

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
February 24, 2015**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Ira Hansen at 8 a.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 2015, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Chairman
Assemblyman Erven T. Nelson, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore
Assemblyman David M. Gardner
Assemblyman Brent A. Jones
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblywoman Victoria Seaman
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Jamie Tierney, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Renee Olson, Administrator, Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
John T. Jones, Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys Association, and Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services
Ben Graham, Government Relations Advisor, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Nevada Supreme Court
Laurel Stadler, Rural Coordinator, Northern Nevada DUI Task Force, and representing the Alliance for Victims Rights
Kimberly M. Surratt, representing State Bar of Nevada
Eric A. Stovall, Attorney, Eric A. Stovall, Ltd

Chairman Hansen:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have three bills to hear today and we are going to go out of order. We will start with Assembly Bill 132.

Assembly Bill 132: Revises provisions relating to displaced homemakers.
(BDR 2-546)

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42:

I had the honor of being the Chair of the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission in the interim. Before you today is Assembly Bill 132, which sets out recommendations for the Subcommittee ([Exhibit C](#)).

I will give you the overview of the mission of the Subcommittee. There are roughly 200 boards and commissions that have been created by the Nevada Legislature. Many of them had not been reviewed for several years. We were not sure if they were still relevant to Nevada or if their purpose had

changed. We decided to look at these boards and commissions, and the task was assigned to the Sunset Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is a permanent subcommittee of the Legislative Commission and was created in 2011 with the passage of Senate Bill No. 251 of the 76th Session. It was a bipartisan sponsored bill and was unanimously passed in both houses. It was codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 232B.

Our mission, as I stated, is to review these boards and commissions and to make the determination of whether they should be continued, modified, consolidated with another entity, or terminated. In the 2011 Interim, we reviewed 29 boards, and last interim we reviewed 31 entities. We reviewed the committees and then made recommendations to the Legislative Commission. They made the decision whether any of those recommendations should come forth to you for changes during this session. You have before you some recommendations regarding the Board for the Education and Counseling of Displaced Homemakers ([Exhibit D](#)), which the Sunset Subcommittee reviewed on May 6, 2014.

Chairman Hansen:

This goes back to the Nevada Spending and Government Efficiency (SAGE) Commission recommendations.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

You are correct. The SAGE Commission made recommendations of whether these boards and commissions are still relevant for Nevadans.

Assembly Bill 132 talks about the Board. It was created in 1989 by bipartisan legislation by a group of Senators. An earlier program had been enacted in 1979, but was allowed to expire in 1985. According to the legislative history, supporters testified that the program's goal was to assist women who had lost their source of income and support because of divorce, death, disability of a spouse, or ineligibility to receive public assistance. Those persons, identified for service from programs sponsored by the Board, were individuals who lacked marketable skills, had not completed high school, or may have been out of the job market for a number of years.

The Board consists of five members appointed by the Governor: one member must be a displaced homemaker as defined in the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, and at least one member must represent a business in Nevada. The Board is under the umbrella of the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (DETR), which also provides staff assistance.

I will now go over the two recommendations that we are making to this Board. The first recommendation is to modify the membership of the Board itself. A displaced homemaker is defined in NRS 388.605 ([Exhibit E](#)). It is a person who is not gainfully employed or has less than adequate employment, has worked at home providing household services to family members without compensation, has difficulty obtaining employment, and has been dependent on the income of others, including public assistance. The NRS says that one of the members must be a displaced homemaker. If, however, that board member becomes employed, that person no longer fits the statutory definition of a displaced homemaker. That is one of the problems; it is a Catch-22. You have the individuals who must be out of work, but you want them to serve as a board member. The problem is that the board members would become employed, and they would lose that person as a board member. They would then have to start all over again. We are recommending that the statute be revised to enable a former displaced homemaker to complete his or her term on the board so he or she does not have to resign.

The second recommendation from the Subcommittee has to do with funding. In order to provide a revenue source for these programs, the Legislature enacted a fee years ago to be applied in district court at the commencement of divorce proceedings. That is existing law. The fees collected by the counties were remitted to the state and placed in a fund for the director of DETR, who administers the funds for the benefit of the Board. The fee was added to the NRS as follows: in 1985 the fee was \$5, in 1989 it was increased to \$15, and in 1995 it was increased to \$20, which it still is.

The Board is not asking for an increase. What they are asking for is to also apply that fee to the dissolution of domestic partnerships. As you know, this body recognized domestic partnerships in 2009 when we together passed Senate Bill No. 283 of the 75th Session. Through February 20, 2015, there have been 6,678 domestic partnerships filed in Nevada. Of those, 664 have been terminated. The Sunset Subcommittee voted unanimously for these two recommendations regarding this Board.

We also have people in the audience—both in Las Vegas and here in Carson City—if there are any questions about the programs for these groups. The Board oversees a number of programs offered through HELP of Southern Nevada, the Truckee Meadows Community College, and JOIN, Inc. in northern Nevada. The programs include work readiness, training, and job search assistance. The Board members themselves do not receive any compensation for the time they are dedicating to provide these services to this population of Nevadans.

Chairman Hansen:

The \$20 fee has not been increased in 20 years?

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

That is correct. The last increase was in 1995.

Chairman Hansen:

What is the amount in the account? Does this go into a separate account? How much money is available to help the people for whom the bill is designed?

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I would like to ask a DETR representative, Mrs. Hill, to come forth. They are the ones who administer the funds for the displaced homemakers.

Chairman Hansen:

I want to know if it is adequately funded. Is the \$20 fee still sufficient to do what they need to do? In 20 years, if you adjust it for inflation, it would probably be \$50.

Renee Olson, Administrator, Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:

The amount varies a little year to year, but we collect around \$340,000 each year: 3 percent of that is set aside as a reserve for the Board for their necessary travel and expenses, 5 percent is set aside for the Employment Security Division for staffing services for the Board, and the rest is passed through contracts to the service providers that were mentioned. It would probably be best to ask someone from the Board to come up and talk about whether it is adequate. We know the program is successful, but I would not be able to address the adequacy.

Chairman Hansen:

I do not want to get too much in the weeds, but I would suggest to the bill's sponsor that, if she is interested in increasing the fee, she talk to the Board and see if there is an appetite to increase it. I do not have a problem with adjusting things for inflation after 20 years. I do not see any questions.

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of A.B. 132? [There was no one.] What about in Clark County? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the neutral position in Las Vegas or Carson City? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 132. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 114.

Assembly Bill 114: Revises provisions governing restitution. (BDR 14-560)

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3:

I am here today because I was the Chair of the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, and Assembly Bill 114 came out of that. It is a simple bill. Right now, if you are convicted of a crime and there was some type of restitution involved in the sentence, you are obligated to repay the money as part of your sentence. This bill deals with how that collection process works.

Currently, if the court orders that the defendant has to pay you—as the victim of the crime—we will say \$1,000, you have to take that order, file it as a judgment within six years, and then it would be treated like any other judgment. After six years, it would lapse unless you refile it. This bill came out of the subcommittee that deals with criminal justice and it says that there is no time limit to file the judgment, and the judgment does not have to be refiled every six years. This bill says the judgment is good forever. It is very simple, but there have been problems in the past where victims did not realize they had to refile the judgment.

Chairman Hansen:

There is an amendment from the district attorneys ([Exhibit F](#)). Are you familiar with that amendment?

Senator Segerblom:

Is it the one that deals with juveniles? They approached me with that.

Chairman Hansen:

It just says ". . . except that a judgment that requires a child or a parent or guardian of a child to pay restitution does not expire until the judgment is satisfied."

Senator Segerblom:

This bill deals with adult offenders. First I was contacted and told that they were going to try to amend it to include juvenile cases, but then I was told they were not going to amend it, so I am unsure.

Chairman Hansen:

John Jones is here, so please come up and we will work this out now.

John T. Jones, Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys Association, and Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services:

I am here on behalf of Nevada District Attorneys Association and Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services. We do have an amendment to A.B. 114 ([Exhibit F](#)). Last session, this Legislature passed a bill that allowed for civil confessions of judgment in juvenile cases. What this proposed amendment does is to also provide that those juvenile judgments do not expire, just as this bill proposes for adults.

Chairman Hansen:

At this point, have you talked?

Senator Segerblom:

He came to me and we talked. I thought it was an agreement, and then I was told there was not an agreement. For the record, I think there is a distinction that can be made between juveniles and adults. To the extent that you want the amendment to be adopted, I think you should consider whether that is a good policy judgment. If you have a 16-year-old kid who does something wrong, do you want that to track him the rest of his life? This is different from an adult offender who knew what he was doing when he pled guilty to the crime.

Chairman Hansen:

Then I will have you two work this out behind the scenes, and let me know if you come to an agreement. If not, we will bring it before the Committee and we will decide which direction we want to go on the policy.

Are there any questions for these men? Seeing none, is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of A.B. 114 at this time?

Ben Graham, Government Relations Advisor, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Nevada Supreme Court:

This is like the 14-year cicadas, because you wander around and up they come. Here we are 20 years later working on things that we thought were going to be worked on back in 1995.

This is a good measure to protect victims. By not requiring something that most people do not even know exists, the victims are not revictimized. Chief Justice James Hardesty—who was on this Commission with the Senator—and the staff wholly support this. There will be more bills coming out of the Advisory Commission over the next several months.

Chairman Hansen:

Are there any questions at this time? Seeing none, is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of the bill?

Laurel Stadler, Rural Coordinator, Northern Nevada DUI Task Force, and representing the Alliance for Victims Rights:

We are very much in support of A.B. 114. This is my twenty-fifth year of volunteering and working with victims of driving under the influence (DUI) crashes, providing programming for DUI offenders, and working to prevent the crime of DUI. This is a very simple bill to change the existing protocol regarding restitution. It goes a long way to put more victim justice in the criminal justice system. I would like to thank the Commission for bringing this bill forward. We support the bill on behalf of all victims.

Chairman Hansen:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of A.B. 114 at this time? Seeing no one, is there anyone who is in opposition in the north or south? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the neutral position in the north or south? [There was no one.] Seeing no one, we will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 114. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 92.

Assembly Bill 92: Makes various changes relating to parentage. (BDR 11-301)

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27:

I have two lawyers next to me who are going to present the bill and answer all questions. The reason I am supporting this bill is because I support the gist and intent of this legislation. This bill is to ensure that the state of Nevada has the ability to recognize and acknowledge and determine which babies are ours. This will enable us to count them appropriately and allow for that process to be put in place.

Kimberly M. Surratt, representing State Bar of Nevada:

This is a bill we processed through the State Bar of Nevada to get approved. During the process of getting the bill's approval, we sent it out to all of the sections of the State Bar of Nevada to determine if there was any conflict between the sections. We also wanted to get approval for the Family Law Section to show up here today to say that the Family Law Section is behind this bill and approves it.

It is a very simple bill. After we updated and modernized our reproductive laws last session, we started practicing under that new law and determined that we had a couple of flaws in the application of the law in the birth certificate process. We had many discussions and meetings with The Nevada Office of

Vital Records over the past two years about how to accomplish what we need to do and what court orders they could take. One of the biggest trend sets that we saw was a tremendous increase in reproductive business in the state of Nevada. What that meant was that other states were coming in and trying to take that business too.

Chairman Hansen:

Please go with the surrogacy. There are new members on the Committee, and it is an interesting and amazing thing that can be done now. It does cause some very interesting legal issues. Please very briefly go over what you mean by surrogacy.

Kimberly Surratt:

In the state of Nevada, if you take intended parents who are having a hard time having a child or cannot have a child at all for various reasons, and they want to utilize a third party to have a baby, under our law they can contract with another woman to carry their baby for them. That third-party woman cannot be biologically related to the child, pursuant to the law that we passed. They can utilize an egg donation or their own eggs, if they are still viable, create an embryo, and have it transferred into that woman. She can then carry the baby for that couple.

Under Nevada law, in order for that to be legal, they need to have entered into a contract before the woman started medication with the fertility clinic or before any medical treatments are done at all. The contract requires that she be represented by separate legal counsel to protect her. The intended parents must have their own independent legal counsel. There are a myriad of different requirements that must go into that contract pursuant to the law, including statements that the intended parents intend to take the child no matter what condition the child comes out in—including if there are any defects. The child is still theirs, and they are required to be the parents of that child. Under our laws, they must follow the contractual requirements. The law provides that they are the parents of that child under all circumstances, from the moment the child is born.

Also under Nevada law, we have to obtain an order, during the pregnancy and before the child is born, from the court that assesses the contract to ensure that the parties have complied with all of the legal requirements, and to ensure that they are actually the parents of that child. The court issues that order and the order is taken to the hospital to be utilized there and with Vital Records. This ensures that the hospital treats the intended parents as the parents and ensures the intended parents end up on the birth certificate for Vital Records.

When all of that is done within the state of Nevada, it goes flawlessly because we have a court and a judge in Nevada assessing Nevada law to determine that those parents are the child's parents. The birth certificate is then issued based on Nevada law. What happens is that some intended parents are utilizing attorneys in other states, for example California, to get a California judge to assess California law to determine that these parents are the parents of that child under California law. They then bring that order to Nevada and tell Vital Records that they have to issue a birth certificate for these intended parents based on the California order. The flaw is that California never had subject matter jurisdiction over the child; the child was not born in California. Vital Records is in a pickle because they are looking at an order and questioning whether they have to give full faith and credit to this order. It is not even a valid order because it did not assess Nevada law in determining if these parents are the parents of this child under said law. You would be surprised at the number of these that we receive out of California. It is primarily California, although we get these from other states.

In my conversations with Vital Records, they pointed out that the law does say that they are the parents, but the extra step to say that Vital Records should issue a birth certificate when they receive an order is not there. This was an oversight last session when we did not look past this. We did not look at the next step of what Vital Records does and what they need the law to include in order to do their jobs and prevent other states from determining parentage in our state. We need Nevada to make that determination for our own citizens.

Chairman Hansen:

The purpose of this bill is to close that loophole.

Kimberly Surratt:

Yes, that is the idea behind the bill. This is to assist Vital Records in the direction to take to close the loophole.

Chairman Hansen:

It is an interesting scenario, since the woman who actually gives birth to the child is not legally the child's mother.

Assemblyman Jones:

How many of these surrogacies are happening, and how many have problems because of California or other jurisdictions in a year?

Kimberly Surratt:

You would be surprised. Mr. Stovall is the other attorney in Nevada who does large numbers of these, but in ten years, I have done almost 300 surrogacies. I would say a majority of those has been since we passed the new law. In the past year, I have probably done at least 100 surrogacies. How many of them had California orders? That is hard to say because they go around me and go straight to Vital Records. I started getting wind of it from Vital Records because they did not know what to do with them. They were familiar with me doing surrogacies, so I have good conversations going with them. There have probably been around 50 in the past year; 50 human beings whose lives and parental status were based on California law although they were born in Nevada.

Chairman Hansen:

We will let Ms. Surratt go through her amendment ([Exhibit G](#)), and then we will go to questions. Since this is your bill and your amendment, it is obviously a friendly amendment. It looks simple, but please take us through it.

Kimberly Surratt:

I did not submit proposed language to the Legislative Counsel Bureau when we started this bill. That is part of the reason we ended up with the amendment ([Exhibit G](#)). I was not sure what Vital Records would want or how they wanted it, and I needed to spend more time on that. The main part of the amendment states that the registrars "shall" require a parentage order. The first paragraph is the addition; the second paragraph is already part of the original bill. Requiring them to actually have an order is partially how we wrote the reproductive law last session. It says that you may get a parentage order to proceed at the hospital. It gives you permission to get a parentage order, but it does not say that you must have a parentage order for Vital Records to issue the birth certificate. There were many parents in the state arguing with the hospitals and Vital Records that it says they can get an order, but it does not say they must get one to be on the birth certificate. They bring their contract proving they have complied with the law, so they think Vital Records will put them on the birth certificate. That put Vital Records in the position of making a legal decision on whether they complied.

The best analogy that I can make is to say that this is just like telling Vital Records that they adopted the child—really they did—and they did not need an order from the court, so just do it. The main change in the first paragraph is saying that they need to have an order.

Chairman Hansen:

Is Mrs. Benitez-Thompson good with this amendment?

Kimberly Surratt:

Yes.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Why do they go to California? Is there an advantage to going out of state?

Kimberly Surratt:

What happens is that these cases are extremely dynamic and vary interstate. The surrogate may be in the state of Nevada, the intended parents may be in the state of New York, and the agency that assisted in matching them to find each other might be in the state of California. In many cases, that is what it is. There are a lot of these agencies in California, and they want to use the lawyers that they are familiar and comfortable with. California, for the longest time, was the most liberal and had the best reproductive laws for surrogacies in the United States. As of last session, we beat them out and now have the best reproduction and surrogacy laws in the United States. Out of habit, they were going to California because they thought they could just force it on other states. It is the interstate part of this that matters when everyone is located and lives in different places. I always tell my couples that they need to focus on where the baby is born since that is where the vital statistics office will be located for that child.

Assemblyman Araujo:

You just answered my question, but I was wondering what the process would be like if the parents were from Nevada and the surrogate mother was from Colorado. How does that usually work? Do they have to make a choice between the states?

Kimberly Surratt:

It is based on where the baby is born. If the intended parents are in Nevada, but the child is going to be born in Colorado, we would look at Colorado law to determine the parentage of the child. We would tell our intended parents that where they live has no impact on their parentage. We have to look at the parentage laws in that state. You do not want to do this in New York because surrogacy is illegal in New York. In my circumstances, if I represent those clients in Nevada, I would have them hire an attorney in Colorado to ensure their parental rights were properly adjudicated and that they would get a birth certificate from that state.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Are there instances where the surrogate mother does not want to give up the baby even though there is a contract and it has all been negotiated?

Kimberly Surratt:

In my experience, I have never had even one surrogate do that. I can tell you part of the reason and that is because of the structure of our law that requires medical screening, psychological screening, and background checks. There are good agencies and bad ones. If they are well matched, the surrogate would have been screened for all of these things. You want a woman who has already had children and this is not her first child. She would typically have a family, is stable, is not desperate for money, and is not doing this for the wrong purposes. We are looking for some altruistic reasons why she is doing this. It is all based on a good agency that matches her well. The days of that happening are fading away, particularly because legislative bodies such as this one have done a good job of modernizing the laws to put these requirements in place to make sure women are not taken advantage of, they are not too young or too much at risk, and that we take care of them.

Eric A. Stovall, Attorney, Eric A. Stovall, Ltd:

Two years ago, this Committee passed the current surrogacy statutes that Nevada enjoys today, and you can be very proud of them. Nevada has the best surrogacy laws of any of the states that I deal with. I deal with adoptions and surrogacy matters. I have also found the same problems that Ms. Surratt has outlined for you. It is a real concern for me, as a Nevadan, that the surrogates who are, for the most part, doing this for altruistic reasons need the protection of Nevada's laws. They do not have that protection when other states' agencies take these parentage laws and try to force Nevada Vital Records to issue birth certificates on contracts that might not have the same protections that Nevada law has. This bill and the amendment would protect Nevadans, both intended parents and the surrogates who are almost always going to be here and the children that are going to be born here.

Assemblyman Jones:

If we make Nevada the only jurisdiction allowed for vital records purposes, what happens if a surrogacy is started under another jurisdiction's laws that do not require a contract prior to starting medication, then it has to proceed under Nevada's law, but cannot because medication was started prior to obtaining the contract?

Kimberly Surratt:

Every once in a while, you have people—even in the state of Nevada—who have not complied with the law and completed the steps that we require, such as starting before medical. In those circumstances, we have gone to court for a hearing. We usually get our parentage orders without a hearing, but we have hearings on those. I have set it out for the judges that I believe, in those circumstances, that the requirement is for the judge to determine whether she was under duress when she entered into the contract. The reason for the requirement that she have the contract before she starts the medical is that we do not want her to feel pressured because she has started the process and now she is hurried to get the contract. She may feel that she has to continue since she has started the medications. We have the judges canvass her independently and intensely to determine why she entered into the contract and what her thoughts and feelings are. Was she under duress? Did anyone force her to do it, et cetera? If the court determines that her reasons are appropriate, they can still agree to the parentage under that circumstance. We need a Nevada judge to do that because a California judge cannot make that analysis because he is not looking at our laws. That is why we need a Nevada order to ensure the judge looked at the woman and determined the Nevada surrogate was not taken advantage of.

The number one criteria in the country, and with all of the agencies, is that the surrogate should never be pregnant before a contract is signed because it is at that point it converts to an adoption. If she was already pregnant, it would not be a surrogacy. It would be a woman walking around who has a child in her that she does not want and wants to put up for adoption. It nullifies the surrogacy process since the reason we allow surrogacies is that they set out with the intent to carry someone else's baby and the mental intent is that it is never going to be yours.

Eric A. Stovall:

The key part of Assembly Bill 92 and the amendment will solve that problem, since it is going to require an original Nevada order coming from a Nevada court, not an order from another state that is being domesticated in Nevada. In a Nevada original case, a Nevada judge is going to hear these facts and make sure that all the parties, including the Nevada surrogate, are protected.

Chairman Hansen:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of A.B. 92? Seeing no one, is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the neutral position in the north or south? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 92 at this time. We will open up for public comment if anyone has something they would like to bring before the Committee. Seeing no one, is there any Committee business that we need to bring up? I see no one so this meeting is adjourned [at 8:42 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: February 24, 2015

Time of Meeting: 8 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
<u>A.B. 132</u>	C	Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams	Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission Bulletin
<u>A.B. 132</u>	D	Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams	Recommendations from the Board of Education and Counseling of Displaced Homemakers
<u>A.B. 132</u>	E	Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams	<i>Nevada Revised Statutes</i> NRS 388.605
A.B. 114	F	John T. Jones, Jr.	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 92	G	Kimberly Surratt	Proposed Amendment