

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

**Eightieth Session  
February 20, 2019**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:09 a.m. on Wednesday, February 20, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019](http://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:**

None



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

James E. Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections  
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas  
Metropolitan Police Department  
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public  
Defender's Office  
Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's  
Office  
Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department  
of Motor Vehicles  
Jennifer Rey, Victim Services Officer, Department of Corrections  
Tom Lawson, Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, Northern Command,  
Department of Public Safety  
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County  
District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys  
Association  
Alanna Bondy, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice; and the Law  
Offices of Kristina Wildeveld and Associates  
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

**Chairman Yeager:**

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol was explained.] On the agenda today we have two bills.  
I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 10.

**Assembly Bill 10: Revises provisions governing the duties of the Director of the  
Department of Corrections when an offender is released from prison. (BDR 16-  
204)**

**James E. Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections:**

I gave a brief background of this issue when I testified in front of you last time. When we  
release offenders into the community, the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) requires the Nevada  
Department of Corrections (NDOC) to confiscate all types of identification from the offender  
being released if we cannot prove their identity. Proving their identity means that we go based  
upon the standards from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) whereby we have to prove  
it by birth certificate, military identification, or social security number. We cannot get those  
types of identification from many of the offenders, especially those who are from other

countries. Most countries, if not all, require the offender to be there in person to be able to obtain a birth certificate. We cannot send our offenders to those countries, so that is an obstacle. We have been trying to work with different consulates to get some other types of proof of identity through birth certificates or consular identification cards. We have been trying to get different avenues to obtain proof of identity. We have been running into obstacles with that.

Most other states in the country now require birth certificate requests to be done online. They require a return email address to the offender who is requesting the birth certificate. Again, we cannot do that in NDOC. That is another obstacle.

Another obstacle is that many offenders do not even know where they were born. How, then, would we obtain a birth certificate? Some have been passed along from place to place. They were in adoption centers, ran away, got caught, and were placed in other states. There have been so many changes of hands on some of these offenders that they themselves cannot even prove where they were born. Other offenders do not want to give us identification of where they were born because they believe that it is a tracking system that the DMV or the local law enforcement can do to track their history. Whether they think it is good or bad, they believe it is another tracking mechanism.

What we do at NDOC is give offenders a NDOC identification card when they come into our system. However, the mittimus from the court tells us the name they assigned the offender—which may or may not be the true name or birthdate of the offender—when they come in. It is based upon the name and birthdate that they gave upon arrest. They match fingerprints if the offender ever had fingerprints taken in the past. If they have never had fingerprints taken in the past, there is nowhere to match an identification through fingerprints. The very first fingerprints become the person's identity. That is the name they come in on. Every other name they come in on in the future becomes their new identity and the original name that they gave becomes their alias. That can go on over and over again. Some offenders can have 20 or 30 names and birthdates when we release them. We go on the very last name that they came in with from a mittimus from the court with the sentence, and we align all of those other names with the last one.

We now do DNA tests on the violent offenders who come in. We link that DNA to every single one of those names. On my end, it does not matter what name they came in with in the past or the name that they come in with on the new mittimus. We link every one of those aliases through DNA. That is something that might put you at ease.

The problem I have is with what happens when we release offenders and we confiscate all of their identification. We release them into the community. Without an identification, they cannot get a hotel, even if we provide them with the resources and money for a hotel, which we do. They cannot get into a hotel or register because they do not have identification. The biggest concern that I have is that the violent offenders going into the community are those who also have underlying mental health concerns. When we send them into the community, NDOC gives them up to four weeks of psychotropic medication to make sure they are

stabilized when they are back in the community. However, when they do not have identification, trying to obtain medication after the four weeks becomes almost impossible. That is when they start to substitute with other drugs and self-medicate. That becomes extremely dangerous. Now we start getting these inmates back into our system and we are shocked that they returned. That does not make sense.

When the inmates go out on parole or probation, we require that they do certain programs. They can be addiction programs, anger management programs, or rehabilitative programs that are behavior programs. We cannot get those offenders into those programs if they do not have any identification. This puts us backwards in our steps to try to make the community safer.

We came up with an option based upon the concept of what the country is doing with the REAL ID Act. We came up with a concept whereby if we verify the identification of the offenders, we give them their regular NDOC identification and photo on their way out the door. If we cannot verify it, we give them an identification which clearly states that it is not a verified identification. That will allow us to give the inmate some form of identification, but it clearly says it has not been verified. That would give them the option when they leave to go out and get housing, medication, and other resources. I have no other thoughts on how to even do this without doing that. The only other way is to continue what we are doing, which I do believe is dangerous, especially for those violent offenders with underlying mental health conditions. They should have downloaded onto the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) a picture of one of these identification cards so that you can see what it actually looks like ([Exhibit C](#)).

The only concern we were getting was from the DMV. Can these offenders use those unverified identifications to actually obtain other methods of identification through the DMV? I know that the DMV was going to put into policy or request a change in the language to make sure that the unverified identification that we give cannot be used to obtain a driver's license or a DMV-issued state identification. I am fine with that. I just want to make sure that I have something to give to the offenders on their way out the door. Then they can get those services so that they do not victimize our communities because they are basically trying to survive with no identification.

That is all I have, but that is the language you see proposed here in [Assembly Bill 10](#). It basically just allows NDOC to give those who do not have verified identification something on their way out the door. The following calendar year, we processed over 4,800 birth certificates. However, with a 14,000-inmate population, it is not enough. We are doing the best we can with trying to get identification. We have been working with the counties—Washoe and Clark Counties specifically—to come up with assistance from them when they first come into the jail system. They begin the process, and we continue the process when they come into NDOC. The process of obtaining a birth certificate is lengthy and costly. We have received approval through the Interim Finance Committee to use the inmate welfare fund to pay for those identifications when we need to, but we cannot even begin the process with some of these inmates, especially those from other countries. The intent of the bill is to allow NDOC to give an unverified identification to offenders when we cannot prove who they really are.

**Chairman Yeager:**

We had discussed a proposed amendment from NDOC ([Exhibit D](#)). I did not see that up on NELIS. Are you still looking to propose an amendment to the bill? It seemed to have to do with whether the DMV could accept this identification as proof to get a state identification.

**James Dzurenda:**

We did submit something to the Legislative Counsel Bureau yesterday. I know it is coming up. The only change was to add language saying that they cannot use the unverified language to obtain a DMV-issued state identification or driver's license. I do not see that in the copy I received this morning either, but we submitted it yesterday.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I have seen it. The way that I read the bill right now, it is pretty clear that the only identification that the DMV can accept from NDOC would be a verified one. Was the thought behind that amendment just to make it abundantly clear in the statute that an unverified identification cannot be accepted by the DMV to substantiate identification?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct. That is why I believe they really would just need a policy change anyway to notify their staff that they will not accept an unverified identification.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is the actual production of the identification cards done at NDOC, or does the DMV make those and then give them to you?

**James Dzurenda:**

We do that at NDOC. There is not any fiscal note to add "unverified" onto the identification card.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

Will offenders be able to gain employment using this identification?

**James Dzurenda:**

Yes and no. They need identification to get employment, so they can use it for that. However, they also need a social security number (SSN) to get employment, which is out of my purview. Even if they have a social security card, they would have to go to the DMV to get a state identification. This unverified identification card will allow them to apply for a job and then they would have to work out the SSN part after.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

I am just concerned that it might not have an actual purpose if they are not able to work with this identification. The only thing they would be able to use it for would be to make purchases or to use a credit card?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct. Another part I did not mention is that we give inmates checks on their way out the door from money they had, what we call, "on the books." That is on their inmate accounts. If they have had a long-term job in the facility, over a long period of time they collect a significant amount of money that they get upon release to be able to start up on housing and to survive when they get out. They cannot cash those checks if they do not have any identification. Sometimes they go out and try to sell them out in the community and they probably only get 10 percent of that money.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I do want to note for the Committee members that the proposed amendment from NDOC is up on NELIS now ([Exhibit D](#)).

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Director Dzurenda, I am glad to hear that you are continuing the process of looking for identification from the moment they come from jail into prison. Can you please elaborate on that some more? I know that there was previously a drop-off on that procedure. How many inmates are you actually able to find a true identification for? How many cases do you have where you realize the name they were arrested under is not actually their name?

**James Dzurenda:**

We actually began the process on over 8,000 of the 14,000 because we did not process those who have sentences of more than 5 years. We have more time for them. We process those when they come in our door. We have four staff that are in our intake facilities. We process them on the way in the door to see where they are in the process. We verify with the county that sent them in, or even the juvenile systems, whether they did anything with them. We started the process for over 8,000. However, we have only obtained 4,800 of the 8,000 during the process. We have been successful with a little more than half of the offenders that we have actually processed, at least so far.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

When you say successful, you are saying their actual true identification?

**James Dzurenda:**

Yes. We actually got a birth certificate.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

I appreciate the effort. When I think of not only individuals getting jobs, but those inmates who have fully completed their sentence and would legally be allowed to leave the state, they would not be allowed to fly with this identification if they have family in another state whom they could go back to for support. Those are my concerns there, to make sure that everyone can get the full services. As you said, you are doing the best with what you can right now.

**James Dzurenda:**

On that topic, I think once we get caught up with all of the ones who are in our system, it will be a lot easier when they come in the door. Right now we are trying to do both those who have been in our system and those who are coming in our door. When that is all caught up, I think it will be an easier process and we will be allowed to have more evident data to show which ones we cannot get and why we cannot get those. I think that will be more important when we catch up.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I am sympathetic to this. Along the lines of my colleague, Assemblywoman Torres, do we have any assurances already that the identification will work with vendors in the community when they go to cash a check or go to some of the programs they have been assigned to? Are they going to accept that identification?

**James Dzurenda:**

We have been using the unverified identification prior to last year, and they were able to cash checks with them. They could not get a driver's license with them and they could not get a job with them unless it was linked with a SSN, but it did get them the services they needed. As long as it has a picture that says who they are and they have the NDOC documentation to back up the picture, they can cash the checks, they can get into the programs, and they can get their medication. If they have nothing, they cannot get any of it.

**Assemblyman Roberts:**

I think it is great that you are trying to give them something when they get out. When they come in under their convicted name and you figure out that they have a different name, would you issue them an identification card under the second name?

**James Dzurenda:**

We issue them an identification under the name that the court tells us at that time. All of the prior names become aliases. Their new names become whatever the courts tell us they are.

**Assemblyman Roberts:**

What if you verify that they are, in fact, somebody else by finding a birth certificate? Would you still issue them an unverified identification under their convicted name?

**James Dzurenda:**

No, when we verify their name, we issue it under that name. When we can verify their real identity, we submit documentation to the courts. Their real identity would go on the court mittimus.

**Assemblyman Roberts:**

Do you ever have inmates dispute their identification and say that they are really another person?

**James Dzurenda:**

Yes, that does happen quite a few times. If we cannot get the birth certificate, we do not care what they say. It is whatever the mittimus says.

**Assemblyman Roberts:**

Even though they may dispute it, you will issue it under the name on the birth certificate?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct.

**Chairman Yeager:**

When you refer to the name that the court gives you, are you referring to the name that is on the judgment of conviction for the offender?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I know that we have had that issue in court before, disputes about how the caption reads and who the person is. I think the court tries to resolve that, but the court has the same problem you have. If the person does not have any prior fingerprints on record, it can be hard to tell. As we think about this issue going forward, we might want to think more about trying to figure that out on the front end in some way. I know I will open up a Pandora's box by saying that because this is resource intensive, but it would certainly be helpful if some of that verification and vetting could be done before the offender is in NDOC custody. That is something to think about as we move forward.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

I am looking at the bill. As I understand, the current law does state that we do give prisoners a photo identification when they leave prison. Is that correct?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct, as long as it is verified.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

What we are trying to do with this new bill is give them a photo identification when their name is not verified. Could they just say they do not remember where they were born or lived, give a fake name, and then get a photo identification? Then, by combining that unverified identification with other documentation, can they go and get a driver's license?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is where the DMV is requesting a change to say that an unverified identification cannot be used for that purpose. That was their concern.



**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

With my new fake name I could use it to go get a job? I could go work with children even if I am a convicted pedophile?

**James Dzurenda:**

With work, it is a different issue. If you only have an identification, you cannot get a job. You must have it linked with a SSN for tax purposes. It will not be able to be used to get a job. It is for services, check-cashing, hotels, programs, medication, and things such as that. A job is a different issue.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

I just have some real concerns. Once somebody has this state-issued ID, can he then try to get a SSN with that unverified identification?

**James Dzurenda:**

The Social Security Administration will not issue them a verified SSN without a birth certificate or a passport, so they will not be able to get that through our identification. The process for Social Security will not allow you to do that either.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

Do you have any concerns about people just saying they are someone else?

**James Dzurenda:**

They can obtain false picture identification anywhere in the community, so I just want to make sure that they can get, really, their psychotropic medication, because a lot of them can become violent. We have to give them something to say who they are. The identification is still linked to DNA, so if we get an inmate who is caught and they see an unverified identification, they can come back to NDOC and find out who that individual is based on DNA. We cannot tell you based upon birth certificate, but it is still linked to DNA. If they use that in a crime, and they get caught with that identification, we can link who they are to their past history. We just cannot verify who they are based upon SSN, military ID, or birth certificate. If we do not give them anything, I truly believe it is going to be a danger to the community. They are not going to be able to do the things that I mentioned.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

I just have some concerns with the unverified name. I understand that they can get a fake identification anywhere, but now this is a government-issued fake identification. That is where I am concerned.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I think the issue here is that releasing them with nothing sets them up for failure and, I think, puts our community at risk. At least with some kind of identification, they can get housing, they can cash the check so that they do not have to sell it for pennies on the dollar, and they can get their medication. I understand this might not be a perfect solution, but I think it is certainly better than what we are doing now, which is releasing somebody with absolutely no

identification and being surprised when he ends up back in the system. When you think about your life and how often you need to show an identification for even the most minor of things, it makes sense. I appreciate the clarification that this cannot be used to get a job, pass a background check, or obtain a SSN.

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

I like the bill. I think it is a good idea. Are other states already implementing this? Have there been studies to show that it reduced recidivism rates?

**James Dzurenda:**

I do not know. I know it will be affecting every state by the year 2021. The only states I have checked with are the ones in which I have previously worked: Connecticut and New York. They do not do this. New York City actually gives back any identification they come in with. Even if it is a fake identification, they still leave with it. Connecticut has not begun an unverified identification program. They are still confiscating. My guess is that they are probably waiting to see what other states are doing. Those were the only ones I was able to verify with. I do not have records from anywhere else. We can get that. I have access to every single director of every prison system around the country, and we can put out a survey to see where that stands.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

As employers, my husband and I like to give opportunities to offenders who have shown real progress. We are proud of that. However, we are intensely strict about background checks. We will work through some things with them. Certainly, sex offenses are a deal-breaker because of the type of work we are doing; we are going into people's homes. Please give some clarification on a background process as part of a job. If I as an employer decide to give someone a chance—even though he has an unverified identification—and then put him through a background check, will it not allow it? Is it correct that you need to have a SSN to do the background check?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

So that would stop the process right there? Even if I, as an employer, say that I am going to give them a chance and then I run a background check, the unverified identification would not allow it?

**James Dzurenda:**

That is correct. If we had the SSN, we would give them a verified identification anyway. It will not allow you to do a background check if you do not have a SSN.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any further questions for the Director? [There were none.] At this time I would like to open it up for testimony in support of A.B. 10. If anybody would like to testify in support, please come forward.

**Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

You might remember, when I gave my presentation a few weeks ago on the overview of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, we had brought a bill last session to let the folks who work in the Clark County Detention Center assist certain inmates who take part in the Hope for Prisoners program with getting an identification card and other proper paperwork for when they leave the facility. It is a benefit to officers in the field. If an officer encounters someone on a call and he has no identification on him, the officer is forced, in many cases, to make an arrest if we cannot verify that the person is who he says he is. Although it is not perfect, having an unverified identification card from NDOC is better for the officer in the field who has to determine if someone is telling the truth about who they are than having no identification at all and having to take that person in to the detention center for booking. It also helps with reentry.

To a small degree, I do share some of the concerns about someone potentially being able to obtain a driver's license or a false identification. However, while they are in prison, their DNA is taken and their identification has been established by the courts, so for all future intents and purposes, they have established this identification through DNA. I think the benefit outweighs any risk.

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

On behalf of the Clark County Public Defender's Office, I would just register our support. We are thankful for all of the work that Director Dzurenda is doing to help with successful reentry.

**Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:**  
The Washoe County Public Defender's Office echoes the sentiments from Mr. Piro, and we thank Director Dzurenda.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Before we continue with testimony, I am going to put this hearing on pause for just a minute. Committee members, I have a couple of bill draft requests (BDRs) that we need to get to the floor before 9 a.m., so I am going to take a couple of motions on these. The first one is BDR 41-716, which was requested by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

**BDR 41-716**—Revises provisions related to gaming employees. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 221](#).)

I will take a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request (BDR) 41-716.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 41-716.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Next I have Bill Draft Request (BDR) 14-842, which was also requested by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

**BDR 14-842**—Revises provisions relating to specialty courts. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 222](#).)

At this time I will take a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request 14-842.

ASSEMBLYMAN ROBERTS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 14-842.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will be seeing these back in the Committee shortly. At this time, we will go back to our hearing on [Assembly Bill 10](#).

**Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I have been a volunteer in correctional settings for 25 years at the federal, state, and local level. I believe [A.B. 10](#) does help in terms of making sure people at least start to have a normal life. My goal is to return people to taxpayer status. Identification verification is at the heart of helping the incarcerated gain employment, receive veteran benefits, and get public assistance to ensure his or her release lowers victimization and helps the ex-offender become a successful, productive, and taxpaying member of society. I would hope that would be a shared objective for everyone here in this Committee. We must give the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) Director the tools he needs to do his job ([Exhibit E](#)).

I spent 12 years at a national laboratory where a major part of my assignment was to find and interview former employees in order to identify hazards associated with the demolition of contaminated facilities. I can attest to the difficulty and critical importance of this task. Please see the PowerPoint if you are interested ([Exhibit F](#)).

If you want someone to be successful, you have to give him the tools to be successful. Gone are the days when an inmate was given \$50, put on a bus, and dropped off in front of a liquor store in Reno. That happened.

Personal identification takes time, effort, resources, and funds. We have to ask ourselves the question, do we want to deal with the causes or the effects?

I am a convicted felon. A question was asked, what are the jobs that I am not eligible for? I tried very hard for several months to find a list. There is no list. That might be something that this Committee can look into at some point in time because it gets a little bit complicated. For example, if convicted, can an accountant work for an accounting firm? I do not know, and I think those questions would be very good to answer.

I also wish to thank Director Dzurenda for his proactive management in this and other foci to reduce criminality. He has made strides in bringing his department in line with the goal of reducing victimization, both inside and outside of NDOC. This proposed law, I believe, is a step in the right direction.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anybody else in support of A.B. 10? [There was no one.] Is there anyone opposed to A.B. 10? [There was no one.] Is there any neutral testimony?

**Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:**

We are here in neutral on behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). We appreciate the testimony from Director Dzurenda. We do commend all of the efforts that NDOC has taken over the years to help inmates being released. I think this is in the right direction. I appreciate his understanding of our standards at the DMV that we must maintain for our citizens. We would always extend our olive branch to keep working with NDOC to continue working out solutions. We do have some indications from other states about how they do this. Even those scenarios are not perfect.

Chairman Yeager, I think what you suggested earlier, about Pandora's box being opened, should be done. This is something that is not new to us. Over the last several sessions, this has been a very important topic. I believe everyone wants inmates to have the proper transition into the public. The DMV is one of the agencies that wants that as well. I would love to see a committee that can be formed with state and federal agencies—Social Security Administration, the courts, law enforcement, DMV, NDOC—to address some of the scenarios. We will not solve it all, but I think we can come together to figure out where the potholes are on this and fill some of them to make it even more robust and to assist NDOC in their programs. I think everybody is at the point where we want to help the courts and NDOC to get a good system for these inmates. I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I do agree with you that the preferred method would be to verify some of this information before the offender ends up in NDOC. There are obviously some difficulties there because some of the offenders are incarcerated in local jails. It is a resource issue, but I think your suggestion is a good one. I do not think we are going to solve this issue this session, but between the sessions is when we can do some of this work. Hopefully we can find a better system. You are right, we are not going to solve it entirely, but we need to solve it in a better way than we are now as a state. We will continue to work on those issues, and we will reach out to your department to be a part of those discussions.

Is there additional neutral testimony on A.B. 10? [There was none.] Director, would you like to give any concluding remarks?

**James Dzurenda:**

I just want to say that our ultimate goal is to reduce victims in our community. When you have inmates who are released who cannot get these tools that were mentioned, it becomes an issue. When inmates are released, their very first concern is where they will live. Where will they get money? Where will they get food? If you take all of that away, they will likely turn to crime. They will do crime because they need to survive. That is really what we are trying to do. I do not have any other options than this. We have met quite a few times with other agencies. I have been meeting with the detention centers in Washoe County, Clark County, and the juvenile system in Clark County. We do not have any other options. If there are any suggestions to make it better, I am all for it. However, we cannot find any right now. I need something to reduce crime. I know for a fact that if we do not do this, we are not going to help the victims in the community. Victimization is going to happen because they cannot get those services, they cannot get a place to live, and they cannot get their medications. All of these things play a factor in keeping the community safe. That is why I urge you to support A.B. 10.

**Chairman Yeager:**

For Committee members, I wanted to mention there was a proposed amendment to this bill on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) regarding tribal identification cards ([Exhibit G](#)). It was determined by the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau that the proposed amendment is not germane to this bill. For the purposes of this bill, you can ignore that amendment. I am working with the sponsor of that to see if we can potentially find a home for it. I wanted to clear up any confusion about why that was up on NELIS. It was officially proposed, but it is just not going to work in this setting. I will close the hearing on A.B. 10.

[[Exhibit H](#)], written testimony in support of Assembly Bill 10 from Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice, was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will now formally open the hearing on Assembly Bill 61.

**Assembly Bill 61: Revises provisions governing the authority of the Director of the Department of Corrections to assign certain offenders to serve a term of residential confinement. (BDR 16-203)**

**James E. Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections:**

The whole intent of Assembly Bill 61 is twofold. First of all, for this residential confinement program, the Director of NDOC currently has no authority to deny anybody. When you look at recidivism and victimization in the community, there are some offenders who need specific evidence-based programs to be successful. When an offender in our system, who is arrested on a specific crime, and that specific crime has evidence-based programs that can help change that individual's behavior—whether it is addiction behavior or behavioral issues—and the offender refuses to do those programs, I have no authority to deny that person residential placement. Residential placement is basically releasing an offender into a residential program before the end of his sentence under the jurisdiction of the Division of Parole and Probation (P&P), Department of Public Safety. I am required to sign them. I was getting them on my desk for a signature, and I was looking at some of the cases saying that these individuals truly need certain specific behavioral therapy, they refused it, and I still have to approve it. It made no sense to me that they would still be jeopardizing the community in that way. That is the first purpose of the bill, to allow the Director of NDOC discretion to deny an offender if he or she refused to take a program or failed the program to make them more successful in the community. That is the first piece.

The second piece has to do with my ability to deny residential confinement to an individual based upon threats made to the victims. I have been getting letters from the victims of the crime stating that the offender still poses a threat to the victims or their family, and they show significant reasons for those threats. I cannot deny someone based upon threats to the victims. When they pose a risk to the community, my signature still says they go out. I have no idea why I even have to sign them if it is automatic anyway. It is putting my name on something saying that I approve it, even when some of these cases can have a devastating effect on the community if the offender is released and we cannot give them those evidence-based programs or change the location of where they will be living. I have no choice. I just sign them and approve them for the program. Those are the two reasons why I am requesting the changes through A.B. 61, to give the Director discretion.

**Jennifer Rey, Victim Services Officer, Department of Corrections:**

One of the things that we are not really sure about is that P&P would be required to notify victims if the Director is considering an inmate for residential confinement. The way that our systems are set up for victim notification, P&P has access to a different pool of victim information than NDOC. This is a two-part process between our agencies with the Director on the front end deciding whether or not it is appropriate for an offender to move forward. The Division of Parole and Probation does its own investigation and takes input from victims. We feel that it might be a more cohesive process if NDOC notifies victims registered with NDOC that the Director will be considering an inmate for residential confinement, and then at the second part of the process where P&P is doing an investigation, they will notify the victims in their own victim pool that they are doing an investigation in consideration of an offender going

into residential confinement. We feel that this would be a more cohesive process. Victims will get information more quickly and in a more concise manner than what is currently written.

**Chairman Yeager:**

That is an issue as well. As we move forward with this bill, if you think of a better way to phrase that in the bill, let us know and we will take that into consideration or in a potential work session. Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

To clarify, why are there two different pools? Is that a good thing, or is that something that can maybe be put together?

**Jennifer Rey:**

On the front end of a criminal investigation, P&P is going to do a presentence investigation report. This is before anyone has been sentenced. The Division of Parole and Probation does the investigation. They go out and make contact with the victims for their input. At that point, they are getting addresses and phone numbers. That information is protected. That information cannot be shared with other agencies, including NDOC. Once an offender is sentenced to prison, we get a presentence investigation report with a victim number. We understand everything that happened, but we do not have the identity of that victim. The victim has to specifically sign up with NDOC for notifications. That is how we have our database that we share with the State Board of Parole Commissioners, so now we have two different database systems for victims. I generally have fewer victims at NDOC signed up, but I also have more up-to-date information because victims frequently move or change their number but it is not easy to remember to notify P&P. We end up with two different pools of information for our different agencies. We do work together the best we can to make sure we are getting that continuation of services for victims throughout the entire postconviction process.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Thank you, Assemblywoman Hansen. That was a good question. I did not realize that information did not transfer over. I am not saying that it should. I think it makes sense that victims might want to opt-in to getting notices from NDOC. Perhaps when P&P comes up we will hear a little bit more about what they do on the victim side. I will open it up for additional testimony in support of A.B. 61.

**Tom Lawson, Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, Northern Command,  
Department of Public Safety:**

We are here today in support of A.B. 61 with a proposed amendment to clarify the notification process. We would be happy to work with NDOC to draft that language for consideration by the Committee. In terms of the victim pools, there are different databases, but a large number of those will overlap. She is absolutely correct that they have to opt-in to their system. We have some information from the police reports and the district attorney's offices when they contact them for victim impact statements and other things, but there are some limitations on what we can share. That is certainly a goal in terms of Marsy's Law to try to figure out the



best way for us to share that information. What is protected and what is not? How can we best serve the victims with the totality of the circumstances?

In terms of the language of the bill, we support consideration of the amendment. Our thought is that NDOC makes the determination of whether the person is suitable for residential confinement prior to their term expiring. They would handle the notification of their intent to hold a hearing. Once the inmate is approved for release, our normal process of parole investigation planning would take place where we would have a second level of notification for the victims in our system.

For the other sections, we do think it is a very good idea for the Director to have discretion in granting these. There are people who have not completed programming. If they are not going to be successful in internal programming, that is a very strong indicator that they will not be successful or comply with programming when released. That level of discretion is a good thing for community safety overall.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there any additional testimony in support of A.B. 61?

**John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

I do not know if the record is clear in terms of the process before an offender is released on residential confinement. The release on residential confinement, as I understand it, is the third step of a three-step process. The first step is that the offenders ask for an evaluation in which they are determined to be an abuser of drugs or alcohol. If they are determined to be an abuser of drugs or alcohol and are found to be amenable for treatment, the second step is an intensive period of treatment inside the prison. The third step would be release on residential confinement. The Nevada District Attorneys Association is in support of giving the Director the discretion to deny in situations where inmates have not proven themselves to be worthy of that third step, which is release on residential confinement. To that extent, we are in support of A.B. 61.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 61?

**Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I guess the real question is, do we really want to build another prison ([Exhibit I](#))? That is what it comes down to. Why would we want to use the money that way? We must give the NDOC Director the tools he needs. If you are looking at the information I gave you ([Exhibit J](#)), the most important paragraph is the review and finding of research principles from the consultant that worked with the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. I quote, "Research has found that incarceration is not more effective at reducing recidivism than noncustodial sanctions like probation and that for certain types of offenders, it results in higher

rates of future criminal behavior (as measured by both re-arrests and re-convictions)." I rest my case.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will also note that we have testimony from Mr. Corrado on this bill ([Exhibit I](#) and [Exhibit J](#)) and the last bill ([Exhibit E](#) and [Exhibit F](#)) uploaded to NELIS if you want to review the testimony or additional documents submitted by Mr. Corrado in support. Is there any additional testimony in support of A.B. 61? [There was none.] Is there anyone opposed to A.B. 61?

**Alanna Bondy, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice; and the Law Offices of Kristina Wildeveld and Associates:**

We are in opposition to this bill, particularly amending the language under current statute from "shall" to "may." The programs that are in place to allow for an inmate to be released on residential confinement are effective programs that help inmates transition out of incarceration while still remaining under the supervision of the state. These programs are not only beneficial to offenders, but also to the citizens of Nevada. They ensure safe transition from incarceration and save taxpayers money because inmates are required to pay for their own housing on residential confinement. These programs are aimed at offenders with drug, alcohol, and other rehabilitative issues. Under the existing law, we believe there is a level of discretion that the Director is allowed to exercise. Before the offenders are released on residential confinement, they are required to demonstrate their willingness and ability to participate in a position of employment in the community. They have to demonstrate their willingness and ability to enroll in programs for educational or rehabilitative purposes, and they have to demonstrate their ability to pay for all or part of the costs of their confinement and to meet any existing obligation for restitution. They are also subject to reincarceration if they do not comply with the requirements of their program.

We do believe there is already discretion within the existing statute. Under NDOC's Administrative Regulations, they do have regulations to ensure the inmates are ready to participate in the program. If they do not meet those regulations, from our experience they are not being released.

With regard to the victim notification, while we do not have any issue with victim notification per se, we do believe that victim concerns or opinions should not necessarily interfere with the inmate's successful rehabilitation or determine whether or not the offender should be participating in rehabilitative programming. I do not think that is the purpose of rehabilitation, and I do not think it has any place in this type of programming.

Another concern we would like to raise is, under the current statute, the inmates are to be released within one year of their parole date. In anticipation for their release, many inmates are required to obtain suitable housing prior to their release. These inmates are working toward that date where they are looking for suitable housing. Our office, particularly, has experienced considerable resistance from NDOC under existing statute with that release date. We have had offenders who have obtained suitable housing, have met the requirements of release, and have

been paying rent for about six months before actually being released on residential confinement. We do believe adding an additional layer of discretion can slow that process down, and it is not necessarily the most effective amendment.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Committee members, testimony in opposition from Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice ([Exhibit K](#)) and the Law Offices of Kristina Wildeveld and Associates ([Exhibit L](#)) is uploaded to NELIS as well, if you would like to review that in more detail. Is there any additional testimony in opposition to A.B. 61? [There was none.] Is there anyone neutral on A.B. 61?

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

We at the Clark County Public Defender's Office have proposed a friendly amendment to A.B. 61 dealing with section 1, subsection 8 ([Exhibit M](#)). We want to thank Director Dzurenda for working with us on this to clarify some of the language regarding residential confinement and when a person will or will not be eligible for that. We understand that if an inmate is not taking part in any of the treatment programs they should be taking part in, perhaps the Director should not be forced to place them in a residential confinement outside. We discussed those concerns with Director Dzurenda, and we are comfortable with the bill.

**Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

I echo the sentiments of my colleague from the Clark County Public Defender's Office, and we appreciate that Director Dzurenda worked on this amendment with us. I also think the new language gets at the heart of what it is that he is trying to achieve. It actually gives him a bit more discretion in making those decisions. For example, if a person had a minor infraction, he could continue with that treatment program and would not be precluded from going into residential confinement. I think that is really the heart of the intent of the amendment.

I was not going to bring up Marsy's Law, but because it came up today, I will. As far as victim notification, it is up to NDOC and the Division of Parole and Probation to determine how or whether they are in compliance with Marsy's Law and the requirements of victim notification and the right to be heard in any proceeding. That is very expansive language in Marsy's Law; it does say "any proceeding." I think it is going to be a while before we know what the courts have to say about what any proceeding means. I would just put that on the record that I do not think it is clear in the interpretation of the law. I would definitely look at that before putting in any kind of victim notification requirements in statute.

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

I echo the statements from Ms. Welborn and Mr. Piro. I want to thank Director Dzurenda for working with us on the amendment. I do want to add that part of my concern regarding this bill initially was that it does not appear that the offenders are provided with information if they are denied the residential confinement, and there is no appeal process. In speaking with Director Dzurenda, it is my understanding that he does notify all offenders if they are denied from this, and there is a review process where they are able to object and have a further discussion. As long as that is occurring, I remain neutral on this.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Thank you for proposing the amendment, Mr. Piro. I just wanted to see if you felt that satisfied the concerns stated by Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice (NACJ). Does the amendment address those concerns, or do you believe there is more discussion that needs to be had on this?

**John Piro:**

I am the president of NACJ. However, as someone who is a president of any organization, you do not have control over all of your members and some of their concerns. Their concerns remain theirs. As far as the Clark County Public Defender's Office, our position remains neutral with the proposed amendment. I hope that explains our position.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I hope I did not put you on the spot. I just wanted to see if that clarified things for me as I look at the exhibits. Thank you.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there any additional testimony in the neutral position on A.B. 61? [There was none.] Director Dzurenda, I want to invite you back up, as well as Ms. Rey, for an additional question. Before we get to the question from Assemblywoman Cohen, I want to get on the record that you, Director Dzurenda, are in agreement with the amendment presented by the folks who testified in neutral.

**James Dzurenda:**

Yes. Last night we had a long discussion with the Washoe County Public Defender's Office. I do concur with their recommended changes.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Thank you for coming back up, Ms. Rey. I have a question about victims. I think Mr. Corrado's quote was a good point about how we are starting to see that more incarceration is not necessarily the key to ending reincarceration for offenders. We want to make sure that offenders are leaving and going out to be a part of society. What are you finding from victims and their families? Are they understanding that? Are you starting to see a change in trends, or do they still want incarceration and punishment?

**Jennifer Rey:**

I have definitely seen a huge response in victims wanting input in residential confinement. One of the biggest questions they have for me that I cannot answer for them is, how is this offender doing? Are they getting better? Are they getting the programs they need? Do I have something to fear when they get out? Victims are not, in general, out for retribution. They do want offenders to get better but they also want some input into that process.

I talked to a woman yesterday who gave me permission to use her story if necessary, and I think this would be a good point at which to bring that up. A few years ago, she lost her disabled daughter—one of her two children—to natural causes. Two months later, her son was killed by a drunk driver when he was riding his bike. That drunk driver did not only have an

issue with alcohol, he also happened to be drag racing vehicles at the time, and then hid the vehicle. He showed no remorse. He had done this before, not necessarily where he had killed someone, but this was not a person who simply made a bad judgment this one time. I was able to send the mother a letter and let her know that this person had applied for residential confinement. She said she hopes he never hurts anyone again, but she does not want him on residential confinement. Her child will never come back to her, and she thought that the minimum term he had been given of 5 years should have been served in a prison facility. Then she would be amenable to him having the freedom that her son would never have again.

I do not think it is too much to ask to give victims a voice. I think that is what was at the heart of Marsy's Law; the victims should have some input. I do not think that we would be inhibiting society by allowing that to victims. In many cases, victims do want to make sure their offenders get better. I do not think victim input necessarily precludes the possibility of residential confinement and additional programming.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Director Dzurenda, I have one additional question. Under the way the law is currently written, I understand you have to do this. Since you have been at the Department of Corrections, how many instances have there been where you said "okay," but then it goes to the Division of Parole and Probation and they say "not okay," and the offender comes back under your custody? Has that happened frequently?

**James Dzurenda:**

There are actually two pieces to that. I see a lot of different programs and rehabilitation that they could see in the community. It does not necessarily work better within the prisons or within the community. Many times, the community programs wrap them around services where they will be living, so it would be better. However, there are also services in NDOC where we know we have their attention and know we have the ability to keep them in a program, watch them, and watch their behaviors. There are two different types of programs that make it an effective program for a person. There are programs that I see in the prison system that I know work based on evidence. When they are in the community, the Division of Parole and Probation may think they need additional programs that are not necessarily the programs we thought they needed. That does happen, and then the person does come back to us because the Board of Parole Commissioners does not approve them based upon what they believe. I do not know what the numbers are, but it does happen.

When I first came into the agency, I truly did believe there was authority on the Director's end to deny offenders this program. I did deny three offenders based upon the risk of their going into the community outweighing the risk of leaving them in prison to continue programs. I now have three litigation cases against me because they say I have no authority, based upon *Nevada Revised Statutes* 209.425. I have to assign them to community residential placement no matter what I believe. On those three cases, I truly believed they posed a significant risk to the community, but I still had to approve them.

Anyway, I do not have the numbers from the Division of Parole and Probation. I do not even know if there is a way to track that. It is more based upon what I hear from the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any additional questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Director Dzurenda, please go ahead and give your closing statement on A.B. 61.

**James Dzurenda:**

The only thing I can say about A.B. 61, with the recommended amendment, is that we are trying to hold offenders accountable for their crimes. We are using evidence-based programs based upon the background of their particular crimes—whether it is addiction, mental health, or some type of behavioral reason for their crime—and we are really trying to change their behaviors before they get into the community. We know that evidence-based programs will change their behaviors at least 51 percent of the time. Evidence-based programs do work. If the inmates refuse, we will be showing that less than 50 percent of them will be successful when they leave. When I know an offender has less of a chance upon release, why would we not make sure he goes through these programs? When an inmate knows he can be denied for not going through these programs, he will go through those programs. If they know that they will get approved automatically no matter what they do, why would they do these programs? Why would they not rather go play basketball or go outside for recreation when the program is going on? That is where A.B. 61 comes into play. There needs to be some discretion to hold the inmates accountable so we can change their behaviors and let the inmates know we are serious about this programming.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will formally close the hearing on A.B. 61.

[([Exhibit N](#)), a document regarding Assembly Bill 61, from James Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections, was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Now is the time for public comment. If anyone would like to give public comment, please come to the table.

**Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

If you look at my public comment ([Exhibit O](#)), you will see justice and release supervision issues. There is no involvement by any of the incarcerated people in the production of any proposed law. I do not understand. I come from an area where, if you have somebody you are trying to serve, you listen to them. Secondly, could one of the 39 percent of prison admission failures be a lack of familial contact and support during incarceration? I believe that is actually true. How can you allow anybody to be released from prison without the basic and necessary skill of keyboarding? Nobody here would allow their children or grandchildren to leave elementary school—let alone high school—without that skill, no one.

The incarceration and release of the mentally ill for being mentally ill is not just an incarceration issue, it is a public health issue, it is a national disgrace, and I believe it is a blemish on the state of Nevada. The study found that over one half of the women prisoners have mental health needs. How can you release them and not expect to get a higher rate of recidivism? Where can they go for help, especially help they can afford?

The Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice study points out that 66 percent of admissions are for non-person offenses. That seems to be a drug problem, not an incarceration problem. Are we dealing with the causes, or are we dealing with the effects? Did we make matters worse or better with incarceration?

What other programs can be found to be successful, evidence-based classes on a national level—the Thinking for a Change program, for example. I have taken that and I practice that. Thinking for a Change does work. It is labor-intensive. The state of Washington has 30 teams of people, both inside and outside of prison, who deal with that because they know it works. They start with the people who are the hardcore offenders, who they know are going to reoffend. What other programs have been found to be successful evidence-based classes on a national level, other than Thinking for a Change? What about making sure everyone has their Holland Code before they leave, for example? Dr. John Holland's research has been verified over many years. Inmates leave and they do not even know what that is.

According to the latest study of the NDOC, there are 253 persons who have been granted parole and cannot leave because they have no place to go. They cannot afford to leave. These programs cost money, so they are incarcerated for one or two months, maybe even a year. We keep these people incarcerated, costing all of us not only housing funds, but with prison crowding, potential for violence against both staff and other inmates, resulting in expensive and successful lawsuits. This is especially true given the return of some of the most violent offenders who were incarcerated out of state and brought back earlier to save money. Do we really want to build another prison?

Is there a correlation between the top crime in the state, stealing, and drug use? If there is, why would we not focus our efforts to deal with the problem and not its effects?

Using statistics are the key to crime-fighting. Anne Milgram's Ted Talk is incredibly enlightening in that area. I refer you specifically to that 15 or 20 minutes of your time. Thank you for your time.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there any additional public comment? [There was none.] Is there anything from our Committee members? [There was nothing.]

Members, if you have been checking your email, you would note that tomorrow's meeting has been canceled. We will not be meeting tomorrow. On Friday, we will meet at 8 a.m., and we have two bills and a presentation. Then we will be back on Monday at 9 a.m. I will see all of you at 8 a.m. on Friday morning. Everyone have a great day. The meeting is adjourned [At 9:32 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lucas Glanzmann  
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 document from James Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections, regarding [Assembly Bill 10](#).

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 10](#), dated February 19, 2019, submitted by James Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony dated February 18, 2019, from Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 10](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "The Key to Historical Hazard Identification – Personal Interviews," submitted by Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada, regarding [Assembly Bill 10](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 10](#), submitted by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, regarding tribal identification cards.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated February 4, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, submitted by Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice, in support of [Assembly Bill 10](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony dated February 18, 2019, from Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 61](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is written testimony from Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada, regarding [Assembly Bill 61](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated February 5, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, submitted by Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 61](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated February 5, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, written by Kristina Wildeveld, Attorney, the Law Offices of Kristina Wildeveld and Associates, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 61](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 61](#), submitted and presented by John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office; Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office; and Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.

[Exhibit N](#) is a document from James Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections, regarding Assembly Bill 61.

[Exhibit O](#) is written testimony from Paul G. Corrado, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.