

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS, PAROLE, AND PROBATION**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
March 7, 2017**

The Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation was called to order by Chairman James Ohrenschall at 8:03 a.m. on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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 www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Keith Pickard
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Alycia Seabolt Barnwell, Intern, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Lisa Rasmussen, Legislative Committee Co-Chair, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Kristina Wildeveld, Attorney, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
John T. Jones, Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada
Monique Normand, Civic Engagement/Member Group Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Amy Rose, Legal Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Robert Langford, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Amanda Cuevas, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Jim Sullivan, representing Culinary Workers Union, Local 226
Dan Edwards, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada; representing Nevadans for the Common Good
Sondra Cosgrove, Chair, League of Women Voters of Nevada Legislative Advocacy Committee
Josh Wolfcale, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Barbara Robinson-Ramirez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Justin Reid, Private Citizen, Dayton, Nevada
Donald G.T. Gallimore, Second Vice President, Reno/Sparks Branch #1112, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Nick Vassiliadis, representing R & R Partners Foundation
Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State

Chairman Ohrenschall:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] Today we have one bill to hear, Assembly Bill 181. We are privileged to have our Speaker here to present the bill. We have a brief work session that we are going to do first. I will turn this over to our committee policy analyst, Diane Thornton.

Assembly Bill 25: Revises provisions relating to certain allowable deductions from the period of probation or sentence of a person. (BDR 14-171)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

We have four bills on our work session today. Our first bill is Assembly Bill 25, which revises provisions relating to certain allowable deductions from the period of probation or sentence of a person (Exhibit C). This bill defines what it means for a probationer to be current with any fee and payment of restitution, and clarifies the requirements that a probationer must satisfy to be allowed a deduction from his or her period of probation. There were no amendments for this measure.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Unless there is any discussion on this bill, I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 25.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chairman Ohrenschall:

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblyman Fumo.

Assembly Bill 27: Transfers certain duties from the Executive Secretary of the State Board of Parole Commissioners to the Department of Corrections. (BDR 16-262)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 27 transfers certain duties from the Executive Secretary of the State Board of Parole Commissioners to the Department of Corrections (Exhibit D). This was heard in Committee on February 14, 2017. This bill transfers the requirements of preparing a list of offenders eligible for parole from the Executive Secretary of the State Board of Parole Commissioners to the Department of Corrections. The Department of Corrections must provide the list to the Executive Secretary at least forty days before any scheduled action by the board. There were no amendments for this measure.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

If there is any discussion on the bill, please let me know. If not, I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 27.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chairman Ohrenschall:

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblywoman Tolles.

Assembly Bill 74: Revises provisions relating to the testing of offenders for exposure to human immunodeficiency virus. (BDR 16-257)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 74 revises provisions relating to the testing of offenders for exposure to human immunodeficiency virus ([Exhibit E](#)). This bill authorizes the Chief Medical Officer to determine if a supplemental test is appropriate when an offender has tested positive for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). The bill authorizes, rather than requires, the disclosure of the name of the offender when the results of a supplemental test are positive. The measure revises the definition of “incident.”

There is one conceptual amendment by John Borrowman, Deputy Director, Department of Corrections (NDOC), clarifying that the Chief Medical Officer, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, is the medical director within the NDOC.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I am sure the members will recall that James Dzurenda, Director of NDOC, made some very compelling testimony in support of Assembly Bill 74. Are there any questions or discussion? [There was none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 74.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assembly Bill 76: Revises provisions relating to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History. (BDR 14-260)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Our last bill on work session today is Assembly Bill 76, which revises provisions relating to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History ([Exhibit F](#)). This bill was

heard in Committee on February 14, 2017. This bill clarifies the authority of the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History to inspect certain sealed records. The term "biometric identifier" is added to the definition of a "record of criminal history." The bill eliminates the collection and maintenance of certain statistical data dealing with delinquency of children and establishes reporting requirements for each state and local law enforcement agency and correctional institution in compliance with the policies, procedures, and definitions of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The measure removes a list of persons and governmental entities to whom records of criminal history must be disseminated. The bill reduces the time period from six months to 90 days when the Central Repository may not charge a fee for providing information on a person that had been previously provided. The name "Revolving Account to Investigate the Background of Volunteers who Work with Children" is changed to the "Account to Process Requests for Information on the Background of Volunteers Who Work with Children." The procedures are clarified for processing requests from agencies for volunteer background information. Within the Record of the Repository for Information Concerning Crimes Against Older Persons, the bill clarifies to whom incidents are reported and revises the information that is included. Certain provisions governing the dissemination of information that are included in federal laws are repealed.

There are two amendments proposed for this measure. The first amendment is dated January 26, 2017, proposed by Julie Butler. It removes the requirement for correctional institutions to report Uniform Crime Reports to the Central Repository and removes the language on page 6, lines 23 through 32 requiring the collection and submittal of certain information related to the use of force by law enforcement.

The second amendment is dated March 3, 2017, also proposed by Julie Butler, and it proposes to retain the existing language in section 8 of the bill. Additionally, the amendment seeks to add any county coroners and medical examiners to the list of agencies that can access Nevada records of criminal history for the purpose of conducting death investigations.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

In the second amendment, Ms. Butler has addressed the concerns that the Board of Massage Therapists had in being removed. There were also some concerns brought up by law enforcement, and those have been addressed by adding the county coroner and the medical examiner. Unless there is any other discussion, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass with both amendments.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 76.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

That ends the work session, and we will now move to our hearing on Assembly Bill 181 and open the hearing.

Assembly Bill 181: Revises provisions governing the restoration of civil rights for ex-felons. (BDR 14-720)

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 181 for your consideration. Assembly Bill 181 revises provisions governing the restoration of civil rights to certain persons who have been convicted of felonies. It specifically addresses the disenfranchisement of the right to vote and the right to serve as a juror in civil jury trials. Let me be clear, A.B. 181 is not designed to be soft on crime or cut a break to felons. To the contrary, A.B. 181 is designed to acknowledge that, in our criminal justice system, felons are given a sentence that is intended to reflect the appropriate punishment for the crime. However, at the end of that period of time set forth to reflect the appropriate punishment, that person is then expected to reenter the community and become a productive member of society. That person is expected to get a job, care for loved ones, and embrace contributing to society in a way that reflects lessons learned about past transgressions. This, of course, includes staying out of trouble and subscribing to the rules of our community. If they fail, they lose those valuable rights. What better way to encourage them to fully reintegrate back into society and provide them with a better chance of recognizing the full value of the freedoms they once lost, but by acknowledging that their debt has been paid and that they have a chance to live a new and meaningful existence. This is the intention of A.B. 181.

For some background information, in 2016, The Sentencing Project, which is a national nonprofit research organization, estimated that 6.1 million people in the United States were disenfranchised due to a felony conviction. That is about 1 out of every 40 adults—or 2.5 percent of the total population—who are disenfranchised in the United States. That total rose from 3.3 million in 1996, to 4.7 million in 2000, to 5.9 million in 2010. In Nevada, the estimated percentage of disenfranchised individuals with felony convictions was 4.02 percent, or just under 90,000 offenders.

There has been significant progress in reducing and/or reinstating civil rights in other states in recent years. In Delaware, in 2013, the state removed its five-year waiting period before they got their right to vote back for most offenses. In 2016, the Alabama legislature eased the rights restoration process after offenders have completed their sentence, except for crimes of moral turpitude. I want to point out that, ironically, in a lot of states that generally refers to folks like us who commit crimes related to our service. In those states, when felons complete their sentence, they are able to vote. Because we are held to a higher standard and level of trust with the public, those who commit crimes related to their service in legislative actions are often deprived of their rights far more than folks who have served their sentence. Rhode Island and Maryland now restrict voting rights only for those in prison as opposed to all individuals currently serving a felony sentence, including those on probation and parole. That means, if they are in those states on probation or parole or even in jail, they can vote, including from jail. In 2016, California restored voting rights to people convicted of a felony

offense housed in jail, but not in prison. In 2015, Wyoming had a bill that directed the department of corrections to issue a certification of restoration of voting rights to certain nonviolent felons five years after completion of their sentence. We are 1 of only 12 states that bar voting postsentence. The largest group of states that address this issue is 18 states. Assembly Bill 181 proposes to have Nevada join that group of 18 states that do what A.B. 181 is designed to do.

Of course, in Nevada, the current state of the law is that anyone convicted of a felony is not allowed to vote under Article 2, Section 1 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* unless their civil rights are restored. Article 15, Section 3 states that a felon is not able to hold office. Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 6.010, a person convicted of a felony cannot serve as a civil juror. Unless a person has been convicted of a specific type of crime, their voting rights are restored. The specific types of crimes are generally category A and category B felonies involving the use of force or violence resulting in substantial bodily harm. In order to get those rights back for felons, they need to have an honorable discharge from probation, have their record sealed, or be granted a pardon. Oftentimes, the challenge with some of those provisions is that folks get a dishonorable discharge from probation or parole because, for example, a month before they got off probation they tested dirty after five years of testing clean for marijuana, they violated curfew, or they were unable to pay the full amount of restitution. Sometimes, they are not able to pay the \$30-a-month supervision fee for probation. Because of those technical violations, it often results in a disproportionate level of punishment and lifetime consequence for what is often a nonviolent offense, or for something the person did when he was young, but has learned his lesson.

At this point, I would be happy to give an overview of the bill in somewhat of a bullet-point form. I believe the bill itself is pretty straightforward. Assembly Bill 181 eliminates the distinction between honorable and dishonorable discharge for the purpose of restoration of rights. As I explained, many dishonorable discharges are for technical violations or violations that, as of this year, may not be a crime anymore. It also removes the limitation for offenders with more than one felony from separate cases because so many young offenders recidivate early in their youth, but reform later in life. This bill attempts to address their reformation and their efforts to reenter society. It removes the requirement that such felons would need to petition the court. In ten years of practice, I have never seen anyone petition the court for restoration of his or her rights, let alone do it successfully. For someone who committed a couple of offenses when he was a young offender, to have to go through that process is a difficult and rare circumstance that requires permission that is rarely granted.

The bill also restores the rights of category A and category B felons involving crimes with the use of force resulting in injury to the victim after a period of two years. That is intended to take into account that their offenses were more serious, and there is a concern that certain offenders are likely to recidivate. This gives them a period of two years after they are off probation or parole or out of prison to show that they are ready. Of course, if they reoffend, they go back in, and Assembly Bill 181 does not allow for anyone to vote from prison.

The bill is not intended to address folks on lifetime supervision. There may need to be some adjustment to make that clear. In an ideal world, folks who completed their sentence would automatically be restored, but there is a recognition that some offenses are more serious and those offenders have a greater likelihood of recidivating. The sense from the community is that they are not fully ready to participate in all of the rights that the rest of us enjoy.

I would also like to point out that there was a similar piece of legislation advanced in 2011 by then-Assemblyman Segerblom, and that measure was vetoed. Part of the reason for vetoing the bill was the sense that the punishment needed to fit the crime. This bill is designed to take that into consideration too, and to take into consideration the reasons for the discomfort rather than simply presenting a bill to you that we have presented before unsuccessfully. There is still a period of time they have to wait after they complete their sentence—for the more serious offenses—to show they are ready to reenter society. I will also note for those who are more familiar with criminal law that very few category A felons get out of prison anyway. The reality is that, if there is a felon with a category A crime who gets out of prison, he still has to wait some time before we are comfortable and confident that he is not going to reoffend. The bill attempts to do just that.

The bill also allows for the automatic restoration of both voting rights and the right to serve on civil juries, but not criminal juries. Currently, the statute to reinstate the right to serve in that capacity is six years after the date of discharge from parole for criminal juries. That part will remain the same under the provisions of Assembly Bill 181.

There are already many barriers to impede ex-offenders once they are released and they try to reintegrate back into society. People coming out of prison already have a heavy burden. They usually have spotty work history and low education levels. They often have substance abuse issues and mental health issues. The consequences of being labeled a felon for their entire lives—years after they may have served their debt to society—can create a barrier that makes it very difficult to rejoin society as a productive member. These individuals have paid their debt to society, and the restoration of civil rights is critical to the process of reintegration. I firmly believe this measure will result in a decrease of recidivism by individuals who are finally able to fully participate as individual members of our community. I think it is a lot to ask of a felon to come out of prison after how many years and be told that they have paid their debt to society, but not be given the opportunity to show it. I believe this will result in folks fully embracing and appreciating the freedoms they lost but have now gained back, and giving them additional motivation to keep those rights and stay out of trouble; folks who have served their time, with a criminal justice system that was designed to give folks a second chance once they have served their time and paid their debt. Assembly Bill 181 will offer individuals that second chance.

I have been contacted by several people who would like to offer support. I wanted to let them do their own thing independent of my presentation of the bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

You hit it on the head in terms of reintegration. Going door to door during the campaign season, I met people who said they could not vote because they were ex-felons. The more barriers we put up to reentry, the more difficult we make it for ex-offenders who have paid their debt to society. When someone can earn that right to vote and to be on a jury and to become a stakeholder in society, we all benefit. There is less of a chance that they will recidivate.

Assemblywoman Miller:

I am going to echo exactly what the Chairman just stated about this. I have a background in prisoner reentry, so for me this is really important because it is part of the dignity that goes into keeping people from recidivating. While we were campaigning, there were many people who stated that they could not vote because their rights had been taken away. I remember one day in particular in one neighborhood where all of the homes were at least 4,000 square feet. I encountered five people on that one day who could not vote: four men and one woman. They all expressed that they could not vote, although they wanted to, even though they had nonviolent crimes that had occurred up to 20 years ago. We need to understand how this impacts many of us. There are ex-felons in every neighborhood, in every part of Nevada—and the country—and restoring the rights of our citizens could really improve their lives.

Assemblyman Watkins:

I wonder if we have any data from the states that have implemented systems like this on how it has affected the rates of recidivism. Do we have any data?

Assemblyman Frierson:

No, I do not have that information. I do have some information from The Sentencing Project and would be glad to get it. I would be surprised if that data was not out there.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I am sympathetic to the notion of repentance and being able to get past our past. Our past should never be a part of our future if it is our choice to leave it behind. The part that concerns me is—and I do not practice in this area, so I may not be reading it correctly—that we acknowledge dishonorable discharges. I recognize that some of them are technical violations and some are not. Some of them are people who do not want to change or find themselves unable to change for whatever reason. As I go through the bill, I see all of the language is stricken where we focus on honorable discharges. It appears that it may be two or four years before the restoration of rights, even though that individual has demonstrated an inability to fully integrate and to fully come within the confines of the boundaries that the law has set. We are restoring their rights anyway. Am I reading this wrong, or is that the intent? If that is the intent, I cannot support the bill in spite of the fact that all of the other reasons are certainly valid and worthy.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I am not sure I understand your question. If they were already being restored, I would not have needed to bring the bill. The distinction between an honorable and dishonorable discharge is an important one. Having been a deputy attorney general, where I oversaw the prosecution of crimes regarding people under incarceration, I would simply suggest that, if a dishonorable discharge was the result of activity that rose to the level that addresses the concern about voting, it would also result in a new crime. I would love to visit the distinction between an honorable or dishonorable discharge in a separate bill. Having sat through it for a decade, the offenses that are more serious that would result in a dishonorable discharge also result in a new criminal charge. I would submit that a majority of the discharges are not ones that rise to that level. I would love to have the distinction, and I could give you pages and pages of examples of dishonorable discharges that have destroyed people's lives for eternity over something that many people who are not in the criminal justice system do.

In a record-sealing event last year, we had all of the departments that are involved with sealing records in one location, and I was there for eight hours. It was so complicated I could only help three people. I can only imagine how difficult it is when they are not all together. One individual made a point that he had a dishonorable discharge because he tested dirty for marijuana just weeks before he got off probation. He had been on probation for five years. He had friends who had been on probation with him who tested dirty in their first year of probation. They were given an opportunity to go through a program and get an honorable discharge. He was on probation for 4 1/2 years before testing dirty at the end of that 5-year period. He was not given the same opportunity, and his penalty resulted in his not being able to vote again.

We put the public at a higher level of safety when we encourage folks not to recidivate and empower these individuals to fully embrace reentry into society. We endanger the lives of the community when we do not give them enough motivation to want to retain those rights. In the last nine years, there has been an excitement about the electoral process that we have never seen before. We have hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of individuals who could not participate. What greater motivation is there to keep your rights than to have a say in the direction that the country is going to go in, regardless of what direction that is. I would simply submit that the benefits would outweigh the drawbacks.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

That is an important distinction that you drew between something that would be a technical offense that might lead to a dishonorable discharge versus something more serious that could lead to a new substantive charge, which would preclude that person.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I want to echo the sentiments of two of my colleagues. In 2016, when I was going door to door, it was hard to have conversations with ex-offenders who are now productive members of society. They have families and go to work, but have lost their right to vote for something they did in their early 20s as young adults. They paid their debt to society and have learned

the value of the law. Allowing them to participate in voting would make them feel like valued members of society again, and that would reduce recidivism.

Assemblyman Hansen:

There is an assumption that I need to dispute: that they have paid their debt to society. If you ask the private citizen in Nevada if these people have paid their debt entirely, they would say no. Part of that debt is giving up the right to vote until they show that they can be in society and reintegrate into that process. That is an assumption that is not accurate. When I went door to door, I did not run into a single person who said he wanted us to restore voting rights to felons. This bill came up before and was vetoed by the Governor over that very assumption. When you commit a crime in Nevada, it is against the State of Nevada.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

The Speaker pointed out that this is not the same bill. It is different and does address the points in the veto message.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Where does the impetus come from? It certainly does not come from anyone I met in my district. No one said they wanted ex-felons to have their rights restored. If you put this question on the ballot, it would be crushed in a heartbeat. I wonder what the impetus is. No one in my district came to me about an ex-offender who has been out of prison for a while and said that it is unfair that he is unable to vote.

Assemblyman Frierson:

Based on research of felony convictions over the past 40 years, nearly 90,000 Nevadans are unable to vote. I welcome you to walk around Assembly District No. 8. It is not uncommon for business owners released from prison 20 years ago to not be able to vote. While interacting at their doors, they expressed their thoughts and opinions with me—many of which we disagreed on.

Assemblyman Thompson introduced a bill dealing with barbers reading to kids. In many of our communities, ex-felons are barbers because that is the only job they can get. We are encouraging barbers to read to kids as role models, and as people they see, once every week or two, who still cannot vote. Over the past four years, that frequently came up while we went throughout the community encouraging folks to register to vote. A large number of folks said they could not, and we continue to encounter more individuals in that situation.

I want to respond to your comment about individuals who have paid their debt to society. The *Nevada Constitution* allows us to assess what "pay your debt to society" is. The loss of the right to vote is in the *Nevada Constitution*, but it says "unless their civil rights are restored." That leaves it to us to restore them at a point in time when we believe it would be appropriate. Our penal code addresses the criminal penalty. I have never—in over 15 years of practicing law—had anyone in a court of criminal law talk about the loss of voting rights being an intended consequence and part of paying his debt to society for the person who reoffended because he was not able to fully reintegrate back into society. I have encountered

victims of repeat crimes, and whatever I can do to decrease recidivism is well worth it. Allowing folks to reintegrate into society decreases crime and increases the protection of the public.

Assembly Bill 181 attempts to address the Governor's veto and his message, and it was designed to do so. It was designed to ensure that, if we send another bill to the Governor's desk, we send one that addresses his expressed concerns. This bill does that by requiring certain people to wait longer. If you do not recidivate after being out of prison for a number of years, you have shown that you are ready to handle civic rights. If you recidivate and go back to prison, you lose your rights again, which this bill addresses.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I have a question for legal counsel. What is the current process? Under existing law, what is the current process and time frame if I am convicted of a felony? We have heard cases of business owners who, after 20 years, have not had their rights restored. Surely it does not take 20 years for an ex-felon to have his rights restored if he wants to apply.

Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:

That depends on the nature of the person's sentence and discharge. If you are referring to someone who was dishonorably discharged from parole—which is the change made in the bill—that person is ineligible and may remain so for 20 years.

Assemblyman Hansen:

That means the individual, obviously, did not comply with the agreement of his parole. Is that correct?

Brad Wilkinson:

That is correct. The person received a dishonorable discharge, and the reasons are set forth in the bill and in existing law.

Assemblyman Hansen:

If the discharge is an honorable one, what is the process?

Brad Wilkinson:

In an honorable discharge from parole, the person's rights would be immediately restored under current law. These rights are the right to vote and to serve as a juror in a civil action. It also depends on the nature of the crime. Rights are not restored for more serious crimes.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I, too, have had the experience, and not just at the door. A plant manager, who oversees about 150 employees, has always had an open mind about hiring ex-felons and helping them get back on their feet. He was an older fellow and disclosed to me that, in the early 1980s, he had served a sentence and still did not have civil rights. This was someone who is a productive, contributing citizen—and it would not have crossed my mind that he had a criminal history.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I want to get back to honorable versus dishonorable and your comments about testing dirty. If that is the case, why does this bill not address setting up a panel—three or four people—to look at those offenders. They can determine if it is too egregious to change the dishonorable, or if it is not egregious, to restore his rights. This seems to just blanket anyone who has been dishonorably discharged. My district is very different from yours. I have not once heard anyone say they want to restore the rights of his neighbor. Why are we doing this in such a blanket way?

Assemblyman Frierson:

I am proposing to do it in such a blanket way because it impacts 90,000 Nevadans, not all of whom are going back to prison. If they go back to prison, it is a nonissue because they cannot vote after reoffending. Regarding your comment about a panel, part of the problem in Nevada is that our Division of Parole and Probation is under the Department of Public Safety, which sends a message that it is about law and order, and not about counseling and reintegration back into society. We have a lot of systematic problems in Nevada that make it difficult to encourage folks to reintegrate back into society.

If we did business in Nevada based only on what our districts wanted and not on what other districts want, we would have a lot more problems. I have said this before but, "We are one Nevada." There is no hunting in District No. 8, but that does not mean that I am opposed to anything regarding hunting. We have an obligation to think about the entire citizenry and how it impacts the state as a whole. There are things that we see in our district that you may not see in yours, and vice versa. We come together to talk about those things, to talk about whether they are real problems or perceived problems, and then we move forward. I would encourage folks to come down to Clark County where there is a very dense population, and take a look at what gives rise to dishonorable discharges versus honorable. The problematic violations are new charges, and the simplest charges. Those folks are not going to be impacted at all.

I also want to address the current process. Frequently, offenders are dropped off in an alley in downtown Las Vegas with a wallet, a piece of paper, and whatever was in their pockets when they went in. If they lose the piece of paper—it is dated—there is a petition process to get another that no one would ever be able to get through. We are in the business of wanting everyone to vote and of helping them vote. It is healthy for democracy as a whole, regardless of who you are and where you are from. Anything that gets in the way of helping folks vote takes away from the beauty of our democratic process. If I can help people vote, without asking their party affiliation or who they support, we as a community benefit as a whole.

Assemblyman Thompson:

We, as a body, need to realize that felons do not have a certain stereotypical look. An analogy is that we automatically think of what a homeless person looks like. In 2017, there are many people who look like us who are homeless. They are struggling, but doing the right thing. The same thing resonates with a person who is an ex-felon. There are people in my community who are doing well for themselves. Unfortunately, they have had to create

their own businesses because they cannot qualify for jobs. I needed to say that because we are getting into a "not in my backyard" type of situation, and you would be amazed where these people are. What would the notification process be? What would be the community outreach or public service announcement? A lot of people will now be eligible to vote. It is a chance for us to spark excitement about voting again, especially now that there is so much voter apathy. Please share your vision with us.

Assemblyman Frierson:

It is an interesting question. While it would expand the field of folks who are able to vote, it does not even touch all of those 90,000 people. Currently, if you have a category C or lower felony, your right to vote has already been restored. I would love to have a process that streamlines this so that you do not have to submit a document to show your right to vote; however, that is not in this bill. We are simply talking about category A and category B offenses that do not involve violence or injury to individuals being able to join category C, D, and E felons. If the offense involves those serious offenses, they must wait a longer period of time to have those rights restored. I do not think it is as large a number as one might think. I believe in moderate progress when we can, but this will not reach even half of the 90,000 people.

We are proposing to join the largest group of states that already does this—and that is only 18 states—and not other states that go even further. Currently, when folks leave prison, they are handed a form. There is also an information packet given out when folks get off probation. I have seen the documents they are given when released from prison, so the paper must be in the probation discharge packet. I think it is nothing more than public notice that they can participate in this process. At the end of the day, it is a relatively small number of folks who are given this opportunity. They still have to assertively exercise their rights and show their paperwork, but that is not a proposed change in this bill.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

If someone is honorably discharged, his or her voting rights automatically get restored. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Frierson:

If someone is honorably discharged, by law he or she has the ability to have his or her rights restored, but he or she still has to go through the process to assert them. He or she still has to show paperwork, and the bill does not change that.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

If someone is dishonorably discharged—which means he did not comply with the things he was supposed to do—he is not automatically restored, right?

Assemblyman Frierson:

If someone is dishonorably discharged, he might as well be in prison for the rest of his life, as far as voting rights are concerned.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

What things would constitute a dishonorable discharge? Why would someone get that tag?

Assemblyman Frierson:

I will only reflect my own experience from practicing law in that area for a limited period of time. I have seen dishonorable discharges result from an inability to pay a fine, restitution, or the monthly supervision fee. Sometimes folks on house arrest are unable to pay for that service. They might violate curfew. There is a hard line. I have had clients who got home five minutes late and got a dishonorable discharge. I have had clients who were completely compliant and, in anticipation of getting off probation, celebrated and then tested dirty, so they got a dishonorable discharge. If offenses can be charged criminally, there would be criminal charges. A new offense, more often than not, results in a new criminal charge, not just revocation or a dishonorable discharge. We have a lot of laws that result in felonies when you are already branded a felon, even with marijuana. Until recently—and we are still figuring out what we are going to do with that—there were two options: a felony option and a misdemeanor option. You get the felony option if you are already a felon. Similarly, if you have multiple theft offenses, even petty larceny, and you steal an iPad from Best Buy, that is entering with the intent to commit a felony. Those types of offenses would result in a new criminal charge and not simply a dishonorable discharge. The dishonorable discharges are essentially offenses or violations of certain conditions short of a new criminal offense. Anything that is short of a new criminal offense—it could be curfew, money, testing dirty, showing up late, or any of those kinds of things—could result in a dishonorable discharge.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

You mentioned something about a distinction between nonsubstantive offenses and substantive offenses. What were you referring to?

Assemblyman Frierson:

A substantial violation would be one that would typically result in a new criminal charge or a new crime. If you commit a new crime, that is not a dishonorable discharge; that is a revocation and a new charge, which is different.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I am confused because I thought we said that the blanket restoration occurred even for those who were dishonorably discharged. I suspect there are some dishonorable discharges where a reoffense did not result in a subsequent criminal charge. Where I am hung up is where we have opened the law. There is an opportunity to make the distinction between a technical violation that would not be worthy of depriving them of restoration and those that would. Would you be amenable to making the distinction since we have that opportunity, so that we can be clear on who should receive the restoration of their rights?

Assemblyman Frierson:

What you are proposing would be the status quo, and then there would be no need for the bill. The question about distinction between dishonorable and honorable is a small distinction compared to the distinction between completing and violating probation.

We either want to help people vote or we do not. We want to help all people who are ready to vote and participate lawfully in society and eliminate those from the process who are not. It is as simple as that. This is a significantly watered-down version of what was proposed several years ago. I have a difficult time explaining to an individual who committed a crime that did not result in an injury why he still cannot vote 1 1/2 years after probation was completed. We either want to encourage the community to vote or we do not. I think this bill does it in a responsible way that encourages folks to embrace keeping their rights.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I agree it is worthy to help those who have been rehabilitated. I would not classify it in the black and white terms that you do. It is not that we are going to help some people, or to refuse to help others. We need to know where the line must be drawn. I was asking that we consider addressing the distinction so that it is clear.

Assemblyman Yeager:

When we talk about dishonorable discharges, it has been my experience that sometimes the parties themselves—the defense attorney, the prosecutor, and the probation officer—will negotiate for a dishonorable discharge in the courtroom. They may decide that revocation is not in order here, but a dishonorable discharge may be the way to go for whatever reason. I only bring this up to ask if that has been your experience also, and how this bill might seek to address those situations where dishonorable discharges were negotiated rather than the judge deciding.

Assemblyman Frierson:

You are absolutely right. Oftentimes, the dishonorable discharge is the result of a deal that allows an individual to get out of prison or jail sooner. If you are incarcerated and want to get out sooner, that certainly is motivation. Instead of 364 days, they may offer you 60 days and a dishonorable discharge. Very few people will turn that offer down. There are a lot of circumstances that could result in a dishonorable discharge that are in no way reflective of that individual's level of risk of harm to the community. That is just another example of why the distinction between an honorable and a dishonorable discharge is so inconsistent and does not necessarily reflect harm or danger to the community. We are talking about the fundamental right to vote that should not be waived based on an individual's determination of honorable or dishonorable.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Oftentimes, a dishonorable discharge can result in no violation whatsoever, but simply a negotiation.

We will take any witnesses who wish to testify in support of Assembly Bill 181, both in Carson City and in Las Vegas.

Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

We are in full support of A.B. 181. We appreciate the Speaker's bringing this bill forward because it does help people assimilate back into society and become productive members of

their respective communities. The right to engage in the democratic process reaffirms a person's obligation to do his or her civic duty, and is a huge step toward that person getting his life back together—whether it is a job, education, family, or counseling. It will not further marginalize that person in society. I have with me Alycia Seabolt Barnwell. She is a social worker intern with the Washoe County Public Defender's Office, and is here today to speak in support of this bill.

Alycia Seabolt Barnwell, Intern, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I am here in support of Assembly Bill 181, which restores the voting rights of people who have served their debt to society. It is very important because the loss of voting rights for a person with a felony conviction has a lot of social implications. Research has been completed by a professor at Cambridge University that shows that the loss of voting rights can make a person with a felony conviction feel alienated in the community, as well as making them feel like a second-class citizen. Moreover, the loss of voting rights makes prior felons feel disenfranchised, stigmatized, and socially isolated. These feelings also hold true for felons who have voted in previous elections, and are now restricted from voting. Restoring a person's voting rights after he has completed his sentence is important because he then has a say on how his taxes are spent and what policies are created. He also feels empowered to be an engaged stakeholder within his community. Therefore, I strongly urge you to pass A.B. 181 and welcome members of our society back into the democratic process.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Do you see more recidivism in your practice with those who have had a dishonorable discharge versus an honorable discharge?

Sean Sullivan:

I do not have any facts or figures. Speaking anecdotally, I do not see any person who may have a dishonorable discharge having a greater or smaller recidivism rate as opposed to a person with an honorable one. I see those technical violations that were spoken of or the negotiations that Assemblyman Yeager spoke of. When I am in court speaking with the district attorney and a person simply wants to get out of custody—or there are issues in his life, familial obligations, or things of that nature that are very minor issues—he wants to negotiate to get that dishonorable discharge. It may not be that he committed a new offense. He may have been late checking in, may have tested dirty once, or may have been remiss in paying his supervision fines or fees for that month, so he wants to "get off paper" or get off probation—so he will accept that dishonorable. Oftentimes, they do not realize the collateral consequences that may be at hand. To answer your question, I do not know of any recidivism rates about honorable versus dishonorable discharges.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

One thing that is significant about this bill is that so many ex-offenders will be able to have their rights restored. Under the current process, they have to file a petition and go to court. Do you know many clients or former clients who have been able to navigate those waters on their own to get that petition filed? To me, it seems like it would be pretty daunting for someone to try to do that, especially when they are trying to get back on their feet.

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

I am in a unique position with that part because Judge Bitá Yeager and I designed the program for sealing records and the restoration of rights. So that you know, the slide presentation that we created was 75 PowerPoint slides by the time we were done talking with people in the meetings. Everyone's eyes were glazed over, and if I were to give that presentation here, I am sure all of you would fall asleep.

That being said, not only was the slide presentation daunting, but going through the process was daunting as well. This bill is probably one of the most important pieces of criminal justice reform. If we are going to talk about helping people get back into society, this is a good way to do that. I really do not want to take too much time because there are many people here who are going to tell you their story. When I taught that class every week, it was the most well-attended class taught by legal aid. When we did the one-day sealing event, the line was out the door. There were so many people there that I worked in a room with Judge David Barker from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., and there were still hundreds of people who could not be served. People want a second chance; they want to come back into society. They want to be back into the fold. If we can make them feel that way, they are going to be much less likely to reoffend.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I am curious. Does the Clark County Public Defender's Office help with sealing and restoration of rights?

John Piro:

We started the program, but it was too big for us to do. Some other public defender's offices do, but we had to hand the duties off to Nevada Legal Services. Sometimes they teach the class two times a week because it is such a packed class. That is the most well-attended class. Luckily, Nevada Legal Services has an AmeriCorps fellow who helps people through the process. It is still a very difficult process, even for trained lawyers.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will second that. Speaker Frierson, Assemblyman Yeager, Assemblyman Anderson, and I were all at that pro-bono event that you coordinated. It is a very daunting process whether you are a layman or a lawyer. If there are no more questions, I will go down to Las Vegas.

Lisa Rasmussen, Legislative Committee Co-Chair, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

The Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice (NACJ) supports A.B. 181. I can elaborate on some of the issues that you have been talking about and answer some of your questions. For the largest part, most people are dishonorably discharged for lack of payment; that can be lack of payment of the \$35-a-month supervision fee or some fine or restitution. Unfortunately, those referrals come from probation, and they go straight to the court. There is no attempt to talk to the probationer, or even to get counseling from the probation officer—who would be someone like me or the public defender—to say he is going to recommend discharge and that it is going to be dishonorable because you owe \$62.

Those papers just go to the court, and the next thing the defendant knows is that he or she is being discharged from probation. The majority of the time, that is what we are talking about. You may have concerns that someone is being dishonorably discharged because he is not complying or he is violating the terms of probation. In cases where there are severe violations, those people are revoked from probation and are sentenced to their underlying term. We can have situations where people are on felony probation from their underlying prison term, but if they violate it in a substantial manner, they are sentenced to prison and are not eligible for parole. It is doing what it is supposed to do. They are, therefore, ineligible for restoration until they have completed parole after prison. What we are really looking at is a host of people who have done something very minor, like not paying, with no consultation with Parole and Probation; they are just dishonorably discharged. Those are the people who I believe the bill targets. It is critically important to allow them to participate in the civil process: to be able to vote and to be able to serve on a jury. When we were talking about voting and jury pools on Friday in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary meeting, we told many members that there is nothing more important or no simpler way to participate in your society than by serving on a jury and voting. These are critical issues.

I would still like to make my argument that people who have had their rights restored should also be able to serve on criminal juries, but I know that is not part of this bill. I know it is limited to civil juries, but at some point we ought to address that. However, I am saving that for another day. We at the NACJ completely support this legislation and are proud to support it.

Kristina Wildeveld, Attorney, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

I am here in support of A.B. 181. I am a private criminal defense attorney who practices in the pardons arena. Oftentimes, I am called upon to represent persons who are seeking community pardons, specifically for the restoration of their voting rights. It is surprising to me that these people do not ask for their gun rights back, but they seem to only want their social rights restored—to be able to participate in the electoral process or to run for an office. They want to be on equal footing with their next-door neighbor, and to be able to vote for their legislators.

It is a daunting process to go before the Pardons Board [State Board of Pardons Commissioners]. For a community pardon, part of the process is to do an extensive background investigation. It is the same for everyone. It would be much easier and less burdensome if that process were streamlined. The statute should allow for everyone to go through the same process.

In addition, back in November 2016, I had the opportunity to go to Washington, D.C., to participate in a convening of the Campaign for the Fair Sentencing of Youth. There I was surrounded by formerly incarcerated individuals who had recently been released from prison, from first-degree murder charges. It was November 15, right after the presidential election, and very eye-opening to be with these formerly incarcerated youth who had the opportunity to vote. I was also with some formerly incarcerated youth from Nevada who were fascinated

that their colleagues were able to vote even though they themselves were unable to vote. It struck me that citizens of Nevada would not want to be on a less than equal footing than those from other states. Because other states allow every citizen the right to vote and we do not, our votes do not count as much as other states'. This seems contrary to what we as citizens of our state would want. That is another reason why we want every citizen's vote to be counted equally.

Some of my former clients who were pardoned by the State Board of Pardons Commissioners live in other states and are office holders. There are some qualified candidates here in Nevada who are not able to hold office because they do not have that right. This bill would put qualified people back on equal footing with the rest.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I appreciate your testimony, Ms. Rasmussen, but now I am even more confused. We just heard Assemblyman Yeager say that oftentimes dishonorable discharges are negotiated, but you just testified that dishonorable discharges come directly from the judge and there is no discussion. I am completely confused on how this works, so would you please clarify your statement?

Lisa Rasmussen:

The majority of the time, the referral for termination of probation—whether it be honorable or dishonorable—simply comes as a one-sheet form that is faxed over to the court. The instances that Assemblyman Yeager is referencing are instances where someone has probably violated curfew, drank alcohol when he was not supposed to, or it was a revocation or violation proceeding that has been brought before the court. In that context, many times offenders will come before the court with their lawyers, after they have been in custody for about a month; they will negotiate and be discharged, since revocation or prison does not make sense for these relatively minor violations. That is how it happens. When someone is sentenced to three years of probation, after about half of that time, a one-sheet statement recommending discharge is faxed over from the probation office if they have done everything right. As counsel, neither I nor my client is ever notified. As I indicated, when someone has committed a new crime, that person's parole gets revoked and the individual must serve his or her prison sentence.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I want to make sure I am clear. What I hear you saying is that the negotiated deals are ones where they have had a more serious violation that the probation officer would not just dismiss as being insignificant. They go in and negotiate that out. It sounds like the probation officer still retains the liberty to submit a discharge request, whether the offender has completed probation or not. If he is serving properly and doing what he is supposed to do, he can be honorably discharged at any time. It is within the parole officer's discretion to determine whether the offender will be dishonorably discharged for the minor offenses. Is that correct?

Lisa Rasmussen:

That is correct. Usually the defendant is not even notified of a court hearing regarding the discharge. They just get a letter in the mail saying they were discharged, and it can be either honorable or dishonorable.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

In your experience as a private practitioner, is petitioning the court to get rights restored something that most clients would be able to do on their own, if they could not afford to hire a private attorney? It is my impression that one of the changes this bill makes is that people can get their rights back without having to go to court.

Lisa Rasmussen:

It is a tiny percentage of people who have the wherewithal and the ability to go to a private practice attorney to inquire about restoring their civil rights. It is a burdensome process, and that is why people do not do it. They do not necessarily know how to do it. I am a retained lawyer, so the public defender's office cannot deal with all of the clients who may have these issues. That is why this bill is so important. The percentage of people who are able to jump through all of the hoops is very, very small.

John T. Jones, Jr., representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

We are in support of A.B. 181. I want to thank Speaker Frierson, on the record, for including the district attorneys in the process regarding this bill. You often hear district attorneys come up and say that both carrots and sticks are important with respect to the criminal justice process. It is important to defendants to show them that there is light at the end of the tunnel. This is one way of doing that. I was on the National Conference of State Legislatures' website and was surprised to see that 38 states grant restoration of rights after termination of parole or probation. Nevada was included in that list of 38 states, but there was a caveat that this is just for people who receive honorable discharges. We are in the minority right now with respect to how we treat people who have completed their sentences.

Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada:

The Libertarian Party of Nevada believes that the permanent disenfranchisement of felons who have served their sentences is a systematic injustice, one that A.B. 181 helps to correct. According to estimates from The Sentencing Project, approximately 4 percent of Nevadans are ineligible to vote as a result of felony disenfranchisement. Nevada is also presently 1 of the 12 states in the country with the harshest felony disenfranchisement laws. Since 1997, however, 24 states have revisited their penalties and reduced or eliminated the scope of felony disenfranchisement, Nevada among them. In 2001, Nevada repealed the five-year waiting period, and in 2003, Nevada restored voting rights to persons convicted of first-time, nonviolent offenses. We encourage Nevada to take the next step in a reform that could improve the lives of thousands of people, especially in economically disadvantaged or majority-minority communities.

Given that implicit bias in the criminal justice system results in the disproportionate conviction of people of color, minority communities in particular are severely affected by

harsh felony disenfranchisement laws. The result is a cycle of poverty, crime, and disengagement from society for those who believe they are not wanted. We believe that Nevadans who have served their sentences or have been discharged honorably from probation or parole deserve a second chance. Assembly Bill 181 gives them that chance.

Monique Normand, Civic Engagement/Member Group Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

I want to lend support to A.B. 181, both personally and for Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN). As a future social worker, we try to be encouraging and uplifting to underrepresented groups, specifically in registering them to vote. Previous offenders fall in this category and are uplifted by the social work code of ethics, which supports restoration of voter rights. As a student at the University of Nevada, Reno, an integral part of my practicum this year was registering people to vote and engaging them in the community. I also registered people to vote as an organizer with PLAN. One issue that constantly came up was the status of voter rights. Many folks who had previously been incarcerated had no idea if their rights had been restored. Most of them just assumed that being incarcerated automatically took their rights away. One man explained that he had been incarcerated at the age of 22 for writing bad checks. Now, at the age of 70, he had never voted, since he believed he could not do so. The current policies regarding previously incarcerated folks and voting rights is confusing to those who have been incarcerated and the agencies that work with them. Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada believes that A.B. 181 will make this process fair and will uplift folks who have served their time and want to live their lives with dignity in our communities. We support this bill.

Amy Rose, Legal Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

You have heard that over 6,000,000 Americans are currently disenfranchised due to a felony conviction, 89,267 of whom live in Nevada. Nevada is 1 of only 12 states to restrict voting rights after a person has served his or her prison sentence and is no longer on probation or parole. More importantly, the current mechanism for reenfranchisement in Nevada is illusory. One study in 2010 from The Sentencing Project estimated that fewer than one half of 1 percent of ex-felons had their voting rights restored through a court from 1990 to 2010. This bill will help fix this broken path. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada stands in support of this bill. Not only will it restore rights, it will also increase public safety and help to combat racial injustice. Remember, voting is a fundamental right vital to society and central to democracy. Citizens have no voice if they do not vote. Tax-paying citizens deserve a say in their government, and voting is an essential part of resuming the duties of full citizenship.

Law enforcement officials and criminal justice experts uniformly agree that restoring the right to vote after completion of a sentence builds community ties, reduces recidivism, and protects public safety. It is also important to ease the burden on reenfranchisement since it is a significant part of combating racial injustice. Nationally, disenfranchisement laws disproportionately disenfranchise African Americans. One in 13 voting-age African Americans is disenfranchised, which is a rate four times greater than that of non-African Americans. In Nevada, although 4 percent of the total voting-age population

is disenfranchised, almost 12 percent of African Americans are unable to vote. African Americans in Nevada are cut off from democracy at a rate three times higher than everyone else. Assembly Bill 181 will make the process significantly easier for thousands of Nevadans to participate in this democratic process and make their voices heard.

The ACLU of Nevada has conducted many different training sessions about restoring the right to vote. The process is really cumbersome and confusing. There are a lot of different rules and restrictions that are tossed around, and you must have your paperwork. If you lose your paperwork, you have to jump through hoops to get new papers. If you were convicted of a category A or B felony for violence, you have to ask the court, which is also a cumbersome and difficult process. People just do not do it, so this bill will go a long way to help restore rights in Nevada.

Robert Langford, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I signed in as an old criminal practitioner. I am not here as a member of any particular group or organization, though I belong to many groups and organizations. There are a number of people who are really well qualified in the room down here to discuss the redemptive qualities of this particular bill. I hope the Committee gives them enough time to discuss that, because it is a very important point.

I have two points to make as follow-up to comments made by Ms. Rasmussen when she was asked whether the typical person who we have represented can complete the petition for restoration of civil rights. Here is what I always say to my former clients: "You do not need an attorney to do it; you really do not." I explain the process and where they can get more information on the process. I tell them what my fee would be. I get paid by the hour; I get paid for my time. I tell them that they can do it, to go out and give it a good try. They try, but invariably, 30 days later I get a call asking again what the fee is. It is a daunting task. It is next to impossible for a person without a law degree to understand what needs to be done and then to follow through once the petition and order are signed.

The second thing is something that usually strikes fear in the heart of legislators, and that is the fiscal impact of this bill. Fear not. The fiscal impact of this bill is a positive one. I have been doing this for 27 years as a prosecutor or a defense attorney, and have seen so much. We always say, "Nobody washes a rental car." How do we invest in our community and society: by serving as a juror—a very important way—or by voting. Not giving someone the ability to vote is the same as making them a renter of a car. No one is going to wash that car. Again, there is a positive fiscal impact. I have seen it over my 27 years in this business. People do great things when they invest in the community.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Have you, anecdotally, seen that the small percentage of defendants who have gone through the process to petition the court to have their rights restored have recidivated less than other clients whose rights have not been restored?

Robert Langford:

Yes, absolutely. In fact, they become better business people and have a concern for fiscal responsibility. That is because they often become small business owners.

Assemblyman Hansen:

This is more of a clarification. You mentioned that there are 90,000 felons in Nevada. My understanding is that, under current law, if you have an honorable discharge, your rights are automatically restored. Did I miss that in your testimony?

Amy Rose:

The 90,000 is the number of people who are disenfranchised for any reason. It is not just honorable discharges. You have to turn in your paperwork and register to vote. If you lose your paperwork, you are disenfranchised. When you complete your sentence and leave prison—which we have not really talked about today—you should also have your right to vote restored. You cannot do that without paperwork from the prison, but it has a strange process and it takes a long time. When we first started investigating this a few years ago, there was no information, so we reached out to the prison. Things may have changed recently, but the whole process is difficult. Regardless of your discharge, if you were convicted of a category A or B felony with the use of force or violence, your right to vote is not going to be restored.

Assemblyman Hansen:

That is beyond the scope of my question. The people who were convicted of category A and B felonies—full convictions and not just charged—are rapists, murderers, and other serious offenders. I have a hard time believing that most of the citizens of Nevada hope those kind of people get the right to vote. They were convicted for extremely serious crimes. We, as a legislative body, have insisted that they not be able to vote. That is one category that I am amazed that you are pushing for. You have still not answered my question. Under current Nevada law, we heard earlier that your right to vote is automatically restored if you have an honorable discharge. You said there are 90,000 felons in Nevada who cannot vote. Are you telling me that 90,000 felons were dishonorably discharged?

Amy Rose:

That is the number that was given to me. I have not personally polled those people. That is the number from The Sentencing Project report called "6 Million Lost Voters: State-Level Estimates of Felony Disenfranchisement, 2016," which was published in October 2016. I would be happy to send you a copy of it and you can look through it.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I would like the statistics on this. Are there 90,000 felons in Nevada who cannot vote who were honorably discharged?

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Please share that data offline with Assemblyman Hansen and copy us. We would appreciate that because we do have other questions.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I feel obligated to respond to Assemblyman Hansen's comment regarding category B felonies. Some are certainly serious, but unfortunately, the Legislature has made category B felonies a catch-all category. When we talk about defining serious crimes, we have to look at ourselves and question how many crimes are so serious that the offenders should be denied the vote in perpetuity, and to have all of these issues forever. It does no good. When we heard all of these bills and created all of these felonies, I do not recall any comments that these people are so horrible they should never be able to vote again. We act as though we have created this grand structure to punish people, but I do not recall collateral consequences coming up in most of these bills where we talk about felonies. A lot of these are serious, and I do not want to dispute that, but we should not act like it should be a perpetual bar. This body did not consider that in most cases.

Assemblyman Hansen:

When someone talks directly to me, I would like the option to respond. That is common courtesy.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will let you briefly respond, but then we have to get back to testimony.

Assemblyman Hansen:

On category A and B felonies, I would like to see a breakdown of the crimes these convicted people have committed. This is after they have worked out plea bargains and such. Some of them are the absolute most violent, dangerous offenders in Nevada. Those are the two worst categories, so you cannot say, *carte blanche*, that category B felonies are just a catch-all.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

That is a policy decision that the Legislature needs to make. Assemblyman Anderson put it well. Once they have paid their debt to society, do we want them to be a contributing, productive member of society, or do we want to continue with the penalties beyond the sentence. I do not believe the Legislature ever envisioned that.

Amanda Cuevas, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

First and foremost, I want to let you know that I am a felon. In 2009, I was convicted of a category E felony for attempting to sell drugs to the Street Enforcement Team under the scope that someone had contacted me. I was in the grips of a powerful addiction, but I have been sober since. With that in mind, I was never told about my restored rights. I have the right to vote, and you have no idea what that means to me. I have the ability to vote for whomever I want to represent me. I can cast my vote after researching and deciding whom I am voting for, and why I am voting for that person. My mother never had her right to vote restored; she never got that opportunity.

The reason I was able to keep all of the paperwork is that I have a great support system. I grew up in a middle-class family who took me in when I was put in drug court. They gave me the opportunity to turn my life around. Most people do not get that. I urge you,

for people like me who just need an opportunity, and people who made a mistake, please give them an opportunity to vote. I understand that category A and B felonies are different from my felony, but when I was in the middle of my addiction, I did or could have done a lot of things that would be a category A or B felony; I just happened to get out first. Please vote yes on Assembly Bill 181.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I have a comment, not a question. Having worked in an addiction recovery program for many years, I think you are the poster child for why these rights should be restored. These are low-level, relatively minor crimes from a social aspect, but they are felonies and are serious. We need to get our arms around them. You have restored your life and deserve those rights. I think both Republicans and Democrats think that someone like you should have your rights restored. I commend you for that. I know that is a very difficult row to hoe, and you have done a great job.

Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

We are in support of A.B. 181. Many of these individuals whom we are talking about are also parents. By allowing them to vote, we are allowing them to advocate via the vote on behalf of their children regarding the many aspects that affect Nevada's children.

Jim Sullivan, representing Culinary Workers Union, Local 226:

I would like to read a statement in support of A.B. 181.

The mass incarceration over the past 40 years—which disproportionately affects people of color—has led to the disenfranchisement of 6.1 million Americans, including many Nevadans. Of these 6.1 million Americans who have been disenfranchised, only a minority are currently in prison or jail. In fact, more than half are disenfranchised due to state laws that restrict voting rights even after completion of sentences, like here in Nevada. This is unacceptable. Disenfranchising an entire class of citizens is deeply problematic to a democratic society and counterproductive to effective reentry. Ex-felons are not broken people unworthy of the right to vote. Rather, they are members of our communities and families who deserve to have their voices heard in the political process.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

There are no questions, so we will go back down to Las Vegas, and then come back up to Carson City.

Dan Edwards, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada; representing Nevadans for the Common Good:

Nevadans for the Common Good supports this measure because of our commitment to the strengthening of democracy and the expansion of citizen participation. The Episcopal Diocese supports the bill through our experience with ministries for felons and people in prison and people doing reentry. We are very involved in both of those projects. Our largest worshipping community in central Nevada is actually in the Lovelock Correctional Center. Regarding the question of where the impetus for this measure

comes from, to some extent it comes from us. Our work with former offenders has led us to a deep commitment to the restoration of their voting rights and their full inclusion in society to help them be members of the group of people who make society work, instead of the group who do not. Regarding the concern about the dishonorable discharge, it is very loaded rhetoric just by the way we name it. It rings the same bell in our heads as a dishonorable discharge from the military, and this is a very different thing. The Legislature has already taken the fundamental step in recognizing the importance of restoring voting rights despite having previously had a felony conviction. We are now actually denying voting rights to people based on very minor technicalities. From our experience with people on probation and parole, the basic question is not whether you can obey laws, but rather, whether you can toe the line, and there are a lot of lines. Some of the lines are very fine, as we heard about a \$62 debt. We see people who not only have not committed another crime, but who violated their probation or parole terms in some seemingly minor way who are revoked on the basis of that minor infraction. This so-called dishonorable discharge criteria is even more technical than that which would lead to revocation. We urge the adoption of A.B. 181.

Sondra Cosgrove, Chair, League of Women Voters of Nevada Legislative Advocacy Committee:

The League of Women Voters strongly supports providing every eligible voter access to secure voter registration and a fair ballot. We also support programs that reduce recidivism and increase civic participation. We, therefore, support A.B. 181 as it will facilitate integrating Americans who have done penance and need to be integrated into society as quickly as possible. Completing one's sentence should be sufficient to once again becoming an eligible voter without going through a complicated legal process that penalizes anyone who is poor or has not had the benefit of our education system.

Josh Wolcalle, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

As an ex-felon, I never thought I would be sitting in a place like this, doing this. The restored right to vote would be pretty cool. I fall into a couple of different categories. I was dishonorably discharged because I did not pay enough of my fines. I never missed a payment, but I had a \$10,000 restitution and I did not get enough of it paid before I got off of parole. I am also a category B felon, but I have never once committed a violent crime against anyone. I have never harmed anyone or laid a finger on anyone. My offenses were burglary and attempted burglary. I have not used drugs in seven years, and I have been out of prison for two years.

I work in the recovery community. It is a rewarding job. You let these people see that you can spend your life messing up, but if you do right and pay your bills, your credit rating goes over 700, and good things can happen. One thing that can happen to people trying to do well is the right to vote. Being able to vote—and speaking your piece on a ballot regarding whom you would want to represent you—is fundamental.

Barbara Robinson-Ramirez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

The last time I was in front of a committee like this was quite a few years ago. I absolutely believe that A.B. 181 should be passed. I encourage you to do so. As a Realtor, I work with

ex-felons to buy a home. Something that has been proven is that buying a home lessens the chances of recidivating.

On March 18, it will be 20 years since I walked out of the gates of Nevada State Prison. I was able to get a real estate license and go into any home in Nevada that is for sale before I was able to vote. My rights have been restored, but it is a daunting process. A lot of people do not know that they are able to have their rights restored, or what it is going to take. I believe the individuals who have lost their right to vote are probably the wrong ones. Individuals who want to go out and vote because it is important to them are not the ones you should be worried about. The other side of that is that the individuals who recidivate and continue to commit crimes are not the ones who will go down and actually register to vote in the correct precinct. They are not going to show up on Election Day or do the research to determine who to vote for. That is not what is going to happen.

My crimes were the result of drugs and alcohol. The majority of the individuals with whom I have worked are the same. Even if they are ex-felons as a result of being convicted of a category A or B felony, more than likely it was probably the result of what they were using. If they have changed their life and are not using, they are going to have something to give back to society. I have raised four daughters, and I have five grandchildren. In my neighborhood—which is a nice neighborhood—I hope my neighbors do not know that I am an ex-felon. I follow the law, pay my taxes, and do the things I need to do to be a productive member of society.

Justin Reid, Private Citizen, Dayton, Nevada:

I have made some bad choices in my life, choices that resulted in becoming a convicted felon. During my incarceration, I sought out all of the programs that were offered. After showing proof of completion of these programs, having a good parole plan and a community of support, the State Board of Parole Commissioners granted me parole. Once on parole, I had to abide by a strict curfew, go to treatment two times a week, check in with my parole officer every week, find a job where they would hire a convicted felon without a driver's license, and pay parole and court fees, all of which I successfully and gratefully did. This led to leniency: no curfew, check in with parole once a month, treatment once per week, and I was hired as a community health worker. This has all led to great opportunities. After facing all of the consequences to my actions, successfully reintegrating back into society, and contributing to my community, I still have none of my civic rights. I believe that A.B. 181 will help me and many others in this same predicament by giving us a new sense of responsibility towards society, and the feeling of freedom from the consequence of a bad decision once made.

Assemblyman Pickard:

Have you tried to get your rights restored through the existing process?

Justin Reid:

No, I have not. It will expire at the end of the year. I have a category B felony, so I do not know how that process will work.

**Donald G.T. Gallimore, Second Vice President, Reno/Sparks Branch #1112,
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:**

We support this bill 100 percent. I can only say [singing], "Happy days are here again!" When we are able to pass this bill, minority families are going to be very happy. I can see the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters welcoming back their loved ones who have been incarcerated for whatever reasons. Category B felonies is a catch-all class, and that is something that I would like to have you reconsider. These people will more than likely not be on the streets again. You might not have to worry about those felons' reentry for a long time. Category B is where we need to take a closer look at parole and probation. I know for a fact that a lot of the parole officers are poorly trained and that the lawyers and some of the people in the district attorney's office have no clue, because they have so many other things to worry about. They do not worry about the reentry aspect of felons. I implore you to look at the overall streamlining potential of this bill. This bill will ease some of the responsibilities of department heads who really do not know what they are doing. It changes every couple of years when the Legislature is in session. We are always making new legislation, and nobody knows what is going on. Look at the facts and make sure this streamlined process does not keep everyone separate but equal. That is my main concern.

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11:

I am here in support of Assemblyman Frierson's bill. Assemblyman Frierson is not only my friend, for whom I have a lot of respect, but he is also my Assemblyman and I am his Senator. He and I are both from District No. 11 and we are entirely aligned on this bill. This afternoon I will be running a parallel bill in the Senate that seeks to do the exact same thing, plus some.

Michelle Alexander, in her book, *The New Jim Crow*, has articulated a very reasonable position. She says that, in our country, we have established a class of individuals against whom we can lawfully—and oftentimes, in my view, illegitimately—discriminate. This can be in housing, because former offenders are not able to receive public housing under certain circumstances; it can be in education, because ex-offenders cannot receive Pell Grants to go back to school; it can be in employment, because of the box that they have to check saying they are ex-felons. As a society, we expect these ex-offenders to reintegrate into society and not recidivate. Another way of discriminating is the area of voting. Many people have been disallowed the opportunity to participate in the electoral process, in the democratic process. During the time of incarceration in Nevada—which is contrary to Maine, which allows its offenders to vote even while in prison—we do not allow that absent extraordinary and very burdensome processes.

I support Assemblyman Frierson's efforts here because I believe we are a better society than that. To be sure, there are a disproportionate number of Hispanics and African Americans who are disenfranchised because of our current laws. Make no mistake, as Mr. Reid—who appears to be neither Hispanic nor African American—can attest to, there are several Caucasians as well who are caught up in this system and should also have their right to vote restored. Beyond the purview of this bill is the right to serve on a jury and the right to do so many things that we enjoy. These individuals have paid their debt to society, most of whom

have been rehabilitated, and in my view, they should be restored to participate wholly in our society.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

We have heard a lot of testimony today about the chances of someone recidivating becoming smaller and smaller the more of a stakeholder he is in our society. That includes voting and participating in our jury process. It benefits us all to see people turn their lives around, like the witnesses that we have heard today who have done amazing things with their lives, but still cannot vote or serve on a jury.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Believe it or not, I bet I have worked with more felons than anyone else on this Committee. For years I have hired people out of the Northern Nevada Restitution Center. I currently have at least one felon working for me. I may have left the impression in my earlier testimony that I live in some type of bubble where there is no crime or people trying to reintegrate into society. The thing that disturbs me most in all of this is that we currently have a process that seems very reasonable to me. As long as you are honorably discharged, which means that you complied with the provisions of your parole, you can and are automatically granted the right to vote, even though you are an ex-felon. What disturbs me about this bill is that it focuses heavily on people who have been dishonorably discharged. In other words, they did not comply with the conditions of parole. It also focuses on category A and B felons. Category A, especially, are the bad guys. Category B may be because of the catch-all factor. We hear a lot about felons, but I want to go on record that I probably have more on-the-ground experience than anyone else on this Committee. I am not a lawyer; I am a blue-collar worker who works side by side with felons. The gentleman I work with now served 5 years for a felony and has been clean for 20 years. He is a great guy and a great plumber.

Why are we so focused on dishonorably discharged people who failed to comply with the basics when they got out of prison?

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Senator Ford, since you were out of the room, before you respond let me explain that there was a lot of testimony about how many ex-offenders received a dishonorable discharge by having a curfew violation, by not being able to complete their restitution or fine payments, or for having a dirty drug test for marijuana. There was also testimony that you missed about how some offenders negotiate a dishonorable discharge that is not the result of any violation, just to get an early release. It was also stated that, if there is a serious offense and not a technical offense, that leads to a substantive new criminal charge that would jeopardize any chance of restoration of rights.

Senator Ford:

I look forward to engaging with you on this. I did see a tweet about the comments you made wondering if citizens were saying to give these people back their right to vote.

Assemblyman Hansen:

The people were category A and B felons. I noticed the tweet too, but she left that part out.

Senator Ford:

For your consideration, I would like to invite you to a soup, salad, and sandwich event that I have every second Saturday of the month. You can hear firsthand from citizens who are asking that exact question, some of whom are ex-offenders who want to reintegrate and participate in our democracy. Others understand the plight of those who have been disenfranchised. Again, I invite you to come.

You used the word "reasonable" in describing the current scheme we have in our statutes for how a person can receive their rights back, but "reasonable" is in the eye of the beholder. I do not behold it as such; I behold it as being onerous. I behold it as being too much and under circumstances that are proper and appropriate, I think we should make it easier for folks to reintegrate into society. In fact, this is not just a Democratic view, it is not just Speaker Frierson's view, it is not just my view; this has become a bipartisan issue over the course of several years. In fact, my bill—which will be heard this afternoon as I have indicated—was taken directly from the Record Expungement Designed to Enhance Employment Act of 2015, or the REDEEM Act, among others. At the federal level, this is a bipartisan effort by Rand Paul and Cory Booker to do exactly what we are trying to do, which is to undo this oftentimes illegitimate, discriminatory effect that we have in our laws. Your question is why, and I feel that the Chairman has spoken eloquently to a lot of that. Not everyone who has pled to a dishonorable discharge deserves to be denied this privilege. Am I asserting that everyone who is should be? No. Am I asserting that some of those who have done so should be? Absolutely yes. The desire of our society should be that everyone who has gone through the rehabilitation process and the punitive process of the prisons would be given the opportunity to completely reintegrate into our society. Again, giving someone the dignity of being able to participate in our democracy should be something that everyone—Democrat, Republican, Independent, Green Party, Libertarian, or otherwise—should want to see occur.

I commit to you those comments, and I hope you find them persuasive when it comes time to vote this bill out of Committee.

Assemblyman Hansen:

That is fair. Senator, I would love to carry on this conversation when we have the chance. You have said some things that were very interesting.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support of Assembly Bill 181, either here or in Las Vegas?

Nick Vassiliadis, representing R & R Partners Foundation:

I want to give a brief "Me too" from R & R Partners Foundation's perspective on giving folks an opportunity for a second chance, and sometimes even a third chance. As a society,

we expect folks who go through the correctional process to come back and rejoin society, but we do not necessarily give them the tools they need to get back into society and have basic rights. We urge support of this bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

We have heard a lot of testimony today about the impediments that we put on someone rejoining society that will make it harder to be successful.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I received a communication from Jon Ponder, who is with HOPE for Prisoners in southern Nevada. He indicated that he wanted to testify, but was unable to be here today. I invited him to send a letter to the Committee, which I will distribute to the members once I receive it.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

There has been a discussion regarding a groundswell. There are a lot of people who are concerned about this. We are here to lead. We are not here to look for instructions on every bill that we process in this building. If we were to go by that standard, how many of these bills should not be introduced? I missed the groundswell for a lot of things. That is not what we are here for; we are here to lead. Legislators should not be afraid to lead just because they may not have heard enough about an issue. That is what we all bring to the table individually, our experiences. I just thought I would make that point since I have heard a number of people talk about that today.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will now move on to opposition to Assembly Bill 181 and anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the measure in Carson City or Las Vegas. I see no one, so is there anyone in the neutral position in Carson City or Las Vegas?

Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

I am here on behalf of Secretary of State Barbara Cegavske. I am testifying in neutral with respect to the policy provisions in this bill. If it is all right, I can provide some background and clarification from the election administrator's perspective when it comes to voter registration.

In 2003, the Legislature approved Assembly Bill 55 of the 72nd Session, which automatically restored the right to vote for people convicted of certain offenses. The automatic restoration applied to those convicted for a first-time offense for minor felony offenses, category C and below. That has been in place since 2003, as I mentioned, and that is the current law. The current structure requires, upon honorable discharge from whatever the sentence may be, that they get a document that says they have been honorably discharged and that their right to vote has been restored as of the listed date. That is a document that is required to be presented to the election administrator in their county so they can register to vote.

As I read the bill, the bill does not address any of those requirements. As far as the impact of this bill on the voter registration process or the process that the local election officials do, it would have no impact on the processes that they follow.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

If Assembly Bill 181 were to pass into law, could the Secretary of State's Office implement this without it creating a tremendous burden?

Wayne Thorley:

Absolutely. It will not have any impact on the voter registration process, as far as the processes that are currently in place. The documentation that is required to register to vote and the verifications that the local election officials and our office do against various databases to verify identity, residency, and eligibility to vote, from our reading would not be impacted.

Assemblyman Fumo:

As a society, we tell people who commit crimes that it is now time to pay their debt to society. It is a social contract that we, as the citizens of Nevada, make with those who commit the crimes. It is about time that we, as the Legislature, keep our end of the bargain when the debt is paid.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else who is neutral? [There was no one.] Speaker Frierson, come forward if you would like to make closing comments.

Assemblyman Frierson:

In closing, and in anticipation of some of the concerns that do not speak to the heart of this bill, you will notice that I did not bring up race, because this is not about race. I did not bring up party affiliation, because this is not about party affiliation. Of the 90,000 individuals who are believed to be disenfranchised, less than one-third of them are African American. This is not an African-American bill. The 90,000 are not those who are currently allowed to participate in a process to restore their rights. The 90,000 are those who were granted a dishonorable discharge for offenses that those of us who are not on probation may get law enforcement flicking their lights at a stop sign as a quick warning. However, if you are on probation, that is a potential violation and a dishonorable discharge. If you make payments every month but lose your job and are unable to pay, that is a dishonorable discharge. These are the 90,000. Anything we can do to help folks who are able to stay out of trouble to reintegrate back into society and to encourage them not to commit future crimes but participate in the process is a good and productive thing.

This bill, which is different from the one in the Senate, attempts to take into consideration the concerns that were voiced in 2011, but scaled back. There are some people who still do not get their rights back. Those who are affected by this bill will still have to wait two years to show they are not going to reenter a life of crime.

It is somewhat disheartening, and a bad day in Nevada, when we legislate based only on what our own district experiences tell us without regard to the impact that it has on the whole state. When we, as policymakers, are individually telling people that it is "people like you" who deserve something as huge as a constitutional right to participate in the electoral process, none of us is so great as to judge 90,000 individuals to say which ones of those "people like you" deserve the right to vote.

With that, I appreciate your time and look forward to having further conversations. I welcome any interest in finding ways to make folks more comfortable, recognizing that over the last four years—because this started for me four years ago—this bill attempts to do that very thing.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

All of us can agree that, if we can help 90,000 individuals reintegrate into society and be successful, productive citizens, we all benefit. I will now close the hearing on A.B. 181. [A group of letters in support of Assembly Bill 181 were received and made a part of the record ([Exhibit G](#)). ([Exhibit H](#)) is a letter dated March 6, 2017, in support of A.B. 181 to the Assembly Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation, authored by Steven Burt, Executive Director, Ridge House, Inc., Reno, Nevada, and is made a part of the record.] I will open public comment if there is anyone who wants to make public comments. I see no one, so I will close public comment and today's meeting. We are adjourned [at 10:16 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 25](#), dated March 6, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 27](#), dated March 6, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 74](#), dated March 6, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 76](#), dated March 6, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is a group of letters in support of [Assembly Bill 181](#):

1. Kathleen Knight, President, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 6, 2017.
2. Sonya Daniels Walker, Member, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 6, 2017.
3. Ethel Archibald, Member, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 6, 2017.
4. Loretta Arrington, Member, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 5, 2017.
5. Ida M. Gaines, Member, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 6, 2017.
6. Debra A. Toney, Member, Las Vegas Chapter, The Links, Incorporated, dated March 5, 2017.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated March 6, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 181](#) to the Assembly Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation, authored by Steven Burt, Executive Director, Ridge House, Inc., Reno, Nevada.