

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-ninth Session  
March 22, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:38 p.m. on Wednesday, March 22, 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  
Senator Becky Harris

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Patricia Farley, Senatorial District No. 8  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo, Assembly District No. 3

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst  
Connie Westadt, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Melanie Crawford, Ph.D., Nevada Psychological Association  
Michael J. Lewandowski, Ph.D., Clinical Associate Professor, Department of  
Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Reno  
Ruth Gentry, Ph.D.  
Nick Vassiliadis, Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
March 22, 2017  
Page 2

Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Magnolia Drew, House Arrest Officer, Resource and Re-Entry Program  
Coordinator, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan  
Police Department  
Bonnie Polley, Chaplain, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan  
Police Department  
Sean B. Sullivan, Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County  
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender,  
Clark County  
Bill Teel, Captain, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police  
Department  
David Cherry, City of Henderson  
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Jack Martin, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County  
Angel DeFazio  
John T. Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association  
Homa S. Woodrum, Chief Advocacy Attorney, Division of Aging and Disability  
Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services  
Ben Graham, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court  
Marlene Lockard, Retired Public Employees of Nevada

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 163.

**SENATE BILL 163**: Revises provisions relating to professional entities. (BDR 7-632)

SENATOR PATRICIA FARLEY (Senatorial District No. 8):

Senate Bill 163 makes important changes that will benefit both patients and practitioners in the health care field. Nevada law provides that a professional entity may be organized only for the purpose of rendering one specific type of professional service, such as architecture, engineering, mental health, medicine, etc.

Senate Bill 163 creates an exception that allows mental health practitioners to join medical professionals under the same roof to provide comprehensive services to the individuals in their care. Section 1 of the bill deletes statutory language that separates medicine and mental health for the purpose of

organizing a professional entity. Senate Bill 163 provides new language allowing persons engaged in the practice of medicine, homeopathic medicine, osteopathic medicine and mental health to provide service within the same entity. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN NELSON ARAUJO (Assembly District No. 3):

Mental health continues to be a pressing issue in Nevada. It is imperative for us to find opportunities to increase access for Nevada patients. It is also important to help our community of providers meet the demand for service.

Senate Bill 163 is simple, but its benefits will be exponential. Passage of this bill will have the following positive effects. It permits integrated multidisciplinary health care services for patients including mental, behavioral and health care coordination and collaboration. It reduces fragmented care, duplication of services or contradictory wellness guidance and increases the quality of patient care. It adds convenience for patients by allowing them to see a primary care physician, a therapist and a psychiatrist all in the same visit and location. It allows ease of access to records and improves the likelihood of developing electronic health records (EHR). It allows professionals to work smarter with the resources they have by pooling capital, support staff and client basis to improve the quality and breadth of services offered in one location. Finally, it improves the ability to collect meaningful data on patient outcomes and adjust services accordingly.

MELANIE CRAWFORD, PH.D. (Nevada Psychological Association):

I am the cochair of the Legislative Committee of the Nevada Psychological Association. I am also a clinical psychologist in independent practice.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Can you give us an example of what you are trying to do?

DR. CRAWFORD:

I am a cofounder of a mental health clinic called Theory & Practice. We provide behavioral health and neuropsychology services for children and adolescents. For a long time, we have wanted to include a psychiatrist in our practice to coordinate medication management. Nevada law prohibits us from adding a psychiatrist to our practice as an equal partner. If we were to add a psychiatrist, he or she either would have to be my employee or would have to colocate under

our roof. We could not be in business together. Senate Bill 163 would allow us to become equal business partners.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Federal law requires EHRs. Would S.B. 163 allow you to share records?

DR. CRAWFORD:

Yes. As business partners, we could share an EHR system and client records.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

You mentioned psychiatrists and psychologists. What other professions could be included?

DR. CRAWFORD:

Two examples are integrated sleep care and pain management.

MICHAEL J. LEWANDOWSKI, PH.D. (Clinical Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Reno):

I am a pain management psychologist and have worked in the field for the past 32 years. In the beginning of my career, I worked with Dr. Richard Cronig, the pain management director at the University of California, Los Angeles. Dr. Cronig moved to Reno in 1983. He set up an interdisciplinary treatment model to help people with pain. We had physical therapists, occupational therapists, psychologists, psychiatrists and orthopedic surgeons. We all worked together as partners helping people with pain. The outcomes were impressive and people got better. People were able to return to work quicker. We were able to treat individuals and have team conferences to discuss their care instead of handing them a prescription for pain pills. That clinical partnership was extremely valuable to the patients. Senate Bill 163 permits these types of partnerships.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Could you add acupuncturists?

DR. LEWANDOWSKI:

I am not sure.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Maybe we should add them. You were just describing an interdisciplinary model. Will this bill allow partnerships as opposed to employers and employees?

DR. LEWANDOWSKI:

It would allow partnerships. It would not only allow us to be partners in the treatment of patients but also in business.

RUTH GENTRY, PH.D.:

I am a clinical health psychologist with Integrated Sleep & Wellness. Most of my training was with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). I did specialty residency training in health psychology and integrated care. Much of what I did in my residency was to study the outcomes of integrated care in the veteran population. We saw pain management reduce reliance on narcotics, sleep medication and other prescription medications and reduce costs. Patients could see a psychologist and a pain management physician in one setting. This happens at the VA and other hospitals, but it is not allowed in Nevada in the private practice setting.

I specialize in health psychology and sleep problems. I work with the sleep medicine doctors seeing referrals for insomnia. The goal is to help people get off Ambien or other prescription medications. Many times people do not follow up to off-site settings. If I were allowed to be an equal partner with other providers in this same setting, patients would be more likely to see me. We know this through research. Patients will see their primary care doctors, but when referred to a psychologist or mental health provider, they do not follow up. If they can go next door to see a psychologist or mental health provider, they are more likely to show up and get the treatment they need.

If S.B. 163 becomes law, Dr. Lewandowski and I will be allowed the opportunity to provide treatment with medical providers in the same setting. We have letters of support from Leslie R. Dickson, M.D., on behalf of the Nevada Psychiatric Association ([Exhibit D](#)) and from multiple medical providers of the Nevada Psychological Association ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR HARRIS:

It seems you are envisioning a very narrow type of entity wherein pain management and mental health services are mixed with traditional medicine. I

thought S.B. 163 would allow any kind of practice to join with mental health service providers and not necessarily be limited to pain management.

DR. GENTRY:

The entity could include pain management, but it could also be for sleep or weight management. In health psychology, we work with gastroenterologist consultants on weight management. We also address anxiety and depression. The scope of services is broad.

DR. LEWANDOWSKI:

Primary care physicians would be able to have within their facilities mental health services to deal with depression.

SENATOR HARRIS:

That is what I was envisioning when I read the bill, but when you were testifying on pain management, I wondered if maybe I had missed something.

DR. GENTRY:

We are using those as examples because we work in that field.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Do other states do this?

DR. GENTRY:

Yes. Since 2013, over 24 states have changed or amended their laws to permit these types of entities.

NICK VASSILIADIS (Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health):

We support S.B. 163. We are only one of a handful of states that do not allow this sort of practice. The states that permit these sorts of professional entities are seeing better treatment and plan compliance as well as shorter hospital stays and reduced hospitalization. This kind of collaboration and integration is important as the health care industry continues to evolve into the twenty-second century.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Senate Bill 163 permits a team of owners as opposed to a team with an owner and employees.

MR. VASSILIADIS:

People will be able to get all of their health care needs taken care of in a single building.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

The Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health is in my district. It is important to do this.

I will close the hearing on S.B. 163 and open the hearing on S.B. 268.

**SENATE BILL 268**: Revises various provisions relating to corrections. (BDR 16-546)

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

This important bill is the brainchild of Magnolia Drew from the Clark County Detention Center. Senate Bill 268 was introduced as S.B. No. 279 of the 78th Session. It fell through the cracks. It is never too late. It is a great idea.

CHUCK CALLAWAY (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

As sometimes happens in the drafting process, the language in S.B. 268 is not what we requested. The most important issue is that the bill is drafted as mandatory rather than permissive. I will also address some other areas of concern. These matters have drawn some opposition.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I want the record to reflect that I have agreed to all of the proposed amendments about which Mr. Calloway is going to testify. We could not get the amendment drafted in time for today's hearing

MR. CALLAWAY:

I will discuss the intent of the bill and what the amended version will do.

Section 1, subsection 2 of S.B. 268 requires the director of the Department of Corrections to verify the full legal name and age of the offender by obtaining an original or a certified copy of the documents required by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). That is not our language, and while we do not oppose it, I do not know where it came from.

The language in section 2 of S.B. 268 regarding the issuance of a photo identification card or driver's license (ID) should be permissive. The intent of section 2 is to allow the detention facility to provide an ID to certain prisoners or, in the case of juveniles, certain children in a local facility for the detention of children. At the Clark County Detention Center, we have organizations such as Hope for Prisoners that are helpful in getting inmates into vocational programs and setting them up for success when they are released.

One of the key factors to successful reintegration into society is access to a new ID. Many of these folks had an ID and lost it. Senate Bill 268 will allow the sheriff, chief of police, town marshal or director of the juvenile detention facility to assist these inmates in obtaining ID. To clarify, this bill is only applicable to certain inmates sentenced to detention facilities who are taking part in certain programs. They will be assisted in getting IDs to help them reintegrate into society.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

For the record, how long can someone be in the Detention Center?

MR. CALLAWAY:

A person can be incarcerated for just under a year by statute. We do have folks in longer who are awaiting trial. For sentencing purposes, I believe the term is 364 days or less.

Section 2 of S.B. 268 also says that the sheriff or chief law enforcement officer, town marshal or director of a juvenile detention facility shall provide the ID. These officials do not actually provide IDs. They will provide assistance.

It was not the bill proponents' intent to include juvenile detention facilities. If juvenile detention facilities want to be included, we do not oppose it. We did not think there was a demand in juvenile facilities for IDs upon release. If that is an issue, we are not opposed to their inclusion.

The purpose of the proposed language in section 3 of S.B. 268 is to mirror the language in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 209.449 regarding vocational training. Training programs for job skills, anger management, parenting, etc., award credits toward early release. These programs are Hope for Prisoner-type model programs.



CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I think the concept is fantastic. We will have a work session after we have seen the amended version.

MAGNOLIA DREW (House Arrest Officer, Resource and Re-Entry Coordinator, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metro Police Department):

Bonnie Polley, Chaplain for the Detention Center, approached me in late 2012 or early 2013, and she asked if we could get some help from John Condor to sponsor legislation similar to that enacted for the Department of Corrections some years ago.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Can you give us an example of what is required to get one of these IDs?

Ms. DREW:

The Detention Center asked the DMV if it could issue IDs for us. The DMV said it could not provide assistance without legislation. That is why we are here. Some inmates do not have any form of ID. We wanted to provide assistance in obtaining IDs for inmates before they are released.

This bill will allow us to collect information regarding inmates such as a birth certificate or some other form of identification while they are in custody. Doing so will allow us to help obtain IDs for inmates in custody or within 90 days of their release.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

If you do not have an ID, life is tough in or out of jail.

Ms. DREW:

The Detention Center houses approximately 60,000 inmates annually. In 2016, 39 percent of the individuals self-identifying as homeless had been incarcerated more than once during the year. The lack of an ID can contribute to delayed essential mental health, medical and substance abuse treatment. The loss of employment and supportive services due to the lack of ID is also a factor in recidivism.

Local detention is the gateway to State imprisonment or incarceration. The goal of this bill is to increase supportive services at the county level, to increase public safety, and to reduce incarceration occurrences and prison terms.

The purpose of S.B. 268 is to provide at our level a warm handoff to the community by helping inmates before they leave the Detention Center. Our hope is to reduce recidivism and to keep these inmates from reaching State-level incarceration.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Pursuant to section 3, can an inmate qualify for up to 20 credit days?

MR. CALLAWAY:

Yes. I believe that there is a cap on the number of credit days that can be earned. I thought the cap was 30 days.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I wanted to be sure that the intent of S.B. 268 is to stack credit days. An inmate would receive five credit days for going to school, five for completion, five for not violating the terms of confinement and five for being on track to complete it.

MR. CALLAWAY:

Yes.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Another benefit of S.B. 268 is the amount of money that we are going to save. The Detention Center is always booked to the gills and costs a fortune.

BONNIE POLLEY (Chaplain, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of inmates having IDs when released. If they do not have IDs, they should just stay in the facility. Without an ID, you cannot find a residence, you cannot apply for a job and you cannot even go to a homeless shelter. An ID is mandatory.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Senate Bill 268 is similar to my S.B. No. 159 of the 76th Session, but my bill only applied to the Department of Corrections. The difference between the two bills is the credit days. We did not have any credit days in S.B. No. 159 of the 76th Session. This one does.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

This bill was here two years ago, but it did not have a hearing.

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

I cannot stress enough the importance of S.B. 268 for our clients. I walked out of the house last week without my wallet; I could not go to the bank or go to the doctor. I could not do anything and had a sense of panic. Imagine someone being in custody for six months and being released with just a bus voucher. That is how it used to be. This is an important tool for attorneys in the criminal justice system. We can help our clients obtain IDs. In addition, we can advise them that, if they get a GED or complete alcohol or drug abuse training or anger management counseling, they will earn credit days. This bill provides them an incentive to do so.

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

We are in support of S.B. 268. I echo the sentiments of my colleague. I wanted to say on the record that Ms. Drew and Ms. Polley do amazing work for our clients in the Detention Center.

BILL TEEL, CAPTAIN (Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I oversee the Resource and Re-Entry Program at the Detention Center. I do not think that I can say it any better than it has already been said. A majority of the population we deal with have never seen or had these forms of identification. This opens the way to success and sustainability in the community where an ID is required to apply for resources, employment, housing, etc.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Is there a way to offer two IDs and hold on to the second one? These things tend to get lost, and then you have to go back through the process.

DAVID CHERRY (City of Henderson):

When it is amended to be permissive, we will be neutral on S.B. 268.

ERIC SPRATLEY, LIEUTENANT (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):

After hearing the testimony from Mr. Callaway, we are neutral on S.B. 268.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
March 22, 2017  
Page 12

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I am hoping that even though S.B. 268 is permissive, you will use it because having an ID is important.

MR. SPRATLEY:

Absolutely. We agree it is a great concept, and we want to comply with it. We just do not want a mandate.

ROBERT ROSHAK (Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):  
We are in support of S.B. 268.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

We can appreciate that this may be tougher to do in the rural counties, but it is important there too.

JACK MARTIN (Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County):  
We look forward to seeing the amended version of S.B. 268. If the language including children and juvenile detention facilities is removed from the bill, we will support it because we agree this is important for the adult population.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Do you already do what S.B. 268 requires?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes. We already do this for families in need.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 268 and open the hearing on S.B. 278.

**SENATE BILL 278**: Revises provisions relating to certain crimes committed against an older person or a vulnerable person. (BDR 15-501)

SENATOR BECKY HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 9):

A constituent in Clark County brought the concerns addressed in S.B. 278 to my attention.

This bill applies to seniors who are victims of crime. It will allow for an advance of up to \$2,500 of restitution money to seniors. It provides that any advancement must be repaid if restitution is paid in full. It allows a victim to

engage in mediation regarding restitution with the offender. It provides for a civil judgment that orders restitution.

Sections 7 and 15 of S.B. 278 were included at the request of the district attorneys. Section 7 would increase the maximum term of imprisonment for crimes relating to abuse and neglect, exploitation, isolation or abandonment of an older or vulnerable person to 20 years. Section 15 authorizes information-sharing between law enforcement agencies and the coroner's office with regard to our elder population, so it is not simply assumed that death is due to natural causes. If there is reason to believe that foul play may be part of the equation with regard to their death, records of criminal history may be disseminated between various agencies in order to come to an appropriate conclusion and resolution.

ANGEL DEFAZIO:

I requested this bill because I have been personally impacted by the absence of such a law. My background is collection law, and I am familiar with collection proceedings.

At the time of sentencing, a judgment should be entered for a victim, thereby avoiding the need to file a civil complaint or a small claims action. Since there is no defense, the court's time should not be wasted.

The bill was received too late to permit amendments to be drafted. I have proposed amendments ([Exhibit F](#)).

The older person who is a victim of abuse, neglect, exploitation, isolation or abandonment has been traumatized. The intimidating experience of going to court should not be required. Upon sentencing, the victim should be issued a judgment that can be recorded automatically. We are very lucky to have self-help groups that assist with writs and garnishments. Senate Bill 278 requires a degree of activity in order to obtain one-third of \$2,500, which is not deducted from restitution but returned to the Account for Restitution to Certain Older Victims of Crimes if restitution is paid in full. In my opinion, the judge should have the option to add damages for pain and suffering for the trauma sustained.

JOHN T. JONES, JR. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

We support S.B. 278. I am here to discuss sections 6, 7 and 15. These proposals are from the Clark County Elder Abuse Unit. A few years ago, Clark County District Attorney Steve Wolfson created an Elder Abuse Unit. Two deputies are assigned to handle elder abuse cases exclusively. The team chief of that unit approached Senator Harris with these recommendations, and she graciously agreed to sponsor S.B. 278.

The change in section 6 of S.B. 278 clarifies that the immunity given under NRS 200.5096 does not apply to a person who engaged, conspired or was involved in elder exploitation.

The proposed change to section 7 of S.B. 278 increases the range of penalties that a judge may impose on a particular defendant from 2 to 6 years to 2 to 20 years. We have what I would call a one-size-fits-all punishment with respect to this particular crime. The law treats a caretaker or family member who neglects a parent the same as a person who engages in conduct that causes the elder person's death. Expanding the possible penalty to 20 years gives the judge the option of a longer term for a defendant whose conduct warrants a longer sentence. This is not inconsistent in other areas of law. For example, child abuse resulting in substantial bodily harm has a possible sentence of 2 to 20 years. The vulnerability of children is similar to the vulnerability of elderly persons. A DUI with substantial bodily harm also has a sentence range of 2 to 20 years.

Section 17 of S.B. 278 adds the coroner or his or her deputy to those who can access criminal records. Both Washoe and Clark Counties have coroners and medical examiners, respectively. In every other county, the sheriff acts as the coroner. Sheriffs have access to criminal records. This proposed change will allow coroners access to those records when they engage in death investigations.

MR. CALLAWAY:

We support S.B. 278.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Does the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department have an elder abuse unit?

MR. CALLAWAY:

Yes, we do. We have a crimes against youth and families section that includes both abuse and neglect of children and the elderly.

MR. PIRO:

The Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice submitted a letter ([Exhibit G](#)). Our objection mirrors their objection. We oppose raising the penalty to 2 to 20 years with no verifiable evidence that the change will deter crimes against the elderly.

We support the rest of the bill. It looks to restorative justice models regarding mediation between the offender and the victim of the crime. I understand that the intent of S.B. 278 is to make victims whole, and that is a goal that we should all seek in the criminal justice system. Our sole objection deals with the increased criminal penalty.

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

Do you want to keep the penalty range from 2 to 6 years?

MR. PIRO:

We would support increasing it to 2 to 10 years. I think adding a 20-year Category B felony is wading into murky territory.

MR. SULLIVAN:

I echo the sentiments of my colleague, Mr. Piro.

HOMA S. WOODRUM (Chief Advocacy Attorney, Division of Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services):

I have been a civil exploitation attorney for ten years, and now I am an elder rights attorney for the State. I am not a deputy attorney general but an advocate.

Senate Bill 278 is needed. There are three pending bills that address the immunity issue: S.B. 278, S.B. 360 and Assembly Bill 288.

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

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

Ms. WOODRUM:

This sort of restorative fund is important because of the difficulty of prosecuting these cases. Abusers deplete a person's assets and then the victim does not have any assets to pursue restitution. The majority of my cases were for the Clark County Public Guardian's Office. The victims had no money and no ability to pursue restitution. We abandoned cases left and right because there was nothing we could do.

The restitution payments in S.B. 278 may affect Medicaid recipients. It may be appropriate to give people the option to refuse restitution if it is going to affect their ability to be on Medicaid.

BEN GRAHAM (Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court):

I originally was not going to testify, but I wanted to tell you just how impressed I am with Ms. DeFazio. If we put her in charge of this restitution program, it would be workable. We are neutral, but we are concerned with finding a home for the program other than the Administrative Office of the Courts. There may be a victims of crime or other restitution program to add this program to.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Retired Public Employees of Nevada):

We support S.B. 278.

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



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
March 22, 2017  
Page 17

CHAIR SEGERBLOM:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 278. The hearing is adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Connie Westadt,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	7		Attendance Roster
S.B. 163	C	2	Senator Patricia Farley	Written Testimony
S.B. 163	D	1	Ruth Gentry	Letter of Support, Lesley R. Dickson Nevada Psychiatric Association
S.B. 163	E	31	Ruth Gentry	Letters of Support, Nevada Psychological Association
S.B. 278	F	3	Angel DeFazio	Proposed Amendments of Senator Becky Harris
S.B. 278	G	3	Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice	Limited Opposition and Proposed Amendment