

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-ninth Session
February 28, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:35 p.m. on Tuesday, February 28, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Vice Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Michael Roberson
Senator Becky Harris

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Senatorial District No. 7
Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senatorial District No. 5
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Counsel
Eileen Church, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brooke Maylath, President, Transgender Allies Group
Ashley Clift-Jennings

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 2

Blue Montana, Transgender Programs Manager, Gay and Lesbian Community
Center of Southern Nevada
Sherrie Scaffidi, Director and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group
Francesca Continolo
Rhiannon Garl-Nabarro
Stacy Shinn, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada
Barry Smith, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association
Forrest Darby
Michael A. Schneider
Jonathan Friedrich, Nevada Homeowners Alliance
Nicolas Martin
Kurt VanGorden
Bob Robey, Nevada Homeowners Alliance
Mike Aupperle
Barbara Aupperle
Tim Stebbins, Nevada Homeowners Alliance
Bonnie McDaniel
Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Garrett Gordon, Community Associations Institute
Norm Rosensteel, Community Associations Institute
Chuck Niggemeyer
Sharath Chandra, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business
and Industry
Danielle Patrick Milam, Director of Development and Planning, Las Vegas-Clark
County Library District
Dennis L. Kennedy, Counsel, Las Vegas-Clark County Library District
Pat Fling, Cochair, Nevada Gun Safety Coalition
Jennifer J. Gaynor, Henderson Libraries
Jeff Scott, Library Director, Washoe County Library System
Steven J. Horner
Sharon Brown, One Pulse for America
Debi Stears, Resources Librarian, Washoe County Library
Daniel S. Reid, State Liaison, National Rifle Association
Jim DeGraffenreid, Vice Chairman, Nevada Republican Party
Gregory Ross
Julius Fortuna, Conservation Division Director, Nevada Firearms Coalition
Kevin Tarkalson

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 3

Eileen Kerlin
Randi Thompson, Nevada Firearms Coalition
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families
Vernon Brooks
Greg Quintana
John Ridgeway

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will open the hearing of the Senate Committee on Judiciary with Senate Bill (S.B.) 110.

SENATE BILL 110: Revises provisions governing the process for a change of name. (BDR 3-142)

SENATOR DAVID R. PARKS (Senatorial District No. 7):

Existing law requires a natural person who files a petition for a court-ordered change of name to publish certain information regarding the petition for a name change in the newspaper of general circulation once a week for three weeks. Existing law waives this requirement if the person demonstrates such a publication would place his or her personal safety at risk. This bill additionally waives the publication requirement if the reason for the change of name is to conform the person's name to his or her gender identity. This bill was previously introduced in the 2015 Legislative Session by Senator Debbie Smith as S.B. No. 358 of the 78th Session. It did not proceed forward and did not get a hearing.

BROOKE MAYLATH (President, Transgender Allies Group):

The Nevada procedure to change a person's name requires the newspaper publication of both old and new names along with the person's address. This requirement effectively outs a person to antitransgender violence, stigma and discrimination. The cost of publication can be extremely costly and burdensome, particularly for low-income transgender individuals.

The existing law requires a person seeking a name change to publish the notice for three weeks. This bill would grant a waiver for a person changing their name to keep their name confidential in order to mitigate the risks that are very real for the transgender community. All transgender people have an increased risk of being the victims of violence and discrimination when their identities are

exposed. They face a personal safety risk with publication of a name change. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

ASHLEY CLIFT-JENNINGS:

I am going to read the testimony of my wife, Allison Clift-Jennings.

I'm a transgender woman who recently completed both a name change and a gender marker change in Washoe County in November of 2016. This included changing my name and gender marker on my birth certificate.

I found that nearly every aspect of the process was very easy, inexpensive and professional, except for the requirement to publish one's old name and new name in the newspaper. Given its public nature, it is a very real threat to harassment and possible stalking and should be unnecessary given other means by which discovery of the current name of an individual could be found, for instance, through a private record at the Secretary of State.

In addition, requiring a publication of name change in the newspaper was the most costly part of the process. In addition, while I did not have a problem paying it, many transgender people struggle to make ends meet, and this requirement just adds to that burden.

I am in full support of removing the requirement for publicly posting a name change in the newspaper when the reason for name change is to confirm the applicant's name to their gender identity.

We have two children in the public school system, and this would further aggravate their own issues if their parent were publicly outed. This does not just affect transpersons but their families as well.

BLUE MONTANA (Transgender Programs Manager, Gay and Lesbian Community Center of Southern Nevada):

Changing one's legal name for transidentified individuals is one of the biggest moments of our lives. The current requirement to announce we are doing so by publishing in the newspaper is antiquated, and it violates our privacy in making a decision that contributes to our personal, mental and emotional well-being.

Requiring a publication for a name change also outs our status as a transindividual, which can have a direct impact on our safety. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

SHERRIE SCAFFIDI (Director and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group):

The current Nevada law requires any person seeking a name change to publish a notice in a newspaper for three weeks. This can put the safety and privacy of a transgender individual at risk. All transgender people face an increased risk of harassment, discrimination and violence when their previous identity is exposed. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

FRANCESCA CONTINOLO:

I am a transgender woman, and I have changed my name to reflect my identity. I published the change required by Nevada law in the *Sparks Tribune*. Immediately after, I was subject to threats from a person who I knew through ham radio. This person had read my original and new name as well as my address and came knocking on my door. I did not answer. He proceeded to tell others through ham radio broadcasts that if he saw me, he would shoot me.

Word got around in the ham radio community and triggered another ham radio threat via Skype. "If you come over in a dress, I will shoot you!"

If this had not been published in the paper, these threats would not have happened. Voting yes on S.B. 110 will help prevent this kind of harassment for other transgender people in the community.

RHIANNON GARL-NABARRO:

I am a transgender woman and in the process of the name change. My name change has been filed with the court. Fortunately, I have not had any physical threats. I am on disability and a tight budget, and publication is the most expensive part of the process. I am attending school and have to change my name before I graduate or my degree will be in someone else's name who did not earn the degree.

SENATOR PAT SPEARMAN (Senatorial District No. 1):

It is my pleasure to speak in support of S.B. 110. As the Committee is already aware, the bill is quite simple. It waives the requirement that personal information be published in a newspaper for several weeks about someone who has petitioned for a legal name change based on the simple desire that the name

conform to the gender identity. Senate Bill 110 seeks to provide a small measure of protection to transgender persons who would like their names to conform to who they truly are.

Members of the LGBTQ community are entering a particularly challenging time. While we have made great strides toward equality and justice over the last years, there are still those who would strip the most basic human rights from transgender persons for no reason other than bigotry and fear.

There are those who may use the simple publication of a name change petition to identify and target those whose basic human dignity and right to live in peace they oppose.

I want to share one story of a tragedy that befalls transgender persons based upon someone else's fear and bigotry. In 2009, Angie Zapata, a transgender teen, was murdered by Allen Andrade. After he beat Angie with his fists, he grabbed a fire extinguisher and hit her in the head several times. During his trial, Andrade told the court, "I killed it."

It is our job as Legislators to serve all Nevadans, but I believe we must work especially hard to protect the rights and lives of those who face the most difficult challenges and who historically have enjoyed the least opportunity, even the opportunity to be recognized for who they truly are.

Senate Bill 110 is a step in the right direction. There may be some who look at this bill and say that transgender persons are seeking special rights. This bill is about equality under the law for everyone.

STACY SHINN (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

Equal bathroom protections have put transgender persons in a game of political football without considering how it is actually putting people's lives in danger. Instead of making a historically oppressed and disenfranchised population a political pawn, let us pass legislation to protect people who suffer disproportionate rates of victimization. With this current climate at the federal level, we have opportunities here in our own State to protect people.

HOLLY WELBORN (Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

The American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada supports S.B. 110. Several states do not have reporting requirements for name changes, and it is an issue of

personal privacy. There are also concerns when it comes to convicted felons and name changes. Legislation this Session will address those issues that would require a name change to be reported to the Central Repository of records.

WENDY STOLYAROV (Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada):
The Libertarian Party supports S.B. 110.

In a just society, the government must safeguard the civil rights of its citizens. Transpeople must be defended, and S.B. 110 represents such a defense of their civil rights. Structural oppression like the required publication of a gender-dysphoric name change may be invisible to many, but to those affected by it, it is exceedingly burdensome. Our society is still transphobic. The required publication of a name change for transpeople is both needlessly painful and potentially dangerous for individuals who simply want to live their lives freely.

Protecting transpeople by removing harmful barriers like this one is not only compassionate but also practical and fully in line with our Country's cherished right to privacy. The unrelenting pursuit of justice for all is a core principle of the American experiment, and S.B. 110 represents another important step in that journey.

BARRY SMITH (Executive Director, Nevada Press Association):
The Nevada Press Association is neutral on S.B. 110. I met several months ago with members of Gender Justice Nevada, and they educated me on this issue. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) does contain the provision that Senator Parks mentioned, but it is not widely known. There is the ability to ask the judge to waive the public notice requirement if presented with proof that the applicant's personal safety is at risk and it applies to everybody. There is no requirement in the statute to publish an address.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I do not have any problems with this bill, as there is an existing provision in State law for personal safety reasons. I believe it allows your record to be sealed.

Would it be more effective to expand the definition of the public safety exception we have in statute so these records could be sealed?

MR. SMITH:

It would be up to the sponsor if they wanted to amend it.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

You mentioned there is an exception for those if they can provide proof that there would be a threat to their safety. From the testimony we have heard today, it sounds like that is something that could stem from the publication. I wanted to make that distinction because the way I am hearing this testimony, it is more proactive than reactive to a current ongoing threat of which there may not be any proof until the publication.

MR. SMITH:

Yes, I think that is true, and a person would have to persuade the judge that there was a reason.

FORREST DARBY:

I support S.B. 110.

SENATOR PARKS:

To answer Senator Roberson's question, we looked at this as being the simplest way to address this one issue.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 110 and open the hearing on S.B. 114.

SENATE BILL 114: Revises provisions relating to common-interest communities.
(BDR 18-681)

SENATOR JOYCE WOODHOUSE (Senatorial District No. 5):

I am here today to introduce Senate Bill 114, which proposes a very simple change to the existing homeowners' association (HOA) ombudsman position. Senate Bill 114 simply moves the Office of the Ombudsman for Owners in Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels from the Real Estate Division in the Department of Business and Industry to the Attorney General's Office and makes the technical changes necessary to ensure that the Ombudsman's Office continues to function properly during and after the move. The Attorney General's Office is a better location for this important position given the legal stature of that Office and its experience in handling fraud complaints and similar consumer protection issues.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 9

MICHAEL A. SCHNEIDER:

On February 28, 1997, the first bill to create the Office of the Ombudsman was introduced. We have returned many sessions after 1997 to enhance the Office and give it more authority.

In 1997, I had this bill drafted, and we had it going to the Attorney General's Office. Because of some political issues at the time, I was asked to find another location and I selected the Real Estate Division.

It is now time to take this back and put it in the Attorney General's Office. Every question that comes in from a homeowner is a legal question. The Real Estate Division is not geared to make legal decisions and instruct people on how to run their HOAs. The Real Estate Division regulates real estate professionals through licensure, registration, education and enforcement.

The Nevada Association of Realtors supports this bill. The Association agrees that it would be better to move it out of the Real Estate Division and place it in the Attorney General's Office.

We have had problems with our Jewish community being harassed and having swastikas painted on pools and clubhouses. It is time to give these issues to the Attorney General's Office that is an advocate for consumers and provides protection of consumers in Nevada.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Have you seen the fiscal note?

MR. SCHNEIDER:

No.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Mr. Guinan, could you review the fiscal note?

MR. SCHNEIDER:

The money for the Ombudsman's Office comes off a door fee, which has been \$3 a door for over 20 years. They increased the fee to \$5 at the 78th Session.

MR. GUINAN:

The fiscal note was submitted by the Attorney General's Office on February 24. For fiscal year (FY) 2017-2018, it is \$834,299; in FY 2018-2019, it is \$776,744. The effect on future biennia will be \$1.5 million.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I assume they are not including where the money is currently spent.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

If you process this bill based on its policy, we would ask that you rerefer it to the Senate Committee on Finance so that we can address the fiscal note.

JONATHAN FRIEDRICH (Nevada Homeowners Alliance):

Senate Bill 114 is needed to protect the one million-plus people living in HOAs in our State. I own a Website called HOAcorruption.com. This referenced-type Website receives between five and ten phone calls or emails a week from people begging for help because they cannot get the assistance they need from the Real Estate Division Office of the Ombudsman. We are also contacted from homeowners across the Nation. We are not attorneys, just lay people trying to help others by offering guidance and limited assistance.

A common response from the Ombudsman's Office is, "Your complaint is unsubstantiated." There is a constant turnover of personnel in this Office. In the past four years, there have been three administrators and a revolving door of investigators at the Real Estate Division. Two years ago, the former administrator dumped 200 intervention affidavits filed by homeowners in the trash because there was a one- to two-year backlog dealing with complaints of homeowner boards violating State law. Where was the help for those owners seeking justice from abuses?

I personally have had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of my own money dealing with an association that refused to follow State law because the Ombudsman's Office would not deal with the violations committed by this association.

The Office of the Ombudsman belongs in the Attorney General's Office. In 1997 when then-Senator Schneider drafted the original bill that created the Ombudsman's Office, he contemplated it would be located in the Attorney General's Office.

A few amendments should be made to S.B. 114, such as allowing the yearly door fees that fund the Office of the Ombudsman to be sent directly to the Attorney General's Office rather than through the Real Estate Division. Currently, owners each pay \$4.25, which can be increased up to \$5 per door per year, to fund this office.

The Ombudsman's Office belongs in a law enforcement environment because it deals with violations of the law. Dr. Lewis Cone, the president of the association that Senator Woodhouse lives in, supports this bill. Unfortunately, he could not be here in person to speak in support of this bill today. He has firsthand knowledge of the inefficiencies at the current Ombudsman's Office.

NICOLAS MARTIN:

I moved to Las Vegas a few months ago. I have spent most of my time becoming familiarized with the laws, bylaws and general rules which govern HOAs. The HOA cedes control to a management association, which along with other management associations has inordinate influence with the Real Estate Division, that falls under the category of regulatory capture. The Attorney General's Office would be far less susceptible to regulatory capture than the Real Estate Division and far more capable to deal with the legal issues which perpetually arise.

Our board has no familiarity with the law, does not follow the law and allows the management association to run the meetings without reference to *Roberts Rules of Order*. If we could take our complaints to the Attorney General's Office, we would have meaningful recourse.

KURT VANGORDEN:

I am an HOA member in Las Vegas. Approximately 1.3 million Nevadans, nearly half of our population, are members of our State's 3,000 homeowners' associations. Members of the State Legislature have properties that are in HOA communities. This enormous populous, comprising nearly one out of two people in our State, deserves the best possible representation to protect them as property owners. I represent numerous HOA members who have filed notarized affidavits with the Ombudsman's Office, yet without a proper resolution. The improvement in S.B. 114 is one of several necessary steps to correct a broken system.

Illegal activity by unscrupulous HOA boards affects all age groups. Yet, as a senior citizen, I am particularly concerned about fellow seniors whose HOA home is their final housing purchase. It is extremely depressing after working a career to make your final large purchase and then feel helplessly trapped in a vortex of dead ends without escape.

We, as senior citizens, find that our HOA is corrupt, illegally spending our funds on themselves, holding secret meetings, lacking accountability, refusing correction and often being bolstered by corrupt HOA attorneys and community managers.

Then we turn to the Ombudsman's Office for a resolution. One problem is the extremely long and arduous process comprising several months just to get them to respond to a simple complaint. We go to the trouble of researching, writing and filing notarized affidavits only to receive a dismissive response or in some cases, no response at all.

We now turn to the State and Legislature for a solution. Senate Bill 114 is on the right road to correct this by transferring the Ombudsman's Office from the Real Estate Division to the Office of the Attorney General. I have two reasons: accountability and streamlining.

This transfer should give more accountability for the actions of the Ombudsman's Office than in the past where it gives few answers to anyone for their actions. I was in a meeting when one of the past administrative directors stood for an hour giving a speech on how he was going to reform the Ombudsman's Office, and he repeatedly stated several times to the audience, "No one is going to go to jail." At the end of his speech, I raised my hand with a comment and told him and the audience that what he has done by repeatedly stating "no one is going to jail" is open our HOAs to more corruption rather than closing the door on corruption. The system invites criminal activity because in his words "no one is going to jail." That is an invitation for any corrupt-minded person to exploit HOA finances or otherwise. Senate Bill 114 gives more power to the Attorney General to directly influence the Ombudsman's Office and makes it accountable to close that door.

Streamlining is rational since the Ombudsman already relies upon the Attorney General, as the Real Estate Division has no legal authority. An example is when the Attorney General's Office is consulted for a legal opinion letter on

ambiguous portions of NRS 116. Therefore, placing the Ombudsman's Office under the Attorney General's Office should streamline business.

BOB ROBEY (Nevada Homeowners Alliance):

I receive many phone calls each week on HOA problems. This is the right move, and it must be done. I received a copy of our HOA newsletter that contains an article from the president of our association that states "Before each board meeting we would meet and discuss the agenda items." The HOA board is admitting that it meets before meetings to discuss the agenda.

I have filed many complaints with the Ombudsman's Office. If I show this to the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman will tell me to file a complaint. I then have to send a letter to the association citing this article and citing the law and ask it to stop. The association will tell me nothing. I will then have to go to a session with the Ombudsman and discuss this with the association. The association will not show up. I have to pay for arbitration or mediation to stop my board from breaking the law, which it now admits to doing.

MIKE AUPPERLE:

We need this bill for the senior citizens and the veterans who are living in the over 55 HOA communities. I served on an HOA board myself. I know what they are doing and how they are doing it, yet I cannot do anything about it. Moving the Ombudsman's Office to the Attorney General's Office is going to give us another opportunity to involve law enforcement in these corrupt organizations.

BARBARA AUPPERLE:

I support S.B. 114.

TIM STEBBINS (Nevada Homeowners Alliance):

I support S.B. 114.

BONNIE MCDANIEL:

I support S.B. 114.

MR. DARBY:

I support S.B. 114.

BRETT KANDT (Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):
The Attorney General's Office respects the proponents' desire to improve HOA compliance with the provisions of State law, specifically NRS 116.

Traditionally, the Legislature has directed the Office of the Attorney General to perform two essential functions: 1) to provide legal advice and representation to Executive Branch State agencies, and 2) in a limited number of instances, to prosecute crime.

Senate Bill 114 takes the Office of the Attorney General into another area entirely. This is more of a regulatory function, which would be something new that does not fit with the Attorney General's Office traditional role in State government. One of the rationales for moving this function to the Office of the Attorney General is due to the significant legal component of the Ombudsman's function. When it comes to the legal piece, the Attorney General's Office will fulfil its role as legal counsel and provide legal advice and representation, but we respectfully submit that alone is not a sufficient justification to make this move.

The other component is fraud. The Attorney General's Office has jurisdiction when it comes to fraud in one specific respect. The Attorney General's Office enforces the provisions of NRS 598, the Deceptive Trade Practices Act. That type of consumer fraud does not require investigating individual complaints and certainly not representing individuals. In those instances, the Attorney General's Office looks at broad pattern deceptive trade acts or fraud that falls across a broad number of individuals and affects a large number of individuals in our State.

Placing this responsibility within the Attorney General's Office could create conflict issues what with the current responsibilities of providing legal advice and representation to the Real Estate Commission, and the Commission for Common-Interest Communities (CIC) and Condominium Hotels; prosecuting cases before the commissions on behalf of the Real Estate Division; and prosecuting deceptive trade practice cases that may involve CIC.

These current responsibilities that require careful allocation and screening of our legal counsel and prosecution functions to avoid conflicts would be further complicated under this proposal.

This has been the consistent position under prior Attorneys General with this proposal under consideration by the Legislature. The Attorney General's Office is a creature of statute and will do as the Legislature directs.

I want to refer to the fiscal note, given section 6 of S.B. 114 provides "to the extent money in the Account is available for that purpose, the Administrator shall pay any claims submitted by the Office of the Attorney General pursuant to section 1 of this act to reimburse the costs and expenses of the Office of the Ombudsman." That qualifying language "to the extent money in the account is available" creates a very significant question that forces the Attorney General's Office to consider the fiscal impact, assuming that money would not be available.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Does the fiscal note take all the money out of there?

MR. KANDT:

Our fiscal note takes into account the fact that there may not be money available in that account to reimburse the Attorney General's Office. It could be appropriated and used for other purposes by the Division. Therefore, we have to be prepared to bear the fiscal impact on our budget.

GARRETT GORDON (Community Associations Institute):

In Nevada, 46 percent of the population lives in an HOA. There are approximately 3,162 HOAs registered with the Real Estate Division and approximately 523,000 units within the registered associations.

We believe, on behalf of the Community Associations Institute that consists of 60 percent of homeowners, that a silent majority are happy with their HOA. The silent majority are happy with the current process of the Real Estate Division. Do we have concerns over the last three to four years with the backlogs and how things have dragged out through the Real Estate Division? With prior Administrator J.D. Decker, who was proactive and we worked with him, and the new administrator, it is working now. In conjunction with that, last Session we sat down with the Real Estate Division and members of the Legislative Body in order to raise the per door fee from \$3 a door up to a maximum of \$5 a door. This shows that the Real Estate Division is working better and more efficiently.

Our major concern is that to the extent the money is available, it will be used in the Attorney General's Office. We are concerned that the per door fee would have to be raised in order to accommodate the fiscal notes put on by the Attorney General's Office and the Real Estate Division.

NORM ROSENSTEEL (Community Associations Institute):

This issue has come up numerous times, and the Attorney General's Office and the Real Estate Division have been opposed. The system does work, but someone is always unhappy with the decision made. That is not going to change if it is moved to the Attorney General's Office. The system will most likely remain much as it is today. Community Associations Institute would like it to remain under the Real Estate Division where it works okay as it is.

CHUCK NIGGEMEYER:

I am opposed to S.B. 114.

SHARATH CHANDRA (Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry):

The fiscal note from the Real Estate Division also increases the cost of doing business. It is a self-funded agency. We did an analysis and by the second year, based on the numbers, we see it goes into the red. Regardless of raising the door fees up to \$5, it does not make fiscal sense because by Year 2, we are getting into the reserves. Based on economic projections, we will see the double-digit growth that we have experienced in this past.

We have a Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels that is comprised of people from all occupations. The mission of that Commission is to move forward, and it is progressing well. We have worked with the Attorney General's Office, and we get the required legal advice from them. We also have mechanics built in that if felonies are part of the investigation, those are referred out to the appropriate agencies such as the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) or the Attorney General's Office.

The Real Estate Division has tried to improve customer service and tried to work with all the parties involved. This is a constant battle with us. It is our goal to improve service to a point where there are no problems.

We have a new Ombudsman, Charvez Foger, and we are looking for individuals who can provide constituent services. Working with people from all different arenas is the best way to bring consensus in this matter.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 114 and open the hearing on S.B. 115.

SENATE BILL 115: Revises provisions concerning the prohibition against carrying or possessing certain weapons while on certain property. (BDR 15-279)

SENATOR DENIS:

In my discussions with librarians at the Research Library, they mentioned that a bill was passed a couple of years ago that exempted educational institutions, but it did not specifically include libraries.

Senate Bill 115 prohibits a person from carrying or possessing certain weapons in a public library unless the person has written permission from the governing board of the public library to carry or possess a weapon.

The existing law prohibits a person from carrying or possessing certain weapons while on the property of the Nevada System of Higher Education, public or private school or child care facility unless the person has written permission from the president of a branch or facility of the Nevada System of Higher Education, the principal of the school or the person designated by the child care facility to carry or possess the weapon.

Current law allows for prohibition of a person carrying or possessing certain weapons on education-related facilities or when in the presence of children unless granted permission. Senate Bill 115 recognizes that libraries are an extension of the education and learning environment and are often used by children and teens. Given the presence of children and teens, S.B. 115 would allow each library district within Nevada to make the decision on whether to allow for the possession of a weapon at a public library.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHANNON BILBRAY-AXELROD (Assembly District No. 34):

Libraries are often an extension of education and learning environments for children and teens. The Las Vegas-Clark County Library District is comprised of

14 libraries in urban areas and 11 libraries in the outlying areas of southern Nevada. Approximately 124,357 cardholders are persons under the age of 18.

Over the years, the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District has coordinated over 20,000 programs in performance bases and lecture halls within libraries. Approximately 600,000 people have attended these programs. Out of the program attendees, approximately 215,910 were youth.

Thirty-seven percent of book, media, movie and music checkouts were from the children and young adult collection. Over 6.2 million visits were made to those 25 branches, and minors made 45 percent of those visits.

Public libraries are active community hubs for learning. Many of the minors who come to the libraries do so to use the computers, study rooms and homework resources. Each library district within Nevada should be allowed to determine if persons are allowed to possess weapons in a public library.

DANIELLE PATRICK MILAM (Director of Development and Planning, Las Vegas-Clark County Library District):

The business of public libraries today is education. Andrew Carnegie, over 160 years ago, established public libraries across the Country as the people's university, and we continue to serve that function in our communities.

A Pew Research Center study from 2013 showed that 70 percent of parents in America report their children visit the public library regularly. It was reported that 87 percent borrowed books, 55 percent did school homework, 46 percent attended a library event, 46 percent borrowed DVDs and CDs, 37 percent used the Internet and met with friends to work on homework, and 32 percent visited a library-sponsored book club or other events. This range of educational activities demonstrates that libraries are a bedrock of education in American communities today. We take it seriously to provide a safe environment for children, youth and families.

Nevada's public libraries are busy public places for learning, especially during the day for families with young children. In Clark County, 75 percent of our service population are families and 75 percent of our 664,000 active cardholders are families. We also have vibrant after-school and weekend use of libraries by students.

Students are young children. Their families, teens, and college students are pouring through our doors using our facilities for things such as homework, studying for tests, obtaining tutoring support, attending teen workshops, accessing technology, researching, and developing business ideas and career path pursuits.

We have provided a Petition of Support for S.B. 115 ([Exhibit F](#)) signed by Boulder City, Washoe County, Henderson District Public Libraries and Churchill County Library. We have also provided a research brief dated February 2017 ([Exhibit G](#)) that discusses in more depth and detail the use of public libraries in Nevada by children, youth and families.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

To the sponsors of the bill, can you explain your view on the current state of the law with regard to open-carry and conceal-carry in a public library?

SENATOR DENIS:

The existing law states in NRS 202.265:

Except as otherwise provided in this section, a person shall not carry or possess while on the property of the Nevada System of Higher Education, a private or public school or child care facility, or while in a vehicle of a private or public school or child care facility.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Are you talking about open- or conceal-carry?

SENATOR DENIS:

It is either open- or conceal-carry.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Does the library system now prevent individuals from bringing in a concealed weapon? Do they prevent people from coming in open-carry?

SENATOR DENIS:

I believe that they do.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 20

SENATOR ROBERSON:

It is important for everyone to understand the current law. What can a resident Nevadan do with regard to carrying a firearm in a public library?

MS. MILAM:

At this moment, we prohibit any kind of dangerous weapon in the library.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Do you think that comports with existing law?

MS. MILAM:

I do.

DENNIS L. KENNEDY (Counsel, Las Vegas-Clark County Library District):

The Library District has a dangerous weapons policy that includes firearms, ammunition and variety of other things.

I represented the Library District in a case involving Michelle Flores, who sued the Library District alleging that the firearms policy violated State law and violated her Second Amendment rights.

Eighth Judicial District Judge Stefany Miley, on a motion for summary judgment, decided that the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District's policy did not violate State law and did not reach the constitutional question of the Second Amendment.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Did District Judge Miley willfully ignore S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session?

MR. KENNEDY:

District Judge Miley interpreted it strictly in accordance with its language. Senate Bill No. 175 of the 78th Session states no city, county or town may adopt a policy prohibiting the carrying of weapons. District Judge Miley read the statute according to the language and said a library district is neither a city, a county nor a town. She was correct in her reading of the statute.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I understand your perspective. You are paid to have that perspective.

MR. KENNEDY:

She is the judge, that is what she decided.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I understand she is the judge. This all came about because someone tried to exercise their rights to open-carry in a public library based on S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session?

MR. KENNEDY:

No, that is incorrect. This all came about when the plaintiff was leaving the library one day and the security guard noticed she was carrying a firearm. The security guard said, "You know we have a policy against dangerous weapons on library premises." The plaintiff was leaving, and the security guard asked her not to bring her weapon when she returned.

She sat down in the main entrance of the library with her three children, who were aged one, three and five, and refused to leave. She and her three children sat down. She was asked to leave several times, and she refused to do so. She was finally told that if she continued to sit in the doorway of the library with her three kids, all of whom were crying by that time, that Metro would be called and she would be trespassed. The LVMPD was called. They asked her to leave, and she would not leave. The library trespassed her.

A motion was filed for a preliminary injunction allowing her to go back and use the library, and the motion was denied. District Judge Miley said that the library was completely within its rights to trespass her because she sat in the doorway. District Judge Miley expressly said this is not a weapons issue, and the plaintiff was not trespassed for carrying the weapon. She was trespassed for sitting in the doorway with her three children and refusing to leave.

Back to your question, did this all come about because of her carrying the weapon. The answer is "no." It came about because of the trespass.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Have you asked the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) if they agree with District Judge Miley's interpretation of S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session?

SENATOR DENIS:

I was not aware of the outcome of that particular court case.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I will ask LCB myself. I would like to get their take on the legislation that was passed last Session.

What kind of security do public libraries typically have?

MS. MILAM:

We go through considerable expense to have both unarmed and armed guards in all of our library buildings because of the amount of foot traffic. We do everything we can to keep it safe for our patrons.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

So you have armed guards at every library?

MS. MILAM:

Not at every library.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I understand there is a statutory prohibition against conceal-carry. As far as open-carry, why do you feel the need to bring this bill if you are so sure that District Judge Miley was correct in her interpretation of S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session?

SENATOR DENIS:

I did not bring this bill because of District Judge Miley's decision. I brought the bill because I felt libraries were left off the legislation passed two years ago. Senate Bill No. 175 of the 78th Session included universities, schools and nurseries, but did not include libraries which are also educational institutions.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

That was not my bill. I did not include those things in my bill. That was existing law for a very long time. If everyone is so sure that they understand what S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session did, there should be no need for this bill.

I have a second concern if libraries do not have adequate security. What we are doing is telling the public that we are creating gun-free zones. Ample studies show that gun-free zones are a magnet for criminal activity and mass shooters.

This bill does two things: 1) it undermines law-abiding Nevadans' right to bear arms, and 2) it actually endangers the public by making public libraries a more attractive place for the criminal element. I want to see adequate security at public libraries and want safety for the people who use these libraries.

SENATOR DENIS:

Senate Bill 115 gives the local library board the option to do whatever they want. If one particular county or city library decides they do not have adequate security, they can do whatever they want. This bill does not say that you have to do this, it is saying that we are giving the local library board the opportunity to make a decision based on their local needs.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I understand this bill is allowing the libraries to create their own policy, but I am trying to understand why this bill is needed.

SENATOR DENIS:

When I put the BDR in for this bill, there was not any court decision or anything like that. I was looking to clarify the record because it did not list libraries.

MS. MILAM:

The Flores case had not gone through the lower courts but we do anticipate further litigation, and it would be nice to get it clarified in the law now.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

As far as I know, there is no evidence to suggest that open-carry firearms or conceal-carry firearms pose any danger to the patrons of public libraries. I also realize that this bill is about safety, but as Senator Roberson said, we are creating another gun-free zone, which is an open invitation to those who choose to harm others since they know that no one will be there to defend themselves. Not all libraries have armed guards.

If someone were to commit an act of violence toward you in or around the library, would you have a quicker response by pulling out your cell phone and calling 911 or pulling out your self-defense weapon?

SENATOR DENIS:

Libraries have always had a policy against weapons. If you look at the history of this Country, I do not think that we have had any violent issues in a library.

They have been gun-free for 100 years, and I do not believe clarifying the law is going to change anything.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I am not saying that it will, but we live in a society that is changing rapidly, and everybody is concerned about going to a restaurant or the movies. Anymore you have to be diligent and aware that things can happen and do happen. I hope that it will not ever happen in a library. We are concerned about protecting ourselves and our families. Many people in my district carry concealed weapons all the time. I do not want to create another gun-free zone. We have to put a stop to it somewhere.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Each individual library district would be capable of creating their own regulations with regard to the gun policy. As I read the bill, section 1 states a person shall not carry or possess while on the property of the public library. When you get down to subsection 3, paragraph (a), subparagraph (3) says in a public library or private facility, you can have a gun if you have permission from the governing board of the library. Does that mean that each individual library district is going to have to issue a letter to every individual patron if they want to allow guns in their library facility?

SENATOR DENIS:

This bill gives the libraries the ability to create a policy that would provide permission, and an individual would still have to seek permission. Currently, an individual has to go to the president of the university or the person in charge to obtain permission to carry a weapon.

SENATOR HARRIS:

The testimony indicates that libraries have more discretion in choosing whether to ban weapons. Libraries have policies established by regulation stating they do not want to have weapons, particularly guns in this case, on their premises. The general policy in Nevada is no guns in libraries. Individual library districts are not free to create an independent policy that states a patron may bring a concealed or open weapon. Instead, we have a prohibition against allowing for firearms in libraries, and then an individual has to submit a letter that specifically asks for an exception. Am I understanding that correctly?

SENATOR DENIS:

I am not sure what each library's individual policy is in Nevada.

SENATOR HARRIS:

As I read the bill, libraries do not have that discretion. If an individual wanted to carry a firearm into a library, they would have to ask for permission to carry. Rural library districts would not be able to accommodate a population that regularly carries firearms. Every individual who accesses that library would have to ask for a letter of exception, which seems potentially burdensome to a library district in terms of contemplating the number of requests.

What circumstances have you contemplated in which exceptions would be granted?

MS. MILAM:

For the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District, the power to grant permission is with the board. The board would be responsible for setting up the criteria and the process for that exemption.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Have you set up those criteria?

MS. MILAM:

No. We are waiting to see if this bill moves forward.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Based on the regulations that you already have that prohibit firearms in libraries, you have granted no exceptions?

MS. MILAM:

No. Our policy would make available the information. If people wanted to store their firearms, we would provide a place to do that.

SENATOR HARRIS:

You are looking at having storage facilities at the library for people to store their weapons?

MS. MILAM:

We would look at a number of different options.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 26

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:
Who funds the library?

MS. MILAM:
The Las Vegas-Clark County Library District is a special district of the State where half of the board is appointed by the City of Las Vegas and the other half is appointed by the County Commission.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:
Would it fall under the guise of the State library or County or city?

MS. MILAM:
It is a special district of the State.

SENATOR DENIS:
The library districts are all autonomous unless they are part of a city government. Most of the larger ones are autonomous districts.

SENATOR ROBERSON:
It is clear that S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session was intended for State law to preempt local law concerning the carrying of firearms. I did find that LCB did do an opinion in 2015 regarding this very issue. I will quote its opinion:

Because there is no general statutory prohibition against the open-carry of firearms in a public building, it is the opinion of this office that the open-carry of firearms is not prohibited in a public building unless otherwise prohibited by a specific statute.

I do not think you are following the law today. I understand why you are bringing this bill because you are currently violating the law.

PAT FLING (Cochair, Nevada Gun Safety Coalition):
Our mission is to advance effective gun safety legislation and policies that save lives and reduce injuries. We support S.B. 115 to prohibit guns from being carried into libraries. Libraries are public places where children and families go for education and learning, and are similar to schools. Libraries should be a safe zone without guns where children's welfare is a top priority.

JENNIFER J. GAYNOR (Henderson Libraries):

We have submitted two letters of support, one from the Vice Chair of the Henderson Libraries Board of Trustees ([Exhibit H](#)) and one from the Acting Executive Director ([Exhibit I](#)).

The Henderson Libraries strongly support S.B. 115. We believe it gives clarity that they would be able to prohibit open-carry.

JEFF SCOTT (Library Director, Washoe County Library System):

Current law allows for prohibition of a person carrying or possessing certain weapons on college campuses, schools and daycare facilities unless granted permission. This bill recognizes that libraries are like universities, colleges, schools and daycares, which are already allowed to prohibit weapons. Libraries are extended education and learning environments that are heavily used by children and teens.

Senate Bill 115 adds libraries to the list of educational institutions and daycare facilities where open-carry can be prohibited. A public library should be a safe place for everyone whether it is young parents bringing their children to story time, students coming after school to get assistance or any patron who would like to safely use the library. Libraries are essential to help Nevada children succeed.

STEVEN J. HORNER:

I grew up as a hunter and a person who knew how to use and maintain many different kinds of weapons. When I joined the Army in 1973, my knowledge of weapons grew. I also knew every safety feature on each of those weapons. When I was 10 years old, I took my first NRA safety course. I knew that there were places where weapons should be and places where weapons should never cross the threshold of the institution such as schools, churches, bars and libraries. I speak today in support of S.B. 115.

SHARON BROWN (One Pulse for America):

I support S.B. 115 and feel libraries should be a weapon-free zone.

DEBI STEARS (Resources Librarian, Washoe County Library):

I support S.B. 115 as a librarian and as a gun owner.

DANIEL S. REID (State Liaison, National Rifle Association):

We are in opposition of S.B. 115 as it expands the list of places where law-abiding citizens cannot exercise their inherent right to self-defense. This bill encompasses more than just the library building; it also extends to the property including the parking lots.

Currently, libraries can ban conceal-carry through the public building statute, which says they have to post a sign or have a metal detector. That statute applies specifically to conceal-carry, which is why S.B. 115 is dealing with open-carry or firearms in general.

This bill creates a dilemma for citizens to choose whether to exercise their right to self-defense or their Second Amendment rights or using the public library. For example, take someone who has a conceal-carry permit. If banned from the library, the individual has the option to store that firearm in the vehicle. The way this bill is written, this person could not store that firearm in his or her vehicle on the property of the library. The bill could apply to someone who uses one of the many book drops. If you drive onto the property to drop off your books, you violate the law. That is why we have an issue with schools and daycare facilities. This is the motivation behind Senate Bill 102, which I hope to hear at some point.

This is going to compound the problem. Libraries are in all different places from stand-alone buildings to storefronts, so we could create a mess for citizens who are inadvertently breaking the law.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Do you agree that if this were treated like the schools, which are currently the law, that you could not open- or conceal-carry?

MR. REID:

Talking about schools is a little bit different because you have federal legislation that deals with the Gun-free Schools Act, and your exception to that is under having a state-issued permit.

In regard to S.B. No. 175 of the 78th Session, if the library was not included in that, then a city or county could create any sort of district it wanted and ban guns anywhere. The purpose of that was to create uniformity so we had consistent regulations throughout the State.

As mentioned earlier, a possible storage situation would be in violation of State Question No. 1, if that were instituted.

JIM DEGRAFFENREID (Vice Chairman, Nevada Republican Party):

The Nevada Republican Party wants to note its opposition to this bill. We recognize that it is proposed with good intentions, but we respectfully disagree that would be the result.

Nevada citizens are guaranteed the right in the State Constitution to appropriately defend themselves. Article 1, section 11 says that "every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms for security and defense, for lawful hunting and recreational use and for other lawful purposes."

Nevada Republicans via our platform have directed us to oppose infringement of this constitutional right. We are already having this right infringed on in many places throughout the State. We urge this Committee to not further infringe on the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.

GREGORY ROSS:

One of my sources of self-employment is as a for-hire driver. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, taxicab drivers and chauffeurs have 20 times the murder rate of the average job, double that of a police officer. This bill will ban guns in library parking lots. I am not sure if that was the intent from the library board, but this affects people who drive for hire. If you are going to drop people off at a place like a library or pick them up, you are going to normally pick them up from the door and go into the parking lot. With this bill, you have to choose as a driver whether you are going to be unarmed for your entire shift just so you can pick up people from the library, or if you are going to avoid picking up people from the library altogether.

Most people who use the libraries are often lower income. Many of these people do not have cars and are using for-hire ride services to get to the libraries. You are going to reduce the number of people who are going to these libraries because many drivers for-hire are not going to be servicing these areas if they are afraid of potentially being unarmed, or they will be forced to place themselves in a position to break the law and commit a crime in order to defend themselves.

JULIUS FORTUNA (Conservation Division Director, Nevada Firearms Coalition):
The Nevada Firearms Coalition strongly opposes the passage of S.B. 115.

This bill will endanger the public safety as it adds another gun-free zone or more accurately, a gun-violent zone. Right now, firearms are already prohibited. Recent events show that these areas are the ones selected for abuse by felonious predators. According to Crime Prevention Research Center, from 1950 to 2016, 98 percent of mass shootings have occurred in gun-free zones. This bill makes more places unsafe for the public and reduces our ability to protect ourselves from those who wish to do us harm.

This bill also includes the parking lots of public libraries as places where people who legally possess firearms would not be allowed to secure their firearms. This would make this difficult for families and honest citizens to safely stow and lock their firearms in the car while attending an event at the public library.

Self-defense is one of the most basic rights. Strict gun control regulations interfere with that right because ordinary citizens abide by regulations and criminals do not. Many people, legislatures and the vast majority of library boards support anti-gun control regulations like this because they are convinced that the majority of legal gun owners are either incapable of using a gun in self-defense or will use that gun in a fit of anger over some petty matter. Those assumptions are false. There are tens of thousands of self-defense incidents that show legal gun ownership stops a lot of crime.

The best example of this is on the morning of October 1, 1997, when 16-year-old Luke Woodham was on a rampage killing students at Pearl High School. Assistant Principal Joel Myrick chased, caught and held Luke Woodham with his Colt 45 pistol, which he retrieved from his truck in the school parking lot.

Here is the hard truth: the only way to stop a bad person with a gun is to have a good person with a gun. I have never seen an armed guard in any of the libraries I have attended in Las Vegas, and our chances of having a library board allow exemptions are about as good as finding Jimmy Hoffa. We urge all of you to reject this bill as written.

KEVIN TARKALSON:

I oppose S.B. 115 and resent the idea that libraries are the same as schools. They are not. The people who constructed the initial bill that decided it was a bad idea to have firearms in schools did so with that intent. If they had intended for libraries to be included as schools, they would have done so at that time. They left libraries out for a reason.

EILEEN KERLIN:

I oppose S.B. 115.

RANDI THOMPSON (Nevada Firearms Coalition):

We oppose the passage of S.B. 115.

JANINE HANSEN (State President, Nevada Families):

I have some personal concerns about this bill. This last year I had 9 of my 14 grandchildren living with me. Several times I took them to the Elko County Library where we were intimidated by people hanging out in front of the library. There were panhandlers and other disreputable people there, and we were fearful.

I oppose S.B. 115. It is not the same as schools. I am concerned about safety and criminals knowing that this is a gun-free zone where people who are law-abiding citizens can become potential victims.

VERNON BROOKS:

I oppose S.B. 115. I am here to dispute the validity of the claims that this bill needs to be passed to protect children and that librarians do not want to worry about whether someone has a gun or not.

When I go to the library, like anywhere else, I lawfully carry a firearm. Gun-free zones do not work. The only thing that stops a bad person with a gun is a good person with a gun.

It is already illegal to carry a concealed firearm into a library under NRS 202.3673. Without any mitigating technology in place, there is no way to know whether someone is carrying concealed. If someone has malicious intentions, neither the current state of the law nor this bill can do anything about it.

Nevada Revised Statutes 379.040 states:

The library and reading room of any consolidated, county, district or town library must forever be and remain free and accessible to the public

This bill removes my ability to have free and open access to the library. As it stands right now, the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District has been in violation of the law for some time and has been enforcing this ban without the legal authority to do so.

Up to this point, I have been able to use the Henderson Libraries as they have complied with the law and not hassled people over lawful open-carry.

This is bad bill and does nothing to protect the law-abiding public. Instead, it creates another victim disarmament zone and in the process makes it off-limits for me and my children.

GREG QUINTANA:

Article 1, section 11 of the Nevada Constitution states:

Every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms for security and defense, for lawful hunting and recreational use and for other lawful purposes.

Senate Bill 115 is a violation of the Nevada Constitution. I have been to the Henderson Public Library open-carrying without incident and have done it many times. Henderson Library staff has seen me open-carrying and have said nothing. The Henderson Library honors preemption, something that the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District does not honor. This bill, if it passes, would prevent me from going to my local library and would prevent people in the rural districts from going to their libraries. Gun-free zones are magnets for the criminal-minded and the insane. Why not make some scum-free zones and eliminate the vagrants crashing on the couches, sleeping off their addictions, and people watching porn on the public library computers with hardly a word or a glance from security.

JOHN RIDGEWAY:

There is a scary statement that says the library needs the power to make the policy to control somebody's natural rights. The library board members are

nonelected officials and should not have that kind of power to control somebody's constitutional rights.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Senate Bill No. 175 of the 78th Session, section 9 states:

The Legislature hereby declares that:

(a) The purpose of this section is to establish state control over the regulation of and policies concerning firearms, firearm accessories and ammunition to ensure that such regulation and policies are uniform throughout this State and to ensure the protection of the right to bear arms, which is recognized by the United States Constitution and the Nevada Constitution.

(b) The regulation of the transfer, sale, purchase, possession, carrying, ownership, transportation, storage, registration and licensing of firearms, firearm accessories and ammunition in this State and the ability to define such terms is within the exclusive domain of the Legislature, and any other law, regulation, rule or ordinance to the contrary is null and void.

This section must be liberally construed to make its purpose.

Mr. Kennedy, whatever District Judge Miley thinks, it is not more important than what this Legislature has put into law.

SENATOR DENIS:

I want to clarify a couple of things. Somebody mentioned that the people who brought this bill were in plays in the library district. I have never been at a play in the library district, never worked for a library district, but I have served on the board, which is an appointment.

The issue regarding the parking lot is in the current law and not added specifically for this.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
February 28, 2017
Page 34

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

If there is no more testimony on this bill nor any public comment, I will close the hearing on S.B. 115 at 3:47 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Eileen Church,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	11		Attendance Roster
S.B. 110	C	2	Brooke Maylath	Written Testimony
S.B. 110	D	1	Blue Montana	Written Testimony
S.B. 110	E	3	Sherrie Scaffidi	Written Testimony
S.B. 115	F	8	Danielle Patrick Milam	Petition of Support
S.B. 115	G	6	Danielle Patrick Milam	Research Brief No. 1, February 2017
S.B. 115	H	1	Jennifer J. Gaynor	Letter of Support from Cindy S. Herman, Vice Chair, Henderson Libraries Board of Trustees
S.B. 115	I	1	Jennifer J. Gaynor	Letter of Support from Gayle Hornaday, Acting Executive Director, Henderson Libraries