

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

**Eightieth Session
May 2, 2019**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 9:33 a.m. on Thursday, May 2, 2019, 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblywoman Selena Torres
Assemblyman Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Ira Hansen, Senate District No. 14
Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9

Minutes ID: 1103



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.
Kyle J. Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League; and Nevada Wildlife Federation
Mike Maynard, Game Warden Captain, Department of Wildlife
Jeff Dixon, Nevada State Director, Humane Society of the United States
Jamie Rodriguez, Government Affairs Manager, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County
Miranda Hoover, representing Nevada Humane Society
Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Appellate Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Clark County Department of Administrative Services
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Chairman Yeager:

[Roll was called, and Committee protocol was explained.] We have two bills on the agenda today and we will take them in order. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 316 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions governing public nuisances. Senator Hansen, welcome back to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

Senate Bill 316 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing public nuisances. (BDR 15-53)

Senator Ira Hansen, Senate District No. 14:

It is fun to be back. I served four sessions on the Judiciary Committee, and it is nice to be here. My district has 38,000 square miles of Nevada, roughly one-third of the land mass, and includes most of Washoe County and all of Humboldt, Pershing, Lander, Mineral, and Esmeralda Counties as well as a large section of Nye County. Some of the big issues in my district are public lands uses, and one of the biggest ones has been the increasing restriction on the ability of the public to use public domain. What Senate Bill 316 (1st Reprint) deals with specifically is—in many cases now, and it is getting worse—private

landowners who, either intentionally or through bluff, block access to the public domain near their properties. Unfortunately, because of that, the public is denied access even though it is public domain.

Some simple examples: You have a rancher who has access crossing some of his property. He puts a gate on it initially to keep the livestock in and then with time, he hangs a No Trespassing sign on it. People like you and I, who respect the law, drive up to that gate, see the sign without realizing it is actually a legal easement across that land to go onto the public domain behind it. The more unscrupulous ones actually will then turn around and lease the access to the public domain to others—guide services and so forth—and create their own private hunting clubs on land that is otherwise completely public.

When you take that type of an action, there is no penalty. I checked with the Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of the Interior (BLM) and the United States Forest Service (Forest Service), and there are some federal laws that apply but there is no ability to essentially enforce them. I went to the Legislative Counsel Bureau trying to figure out where in state law we could do this, and the public nuisance statutes were the place to put it.

What this bill will do is give you, as an ordinary citizen who wants access to the public domain and is being blocked, legal access to that domain to have some recourse and make it a penalty to intentionally do that. This bill does not impact the BLM or the Forest Service in doing their jobs. This is pretty much exclusive to private individuals who do that.

Essentially, the bill lists all the different ways people do this and makes it a crime to intentionally and knowingly do so. I apologize for the lateness in getting the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to you this morning. Some county commissioners suggested we add "minor county roads" into the language because that is another definition under Nevada law. We wanted to make sure that we were broadening this to ensure that the public has reasonable access to the public domain.

Assemblywoman Backus:

On the amendment it states "public roads" are commonly referred to as "R.S. 2477 roads." What is an R.S. 2477 road?

Senator Hansen:

That is verbatim from *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 405.191(2) currently. An R.S. 2477 road is "Revised Statute 2477," which is a federal law from 1866. It is the main driver to allow public access, because if a road was made between 1866 and 1976 when they changed the law, by law those are public access roads. Consequently, you cannot legally block access to the public on an R.S. 2477 road. The R.S. 2477 requirement was actually eliminated in 1976 with the passage of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The bulk of the roads in Nevada have been in use in the public domain well before 1976.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

To make sure I understand, we are talking about both state public lands and federal public lands and making sure that people are not trying to take over land that is in the public domain, whether state or federal?

Senator Hansen:

Just the opposite. We are trying to ensure that the public lands are kept public and that they have reasonable access to the public. The original bill from Senator James Settelmeyer was limited exclusively to state-controlled public lands, which is 3,000 acres in the whole state. We recognized that there are almost no state lands so it would have had zero impact on the actual problem that we are trying to address. Eighty-seven percent of Nevada is federally controlled and the bulk of that is controlled by the BLM and the Forest Service, so we expanded it to go beyond mere state lands to all public lands within the boundaries of the state of Nevada.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Because there is language about obstructing transit over highways, state or local, is this going to prevent us from putting up fences to protect wildlife on our public lands?

Senator Hansen:

No, not at all. In fact, as I mentioned, it does not affect BLM or the Forest Service at all. They have fenced public lands that they need to protect from misuse, or for some of those, even block access if they need to. This bill would in no way impinge on their ability to do their jobs.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I understand what the intent is and what we are trying to do. It seems as though it is a real issue in our rural communities. However, I am concerned that this piece of legislation might unintentionally capture individuals who are protesting on public streets. I understand that there are procedures that go into that. Whether or not you agree with the protest, my concern is that we would further criminalize that right.

Senator Hansen:

Interesting question; perhaps your legal counsel can address that. That is certainly not my intention. In fact, I am usually in support of people who protest, and on these very issues in many cases. Just for the record, that is not my intent in any way, shape, or form. These would be public lands. The mention of "highways" in the bill may be a little bit confusing because, in our mind, a highway is actually a big main boulevard. But actually, under Nevada law, a highway is simply any access road, even two-track roads out in the middle of nowhere—"jeep trails" if you will—and those under Nevada law and federal law are actually considered "highways." Highway basically means any kind of access that the public can utilize. For the record, if there is any doubt about my intention, it certainly is not to stop legitimate protests on any highways or byways or cities or whatever. Interesting question though, as nobody has brought that up. I do not know if legal wants to get on the record to

make sure that the intent here is not to be abused by trying to prevent legitimate protests by our own citizens.

Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:

In reviewing the language of the bill, I would not interpret it as prohibiting any type of protest. There are two separate acts here: [section 3.2, subsection 5] by force, threat or intimidation, or by any other unlawful means preventing or obstructing the highway, and that also has to be done "if the person has no leasehold interest, claim or color of title, made or asserted in good faith." Typically, people would have some kind of permit if they were going to have a protest. You would have some ability to show you have a right to be there. The other paragraph, knowingly misrepresenting the status of or asserting a right over it, would simply not apply. I would not read the language of the bill as prohibiting any kind of protest that is lawfully held.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I think to expand on that, we may want to address some of that language. I think of some of the great protests that we have had in this country—the Civil Rights Movement, the movement in California for the farm workers. Those protests did not get permits, and I am concerned that we would be further criminalizing those types of behaviors. We have seen what that has done to our country in the past. I want to make sure that this legislation in no way captures that.

Senator Hansen:

Thank you. I will leave that up to the Chairman and his legal staff; if they think that is something that needs to be added, I am fine with a conceptual amendment to that fact. The last thing I want to do is block the Cesar Chavez protest, specifically what you are talking about, or the 1964 protests in Mississippi and Alabama. Of course, I would never want to see this statute being abused by blocking anything like that.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I am assuming the jurisdiction if there is a violation—if this bill were to pass—would fall under a sheriff or the Nevada Highway Patrol depending on where the blocked access was? And also, what kinds of penalties are we talking about?

Senator Hansen:

This would fall under the typical misdemeanor statute and it could be enforced by the Highway Patrol, the Department of Wildlife game wardens, or the local sheriff, just like any other NRS. If I remember correctly, the maximum penalty is six months in jail and a \$1,000 fine as a worst-case scenario. If it passes, I suspect this would be more of a preemptive-type law once people realize that there are, in fact, now penalties in law for doing this. Currently, it is not an unlawful act, frankly, under Nevada law. If it becomes a law, I think the word will spread fairly quickly and we will see a reduction in these intentional misuses of blocking public access.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there any follow-up, Assemblywoman Hansen? Feel free to follow up off-line as well. I think you might know where to find Senator Hansen on occasion.

Assemblyman Roberts:

There are other statutes that cover if a protest blocks an entire road without a permit. Would this apply to the Bundy cattle situation in southern Nevada? A militia had set up roadblocks throughout BLM land, and we did not have a statute that prohibited it. The militia did not necessarily block or stop traffic, but they intimidated people and turned them around in order to control the whole area. I think this would combat something like that on land with dirt roads or not much of a marked highway.

Senator Hansen:

I did not even think about that situation, frankly, when this was coming up. Any intentional act to intimidate or otherwise to block access for the public into the public domain will now be a crime. So, yes, this statute probably could be used by law enforcement in circumstances like that as well.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open it up for testimony in support of S.B. 316 (R1).

Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.:

Public access is a very important topic for sportsmen around the state and access to our public land is not only always important, but occasionally a contentious issue. We strongly support this bill and want to commend Senators Hansen and Settlemeyer for bringing this issue forward.

Kyle J. Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League; and Nevada Wildlife Federation:

We are here today in support of the bill. I think Senator Hansen has done a good job of outlining the need for the bill. It is not as common in Nevada as it is in some other western states but, unfortunately, it is happening more and more often. We see these situations where public land that is supposed to be accessible to anybody, you have some private landowners who are able to block off that access to public land and then essentially treat it as their own private land. We do not feel that is correct. We are lucky here in Nevada to have access to so much public land for all different types of recreation, and that access ought to be available to everybody. This should not be something that is allowed to happen. Currently there are penalties under federal law, but nothing exists in state law, as you have heard. This gives us the ability that, if something is happening, somebody can go to the local sheriff or a game warden to say, Hey, this is supposed to be public access; this is an historic road and this is being blocked illegally. We can do something about it so that the public has the ability to access their public lands. We are in strong support of the bill and appreciate Senator Hansen for bringing it forward.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there any other testimony in support of S.B. 316 (R1)? [There was none.] Do we have any testimony in opposition to S.B. 316 (R1)? [There was none.] Do we have any neutral testimony on S.B. 316 (R1)?

Mike Maynard, Game Warden Captain, Department of Wildlife:

As a state agency, we are testifying in the neutral position. We have looked over the bill and we have found that there will be no issues with regard to enforcement. These issues have been encountered by our officers in the field in the past. We understand the direction the bill is going.

Assemblyman Daly:

If you can, are these access points? It is difficult if somebody has a locked gate and over time has put up the No Trespassing sign, and maybe you are not as familiar with the area and where you are and that you do have access to public land on the other side of that access road. Is it marked? Do you guys mark it? Is there a way for somebody to mark it so people know? What is the case now? You get up to that gate and you can argue with the guy and maybe you do know and have that information, what are you supposed to do? Do they call your department? How would this be handled in real life if you did not know the road was there? Is there any way to notify people? Obviously you have maps of various places, but not everybody has the same level of access as your officers. If they are just out recreating one day and come up on that gate, how does your agency handle it if it comes up?

Mike Maynard:

I have personally dealt with several of these in the past. Usually we get a call from the hunter stating that they were run off of a piece of land that they felt was open to the public. We would typically look on maps—and nowadays there is GPS—which shows the actual land holdings, although you should not rely completely on that, but it is a good start. We would take the report, see if there were any other elements that would be of concern, such as, was somebody threatened, or was it just, Hey, I own this property, you cannot hunt here. We would go to the area and survey the land. Several cases are simply mismarked, as a lot of landowners do not mark their property correctly or, because of geographical issues, they put the signage in different spots than they probably should per statute. We try to figure out who the person is who is preventing access and try to approach them to see what their reasoning is for posting or saying what they did to make sure we get the accurate story from both sides as best as we can determine. Sometimes it is pretty straightforward in more suburban areas—hopefully there is no one hunting near houses. But in the rural areas, geographically, that can be difficult to determine, as fence lines do not go well over really steep escarpments. There can be issues there with somebody finding a side way into what may be private property, so a sign may have been posted on public land with the intention of preventing egress into that particular spot that could not be posted for trespassing per the statute. We look at all those factors. Typically we educate, and in some cases, it is simply a misunderstanding of the trespass statute and we work it out between the parties and we make sure they are both aware of what their legal rights are in the case going forward.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any additional questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Do we have any additional neutral testimony on S.B. 316 (R1)? [There was none.] I will invite Senator Hansen back to the table for concluding remarks.

Senator Hansen:

I would like to thank the Committee for allowing me to present the bill. In answer to Assemblyman Daly's question, in 2009, then-State Senator Mark Amodei actually had a joint resolution encouraging all of the counties to make maps for the R.S. 2477 roads, and some counties have done that. Humboldt County is in the process as we speak and Nye County has completed it. These issues come up when you come to a gate and you have a map that was done in Nye County and it indicates that this is an R.S. 2477 public access road. I suspect that once this law—assuming it makes it through—is in the field, you will see a lot fewer of those situations where people intentionally block access knowing that there may actually be a penalty, because currently there is not one. With that, thank you very much, Chairman and Committee. If anybody does have any questions, I am always available and would be delighted to have any opportunity to address any concerns.

Chairman Yeager:

Thank you, Senator Hansen, for your presentation of the bill. Good to see you back in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. I will close the hearing on S.B. 316 (R1). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to animals. Welcome, Senator Scheible, to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to animals. (BDR 14-748)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint) relates to both criminal procedure and animals. I want to start off by giving you a bird's-eye view of the problem that we are trying to address and how we would go about doing that with this bill. Then I will walk through the portions of the bill which has been heavily amended since its first printing. I also believe there is still room for amendment and those conversations are ongoing with more stakeholders than I even realized were interested in this bill. It has been fantastic to have everybody come to the table to talk about it.

I will start by addressing the genesis of this bill. When individuals are arrested and taken into custody, their animals do not go with them. Their animals might have been with them at the time, on a leash, in the car, or might be at home in a house or apartment by themselves when that person is taken to jail. In different counties the process is different, but generally those animals will one way or another be impounded. If the person, when arrested, tells a law enforcement agency, I have a dog at home; someone needs to care for him or her, they may communicate with the animal control agency in that jurisdiction to respond to the home, seize the dog, cat, bird, fish or whatever animal it might be, and impound that animal to the local shelter. There are also situations in which people are arrested with their animals present. If someone is pulled over for a traffic violation with their animal in the car and

arrested on another warrant, again that animal will generally be taken to the local animal control shelter and impounded. From there, there has not traditionally been a really good system for reuniting their animals with those people who have been arrested. It has been a source of much confusion and much heartache for those people who are in custody as well as those people trying to care for the animals.

Last session, Senate Bill 371 of the 79th Session sought to address this issue and made great strides forward in establishing a rule that the impounding agencies would communicate with the individuals who were the caretakers or owners of the animals and develop a plan together to care for the animals. The issue with S.B. 371 of the 79th Session is that it did not set a time limit in either direction. It did not give individuals who were in custody a certain amount of time that they were guaranteed to have to be able to make arrangements to retrieve their animals. It also did not give shelters or animal control agencies a time limit after which they could rehome or find a foster care situation for the animals. I want to point out the foster care situation because, in our conversations with Washoe County, Clark County, and local rescue organizations, that is the preferred outcome; that is the preferred place for an animal to go when somebody is in custody. It is not good for the animal to be sitting in a shelter. It is not financially efficient for the state to be paying for the care of an animal in a shelter while their person is in custody. If there is not another person related to, a friend of, or neighbor of the person in custody to care for the animal, foster agencies will take those animals and will allow a person like you or me or your mom to have a dog or a cat in their home for a week, two weeks, or a month while somebody is in custody. That is the resolution that we want to help facilitate; that animals do not languish in county animal shelters—essentially, puppy prison—while their people are in human jail.

Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint) addresses that in two different ways. The first section of the bill addresses animals that are not seized pursuant to a cruelty investigation. I want to be clear that we have two completely different scenarios. I have spoken mostly to the first one so far because that is the problem that we originally set out to solve, and then we discovered that it is different when an animal is seized pursuant to a cruelty investigation.

Section 1 of the bill with all of its numerous subsections says that a local jurisdiction will come up with a system and come up with a plan, regulation, or ordinance that says this is how and when an animal will be reunited with its person if its person has been taken into custody. It also comes with a notice requirement. The notice requirement, which is spelled out in section 1, subsection 2, says that anybody who is arrested has to be informed that their animal has been or may have been impounded and given the information on where that animal might have gone. This is somewhat permissive and does call for a statewide notice. In conversations with law enforcement agencies, it is my understanding that these will be posted next to the phones in a local jail much like they provide the contact information for bail bonds companies. They are available to everybody; they are in a conspicuous location and they could also be included in paperwork or in a verbal notification, but the written notice has to be made available.

We decided to go with a statewide form because as soon as we tried to determine which jails should post information for which shelters, it became increasingly difficult to determine. Maybe out in Eureka it still made sense to provide the information for the shelter in Fallon, and in Fallon it made sense to provide the information for the shelter in Reno. In Reno it made sense to provide the information for the shelter in Carson City, and the next thing you know we are providing the information for the shelter in Las Vegas to Eureka. We decided that was better than cutting people off and preventing them from having access to information about the shelter where their personal animal may be impounded. That shelter could be in the place where they were arrested if their animal was with them; the place where the animal was found if they were arrested outside of the county where they live; or it could be a third and different county if the animal got loose or if something else happened. Weird things happen.

Section 1 of the bill says that every detention center in the state of Nevada will provide notice to every single person who is in custody about where their animals might be and how to contact those agencies. Every jurisdiction will independently create an ordinance, rule, or regulation that stipulates the time frames in which somebody must contact that agency or in which the agency must contact that person to allow them to make an arrangement for somebody to care for the animal. Sections 2 through 6 of the bill provide us with some definitions.

Section 7 talks about animals that are seized pursuant to a cruelty investigation. If an animal is picked up because it is the victim of cruelty, neglect, or some kind of mistreatment, the individual who was responsible for the care of the animals does not automatically get the animal back simply by requesting it. Sections 7 through 9 of the bill spell out a court hearing process for those individuals. Essentially, the way this works is, if an animal is seized pursuant to a cruelty investigation and the person, whether they are in custody or not, wants that animal back, they have to request a hearing in front of a magistrate with proper jurisdiction to come before the court and essentially prove that they should get those animals back. There is a procedure for them to actually retrieve the animals.

The purpose of this is that cruelty investigations can be very long and it is unfair to the animals to keep them in county custody when investigations are ongoing, while prosecutors are still deciding what charges to bring, while prosecutors and defense attorneys are still discussing plea negotiations, and while individuals are still being arrested. It is unfair that the animals languish in state custody when they could be sent to rescue organizations that are ready to rehabilitate those animals and readopt them out or rehabilitate them and keep them in sanctuaries for the rest of their lives. This is an expedited process to allow people to come in front of a magistrate in a civil proceeding and adjudicate that one question alone of whether or not they would regain custody or possession of the animals. If the answer is no, then those animals can be rehomed, rehabilitated, or adopted; and if the answer is yes, then that person has a certain amount of time to retrieve the animal. If the person is in custody, they would have to send somebody else who would have to prove that they are able to care for the animals in order to retrieve the animals from a county shelter.

That sums up the bill, and I would like to give Mr. Dixon an opportunity to provide a little bit more background and information before questions.

Jeff Dixon, Nevada State Director, Humane Society of the United States:

I surveyed the animal control and sheltering professionals last year to see what kind of changes they needed to see in statute to be able to better perform their functions, and the one answer I received was to update and revise S.B. 371 of the 79th Session. Animals were languishing in shelters on indefinite police holds. For shelters that do not have a surplus of kennel space, this was creating a problem. If an animal is in there for a very long time or indefinite period, that is space that could be used for an otherwise healthy and treatable animal. If you are out of space completely, a lot of times that can have a tragic outcome for the healthy and treatable animal who just needs a kennel while they are waiting to be rehomed. That is the main thing that we want to avoid above everything else. We want to support our people in the animal shelters and animal control professions. We want to honor the human-animal bond and give people in custody the opportunity to get their animals back in a reasonable amount of time but, ultimately, shelters cannot be boarding facilities with indefinite holds.

What S.B. 371 of the 79th Session also did was give the shelters a mechanism to recover the costs, but a lot of times those costs were not recovered. They not only had animals on indefinite hold, but they were not able to recover the costs and that ends up coming out of the taxpayers' pocket. We feel like we struck as good a balance as we could in working with stakeholders here and, as Senator Scheible mentioned, we may have more conversations happening. We do have two amendments that I have seen, but we wanted to make exceptions initially for indigent clients who do not have the money. We say, Find another arrangement for your animal. Well, some people do not have the opportunity to make another arrangement for their animal, and they are separated from their animal because they do not have a home. We would like to have extended that time but, again, we ran into the space constraints that the shelters face, so we really need to rely on and expand our capacity, outside of law, the fostering and rescue community—especially for animals belonging to those who are incarcerated, which can be for a week, a year, or several years. We thank Senator Scheible for her work and all the stakeholders for their participation in this bill. We feel we have gotten it to a good place.

Chairman Yeager:

Before I take questions, I wanted to ask about the two amendments on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System from the Nevada District Attorneys Association ([Exhibit D](#)) and Clark County ([Exhibit E](#)). I just wanted to ask if you have had a chance to review those and whether you see those as friendly at this point or whether that still remains to be determined?

Senator Scheible:

Those are friendly amendments.

Chairman Yeager:

We will let those who proposed the amendments explain them when we take additional testimony.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

My concern is with the procedure with the courts. For instance, in section 7, subsection 3, the court is having a hearing within 15 judicial days. That is putting a lot on courts to get those hearings done within 15 judicial days. Is that something that is going to be amended or changed?

Senator Scheible:

We would be open to that. The truth of the matter is that these cases are not that common and so it is not like every person who is arrested would be having these hearings. It is only if the animals were seized pursuant to a cruelty investigation and that happens with less frequency. We think that the 15 days is adequate, but I would be open to an amendment if the judicial officer has requested it.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

My concern would be not so much that there are so many of these cases, but that there are so many other cases that the courts are hearing. My next question is in section 8, subsection 3, where it says, "If the court makes a determination pursuant to subsection 2, the court may order the impoundment of any other animals owned or possessed by the person arrested." Subsection 2 states, "If the court determines that there is not clear and convincing evidence that the person arrested is the owner of the animal or that the person detained is not able and fit to provide adequate care and shelter for the animal." That concerns me because it does not account for the fact that it is saying maybe with regard to this one animal there is not clear and convincing evidence that the owner owns this animal, but that does not mean that they do not own the other animals. We are possibly detaining those other animals now, or the person may legitimately not be capable of caring for horses because that takes effort—you have to get the farriers there, you have to actually do a lot to take care of a horse—but their house cats are just fine. If you could address that, please.

Senator Scheible:

I definitely understand the question you are bringing up and I think that is why, in section 8, subsection 3, line 2, it states the court "may" and not the court "shall." We are envisioning that judges would use their discretion so that if the finding is that they have neglected a dog and they have two more dogs at home, they can empower the animal control agency to seize those other two dogs and get them medical care. But presumably, if the finding was just that the person was not the owner of the animal, not that there was cruelty, then presumably that judge would not order that the animals be seized from that person.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I think we all share a passion for wanting to take care of pets. Under section 1, subsection 7, there is the definition of "animal" meaning any cat, dog, horse, or other domesticated animal, and then it goes on to further delineate chicken, pig, rabbit, and so forth. I am just

wondering, does that also include exotic birds, for example, parrots? I know that there have been some interesting cases in the news over the last couple of years involving birds that have supposedly witnessed murders. There is a grey parrot named Bud, in Michigan, who kept repeating presumably the last words—and I will not quote directly due to explicit language in the middle but something like, "Don't 'blank' shoot" over and over again—and that was considered in that case. I am just wondering if: (1) parrots and exotic birds are included in the statute, and if not, if you would be amenable to amending that into the bill so that it is clear, and (2) how that might play a role in this bill.

Senator Scheible:

It is now my new life goal to try a case with a parrot as a witness, so if anybody hears of one, please let me know. Our thinking on this was to not mess with the definition of animal, so I would kick this over to legal counsel to ask how exotic birds are treated in other sections that define animals.

Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:

I think a parrot would fall under the definition of a domesticated animal. I would need to confirm that, but I believe it would.

Chairman Yeager:

I am not yet sure if they can testify in court though. We will have to get to the bottom of that and maybe that is another piece of legislation that we will have to consider.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

We have to consider everything. That is what I have been amazed about in this process. If you could just summarize what the process is now without this in place.

Senator Scheible:

The process is not consistent, both across different jurisdictions and different counties and even within a single county. I believe we have some people here from the animal control agencies who can be more specific.

Jeff Dixon:

My understanding is that it is an administrative hold so it might go as far as pending the outcome of the trial. The animals can be in there for quite a while. We would want confirmation from the animal control people, but it is in limbo and they are a subject of the case, the "victim," and right now we do not have a process to determine whether that victim should even remain with that person outside of whether that person is guilty or pleads no contest to it. It is sort of a welfare system with this, but I think it can go indefinitely pending the outcome of the case unless the animal needs veterinary care. If they are a fighting bird, they get put down right away because they will not be returned or rehomed because it was not legal to have them to begin with in that situation.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

If we get an opportunity to talk to people who might be representing the counties or animal control, I have some other questions regarding that.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open it up for testimony in support of S.B. 342 (R1).

Jamie Rodriguez, Government Affairs Manager, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:

We are here in full support of this bill and I want to thank Senator Scheible for working with us very diligently. There have been several iterations of the bill as we have tried to work through some of the concerns.

This really started for us with the passage of S.B. 371 of the 79th Session, which was intended to create a standard for if a person is arrested and the animal is detained, creating that statewide process for how long the animal is detained and what the potential outcomes of that are. For Washoe County, we read the final passage of that bill to state that if the incarcerated individual did not agree, did not have anybody to come get the animal, was not willing to allow for it to be transferred out, or anything else, that mandated that we had to hold that animal. We have been keeping track of this since the passage, for 18 months. Poor Buddy is my example: we have a dog named Buddy, who over the last 18 months was held once for 118 days and then a second time for 93 days. Both times, he was returned to the owner, which obviously is a good outcome. But we have concerns about the welfare of that animal and our holding it for that long, that many times. Is that really the best option and solution for that animal?

The first section of the bill covers that; we very clearly state in statute how long those individuals have to try to find a solution and if not, then it falls back on us to find a better solution and see if we can get that animal adopted out or find a home for that animal that is not keeping it in the shelter for 100 days. That was really our genesis. The secondary piece of the animal cruelty, I can answer questions where appropriate, but I will say that is not a substantial issue in Washoe County. It might be a little more in Clark County. We have worked extensively on that. I did want to point out to Assemblywoman Cohen, based on questions from the Committee, I did speak with our Second Judicial District Court and they are completely comfortable with the 15 judicial days. Obviously that is only my district court, but they were comfortable with that. Assemblywoman Tolles, yes, we take birds, snakes, a handful of chickens, and miniature goats. If it is a household animal and not a livestock animal, it is something that we have taken possession of and cared for in these circumstances.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

The amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) indicates 10 days, but you said 15 days. Is the 10 days correct?

Jamie Rodriguez:

The 10 days is for the hold if you are simply arrested, and the 15 judicial days that Assemblywoman Cohen referenced is related to those animals that are held based on cruelty charges, which is in section 7, subsection 3 of the bill.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

It is 15 days if it is cruelty and 10 days if they are arrested. Somebody testified earlier that currently the animal could be there indefinitely, but under this bill, the animal would be kept either 10 or 15 days. If somebody does not adopt that animal in 10 or 15 days, does the animal get put to death?

Jamie Rodriguez:

It is up to ten days if you were simply arrested and your animal is detained. That is separate from the animal cruelty provision. You could be arrested for drunk driving, your animal is in the car, we take the animal, and it is up to ten days for that circumstance. The 15 days is a separate process and applies if you are charged with animal cruelty and your ability to get a hearing from the judge to try to get the animal back. I apologize, but could you repeat your second question?

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Currently the animal can be there indefinitely if you are arrested. Now in this bill we are changing it to ten days. If nobody adopts the animal or no other arrangements are made, is the animal put to death?

Jamie Rodriguez:

Washoe County has a no-kill shelter. If an animal comes in and has aggressive tendencies—we have had incidents where animals have come in severely injured and euthanasia has had to be an option. But for lack of adoption, we do not euthanize any animals for that purpose. I will say that Washoe County has a phenomenal community; it is not something that we as a county have done. We work with a multitude of agencies and rescue organizations to really try to give all of those animals the best chance they can to get adopted. We do not euthanize animals for lack of being adopted.

Miranda Hoover, representing Nevada Humane Society:

First, I would like to extend a huge thank you to every single stakeholder for coming to the table and being part of this conversation. One of our biggest concerns, as I am sure you all know, is unintended consequences. That was our No. 1 goal in working on this piece of legislation—making sure no agencies would have any undue, unintended consequences or undue fiscal burdens on them. A big thank you to all involved. We are here in full support of S.B. 342 (R1), and thank the bill's sponsor for helping with this clean-up language.

Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Appellate Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

I would like to begin by thanking Senator Scheible for working with us on our concerns with respect to this bill. You will see that our association has proposed an amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) and as Senator Scheible indicated, she is accepting that as friendly. What it does is change the requirement in section 7 that the prosecutor provide notice to a person who has been arrested for animal cruelty or animal fighting. It changes the requirement that we, as the district attorney, notify them of their rights. The reason for that is when you have someone arrested for that type of charge, they are usually represented by counsel. We wanted to remove any sort of confusion by a defendant that we are representing them or that we are advising them of their rights. It is not appropriate for us to make contact with them or to advise them. What it does is take that notice portion and move it to section 11, and it requires the officer who is removing the animal from the situation to notify the defendant or the owner of the animal of those rights at the time the animals are taken. That would just be included on the written notice that is already being handed out when this occurs. We would just add that language.

Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Clark County Department of Administrative Services:

We are in support of the bill with our proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)). I want to thank the sponsor for giving us the opportunity to be a part of this discussion over several weeks during session to come up with the bill we have today. Our proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) intends to remove the words "in addition to the time set forth in subsection 1" from section 1, subsection 5, to bring the language into conformity with the language set forth in section 1, subsection 6, for cities. I believe that was an oversight and that is why we are requesting this change. The intent is to match what the cities and county do as well.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Ms. Rodriguez testified that Washoe County has a no-kill shelter. Do you know if the other counties in the state also have no-kill shelters? If, after ten days, nobody is able to adopt the animal or no provisions are made, is the animal put to death in other counties?

Alex Ortiz:

I cannot speak to the other 16 counties, but I can speak a little bit to Clark County. In Clark County, City of Las Vegas and the City of North Las Vegas have a contract with The Animal Foundation. It is our communitywide shelter. In that respect and through our contract, what happens is, after a certain amount of time after we release our hold, it goes to their side of the house and they will adopt or attempt to adopt the animal out. I cannot say what happens after that because it is not part of our contract with them. But after our hold, it is then up to them to manage that process of adopting the animal.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

So you do not know if it will get put to death if it does not get adopted out?

Alex Ortiz:

Ultimately they want the animal to survive, be adopted, and be in a loving family. But I cannot definitively answer the question.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there any other testimony in support of S.B. 342 (R1)? [There was none.] I will now open it up for testimony in opposition to S.B. 342 (R1).

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

I do want to thank Senator Scheible and Mr. Dixon for meeting with us. The main concern that we have is in section 1, subsections 5 and 6 that allows the permissive language to move it to five days. Our main concern is with the five days. I think if a municipality can move to that, they are probably going to for cost savings. For us, part of the problem is that is too short of a time frame. A lot of people who get arrested, their cell phones get put in their personal property. I do not know how many of us in this room can recite certain numbers. I know my wife's and my stepson's numbers but probably not many other people's numbers by heart anymore. I am part of the older generation that grew up pre-cell phones when you had to memorize numbers. That being said, it would be difficult for us, as their attorney, to help them work the phone. I do like everything else that this bill is trying to do to provide information, let them have the phone calls, and I know that we will have to have conversations with the Clark County Detention Center to make that work and have that happen. Our concern is the length of time that the person will be able to have a chance to get their pet situated before the shelter either takes possession of them or moves them out. For a lot of our clients, the pet is the best thing they have going on in their life so to remove that from them in such a quick time frame is what we are concerned about. If that was bumped up to maybe 15 days—I know that would be a problem—but that falls in line with our preliminary hearing schedule and when we deal with clients. A lot of times people in my office are the ones making the phone calls and making the family connections and even, in some cases, rescuing dogs. We have a mascot at the office right now that [Clark County Public Defender] Sarah Hawkins rescued and is holding until that client gets out of prison. I have rescued dogs as well, so we are the ones who are making the connections, and if The Animal Foundation is going to take themselves out of the mix a little bit here and lower that potentially to five days, that is our concern.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Just a clarification: originally on the Senate side if my notes are right, you were fine and it is this portion that is causing you discomfort now. Is the time frame portion being changed?

John Piro:

That is correct, Assemblywoman Hansen. We are supportive and we are still supportive of a lot this bill tries to do, but then once it got locked into this five days, that is when we had to switch positions.

Assemblyman Fumo:

I do not know who can answer my question, but a lot of times I hear from clients that there was a search warrant issued, they get arrested, and they tell the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) or even the feds, Please do not take my pet. My neighbor can take care of the dog; he is right here willing to do so—or we can contact my mom, my sister, or whoever to take care of the dog. Do you know if it is the policy to just take the animal anyway, or do they give them that option to have someone else care for the animal rather than having it taken away and possibly euthanized?

John Piro:

I think that would be more of a question for Metro.

Chairman Yeager:

Okay, we are going to phone a friend.

**Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

Our policy is if somebody is going to take care of the animal, whether that is a neighbor or family member, they can pick the animal up.

**Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's
Office:**

I also want to thank Senator Scheible and Mr. Dixon for all of their diligence with this very important issue. I think we, even those coming in opposition today, agree that for our clients and for individuals who are in custody, usually the most important topics are where their children are and where their pets are. So this is extremely important. I can say that when I testified in support, I provided information regarding a client I had who chose to be homeless because of his pet; he was no longer allowed to remain in the apartment complex. Then when he was arrested, it was very difficult for me to try to figure out where his pet was. This was an animal that was a companion dog to him. I do not think it had actual service dog training but it was his companion dog, and that was extremely important and frustrating for everyone involved, including the district attorney, to try to figure out where that pet was.

I would echo the statements made by Mr. Piro that the time line unfortunately will not work with our office in terms of how we are afraid that more pets will be separated from their loving owners due to the time frames set forth. I would also add that we are concerned with the provision regarding the civil trial since our office does not represent anyone in those civil hearings. With the time frames of that civil proceeding regarding an allegation of animal cruelty, it would occur probably before our preliminary hearing would even take place. So we have an individual who is not represented by counsel who is then testifying about

everything that would come up in our criminal trial without having any form of notifications, potentially saying, Hey, you have a Fifth Amendment right. I am not even sure if that would necessarily apply in that civil trial. We have not even set forth that there would be an admonishment.

There was a recent decision that came out of the Nevada Supreme Court, *Cooper v. State*, 422 P.3d 722 (2018), that is regarding probationers, which stated that a probation revocation hearing held prior to the disposition of criminal charges arising out of the alleged violation of conditions of his probation is admissible against the probationer during subsequent proceedings on the related criminal charges. I think that if we fashion something like that in terms of whatever the individual stated during that civil trial could not be used against them at their criminal trial, except for impeachment purposes, I think we would solve some of the problems where I understand the policy reasoning of trying to have a civil trial occur as quickly as possible, but they do have that pending criminal case that we are concerned about. I would note that this is very similar to what happens in dependency cases as well where, if there are allegations of child abuse and there is a petition that is filed where that child is removed, there are adjudication hearings that occur prior to any criminal trial that would happen, but it is out of statute as well as case law that those findings in a child protective services investigation cannot come into the criminal trial. I believe that we can fashion something that would alleviate our concerns, but at this point we do have to be here in opposition.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there any other testimony in opposition to S.B. 342 (R1)? [There was none.] I will open it up for neutral testimony on S.B. 342 (R1). [There was none.] I will invite the presenters back to the table for concluding remarks.

Senator Scheible:

I do want to address some of the questions and concerns that came up, and these very much mirror the conversations that I had with the stakeholders over the past two months trying to find the right balance of taking care of people, taking care of animals, and also being practical. The first thing that I want to point out is that the time lines are not intended to be harsh due dates, deadlines, and lines in the sand. Certainly we are not going to be euthanizing animals just because someone has not come to pick them up. I want to put this in context of how this would actually play out in a criminal case or one of these circumstances.

I think that Ms. Rodriguez brought up a perfect example. If someone is arrested for a DUI and they have their animal in the car at the time and—unlike one of Assemblyman Fumo's clients—they do not have somebody else who can take the dog right now or perhaps they are not in a position to communicate that to the people who are arresting them. This person goes to jail and the dog goes to The Animal Foundation. I will start with the ten-day time line and then will move to the five-day time line. This bill says that while that person is sobering up for two days in jail before they meet their attorney on the fourth day, and moving into the

fifth day when they have figured out where their kids are, and now they are starting to think about where their pets are, they have ten days to contact the shelter and say, Hey, that is my dog and I am going to come get him or I am going to send my wife to get him or my sister is on the way. It does not mean that after those ten days have passed that they will not be allowed to get the dog back again. It means that if I am the person at the shelter who has taken in this dog, it is a blue heeler named Max and I know that Max belongs to the guy who was arrested for the DUI, I have to wait ten days before I can adopt that animal out to anybody else or before I can give that animal to a fostering agency because it is not fair to the person in custody that I would turn around and adopt the animal out on day three.

On day ten, once that person has had the opportunity to—remember, we have posted a notice at the jail that tells them where their animals are—call the animal shelter, free of cost, to figure out where their animal is, if over the course of ten days they have not made an arrangement, now, as the animal shelter, I can start looking for another placement for that animal. It still does not necessarily mean that this person is not going to get their animal back. It means that if I have a foster family who says, Sure, I will take Max the blue heeler until his person comes back around, I can let Max out of the shelter to go home with a family to chill in a yard, eat grass, and drink water from an individual bowl instead of a trough until that person gets out of jail.

That is what the ten-day time line does. That allows for the flexibility of people not wanting their animals back, wanting them back, being able to care for them, not being able to care for them, and it allows for the shelter to have some flexibility with their options. It could also be that Max stays at the shelter for another ten days while he is available for adoption. Maybe the person who was arrested comes to get him on day 13 if no one else has adopted him. But what it also does is, it says that if the person who originally had possession or custody of the dog does not take action within 10 days and if somebody else comes to the shelter on day 13 and falls in love with Max and adopts Max, they do not have to give him back because that person did not exercise their right to retrieve the animal in a timely fashion—and we call a timely fashion 10 days.

I do not think that we see those cases happening often. I have never heard of an animal being adopted while the person was in custody, but as Assemblywoman Hansen said, we have to think about everything. And if that happens, we want the law to be clear about who would get possession of that animal. If it was before day ten, it would be the person who originally had possession; after day ten, if they had not made arrangements, the new family is the new family. I know that is tough, but we have to make tough decisions here at the Legislature. That is the ten-day time line.

Now I want to talk about the five-day time line. This bill does not represent all of the conversations that were had in my office over the last two or three months to come to a compromise on the time lines. What we learned over the course of this process is that different counties operate differently and especially in some smaller counties, which paradoxically have more resources. If I am not The Animal Foundation, I am not taking in ten animals per day. If I am the local animal control in a rural neighborhood that only gets

one animal per week, five days might actually be a reasonable amount of time for me to go down to the jail, which is a thing that animal control officers do, and meet face-to-face with the person who previously had possession of the animal and talk to them about where they want their animal to go and what they want to be done with their animal. I might do that as an animal control officer on day two or day three, and that still gives them two days to make their decision about what they want to do with the animal. If that is the route that a certain county or certain jurisdiction animal control agency wants to take, they have to adopt regulations and ordinances that spell out what they are going to do in those five days to help the person rehome the animal. If all they are doing is putting the notice in the jail, they cannot move to the five-day time line. They are stuck on the ten-day time line. To move to the five-day time line, they have to outline in their ordinance or their code that their animal control officers are going to do something more. They are going to go to the jail and talk to the individuals whose animals have been seized, they are going to go to the homes and talk to the families of the individuals who have been arrested to take care of the animals, and they are going to be more proactive in providing an opportunity for the person to take care of the animal.

With the five-day time line, the same rules apply as the ten-day time line if the person within five days just will not agree, just will not allow that animal shelter to put the animal with a fostering agency; after five days they do not get the choice anymore. Then the animal control agency can put the animal in a foster home, but it could still be a foster home that is going to return the animal to the person who originally had custody of him or her, the person who was incarcerated, after the time that they get out of jail. None of this is intended to seal the fate of any animal. It is intended to give the agencies the opportunity to cooperate with each other and provide clear guidelines for the court to tell us when people have been timely in taking care of their animals and when they have not so that animals do not have to languish in custody while people are essentially doing the same.

I think that covers the majority of the questions that were raised to this point. We have worked really hard to make this bill palatable for all of the people involved, and I think that it takes great strides towards ensuring that people are reunited with their animals and animals are not left in state custody longer than necessary. As always, I remain open to conversations with anybody who has questions about the bill or has unique circumstances in their jurisdiction that would require some kind of amendment to the bill. I am always happy to have those conversations, and I think it is really important that we continue to work on this issue and pass meaningful legislation this year to help people and animals who have been adversely affected by the present state of the law.

Jeff Dixon:

Assemblywoman Krasner, I want to address the question you had about animals being euthanized after ten days. I have been to nearly every shelter in the state, and just as a practice in the profession across the country, they are in the rehoming business. To put an animal down is an outcome that they try to avoid. As standard practice, that goes against their statistics that they keep which can hurt fundraising and public trust. People in the community wonder why you are putting animals down without needing to. There was a

former shelter director in Boulder City who would do that and it caused an uproar, and now that person has been convicted of some crimes related to that activity. Not to say that euthanizing is illegal, but they are trying to rehome animals. At ten days, no, they do not get put down. If it is an animal that is not healthy and treatable, it may get put down for reasons unrelated to the ten days. The ten days has nothing to do with that outcome other than whoever has custody or possession of them, they may be transferred to the shelter if the shelter so wishes.

As far as the 10 days goes, The Animal Foundation's current police hold time line is 10 days. We could not make that 15 days, although we understand we want to give people in custody ample time, but we could not make it more than 10 days—otherwise you would run into space constraints at The Animal Foundation which can lead, as I stated earlier, to euthanasia for space. During the summer they have 100 animals coming in every single day and they are not adding space all of the time. They want to get animals in and out as quickly as possible.

As far as the five days is concerned, that is when there is active assistance. Ten days is where there is passive assistance including signage near the phones, phone calls are free, and it can be on their booking paperwork. There is ample opportunity within ten days but nobody is assisting them. At five days, that is where a county has decided to adopt a procedure where they are going to say, This is what we are going to do for this person in custody to help them get their animal out within five days. Whether it is making the calls for them or doing whatever, but they are actually involved in getting that animal out and not just saying, Well, we told you and now it is five days.

We are going to be watching this, if it is passed, in every county and jurisdiction around the state to make sure that it is not ripe for abuse and they are meeting Mr. Piro's concern that they are going to shorten it to five days and not do a whole lot and then to save money. We want that to be active, meaningful assistance to the person because, again, we want people to stay with their animals after they are out of custody if at all possible.

Chairman Yeager:

Committee members, please feel free to ask any questions offline. Before I close the hearing, I wanted to share with the Committee a link to an article sent to me by Assemblywoman Tolles and it is from July 20, 2017, in the *USA Today* by the Associated Press. The title is, " 'Don't (expletive) shoot': Michigan woman convicted of murder in parrot witness case," and it reads:

WHITE CLOUD, Mich. - A jury has convicted a western Michigan woman of first-degree murder in the shooting death of her husband in a crime apparently witnessed by the man's pet parrot.

The Newaygo County jury deliberated about eight hours before finding 49-year-old Glenna Duram guilty Wednesday of killing 46-year-old Martin

Duram. He was shot five times in May 2015. Glenna Duram suffered a head wound in what prosecutors said was a suicide attempt, but survived.

Martin Duram's ex-wife, Christina Keller, has said that after the slaying, the pet parrot, Bud, repeated "don't (expletive) shoot" in Martin Duram's voice. Keller took ownership of the bird after Martin Duram's death.

Duram is due to be sentenced Aug. 28 on the murder and a felony firearm charge.

Testimony from a parrot apparently has been used in at least one prosecution.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I would like to thank Chairman Yeager, in honor of the topic today of animals, for triple-dog daring me to ask the question.

Chairman Yeager:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 342 (R1). Do we have any comments or questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open it up for public comment in Carson City or Las Vegas. [There was none.]

I have a couple of announcements for the Committee and the public. If you happen to be in Las Vegas this weekend, the Clark County Public Defender's Office is hosting a warrant-quashing clinic from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. at the Regional Justice Center. If you are interested in checking that out or if you are watching online and want to participate in that, you do have to preregister so I would encourage you to reach out to the Clark County Public Defender's Office. It sounds as if they will be quashing warrants from the City of Las Vegas Justice Court, Henderson Justice Court, and North Las Vegas Justice Court, as well as City of Las Vegas Municipal Court. If anybody is listening and you have a warrant, perhaps try to get on the calendar and get that taken care of on Saturday morning.

I also wanted to announce something that I thought was pretty interesting. The Committee might remember hearing Assembly Bill 267, which was the compensation for exonerated persons and you probably remember hearing from Mr. DeMarlo Berry. Mr. Piro shared with me that apparently, according to Mr. Berry's Facebook post, when he was here in the building he learned that his grandfather, Woodrow Wilson, was actually the first African American elected to the Nevada Legislature in 1966. The Rocky Mountain Innocence Center posted a photo of Mr. Berry standing next to the graphic of his grandfather on Facebook. That is an interesting story, and I wanted to make sure that I shared that with the Committee members.

We do not have a meeting tomorrow morning. Monday morning we will be meeting at 9 a.m. We have one bill, which I will call a big-ticket item, Senate Bill 131. If you have not read the bill yet, you will know why we call it a big-ticket item.

This meeting is adjourned [at 10:57 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Traci Dory
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment dated May 2, 2019, to Senate Bill 316 (1st Reprint), submitted and presented by Senator Ira Hansen, Senate District No. 14.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint), submitted by John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office, and Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Appellate Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 342 (1st Reprint), dated April 25, 2019, submitted by Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Clark County Department of Administrative Services.