

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 14, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Greg Brower at 2:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 14, 2015, in Room 2134 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 Greg Brower, Chair
Senator Becky Harris, Vice Chair
Senator Michael Roberson
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen
Senator Tick Segerblom
Senator Aaron D. Ford

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Counsel
Julia Barker, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michael Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association
Connie S. Bisbee, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners
Alex Ortiz, Clark County
Steve Yeager, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County
Sean B. Sullivan, Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County
Natalie Wood, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety
David Barker, Chief District Judge, Department 18, Eighth Judicial District

Chair Brower:

I open the Senate Committee on Judiciary with the continuation of the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 11.

ASSEMBLY BILL 11: Revises provisions governing reports of presentence investigations. (BDR 14-356)

Michael Giurlani (President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association):

The Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association supports A.B. 11. This bill enables the Division of Parole and Probation to better prepare the presentence investigation (PSI) reports and save in overtime costs.

Connie S. Bisbee (Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners):

The State Board of Parole Commissioners supports A.B. 11.

Chair Brower:

It is done differently in federal court. Under Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the timing is different and staggered. A PSI report is provided to the parties 35 days before a sentencing hearing, objections are lodged 14 days before a hearing, and the court is provided with a PSI report and attendant objections 7 days before a hearing. That system works well. We may get into why we are not adopting a similar system at the State level.

Alex Ortiz (Clark County):

Clark County opposes A.B. 11. Even though this is a policy committee, reducing the number of calendar days the Division has to provide a PSI report to attorneys and defendants before a defendant is sentenced has a fiscal impact to Clark County. Because of legal counsel requests for continuances to properly represent clients, it increases the number of days a defendant is held in custody at the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC). The daily cost to house an inmate at CCDC is approximately \$135 per day. Any delay in processing an inmate out of CCDC adds to expenses paid by the County.

The County pays 70 percent and the State pays 30 percent of the costs related to developing PSI reports. During the Assembly Committee on Judiciary hearing of this bill, the Division testified it was compliant with the 21-day requirement in the southern region of the State, Clark County. That may have changed. We do not see a need for this Legislation in the southern region because the regions

work independently of each other. If a concern is meeting the deadline, we suggest adding an amendment to exclude the southern region of Clark County and apply this legislation exclusively to other portions of the State as deemed appropriate. We support the proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) from the Clark and Washoe Counties Public Defender Offices that changes the word "calendar" to "working" in section 1 of A.B. 11.

Chair Brower:

Can you explain the issue with the number of days in custody? Some cases result in releasing an in-custody defendant after a sentencing hearing, but a defendant in custody prior to sentencing is likely not to be released postsentencing. How is this a cost issue?

Mr. Ortiz:

This would provide additional continuances because counsel would not have the PSI report available to properly represent his or her client. The likelihood of a continuance is higher if the public defender and defendant do not have more time to review the PSI report and prepare to present in court.

Chair Brower:

What do the judges think?

Steve Yeager (Office of the Public Defender, Clark County):

The Clark County Public Defender's Office opposes A.B. 11. We tried to compromise on the Assembly side. I have proposed amendments, [Exhibit C](#), which are not viewed as friendly to the bill. This bill deals with when a PSI report should be provided to relevant parties. I have brought a copy of a PSI report, but I cannot share it up close because these reports are confidential,.

Chair Brower:

Could you redact one? The Committee would benefit from seeing one.

Mr. Yeager:

Yes. A PSI report is typically a nine-page document detailing the history of the defendant. When this document is prepared by the Division, copies go to the judge, defense lawyer and district attorney. This helps judges impose sentences.

These documents follow a defendant. If he or she goes to prison, it follows the person to prison. If he or she is on probation, it follows the individual there. The

import of that is in 2011, the Nevada Supreme Court ruled on the *Stockmeier v. State* case, deciding an error in a PSI document must be corrected before the sentencing hearing. Otherwise, there is no chance to correct it. Errors can have a big impact. An attempted escape listed in a PSI report may result in possible denial of parole. That is the genesis of how we got here.

Before the passage of A.B. No. 423 of the 77th Session, no time frames appeared in statute for when to produce PSI reports. Portions of that bill talked about reconciling objections. It was a comprehensive bill from the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. The stakeholders created something to work for Nevada. Federal legislation was used as a model. The 2013 hearing included fiscal impacts associated with objections and resolutions of objections. Those portions were taken out. What was left were time frames of when PSI reports were to be given to various parties. It ended up at 21 working days, which was not anybody's intent. Everybody thought 21 calendar days were appropriate.

One of the proposed amendments in [Exhibit C](#) returns to 21 calendar days, or 14 working days. That is the same amount of time. This bill takes two steps back. Slide 5 of the Division of Parole and Probation presentation ([Exhibit D](#) was Exhibit C in the meeting held on April 14, 2015, of the Senate Subcommittee on Judiciary) shows a timeline of statute versus the timeline in [A.B. 11](#). Going from 21 business days to 14 calendar days cuts out 2 weeks. A good compromise would be shaving 7 days off. In an ideal world, I would get a PSI report and march over to the jail to talk to my client about it. That is hard to do with caseloads of public defenders. Typically, the defendant will be sent a copy of the PSI report when we get it so he or she can review it.

Before A.B. No. 423 of the 77th Session, we would get the PSI report 1 or 2 days before court. Sometimes, we would not have the report when we showed up to court. We would continue with the sentencing hearing because there was not enough time to go over the report. It is not a long document, but it is important to get criminal and social history right. We tried to ensure we had time to review a PSI report before court and tell the judge what items were still in dispute with A.B. No. 423 of the 77th Session. Given disputes, the judge may grant a continuance so there is time to resolve it. The idea is to give everyone a chance to look at the PSI report.

Senator Ford:

What do you have to say about Slide 6 of [Exhibit D](#), indicating 85 percent of probationers reported reviewing reports with legal counsel 14 working days or less prior to sentencing?

Mr. Yeager:

We were not included in the survey. It was not a comprehensive survey because the Division only surveyed individuals who received parole or probation. A number of our clients go straight to prison without stopping at the Division. I would say at least half of my clients do not get probation. The survey is not a representative sample. Not every attorney in our office reviews a PSI report with his or her client the second he or she gets it. That is the reality, and we could do a better job. I do not know how the survey questions were asked or who asked them. We are potentially looking at taking legal action as a result of that survey.

Senator Ford:

I do not operate in this area of the law. Even though it is a nine-page document, a competent attorney will look at it first before talking about it with his or her client to make sure there are no obvious errors. Do you spend time doing that?

Mr. Yeager:

Yes. When my secretary gets a PSI report, she sends a photo copy to the client—whether that client is in jail or out of custody—then I get a copy. I go through the report to see if there is anything concerning or if prior convictions appear that my client did not disclose. I flag what I think is important, then talk to the client to see if he or she thought anything was incorrect. I tell him or her what I noticed, asking if it is correct. When the client is at CCDC, we can call. However, a number of my clients are rightfully skeptical about talking on recorded phone lines. Talking to the client usually requires a visit to the jail. The CCDC is experiencing challenges and many clients have been moved to the North Valley Complex by Nellis Air Force Base, which is a long drive. We need to have adequate time to talk to clients. I understand where the Division is coming from. It does not have the resources to do what it needs to do. None of us working for the State do. The compromise scales the bill back to the middle.

Senator Ford:

We passed this law last Session, and it has not been given an opportunity to take effect. The immediate concern with going from 21 working days to

14 calendar days is you have less time to discuss PSI reports with clients. I like that the first proposed amendment in [Exhibit C](#) changes the word "calendar" to "working." How many more days does that give the Division to compile the report?

Mr. Yeager:

It depends on if the calendar days fall on weekends. Under the law, we receive PSI reports about 28 days before sentencing. If we adopted the first proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#), it would be 21 days. The Division is given about 7 more days to prepare the report, and we will have 7 days to review it.

Senator Harris:

My concerns are about those in custody. Are 21 calendar days enough time to prepare and protect defendant's rights?

Mr. Yeager:

I would like to have more time, but it is a workable compromise. Three weeks should work for everybody. It is a bit longer in the federal system, but those PSI reports are more involved than these and there is a mechanism for people to resolve disputes. Without that mechanism, 21 days is good for everybody.

Senator Harris:

My concern was with the calendar days versus the working days. As you noted, depending on where that falls, not every defendant will get the same amount of time to converse with counsel to determine the accuracy of his or her PSI report. Working days parse that out because a defendant is not punished for holidays or days courts close. We would not want to get too close to the sentencing date so you do not have an opportunity to appropriately prepare and review the information.

Senator Segerblom:

When does the Division know it is supposed to prepare this? It seems whether it is 7 days or 40 days, it knows the deadline. If we extend the time period, once it adjusts, it would not matter how many days.

Mr. Yeager:

You are right. The court or the Division may be able to speak to that more. When a defendant enters a guilty plea or is found guilty at trial, the court refers the case to the Division to complete a PSI report, and the district attorney sends

the individual's file to the Division. The Division knows it needs to complete a PSI report and has a sentencing date a day or two after the finding of guilty.

Senator Segerblom;

Is the sentencing date 2 months away?

Mr. Yeager:

It is not uniform throughout the State. In Clark County, in-custody sentencing dates are 60 days out. We may be moving that to 50 days. Out-of-custody sentencing days are 120 days out. If it helps the Division, we would not have heartburn with moving out-of-custody sentencings further down the line. Those people are not in the jail taking up bed space, but that is outside of the scope of this bill. Nothing in statute determines how many days out-of-custody sentencing hearings need to be because it is a local practice.

Chair Brower:

Can you give an idea of the percentage of PSI reports with errors that need to be addressed?

Mr. Yeager:

A number of PSI reports have small, insignificant errors. About 10 percent to 15 percent of PSI reports have errors relevant to sentencing. A client may decide that even though there is an error, he or she wants to go forward with sentencing without correcting the PSI report. That requires a longer conversation to explain to the defendant that the PSI will follow him or her. Some defendants want to get out of CCDC and go to the State facility. When we find a relevant error, we bring it to the judge's attention. Sometimes judges determine it is not an error and move forward; sometimes judges grant a continuance for further investigation either from the Division or defense attorney.

Chair Brower:

We want to get this right. We have seen what the Assembly decided to do. We have gone from zero days—which anybody involved in this process thought was unfair and dysfunctional—to 21 working days. Now the proposal is 14 days. If the system worked at zero, why can it not work at 14 days?

Mr. Yeager:

The genesis of A.B. No. 423 of the 77th Session was a system not working with too many delays. It is a policy question. Where do we end up? Last Session, the Legislature saw fit to require 21 calendar days. We can debate about what is appropriate, but under the amended 21-calendar-day proposal of the bill from last Session, nobody opposed it. Natalie Wood was not here at the time, but the Division was okay with that timeline. The bill passed through the Assembly and Senate without any dissenting votes. It is fair for the Division to want to change the timeline, but I would hate to go back to a similar situation before we had any time frames by going to 14 calendar days. Before this, we had entire days where calendars were continued and all 15 defendants were pushed back. This is a reasonable compromise. If we are back here in 2017, we can make further adjustments.

Chair Brower:

We could also change the law to prevent continuances, but I am not sure we would do that. The federal system has a different approach. Why is that not a preferable approach for the State system?

Mr. Yeager:

It is a preferable approach. We would be well-served to have a mechanism to hammer some of these things out. Last Session, that came with a large fiscal note. Part of the reason the Division in Clark County does not send an officer to court at the time of sentencing is fiscal. My understanding is that they do so everywhere else. The concern of the Division is if we get into these disputes, a Parole and Probation officer may need to be in court to defend the Division's recommendation. The federal scheme would be preferable, but we have to be mindful of the Division's financial resources. A mechanism to resolve conflicts out of court would be preferable. We have been unable to get there.

The first amendment of [Exhibit C](#) that concerns calendar versus working days is important. The other amendments deal with information in the PSI report. If the public defender gets less time to review the report, we should have access to more information or not include some information causing disputes.

The second proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#) deals with involvement in prior cases by the defendant. Even if the disposition is unknown, this information can cause disputes.

It is not uncommon for a defendant to deny gang affiliation during the interview with the Division. However, the Clark County Metropolitan Police Department could believe the defendant is a member of a gang. There would probably be a dispute about that in court. The third proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#) requires the documentation to indicate any gang activity at the time the PSI report is given so we can evaluate it.

The fourth proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#) is based on the Division's sentencing recommendation scale used, resulting in a sentence recommendation. We occasionally dispute that. When that happens, we go to court to ask a judge to order the Division to provide that documentation. The proposed amendment requires the Division to provide the documentation at the time the PSI report is provided. No judge has denied our right to get that documentation. Nevada Supreme Court Chief Justice James Hardesty indicated a competent defense lawyer would get that information in every case. We do not have a delay in getting the information if the documentation is provided up front.

The fifth proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#) takes out the sentencing recommendation. The Division makes a sentencing recommendation in the PSI report. If we did not have a sentencing recommendation, we would not have to deal with the subjective score sheet that contains objective and subjective components. If the Committee adopted any of the proposed amendments, we would support the bill. Our preference would be the first proposed amendment because it gets at the heart of the timing issue. The other amendments cut down on the number of disputes, resulting in less delay.

Sean B. Sullivan (Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County):

The Washoe County Public Defender's Office opposes [A.B. 11](#). I have been working with Mr. Yeager concerning the proposed amendments and Washoe County has the same concerns as Clark County. All parties concerned with a PSI report agree getting a PSI report correct and presented to the district court judge for sentencing is one of the most important things. All parties concerned need adequate time to do that. We would be happy if the Committee adopted any one of the proposed amendments in [Exhibit C](#).

Senator Segerblom:

Does the Parole and Probation officer come to sentencing in Washoe County?

Mr. Sullivan:

Yes.

Senator Segerblom:

Things like this drive me crazy. Clark County is treated differently than the rest of the State even when we have 90 percent of the criminal population.

Chair Brower:

Is it discretionary with the Division?

Senator Segerblom:

That is the point. Clark County does not get it, but everybody else does.

Mr. Sullivan:

In Washoe County, a member of the Division is in the courtroom. He or she is ordered to complete a PSI report and be asked by the judge if there are any corrections or additions to the PSI report at the sentencing hearing. There is always a member of the Division when the court orders the creation of a PSI report at arraignment and at sentencing hearings.

Natalie Wood (Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):

It comes down to a budget issue in southern Nevada. I understand 70 percent of our business is in Las Vegas; however, we are fortunate in Washoe and the rural counties because we have the staff available to be in court. We do not have the demand of the hundreds of PSI report requests that come into Las Vegas. I would have to double my staff in Las Vegas to have a Parole and Probation officer in court at the time of an arraignment and sentencing hearing. That would require a budgetary increase.

David Barker (Chief District Judge, Department 18, Eighth Judicial District):

I am intimately familiar with the process that is the focus of A.B. 11. The Eighth Judicial District Court is neutral. The bench wants a quality product to make decisions based on quality and law. Time is a component of that from perspectives of the time needed for the Division to prepare a PSI report, for a defendant to review the report in preparation for trial and for the bench to review the PSI report.

Mechanisms under law address identified errors. These mechanisms have been adapted to better reach a timely decision. Lawyers routinely have a dispute. The judge resolves the dispute and makes special findings included in the judgment of conviction. The Nevada Supreme Court has affirmed that. It is a method I set up to get to a fair decision based on merit and law. We do not send every PSI report back to the Division.

The point of contention is 14 working days versus calendar days. A lot of what Mr. Yeager and Chief Wood said is accurate. Individuals do come to a sentencing hearing with a fresh PSI report. Some of those individuals engage in that sentencing hearing for the time they deem necessary. Many occasions we continue that effort because the defendant has not had an adequate opportunity to review the PSI report. Many defense lawyers get in front of that—as they should and must do—by presenting briefs in mitigation. The defense lawyer does private PSI reports from his or her perspective to get to a point of fair decision based on merit and law.

I agree with Mr. Yeager that about 10 percent to 15 percent of PSI reports have identified errors or concerns requiring additional attention. Many times a sentencing can be ordered if the judge is in front of making a finding and calling the ball. Gang affiliation is a common dispute, and the bench has a mechanism to address that conflict.

I am not intentionally trying to move between 14 calendar or business days. The courts are neutral on this public policy decision. We can work with either perspective. You, as Legislators, set policy and make the law. We will follow it. It does not ultimately impact the decision we make.

Chair Brower:

Judges are the chief consumers of PSI reports. If the report does not enable judges to make the best sentencing decision possible, it does not work at all. If the Committee were to hear one or the other number of days does not work, that would be important, but we are not hearing that.

Senator Segerblom:

Under the system, if there is a dispute at the time of sentencing, do you routinely grant a continuance?

District Judge Barker:

It depends on the nature of the dispute. We do not if something can be satisfied based on information available to both sides as a function of the hearing, such as a district attorney having an answer to the dispute in his or her file. Commonly, it is a controversy or concern in error posed by the defense. Gang affiliation is common, as are concerns about the accuracy of the criminal history. Mr. Yeager mentioned cases filed and ultimately dismissed. That is all a component in a subsection of a PSI report. There is a lot more going on here because of the budget and overcrowding issues in jails and ultimately, it comes down to money. The Division of Parole and Probation does a great job with the resources and assets it has, but it is very stretched; it needs and deserves as much support as the Legislature can give it to do the important work it has. A PSI report follows an individual throughout the justice system. Information needs to be accurate because it does not end with me as a sentencing judge in deciding the sentence.

Senator Segerblom:

You said it comes down to a financial decision. Is it cheaper to give more time to preparing the PSI reports than risk a continuance, keeping the person in jail?

District Judge Barker:

Each case is unique. We have reduced time of hearing to plea from 65 days to 50 days, understanding the Division can meet those deadlines. Every day we save is a taxpayer dollar saved from the County perspective. A fair number of individuals in custody at the sentencing hearing receive probation. It is somewhat different than the federal system, which has a lot more front-end work in terms of custody status. We are talking a significant number of people.

Senator Segerblom:

Is it cheaper to have more time for a PSI report to be prepared before the sentencing? If we do not pass this bill, will it make a difference?

District Judge Barker:

It is a waste of money if the information in a PSI report is not accurate. The only way this works is if information is accurate. The Division says it needs additional time to produce an accurate document, but I do not know. If we are not all working from the same perspective on the facts of the case—the criminal history and a sentencing recommendation—we are not doing our jobs. Each case is unique.

Senator Ford:

There is no guarantee that accuracy would significantly increase under the time frames suggested in A.B. 11. Before 2013, no requirement existed for when defendants got a copy of a PSI report, and there were still inaccuracies. There is a balance between the accuracy issue and the defendant's right to look at a PSI report to see what is going to be used against him or her. Inaccuracies can be found earlier if defense attorneys have the information earlier. Would you agree there may be a counter issue?

District Judge Barker:

Yes.

Senator Segerblom:

Is the Division notified a PSI report is due within a number of days when the defendant is found or pleads guilty?

Ms. Wood:

Yes.

Senator Segerblom:

How many days does it take to prepare a report? If we shorten the time frame, do you and your staff have to catch up, or do you need all of the days allotted?

Chair Brower:

It depends on the defendant.

Ms. Wood:

From the point the defendant is arraigned, someone will be in the northern Nevada courtroom to take that information, meet with the defendant and assign a date for the defendant to meet with his or her PSI report writer. The time varies, but it is an average of 53 days. We equally need that same amount of time to make sure a PSI report is accurate. This benefits the defendant and the victim. That is crucial. There is no cost to CCDC. This is not a cost bill in regard to the time a defendant is in custody. If you are arraigned, you will be given a sentencing date. We are asking that we get the PSI report to the judge 14 calendar days in advance.

The proposed amendments in [Exhibit C](#) give the appearance that the Division is not cooperating. Statutorily, we have no discretion on those. We are required to

include certain information in a PSI report. The timelines make a difference of an entire week. You have to look at the volume of PSI reports one writer is preparing. Division writers prepare 16 PSI reports per month, while federal writers prepare 5 per month. It is a significant difference. Reporters are constantly working on PSI reports and may work on three to four on any given day. The average PSI report could be 10 or 20 pages long, depending on the criminal history. The Division is not budgeted for the proposed compromises. As the Division Chief, I find it is fiscally irresponsible to maintain a statutory mandate we are physically unable to meet. We try.

In terms of operation, personnel and overtime, we cannot meet this deadline. We cannot go to 21 calendar days or 14 working days because I would be setting the Division up for failure. I am presenting what we can achieve across the State so product quality will not change. This is not a lack of cooperation, this is to produce a quality document and continue to satisfy the *Stockmeier* concerns. The Division has done everything to comply with the initial \$1 million fiscal note. As the Chief, I am representing what is fair and just. We will be able to achieve this.

Senator Ford:

I have not interpreted anything anyone has said as uncooperative. The policy issue is weighing a defendant's right to have time to review information that is going to be used against him or her in the sentencing hearing, and to make sure a PSI report is accurate. I am ready to have a discussion about how to fund this system. Putting the money issue aside, why would the first proposed amendment of [Exhibit C](#) not work?

Ms. Wood:

While this is both a policy and money issue, the Division has not asked for additional funding. We are physically unable to comply with the policy decision made last Session. The entire Division is out of compliance with State law. We cannot comply with the amendment because I would be agreeing to something I cannot meet.

Senator Ford:

Is the reason you cannot meet it because you lack the staff?

Ms. Wood:

Partially. The other portion is sentencing. In northern Nevada, the turnaround time is 43 to 45 days. A PSI report is due either the day before or the day after sentencing under the statutory requirements. It is a timeline issue in the north, and a timeline and a personnel issue in the south. Because of renovations and internal work in CCDC, shorter times between arraignment and sentencing hearings have been requested. We are trying to comply with that. I do not have the luxury, nor am I sure it is fiscally sound, to request additional funding for additional personnel. What do we accomplish if the offender states he or she does not see the report until the day before or day of the sentencing hearing?

Senator Harris:

Everybody on the Committee and those involved in the criminal justice system have a great investment in making sure PSI reports are accurate. If we cannot give you the financial resources, we will work to make sure you have a meaningful time frame to allow you to do what you need to do while recognizing the need for a balance of the defendant's rights. Maybe neither 21 calendar days nor 14 calendar days is right, but we have a lot to consider to help the Division be successful and recognize defendant's rights.

Ms. Wood:

I think we are on the same page. If we could reach a compromise, that would be wonderful. But I would be remiss to commit resources and staff to something I know, and have shown, is unattainable.

Senator Segerblom:

What about the other amendments proposed in [Exhibit C](#)? Those do not seem too difficult.

Ms. Wood:

The Division is statutorily required to provide a sentencing recommendation to be considered or ignored. The tools used to provide that recommendation are internal. We have to put certain information into PSI reports under NRS 176.145. Some of the proposed amendments are not within our ability to grant. I do not know if we would do a disservice to the court to not include certain arrests or dispositions. We are good at stating on a PSI report whether a final disposition is unknown or dismissed. A PSI report is an impartial document the court can take or leave.

Senator Segerblom:

Why not provide the information indicating a person was affiliated with a gang?

Ms. Wood:

That is something the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) would provide. We are an independent investigator documenting if our investigation led us to believe a defendant was affiliated with a gang.

Senator Segerblom:

Is the LVMPD claiming a defendant was a member of a gang?

Ms. Wood:

It keeps an internal gang database. You would have to speak to the LVMPD to learn the dynamics. That is not something the Division of Parole and Probation is holding back; we would put that information in the report if we had it.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 14, 2015
Page 17

Chair Brower:

I close the hearing on A.B. 11 and adjourn the Senate Committee on Judiciary at 2:58 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Julia Barker,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Greg Brower, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
A.B. 11	C	2	The Offices of the Public Defenders, Clark and Washoe Counties	Proposed Amendments
A.B. 11	D	6	The Division of Parole and Probation	Presentation