

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
May 1, 2013**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Jason Frierson at 9:10 a.m. on Wednesday, May 1, 2013, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, 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 [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop  
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman Andrew Martin  
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel  
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17

Minutes ID: 1016



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst  
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary  
Colter Thomas, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Nancy M. Saitta, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada  
John R. McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts  
John T. Jones Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys' Association; and Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County  
Carey Stewart, Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services; and representing Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators  
Scott J. Shick, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department  
Terry A. Care, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Sandy Marz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Chad J. Schatzle, Student Services Librarian and Assistant Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Cheryl Bricker, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada  
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Legislative Services, Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
Michael Hackett, representing the Nevada State Medical Association  
Erin McMullen, representing Altria Client Services, Inc.  
Ramir Hernandez, representing the City of North Las Vegas  
Vanessa Spinazola, representing American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Christopher Frey, representing Washoe County Public Defender's Office  
John "Jack" Martin, Assistant Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County

**Chairman Frierson:**

[Roll was called and standing rules reviewed.] We have three bills on the agenda today and will begin with Senate Bill 31 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 31 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing children within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and children in protective custody. (BDR 5-385)**

**Nancy M. Saitta, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada:**

Senate Bill 31 (1st Reprint), in short order, is nothing more than an enhanced communication bill. It is something that will not only bring Nevada into statutory compliance with a number of federal mandates relating to children who are in need of protection, our "432B" kids, but it will allow all of the people who touch the lives of those kids to talk to one another, to access information, if and when access to that information is appropriate, and finally it will allow meaningful research to be done on matters that heretofore have never been available to those people who may need to research and analyze how we treat our children in these tender situations. Quite simply, this bill does absolutely nothing to common or usual practice. Any of our partners who typically exchange or share information, should not consider this bill to be in any way changing what that practice is. This is a permissive bill that allows appropriate exchange of information; more so between courts and educators than ever before.

I am pleased to tell you that we have used a model from our neighbor state, Arizona, that has been in practice for several years now without any difficulties whatsoever. We have also taken some language from the District of Columbia because they are closest, obviously, to the federal heart of our country and they are best able to apply statutory language to that which the feds require. I am also pleased to tell you that when this bill was drafted it was a partnership among and between all of the stakeholders. When we first met in the Senate, although we had some diverse positions over the last couple of weeks, we have all come together and made amendments, changes, and modifications that we believe satisfies all of the stakeholders, but also maintains the sanctity of this bill, which is to provide a meaningful way for our educators and our judges—any of the individuals who work so hard in the child welfare and juvenile justice system—to communicate with one another so that we can all do a better job for those kids. You have before you the amended version where we have taken federal language and imposed it into our state statutory scheme. Beyond that, this simply allows better and more meaningful communication between the partners of those who serve kids.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you. I know this is a passion of yours. I appreciate you bringing this forward and your interest in helping folks communicate better.

**John R. McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts:**

I would like to point out that some parties brought concerns regarding this measure to us late yesterday afternoon and we will be meeting with them to get those concerns ironed out.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

On page 2, line 7, it states, "construed as broadly as possible in favor of the release of juvenile justice information." From a policy perspective, why is that not "narrowly" instead of "broadly?"

**John McCormick:**

There are exceptions in federal law for information sharing between juvenile justice and education, for example, and we are trying to allow those exceptions in federal law to be construed as openly as possible to facilitate that communication within the framework of this bill. It is language I borrowed from Arizona.

**Chairman Frierson:**

On page 10, line 7, this bill proposes to remove the word "willfully" so that a person who releases information would be subject to what is currently a misdemeanor to a gross misdemeanor. I see the word disseminates added, which insinuates intent, but it is separate from releases. My concern in reading this is if someone released data but was not necessarily willful—they accidentally released it—without any type of intent, they would be subject to not only what is currently a misdemeanor, but now even a gross misdemeanor. Was the intention that disseminate would incorporate willful, because that seems it should be separate from release.

**John McCormick:**

That is my understanding. This is language that we worked on with the Clark County District Attorney's Office. The intent was to bring our language in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 432B in line with Arizona when they passed the first part of this bill. It is my understanding that disseminates was supposed to include that. I do not think anyone wants to prosecute someone for a mistake.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Similarly, on page 15, the penalty is increased to a gross misdemeanor for anyone who disseminates, which I think insinuates intent, but also anyone who makes the information public. Without the word "willfully," it is the intent that we are not talking about accidental mistakes. We are talking about folks who either intentionally or neglectfully release this information.

**John McCormick:**

That is exactly what we are after.

**Nancy Saitta:**

In addition, I would also note that this is designed to protect against those instances where someone might use this information in another proceeding for their own device.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Will you explain why we are raising the penalty from a misdemeanor to a gross misdemeanor, and if the misdemeanor was ever fully used, or was it inadequate?

**John McCormick:**

I would like to defer that to John Jones with the Clark County District Attorney. But it is my understanding that it was to strengthen it to reinforce the fact that this is an important topic and we do not want this information used maliciously.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

As a court appointed special advocate, I really appreciate this bill. On page 8, line 9, regarding awaiting foster care placement, can you explain where it says, "during which a child is removed from his or her home until he or she is legally adopted or enters a permanent placement." Does this refer to the reunification or independent living? I think we need to firm up "permanent placement."

**John McCormick:**

What we are doing is trying to ensure eligibility for kids who have been removed from the home under the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Specifically, the provision you are questioning defines awaiting foster care placement in a way that is consistent with the American Bar Association's (ABA) recommended practice, and the District of Columbia's definition to ensure our kids are eligible for that assistance from the time they are removed from the home until they get a permanent placement, or adoption. That permanent placement is when the court makes the final disposition; they can age-out, go to independent living, or whatever the final permanent reunification might be.

**Nancy Saitta:**

The awaiting foster care placement language in the front of that section is designed not only as a result of what is considered to be the ABA best practices language, but it is to be overly inclusive, which is to be sure that a child who is removed, but before a legal status is attached to him, has the benefit of everything that flows from McKinney-Vento.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Page 14, line 5, discusses unsubstantiated reports and malicious reports. I thought the reports were always kept confidential. Is this creating a new cause of action?

**John McCormick:**

That, again, is something we worked on with the Clark County District Attorney and borrowed from Arizona.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I will ask Mr. Jones to address that as well when he testifies. When we are discussing confidentiality and the dissemination of information, is this dealing strictly with records and documentation or is this also information obtained throughout the child welfare system and the processes that are in place? For example, information is discussed at a child and family team meeting where the worker, the family, and the child get together to talk about a case plan. If information from the meeting were to be disseminated, would that fall within this structure of confidentiality?

**John McCormick:**

The way we define information is on page 10, line 1, which states, "information maintained by an agency which provides child welfare services, including, without limitation, reports and investigations made pursuant to this chapter." So this would be the information accumulated by the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, or the equivalent child welfare agency during the course of the investigation.

**Nancy Saitta:**

I think it would include pertinent or appropriate parts of those discussions as long as they are part of what ultimately becomes the child's or the family's case plan.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? I see none. I will now invite those in support to come forward.

**John T. Jones, Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys' Association; and Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County:**

I am here in support of S.B. 31 (R1). We are in favor of this bill because it helps maintain communication between the agencies; specifically the Department of Juvenile Justice Services, the Juvenile Justice Court, and the Dependency Court. One of the best examples to give is when one side has knowledge of a mental health diagnosis and the other side does not have that

specific knowledge, especially when one side is working out a treatment plan and the other side is not aware of it. It will help facilitate communication between the agencies, so together they can work in the best interest of the child.

Regarding the gross misdemeanor, that was adopted from the Arizona statute. One of the reasons we are asking you to increase it to a gross misdemeanor is that there are circumstances when information should be shared between agencies; but in situations where it should not be shared, we want the level of punishment to be appropriate. We are dealing with very personal information, including mental health diagnoses, and the fact that the child may or may not be the subject of the jurisdiction of the court. It is our position that a gross misdemeanor is a level that is sufficient in terms of protecting this information.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Will you address page 14, beginning on line 5? There was a question about whether this would create a civil cause of action.

**John Jones:**

It basically clarifies the process. When someone feels they are the subject of numerous unsubstantiated reports of child abuse and neglect, they can go to a judge, and this will help facilitate that information sharing between the courts as part of that cause of action and the individual who is making the request.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I always thought those were confidential.

**John Jones:**

They are confidential. We do have situations where people are claiming they are the victim of numerous unsubstantiated reports of child abuse and neglect. This, through the judge, helps them access that information.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Have there been many instances in which a juvenile's confidential information has been disseminated when it should not be?

**John Jones:**

I do know there have been instances where information was inappropriately shared; however, I do not have a specific example.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I have some examples. If a foster parent or someone who participated in a child and family team meeting went out and discussed things that occurred in that meeting, which is confidential, that could conceivably be a violation of this proceeding.

**John Jones:**

That is a great example. Just for a matter of practice in Clark County, it is typical, if not standard, that when a parent comes into a child and family team meeting, the caseworker makes a statement that everything said in the meeting is confidential.

**Carey Stewart, Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services; and representing Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators:**

We are definitely in support of S.B. 31 (R1). What this does for Juvenile Justice Administrators is allow us a mechanism to share information in a timely manner with our partners, most notably our social services partners in the coordinated care management of kids. This legislation, we feel, has been a long time coming, and we appreciate the efforts of Justice Saitta in bringing this to the forefront.

**Scott J. Shick, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Juvenile Probation Department, Douglas County:**

Just to drive home Mr. Stewart's points, the collection of good aggregate data drives good decisions on behalf of juveniles that we work with, specifically at-risk kids who need services. The wrap-around case management approach has been part of our juvenile justice system in the state for ten years. This enhances our ability to exchange information and get these at-risk kids on their feet as soon as possible. I would also speak to the training for juvenile probation officers, child care workers, and foster care. All of us are trained in those confidentiality aspects, and are driven in our daily work by that. The sanctity of the juvenile record is what we do on a daily basis. If something needs to be shared, we do it on behalf of the child.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Is anyone else here wishing to offer testimony in support of this bill? Is there anyone here in opposition? Is anyone here in a neutral position? Seeing no one, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 31 (R1). I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 105.



**Senate Bill 105: Enacts the Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act.  
(BDR 59-168)**

**Terry A. Care, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have Mr. Combs with me because this bill implicates the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). I know he cannot advocate for or against the bill, but perhaps he can explain how some of the measures would apply. There was a fiscal note attached to this bill for \$7,500 from the Administrative Office of the Courts, but that has been withdrawn.

I have also provided a couple letters of support, one from the American Association of Law Libraries ([Exhibit C](#)) and the other from the Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress ([Exhibit D](#)). This is one of the newer acts of the Uniform Law Commission. Last year it was adopted in Colorado and California; this year it has been adopted in Hawaii, Minnesota, North Dakota and there are another nine introductions this year, including Nevada. Basically, the reason for the act is that increasingly, state governments publish laws, statutes, agency rules, and court rules online. In some cases in other states some material is available only online. This will provide greater public access to those materials, but it has also raised a few questions. For example, are the materials really authentic, how should the materials be preserved, and how will there be access to these materials a couple decades from now? This act is in response to those questions and that trend.

Senate Bill 105 requires official electronic material to be authenticated by providing a method to determine that it is unaltered, preserved either in electronic or print form, available for use by the public on a permanent basis, and a few other points. If electronic legal material is authenticated, it is presumed to be an accurate copy. If another state enacts the uniform act, its legal materials are presumed to be an accurate copy for use in Nevada. This should ultimately lead to harmonization with all the states as to what can be accepted as legal materials. Finally, the act provides a provision for backup and recovery of legal materials.

This is a brief bill, sections 4 through 9 are definitions. Section 5 refers to the definition of "legal material." This is only referring to the *Nevada Constitution*, the *Statutes of Nevada*, the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, and the *Nevada Administrative Code*. Section 6 is important because the official publisher is designated as the LCB, thus the presence of Mr. Combs this morning. Section 10 refers to the applicability and effective date which is January 1, 2014, so we are talking about legal materials designated as official after that date. Section 11 is left to the LCB, as the official publisher, when to do this and how to designate an electronic record. Section 12 implicates the

LCB as the official publisher goes to authentication. The effective authentication is discussed in section 13, subsection 2, which makes the reference to if another state adopts the same act then that is recognized as authentic in this state. Section 14 goes to preservation of security of record in electronic form. I mentioned public access and that is addressed in section 15; again, another role for the official publisher. Section 16 goes to the standards to be considered by the LCB as the official publisher in implementing this chapter. Sections 17 and 18 are what you will find in any uniform act. That is the walk-through of the bill and the reason for the act.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I recall there being concerns on the implications of this bill on whether this would relieve the state of having to publish the statutes in paper form. We did note that *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 220.130 requires the printing of those documents. It seems that this is enabling the ability to electronically create authorized documents rather than relieving us of the burden of having to print the documents.

**Terry Care:**

I would agree with that. There is nothing in this bill that deletes or amends existing law. [Also provided but did not discuss ([Exhibit E](#)), ([Exhibit F](#)), ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Senator Care asked me to fill you in on what the impact to LCB will be. Section 11 obviously is the key for us. It basically says that if we decide to not print something in a hardcopy format, then we would need to go through this process. That is not something we have been asked to do, nor are we getting any pressure to eliminate the hardcopy of any documents. I do not anticipate that is going to become a requirement. This section also authorizes us to authenticate a document as well, even though we are not required to. If we are to authenticate a document, we have to follow the provisions of the bill—we are fine with doing that if we decide to go that route. Section 16, as mentioned, includes the standards of practice that we would need to follow; things we would need to look at in determining how we would authenticate documents. The authentication would provide people using the materials with a little assurance that the online copy matches the hardcopy. This is a bill that we believe we can handle within our existing resources without too much trouble.

**Terry Care:**

Sandy Marz and Chad Schatzle are here to give statements on this bill. Also present are Susan Southwick, retired Supreme Court Library director and

Sara Jones, former Nevada State librarian and current director of the Carson City Library.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I will now invite those who are here to provide supportive testimony.

**Sandy Marz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am here in support of S.B. 105, which enacts the Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act. I am the retired Director of the Washoe County Law Library and a member of the American Association of Law Libraries. [Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Have many states done away with their hardcopy code? Have any of your patrons had trouble in terms of citing that code?

**Sandy Marz:**

I think there are only a few states that only use electronic code. I do not remember how many. Colorado has their administrative rules online, but the rest of their codes are on paper. As far as citing, there is a way to cite with online research. It is done through paragraphs rather than pages. Not all states have adopted that method of citing.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

In your experience, have there been inconsistencies between a hardcopy and an electronic version?

**Sandy Marz:**

I personally have not noted any. Groups such as the American Association of Law Libraries have noted some.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, is there anyone else wishing to testify in support?

**Chad J. Schatzle, Student Services Librarian and Assistant Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

Mr. Chairman, I am here in support of S.B. 105, which would enact the Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act. As the Student Services Librarian of the Wiener-Rogers Law Library at the William S. Boyd School of Law, I provide legal research assistance to members of the law school community, including law faculty, law students and members of the public. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit I](#)).]

[The Vice Chairman assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chairman Ohrenschall:**

Are you finding that people are running into the problem of having a print version that is not the same as the electronic version? Are you finding in the states that have adopted this uniform act that the issue is being solved?

**Chad Schatzle:**

It is not so much that the patrons come in and we show them the books and it is different than what is actually online. It is more a matter of people either in our community, or out of state, who are Googling on line and are unable to find authenticated material. There is information out there that is not from LCB and is not always correct.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Sometimes our access to Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System is bumpy, because technology is not 100 percent all the time. I want to be comfortable with the notion that if we go to electronic means, will there always be an avenue by which people can look for things when they need them. Systems can be down, which can throw everything off kilter. Do you see anything that sometimes prevents people from accessing the information when they need it? I know sometimes I will be looking for something, and the system is running slow and bogs down the process.

**Chad Schatzle:**

Not generally. I have always found the LCB website to be very reliable. The big access issue is for public patrons who cannot come into the library physically. That is much more of an issue for this information to be available online, in an authenticated format.

[Chairman Frierson reassumed the Chair.]

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

In the states that have done away with the hardcopy and only have an electronic version, do you feel comfortable that if a mainframe or public server goes down, the public will still be able to have access to the accurate code?

**Chad Schatzle:**

I would defer the matter of technology to the LCB staff. I can speak for the print versions; we have all 50 states in our law library. I know some states have done away with all 50, keeping just a few neighboring states' books.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, is there anyone else in support? Is there anyone in opposition? Is there anyone in a neutral position? Seeing no one, Mr. Care, do you have any closing remarks?

**Terry Care:**

In response to Assemblyman Ohrenschall's question, section 14 of the bill states:

1. The official publisher of legal material in an electronic record that is or was designated as official under section 11 of this act shall provide for the preservation and security of the record in an electronic form or a form that is not electronic.
2. If legal material is preserved in an electronic record, the official publisher shall . . . Ensure the continuing usability of the material."

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

Has there been a cost-benefit analysis on this? Will this actually save us a certain amount of dollars being that we will not be printing as many documents as in the past? Or, will this become a wash because there will be a need for more staff to deal with updating the computer?

**Terry Care:**

Not that I am aware of. The only fiscal impact was from the Administrative Office of the Courts; they have since withdrawn the fiscal note.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Thank you. With that I will close the hearing on S.B. 105 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 177 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 177 (1st Reprint): Prohibits a minor from committing certain acts relating to the possession and use of tobacco products. (BDR 5-689)**

**Senator James A. Settlemeyer, Senatorial District No. 17:**

This smoking bill has come before us in the past. I understand it may be a little contentious today. This issue started in 2007 when Senator McGinness had a bill pertaining to this subject, talking about creating possession laws for youth in the realm of tobacco and tobacco-related products. His bill came over to the Assembly, and unfortunately did not progress.

We still have the same issues in rural communities. I do not think anyone here will deny the reality that across from every high school and middle school there

are smokers' corners. The issue comes about when my constituents say they cannot even break them up. A friend of mine, who is a police officer, tried to break up the smokers at smokers' corner. A 12-year-old kid literally took a drag off of his cigarette and blew smoke in the officer's face and told him, "You cannot touch me." He was right. This infuriated the officer. He told me privately that he was ready to taser the kid. There was nothing he could do. He had no recourse. That is what this bill addresses.

We have an interesting situation here in Nevada where you cannot buy cigarettes until you are 18 years old. However, there is no age of possession. You can be an 8-year-old kid and get a pack of cigarettes from someone, who is not in trouble for giving them to you; he would only be in trouble if he sold them to you. That is what we are trying to correct. I have provided a compendium of all 50 states and what their laws are on possession and smoking ([Exhibit J](#)). Nevada and ten other states have no laws on point. When we began this process, we looked at all the other states and tried to fabricate something that was on the low end. We were not trying to be the radical state with \$500 fines, et cetera. We were trying to do something very modest and be on the lower end of the spectrum. However, if this issue is too contentious, I would gladly entertain the idea of doing something, anything, so that it becomes apparent that it is not good for kids to smoke. Kentucky and Wisconsin simply have confiscation. That is something, which is better than nothing. Again, I am willing to work on amendments, if necessary.

Some people have felt that this bill goes too far. This bill is only a citation offense. This is not something that is used as a multiplier by a judge for another crime they may commit. This is only a citation offense. Some individuals will tell you it should not even be a citation offense. If that is how they truly feel, they need to come with a bill saying that alcohol should be the same way; that alcohol should not even be a citation offense. I am a little concerned and I think it is disingenuous of them to say it is wrong to make smoking a citation offense, but they have never fought the concept of alcohol being a citation offense. Can you imagine if we allowed kids to shoulder tap and get alcohol without any type of penalty for possession? That is what we have done for cigarettes.

I have been working with members of organizations who work toward trying to keep teens away from tobacco. I have been involved with the Kick Butt Day at the Nevada Legislature, which is where people come forward to try to keep kids from smoking. The juvenile justice individuals came forward and they had some opposition to the bill. We worked with them, and we accepted their amendments. However, Clark County did not necessarily come to the table. I do know they will be here today and have a problem with the bill.

I understand they are indicating that it would potentially double their workload. If that is true, that means they did not have much of a workload to begin with or they have a serious problem with teen smokers in Clark County. I know another entity is going to come forward that is worried about the effect of this bill. They feel the bill will unfairly affect individuals and minorities. Think of the opportunity you have. You have a bill in front of you that has the ability to help minority kids not get cancer.

Again, I am okay modifying this bill. Whatever is necessary to get something out there so we can encourage kids to quit smoking. We do have support today from the cigarette manufacturers. I have provided a walk-through of this bill that I can review with you if that is the desire of the Chair ([Exhibit K](#)).

**Chairman Frierson:**

This is often confusing to see the changes because we did not see the original bill. It may help if you go through the sections of the bill.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Section 1 is a reference to the defining section, which is section 10. All the other sections deal with an offense related to tobacco.

Section 4 is the procedure for the officer; again, this is only a citation offense. It states that if the officer has stopped a child who has tobacco, he will issue him a citation, but he is not allowed to take him into custody.

Section 5 pertains to the court. This is discretionary to the court, and it is a staggered system. Upon the first offense, the individual will be given a \$25 citation and must attend a tobacco cessation program. The second offense is a \$50 fine and attendance of a cessation program. The third offense is a \$75 fine and attendance of a cessation program. Also with the third offense, there is a postponement or revocation of a driver's license. The court may order the offender or his parents to pay the cost of the cessation program. Failure to pay the fines can also result in the loss of driving privileges. One of the things I made sure was in section 5 is that if a license is suspended or delayed, there needed to be exemptions for individuals who need to drive to work or school, who may have medical issues, or if they need to get food.

Section 6 discusses the concept of the juvenile court imposing a fine against the child and to order the child to pay administrative assessments of \$10 in addition to the fine.

Sections 7, 8, and 9 have been deleted at the request of juvenile officers.

Section 10 is the minor in possession definitions. The exceptions to possession are if they are required to handle tobacco in their jobs, or if they are in the company of their parents. That is the bill in a nutshell. [Also provided but not discussed ([Exhibit L](#)).]

**Assemblyman Martin:**

Was community service ever part of this bill? When kids are forced to pay a fine, it is probably the parents who pay it. But picking up cigarette butts in parks or going to an old folks' home to see the effects of what smoking does may have a bigger impact than paying a fine.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

That was part of the original bill. The individuals within the juvenile service said that community service is never used. In other words, the judge does not sentence it and the kids do not want it. The education portion will be done through the cessation program.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Do you have any data that shows when kids experiment and start smoking cigarettes that they become adult smokers?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I do not have any of that data.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Why does this bill designate the children as children in need of supervision (CHINS) versus delinquency?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

The wording for that was added by the amendment. Legal decided to go with that definition.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

The assumption of a CHINS is that the parent has done something wrong, whereas a child who is charged with committing a delinquent act, it is the child's act.

**Chairman Frierson:**

That struck me as different also, deeming a child as a CHINS, I presume with the intent of making it easier to make this a citation offense instead of making it a delinquent act that would burden the court system. Traditionally, we think of a CHINS as a victim of abuse and neglect.



**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I will try to find out why Legal drafted the amendment using those words. It may have been done to ensure that this can only be a citation offense.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

Regarding the tobacco awareness program, in my opinion, we try to divert and change the behavior. In the cessation program, is there a pre- and post-test to ensure they are actually getting something from the program? Also for the second and third offense, is there a different program?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

We wanted to leave flexibility for the judges to determine what program would be best for the individual. I do have someone here who can give you some examples of the cessation programs that are currently being held.

**Cheryl Bricker, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada:**

I am here to testify as a private citizen. I do wear another hat as the executive director of the Partnership of Community Resources coalition for substance abuse prevention and wellness promotion. I am happy to answer any questions that will educate you as I am not lobbying on federal dollars. Many of you know that when an individual enters a cessation program, whether an adult or child, sometimes it takes several attempts before they actually quit. The cessation program that we focus on for younger people is called N-O-T, which stands for Not on Tobacco. It is an American Lung Association evidence-based program. The idea is for those who are smoking a pack a day and perhaps are addicted to have them cut back. As they move through the program, maybe they will quit. This is about an individual decision. This is not about forcing someone to quit because it is against the law. It is the same situation with youngsters who get hooked on alcohol or another drug. You need to provide a treatment plan for them that is effective and makes a difference. We also do Freedom From Smoking for adults. So, it is whatever the court, juvenile probation officer, parent, or the youth himself wants to negotiate in terms of what is going to make it better for them.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

We are basing the cessation programs off of the national models.

**Assemblyman Thompson:**

Are you looking at a uniform modeled program or is it going to be up to the judge to determine?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I feel judges need flexibility for individual situations. Maybe they find a repeat offender and the judge wants to give him more of a stringent program, maybe go to the local morgue and see a black lung—that is up to the judge. I think the cessation program is to indicate that we feel education is necessary. Our goal is to get kids not to smoke.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Section 4 discusses the citations. I can see a kid getting a citation and making a joke of it and throwing it away. What is the process if the kids do not show up?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

To my understanding, if an individual were to throw the citation away and not show up, he would get a letter stating he could not get his driver's license until this situation is remedied.

**Chairman Frierson:**

In reviewing the other states, I certainly see the reason behind the structure created in the bill. I am wondering if we can simply say a fine of up to \$50 and the right to confiscate the tobacco, without involving the court system, or a juvenile record. It seems that might be an easier way to go. Then we do not have to have a probation officer acting as a hearing master and any of the other things that do not necessarily need to be impacted.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

During the first round of negotiations and discussions, I accepted an amendment that did just that from the juvenile justice individuals. Then they said they did not want that. They wanted a staggered system like several other states. Again, I am totally open to what this body feels is the best thing to do to accomplish this goal and ensure children realize that they do not have the right to possess tobacco.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will invite those in support of this bill to testify.

**Cheryl Bricker:**

I am in favor of this bill. I am here today in favor of aligning Nevada tobacco laws, clarifying the disconnect between unlawful purchase of tobacco and tobacco use among youth under 18. [Continued to read from prepared text ([Exhibit M](#)).] As an aside, my son, who had never broken a law, smoked because it was not illegal and he thought he was cool. He does not smoke

today. [Continued to read from text ([Exhibit M](#)). Also provided a large jar of cigarette butts ([Exhibit N](#)).]

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any questions? Seeing none, is there anyone else wishing to offer testimony in support of this bill?

**Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Legislative Services, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:**

I am also representing the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association. I am here to support S.B. 177 (R1) and to thank Senator Settlemeyer for bringing this bill forward for the health of our youth. It is not the intent of law enforcement to conduct raids on smokers' corners or brace kids against a wall to pat them down for a pack of Winston's or a can of Skoal. This will allow law enforcement to take appropriate action at those times when it is appropriate. As a citable offense it is well within the officer's discretion at a scene to take action in an official manner or simply resolve the contact with a warning depending on the facts and circumstances of the situation. The bottom line is that codifying this in statute will help law enforcement help the health of our young and provide a deterrent for some of our youths who would consider starting smoking or chewing tobacco.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

In regard to citations, section 4 talks about a peace officer may prepare and issue a citation. If you pull a juvenile over who could legally drive, under the age of legal smoking age, would you be able to cite them for smoking as a secondary offense?

**Eric Spratley:**

If I had a legal reason to pull them over, we could certainly extend the citation for either a traffic violation or the tobacco violation.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

If someone was pulled over for a moving violation or texting and you happen to see they are smoking, you could get them for the hand-held device infraction but you could also get them for smoking.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I am wondering if it has been contemplated that you could actually pull someone over for smoking and not any other offense.

**Eric Spratley:**

I have not studied the language in the amended version to know if we could stop for smoking. I do not believe that law enforcement would do so.

**Carey Stewart, Director, Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services; and representing Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators:**

I and my colleague Scott Shick worked with Senator Settlemeyer following the hearing in the Senate about the concerns on behalf of juvenile justice. Initially our concern was that we had seen a mechanism in the original bill that would truly net-widen kids being involved in the juvenile justice system. We are the responsible parties for the CHINS recommendations and the lack of community service because we felt that the CHINS component would be a barrier that could be put into place so that kids did not end up in detention by following Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention guidelines that limit detention for kids. In regard to not recommending community service, our concern was what if kids do not do the community service? What mechanisms will be put into place? Unfortunately, when kids are noncompliant within the juvenile justice system, formal charges are filed against them. Further noncompliance results in detention and being placed on probation. We wanted to ensure that there were mechanisms in place that would be able to address the educational components as were discussed earlier without involving kids in the formal aspect of the juvenile justice system, which happens when you take low-level offenders and try to apply the consequences of the juvenile justice system.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I think we all agree that children smoking is a terrible problem that needs to be checked. Do you feel you have the resources to try to police this in addition to everything else you do?

**Carey Stewart:**

I think there are educational resources that can be applied. Any time a child touches the juvenile justice system, we are setting up the opportunity for further involvement or noncompliance to be involved in the formal components. I do not know if I can support the idea of confiscation and educational components, if there is a mechanism for juvenile justice to help and assist that. We do not want kids smoking.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

What do you feel is the benefit of classifying these kids as CHINS rather than charging them with a delinquent act? What concerns do you have about the assumption that the parents may have done something wrong if their children are classified as CHINS?

**Carey Stewart:**

If the juvenile justice system is going to be involved, we feel the classification of CHINS is necessary. We deal with CHINS offenses all the time and we do

not classify that as an issue against the parents. The last legislative session had a texting bill which would keep that behavior out of the formal delinquency components of the system, so that was also added to CHINS. There are bills right now that put loitering and curfew with CHINS. We see it as a mechanism to put in place so the kids do not end up in detention.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

As I read the bill, it seems to call for juvenile probation officers. My experience is that the juvenile probation officers do not usually work with CHINS. How would this work?

**Carey Stewart:**

Within the juvenile justice system, CHINS are assigned to either intake workers or probation officers. We do not utilize the formal aspects of the system in dealing with those particular cases. Those are referred to the juvenile probation department. When working with Senator Settlemeyer, if we were going to be involved, we wanted a mechanism of accountability that was to the point, have the CHINS exit our system, and hopefully there were some behaviors that were learned. That is why our probation officers handle cases all the time that do not involve case management or supervision, but a sanction or referral.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Currently, if a child is placed on juvenile probation and he is caught with tobacco, does that bring about a violation of his juvenile probation?

**Carey Stewart:**

As a condition of probation, we do not have them sign terms that they shall not use tobacco products.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

One of the points in opposition that was raised is that these citations are the type that should be self-reported on employment and college applications. I am under the impression that all juvenile matters were kept confidential. What is your understanding on that?

**Carey Stewart:**

Currently, records are automatically sealed at the age of 21. We do, on a daily basis, receive requests from parents and children for their juvenile records for various things such as acceptance into the military, Job Corps, and sometimes for higher educational settings. The only way that information is released is on the basis of a court order. Parents ask all the time, if their child had a citation, does he need to report that on a job application. We tell them that the information is confidential, however, we do a qualifier that if a court order is

granted, we would release that information to them. It really comes down to the judge on the request of what the information is going to be used for.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Would it work to make this a citation and a fine?

**Carey Stewart:**

I think it would, but what happens if the fine is not paid? I do like it, I think if there is a way to draft it so there is not an involvement in the system. My only question is what if the fine is not paid?

**Chairman Frierson:**

What currently happens with a minor in possession of alcohol if the fine is not paid?

**Carey Stewart:**

Currently, we would allocate community service, but also what happens with a minor in possession of alcohol is the suspension of the driver's license. We will decide if it is a worthwhile case to take to the formal aspects, file a charge, and go to court; or we will cut our losses, knowing that we already have a driver's license suspension in place through statute. We find for a minor in possession of alcohol cases, we have about an 80 percent success rate that kids do not come back into our system for those particular offenses. In talking with the kids, we attribute it to the fact they do not like losing their license.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I guess I see the difference between alcohol and tobacco, otherwise they could have just proposed a change in statute to minor in possession of alcohol or tobacco products.

**Michael Hackett, representing the Nevada State Medical Association:**

We support S.B. 177 (R1), and I appreciate the comments made by Ms. Bricker regarding the health consequences of tobacco use. I would add that because many of these diseases caused by tobacco use are chronic in nature, they often require a lifetime of treatment and care, which can come at a considerable cost. Tobacco use by minors has long been a challenge in Nevada. Getting kids to quit tobacco, or to never start using in the first place, has been a priority for tobacco control in certain health care organizations. As stated, this bill addresses an inconsistency in state law where it is illegal to sell tobacco products to minors, but it is not illegal for minors to possess and use tobacco. Senate Bill 177 (R1) makes it illegal for people under the age of 18 to possess or use tobacco, which we feel will help encourage kids to stop using or perhaps never even start using tobacco. We appreciate the flexibility the bill provides

regarding citations and punishment. Young people do not always know how harmful tobacco use can be. Sometimes a wake-up call is all that is needed to get them to understand the consequences they may be facing. We especially appreciate the option the courts have to require an offender to attend a program of tobacco awareness and cessation. Tobacco cessation programs have proven to be successful in getting people of all ages to stop using tobacco.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any questions? Seeing none, is there anyone else wishing to offer testimony in support?

**Scott J. Shick, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department:**

I think what we were looking for in working with Mr. Settlemeyer was prevention with reasonable leverage. From a treatment provider standpoint, how do you require someone go into treatment or a cessation program when the day is done? I think sometimes that is what kids need, just a little bit of leverage to get them to the cessation class. Our recommendation to Mr. Settlemeyer was not to require attendance because enforceability of smoking cessation on the back end would be more difficult for Clark County or Washoe County to accomplish. That is why we recommend keeping it at the lowest level possible. I think your recommendation on the fine and confiscation and potential loss of driver's license is a nice place to be as far as middle ground is concerned, while still supporting and recommending the smoking-cessation programs that are available in the jurisdictions and region within the framework of the jurisdictions. I supervise the drug and alcohol counselors at China Spring Youth Camp and Aurora Pines Girls Facility who see hundreds of kids each year. I do not have exact data, but I would say 65 percent of the kids in their self-reporting assessments state they have smoked cigarettes and would still if they could. In the delinquency population, there is a need to address this.

**Erin McMullen, representing Altria Client Services, Inc.:**

Altria Client Services, Inc. is the parent company of Phillip Morris. We are in support of S.B. 177 (R1) as we have long supported any type of youth access prevention efforts in the states. We are also offering a friendly amendment ([Exhibit O](#)), and within the guidelines of your rules, I have talked to the sponsor about this and he deems it a friendly amendment as well. Basically, the purpose of our amendment is to align the definition of tobacco products in this bill which would be a Nevada statute with the federal definition of tobacco products to include products derived from tobacco. That would be something where the nicotine in the product is derived from tobacco but not expressly made from tobacco. The additional language is to conform the other relevant statutes dealing with youth access prevention and conform those within the definition.

There is an additional segment, which clarifies that this would not include products such as Nicorette gum, which are drugs regulated under Chapter V of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and used for cessation but are not necessarily tobacco products or derived from tobacco.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

Are children younger than 18 allowed to go through cessation programs with the use of the drugs such as Nicorette gum?

**Erin McMullen:**

I would have to find the answer for you. I do not know if children are prevented from purchasing it.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

Many times you go through a cessation program that does not require any type of drugs. I am not sure if a prescription is required to purchase them.

**Erin McMullen:**

I would have to get back to you with that information.

**Ramir Hernandez, representing the City of North Las Vegas:**

We support this bill because it gives law enforcement the teeth it has always needed to enforce teen tobacco smoking cessation. Also, ditto to what Lieutenant Spratley and others have said regarding the enforcement mechanisms of this bill.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Is there anyone else wishing to offer testimony in support? Is there anyone here in opposition?

**Vanessa Spinazola, representing American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

I am here in opposition to S.B. 177 (R1). I appreciate what Senator Settelmeyer is trying to do and also appreciate the significant downgrade in the penalties that came over from the Senate side. However, I put a letter on NELIS ([Exhibit P](#)). We are concerned about the disproportionate impact in communities of color. The Clark County Juvenile Statistics ([Exhibit Q](#)) demonstrate that while African-American youth in Clark County are 12 percent of the population, they are cited into the juvenile justice system at the rate of 28 percent, which is more than twice the rate of their existence in the population. We support kids not smoking, but we think that an education campaign across the board might be more effective than criminalization. All sorts of kids smoke. I smoked in high school. I did not get caught. Only certain kids get caught. I think you will



have a better chance at reaching everybody if you have education in the schools.

**Assemblywoman Fiore:**

Did you really just make this a racial thing?

**Vanessa Spinazola:**

I think that kids of color get cited at a disproportionate rate for all sorts of citations. So, we are against expanding the citations for something like this.

**Chairman Frierson:**

In the interest of preventing us from going really deep in the weeds, in 2001 there was a study on racial profiling that confirmed the existence of racial profiling and subsequently outlawed racial profiling. This is not about racial profiling but certainly you have the right to your opinion on the impact. My question is, are you also opposed to some of the proposals that were discussed today about making this a citation, giving the authorities the right to confiscate with a fine?

**Vanessa Spinazola:**

Conceptually I agree with the amendment being proposed earlier.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

Do you have any proof that a citation offense in Nevada has actually led to a loss of employment?

**Vanessa Spinazola:**

I do not.

**Christopher Frey, representing Washoe County Public Defender's Office:**

I met with the sponsor and voiced my concerns with respect to section 10 which seems to lack a religious exemption that is contained in the minor in possession of alcohol statute. My concern is that it seems like an easy fix to bring this statute into conformity with the minor in possession of alcohol statute which does contain an exemption for religious use. That is my lingering concern.

Another concern is whether this is a secondary versus a primary offense. Section 4 states that this is a primary offense, so it is an offense that is cause for an officer to subject an individual to a detention. Section 4, subsection 1 reads, "If a child is stopped or otherwise detained by a peace officer for an offense related to tobacco . . . ." I think this language makes it clear this is an offense that can have someone pulled over in a traffic stop setting. My concern

is that there is no way for an officer to independently verify in a situation such as a juvenile riding in a vehicle with an adult. The officer has no way to tell if there is a familial relationship between the two, and there is a pack of cigarettes sitting on the dashboard. Under this statute, that would be justification to detain both occupants in the vehicle. This certainly can go poorly for the driver, and also for the juvenile, depending on who actually possesses the cigarettes. In any event, this is a detention, it is an interference with the liberty of the motorist, and I think this bill would actually allow an officer to get his foot in the door simply upon observing a pack of cigarettes inside a vehicle. I do think this is a primary offense. We would be in support of making this a secondary offense, along the lines of a seatbelt violation, the language of which can be found in NRS 484D.495.

To summarize, we are in favor of religious exemption along the lines of the minor in possession of alcohol statute which can be found in NRS 202.020, as well as making this a secondary offense.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Can you give me an example of a religious tobacco use?

**Chris Frey:**

Native American ceremonial use comes to mind.

**Chairman Frierson:**

What is the NRS section for the religious exemption?

**Chris Frey:**

It is in NRS 202.020. The structure of that statute, which is the minor in possession of alcohol, is that public possession is prohibited and there is a series of exemptions to the definition of public, one of which is possession for an established religious purpose.

**John "Jack" Martin, Assistant Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County:**

I agree with much of the testimony in support. We, at the Department of Juvenile Justice Services, do not disagree that tobacco use with juveniles is obviously a public health concern that will travel with them throughout their life. We do have some concerns in the mechanism in which this bill is laid out. I heard earlier the recommendation that we could possibly live with.

I also share the concerns that Mr. Stewart discussed earlier in terms of what mechanisms are in play when probation is now the caretaker of the case. Last year we had 18,000 referrals come into juvenile justice in Clark County; 11,282

of those were unique cases. Two thousand of them were for habitual truancy, which I would argue is going to be similar to this level of offense as the possession of tobacco. We are talking about massive resources for an already taxed system. We are looking at protecting the community and rehabilitating kids who are already in the system. I have a fear that by criminalizing this, there will not be enough resources to adequately address it. What happens when the kid does not pay his fine? We have over \$400,000 currently owed to Clark County in juvenile restitution fees and fines. So what do we do when the child does not pay the fine? When he does not pay the second fine? When he does not do the community service, or he does not go to the cessation program? The teeth that my law enforcement partners talked about earlier that they would be given, I have not been given any teeth. At some point this is going to end up back in front of a judge and we have widened the net to capture kids inside the system which, in fact, disproportionately, are represented by minorities in Clark County by about 73 percent.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Conceptually, would some of the things that have been discussed today alleviate your concerns about how to put this type of statute in place, namely making it simply a citation fine, giving the authorities the right to confiscate, even including language similar to the seat belt secondary stop, along with the religious exemption? I wonder if that would even involve juvenile justice.

**Jack Martin:**

Conceptually, I could support that. We support anything that is going to help our children get away from tobacco products. I do not want to end up stopping someone from tobacco use and capturing them in the net. We already have issues in terms of capturing kids in the net and finite resources in terms of how I can deal with the kids already in the net. A citation, possibly some kind of smoking cessation classes offered in our education venues, could work. I do not disagree with the sponsor that this is an issue, but I would disagree with the teeth.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Do we currently have tobacco cessation programs in our juvenile justice system?

**Jack Martin:**

We do in Clark County. We offer smoking cessation at the Spring Mountain Youth Camp and our detention facilities, along with literature and access to the resources at our probation centers.

**Assemblywoman Diaz:**

Do you think that maybe more programming on the front end, doing more education advocacy with high schools, or even starting in middle school would be more effective?

**Jack Martin:**

Without a doubt. If we can keep kids away from the system, prevention and intervention are always going to beat out suppression. If we can get classes through this legislation that will mandate more education on the front end, we are 100 percent supportive.

**Chairman Frierson:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, is there anyone else wishing to offer testimony in opposition? Is there anyone wishing to offer testimony in the neutral position? Seeing no one, I will invite Senator Settlemeyer back up for closing remarks.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Thank you for hearing this subject. Again, I am willing to do whatever is necessary to pass this bill so we can indicate to the kids that smoking is not a good idea. My constituents have brought this issue to me numerous times. They are tired of smokers' corners. I would caution on the secondary driving offense; I suggest we make it just that. It is a secondary offense when it is related to a vehicle only. Otherwise we would not have the ability to break up smokers' corners. I did find out that Douglas County gets approximately \$12,000 for tobacco prevention and about \$40,000 from Alpine County. There are funds out there for prevention that we need to utilize to get these individuals on the right path.

**Chairman Frierson:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 177 (R1) and open it up for public comment. Seeing none, this meeting is adjourned [at 11 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Davis  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman

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

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Judiciary

**Date:** May 1, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 9:10 a.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 105	C	Terry Care	American Association of Law Libraries Letter of Support
S.B. 105	D	Terry Care	American Bar Association Letter of Support
S.B. 105	E	Terry Care	Uniform Law Commission Electronic Legal Material Act Summary
S.B. 105	F	Terry Care	Uniform Law Commission Legislative Fact Sheet
S.B. 105	G	Terry Care	Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act
S.B. 105	H	Sandy Marz	Written Testimony
S.B. 105	I	Chad Schatzle	Written Testimony
S.B. 177 (R1)	J	Senator Settlemeyer	State Penalties for Minors Possessing Tobacco Products
S.B. 177 (R1)	K	Senator Settlemeyer	Bill Walk-Through
S.B. 177 (R1)	L	Senator Settlemeyer	Youth Tobacco Cessation Programs in Nevada
S.B. 177 (R1)	M	Cheryl Bricker	Written Testimony
S.B. 177 (R1)	N	Cheryl Bricker	Picture of a Jar Filled with Cigarette Butts
S.B. 177 (R1)	O	Erin McMullen	Proposed Amendment

S.B. 177 (R1)	P	Vanessa Spinazola	Letter in Opposition
S.B. 177 (R1)	Q	Vanessa Spinazola	Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services Statistical Report