

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-ninth Session
May 8, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:31 p.m. on Monday, May 8, 2017, 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 Tick Segerblom, Chair
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Vice Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Michael Roberson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Becky Harris (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner, Assembly District No. 26
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Pat Devereux, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 8, 2017
Page 2

Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Sheriff's Office, Washoe County; Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Marlene Lockard, Nevada Women's Lobby; Retired Public Employees of Nevada

Jennifer Noble, Nevada District Attorneys Association

Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Jo Ann Chadwick

Kimberly Mull, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence

Benjamin Lublin

Lisa-Lotte Lublin

Daniele Dreitzer, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Center

Edward Baron

Bill Tarbell

Jared Busker, Children's Advocacy Alliance

Sherry Powell, Ladies of Liberty

Egan Walker, District Judge, Department 2, Family Division, Second Judicial District

Pete Todorov

Barry Smith, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association

Kim Spoon, Guardianship Services of Nevada, Inc.

Sally C. Ramm

The Honorable James W. Hardesty, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court

Christine Miller, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

Dara J. Goldsmith, Goldsmith and Guymon

Jay P. Ramen, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County

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

Barry Gold, AARP of Nevada

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 145.

ASSEMBLY BILL 145 (1st Reprint): Extends the statute of limitations for certain civil actions for damages for injuries incurred as a child as a result of sexual abuse or pornography. (BDR 2-584)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LISA KRASNER (Assembly District No. 26):

You have my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)). Assembly Bill 145 extends the statute of limitations for child sexual abuse or pornography. Child sexual abuse is a worldwide problem. We do not know how many child victims of sexual abuse there are because so many do not disclose or report their abuse. Many children do not disclose the abuse for years, if they disclose it at all. Many adult survivors of child sexual abuse have never disclosed their abuse to anyone.

Children do not tell for a variety of reasons. These include shame, threats to the child, fear of the perpetrator, a lack of understanding of child sexual abuse, a relationship with the perpetrator or fear of upsetting their parents.

Children from low socioeconomic households are three times more likely to be victims of child sexual abuse. In a process called grooming, perpetrators frequently seek out children who are particularly trusting and establish a relationship with the child before sexually abusing them.

A few months ago, 368 gymnasts who had been sexually assaulted as girls by coaches over a period of 20 years ([Exhibit D](#)) came forward. A couple of weeks ago, the television program "60 Minutes" revealed another case of sexual abuse ([Exhibit E](#)) in which 60 women came forward who, as girl gymnasts training for the Olympic Games, had been sexually abused by the gymnastics doctor. The women are all in their 30s, reporting the abuse 20 years after it had occurred.

Child sexual abuse is a crime that is perpetuated in silence and in secrecy. Children may not feel they have anyone to tell because the very people who are supposed to protect them may be abusing them. Sexual abuse of our children must stop. Victims deserve to have justice and closure. This is a bipartisan issue.

Assembly Bill 145 extends the current statute of limitations in a civil case from 10 years to 20 years from the time a victim reaches the age of 18. It also extends the statute of limitations from 3 to 20 years for a civil action to recover damages for someone who appeared as a child in a pornographic film.

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42, sponsored A.B. No. 212 of the 78th Session, which changed the criminal statute of limitations for the crimes in A.B. 145 from 4 years to 20 years. Assembly Bill 145 would put the civil statute in line with the criminal statute.

Doctor William O'Donohue, a clinical psychologist and expert in child sexual abuse, testified in favor of A.B. 145 in front of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. He is not here today, but you have his written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)). Nevada and 12 other states are proposing either a 20-year or no statute of limitations for child victims of sexual abuse or pornography.

CHUCK CALLAWAY (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
Although A.B. 145 deals with civil, not criminal, statutes of limitations, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) supports the victims' option to hold abusers and attackers accountable.

ERIC SPRATLEY, Lieutenant (Sheriff's Office, Washoe County; Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):
The Sheriff's Office of Washoe County and the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association support A.B. 145.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Nevada Women's Lobby):
The Nevada Women's Lobby strongly supports A.B. 145.

JENNIFER NOBLE (Nevada District Attorneys Association):
The Nevada District Attorneys Association supports A.B. 145.

BRETT KANDT (Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):
The Office of the Attorney General supports A.B. 145.

JO ANN CHADWICK:
I support A.B. 145 because I was a victim of child sex abuse, and it has lived through me every day since.

KIMBERLY MULL (Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence):
As a survivor of being forced to make child pornography, I know there comes a point as an adult when it is unlikely your abuser will face criminal charges. The standards of evidence are high as time, memories and most of the evidence have eroded. You try to make it through each day without your world imploding. For some victims, civil remedies are a way to take back power through seeking justice. Victims, not prosecutors, decide to pursue civil cases.

Unlike the celebrity child sex abuse cases you see on television or in movies, most abusers cannot pay large restitutions or settlements. However, victims

may make their case in courts and try to get justice for themselves and protect others. Some survivors make it in life, and others do not and wither. There is no statute of limitations on the trauma to which these crimes subject children. In my case, it has been 17 years since I was the victim of child pornography, but images of me are still floating around in cyberspace. Knowing that is a continuing aspect of abuse I face every day, it took me 17 years to acknowledge the fact that pictures of me are still out there. It seems cruel there is a time limit for anyone to seek justice. Twenty years is a decent start to allow us to do so.

BENJAMIN LUBLIN:

You have my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)) in support of A.B. 145. I was a victim of child sexual assault. It is important to have a long statute of limitations for child sexual assault and pornography.

LISE-LOTTE LUBLIN:

I am a victim of child sexual assault, [Exhibit G](#). I support A.B. 145 because it is valuable to empower individuals subjected to these crimes. Giving them 20 years is a good start. It is something to look forward to when you feel you have lost all opportunities to fight for yourself.

DANIELE DREITZER (Executive Director, Rape Crisis Center):

You have my letter of support ([Exhibit H](#)) for A.B. 145 on behalf of the Rape Crisis Center of Las Vegas.

EDWARD BARON:

I support A.B. 145.

BILL TARBELL:

I am a retired Presbyterian minister with more than 40 years' experience of service all over the Nation. The effect of any kind of abuse may be lasting, damaging and very difficult to deal with. Twenty years of limitation is a help, but having been abused as a child, I know even that may not be long enough. I am concerned about the accused, but not if the evidence against them is clear.

JARED BUSKER (Children's Advocacy Alliance):

You have my written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)) in support of A.B. 145.

SHERRY POWELL (Ladies of Liberty):

Only 1 percent of violent crime is prosecuted, while more than 98 percent is plea-bargained. After my daughter was raped, it took me two years just to get her into a courtroom. Her attacker's attorneys plea-bargained the charge down to a gross misdemeanor, and he walked free. My daughter was his third victim. She still carries the scars, but I am proud of her for coming forward. She was subjected to and passed three polygraphs. She deserves justice in the civil or criminal courts.

EGAN WALKER (District Judge, Department 2, Family Division, Second Judicial District):

You have my letter of support ([Exhibit J](#)) for A.B. 145. Based on my experiences in three professional domains, there is no more manifest way to change the course of a human's life than to expose him or her to inappropriate sexual misconduct.

PETE TODOROV:

As a victim of child sex abuse, I support A.B. 145. The effects of this crime never leave you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

I ask for your support of A.B. 145.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 145 and open the hearing on A.B. 173.

ASSEMBLY BILL 173 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the process for a change of name. (BDR 3-586)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LISA KRASNER (Assembly District No. 26):

You have my written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)). Assembly Bill 173 revises the process for publication of name change for an adult. Currently, the process for requesting a name change is quite cumbersome and can take months. In domestic violence cases, the change of name may benefit someone who is fleeing from harm. Assembly Bill 173 streamlines the process for receiving a name change.

Statute provides an adult may change his or her name by filing a petition with the appropriate district court. The petition must include the applicant's present

name, the desired new name, the reason for the request and information indicating whether the applicant has been convicted of a felony.

The applicant must obtain a notice that indicates the request for a name change and then publish the notice in a general circulation newspaper once a week for three consecutive weeks. After the final publication, the applicant must wait ten more days from the last publication of notice. If no written objection is filed and the court is satisfied with the information submitted in the petition, the applicant must go to court. The court will make an order changing the name, which may take months.

According to section 1 of A.B. 173, the applicant for the name change must include in the petition a statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that the applicant is not changing his or her name for a fraudulent purpose. In section 2, the number of times the publication of notice must be posted in a newspaper is reduced from once a week for three consecutive weeks to one time only. Section 3 clarifies that a court order to change a name will be rescinded if it is discovered that the person submitted the name change for a fraudulent purpose.

This chart ([Exhibit L](#)) illustrates what is required in the other 50 states, regarding publication of name change. The length or necessity of publication of the notice varies. In a majority of the states, the requirement is only one publication.

The cost of posting a legal notice once a week for three consecutive weeks is a concern for people. In northern Nevada, it costs a total of \$231 to post the publication of name change. The bill would reduce the cost by decreasing the number of weeks required for publication.

In *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), there is a provision to keep the process for a person seeking a name change private, without posting notice, if someone is fleeing from an abuser. Assembly Bill 173 adds to that, reducing the time and cost for such cases, including abuse situations that have not risen to the level of or do not meet the court's standard of proof required in NRS 41.280, subsection 2. These changes will increase the efficiency of the process for changing a name, decrease costs and place Nevada in line with the majority of the 50 states.

MR. TODOROV:

I support A.B. 173 because I enacted a name change in another state, so I know how much it costs. The bill will make it simpler by requiring the change to be published just one time, plus save courts' time.

BARRY SMITH (Executive Director, Nevada Press Association):

The Nevada Press Association is neutral on A.B. 173. There is no magic number around the Country, Exhibit L, for how often name changes should be published. However, it is important that they do appear in newspapers.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER:

Please support A.B. 173.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 173 and open the hearing on A.B. 150.

ASSEMBLY BILL 150 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing private professional guardians. (BDR 13-808)

ASSEMBLYMAN MICHAEL C. SPRINKLE (Assembly District No. 30):

Assembly Bill 150 is a secondary bill from legislation passed in the Seventy-eighth Legislative Session licensing private professional guardians within the State. The new bill irons out some of the sticking points without losing the intent of licensure of private professional guardians so they might more easily adhere to the standards in statute.

I have submitted a proposed friendly amendment (Exhibit M). Assembly Bill 150 removes the requirement that individuals be licensed as private professional guardians, instead requiring licensure of the entities and the owners of the entities employing the guardians. Individual private professional guardians will still be required to have national certification plus background checks and fingerprinting every five years.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Can you explain the amendment to the Committee?

KIM SPOON (Guardianship Services of Nevada, Inc.):

I am a licensed private professional guardian and part owner of a private professional guardianship office for 19 years in northern Nevada. I was also a

public guardian in Washoe County for six years. The proposed amendment, [Exhibit M](#), clarifies the difference between private professional and certified guardians. The Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry, thought it was licensing all certified guardians, but not all certified guardians are private professional guardians. There are certified guardians in county public guardian offices like case managers who are not private professional guardians.

The bill removes provisions regarding private professional guardians while leaving provisions about certified guardians in statute. Entities are now authorized as guardians. Summary administration statutes from the 2015 bill were removed. Entities may now do summary administrations for protected persons.

SALLY C. RAMM:

I am a retired elder rights attorney in Nevada. In the proposed amendment's section 16, subsection 1, a private professional guardian company shall maintain separate accounts for wards "unless otherwise ordered by the court." The Nevada Supreme Court's Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships in Nevada's Courts has been working on consistency throughout the State on how guardianship cases are adjudicated according to NRS. Inconsistencies between counties are based on resources, culture and interpretation of the law.

The separate accounts are important because if you are under a guardianship and your money goes into a general account, the real accounting of how it is spent is the ledgers of the bookkeeper of the guardianship company. There is no other accountability. A reason for the licensing is it will relieve courts of the burden of accountability of the business practices of private professional guardians. Keeping accurate records and not commingling wards' funds is important.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

How would you change that language?

MS. SPOON:

I would remove the phrase in the proposed amendment's section 16, subsection 1 "otherwise ordered by the court." If so, all accounts of wards

would be separate, not commingled, so courts are not responsible for making that decision.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Would you also remove from section 16 "unless otherwise ordered by the court for substantiated reason"?

Ms. SPOON:

Yes, we asked for that change. For the most part, there is not an issue with making an account for every protected person; however, that is impossible in certain situations. A case I have involves a Mexican resident who was in a car accident while visiting family here. He had a settlement and, due to a brain injury, was assigned a guardian. The family was to be given a certain amount each month. As the guardian, I could not use a bank account because the ward did not have a passport or social security number, and I could not establish an account in his name. I had to set up a guardianship account under my business name for him. I cannot comply with the law.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Would you ask the judge to allow you to set up an account for the ward?

Ms. SPOON:

Yes. The Division of Financial Institutions Commissioner George E. Burns was concerned about that and added some wording to the "substantiated reason" provision. The judge has to have good reasons to allow guardians to set up accounts on behalf of wards. I am left noncompliant if I do not have some mechanism to do so.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 250 and open the hearing on A.B. 319.

ASSEMBLY BILL 319 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the guardianship of minors. (BDR 13-502)

ASSEMBLYMAN MICHAEL C. SPRINKLE (Assembly District No. 30):

The Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships was established during the 2015-2016 Interim to examine guardianship. Assembly Bill 319 was a legislative recommendation that came out of those meetings. It primarily differentiates between minor and adult guardianships in statute.

THE HONORABLE JAMES W. HARDESTY (Justice, Nevada Supreme Court):

One of the issues highlighted by the Commission was the need to separate into a statutory scheme provisions relating to guardianship for minors. I appointed a subcommittee to formulate a guardianship statute for minors, which became A.B. 319.

DISTRICT JUDGE WALKER:

I am responsible for the minor guardianship caseload in the Second Judicial District Court in Washoe County. The Commission looked at how all other states handle this. Some have separate provisions for minors, others hybridize minors and adults, and others lump them together. The bill is a hybrid that uses the best provisions of NRS 159 and NRS 159A for guardianship of minors.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 150 and open the hearing on A.B. 254.

ASSEMBLY BILL 254: Revises provisions governing guardianships.
(BDR 13-595)

CHRISTINE MILLER (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada):

I have been part of the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada's guardianship program since January 2016, representing adults in court and advocating for their legal rights. Many of my guardianship clients have benefitted from a trust with assets managed by trustees. Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9, has submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit N](#)) to A.B. 254 that narrows the application of the bill to protected people under guardianships who are designated beneficiaries under trusts and entitled to receive distributions.

Assembly Bill 254 aims to create a mechanism for guardians, protected persons or their attorneys to demand an accounting of trusts from trustees. If trustees fail to comply, the bill provides a method for the parties to petition courts to assume jurisdiction of trusts in accordance with provisions in NRS 164.

DARA J. GOLDSMITH (Goldsmith and Guymon):

For more than 25 years, I have practiced in the area of trusts, estates and guardianships in southern Nevada. You have my letter of concern ([Exhibit O](#)) about the constitutionality of A.B. 254. Some of my concerns are addressed in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#). At a prior hearing on the bill in the

Assembly, Ms. Miller said she had seen protected persons taken advantage of through trusts. Often trusts are established by parents or grandparents or are self-settled. One person may be a small-income beneficiary of a trust. Trusts domiciled in other states may be administered in other states with someone in Nevada entitled to 1 percent or 2 percent of the assets as income.

There are constitutional issues with requiring trustees to appear in Nevada guardianship courts when they have no nexus aside from providing distributions to beneficiaries. If a person is a sole beneficiary or creator of an irrevocable trust, that is appropriate. However, if trusts are being administered in other states, there is a problem. The NRS goes way too far because often trust beneficiaries are from other states. To require their trusts to come under Nevada's jurisdiction, if the shoe were on the other foot, we would not appreciate that. The Nevada trustee would have to hire counsel, prepare an accounting and go forward with a case in another state.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

What changes to the bill would you recommend?

MS. GOLDSMITH:

In NRS 159.113, subsection 1, paragraph (l), only guardianship courts have jurisdiction over revocable trusts. Adding the word "irrevocable" would include both kinds of trusts. If the beneficiary is the sole beneficiary, a guardianship court may take jurisdiction. If all of a judge's beneficiaries are Nevada residents and the trustee is a Nevadan, it is appropriate for the court to confer with the probate court about which court should take jurisdiction. In smaller counties, the problem is less. In a trust case, jurisdiction is not over a person; it is over the property.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Ms. Miller, what do you think of that suggestion?

MS. MILLER:

I understand Ms. Goldsmith's concerns about the constitutionality of A.B. 254. However, we addressed them in section 1, subsection 5, which states, "The provisions of chapters 162 through 167, inclusive, of NRS apply to a trust of which a court has jurisdiction." There could be a situation whereby there was a question as to the situs of the trust or if there is a nexus to Nevada. Those

issues will be addressed by the court through the petition process outlined in the bill.

As to the suggestion to add "irrevocable" to NRS 159.113, subsection 1, paragraph (l), if we want to get an accounting for a protected person who is the trust beneficiary, it only applies if the person or his or her spouse are the grantors and sole beneficiaries or if the trust was created by the court. In many instances, the person is the beneficiary but not the grantor. Ms. Goldsmith's proposals are too limiting. We want to get the court, the protected person, the attorney and the guardian—who is not always the trustee—to be aware of the management of the trust assets.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Is there additional language you would add to A.B. 254? Would the court decide the jurisdiction in out-of-state cases?

MS. MILLER:

Yes.

MS. GOLDSMITH:

If the court determines it has jurisdiction over such cases and makes a demand to the trustee, that is unconstitutional. If it does not get a response or is unsatisfied with it, the court will take jurisdiction. The language in the proposed amendment is mandatory.

JAY P. RAMEN (Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County):

I support A.B. 254 and the proposed amendment, Exhibit N. As a member of the Elder Abuse Unit of the Office of the District Attorney, Clark County, and a former member of the Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships, I believe the bill does a lot to help protected persons regarding trusts.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

I understand the concerns about the bill; however, if we are going to strike a balance, it should be in favor of the protected person, transparency and making sure no one is exploited. That is what the amended bill seeks to do.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 254 and open the hearing on A.B. 288.

ASSEMBLY BILL 288: Revises provisions relating to the protection of older persons and vulnerable persons. (BDR 15-724)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN AMBER JOINER (Assembly District No. 24):

You have Proposed Amendment 4503 ([Exhibit P](#)) to A.B. 288. The purpose of the bill is to strengthen laws governing older and vulnerable people, which is of paramount importance. I was the committee policy analyst for the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults With Special Needs for two Interim sessions. I heard horror stories about neglect and abuse of vulnerable people. I am horrified when I hear stories from my parents, grandparents and their friends about people who try to take advantage of them. Assembly Bill 288 closes loopholes and increases penalties for those who victimize the vulnerable.

Senator Cannizzaro sponsored Senate Bill (S.B.) 360, which overlaps with A.B. 288.

SENATE BILL 360 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the protection of older persons, vulnerable persons and persons in need of a guardian. (BDR 15-965)

Ms. RAMM:

I worked on the arbitration clause of A.B. 288.

MR. RAMEN:

I fully support A.B. 288. If we could merge it and S.B. 360, Nevada's seniors would benefit. My staff and I have no objections to Proposed Amendment 4503, [Exhibit P](#).

JOHN J. PIRO (Deputy Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County):

The Office of the Public Defender, Clark County, opposes A.B. 288. In regard to its enhanced penalties for abusers, we are concerned about stacking the charges for a single scene or transgression. Also, the conspiracy charge element needs more work.

SEAN B. SULLIVAN (Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County):

The Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County, was hoping for a more graduated penalty scheme with the first-time offense being a gross misdemeanor, the second possibly a Category C felony with one to five years imprisonment and subsequent offenses being a Category C felony with two to six years imprisonment.

The bill's conspiracy section seems a bit inconsistent. Historically, most conspiracy charges under NRS are gross misdemeanors, except the more serious ones like conspiracy to commit murder, robbery and engage in activities under the Uniform Controlled Substances Act.

SENATOR FORD:

Once we pass legislation recommended by the Nevada Sentencing Commission of the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, all of these sentencing concerns will be revisited.

BARRY GOLD (AARP of Nevada):

The AARP of Nevada supports A.B. 288 because a society is judged by how it treats its elders.

Ms. LOCKARD (Retired Public Employees of Nevada):

The Retired Public Employees of Nevada supports A.B. 288.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER:

We need the highest possible punishment for the crimes in the bill. We need to keep Category C felony as a sentencing option because some of the crimes result in death and are extremely egregious.

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

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 8, 2017
Page 16

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 288. Seeing no more business before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, we are adjourned at 2:31 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Pat Devereux,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	7		Attendance Roster
A.B. 145	C	2	Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner	Written Testimony
A.B. 145	D	2	Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner	Article: "A 20-Year Toll: 368 Gymnasts Allege Sexual Exploitation"
A.B. 145	E	1	Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner	Article: "Former Female Gymnasts Accuse Doctor of Molesting Them During Treatment"
A.B. 145	F	1	William O'Donohue, M.D.	Letter of Support
A.B. 145	G	2	Benjamin Lublin	Written Testimony
A.B. 145	H	1	Daniele Dreitzer / Rape Crisis Center	Letter of Support
A.B. 145	I	2	Jared Busker / Children's Advocacy Alliance	Letter of Support
A.B. 145	J	1	Judge Egan Walker	Letter of Support
A.B. 173	K	3	Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner	Written Testimony
A.B. 173	L	2	Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner	"Survey of States: Publication of Notice For Adult Name Change"
A.B. 150	M	27	Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 254	N	5	Christine Miller	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 254	O	7	Dara J. Goldsmith / Goldsmith and Guymon	Letter of Concern
A.B. 288	P	6	Assemblywoman Amber Joiner	Proposed Amendment 4503