several agencies which indicated they need judgments in order to adequately collect the fines.

Senator Hutchison:

If this bill passes, is it the intent of the court to aggressively collect on these fines?

District Judge Voy:

Yes. We are writing these fines off each year. This would allow for the collection of additional revenue.

Senator Hutchison:

Would the collection of these fines increase revenue?

District Judge Voy:

Yes. That is the intent.

Senator Ford:

If these fines are converted to a civil judgment, would they appear on a credit report? Does the conversion from a fine to a judgment have an intended or unintended effect on the credit report? Would people trying to get their lives together now have an additional issue with their credit being affected by these fines?

District Judge Voy:

I do not know. I assume it does. A civil judgment typically shows up on a credit report.

Judge Saragosa:

Fines do not appear on the credit report. The court has significantly increased revenue with the use of collection agencies. The first year the court used a collection agency in 2011, the court received collections of approximately \$4.1 million. The court is projecting an increase to \$8.6 million for 2013.

Senator Ford:

The collection of fines has not had an effect on the credit worthiness of juvenile offenders. Will this bill have an unintended consequence of adversely affecting credit worthiness?

District Judge Voy:

Assemblyman Horne felt the child should be able to walk away from any entanglement at age 18. My position was that once you reach 18, as a judge, I can keep the individual on probation until 21 to pay this restitution. If the individual would like to disentangle from the system and not be subject to the requirements of probation, he or she can request a civil judgment be instituted under this bill. What about the victims' rights and the monies owed to them? We are trying to strike a balance between competing interests.

Senator Ford:

The bill does not allow the juvenile to select one or the other. The bill only allows for the judicial discretion. Perhaps a juvenile would prefer to remain entangled in the system as opposed to having a judgment which may adversely affect his or her credit. What is the rationale behind the bill and what are the effects the bill may have on those individuals coming out of the system?

District Judge Voy:

A majority of the time, the fees are imposed against the parents. This bill would create joint and several liability between the parents and juvenile. There is nothing mandatory in the language. The bill states that the court "may." If juveniles want to stay entangled, they can. Most people working in the juvenile system on the defense side support the bill.

John Jones, Jr. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

We support this bill.

Regan Comis (M + R Strategic Services):

We support this bill as it offsets costs while holding youths and their parents responsible. The M+R Strategic Services manages a campaign with the MacArthur Foundation to reform juvenile justice in various states.

Carey Stewart (Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services; President, Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators):

The Juvenile Justice Administrators support this bill. Restitution is an important component of the system, but is very complex. Victims have the understanding that they will be receiving restitution. Most often, they do not. This bill allows a civil judgment against the parent while the child is under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. This bill allows for additional options and flexibility to collect these fines while the child is still under our jurisdiction.

Senator Ford:

Do the offenders themselves have a civil judgment against them, joint and several? It appears that the civil judgment would apply to the juvenile. Would the parents have a civil judgment against them as well?

Mr. Stewart:

We only do confessions of judgment on juveniles who exit the system at the age of 18. Victims become frustrated at the system. The victims have to get the civil judgment against the juveniles once we are unable to collect. If the victim decides to get a civil judgment after a juvenile offender turns 18, it may affect credit. This bill puts the responsibility on the parents before the child exits the system.

Chair Segerblom:

Is this in lieu of a confession of judgment, or is it both? Is it difficult once a person receives a confession of judgment to have it removed once the person pays the amount?

District Judge Voy:

I have imposed a confession of judgment a few times, and it is very difficult. The court cannot force it upon the individual. Once an individual is sentenced in the adult system, the juvenile case takes a second seat to the adult criminal

case. This bill also allows restitution to carry over to the adult criminal case. The individual would continue to be obligated to that juvenile civil obligation after the fact.

Frank Cervantes (Division Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services):

Restitution is important in our system, and this bill allows for the payment of restitution.

Chair Segerblom:

I will close on the hearing on S.B. 106. We will move on to S.B. 108.

SENATE BILL 108: Revises provisions governing juvenile justice. (BDR 5-518)

Mr. McCormick:

This bill is sponsored by the Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform. Sections 1 and 2 provide that a child who violates a county or municipal ordinance imposing a curfew or who violates a county or municipal ordinance restricting loitering is a child in need of supervision instead of a delinquent child. This bill brings uniformity. Different courts may charge a child with the same type of offense. One court may adjudicate a child as being in need of supervision and another court may adjudicate that same child as a delinquent child for the same act.

Chair Segerblom:

What is the difference between a child in need of supervision and a delinquent child?

Mr. McCormick:

Children in need of supervision are commonly referred to as status offenders based upon the age of the child. A delinquent child is one who commits a crime which would also be a crime if an adult committed the same act. *Nevada Revised Statute* 62B.320 governs children in need of supervision. The offense is only a crime because of the age of the child.

This bill decreases the time a child may remain in detention pending the filing of a petition by the district attorney. The bill reduces the 8-day time limit to 72 hours. The amendment ([Exhibit K](#)) clarifies that status offenders must not be held in detention in a manner that would violate federal law.

Sections 4 and 6 of the bill allow the juvenile court to order the Department of Motor Vehicles to issue a driver's license to the juvenile if the offense revokes that license. This issuing of a license would occur if the delay in receiving a license would cause undue hardship to the child or the child's family. The bill gives the judge the ability to alleviate that hardship. This bill additionally revises the statement of State policy regarding the distribution of money to the juvenile courts in order to carry out the program.

Senator Ford:

The bill is primarily geared toward the rural areas but is not limited to just those areas. How would this apply to urban areas?

Mr. McCormick:

If the child has a job that helps to support the family and the child needs to be able to get to that job, the court could allow for the DMV to issue a license.

District Judge Voy:

For example, a 17-year-old offender who has a license gets into serious trouble, and his license is suspended. He has a grandmother who is disabled and needs to be driven to her appointments. The court would allow for the issuance of the license to alleviate the hardship on the family. It is common for a parent or guardian to have difficulty driving and needs to have the child drive on behalf of the family member.

Senator Ford:

That is helpful.

Mr. Graham:

The Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform has provided three documents for review ([Exhibit L](#), [Exhibit M](#) and [Exhibit N](#)).

Mr. Stewart:

The Juvenile Justice Administrators support this bill. We support the decrease regarding the time frame from 8 days to 72 hours. We support the reduction of unnecessary detention. During the past 9 years, Clark and Washoe Counties have been able to reduce detention populations between 45 percent to 50 percent. This bill takes the next step in detention reform by reducing the time the charging petition has to be filed.

Mr. Jones:

The Nevada District Attorneys Association is opposed to this bill, specifically section 3. The Clark County District Attorney's Office participated, along with other interested entities, in implementing the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative. As part of that Initiative, Clark County agreed to speed up the time in which to file a petition. Last year, Clark County had 2,068 youths detained. Of those 2,068, the Clark County District Attorney filed 1,666 petitions within 4 days. Over 80.5 percent of petitions were filed within 4 days. The district attorney is statutorily allowed 8 days. The district attorneys are making improvements on filing petitions in an expedited manner. The 19.5 percent of cases not filed within 4 days were generally comprised of extremely serious cases, certification cases or sexual assault cases. Those cases require a higher level of scrutiny and contain more evidence to review prior to charging. It is difficult to make an appropriate charging decision within that short period of time as proposed in this bill.

Chair Segerblom:

What happens if a petition is not filed within the 8 days?

Mr. Jones:

The youth is released.

Chair Segerblom:

Can the youth be remanded back into the detention facility?

Mr. Jones:

Yes, this happens by court order. However, a youth who has potentially committed a very serious crime, such as a sexual assault or violence, should not be out and back on the streets.

Chair Segerblom:

Do you have a compromise yet?

Mr. Jones:

There is no compromise yet.

Jo Lee Wickes (Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Washoe County District Attorney):

The Washoe County District Attorney's Office is opposed to this bill. Most of the juveniles in Washoe County have serious charges pending. We work with law enforcement to get the information as quickly as possible. My concern as a prosecutor is it is critical to analyze all the information available in order to make good charging decisions. If the information is not available for review, it will be difficult to make a good decision. I also believe defense attorneys would be reluctant to have a client plead or confess until the attorneys have all pertinent documents and evidence. The district attorney attempts to file as quickly as possible. We are working with law enforcement agencies to get us the complete information in an expedited manner, but it is a complicated process. We are opposed to the 72-hour rule. In an attempt to detain youths who are a danger to themselves and the community, we may be making premature charging decisions and will be forced to amend and further delay proceedings once additional information is received.

Chair Segerblom:

Mr. Graham indicated that the recommendation of 72 hours came from the Commission, which is comprised of a vast group of individuals.

Ms. Wickes:

I am a member of that group. I expressed my concerns. This bill was not unanimously approved.

Chair Segerblom:

Could a district attorney who was unable to meet the 72-hour requirement request more time?

Ms. Wickes:

I believe that is the process in the adult courts. I would be amenable to that. In Washoe County, we do not have the police reports within 8 days.

Mr. Jones:

The Commission's vote was 12 to 9 regarding this bill.

Senator Hutchison:

What is the time frame for the production of the evidence to make these critical decisions.

Mr. Jones:

In Clark County, we work closely with law enforcement to get the reports in a timely fashion. Typically, it is at the time the juvenile is booked into the detention facility. The more serious the case or if the case involves a lot of witnesses or evidence, the time frame is extended beyond the 4 days.

Senator Hutchison:

What information do you lack in the 72-hour time to make the charging decisions?

Ms. Wickes:

Normally, within 72 hours, we have the booking sheet which provides the probable cause. We usually lack specific addresses if there are multiple crimes. Additional identifying information is usually lacking. Often, there is an incomplete police report. Basic information is lacking which we require to give the child notice as to what he or she is being accused. It is common practice to gain information as it trickles in. This is due to law enforcement's continued investigation.

Senator Hutchison:

Is that true in Clark County as well?

Mr. Jones:

Yes. We work with law enforcement on a constant basis. There are times in which we do not have all the appropriate information available.

Senator Hutchison:

It appears the agencies get the charging documents completed within the 72-hour time frame, even though you do not have all the information.

Mr. Jones:

Many times we do receive all the information we need within 72 hours. However, there are cases in which we need more time.

Ms. Wickes:

That is not true in Washoe County. We are unable to hit the 80 percent within 4 days as Clark County does. We do not have the appropriate information from law enforcement within that time.

Senator Hutchison:

Is there a way to break the type of cases into categories which require a certain amount of time to be complete?

Mr. Jones:

The issue with 72 hours is it cuts off a full day that we use now. Our office can perform in 4 days.

Mr. McCormick:

We are willing to work to come to a resolution.

Chris Frey (Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

The 72-hour rule governs adult cases. We feel that if that time frame can be met in the adult system, it should be met in the juvenile system as well.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 19, 2013
Page 20

Chair Segerblom:

I will close the hearing at 10:18 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsay Wheeler,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
	C	1	Mindy Martini	Work session bill list
S.B. 32	D	1	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 9	E	2	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 17	F	1	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 30	G	2	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 38	H	2	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 71	I	2	Mindy Martini	Work Session Document
S.B. 106	J	7	John McCormick	Statewide Commission on Juvenile Justice Reform Amendment S.B. 106
S.B. 108	K	1	John McCormick	Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform Commission Amendment
S.B. 108	L	3	Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform	Overview
S.B. 108	M	4	Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform	Letter dated 2/4/13
S.B. 108	N	3	Nevada Supreme Court's Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform	Memorandum dated 10/31/12 Recommendations to Reform Funding for Deep-End Commitments