MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY

Thirty-Sixth Special Session
November 13, 2025

The Assembly Select Committee on Public Safety and Security was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 2:17 p.m. on Thursday, November 13, 2025, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [Exhibit A], the Attendance Roster [Exhibit B], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/36th2025Special.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Venicia Considine
Assemblymember Joe Dalia
Assemblymember Cecelia González
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember David Orentlicher
Assemblymember Jason Patchett
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adam Drost, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Kathleen Capron, Committee Counsel
Cyndi Latour, Committee Manager
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary
Shiloh Reading, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Christopher J. Hicks, District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office
Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Jason Woodard, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Virginia Valentine, President, Nevada Resort Association
Matt Griffin, representing Nevada Resort Association
Don Southworth, Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of Corrections
James Dzurenda, Director, Nevada Department of Corrections
Joe Hill, Policy Analyst, Retail Association of Nevada
William C. Horne, representing SafeNest
Jason Gray, Vice President, Government Affairs, MGM Resorts International
Erik D. Hansen, Chief Sustainability and Government Affairs Officer, Wynn Resorts
Nick Schneider, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Lesley Pittman, representing Red Rock Resorts
Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Karlos R. LaSane II, Regional Vice President, Government Relations and Community Affairs, Caesars Entertainment
Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Nicole Rourke, Director of Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson
Russell Rowe, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation
Sam Anastassatos, representing City of Sparks
Miranda Hoover, representing Energy and Convenience Association of Nevada
Andrew McKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Paul J. Enos, CEO, Nevada Trucking Association
A'Esha Goins, representing Service Employees International Union
John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office
Elgin Lofton, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Yessica Valencia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Elizabeth Ortiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Brennan Bartley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
John J. Piro, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Tamara Favors, Housing Justice Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Noé Orosco, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Immigrant Coalition
Naomi Joy, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Deborah E. Hecht, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Manuel Santamaria, Campaigns Director, Battle Born Progress
Brian Harris, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Melody Judilla, Deputy Director, Silver State Voices
Mathilda Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada
Quentin Savwoir, President, Las Vegas Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Shaun Navarro, representing Action Network
Gerald Mayes, Executive Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111
Taisacan Hall, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Tanisha Brandon, Assistant Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111
Anwar Green, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
Evelyn Grosenick, Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Marcie Ryba, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Hallery Ferrini, Immigrant Justice Organizer, Make the Road Nevada
Lauryn Kern, Founder, Reno Sunrise Movement
Cathy Fulkerson, Facilitator, Third Act Nevada
Elisa Cafferata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Marissa Crook, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Jagada Chambers, Executive Director, Mass Liberation Project Nevada
Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Jessica Munger, Program and Policy Manager, Silver State Equality
Olivia Tanager, Executive Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Nathaniel Phillipps, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Reverend Paul Larson, Advocacy Director, Lutheran Engagement and Advocacy in Nevada
Tanya Freeman, Churchill County Lead, Battle Born Patriots
Lily Baran, representing Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality
Bishop Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jollina Walker, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Erika Marquez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Peter Handy, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services
Jessica Goodey, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court; and representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction

Chair Miller:
[Roll was called.] Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the first meeting of the Assembly Select Committee on Public Safety and Security for this 36th Special Session of the Nevada State Legislature. I would like to welcome everyone here in Carson City as well as those who are viewing from Las Vegas.

Just to give an overview before we get into some of our housekeeping issues, we are here at the call of the Governor to serve the people of Nevada to address a variety of issues concerning public safety and security. As you noticed, this Select Committee has been named "Public Safety and Security," but please grant me some grace if you hear me slipping and saying Judiciary throughout the day.

Before we start, a few housekeeping issues. First, I am asking everyone to silence their electronics including members as well as anyone in Las Vegas and Carson City. We do have an agenda. We may take items out of order. I will tell you today, we are starting with Assembly Bill 4. Of course, the Chair or members of the Committee may request from testifiers to submit any supporting documentation. If you wish to testify, we ask you sign in at the table, but that is not a requirement. If you did not sign in at the table, you are still more than welcome to come forward and testify when that time arrives. When testifying, we ask you turn on the microphone and clearly state your name and spell your name so we have it for the record and if you are affiliated with any group. Please leave your business card with the Committee secretary because that also assists with accuracy for the minutes making sure we spell everything correctly.

As you know, this can be viewed and you can submit testimony and review our documents through the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). However, right now, not all submitted exhibits have been uploaded because we are having some technical difficulties. Hopefully within minutes or soon, those technical difficulties on NELIS will be resolved, which means you may then view those documents because they will be uploaded immediately. You may also watch this hearing on our YouTube channel under the Assembly.

When we get to testimony, each person will have two minutes to speak. We ask you to keep your comments to two minutes. If you find you are going to say exactly what someone before you just said, we welcome you to say ditto because that enables more people to participate in the process. If you are not able to finish all you intended to say within those two minutes or if you have other things to add, you are more than welcome to submit those comments in writing. You have up to 24 hours after the hearing to submit your comments or your position in writing.

I, of course, expect courtesy and respect in all interactions from everyone in the room here in Carson City as well as those in Las Vegas. You will notice Committee members will be on their laptops and have a variety of electronics. Please do not take it as a sign of inattention. It is just people are up here busy researching and having discussions, and this is how we are able to view our documents. So you know, we will have another committee meeting tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. We are agendized for 9 a.m. tomorrow morning so you are prepared for that. With today's agenda, again, we are starting with Assembly Bill 4. Time permitting, then we will move on to the second bill. If we do not have time afterward, then it will be rolled over to tomorrow morning.

I would like to start with Committee introductions because as you see, we have a few new members here. We have one who was just sworn in a few hours ago. And then of course, we have one who has been around for a while, but he is joining us for this special committee. We will start with introductions. I will ask all members to briefly tell us your name, which district you represent, and how long you have served on our regular standing Committee on Judiciary as well as today. I will begin with Vice Chair Marzola.

Assemblymember Marzola:
I represent Assembly District No. 21. I just finished my third session, so six long years.

Assemblymember Hansen:
I represent Assembly District No. 32 and have been serving since 2019. This is maybe my third special session, I think. I live in Washoe County in Sparks, so I am a Sparkler. I cover six counties, five of them rural. I have urban and rural, which is fabulous, and I will pass it over to my colleague whose district and mine we share.

Assemblymember Gurr:
Thank you, Assemblymember, I appreciate it. I thought you were going to say we butt up against each other, and we do but only in district lines. I represent Assembly District No. 33, which is about the eastern third of the state of Nevada. It is 55,200 some odd square miles. I have 1.49 persons per square mile in my district. This is my third special session. I just finished my second full session. This is interesting to be on a kind of quasi-Judiciary Committee.

Assemblymember Cole:
I represent Assembly District No. 4, the northwest part of Las Vegas. I have served one regular session. This is my first special session, at least as a legislator.

Assemblymember Dalia:
I represent Assembly District No. 29 in Henderson. I just finished my first regular session and this is my first special.

Assemblymember Karris:
I represent Assembly District No. 10. This is also my first time serving in the Legislature and my first special session. Also, it is my first time on slash Judiciary.

Assemblymember González:
I was elected in 2020. So, with many colleagues on this dais, a long six years.

Assemblymember Moore:
I represent Assembly District No. 11 in beautiful east Las Vegas and downtown as well as North Las Vegas. I just finished my first regular session and this is my first special session.

Assemblymember Patchett:
I am brand-new so I do not even know the button arrangement here. I represent Assembly District No. 19, which is Henderson, Logandale, Overton, Moapa Valley, and also Mesquite. I am brand-new, so thank you.

Assemblymember Roth:
I am proud to represent Assembly District No. 24 in Reno. This is my first special session. I have served one regular session.

Assemblymember Hardy:
I just finished my fourth regular session. I was elected in 2019 and I was sitting here trying to count how many specials. I think I have actually served more special sessions than regular, like five or six maybe. I represent Assembly District No. 22 in Henderson, and this is my third regular session on Judiciary.

Assemblymember Considine:
I have the honor of representing Assembly District No. 18, which is in southeast Las Vegas and a little bit of northeast Henderson. I was on Judiciary my second session, so this is a good thing to come back to. I missed it. Other than that, what else was I supposed to say? Oh, so this is my fourth special session and I have served three sessions. As my colleague said, it is more special this time than regular sessions.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
I represent Assembly District No. 20. Just as I sit next to Assemblymember Considine here, our districts are next to each other on the southeast side of Las Vegas. I have served three regular sessions all on Judiciary and this is my fourth special session.

Chair Miller:
I represent Assembly District No. 5 in Las Vegas. This is my fifth session. I do not even want to begin to think of how many specials as that would take me a minute. So this is my fifth session. Four of the sessions I have served on Judiciary. Two of those sessions I served as Chair. I was elected in 2016, so those saying it has been a long six years, it has. I do not even remember life before the Legislature at this point.

Welcome everyone, especially to our newest member, Assemblymember Patchett. Glad to have you here and you are between two very experienced members so feel free to lean over and ask questions, anything you need. We will go on to introduce our staff too because as you see, for special session, staffing is different as well. We have some regular staff who

have been with us for session after session, but some new additions as well. I would like to invite Ms. Dory to give some brief remarks about herself. I will read the script. We know how I do not do well reading scripts, but I am going to read anyway for you. Ms. Traci Dory, committee secretary, has served as Committee staff on five regular sessions. She is a native Nevadan, born in Elko. Ms. Dory worked for the State of Nevada for 30 years; 14 of them in the Office of the Attorney General and 16 years with the Department of Corrections. She retired in 2017; you do not look retired. She enjoys traveling, gardening, and raising chickens.

Next is Ms. Latour. Where are you? She is downstairs but she is our committee manager, one of the people who does all of the work behind the scenes and organizes things. She has served in two regular sessions. She is serving as committee manager and the history clerk for the Assembly front desk during the 36th Special Session. Previously, she managed traffic departments for television stations and the cable industry for over 20 years. She loves spending time with her big, fun-loving family, taking road trips, and hiking with her border collie Sailor.

We are also fortunate enough to have Maria Velasquez, who is a research policy analyst in the Research Division who will be assisting our committee policy analyst with the Committee. She has served in the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) for two regular sessions. Next, I will introduce and allow him to speak, our committee policy analyst, Cesar Melgarejo.

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
I have been with the LCB for almost eight years. I have done a couple of regular sessions in the Senate and one in the Assembly, and a couple of special sessions. I am happy to help.

Chair Miller:
Next, we have Miss Kathleen Capron.

Kathleen Capron, Committee Counsel:
I started in 2018. This is my third regular session and I am the senior principal deputy legislative counsel.

Chair Miller:
We also have Shiloh Reading, our committee assistant right over here. Lastly, we have Mr. Drost from the Fiscal Division if you would like to introduce yourself.

Adam Drost, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:
I am a principal deputy fiscal analyst with the Fiscal Analysis Division here to assist with any fiscal matters. I have been with the division and the LCB since 2012.

Chair Miller:
I would also like to acknowledge our audio visual and public hearing staff, also known as AVH, who are also working behind the scenes to make sure the meetings are broadcast to the public. Thank you to all the staff who are coming back and joining us for this Special Session.

Before we get into the bill hearings, we also have some Committee policies [Exhibit C]. I believe the policies have been posted on NELIS or they are still trying to post them. Members, you should have a copy of it if you would like to take a moment to review them. They are pretty standard and pretty much exactly what happens during regular session. If you would like to take a few moments, again, we have members who are new to our Committee today. Please just make sure laptops and all electronics have the volume turned down. When we get to member questions, please contact me electronically to request a question. Are there any questions about the Committee rules? Not seeing any, I will take a motion to adopt the policies.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE 36TH SPECIAL SESSION LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES FOR THE ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will move through our agenda and just a few words before I open the bill hearing to give context to this. The Governor has called us into special session, and this bill was heard on the last day of session. The bill that will be presented is the same version that was heard on the last day of session. But we all know there was a lot going on that last day. For those who were not able to participate, it is the amended version that was passed out of the Assembly. We also want to make sure the public and stakeholders have the ability to present and ask questions. Presenters, just like in regular session, you are asked to keep your presentation for your entire group to 15 minutes. We need to make sure there is enough time for members to ask questions.

Members, as we usually do, I will go through the first round of questions to make sure everyone gets a chance to ask their first question, and then I will circle back if members have additional questions. A point of clarification, when you are asking for a follow-up to your first question, please make sure it is a follow-up for the purpose of clarification. Follow-up is not a brand-new, second question.

For this hearing, I will provide one hour of testimony in support, one hour of testimony in opposition, and one hour of testimony in neutral. Again, a point of clarification, neutral is not to take a position. It is usually for groups or agencies who have facts to present, data to present, impact to express, but not taking a position one way or the other on the bill. Please make sure you honor what neutral testimony actually is. I know it is confusing for everyone.

I will now open the hearing for Assembly Bill 4, if the presenters would like to approach, please. Once you are settled, I will have you all introduce yourselves, and again, it will be 15 minutes of presentation for the whole group. Whenever you are ready, please proceed.

Assembly Bill 4: Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 15-31)

Christopher J. Hicks, District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office:
I am also the president of the Nevada District Attorneys Association. Would you like the other individuals up here to introduce themselves or should I go through my testimony first?

Chair Miller:
I would say each person introduce themselves, and then we will begin with the testimony. Once all three of you finish presenting, we will open up for questions.

Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:
I am here on behalf of the Nevada District Attorneys Association and the Washoe County District Attorney's Office.

Jason Woodard, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:
I am here on behalf of the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Chris Hicks:
Nevadans deserve to feel safe in their homes, their neighborhoods, and their schools. Governor Lombardo's Safe Streets and Neighborhoods Act, which has been mentioned was initially heard in the last legislative session, is a responsible commonsense effort to protect our communities by addressing serious and repeat criminal behavior. By prioritizing accountability, victim protection, and public safety, this Act offers balanced reforms that reflect the values of Nevadans across the political spectrum. This legislation strengthens protection for victims and ensures accountability for offenders in several important ways. It modernizes our stalking laws to include harassment and intimidation carried out through social media, and it expands the definition of domestic violence to include kidnapping and attempt crimes recognizing the many forms of abuse and control.

It enhances enforcement of firearms surrender orders, ensuring dangerous individuals actually comply with court directives intended to prevent future harm. The Act protects vulnerable Nevadans by ensuring those who abuse children or the elderly cannot automatically have their records sealed and later obtain positions of trust caring for those

very same populations. It targets smash and grab thefts, ensures appropriate accountability for child pornography possession, and prioritizes victim restitution before court fines and fees. It also takes steps to reduce violence in our classrooms by requiring evaluations for students who seriously harm educators, and it strengthens our DUI laws to address the devastating impact of impaired driving. These targeted measures are meaningful steps toward building safer streets and stronger neighborhoods in our state.

We are all here today because we serve the great people of Nevada, and a measure this important deserves to be completed. I am grateful this Committee is willing to take it up again. Today is an opportunity for all of us to finish that work and move forward with reforms that will strengthen public safety in every corner of our state. I respectfully encourage and request your support. I am now going to turn the presentation over to Chief Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Noble and Lieutenant Jason Woodard to walk you through key provisions of the bill, and I am going to make room for other presenters.

Jennifer Noble:
Good afternoon again, Chair. Given the interest of time, I am just going to move right into it. I will start with section 3 of the bill. This is grouped by category subject matter for ease of reference. Hopefully that works for the Committee.

Under current law, the victim's family and household members are recognized as persons who may be targeted as part of a stalker's course of conduct. Section 3, subsection 1 expands this list of persons to people with whom the victim has or has had a dating relationship but with whom the victim does not cohabitate. Section 3, subsection 11, paragraph (a) through paragraph (d) specify that a course of conduct is two or more acts conducted in person or by electronic means including using social media. They revise the definition applicable to what is commonly known as "cyberstalking" to include social media communications and similar means used to electronically publish, display, or distribute information. Section 3, subsection 11, paragraph (i), subparagraphs (1) and (2) define social media communication to include private messaging on a social media platform or communication shared on a social media platform visible to other users.

Section 13 pertains to domestic violence. Stalking is often part of the domestic abuser's efforts to control and terrorize their victim, but other crimes we might not typically associate with that cycle can also be part of it. Current *Nevada Revised Statutes* 33.018 provides a list of crimes that can constitute felony domestic violence when they are committed in the context of a dating or domestic relationship. Section 13 adds kidnapping and attempt offenses to the list of felonies that may constitute domestic violence.

Sections 5, 11, 12, and 26 pertain to firearm surrender compliance. Nevada law requires courts to order convicted domestic batterers to surrender their firearms, and similar orders may be issued when a person is subject to an extended protection order or as a condition of pretrial release. These sections require those persons ordered to surrender their firearm to appear for a compliance hearing within two to five business days after these orders are issued. If the person is in custody when the order is issued, the hearing must be held within

one day of their release. Now, the hearing may be canceled if the person (1) provides documentation demonstrating the firearm has been surrendered, destroyed, sold, or transferred; (2) a search warrant has been issued; and (3) the follow-up compliance hearing may also be canceled if the subject of the order submits an affidavit under penalty of perjury that they do not own any firearms, they do not possess any, or have access to them.

Section 4 pertains to possession of child pornography. In *Castaneda v. State*, the Nevada Supreme Court recognized the important public policy goal of tying punishment for possession of these materials commonly known as "child sexual assault materials" (CSAM) now, to the number of images a defendant possesses, but it explained that under our current scheme, Nevada law only allows for a single count to be charged even if the defendant has lots of pictures of children being sexually abused. For example, in *Castaneda*, 19 such images, one felony count. Section 4 amends our statute to provide each child depicted in the images may be charged as a separate felony count.

Sections 21 through 24 prohibit automatic sealing for offenses against children or the elderly. Under current law, offenders charged with felony abuse, neglect, or exploitation of children or the elderly may access diversion, dismissal, and automatic sealing of their records. This new version of the bill, the last one you heard, still allows for diversion or dismissal, but it does away with automatic sealing. This gives potential employers the opportunity to learn of a person's history before they are hired to care for these vulnerable populations.

Sections 28 and 29 prioritize restitution to victims consistent with the *Nevada Constitution*, commonly known as Marsy's Law. These sections require that any money collected from the defendant be first used to satisfy restitution before it can be applied to court fines and fees. The language also provides that where a person other than the defendant posts bail, these funds may not be used for this purpose without prior notice to and consent of that third party.

Section 15 pertains to violence against school employees and child welfare workers. Children, teachers, and school employees deserve a safe learning environment, and in 2023 there were 6,800 violent incidents in Clark County schools within a seven-month period. Same year, 7,400 violent incidents in Washoe County schools. This section helps ensure that unacceptable violence is adequately addressed by providing that when a child is taken into custody for a battery on a teacher, school employee, or child welfare professional for the third time in one year and has been offered services through the juvenile justice system previously, the court may order the child be detained or released with an ankle monitor pending an evaluation prior to returning to school.

Section 7 provides if a person causes property damage to a retail establishment during the commission of a theft offense and the aggregate value of the property of the theft and the property damage is $750 or more, that person is guilty of a category C felony.

Section 30 allows for cross deputization of city attorneys for pretrial release hearings for purposes of the rural counties—only populations under 100,000.

With regard to driving under the influence, I will remind this Committee that in 2024, 412 people in Nevada died as a result of deadly crashes. That is an increase from 390 deaths in 2023. The leading cause of crashes were speeding and impaired driving. Sections 52 and 54 are cleanup provisions regarding the applicability of the per se marijuana law to felony DUI. They do not establish new law. They are cleanup provisions. Sections 53 and 55 increase the penalty range for DUI causing substantial bodily harm to 2 to 20 years for persons who have been previously convicted of DUI and commit a DUI which causes the death of another person, the penalty range is moved to 5 to 25 years.

Sections 34, 37, and 43 pertain to medication for opioid use disorder programming for our prisons. Sections 31 to 33, 35, and 36 allow the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) to establish an alternative correctional program. Director Dzurenda is available here today to answer any questions you may have regarding those sections.

Section 14 provides that a certificate of innocence and a provision of an award in a wrongful death action is not a finding of certain wrongdoings in the investigation or prosecution and it is not a finding that there was not probable cause related to the offense. Jason Frierson is available here today to elaborate further and answer any questions you may have. Finally, sections 1, 2, 9, 10, and 46 pertain to our resort corridor. Virginia Valentine and Matt Griffin are here to address those sections.

Virginia Valentine, President, Nevada Resort Association:
I am here today in strong support of A.B. 4. I would like to take a moment to note for this Committee the language in the bill as it relates to the tourism safety proposal, which we will be presenting, is the same language that was in the last version of Senate Bill 457 of the 83rd Session that was voted out of the Assembly last session. I would like to thank the Governor for bringing this bill and the opportunity to appear before you all today to present it.

For our 72 resort hotel members in northern and southern Nevada, the safety and security of their employees and guests is a high priority. Every day, our members make countless decisions about their operations, and with each decision, safety is always taken into consideration. And every day, more than 150,000 Nevadans working directly in hotel casinos throughout the state put their faith in our members that they will be safe from crime at work and while walking to and from their cars or to their ride home. This covenant to protect our team members is paramount. No employee should have to think about their safety in coming to the workplace. To keep our employees and guests safe, our member security teams work hand-in-hand with law enforcement to prevent crime and to catch those committing crimes. However, as we have noted before, despite all of our collective best efforts, there remain those offenders who are not deterred and continue to perpetrate crimes undaunted by the current penalties. Recidivism continues to be a significant issue in our tourism areas.

I would like to provide context on the prevalence of trespassing, as its application may not be clear. Before a trespass is issued by resort security, a crime has been committed or some incident on private property has resulted in security asking the individual to leave. I think the

best way to explain the increase in incidents seen by resort security after the resort court might be explained by giving you a few examples. Scenario one, an individual starts a fight, security breaks it up, and asks if anyone wants to press charges or file a police report. They do not. There is no arrest. The instigator is trespassed from the property.

Scenario two, an individual steals a purse. Resort security catches the individual on surveillance and recovers the purse. The owner has an early flight, does not want to stay to file a police report or be a witness. The perpetrator is trespassed from the property. Again, no arrest is made.

Scenario three, an individual steals a Ticket-In, Ticket-Out (TITO). Some of you probably know what a TITO is. It is a little paper receipt you get when you get your change out of a slot machine. They fall on the casino floor or they stick out of the machine. So here is scenario three, an individual steals the TITO. Although it is a felony to steal a TITO, the amount of these TITOs amounts to pocket change. No police report or arrest is made due to the unlikelihood of a prosecution for such a minor sum. That individual is trespassed from the property.

Scenario four, an individual starts a toilet paper fire in a resort restroom. The fire is extinguished with minor property damage. No arrest is made and the individual is trespassed.

In cases like these, the same individuals return to the property and either commit additional crimes and/or additional trespasses. Typically on the tenth trespass, resort security will ask for that individual to be arrested. Resort security documents the incident as required in Nevada law. If that individual returns, they may be trespassed again. Security is very judicious in its use of Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) resources and it may trespass an individual up to ten times before calling Metro. At that point, Metro may make an arrest. If they do not, it does not appear in the crime data. If the district attorney charges the individual, they will appear before a judge in court. If they do not charge the person, this also does not appear in the data. After an individual has been charged with multiple crimes, in many cases, the charges are reduced or pled down. If the charging documents are complete, then a judge will hear from the counsel for the defendant and the prosecutor and make a determination on a sentence, a suspended sentence, a diversion program, and hopefully an order-out to discourage the individual from returning to the area within the order-out area.

But multiple crimes have occurred in these examples and they will not be reflected either in Metro's data or the order-out data. The number of cases seen by the court pale in comparison to what hotel security sees. As you can see from these examples right now, data is not consistent across the justice system or, in some cases, not even available. Different pieces of data are being reported but they do not tell the entire story. During the resort court operation, resort security reported a decrease in the number—

Chair Miller:
We are at 15 minutes right now. You will have five total for the entire group and then I will close the presentation.

Virginia Valentine:
I am going to ask Mr. Griffin to walk through the amendment.

Matt Griffin, representing Nevada Resort Association:
It is good to see everybody so soon. I am going to walk you through the provisions of the bill, but first, I want to start off with some information that has occurred since the last time we were in this building having a hearing on this. There has been a development, at least with respect to the case law. On April 9, 2025, Clark County District Court Judge Michelle Leavitt heard an appeal from a decision rendered by Justice of Peace Sciscento. In her order affirming the conviction, the district court relevant to the discussion today held two things. Number one, it affirmed Clark County's authority to enact ordinances and criminal ordinances in the corridor that is within the authority of the county. And number two, it affirmed there is no violation of the First Amendment by ordering folks out of a corridor once they either are charged or convicted of a crime in the corridor.

As I present to you today, I am going to take this a little out of order because it is easier to explain. I am going to start with section 46. That is kind of the meat of what is being proposed today. Then from there, I am going to move to sections 9, 10, and at the end, I will do sections 1 and 2. Madam Chair, I will go through as swiftly as I can to make sure we fit within the time limits.

First, in section 46, in acknowledging the county's authority over criminal misdemeanors in their jurisdiction, subsection 1 provides that counties with 700,000 residents or more, so Clark County, must establish one or more order-out corridors. Pursuant to subsection 2 of section 46, the corridors do not have to be contiguous and there can be more than one order-out corridor. That is currently how the corridors exist in the City of Las Vegas—they are not contiguous, and there is more than one. Also under subsection 2, the county is required to display a map of whatever that corridor is on their county website for everybody to see.

Second, under subsection 3 of section 46, the county establishes the order-out court in a corridor—in this case, it would be Clark County. A person who is charged or convicted with the offense within that corridor, the enhanced penalties are proposed as follows: for a first offense, that person may be prohibited from entering the corridor for up to a year. It is not a mandatory sentence for an order-out on a first offense and it is up to a year as opposed to a year minimum. Conversely, for a second or subsequent offense, it is a mandatory, a must order-out of the resort corridor for a period of not less than one year. So, first offense, discretionary; second offense, you cannot go back to the corridor for at least a year. I should say those offenses have to occur within two years. There is some time frame if you did it ten years ago and you come back ten years later, then these provisions would not apply.

Finally, under section 46, and I am referring now to subsection 3, paragraph (b), the county commission can provide for local ordinance for exemptions in which a person who is charged or convicted and ordered out of the corridor may come back in. Right now, the City of Las Vegas has what we are proposing here today. Clark County used to have what we are proposing and they both have exceptions. Those relate to things like medical visits if your doctor is in there, for religious services in there, if you are taking public transportation and it goes through. The mechanism of how this works is the justice of the peace will ask the person, Do you have any reasonable reason to go into the corridor? If so, for why and for how long? If they meet the code the county adopts, then that person can be allowed in. It is not a one-shot and you are done. You can come back if circumstances change and you can ask again for permission, My doctor is now in the corridor, and you can go back in. That is the gist of what is being proposed in section 46.

Sections 9 and 10 deal with related aspects of section 46. First of all, section 9, and I want to highlight this section because I think there has been some misunderstanding about what is being proposed today. Section 9 deals with the authority of a justice court to enact a corridor court. It is not mandatory that they enact the corridor court. We are not seeking this body to enact a corridor court. That is a decision for the justice court to make and the justice court to make alone.

Section 10 on the other hand, that section deals with data. We are having trouble getting the data we need because our goal in this measure is to measure the efficacy of what we are proposing. If it is working, we want to keep it; if it is not working, we want to make sure we go back and revisit it. There is an issue we are trying to solve and we want to make sure we are actually solving that issue. There is data that has to be reported monthly to the county commission and annually to the Legislature for everybody to look at. Anybody can go and get that data. It is not a system we are trying to bury into some of the bureaucracy. We want the data to be known so we can actually attack the problem.

Finally, and I know, I am hurrying and I am close. Sections 1 and 2 deal with our employees. Section 1 is assault, section 2 is battery. All we are doing in these sections is it is of paramount importance to us to protect our employees who work in these resort hotels. We are asking they be put in that protected class with utility workers and with school teachers so if a crime is committed against them, there are two changes. One, a simple battery, no deadly weapon, no substantial body harm, it would be a gross misdemeanor so long as these employees are wearing identification and they are in the corridor. If they are outside or not wearing, we are not saying that applies. If a person knows they are attacking someone who works at a hotel casino, we are asking for a misdemeanor to become a gross misdemeanor and they be included in a category B felony when there is substantial bodily harm as opposed to a category C felony. The same applies to a battery. If it is a battery, we are asking that it be a gross misdemeanor as opposed to a misdemeanor, and that they are of the protected class to get a category B felony instead of a category C felony. I think I was close.

Chair Miller:
At the rate of speed you were speaking, it demonstrates you know this subject well. I believe when we open up for member questions, there may be some chair hopping. Please just do what you need to do by whoever is going to respond to the question. As you are responding to questions, make sure you state your name so we have it clearly for the record as well. I will give members a few minutes to start formulating their requests. We will begin with a question from Assemblymember Moore.

Assemblymember Moore:
The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada sent letters to us up here with a proposed amendment [Exhibit D] that is germane to this bill that would protect against U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) impersonators. We have seen recently that even the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is urging U.S. Department of Homeland Security and ICE, as well as the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to have their agents wear masks. This amendment the ACLU submitted would require local law enforcement to respond and investigate two reports of masked individuals detaining others as potential kidnappings. Why is the language in this amendment not being considered?

Jennifer Noble:
Assemblymember Moore, as part of the presentation and preparation for this bill, I was not aware that had been proposed by the ACLU. The Governor's Office ultimately decides what amendments are accepted and what are not. Other than it sounds like there might have been discussions, but an amendment did not make it into the bill, I do not have an answer for you.

Assemblymember Roth:
I look at the corridor court parts separately than the rest of the bill, so my question is more on the rest of the bill. Specifically, I believe it is section 7, the retail theft. I am just trying to take a step back of the why on all this. A press release recently by the Washoe County District Attorney's Office said burglary is down 25 percent since 2021, robbery is down 24 percent since 2022, and he quotes, "The facts are clear, our community is safer." That data can be found on the Nevada Crime Statistics website. When we are considering how we have seen a decrease in crime rates since the passage of Assembly Bill 236 of the 80th Session, coupled with now rolling back some of those protections we put in place, what is the reason if we are seeing that drop in crime?

Jennifer Noble:
I would say a couple of things. As you know as a practitioner, burglary is separate. After A.B. 236 of the 80th Session was passed, we have to prove there is an unlawful entry and intent at the time someone enters the establishment. But let me talk to you about this provision because it is a compromise provision in response to objections to reduction of the felony theft threshold. Because of the way Nevada crime statistics are tracked, the examples are anecdotal. There is not specific data currently collected on these smaller scale thefts that specifically involve damage to security measures, such as glass cases or wires that are designed to prevent theft. This is not targeted toward the organized retail theft where we see on the news, tons of people swarming an Apple store or a Sephora or something like that.

This is more targeted toward somebody who is just trying to protect their merchandise in the best way they know how. As you know, our organized retail statute requires proof of: (1) a series of thefts with (2) an intent to resell the stolen merchandise. This is a compromise measure designed to leave the felony theft threshold alone, keep it intact as A.B. 236 of the 80th Session left it, while still sending a message to Nevada businesses, especially small businesses, this Legislature sees them and will support their individual efforts to combat theft. As we know, Nevadans are not numbers.

Assemblymember Roth:
To clarify, when we are talking about the statistics being reported, you are saying these thefts are not included in that data?

Jennifer Noble:
It is going to depend on the elements of each theft-related offense. As you know, we have lots of them. Is there something in the Nevada Crime Statistics that specifically is going to let us search for theft offenses that do not fit within organized retail theft or some other theft offense that specifically involve the interference with a glass case or something the business owner is trying to use to protect their merchandise? That specific inquiry, that scenario—I am pretty good at searching the Nevada Crime Statistics—but this was designed to address that scenario specifically proactively not reactively.

Assemblymember Cole:
My question is actually on the same section. The way I read this is in order for the felony to apply at this level, there has to be the property damage. It is not just shoplifting. Somebody goes into Target, fills up a cart, walks out the door. It will not change that at all. Is that correct?

Jennifer Noble:
That is absolutely correct. The aggregate value of the property and the damage to the security measure, whether it is a wire holding in the tags or a tag or something like that or a glass case protecting merchandise in a pawnshop, whatever it is, it has to have an aggregate value of $750 or more for this to apply. It would not apply to a shoplift.

Assemblymember González:
I was wondering if you could talk about what the fiscal costs or the impacts are going to be on the Department of Corrections in terms of incarcerating more people.

Chair Miller:
I can have fiscal respond. Mr. Drost is here. Another point of clarity, a little difference between regular and special. Obviously, in regular session, we do not discuss fiscal impact or requests because we have committees committed to that. We have Assembly Ways and Means and of course, Senate Finance, but we do not have a Ways and Means Committee to refer this bill to right now. That is why he is joining us and can respond to fiscal questions.

Adam Drost, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:
In response to that question, you will note in the bill, sections 59, 60, and 61 have State General Fund appropriations to the Administrative Office of the Courts as well as the Nevada Department of Corrections. For the Nevada Department of Corrections, the one General Fund appropriation is consistent with what was included in S.B. 457 of the 83rd Session. However, I believe the amount for the Nevada Department of Corrections for the alternative program is relatively new. I know Director Dzurenda is in the audience and can speak to both items in more detail regarding how those projections were made.

Don Southworth, Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of Corrections:
When we are looking at this bill, there are a few different parts that may affect the fiscal impact. The majority of the bill relating to different criminal laws, we have a projection that says for fiscal year 2026 we expect a population increase of about 6.52 offenders. For fiscal year 2027 that would be 11.56 offenders. That relates cost-wise in fiscal year 2025 to $264,634.41 and for fiscal year 2027 it would be $472,617.70, with future biennia costs of $1,196,193.61. However, there is another element to this bill for a community transition program which allows certain offenders to be released from DOC custody early into the community while still under our supervision. There is an initial setup fee for that program, but what you will see is the population reduction in our custody in our facilities will actually, over time, offset the population increase relating to the other portions of this bill.

Chair Miller:
Director, did you have anything to add before a clarifying question?

James Dzurenda, Director, Nevada Department of Corrections:
I was just going to explain what the community transition program would look like and what qualifies for it if it is presentable. But I have nothing more to add about the actual costs and what the numbers are.

Chair Miller:
Okay, then we will go to the Assemblymember's clarifying question.

Assemblymember González:
Thank you so much for those numbers. I just want to clarify. You are saying that overall this would cost us about $1 million. Am I understanding that correctly?

Don Southworth:
The criminal portions of A.B. 4 would cost in future biennia about $1.1 million. However, the population reduction savings we get will offset that. After fiscal year 2026, the savings due to a decrease in overall population will offset the population increase relating to the other portions of the bill.

Assemblymember González:
Do you know how much money the offset is here?

Don Southworth:
That is very difficult to measure because there are a lot of factors we do not know. We have an eligibility list of how many offenders meet the criteria that would be set up in the bill. But understanding exactly how many offenders have the community support that would be needed, have the ability to enter, and the interest to request to go into the program; until we know that for sure, a lot of what we are doing here is just ballpark estimates and kind of best guesses. We do expect a population reduction of as many as 500 offenders that would be eliminated from our in-house custody.

Chair Miller:
Director Dzurenda, are your comments based on the fiscal questions? Because if it is just about the programming, that is part of a presentation again. We are going to hold off on that unless a member asks just for the sake of consistency, but none of you go far.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
I will start with section 7. As you were describing the rationale for section 7 about the smash and grab thefts and the damage to the property designed to provide security, it sounded like you were describing the proposed amendment [Exhibit E] from the public defenders rather than the bill, because the proposed amendment says if you commit this theft and you damage "a secured door, a window, a showcase, a display case . . . ." It sounded like that actually reflected your policy purpose better than the language you have. It strikes me that is a good thing and you would welcome this amendment. I do not know if you have seen their other proposals, but they have a series of what seem like very sensible suggestions to make sure this bill reflects what you are trying to do without going beyond and having unintended consequences. I appreciate your thoughts about this particular section 7 and their other proposals, if you have had a chance to look at them.

Jennifer Noble:
With regard to section 7, and I hate to do this to you, but if you can point me to a line of concern. I have not seen and have not had an opportunity to review a proposed amendment from the public defenders on this particular issue. I am always happy to work with stakeholders and look at language with them, but I do not want to speak to something I have not reviewed.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
That makes sense. If you could take a look, and as soon as you have reasonable opportunity to get back to us and let us know because as I say, they seem designed to carry out what you are trying to do in a more careful way.

Chair Miller:
I do not believe we have any additional member questions. I have a few brief ones. If we could return to section 3, subsection 11, paragraphs (b), (d), and (i) on pages 16 and 17 of the printed bill about the stalking concerns and social media. We know social media is somewhere where many of us live and even in our daily vernacular, we use the term "stalking." Stalking does not mean the criminal sense of stalking; stalking can be as simple as

junior high kids who have a crush on someone who keeps going back and looking at their story or looking at their photos or something like that. Not saying as adults we have ever done that, but I am just saying children. Obviously, we are talking about a stalking concern or issue that has already happened with people who were or are currently in a relationship. I guess I would just like clarification on paragraph (d) when it says electronic means "without limitation, through the use of an Internet or network site, a social media communication, electronic mail, . . ." these types of things. Before that, in paragraph (b), it says, "conducted in person or by electronic means over a period of time . . . directed at a specific person."

I should not say it seems obvious, but I imagine we are speaking in terms of if someone is directing threats to someone through email, through social media, something like that, but there is also this gray area. Again, you can see in your stories that someone has viewed it, and so that concern about someone getting caught up where maybe they are still reviewing a story. Again, this happens in breakups, right? Social media gets entangled in relationships where there is absolutely no abuse, no violence, no anything of the sort. So making sure these people are not captured because someone reviewed the story of their ex 19 times a day. That may be part of the process or someone has a crush on someone and they are not getting in trouble because they keep looking or liking or commenting if those comments are not of a violent or threatening nature, could you speak to that? And then I will have a follow up.

Jennifer Noble:
This is an important question. What we are trying to get at here—and I think the language could be refined and I would be happy to help refine it with whoever wants to work on it—is, number one, maybe you know the login and password information of your ex-boyfriend or girlfriend or person you were dating from Facebook, and you use that to get into their account and do a bunch of bad stuff. That would be one scenario. Number two, you have got your own Facebook page and you post on it, Jenny Noble is a horrible person and all kinds of damaging things about me and you know someone is going to show that to me; it is definitely aimed at me even if I am not friends with you on Facebook. Those are the types of acts we are trying to get at. Not necessarily, Okay, I am on my Instagram reels, someone's story pops up in my feed, they have not blocked me, and I happen to see it. That should not be captured under the amate of this bill. I am happy to work on language to make sure that type of activity falls outside the criminal conduct described.

Chair Miller:
You just mentioned something about logging into someone's electronic program using their passwords and stuff like that. Obviously, that is a problem. But then you said posting that my ex is horrible, and initially I was like, Yeah, but then I was like, Wait First Amendment. Obviously, we know not pornographic or revenge porn or stuff like that, but if someone said my ex is horrible on their social media, how do we criminalize that?

Jennifer Noble:
Again, Chair, another important clarifying question. The First Amendment says you could say anything you want to about me, right? But if you say, I am going to kill her at 8:30 tomorrow morning, then that could be part of a course of conduct for stalking or

something like that. Some sort of defamatory, harassing stuff that falls outside, I do not like her, she is not a good person, is covered by the First Amendment and again I am ready and willing to work quickly on language that would help alleviate these concerns for anybody on the Committee, including you, Chair.

Chair Miller:
I did not say me; I said junior high kids—not me—do that. My other question is about the resort corridor. Often in this Committee, we assume everyone in Nevada knows what we are talking about when we use these certain terms. I have said it before in past years about the average tourist who does not live in Nevada, they know prostitution is legal in Nevada. That is it. That is all they hear. Marijuana is legal in Nevada. That is it. That is all they hear. With the resort corridor, I actually went on a ride along a few weeks ago, another one on the resort corridor specifically so I could see what was going on. There were multiple officers and they were talking about the resort corridor and I said, Who explains to individuals what the resort corridor is? I know when they showed me the map, my reaction was some of it I assumed, like many of us in these rooms would—just because we are involved in this work—Oh, yeah, of course, that makes sense. But would the average person, the average tourist, the average Nevadan necessarily know what is included? They know what the Strip is. We all know what the Strip is. But now the resort corridor expands a little more than that. If someone does get restricted—and again, Mr. Griffin, I am glad you said the exemption for if my doctor or even my job is on the Strip and I have to go—who is communicating what the resort corridor actually is and the areas that would be prohibited?

Virginia Valentine:
I believe on the first offense, the individual is not going to get an order-out. When they get that order-out, they are going to get a map, and it is going to show them where those areas are.

Chair Miller:
Who provides that map?

Virginia Valentine:
That would happen with the courts. It would happen from the judge who issues the order.

Matt Griffin:
I repeat what Ms. Valentine said. If you are a tourist in Las Vegas and you have not committed a crime, you do not care where the corridor court is. The idea would be, and we want it on the website of the county, but also if I am getting sentenced or I am a deferred prosecution or I am on probation where the case is, it is just a matter of course for a justice of the peace to say, This is the area you cannot go back in. I analyze it to like if I go into an ampm and I steal something from ampm. While I am waiting to be adjudicated, the judge is going to tell me you better not go back to that ampm. I do not need to be told 20 feet, 40 feet, 60 feet; stay away from that ampm. I think that is the kind of information we want to get.

If there are ideas to make that clearer, we are all ears; but our goal is to make sure they understand if you have committed an offense and you have been ordered out, you are not allowed to go in this area and we want to make sure you understand what that area is.

Assemblymember Considine:
I just have a question from what you just mentioned where you compared it to ampm. I just want to make clear the difference between an ampm, which is a private location, or are we quasi-privatizing the entire resort corridor?

Matt Griffin:
No, I do not think there is much difference in those that are both public properties. They are private properties that have been opened up to the public. There is a quasi-public expectation in these circumstances. When you talk about trespass, nobody can come in right now and haul me out of the room and say, Matt, you have trespassed. Under Nevada law, I have to be told in advance that I need to leave, and then I make a volitional decision not to leave. This is not trying to change the character of a property. It is just if you are somewhere you have been asked to leave, then you have to leave. The ampm example, there are a million of those when people go and steal candy bars or they try to rob ampm or whatever the case might be. There are a million of those examples. You cannot go back until we figure out what your case has done. That is what we want for the corridor and the justification of this is because when you go down to the Strip, and we have all been in the Strip a lot of times, the amount of people down there is immense. We have only confined this to where there are a large number of people, employees, and tourists where the risk to the public is enhanced just by the sheer concentration of people.

Chair Miller:
That concludes our questions. We will open it up for testimony. As I stated before, anyone testifying, please make sure you state your name, you spell it, and you mention any affiliation you may have. Each speaker will be given two minutes to speak. If you notice there is a lot of repeating or we have a lot of people, I again ask you say ditto because I am only allowing one hour in support, one hour in opposition, and one hour in neutral. I will again remind you what neutral is. Neutral is not taking a position either way. It is just stating any facts or information or projected impact you have. If you have a position, it needs to be either all-in support or all-in opposition. Again, another gray area where sometimes we get confused is if you have an objection. For instance, I support this bill for these three things except for or a but, then that is not truly support. I would ask you just let us know in other means. Again, we will move between here and Las Vegas. We will start in Carson City. It is 3:24 p.m. as we begin support testimony. And, of course, those in Las Vegas, the same process. You may fill those chairs and just have them revolving as necessary. We will begin in Carson City.

Joe Hill, Policy Analyst, Retail Association of Nevada:
We support A.B. 4, specifically section 7. We would like to thank the Governor and the Legislature for tackling this ongoing issue that will help our workers and customers.

William C. Horne, representing SafeNest:
Thank you for the opportunity to speak in strong support of Assembly Bill 4, specifically sections 5, 11, and 13 [Exhibit F]. SafeNest is Nevada's largest nonprofit responding to domestic and sexual violence. Every day our team witnesses the devastating impact firearms have in abusive relationships. Approximately 80 percent of domestic violence related homicides including victims, children, bystanders, and nearly all murder-suicides are committed with a firearm. Section 5 of A.B. 4 creates a mandatory compliance hearing when a court orders firearm surrender. This closes a life-threatening gap between what judges order and what actually happens.

Section 11 extends the same protections to domestic violence protective orders, which is the most dangerous time for a survivor. Ensuring firearms are truly surrendered, not just ordered surrendered, will save lives.

Section 13 strengthens Nevada's domestic violence statute by adding kidnapping and attempts or solicitation of domestic violence crimes, providing earlier intervention and earlier points where firearm removal can occur. Madam Chair and members, these reforms are evidence-based, urgently needed, and will prevent the predictable tragedies that devastate families across Nevada. On behalf of SafeNest and the survivors we serve, we respectfully urge your support of A.B. 4.

Jason Gray, Vice President, Government Affairs, MGM Resorts International:
I am here to testify in support of Assembly Bill 4, including and in particular the tourism safety provisions contained in sections 1, 2, 9, 10, and 46. We sincerely appreciate the Assembly's approval of this very same language just a few months ago during the 2025 Regular Session of the Legislature. These provisions will strengthen important deterrent and enforcement tools to improve public safety and combat repeat offenders in an order-out corridor to protect visitors, employees, and Nevadans. Language to strengthen penalties for offenses committed against hospitality workers will further affirm this body's longstanding recognition of the importance of the hospitality workforce to the proper functioning of the tourism industry and, by extension, our state's economy. It demonstrates that crimes committed against hospitality workers will not be tolerated. The provisions also contain important new and needed requirements relative to reporting that are intended to make informed, evidence-based decision-making relative to order-out offenses among other matters.

Our state's travel and tourism industry employs 437,000 Nevadans and is 28 percent of total employment, contributes 24 percent of all State General Fund revenues, and comprises $98 billion in total statewide economic impact. These provisions are intended to ensure that priority public safety issues counter to a thriving tourism economy and the safety of our workforce is properly addressed and mitigated. We thank you for your consideration and we urge your support.

Erik D. Hansen, Chief Sustainability and Government Affairs Officer, Wynn Resorts:
We echo the comments by the Resort Association. The Wynn is home to 13,000 employees and we see visitation of over 20,000 guests per day. We are here in support of A.B. 4 because this bill would enhance the safety of those 13,000 Nevadans when they are at work. Our housekeepers, our security personnel, all the people who make our resort what it is as well as our guests, who expect a safe visit to Las Vegas. Wynn Resorts is also supportive of the data component, allowing elected officials, resorts, and the public to understand what is needed to determine where resources are needed, and finally, to evaluate the effectiveness of any resort court and diversion programs. Thank you for being here, and we urge your support.

Nick Schneider, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:
I am here in support as well for A.B. 4, particularly sections 1, 2, 9, 10, and 46 regarding the Strip safety corridor. For the sake of brevity, we will just echo the comments of Mr. Gray, Mr. Hansen, and Ms. Valentine.

Lesley Pittman, representing Red Rock Resorts:
I am here today in full support of Assembly Bill 4, particularly sections 1, 2, and 46. But I am mostly here to emphasize the importance to the entire southern Nevada gaming community of keeping our resort corridor employees and visitors safe, as many of them are our customers as well. We urge your support of this very important legislation.

Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
We rise in support of A.B. 4 and we would like to speak to the violations of the order-out corridor. We believe that is an important part of this piece of legislation that will help combat folks who are reoffenders in the resort corridor. Just a few statistics: in 2023 we made 1,088 arrests, in 2024 we made 1,272 arrests, and in 2025 we made 387 arrests for the violation of order-out. Thank you for your support.

Karlos R. LaSane II, Regional Vice President, Government Relations and Community Affairs, Caesars Entertainment:
On behalf of the thousands of hospitality workers and the millions of tourists who visit Las Vegas in the Strip corridor and beyond, I come before you today and humbly ask for your support of A.B. 4. The success and failure of tourism as a destination is closely related to providing tourists and our employees with a safe and secure environment. Implementing laws that protect visitors and our hospitality employees is crucial to deterring crime by establishing a safe and secure environment. It safeguards the local economy and it protects Vegas's reputation, and we can ill afford to lose that. Our guests, our employees, the confidence as it relates to safety, is paramount. I know there is data that reports crime is down. What is critically important to note is that so many crimes go unreported. And it is for a myriad of reasons, such as the fear of illegal entanglement, embarrassment, language barriers, cultural obstacles, and the lack of time stops the victim from reporting. All crime is not violent. Theft, fraud, property damage, disorderly conduct, and trespassing is a huge

issue, particularly as it relates to the habitual offender. Without legal consequences, these crimes can escalate. We reviewed the crime bill and we understand its importance. On behalf of Caesars Entertainment, we are in full support of A.B. 4.

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:
We support Assembly Bill 4. This bill enhances driving under the influence sentencing in cases involving death or substantial bodily harm. It updates provisions related to opioid use disorder treatment and reentry programs, recognizing the importance of both accountability and rehabilitation in improving long-term community safety. For these reasons, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office strongly supports and respectfully urges its passage. This legislation strengthens victim protection, enhances community safety, and provides law enforcement with the updated statutory tools needed to address today's public safety challenges.

Nicole Rourke, Director of Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson:
I am here in support of A.B. 4, specifically the provisions that add social media to the stalking statute in section 3 as well as the additions to the DUI penalties.

Russell Rowe, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation:
We just simply wish to echo the comments of Ms. Valentine on behalf of the Nevada Resort Association, and strongly encourage your support of this legislation.

Sam Anastassatos, representing City of Sparks:
I am here to show our support.

Miranda Hoover, representing Energy and Convenience Association of Nevada:
We are in strong support of A.B. 4, specifically section 7. The national average of state retail theft thresholds, which include Washington, D.C., in comparison to the penalty being presented today is $692.16. Bringing Nevada back to the $750 threshold will put us back in line with the national average. Across the country, our convenience stores are seeing an increase in smash and grab incidents. We believe with the implementation of this bill, law enforcement will have the ability to go after those individuals, which will help to deter future incidents. We ask for your support of this bill to help deter theft at our convenience stores, many of which are the only option for groceries in our rural areas of Nevada.

Andrew McKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:
We are the trade association that represents all the new car, light truck, and heavy duty truck dealers across this great state. Simply put, we rise in support of A.B. 4. We were in full support enthusiastically of Senate Bill 457 of the 83rd Session. We supported the bill for several reasons, but it was a quality of life bill and is something we have consistently maintained in our association since its beginning—that we support measures that advance and protect the quality of life of not only our Nevada residents, but also our visitors. Simply put, A.B. 4 accomplishes all of this. It protects our employees, our citizens, our visitors, and our businesses alike. As a result, we respectfully implore this Committee to pass this measure. It is an extremely important measure and one that warrants your due consideration.

Paul J. Enos, CEO, Nevada Trucking Association:
We are here today in support of Assembly Bill 4. I would like to thank the Governor for bringing this measure forward. We do think this bill does give the folks who are out there fighting crime and prosecuting criminals the enhanced tools for them to be able to make Nevada a safer place. Specifically, we support the enhanced penalties for repeated DUI violations. You know, our truck drivers are out there. This is a measure that does not just protect those men and women who are moving 95.3 percent of all the freight in the Silver State, but everyone who uses our roads, and we do think this is an important provision in this bill along with the overall provisions. We are in full support.

A'Esha Goins, representing Service Employees International Union:
Service Employees International Union is the largest health care and public sector union in Nevada, representing 20,000 workers and 14,000 health care workers, and they support A.B. 4, specifically sections 1 and 3. Our members face threats of violence. The bill provides critical protections for child welfare staff and child protective workers. Thank you for recognizing their safety matters. Enhanced penalties will deter assaults on their workers.

Chair Miller:
We will move to Las Vegas. Please proceed with your testimony.

John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office:
I am sorry I am not up there with you this afternoon, but it is great to see all the members of the Committee. I am here in support of A.B. 4 and first would like to start off by thanking Governor Lombardo for bringing the bill. One of the big reasons we are supporting this bill is the fact that it decouples the penalty between DUI substantial bodily harm and DUI death. Right now in statute, those penalties are covered in the same statute, it is 2 to 20. That works to artificially cap the penalty for DUI substantial bodily harm. In other words, if the penalty for DUI death is 2 to 20 and the penalty for DUI substantial bodily harm is 2 to 20, most judges are not going to give the max penalty on a substantial bodily harm case, a 20 on the top, because that is reserved specifically for death. What A.B. 4 does is, it makes the penalty for DUI death more akin to that of a second degree murder, which we would argue that a DUI death is closer to second degree murder than anything else. The range of 2 to 25, if you do not have a DUI prior, or 5 to 25 if you do have a DUI prior, goes a long way toward meeting some of the goals we have advocated for down here in Clark County.

I also want to say we appreciate Virginia Valentine, Matt Griffin, and the entire Nevada Resort Association for bringing the Strip safety language. There are few places on this planet like the Las Vegas Strip, and A.B. 4 goes a long way in giving us some innovative solutions. I can tell you, it is not going to stop with A.B. 4. We are already working with others to figure out how we can integrate the Strip corridor court with Campus for Hope and other issues. We are trying to be innovative in how we deal with crime on the Strip. I think A.B. 4 is a great place to start.

Chair Miller:
Next, is there anyone who would like to testify in support in Las Vegas?

Elgin Lofton, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I serve as both academic coaching coordinator and Rebel rebound coordinator at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), where I mentor and support more than 100 justice-impacted college students. I am also the founder of a 501(c)(3) nonprofit. Through that work, I go inside the Nevada Department of Corrections in men and women's prisons to deliver re-entry curriculums, helping people prepare to come home to unify with their families and succeed. I must note, I am here today in my personal capacity, not representing UNLV or NDOC. Before this work, I spent 15 years incarcerated, so I know what it looks like when policy chooses punishment over people. This bill before us, S.B. 457 of the 83rd Session [*sic*], the Safe Streets and Neighborhood Act, propose stricter penalties for repeat DUIs, assault, stalking, and other—

Chair Miller:
Excuse me, sir. Are you in support of the bill or opposition?

Elgin Lofton:
I am not in support.

Chair Miller:
Okay, we are in support testimony. I am going to have you wait until we open opposition. If you would just like to take a seat, and when we have opposition, you are more than welcome to come back up and give your full testimony. Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.]

[Exhibit G was submitted but not discussed and is included as part of the record.]

I will close support testimony. I appreciate everyone for staying within their limits and I will open up opposition testimony. Sir, in Las Vegas, if you would like to come forward and continue because we are now officially in opposition.

Elgin Lofton:
I serve as both academic coaching advisor and Rebel rebound coordinator at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, where I mentor and support more than 100 justice-impacted college students. I am also the founder of a 501(c)(3) nonprofit. Through that work, I go inside men's and women's prisons of the Nevada Department of Corrections to deliver reentry curriculums, helping people prepare to come home, reunify with their families, and succeed. I am here today in my personal capacity, not representing UNLV or NDOC. Before this work, I spent 15 years incarcerated, so I know what it looks like when policy chooses punishment over people. This bill before us, S.B. 457 of the 83rd Session [*sic*], the Safe Streets and Neighborhood Act, proposes stricter penalties for repeat DUIs, assault, stalking, and other offenses and also revitalizes the resort corridor court to handle crimes originated

from the Las Vegas Strip. This focus on more incarceration and harsher sentences will not build safer communities. It will make them smaller by closing doors to those trying to rebuild their lives because safety does not come from piling up punishment. Safety comes from opportunity, stable housing, meaningful education, decent jobs, and the community that supports people when they return. I am living proof that with structure, support, and second chances, people can and do change. If we invest in redemption, equity, and hope rather than simply investing in more incarceration, that is how we create safe streets and stronger neighborhoods for all.

Chair Miller:
Thank you so much, sir. If there is anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to make opposition testimony, please come forward.

Yessica Valencia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I live in Assembly District 28 and Senate District 2. I am here to oppose the crime bill. I urge you to vote no on A.B. 4 because our community continues to be under attack and we need bills that protect our vulnerable families. As a community activist and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipient, I fear daily going out in my community to help to support the same community that is being attacked. I see the fear grow and people not coming out of their homes, while I am finding resources to help with food. I am doing my part. I ask you to do yours. This bill does nothing for the people like me. We need to focus on legislation that bans face coverings and allows impersonations of law enforcement officers which, in return, attack our community and abduct and separate our families. We need to focus on legislation that protects our communities instead of harming it. Thank you for your time and once again, I hope you vote no on A.B. 4.

Elizabeth Ortiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I live in Assembly District 14 and Senate District 21. I am here in strong opposition to A.B. 4. If the Governor wants to talk about safety, he needs to include the safety of immigrant communities in Nevada. Immigrant families face harassment, confusion, and fear every single day. This bill looks away from the harm already happening to us. Nevada students should feel protected in their schools, not watched or exposed to policies that open the door to federal enforcement. This bill fails to make our communities safer. It leaves immigrant families and students with even fewer protections and more uncertainty.

Brennan Bartley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a public defender who defended people in the corridor courts for the last year of their operation. I speak today in my personal capacity as a member of Assembly District 10 [Exhibit H]. To explain to Assemblymember Karris and all of you what the corridor courts and the order-out actually meant on the ground, the crimes that occurred in the corridor court were almost exclusively misdemeanors, nonviolent, or nonviolent misdemeanors. The reasons we were given for why that court existed are either already served by the rules of the justice court or were not borne out by the facts. My clients were promised this would be better for connecting them to resources, resources that never materialized.

The people who were most heavily impacted by these provisions were people who were homeless. I watched officers walk up to homeless people who were doing nothing more disruptive than sitting on a planter box or stacking rocks and ask them for their names so they could arrest them if they had an order-out. In my experience, 85 percent or more of the people charged with violating an order-out were homeless. And you would see these people caught in a vicious cycle of doing months of jail time, and you had to go back three, four, five cases to get them doing anything other than violating an order-out, often just trespassing.

The measure of efficacy is in: since corridor court has ended, all verifiable statistics—verifiable statistics—show crime is down. These are failed experiments that harm some of the most vulnerable among us, turn our jails into more expensive homeless shelters, and fail to accomplish any goal of criminal justice. What they do is make it easier for the one or two judges who hear these cases to be chosen, to be bought by the powerful to rule against the powerless, and justice can never be bought. That is why I am respectfully urging you to vote against A.B. 4.

John J. Piro, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:
Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice represents hundreds of attorneys throughout the state. This bill is not evidence-based, it is not research-backed, and it has not been transparent. We are not hard to find, and we have not been reached out to by the Washoe County District Attorney in doing this bill. In fact, this bill runs contrary to data and I have the receipts. Today, on November 13, *The Nevada Independent*, using statistics and data, cited crime is down on the Strip. On October 28, the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* cited Sheriff McMahill in Las Vegas saying double-digit crime reductions have happened. After testifying to this Committee last legislative session on June 9, Washoe County District Attorney Chris Hicks stated to Channel 8 Reno [KOLO 8] that crime is down, and he cited Nevada Crime Statistics as a source. On November 9, Lyon County Sheriff Pope cited crime is spiraling downward, and today I checked joelombardofornevada.com, and his results page says crime is down. Crime is down across the state.

I was here in 2019 and worked to pass A.B. 236 of the 80th Session. At that time, this body committed to evidence-backed reforms and now it is backing away from that. Nevadans are safer today by being smart on crime. This is not an emergency measure. This is a resuscitation of a failed policy from last session, and this failed policy should not be revived. Last session we had hours of opposition and cutting the phones off has now cut off hours of opposition for this bill. Do not let the limited amount of working class people who could make it here today not be an example of everybody else who opposes this bill. Moreover, this bill will not have a negligible fiscal impact. It will cost my office roughly $8 million to staff the corridor court, and that is money that should be going to vulnerable Nevadans to feed them rather than to support a failed policy. You should vote no.

Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:
I am a civil rights attorney by background. I am not happy to be here today. This sham of a Special Session called by the Governor contains no emergency measures. Neither the Sony bill is an emergency, this bill is not an emergency, and none of the other ones presented thus

far have been an emergency. The fact there is no telephonic testimony permitted for working class people is an affront to the system of justice we have and participatory democracy. For years, I have heard this body talk about inclusivity and access points. And yet today, just today, telephone testimony is cut off for no reason. There is a reason why the only people who seem to support this bill were a specific special interest group and not ordinary people. We have heard every casino operator step up and say the resort corridor has been great. Well, where is the data that backed that up?

Why is it that this was not connected to a district court where there is serious crimes, but instead a justice court for misdemeanors and low-level crimes? It is because my colleagues have articulately and wisely pointed out that this was a court used to target the unhoused. If it was only about gaming properties, it would have been limited to what occurs inside of the casinos, but it is not. It was used to target people on the street.

Beyond this, the fact is, we at the ACLU submitted a proposed amendment [Exhibit D] days ago to include immigrant protections that, in fact, are germane to address ICE kidnappings or impersonation of ICE officers that are occurring. Local law enforcement should serve our public, but instead we get two minutes of testimony time, the public is cut off, and we can see this for what it is: this is an opportunity for the corporations to buy out our judicial system much the same way they bought out our political system. We urge a no vote and for you to reconsider betraying the people of this state.

Tamara Favors, Housing Justice Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:
I live in Senate District 2 and Assembly District 11. I am here to urge you to vote no on A.B. 4. Not only am I a housing justice advocate, I am also a child of a formerly incarcerated parent. I remember the moves, the fights, and the splitting up of my immediate family; all because of my father's record. We had to be very careful on which homes we applied to and we still got denied. Because of his background, my family had to move various times because there was no strong housing laws to keep families together and housed regardless of income or background. Regressive, tough on crime bills only make it more difficult for formerly incarcerated folks to rejoin society after serving their time. We cannot contribute to more incarceration while also having protections in place for reentry and rehabilitation. If we keep incarcerating folks and judging who is living in our neighborhoods, how will they be able to find a good shelter to call their home? This is a housing issue and not just a crime issue. Making it easier for our community to be caged will lead to increased homelessness in Nevada. Thank you for listening, and I urge you to not be cruel to Nevadans, and vote no on A.B. 4.

Noé Orosco, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Immigrant Coalition:
We are here in opposition to A.B. 4 as it stands. The immigrant community is under attack and due process is being eroded by the current overreach of the federal government. In Nevada, we have seen two surges since the beginning of the year where our families were terrified to go outside to simply take their kids to school or to go grocery shopping. These attacks push our communities further into the shadows. A perfect example is the economic

impact communities faced over the threat of ICE enforcement at the Broadacres swap meet over the summer. Broadacres is one of the largest employers in North Las Vegas. The closure caused significant economic disruptions to vendors, and we have seen persistent fear even after the reopening. Anything less than substantive policies and meaningful protections is just performative. It is a deflection for moral responsibility. We do not need a study to tell us what we already know. Numerous studies have already documented the devastating impact of kidnapping mothers and children, the economic destruction it brings to the local communities, and the deep rupture it causes in our social fabric. It is time for our elected officials to step up and protect our communities.

The Nevada Immigrant Coalition urges this body to take real action for our friends, families, and neighbors. We need meaningful protections for all Nevadans regardless of immigration status, and that means protecting sensitive locations from increased ICE enforcement, restricting any face coverings or masks of local law enforcement, and ensuring the data is not shared for immigration purposes unless there is a judicial warrant. This is the time to show up for our immigrant families.

Naomi Joy, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:
I am a Henderson community member, a youth minister, activist, and volunteer with multiple organizations throughout the valley including Indivisible Las Vegas, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, and Nevada Immigrant Coalition to name a few. Today, I am here to address you on behalf of myself, the organizations I support, their lead advocates, and the fellow Nevadans they serve. First, I want to take a moment to address the accessibility, the timing the session fails to provide. Prohibiting phone testimony with less than one day's notice for the session, the Assembly is excluding its working people and those with accessibility needs from opposing.

Now, in regard to Governor Lombardo's crime bill, crime is down. The bill promotes spending money Nevada does not have to funnel more people into prisons and jails while the Strip corridors function to incorporate unhoused people and other vulnerable community members. If our Governor wants to protect Nevadans from crime, he should consider bills that restrict ICE agents from entering sensitive locations like churches and schools, prohibiting masking, and require visible identification for agents. I desperately urge you to oppose this bill, A.B. 4. Prioritize people over profit and its citizens over donors.

Deborah E. Hecht, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am in Assembly District 3 way up north, and because I happen to be a retired person, I could make it down here. But many of the people who you will notice are speaking against this bill are people who are working in this city. The reinstatement of this, I know there were Strip courts before and which were specialty courts on the Vegas Strip that funneled unhoused people and others into the criminal system. We already have enough problems. The immigration is awful in this town. And I do not understand why the Governor is trying to make it more difficult for our local people, who are from other places, who are trying to make a life deal with also having to do this court situation on the Strip. It should go through a regular system, and we should not put more attention on it because we have

enough attention on the immigrants who are in this city. I am appalled we are even considering doing this. We have more important things to do, like take care of these people who we live with who are our neighbors.

Manuel Santamaria, Campaigns Director, Battle Born Progress:
First thing I want to say is, I paid $45 one-way on an Uber just to get here because this body has decided calling in was not an option, but this was an emergency for me. So I came, and it is an emergency because apparently providing extended sentences is also an emergency in the state. Meanwhile, there are over 600 homeless veterans in the state. I am a veteran. According to the Nevada Department of Veterans Services, 129 veterans killed themselves in this state in 2023. Most of those veterans were past the age of 75. Veterans are living in streets and dying without dignity. This year, 120 veterans died alone and unclaimed by anybody. That is an emergency. This body's lack of concern to prioritize the lives of people like me, people who are broken and scarred from defending you, is appalling. Instead of helping those in need, we are praised to add an added burden on the taxpayer, but we cannot currently afford to keep our own DOC funded. Please reconsider this bill, and instead addressing the emergencies you have gathered here to actually address. Vote no.

Brian Harris, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I would like to ditto the comments made before me. Please oppose this bill.

Melody Judilla, Deputy Director, Silver State Voices:
I am here to testify in opposition to A.B. 4 [Exhibit I]. I echo fellow comments in opposition in solidarity with our partner organizations. We are also similarly upset about the lack of telephonic testimony for today, which is not a good indicator of civic participation for our communities. Our vision for a healthy democracy includes a vision for healthy communities and we do not believe this bill gets us there. We urge a no vote.

Mathilda Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada:
We are in strong opposition to Assembly Bill 4. This bill does not make Nevada safer, it expands punishment instead of reducing harm. It puts more people in a system that has already failed to deliver safety, stability, or true justice for the communities that are most impacted. We know what actually prevents crime: it is housing, it is treatment, it is mental health care, it is strong schools, it is stable jobs, culturally-grounded services. Nevada does not have a shortage of punishment. Nevada has a shortage of investment in things that keep families whole. Assembly Bill 4 sends more kids and adults into cycles that are almost impossible to escape. Indigenous families, Black families, Latino families, and underserved communities will feel the brunt of this measure. When we talk about public safety, we must talk about the safety for the people who are actually living through the consequences of this policy, not the convenience of the system that refuses to reform itself. We urge you to oppose this bill.

Quentin Savwoir, President, Las Vegas Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:
Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I rise in opposition to Assembly Bill 4. We are living in a moment of deep national scrutiny around policing, civil liberties, and the proper limits of government authority. Across the United States, the public is demanding greater transparency and accountability amongst our law enforcement professionals, not expanded powers without guardrails. Unfortunately, A.B. 4 goes in the wrong direction.

This bill dramatically broadens the definition of who is considered an officer, extending enhanced penalties to interactions involving a wide range of public-facing employees. While protecting workers is very important and you will not ever hear us argue that, this provision risks criminalizing ordinary behaviors and disproportionately escalating minor incidents into felonies fueling our prison pipeline system. In a climate where over policing in marginalized communities is already a major concern, we should not be expanding categories that trigger enhanced penalties without clear evidence of necessity.

Assembly Bill 4 also introduces compliance hearings and accelerated enhancement mechanisms around firearm relinquishment and pretrial conditions. Without adequate due process, these sections invite inconsistent application and widen the door to coercive practices. In a time when courts nationwide are grappling with unequal treatment in the justice system, Nevada should not be adopting procedures that allow for more aggressive surveillance and control without guaranteeing fair access to counsel and meaningful judicial review.

Perhaps the most troubling of these is the corridor geographic zones that are created where individuals can be banned for up to a year. This approach mirrors policies in other jurisdictions that have been widely criticized for enabling selective enforcement, displacement of vulnerable populations, and the stigmatization of entire neighborhoods. One has to beg the question, what will this cost Nevadan taxpayers. These provisions do nothing to address root causes of crime and instead increase the risk of profiling and further civil rights violations.

In this political moment defined by public concern about government overreach, A.B. 4 expands punitive authority without providing transparency, accountability, or community-focused solutions. I urge the Committee to reject this bill and sufficiently engage community stakeholders about how we can substantially narrow its scope to prevent foreseeable abuses. We urge a no vote.

Shaun Navarro, representing Action Network:
I live in Assembly District 34. We strongly oppose this bill and we strongly oppose calling this bill a crime bill. This is not a crime bill. This is a mass incarceration bill. This bill does not address the systemic root cause of crime, like lack of affordable housing, lack of mental health care resources, lack of drug and substance abuse rehabilitation, inequality in the public education system. This bill only seeks to arrest more people, to arrest poor people, to arrest people in a marginalized community, arrest people of color, arrest minorities. This bill is just

a number of questionable actions by police force here in Nevada, including the donation of a fleet of Teslas from a private donor. This bill, along with other actions, makes it clear there are two justice systems here in Nevada, one for the poor working class, and one for the rich. I believe we are speaking about community safety, the community should be able to be involved in these discussions. Banning phone comments is a specific action to stop people from commenting on a bill that will impact their lives. If this bill is passed, it will impact generations of Nevadans and just include putting Nevadans in the incarceration system. I think this creates an adversarial relationship between law enforcement and the community. This specifically is targeting the work of community members who come together to try to improve the system. I think this creates an us versus them mentality and does nothing to impact crime. It only makes it worse.

Chair Miller:
I just want you all to know in Las Vegas, you have about eight more minutes left. So if people could be brief with their comments in case there is any more. Please continue.

Gerald Mayes, Executive Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111:
I am here today on behalf of our members. Let me begin with what is most important: the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) wants safe communities. We want safe workplaces, safe neighborhoods, and a justice system that protects every Nevadan. We are not opposed to law enforcement. In fact, we work alongside many of those partners in our communities. Our concern is not about whether to address crime, but how we address it. Nevada has already taken meaningful steps in recent years to modernize and balance our criminal justice approach. Those efforts recognize that if we want long-term safety, we must be strategic, not reactive, in how we design policy. We have to understand the difference between targeting real threats to public safety and creating broad policies that unintentionally sweep in people who are simply trying to stay afloat. Our members consistently tell us the same thing. When people have stability, access to services, mental health support, treatment and opportunity, communities are safer. When families are pushed into deeper instability, the challenges only grow. The NAACP believes we must focus on what works, and that means being precise, targeted, and informed in how we craft public safety policies.

Taisacan Hall, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a lived experience specialist with the Nevada Homeless Alliance and I am testifying in opposition to A.B. 4. The resort corridor court was meant to reduce crime on the Strip, but in reality, it punished people for being poor and unhoused. We all want a safe, welcoming Las Vegas, but the resort corridor court failed to make that happen. What we need is not another specialized courtroom that punishes poverty, but a system that invests in housing, treatment, and a path to stability. Real safety starts with stability, not criminalizing the most vulnerable people in our community. Since the court was shut down, crime has actually gone down, with violent crimes decreasing by about 17 percent, property crimes by 25 percent,

and nonviolent offenses by over 40 percent. That shows that public safety improvements are happening because of broader efforts, like community partnerships and social services investments. We know the answer is not another court that criminalizes homelessness.

Supportive housing, case management, and treatment are proven to reduce both homelessness and recidivism. Collaboration between the city, county, nonprofits, and law enforcement can build safer communities that does not rely on punishments. The resort corridor court did not create safety; it created barriers. If we want a safer, stronger Las Vegas, we cannot keep cycling people through the system. We need to be passing legislation that provides people with the tools and stability they need to rebuild their lives, especially after the longest funding lapse in history that served as a major detriment to our community. We need to build people up, not push them out. I urge you to vote in opposition to A.B. 4.

Tanisha Brandon, Assistant Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas Branch 1111:
I am speaking today on behalf of citizens like myself who are new to the community. I am here, and recently my two young Black sons moved here with me. I moved here to Nevada for a safer environment. I moved from the Memphis, Tennessee area. What you are proposing in this bill is going to mirror what is currently happening in Memphis right now. I just left for a two-week trip. I was there for a family matter, a death in the family, but it is horrible there. You are talking about over policing. This bill is going to create that same environment where young Black children, Black and Brown, will be the ones who are predestined. They will be the ones who are mostly affected by this bill. It will be very much so predatory, expanding the penalties to different types of thefts that the resort corridor crime zone and all of that will not address the root cause of the crime. It is going to expand more overcrowding in the prison system, which is what is currently happening now. Check the data. You are going to turn this city and the state into a mini-Memphis, Tennessee. Please oppose this bill.

Chair Miller:
I will take one last testimony from Las Vegas, and then we will move to Carson City. If there is any time left in that hour once Carson City does their testimony, we will return to Las Vegas. Please proceed.

Anwar Green, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am here in opposition to Assembly Bill 4. Committee, health care is an emergency in this state. Housing is an emergency in this state. The state of our educational system is an emergency in this state. Last I heard, I have been sitting here for a while, and I have heard everyone say that in this state crime is down. So for this bill to be even heard, unless the emergency is we have run out of people to arrest, it is laughable, and I know we do not have a whole lot of time so I am not going to repeat a whole bunch of stuff everybody else said. But if crime is down, we do not need another bill to lock up more people, especially poor

people in marginalized communities. We need to direct our attention toward the other emergencies I mentioned, and again, I ain't got that much time, so I am not going to repeat them, but I urge you to vote no.

Chair Miller:
We will return to Carson City. Please proceed.

Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:
As we have heard, this bill offers one solution to crime and that is fines, fees, and incarceration. That is it. It does not in any way address a single underlying cause of crime. Those who will be most impacted by this legislation and who are currently most impacted disproportionately by incarceration are people in rural Nevada and people in low-income minority neighborhoods. Those are also the two groups who were barred from participation today when we did not allow the phones.

We heard conversations about the cost of prison, and while we can run the numbers and say one individual in prison costs X amount of dollars, we run a prison system that routinely takes immense amounts of money out of the pockets of the families of those who are incarcerated. When we put people into the prison system through tablet fees, through medical fees, through a litany of fees, we destabilize the very communities they have come from and exacerbate crime. We do not solve it, and this bill will exacerbate those issues. When we talk about the order-out provisions and these corridor courts, it is clear, talk to anyone who has worked there, they are a revolving door of people, mostly unhoused people. Those who are lucky enough to not be unhoused are hit with fines and fees further destabilizing their economic situation for very minor offenses, mostly trespassing, mostly trespassing outside of buildings.

This bill was rushed in the regular session. Stakeholders were not brought in in any meaningful way until the final days and it was rushed then. There were no conversations between then and now and we are rushing this bill again. This is bad policy that is rushed. It is not needed at this time, and we urge you to vote no.

Evelyn Grosenick, Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:
Today, I am here to testify in opposition to this bill. I echo my colleagues' concerns about the process. In a lot of ways, the process can be more important than the substance. In cutting off phone access to the public to call in and express their concerns or their support really says a lot. I understand this is rushed and it is a tight time frame, but that is all the more reason this type of bill should be considered in a regular session.

No discussion of this bill is complete without a discussion of A.B. 236 of the 80th Session. I know we do have some newer legislative members here, so just to revisit for a moment, that was a major crime reform bill based on extensive studies and data, multiple hearings, and opportunities for all stakeholders to have input. The passage of that bill was based on the final report by the Nevada Advisory Commission for the Administration of Justice. It was an evidence-based approach to public safety. Significant reforms that A.B. 236 of the

80th Session made, again based on evidence and best practices, were reduced penalties for certain offenses. They gave judges more discretion, increased opportunities for people to participate in diversionary specialty courts, and dedicated more resources to treating behavioral health disorders. Since its passage, property and violent crime are lower, and Nevada is estimated to be saving millions of dollars on avoided costs of incarceration.

The bill in front of you attempts to undo many of those measures. It will also put more strain on our prison system, which is already in crisis, and this bill will have fiscal impact. I will not speak for other stakeholders, but it does follow logic that when you increase prison sentences and create new crimes, you will need more prison resources. The public defender's office in Washoe County will need additional attorneys and support staff to meet the increased workload this bill would create. In closing—

Chair Miller:
I am sorry, your time is up.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:
Our office, along with the Washoe County Public Defender's Office, has submitted proposed smart-on-crime amendments to this bill [Exhibit E]. These are changes that still preserve public safety but reduce some unnecessary harm to our communities. I will talk about three of those amendments. First is the stalking statute. This is section 3 of A.B. 4 and amendment number 3 in our proposed amendments. The intent behind updating the stalking statute for the digital age is understandable. However, the current language is overly broad and criminalizes normal, lawful behavior. As written, the bill defines an act of stalking as something as simple as accessing another person's social media account. That means if you look at your ex's Instagram account, TikTok account, even without contact or any sort of threat, you can now be arrested and charged with stalking. Our amendment simply removes this definition so it targets true stalking behavior, conduct that is threatening, conduct that is harassing or obsessive, not ordinary nonthreatening online activity.

Next is a new smash and grab statute, the felony provisions in section 7 of the bill. As currently drafted, it makes this offense a category C felony. We are proposing just to adjust this to a category D felony, a small but important change that better aligns with how Nevada categorizes similar property crimes. For example, category C theft usually involves losses of $5,000 or more. In contrast, these smash and grab incidents often involve much smaller amounts, and without this adjustment, we risk turning what would currently be misdemeanor or low-level felony cases into serious felony convictions, and these are penalties that can derail a person's life for years. Our goal here is just to ensure the punishment fits the crime and maintain proportionality.

Finally, we proposed amendments to the DUI provisions to bring them in line with Nevada's other enhancement statutes. These are sections 53 and 55 of A.B. 4.

Chair Miller:
Your time is up. Again, you can submit any additional comments in writing.

Marcie Ryba, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:
I am going to hit upon two amendments we have talked about, and I have to say, walking through the building today, I saw a great sticker. It said, "I heart the Second Amendment." But I can tell you, section 26 of A.B. 4 does not. This section creates new mandatory firearms surrender hearings for people who are accused of a crime, presumed to be innocent, and you are awaiting trial. And if you own a gun and the judge says you cannot, you need to come into court and give the name of the person to whom you are giving the gun. You need to describe the condition of the firearm and you need to provide those serial numbers. Of course, if you do not have any firearms, you can just sign an affidavit, and say I do not have a firearm. But if you have exercised your Second Amendment right, and you have those firearms, you need to come in and show you got rid of those even though you are presumed to be innocent while you are awaiting trial.

I think this unfairly treads on due process in our privacy rights. These hearings are also unnecessary. Other conditions for bail, we do not have to come in to prove that we are complying with. Do we have to show our weapons, that we got rid of our nunchucks, and description and where they went? No, this is specifically looking at firearms, the government wanting to know where these are, who we gave them to, and what their addresses are.

I cannot help but think about our public defenders in our rural communities. I used to serve as the executive director for the Department of Indigent Defense Services, and I spent a lot of windshield time going from justice court to justice court, which is hours. If you set a hearing and you give three to five days' notice and I need to be in Tonopah, but I have a hearing in Goldfield or Pahrump or Hawthorne, I cannot make it. This is an unreasonable increase in workload for our public defenders in the rurals as well as the public defenders in our urban communities. I also am asking you to remove that completely.

The sealing provisions in sections 21 through 24. This is for individuals who are convicted of child abuse, and it prevents that you can ever seal that record.

Chair Miller:
Your time is up. Again, the same thing, any additional comments, please submit them in writing.

Hallery Ferrini, Immigrant Justice Organizer, Make the Road Nevada:
I also live in Assembly District 40. I am here to strongly urge you to oppose A.B. 4 because we also need to consider the safety of immigrant communities in Nevada. Our families live with threats, intimidation, and fear every day. This bill refuses to acknowledge that reality. Nevada's children deserve schools that protect them, not policies that invite surveillance or enforcement into our campuses. Our families also deserve transparency from law

enforcement, not officers covering their faces and creating more fear in our neighborhoods. This bill does not protect Nevada families, it does not protect our students, and it creates more fear and fewer safeguards for the communities that already face the most risk.

Lauryn Kern, Founder, Reno Sunrise Movement:
Reno Sunrise Movement is a grassroots organization with an emphasis on educating the local community on pivotal political and social issues. I want to echo the concerns of my colleagues here today. As a spokesperson for Sunrise Movement, we oppose this bill and as the Special Session was given with less than 24 hours' notice, making it inaccessible to working class Nevadans. I also denounce this bill's incessant spending for the Governor's mass incarceration plans that do not promote state growth and instead further criminalize while crime is down.

Cathy Fulkerson, Facilitator, Third Act Nevada:
Third Act Nevada is a national organization that works on behalf of older Americans on issues of democracy and of climate. This bill is an expensive solution in search of a problem. As we have heard from many others, overall crime in Nevada is down by 10 percent, burglaries have declined by 15 percent, robberies have declined by 26 percent, all since Governor Lombardo was elected. We do not need tougher penalties. We do not need to broaden the scope of crime infractions. We do not need anything special for the Las Vegas Strip. This bill is costly and a waste of money when Nevada revenue is down. How many bills died during the 2025 Legislative Session for lack of a fiscal note, or because they had a fiscal note, and were sent to those committees to die?

This bill is obviously not about public safety nor does it improve the quality of life for all Nevadans. I believe this bill will actually increase robberies because it will rob Nevadans of our hard-earned money that could be put to better use elsewhere. This bill does nothing to address the current state of fear our immigrant communities and those who look like immigrants are now living with. Assembly Joint Resolution 9 of the 83rd Session was passed unanimously by this body in 2025 urging Congress to enact legislation to prohibit ICE from entering schools and places of worship. Why are none of those concerns addressed here? Oh, that is right. The Governor vetoed the one that required ICE agents to have a warrant before going into public schools. I urge you to not approve this bill.

Elisa Cafferata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:
We opposed this bill during the session and we continue to have the same concerns over young people being caught up in the juvenile justice system. We would rather see Nevada invest its money in training and supports for young people and their families. So we remain opposed.

Marissa Crook, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am opposed to Assembly Bill 4 and I live in Assembly District 24. I am a local attorney who practices criminal defense law in Washoe County, and I have several concerns about the firearm compliance hearings in section 26 as they impact and interact with the Second and Fifth Amendments.

In current practice, compliance hearings in Washoe County require a person to disclose whether or not they have firearms and if they do, make, model number, and serial number of each firearm they possess. This is extremely sensitive information and the procedures that are present in a pretrial bail hearing are not the same as those that are present in an extended protective order hearing or in a hearing for someone who has been convicted of a felony or domestic violence crime. Additionally, I have concerns about how it would affect a person's Fifth Amendment right to remain silent.

I am also concerned about increasing the penalties in Nevada without it being driven by data, which was what happened in A.B. 236 of the 80th Session, and we resultingly saw a decrease of crime in Nevada. The FBI says that in 2024, Nevada crime was at its lowest since 1986. Washoe County District Attorney Chris Hicks said burglary rates were down 25 percent from 2021 and robbery was down 24 percent since 2022. Part of that is thanks to the data-driven practices that were enacted in Assembly Bill 236 of the 80th Session. This bill is not similarly data-driven. I am also concerned these increased penalties are prevalent throughout the bill, creating the smash and grab penalties, expanding the definition of assault and battery on an officer, expanding the definition of stalking, increasing penalties for CSAM possessions, increasing the definition of domestic violence, and increasing penalties for DUI repeat offenders. We currently, in Nevada prisons, cannot safely house prisoners. There are multiple, unlawful wrongful death lawsuits and the NDOC is over budget.

I am also concerned about the incentives for people who are charged with child abuse. In my current practice, most of the people who are charged with that crime are single mothers. Currently, if this bill were to pass and they were to get into mental health court or drug court, they would not have the incentive to complete, as they would not be eligible for the dismissal and deferral at the end. The smart-on-crime amendments proposed by the public defenders' offices would address these concerns, and I would ask you to vote no or adopt the public defenders' amendments.

Jagada Chambers, Executive Director, Mass Liberation Project Nevada:
I am definitely in opposition to the bill. I concur with a whole lot that has been said today. I do want to bring up a couple of things that have not been mentioned. Along that resort corridor on the Strip, there was a law enforcement officer who was using it as a haven to inflict trauma on folks with false cases. We know that reality and that was not presented at all by anyone today as it pertains to law enforcement.

One thing that really sticks out to me personally—in my free time I frequent casinos regularly—we have no problem filling our folks up with liquor and sending them on our way. Never is the casino addressing that part of our DUIs. So, as we find out deeper ways to handle people and rectify what is the responsibility of the casinos to stop liquoring people up and just ushering them to their car saying, Good luck. I have lost a friendship with a bartender for somebody because money is so frail, you will keep serving somebody liquor just to get another dollar and another dollar. And so when I confronted this brother, we got into it. So I just want us to look at the totality of it and it is impossible when law enforcement does not bring community to the discussion. That is why you get a wayward piece of

legislation and policy that is going to be detrimental versus something that could be healing to our communities. I will say that much and thank you all for y'all's attention. I see you listening on a long day, fresh out of retirement. You guys are back.

Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:
I am here in opposition to Assembly Bill 4. Assembly Bill 4 implements a major policy change that requires thorough debate, not a costly Special Session driven by a false sense of urgency. There are real human costs associated with the penalties imposed by this bill. This bill will give the green light to racial profiling along the resort corridor, increasing felony charges leading to harsher sentences and higher incarceration rates. The Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada believes true community safety depends on holistically addressing the root causes of crime, such as widespread poverty, funding shortfalls for education, and mental health support. The hardships Nevadans have faced increased over the months, and instead of fueling the prison pipeline, we should be investing in Nevadans by meeting their basic needs. Prioritizing free school lunches, early childhood education, paid family leave, affordable housing, jobs, protecting immigrant communities, and providing alternative options to incarceration, including treatment and recovery programs—all bills that died or were vetoed last session. Assembly Bill 4 is simply cruel legislation, and we urge you to vote no.

Jessica Munger, Program and Policy Manager, Silver State Equality:
We are in strong opposition to A.B. 4. By expanding fines, fees, and arrestable offenses for minor infractions, this bill will funnel even more vulnerable people into the criminal justice system, which as you know, is already overwhelmed and unsafe, increasing incarceration rather than addressing underlying needs. We urge you to reject policies that criminalize poverty and disproportionately harm the most vulnerable Nevadans who were not afforded the time and mechanisms to speak with you today themselves as they deserved.

Olivia Tanager, Executive Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:
The Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club is the largest grassroots environmental organization in the state of Nevada. We are an organization dedicated to environmental democracy and community voice. We oppose this bill because it undermines the very principles of fairness and public participation that healthy communities and a healthy environment depend on. We have not heard today that any of the proponents of this bill have been able to cite any actual data supporting the need for the changes laid out in this bill. Rushing this bill through a special session silences the community and contradicts the inclusive, transparent process that true democracy requires. At a moment when Nevada urgently needs investment in climate resilience, public lands, public transportation, and community health, this bill would waste millions on policies that make our state less just and less sustainable. I encourage you all to vote no on this bill.

Chair Miller:
Just for information’s sake, we have about 10 more minutes of opposition testimony left.

Nathaniel Phillipps, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
It is a pleasure and an honor to testify before you today in opposition to this bill. This bill shows us so much in its haste missing data and information. It sounds like it was written by people who live in a completely different world than the majority of Nevadans, and it shows the deference to profits over people, which is the rule of the day in this state. And you can see from the presenters behind me where it came from. The Nevada Resort Association, which in the revolving door of political favor in the state of Nevada apparently gets to pass our laws, set our police budgets, and whatever else they wish. This house should represent the most vulnerable everyday people in our state. And this bill and this Session shows the dysfunction. It was so poorly written before it was swiftly rejected. So what has changed? In my minute, I will try and get to it.

Let me say this though. As a crime victim, the Resort Association does not speak for me or all crime victims. The district attorney's offices do not represent me or all crime victims. Stop politicizing crime victims—it is abhorrent. So what changed? Politics did. Candidates have announced who is running for attorney general, and apparently their campaigns believe that mass incarceration is a winning tactic, and our Governor, up for reelection, is still moonlighting as the former sheriff. This bill is unserious and crime victims like me, people who are more likely to be victims of crime like me and from my neighborhood, deserve real leadership not cosplaying as tough on crime. Twenty more seconds. Instead of feeling safe, we need real safety. This bill takes us backwards by not addressing the legitimate crises all around us that others have spoken to that make Nevada one of the most challenging states for working people. Please reject this poor excuse of a bill.

Reverend Paul Larson, Advocacy Director, Lutheran Engagement and Advocacy in Nevada:
I am here to ditto the testimony that was just given. It is important that we oppose A.B. 4 and actually start restorative justice here in the state of Nevada.

Tanya Freeman, Churchill County Lead, Battle Born Patriots:
I echo the words of those people who spoke before me, and I urge you to say no to this bill.

Lily Baran, representing Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality:
It is the 13th day of a month that has been absolutely hellacious for those of us who provide services of food, shelter, clothing, and support to other people. I have spent nearly every single hour of every single day trying to connect people to services, delivering groceries directly to their door, collecting grocery cards as well as opening an emergency warming center for women and families because our shelters are completely full and people will freeze to death tonight. Last night, we had a woman come in who is a senior citizen who has only three toes left due to us not treating these kinds of things like emergencies. If I need to come down here in between distributing food and trying to connect people to emergency shelter to address something that is very much not an emergency where we are putting other people at risk. We are putting other people at risk of death and worse.

Criminalization of these issues has no evidence base that it is ever effective and connecting someone to a job after receiving these kinds of infractions and even misdemeanors is nearly impossible. It is also 100 percent impossible for us to connect someone without income to housing right now in the state of Nevada. Even doing that is very difficult. It takes about four to six months if someone has a perfect record and receives over $1,700 a month of income. I am glad everyone can get here for an emergency. Let us address the emergencies of housing, health care, and food.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in opposition? Not seeing anyone, I am able to take three more testimonies in Las Vegas if there is anyone who would like to oppose.

Bishop Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I live in Assembly District 37. I oppose this bill because of course, ditto what everybody else said. Just coming as a citizen, this bill, especially being rushed like this, does not really feel to me like it is coming in good faith. I wish the people who are presenting this bill would actually work with the opposition so if they want to try to get it passed, you can get it more refined, but I feel like we have already got enough answers that this bill does sound pretty terrible. That is it.

Jollina Walker, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I want to say thank you to the Chair and the Committee for hearing our opposition testimony. As a founding mother of the Birth Collaborative, a reproductive justice training and advocacy organization, I strongly oppose this bill and I hope you will as well.

Erika Marquez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I live in Assembly District 14 and Senate District 21. Assembly Bill 4 attacks families, communities, and people like me [Exhibit J]. I am a DACA recipient, mother of four whose children are under six, and know this bill does not protect me, but leaves me, many families, individuals, and most importantly, our community, unprotected. Our focus should be on banning bounty hunters that impersonate law enforcement and separate working families, leaving pain, insecurity, and trauma to our community. As a community member and organizer, I hear the stories daily of the fear that is being instilled. We need to focus on making our schools, churches, and hospitals safe and not under attack. Our children should focus on their education. Those who are sick should focus on their health, and both should not have to face uncertainty of safety in these locations. I plead for you to take in consideration how our families, those who have mixed legal status, different races, and possibly beliefs, are all affected people. And most importantly, we are all Nevadans. Let us bring back the word unity in community, and stop bills like A.B. 4.

[Exhibit K was submitted but not discussed and is included as an exhibit for the hearing.]

Chair Miller:
That concludes our opposition testimony. I will open it up for neutral testimony beginning here in Carson City.

Peter Handy, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:
I am here to provide some neutral commentary for this Committee. Obviously, I am taking no position on this bill. I trust the Committee will consider the bill holistically and its effects. I have some issues to raise for the Committee's consideration. Some of those things were brought up earlier in different portions of the testimony and the public comment.

First is the reported increased need for the urban offices. As you likely already know, there is a significant lack of attorneys in Nevada's rural counties, and we still have a really high need to get more people to come to work out there. The urban offices are a significant draw for attorneys who are currently practicing out there. Certainly increased pay, better opportunities for a lot of them to see it that way and so a lot of them make their way out there when these kind of openings come up.

The second is section 26, as was mentioned earlier. Any time we are adding a hearing to the already crowded plate for the attorneys, especially in rural Nevada, we are adding to their workload. Many of these attorneys carry very high caseloads and have to report to various courts in different counties. Any time we are going to start imposing additional requirements on those attorneys to be appearing for their clients in these different forums, we are adding to that already high workload. So just a couple of things I would like this Committee to keep in mind when making their decisions.

Chair Miller:
We will go to Las Vegas for neutral testimony.

Jessica Goodey, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court; and representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction:
I am also the chair of the legislative committee and vice president of the Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction (NJLJ). I am here speaking on behalf of both my court and the NJLJ. As you may know, judges are limited in the testimony we can provide. I am here testifying in neutral on behalf of the court and NJLJ. My comments will be brief and we will submit written comments later. Specifically, I am going to focus on section 5, which is what Mr. Handy just spoke about regarding the return hearing when the defendant has been ordered to surrender guns. Many of our rural courts throughout Nevada believe they will not be able to comply with a two- to five-day return hearing and we do not think any of our courts would be able to comply with the one-day return hearing if the defendant is in jail and has been ordered to surrender their guns. Most of the time we are not notified when the defendant has been released from jail. In order to be able to get a return hearing in one business day is likely just not feasible. We wanted to bring that to the Committee's attention.

Also, I would like to comment on section 10, which is the reporting requirements for the resort corridor. We are expecting a significant fiscal impact. I believe the last numbers I saw were in the seven figures. That will be submitted as a formal fiscal note in conjunction with Clark County.

We also have concerns with the potential separation of powers issue with requiring us to report to the Legislature and the board of county commissioners instead of the Nevada Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts, which is who we normally report our stats to. I would also like to note, our judges currently can and do issue order-outs when they are requested by the district attorney who is prosecuting the case as well as handle and hear violations of the order-out when those cases are brought before us. If any members of the Committee have any questions, I will make myself available to answer those for you and thank you for your time.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas or Carson City who would like to make neutral testimony? Not seeing any, I will give the presenters an opportunity to make any brief closing remarks.

Chris Hicks:
I am just going to end where I started earlier today. I want to thank you very much for your time and consideration. What I want to circle back to is, this is very much commonsense criminal justice reform that will have a direct impact on everyday Nevadans. We are not talking about a rollback of A.B. 236 of the 80th Session. Nothing in this proposed bill rolls back A.B. 236 of the 80th Session. What we are talking about is what will help all Nevadans: making our roads safer, protecting our children in terms of child pornography possession, domestic violence reforms, stalking reforms, helping crime victims, and protecting educators. What I would end with is this is a bill, I do not have to say it to all of you, but passed out of not this exact Committee, but a very similar one and got to the finish line. I think it is time to finish as Governor Lombardo said. This unfinished business is something that will help Nevadans, and I again, respectfully ask you to do so.

Chair Miller:
I would just like to say thank you to all the presenters and to everyone who participated physically in Carson City or Las Vegas. Thank you to everyone who testified, whether in support or opposition, for the civility and the diplomacy and just the respect for everyone, even with opposing views. I really appreciate that and you stayed within the time limits. I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 4. We will take a brief recess; meaning do not go too far because we are waiting for our presenter for Assembly Bill 3. Let us just relax, maybe a five-minute recess, and then as soon as our presenter is here, we will proceed with Assembly Bill 3.

[Committee recessed at 4:50 p.m. and reconvened at 5:02 p.m.]

Chair Miller:
We will come back to order. We will hear our next bill, Assembly Bill 3, which revises provisions relating to public office. Just like earlier, we ask you keep your presentation to 15 minutes. I will cut you off at 20 minutes. We also ask anyone testifying to please state your name and spell it for the record. Please keep your comments to two minutes each. Again, I will take one hour for support testimony, one hour for opposition, and one hour for neutral. I will officially open the hearing for Assembly Bill 3. Assemblymember Watts, you may proceed when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 3: Revises provisions relating to public office. (BDR 24-21)

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:
I am glad to present Assembly Bill 3 for your consideration today. Hopefully, we will keep you well under the time limits outlined by the Chair. Fundamentally, what this bill is about is protecting vulnerable persons. Since we adjourned our regular session, I think all of us are aware of the tragic shootings and the murder that occurred in Minnesota where members of their state legislature were attacked in their homes. That obviously is a worst-case scenario; the most horrifying thing that can happen. But there is so much more that members of our body and other people serving in public, official positions have gone through. In conversations I have had with folks since then, people have had nightmares about home intrusions. Folks have had experience with people intruding into their homes, going into their yards, people vandalizing members' homes. People have gotten their address and personal information doxed and put out there on the Internet. People have received threats of violence by phone, by email, via social media, and we must realize that everyone who takes on the responsibility of serving as a public official does have a risk and faces being a target for violence and harassment.

Assembly Bill 3 looks to make a few adjustments to our statutes to help protect public officers' personal information from being put out into the public square and making them more at risk for attack and harassment. There are a few sections to the bill. I am going to start with section 3 because I think this is kind of one of the core pieces of this. In section 3, and this is one of our elections statutes, you can see there is already a list of people who can request their personal information kept in the records of the Secretary of State or county or city clerk be made confidential. In other words, our election information, our voter registration, et cetera, where we have our addresses made public. It includes a number of folks, particularly folks involved in the justice system, in the welfare system, as well as others. What this does is add a public officer to the list of persons who can request to have their information made confidential.

On page 10 of the bill, you will see there is now new added language defining what a public officer means, and that is "a person elected or appointed to a position which: (1) Is established by the *Constitution* or a statute of this State, or by a charter or ordinance of a political subdivision of this State; and (2) Involves the continuous exercise, as part of the regular and permanent administration of the government, of a public power, trust or duty."

This is wide-ranging. As many of you know, some of our financial disclosures in particular, have to be filed not just by elected officials, but also by other appointed public officers of the state. This provision would cover all of those people serving in public official roles.

Going back to sections 1 and 2 of the bill, there is essentially conforming language around declarations of candidacy and residency to ensure someone who has made this request can have that information made confidential on those forms as well, which are otherwise public records. There are already existing in statute certain exemptions and qualifications under which some of this data can be released. But again, we are trying to reduce the exposure of this for people who may be at risk of threats or violence.

Section 4 is conforming language related to local elections. Section 5 makes a new category and explicit allowance for campaign expenses by candidates to be used for personal security. You can see that is within section 5, subsection 1. Within subsection 2 of section 6, you can see there is some additional definition around the use of this. Essentially, if by being a candidate or a public officer, you are facing an elevated security risk, then using funds to provide for your personal security is an allowable use and not considered a personal use of funds. We are clarifying that. Within section 7, it adds a new category to contribution and expense (C&E) reports for expenses related to personal security.

Section 8 is really conforming language related to county recorders. Again, there is a very similar list of individuals who may petition to have their personal information made confidential in county recorder records, again for property records in particular. This would add public officer and define that within that section of statute. Section 9 also adds a public officer. In section 10, we are also adding that, and this relates to the ability to request the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) display an alternate address on someone's personal identification card. Again, these provisions already exist to protect law enforcement officers, folks in our justice system, and folks in our social service system who, in the course of their duties, may be at risk of retaliation, threats, or violence.

This provides some means to reduce the exposure of their information from those who mean them ill intent. Essentially, what this bill does is makes it clear that public officers may also be entitled to the same protections and also make it clear that candidates and elected officials may use campaign funds to invest in their own personal security related to the higher risk they face as public officers. That concludes the bill. We do have a representative from the Secretary of State's office here who can help answer any questions, and thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Miller:
We will begin questions with Assemblymember González.

Assemblymember González:
As a new mom, I think it has been very difficult in terms of talking about safety as a public officer, so I really appreciate you bringing this forward. I had a question about the C&Es, and I am just not sure if I was not following correctly. Can you talk about what address we would put in place of reporting on our C&Es? With the DMV alternate address too, please?

Assemblymember Watts:
I actually will have to get back to you on the process with the DMV. I am not familiar with it. Essentially for anything made confidential, it is redacted from those forms, so it is removed and it is not visible. They do not display an alternative address. They essentially redact it and note it as confidential on whether it would be your voter registration record, your assessor record if you have a property under your name, or under any candidate filing or candidate-related documents.

Assemblymember González:
Sorry, I have a lot of questions. Is this just for current elected or let us say I request for this information to be private and then I am no longer an elected. Would that then make my information available?

Assemblymember Watts:
We may have to get some additional follow-up from Legal because I am not 100 percent sure on that. My understanding is this can be taken advantage of by anybody who is in that position. There is also a more open-ended provision for others who may also have direct evidence of being threatened. I know in those circumstances, the time is limited to five years for the provision of that information being confidential. As far as I know, there is not a time limit for the people who are within this list. Once you are a public official and you request for this to be confidential, I think it would be confidential from that point moving forward. If you have previously served in office, this does not explicitly say it applies to people who formerly held those positions.

Chair Miller:
I also have a brief question. I see the intent of the bill is information that is publicized. As you know, many of us have other professions we are in and often some of those professions post pictures and information about their employees. That also still makes individuals vulnerable, especially if they know what your profession is or where you work, which often they do. Could this be used to—because again, anyone can request to have their picture, their name, that kind of stuff removed from employment websites, but often they are not. I am just wondering if there would be a way to enforce that when it came to professions?

Assemblymember Watts:
As far as I know, there are no statutory provisions laid out like the ones we see in the various sections of this bill relating to private employers and entities. This would not explicitly touch that or provide that kind of right by statute. I will say, if related to professional licensing and some of that information that is within a state body, there were some initial conversations about broadening the scope outside of these areas that have been very clearly laid out in

elections and county documents because there are also business documents, professional licensing documents. There are a lot of places our information can get out to. Being that we are in a special session, I think the comfort level was making sure we apply this to where we already have those protections in place and then potentially look at broadening that to cover other state or local entities that may also be posting personal information in the future. I hope that helps.

[Exhibit L and Exhibit M were submitted but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the hearing.]

Chair Miller:
It does, thank you. Not seeing any additional questions, I will open it up for testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] I will close support testimony and open it up for opposition testimony. Not seeing anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas, I will close opposition and open it up for neutral testimony. Also not seeing anyone, I will close testimony and welcome the bill presenter for final comments. [Final comments were waived.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 3.

With that members and staff, thank you so much for a very effective and efficient evening. We will adjourn today and we will begin tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:17 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Traci Dory
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Assembly Select Committee on Public Safety and Security 36th Special Session Legislative Committee Policies
A.B. 4	D	Kaylah Maese, Civil Rights Analyst, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada	Proposed conceptual amendment
A.B. 4	E	Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office; and Marcie Ryba, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office	Proposed amendment
A.B. 4	F	William C. Horne, representing SafeNest	Written testimony in support
A.B. 4	G	Various individuals	Letters in support
A.B. 4	H	Brennan Bartley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Testimony in opposition
A.B. 4	I	Melody Judilla, Deputy Director, Silver State Voices	Testimony in opposition
A.B. 4	J	Erika Marquez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Testimony in opposition
A.B. 4	K	Various individuals	Letters and emails in opposition
A.B. 3	L	Mark Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary of State for Elections, Office of the Secretary State	Proposed conceptual amendment
A.B. 3	M	Mark Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary of State for Elections, Office of the Secretary State	Various reports