

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

**Eighty-First Session  
March 12, 2021**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:05 a.m. on Friday, March 12, 2021, Online. 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/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola  
Assemblyman C.H. Miller  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblyman David Orentlicher  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30  
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst  
Ashlee Kalina, Assistant Committee Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Bonnie Hoeffcker, Committee Manager  
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary  
Linda Whimple, Committee Secretary  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ximena Chica, President, Nevada Interpreters and Translators Association  
Manuel Mederos, Language Access Specialist, Northern Nevada International Center,  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Olivia Whiteley, Western States Advocacy Officer, Refugee Advocacy Lab and  
International Rescue Committee  
Gillian Block, Legal Intern, Coalition of Legal Service Providers  
John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the  
Courts  
Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual  
Violence  
Margaret I. Campe, Director, Jean Nidetch CARE Center, University of Nevada,  
Las Vegas  
Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's  
Office  
Jim Hoffman, Member, Legislative Committee, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal  
Justice  
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public  
Defender's Office  
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County  
District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys  
Association  
Daniele Staple, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Center, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Megan A. Lucey, representing Washoe County Human Services Agency  
Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General  
Leisa Moseley, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center  
Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition  
of Legal Service Providers  
Kristina Wildeveld, Attorney, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
Sophia Romero, Attorney, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada  
Nicholas Shepack, Policy and Program Associate, American Civil Liberties Union of  
Nevada  
Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association  
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts  
Anthony Thomas Jr., Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

**Chairman Yeager:**

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have three bills and a work session today. We will take the bills in order and take the work session either after the first or second bill, depending on timing. I want to make sure we have all members present and able to vote on the work session.

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 212, which makes various changes relating to court interpreters. There is an amendment that you can find on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit C](#)]. I would like to welcome to the Assembly Judiciary Committee for the first time this session, Assemblywoman Natha Anderson. She is going to present the bill and I think she has a couple of people with her to help do that.

**Assembly Bill 212: Makes various changes relating to court interpreters. (BDR 1-758)**

**Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30:**

Today I am presenting Assembly Bill 212. The court interpreters whom I have been working with for the past few weeks are bringing this language forward because they truly believe that the phrase "justice for all" is not just an empty phrase. It is more than a pledge. It is a belief. Too many of our individuals, when they are appearing in court, do not always have the same language access, so this is a way to start addressing some of those issues.

In 2016, the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice had a report that has many different elements in it, and it was about all the different court systems across the nation. It dealt mostly with registered court interpreters and exactly how we are providing this idea of justice to individuals who do not speak English as their main language. Unfortunately, Nevada had a score of 16.8 on key measures. If that were on a 25-point scale, it would be wonderful. But it was on a scale of 100. We need to start making some changes. Some of those changes have already been started. One element is a report that is done every other year where all the courts are expected to turn in a language access plan. Every other year, the courts are expected to turn in something to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to look over it. There is a committee that actually studies language. Last year, the committee was unable to meet because of COVID-19 as well as the fact that the individuals serving on it are volunteers and incredibly overworked. At the same time, we have to do something to ensure that "justice for all" is truly something that is happening.

I would like to turn it over to two individuals who have been very intimate with this—Ximena Chica, president of the association bringing this forward, and Manuel Mederos of Northern Nevada International Center.

**Ximena Chica, President, Nevada Interpreters and Translators Association:**

I am a certified court interpreter and have interpreted in court for two years. I would like to give you a little information about the real-life, day-to-day situations of court interpreters and their relationship to this bill and to the Administrative Office of the Courts.

As a court interpreter, I stand next to a person of limited English proficiency (LEP) and whisper into the ear of that person everything that is going on around them in the courtroom and ensure that that person has a voice within the courtroom before a judge—sometimes a jury—and the other party and make sure their voice is heard. I guarantee to people of LEP their Fourteenth Amendment right to due process and to participate in the due process that is going on around them, which would mean that they have to comprehend what is going on around them in a courtroom. This person of LEP is on occasion a mother who is fighting to be understood so she can keep custody of her children, or a father who would like to have or keep custody of his children. It can be a family who is trying to stay in their home. It can be a property owner who is wrestling to keep rights over their property. It is also for people who are being brought to justice for a crime committed. On occasion, I will stand next to a murderer, drug trafficker, or rapist, and I will make sure that that person understands the crime and the accusations that are being brought against them, the process that goes on to determine their punishment for that crime, and the reasons why and how they are being punished for the crime committed.

I consider our position in the court very important and it should not be taken lightly. None of us take this responsibility lightly. We are highly trained individuals. It is necessary that we are trained, tested, and tried, and that we go through many hours of observation. There is a system that is established so we can do this. To give a little contextual history of that system, in 2002, the AOC created the Nevada Certified Court Interpreter Program. We receive a little training, but mostly we are tested and certified to participate in the system. In the languages that they have no testing for, we are registered to participate in the system. This is for languages that are less common; for example, Japanese, languages spoken in the Pacific Islands, or many of the African languages. There are many of us and there is an immense variety of languages that are spoken in the state of Nevada. The people who have LEP or do not understand English and go before the courts need someone like us.

The first attempt of the language access committee to create a language access plan within the AOC was in 2013, which is what Assemblywoman Anderson just referred to. Three years after the creation of the Language Access Plan was the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) report in which the state of Nevada did very poorly with reference to the actual reality of language access in its courts. In 2019, due to the poor grading in the DOJ report, there was a revamping within the AOC of the Language Access Plan, trying to make it more executable and trying to give people of LEP more access to us and give us more access to them. The reason why we wanted to put this bill forward at this moment, despite the existence of a language access committee within the AOC and a language access plan that has been worked on and revamped, is because, as interpreters, we have no access to this committee. All the big decisions regarding us and language access within the courts disregard the presence of an interpreter who has direct access to language access within the

courts. The elements that we are requesting in this bill are that there be interpreters representing court interpreters within the committee that makes decisions on the reality of language access within the courts.

**Manuel Mederos, Language Access Specialist, Northern Nevada International Center, University of Nevada, Reno:**

This bill is straightforward and, in my personal opinion, adds even more diversity to the commitment that advises the Court Administrator; in particular, providing a committee member who represents a language other than Spanish, which is critical as we are now living in a global economy in our state. In addition, A.B. 212 allows the committee to celebrate their annual accomplishments and feature them in a public report, which in turn spotlights their hard work, spotlights their critical work, spotlights their important contributions, and the report spotlights their commitment to the profession of interpretation, language access, and the LEP individuals in our state.

I want you to know that the state of Nevada is very fortunate to have court interpreters who are trained professionals that go through a vigorous process to become fully certified. They are required to do so and provide many continuing education credits to the professional language and interpreting skills at their very best level. They wanted to do that so they can keep it at their best level. All these professionals love the art of interpreting and they care, protect, and love their profession so much. I speak Spanish fluently; however, if you put me in a court setting, I am not a trained interpreter. I would fall apart and would not know what I am supposed to be doing or saying. I would make many mistakes. Just because I speak the language does not make me a trained interpreter nor a competent one. No LEP person deserves an individual like me in a court setting. They deserve a certified court interpreter, someone who lives and breathes legal terminology every single day because their freedom might actually depend on it. A court interpreter needs to possess not only a deep understanding of the language in which they are specialized, but also a high level of knowledge of the justice system, incremental procedures, and legal ethics.

In closing, I want to thank all of you and all the body for hearing A.B. 212. I hope all of you support the bill. Thank you for the opportunity to speak in front of you and allowing me to spotlight the profession of interpretation and the importance of our LEP persons in our state.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

This bill is just one more step in how we continue to improve the ability to provide the language access for other individuals. It expands the number of individuals on the advisory committee. It expands it by two. There is one individual who will be a specialist in the Spanish language, and the second will be an individual who is not a specialist in the Spanish language. Yesterday, I was asked if this could possibly include an individual who was an interpreter for the deaf, and I said, Of course, that would be fine as well—all languages should be represented and that is considered to be another language. The bill adds two interpreters to the committee under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 1.530.

The second thing it does is clarify that the report should be submitted to the Nevada State Legislature in addition to the Chief Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court, and that the report should be made readily available. It is an important thing for us to also get it here in the Legislature so we can start making some data decisions. Too often, we get told anecdotal things. This would allow us to see the reports that are coming and to try to make those connections. I know all of you open up the envelopes every month and read every single report you receive. This will be an email, so it will be easier for you to receive them.

What exactly is in the report? It is going to be utilizing the Language Access Plan as was mentioned by Ms. Chica. The latest report on the website is from 2013. Based upon information from a recently termed-out member of this Committee, there are more updated plans, but we do not know what that plan is. I have a copy of the Reno Justice Court's report, if this Committee would like me to submit it to you. This way you can see what exactly is on the report. There are numerous elements on the report. It includes the number of individuals who have been asked to be interpreters, what services were provided, and the number of languages that are being utilized so we can start to zero in on if we have enough people in this field right now.

Finally, it asks for a reporting of the number of employees who oversee or coordinate the court interpreters. Recently, the AOC had some changes going on, and the person who was overseeing this retired about a year ago, so some of the paths we were going down got diverted because of that. The good news is that there is a new director for the AOC, Ms. Katherine Stocks. I have not contacted Ms. Stocks about this bill. It is in my plans to do so. This plan clarifies the report, the number of people, and allows for more opportunities for us to make changes.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Many of you know that for a long time I practiced in the criminal courts in Clark County, and I want to thank our interpreters. They are amazing in what they do. I remember having a jury trial where my client was Spanish-speaking and there were several witnesses who were Spanish-speaking, so we had multiple interpreters in the courtroom all doing their thing, trying to interpret contemporaneously, which I thought was very impressive. I want to thank all of you for your hard work and the fact that you care so much about making sure individuals have access to justice and understand what is going on in the courtroom. Are there any questions from Committee members on this bill?

**Assemblywoman Hardy:**

During my years of working in the courts, I interacted a lot and saw the great work that court interpreters do in providing access to justice. I think this is a good idea. How many languages do we have in the courts currently? How would you determine what other language would be chosen?

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I had the same question. How many languages are there? I sat down and started trying to figure it out. There are numerous languages. Just with the group I met with the other night,

there was Tongan, Japanese, Spanish, and Portuguese. There are so many, I think it is almost impossible just to define that. With respect to the second question, at this time, the committee has decided upon the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He is the individual who makes that decision. It would be whoever is certified in any language other than Spanish to be able to choose from.

**Ximena Chica:**

There are five or six languages that there are currently certification exams for. The more commonly spoken languages are Spanish, Portuguese, French, Mandarin Chinese, Cantonese, and Russian. There are some languages that have not had enough frequency to create an exam for, nor do they have a highly experienced interpreter that they could create the test with. The less frequently used languages are Japanese, northern African languages, and Arabic. As the need arises, someone will come out of the community and say, I can register and I can train and I can become the interpreter for my group before the courts.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

The list of recommendations in NRS 1.530, subsection 1 is basically a list submitted by the Court Administrator to the Supreme Court Chief Justice. They are the ones to make that decision.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other questions on A.B. 212 as presented with the amendment? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide support testimony?

**Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

We all know that legal language is difficult to understand for most people who do not have a law degree. Court interpreters are essential for criminal justice to ensure accurate communication, give every individual a voice in the process, and are helpful to avoid delays and dropped charges. Assembly Bill 212 is an important step to help Nevada increase access to court interpreters and, as they are the most knowledgeable, they should be involved in the process to improve the program. We urge your support of A.B. 212.

**Olivia Whiteley, Western States Advocacy Officer, Refugee Advocacy Lab and International Rescue Committee:**

I am asking you to support A.B. 212. Over the past several months, I have surveyed Nevada's resettlement agencies, and the number one shared concern of these agencies is language access, particularly for refugees who speak uncommon languages, such as Kituba and Lingala, spoken in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or Tigrinya, spoken in Eritrea. Assembly Bill 212 supports refugees in their search for equity in everyday legal activities such as COVID-19-related eviction hearings, general family proceedings, and economic opportunities for employment. As individuals in need of language services, A.B. 212 supports refugees by requiring an annual report that contains information on the activities of the AOC committee. This provides an additional measure of transparency on the policies and procedures used to provide language access. Some members in the refugee community would then be able to recommend revisions such as further activities regarding infrequently

spoken refugee languages, literacy consideration, or cultural competency training. Further, inclusion and statistical information regarding the need for language services ensures that refugee languages, which are often but less frequently spoken, are accounted for in judicial proceedings. As individuals become translators and interpreters, A.B. 212 invests in refugees by increasing the representation of interpreters on the AOC's committee. The inclusion of an interpreter who works in a language less commonly used ensures procedures support rather than hinder refugees that work as interpreters, as the optimum number of required working hours, trainings available, and cultural considerations may divert significantly from the Spanish language standard. I urge your support of A.B. 212.

**Gillian Block, Legal Intern, Coalition of Legal Service Providers:**

I am speaking in support of A.B. 212. Nevada is a multilingual state, and access to language interpretation services is critical for access to justice. Improving language access can make a world of difference to our clients, who already face significant barriers in accessing the court. Every person deserves a meaningful opportunity to understand their rights, responsibilities, and obligations when they come into contact with the justice system. This legislation will help ensure that all Nevadans, regardless of language or national origin, are able to access court services and information.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other callers who wish to testify in support of A.B. 212? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in the neutral position?

**John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:**

I am calling in neutral on the content of the bill this morning and want to put on the record that the Administrative Office of the Courts is happy to work with the sponsors and the Committee in any way we need to on this bill. I would like to briefly point out that statutorily, the court interpreter program at the AOC does not include interpreters for American Sign Language or for people with hearing impairment. That is regulated through the Department of Health and Human Services.

Additionally, I can provide some clarification as far as the program operation at AOC. We did have our coordinator leave us last February and have been unable to fill that position since, due to the pandemic-related budget cuts that have been necessary, so my staff and I have been filling in. It has been difficult during the pandemic to provide adequate testing because testing has to happen in person. However, not to belabor any of these points, but we are happy to work with the Committee and sponsors in any way necessary.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else who would like to give neutral testimony? [There was no one.] I will close neutral testimony. Assemblywoman Anderson, I will hand it back to you for concluding remarks.



**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I will be reaching out to Mr. McCormick as well as Ms. Stocks to figure out what is going on. Thank you for the clarification around the sign language—I was unaware of that. In closing, thank you for this opportunity. I would like to point out that the state of Nevada has a very rich history in honoring our translators. Sarah Winnemucca is probably the most famous of our translators, and I just wanted to bring her name into the room as well to show how we have always honored them and I believe this is another way for us to do so.

[[Exhibit D](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

**Chairman Yeager:**

Thank you, Assemblywoman Anderson, and to your two copresenters. You did a wonderful job presenting your first bill in front of the Assembly Judiciary Committee. It was an honor to have you here this morning.

I will close the hearing on A.B. 212. We do not have all our members back yet, so we will hold off on the work session for a while longer and ask for your patience. At this time, I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 214. There is a proposed amendment on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit E](#)]. I would like to welcome to the Committee for the first time this session, Assemblywoman Considine.

**Assembly Bill 214: Revises provisions governing sexual assault. (BDR 15-103)**

**Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18:**

This bill removes gender language under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 200.366, which is under the sexual assault and seduction section of NRS Chapter 200. There are five changes that have been made throughout this section. There is a conceptual amendment [[Exhibit E](#)]. Before I go through the bill, I want to let you know that Serena Evans from the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence (NCEDSV) is here to present this bill with me. My goal is to go through the bill, explain the conceptual amendment, and then turn it over to Ms. Evans for testimony and some questions.

Assembly Bill 214 section 1, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (b), and subsection 5, paragraph (b) removes the language "his or her," "himself or herself," and replaces that language with ungendered language. The reason for this is to recognize that there is a spectrum of genders so the assault statute can be eligible for anyone to utilize it and ensures the understanding that men can also be victims of sexual assault. We did this to align it to other chapters of NRS with the goal of degendering the language. For example, domestic relations was changed in the last two sessions to fix that language, and this aligns with that idea.

The conceptual amendment [[Exhibit E](#)] is specifically for subsection 1, paragraph (a) which reads, "Subjects another person to sexual penetration, or forces another person to make a sexual penetration on . . . ." The original change was "that person." This conceptual amendment takes out "that person" and changes it to "themselves." It would then read,

"Subject another person to sexual penetration, or forces another person to make a sexual penetration on themselves or another, or on a beast, against the will of the victim or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of the perpetrator's conduct." It is a simple bill that has a few changes. I think it makes a big difference.

**Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:**

For those of you who are not familiar with NCEDSV, we are the statewide coalition of domestic and sexual violence programs throughout all of Nevada. I want to thank Assemblywoman Considine for working with us along with many other stakeholders throughout the interim to work on this issue.

Since last session, I have been contacted by a few programs and sexual assault advocates throughout the state expressing interest in wanting to work on the NRS definition of sexual assault. In response to the recurring interest in this topic, we convened a work group of sexual assault advocates throughout the state and held this work group in July 2020. This group was a loosely constructed work group where I was just listening to the concerns the advocates were raising. We had a conversation around what the ideal definition of sexual assault would look like for Nevada. One of the concerns among others that arose out of this work group was that the current gendered language used in NRS 200.366 was problematic and not necessarily inclusive of all victim survivors. Many clients that our wonderful advocacy organizations serve do not necessarily identify as female or male but fall into the nonbinary gender spectrum. The current "himself" and "herself" language that is used is exclusive of these gender nonconforming survivors, and many lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, and asexual survivors did not feel safe to come forward about their sexual violence victimization. They also felt that their victimization was not truly valid or taken seriously with the current gender language.

The other part of this conversation was that there was a traditional narrative with sexual violence that it is usually a male perpetrating a female victim. We know that is just not true. Anyone can be a victim survivor regardless of their gender and anyone can, unfortunately, be a perpetrator as well, regardless of their gender. Replacing this language with "themselves," or "the perpetrator" and the "victim" gets rid of the traditional narrative. It allows people and victim survivors, regardless of the gender of themselves, regardless of the gender of their perpetrator, to feel comfortable and safe coming forward and sharing their stories.

This is a very small change in the statute, but we know that inclusive language is necessary for the safety of everyone. Language is powerful. This small change will truly have a meaningful impact for victim survivors throughout the state. I also want to note that according to the U.S. Department of Justice, sexual assault is the most underreported violent crime with only one-third of victim survivors reporting to law enforcement. If we can make this small but meaningful change to increase the likelihood that more survivors will feel comfortable enough to come forward and potentially report to law enforcement, that means we are increasing the likelihood that more perpetrators are being held accountable.

I would like to thank Assemblywoman Considine again for her willingness to take on this piece of legislation to address the needed change in our sexual assault definition. This legislation is honestly the first step in what is a larger effort to make positive changes in the sexual assault laws in Nevada. At the Coalition, we plan to work on this issue through the interim and beyond, however long it takes, to collaborate with all stakeholders to address not only the definition but the prosecution and adjudication of sexual assault in Nevada [[Exhibit F](#)].

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions about the bill from Committee members? [There were none.] I think this particular concept in the bill was one of the concepts that was worked on by our former colleague in the Legislature, Assemblywoman Connie Munk. I want to confirm that and, if so, thank her for her work on this and thank you for picking up where she left off.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

This was originally her bill from the last session. The conception of this bill was much larger than this, but there is a long-term plan to work out other issues under this statute, but we did not want to lose the opportunity to do something small yet very meaningful that we could get done now as a beginning. The genesis and credit of all this goes to former Assemblywoman Connie Munk.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Assemblywoman Munk, I do not know if you are watching, but if you are, I just wanted to say thank you for your work on this issue, and I am glad Assemblywoman Considine was able to pick it up and run with it. I think there is more work that needs to be done, but we will take it one step at a time.

Are there any questions from the Committee members before we move on to testimony? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 214?

**Margaret I. Campe, Director, Jean Nidetch CARE Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I am the director of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas CARE Center where CARE stands for "Campus Antiviolence Advocacy, Resources, and Empowerment." I am here to testify in support of A.B. 214. Gender-neutral language in legislation is imperative, especially as it relates to interpersonal violence including sexual assault. Although much of the earlier research, as noted by Serena Evans, focuses on female victims, more recent research underscores those who occupy more marginalized identities including trans or gender-nonbinary identities are at a disproportionately greater risk of experiencing sexual assault than their cisgender counterparts. As such, it is imperative that legislation not assert gender binaries as it is not inclusive to those who are most at risk for experiencing such violence. Not only is it inclusive, but it is also empirically supported, and these statutes should be a resource to all members of the public regardless of gender.

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

I would like to thank the Assemblywoman as well as Nevadans for bringing forward this very important bill. We appreciate having the opportunity to work with them on this issue during the interim and really appreciate them for bringing this language forward. As we all know, language and words that we use are extremely important, and gender-neutral language assists to reduce the stigma for victims of sexual assault. I, unfortunately, have represented many men and women who themselves were victims and used substances or failed to use services which had led them into being criminal defendants under our care. It is all too common for our clients to disclose for the first time while appearing as a defendant that they too had been victimized. We hope this will help break that cycle to provide all victims the services regardless of their gender.

**Jim Hoffman, Member, Legislative Committee, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:**

I would like to echo the testimonies from the presenters and from the other people who spoke. Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice supports this. If you are dealing with crime through the criminal justice system, you have already failed in some sense. The best thing to do is to try to prevent crime from happening. As Ms. Bertschy said, previously being victimized is one of the main predictors of someone going on to victimize someone else, and we believe that by helping victims and making the system more inclusive of all victims, we are not just helping those victims—which is very important—we are helping to break the cycle. Again, we are thankful for this bill, and we support A.B. 214.

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

We would like to thank the bill's sponsor for bringing this bill forward and speaking with us during the interim about this issue. We recognize at the Clark County Public Defender's Office the value of all human beings and that the change of language in this bill brings forward hope that this language will help survivors feel comfortable coming forward, and we urge the passage of A.B. 214.

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

We are here in support of A.B. 214, and we support efforts to degender our statutes in an effort to be more inclusive. I want to thank Assemblywoman Considine, who reached out well before this session to discuss this bill with us. I also want to thank her for the amendment which we feel provides more clarity. The original draft read a bit confusing, as "the person" referred to the defendant and "that person" referred to the victim. The amendment that she filed this morning makes the statute clearer.

I also want to reiterate the intent of this bill is not to change any of the elements of the current sexual assault statute. It is simply to degender the language contained within it. We want to reiterate our support of A.B. 214.

**Daniele Staple, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Center, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the executive director for the Rape Crisis Center in southern Nevada, and want to speak in support of this bill. I want to thank the Committee for hearing it so promptly, and Assemblywoman Considine for bringing it forward, and the Coalition for all their work representing the task force that Ms. Evans mentioned had been working on the bill prior to the session. The Rape Crisis Center feels this kind of language change is critically important, as Dr. Campe said. We know that transgender individuals are disproportionately impacted by sexual violence. Having the statute correctly represent gender-neutral so all potential survivors and victims feel comfortable coming forward for services and to receive the justice they so richly deserve, it is critically important in our statute and we are wholeheartedly in support of this bill.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else who wishes to give support testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to give opposition testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to give testimony in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Considine, I will turn it back over to you and Ms. Evans for any concluding remarks you might have on A.B. 214.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

Thank you, Chairman Yeager and Committee. I really appreciate it. This is my first bill hearing and I am grateful for your time and patience with this bill and the support of everyone who worked on this bill, especially Serena Evans and Connie Munk.

**Serena Evans:**

I will keep it brief and thank you for hearing this bill so quickly. Also, thank you to Assemblywoman Considine and former Assemblywoman Connie Munk for getting this conversation started. We are really excited to continue this work throughout Nevada.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I want to thank you and everyone who worked on this piece of legislation, including our former colleague, Assemblywoman Munk. Assemblywoman Considine, we look forward to having you back in the Assembly Judiciary Committee at some point later this session.

I will close the hearing on A.B. 214, and we will now move to the work session. We will begin with Assembly Bill 25.

**Assembly Bill 25: Revises provisions relating to the conditional release of certain persons found to be incompetent. (BDR 14-295)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 25 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services and was heard in this Committee on February 18, 2021 [[Exhibit G](#)].

This bill authorizes, without obtaining a court order, a forensic facility supervising the conditional release of a person who was found to be incompetent to stand trial or be sentenced to either transport the person or request that a law enforcement agency transport the person to the supervising forensic facility if there is probable cause to believe that the person violated a condition of release from commitment and is a danger to himself or herself or others. This bill also requires that, not later than ten days after the person is transported to the forensic facility, the court must hold a hearing to determine whether to continue, modify, or terminate the conditional release of the person.

There is one amendment to the measure. It was proposed by Jim Hoffman, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice. Mr. Hoffman worked with Dr. Neighbors from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health on the amendment and they are in agreement with it. The amendment does the following:

1. Changes "must" to "may" in section 1, subsection 2, concerning law enforcement taking the person into protective custody and transporting to a forensic facility;
2. Changes from ten days to three days when the court must hold a hearing regarding the person's conditional release; and
3. Allows the hearing to be continued up to ten days upon agreement by both parties.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I want to thank Dr. Neighbors and Mr. Hoffman for working on this bill. You may recall during the hearing there were some concerns about some of the time frames, but I am happy to report that there was a consensus reached from the bill sponsor and those proposing the amendment. Are there any questions about A.B. 25 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 25.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 25.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler.

**Assembly Bill 33: Authorizes the establishment of paternity in proceedings concerning the protection of children. (BDR 38-436)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 33 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Nevada Association of Counties and was heard in this Committee on March 5, 2021 [[Exhibit H](#)].

This bill provides that the process for establishing the paternity of a child be legally established during a civil proceeding concerning the protection of a child. A judicial officer is required to order tests for the typing of blood or tests for the taking of specimens for genetic identification of a child, the natural mother of the child, and the alleged father of the child when paternity is disputed. Any recommendation by a master that is approved by the district court establishes the legal paternity of a child for all purposes. This bill generally requires the agency that provides child welfare services in the county in which paternity is alleged to pay the costs for conducting any tests. However, if such tests establish a conclusive presumption that the alleged father of a child is the natural father of the child, he is required to reimburse the agency for the cost of the tests.

There is one amendment proposed by Dagny Stapleton, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties. The amendment does the following:

1. Deletes sections 1 through 11, 13, and 14 of the bill;
2. Amends section 12 of the bill by adding a reference to Chapter 432B, Protection of Children From Abuse and Neglect of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS);
3. Adds a new section 13 amending NRS 126.091, Jurisdiction; venue by allowing a district court's jurisdiction over a Chapter 432B of NRS proceeding; and
4. Amends NRS 126.161, Contents and effect of judgment or order, to provide that: (1) a judgment or order issued pursuant to Chapter 126 of NRS within an NRS 432B proceeding is excluded from the confidentiality provisions of Chapter 432B; and (2) a judgment or order issued pursuant to Chapter 126 of NRS within an NRS 432B proceeding is considered a final order.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from the Committee members?

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

During the Committee hearing on this bill, they talked about creating a final amendment that allows the right to appeal. Was that included in the amendment?

**Megan A. Lucey, representing Washoe County Human Services Agency:**

On the work session document, the reference to the amendment to the proposed NRS 126.091 and NRS 126.161, if you look at number four of the new changes, you will see that the second one says "a judgment or order issued pursuant to Chapter 126 of NRS within a NRS 432B proceeding is considered a final order" [page 1, [Exhibit H](#)]. That language specifically addresses the appealable issue because all final orders are appealable, and that was a concern that was brought up to the stakeholders and was addressed specifically with that provision. Yes, these orders would be appealable.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there other questions from Committee members on A.B. 33 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 33.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 33.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller.

**Assembly Bill 60: Makes certain provisions of a contract or settlement agreement void and unenforceable. (BDR 4-422)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 60 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Attorney General and was heard in this Committee on February 16, 2021 [[Exhibit I](#)].

This bill provides that a provision of a contract or settlement agreement is void and unenforceable if the provision prohibits or restricts a party to the contract or settlement agreement from testifying as a witness at a judicial or administrative proceeding concerning another party to the contract or settlement agreement and his or her commission of criminal conduct or sexual harassment. These provisions do not apply to a settlement agreement that results from successful mediation or conciliation by the Nevada Equal Rights Commission.



There are two proposed amendments to this measure:

1. Kyle George, First Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, proposed an amendment to add additional protected classes including race, religious creed, color, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, ancestry, and familial status to the bill; and
2. Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong proposed to add age, in addition to the list proposed above, to the protected classes in the bill.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 60 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 60.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 60.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong.

**Assembly Bill 64: Revises provisions relating to certain crimes. (BDR 15-407)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 64 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Attorney General and was heard in this Committee on March 8, 2021 [[Exhibit J](#)].

This bill changes the penalties for certain unlawful acts relating to preventing or dissuading certain persons from testifying or producing evidence. The definition of soliciting a child for prostitution is revised. Penalties are increased for the crime of soliciting a child for prostitution. Any civil penalties collected from this crime must be used to fund a program to provide support to children who are victims of crime in the city or county, as applicable. This bill removes the existing prohibitions on the illegal advertising of houses of prostitution and instead prohibits knowingly advertising for prostitution, or in a manner that induces a person to engage in prostitution, where prostitution or where the licensing of a house of prostitution is unlawful. Penalties are increased for the commission of this crime.

There is one amendment from Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General. The amendment does the following:

1. Strikes the new language in the bill in subsections 1 and 2 of section 1, and reverts to existing law regarding certain unlawful acts relating to: (1) preventing or dissuading persons from testifying or producing evidence; and (2) preventing or dissuading a victim, a person acting on behalf of a victim, or a witness from reporting a crime;
2. Adds a new section 3 amending *Nevada Revised Statutes* 201.354 providing that the Attorney General has concurrent jurisdiction with the district attorneys in this state to prosecute violations of facilitating sex trafficking and engaging in prostitution or solicitation for prostitution and may also charge related offenses;
3. Revises the definition of the crime of soliciting of a child for prostitution in section 4, subsection 2 of the amendment;
4. Strikes the new language in the bill and reverts to existing law regarding prostitution and associated penalties in section 4, subsections 2(c) through 11; and
5. Strikes the new language in the bill and reverts to existing law in section 5 of the amendment, regarding the unlawful advertising of prostitution and associated penalties.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 64 as detailed in the work session document?

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Could we have a quick recap as to why we went back to some of the original language?

**Chairman Yeager:**

I believe the language in the amendment was the language that was presented at the hearing.

**Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General:**

The amendment that Ms. Thornton read was the amendment that we presented in the hearing on this bill. If there are specific sections on the amendment you want me to review, I can. In terms of the witness dissuading section, we decided to go back to the original statutory language after some concerns from stakeholders regarding the practicality of that section. In terms of the advertising for prostitution, we reverted to the original statutory language regarding some constitutionality and practicality of it for legal brothels. If you have any other specific questions about other sections of the bill, I am happy to take those.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other questions from Committee members on A.B. 64 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 64.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 64.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Krasner.

**Assembly Bill 115: Revises provisions relating to parentage. (BDR 11-118)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 115 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Nguyen and was heard in this Committee on February 26, 2021 [[Exhibit K](#)].

This bill authorizes a court to determine in certain circumstances that more than two people have a parent and child relationship with a child. Provisions are established concerning custody and visitation, adoption, and the termination of parental rights in cases in which a child has more than two parents. If a court determines that more than two people have a parent and child relationship with a child, a court must not grant a petition for adoption of a child unless each parent of the child has provided his or her written consent.

There are three proposed amendments to this measure.

1. Assemblywoman Nguyen proposed a conceptual amendment that would do the following:
  - Deletes provisions of the bill that would have amended or added to certain chapters of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) pertaining specifically to Chapter 125C, Custody and Visitation, Chapter 126, Parentage, and Chapter 128, Termination of Parental Rights;
  - Deletes language which would have required the Committee to Review Child Support Guidelines to review the guidelines within 90 days of the effective date of the bill, NRS 425.620; and
  - Adds and amends language to Chapter 127, Adoption of Children and Adults, of NRS regarding the adoption of minor children.

2. Assemblywoman Nguyen and Kimberly M. Surratt, Attorney, Surratt Family Law Practice, proposed a second amendment that adds language to Chapter 127 of NRS to allow that if one of the petitioners is related within the third degree of consanguinity, that the court may, in its discretion, waive the hearing.
3. Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen proposed the third amendment to revise the amendment in NRS 127.040 by deleting "or" and replacing it with "and" between paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection 1.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 115 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 115.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 115.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Nguyen.

**Assembly Bill 145: Adopts the Uniform Registration of Canadian Money Judgments Act. (BDR 2-772)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 145 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Cohen and was heard in this Committee on March 2, 2021 [[Exhibit L](#)].

This bill revises the procedure for Nevada to follow when asked to recognize and enforce money judgments from foreign countries. When applying and construing the provisions of this bill, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law among states that authorize this Act. Lastly, this bill applies to judgments entered in a proceeding that is commenced in Canada on or after October 1, 2021. There are no amendments for this measure.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 145 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to do pass A.B. 145.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 145.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Cohen.

**Assembly Bill 151: Revises provisions relating to offenses. (BDR 14-776)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 151 was sponsored by Assemblywoman González and was heard in this Committee on February 25, 2021 [[Exhibit M](#)].

This bill removes the authority of the court to suspend the driver's license of a defendant or prohibit a defendant from applying for a driver's license for a specified period if the delinquent fine, administrative assessment, fee, or restitution was originally imposed for a minor traffic offense. The Department of Motor Vehicles must immediately reinstate the driver's license of the person or the ability of the person to apply for the issuance of a driver's license and notify the person of the reinstatement of his or her driver's license or ability to apply for the issuance of a driver's license.

There is an amendment proposed by Assemblywoman González, and she is proposing to add cosponsors to the bill.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 151 as detailed in the work session document?

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I have not had any clarity on this yet. When you drive without insurance, is that classified as a minor traffic offense?

**Chairman Yeager:**

It is an interesting question, and there are a couple of different parts to it. Driving without insurance is considered a minor traffic offense, but if you drive without insurance, this bill is not going to prevent your driving privileges from being suspended. The fact of not having insurance is going to get your driver's license suspended. This bill says that if you do not

take care of your fines and fees or if you do not appear in court, they cannot suspend your driver's license for that reason, but driving without insurance in and of itself is something that will get you suspended. Sometimes there is a lack of communication between your insurance company and the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), and you will get a notice from the DMV that they do not have updated insurance information; if you do not provide it, your license will be suspended. To answer your question, it is already considered in existing statute as a minor traffic offense, but this bill does not really speak to that particular offense because it would still be a suspendable offense.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

May I have the opportunity to sign on to this bill at this time?

**Chairman Yeager:**

Yes, we can incorporate that into the amendment that is going to be made.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I like this bill, but would you refresh my memory? I do not think anyone should go to jail for minor traffic violations, but if a person continues to rack them up and does not do anything, is community service mandatory? How do we address someone who does not do anything about this? We removed incarceration—which I think is a good thing—but how are we addressing it if someone does not deal with it at all?

**Leisa Moseley, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:**

There are already provisions in the law to allow for civil judgments. The only thing this bill would do is prevent anyone from having a driver's license suspended for not paying it. The law currently allows for civil judgments, so I believe that is what would happen. If they continue to rack those up, it would become a civil judgment against them.

**Chairman Yeager:**

We did not really talk about this at the hearing, this concern about the people who will game the system, not pay, not do community service, and about their licenses not being suspended. If you are a bad driver, the DMV is still getting information about your tickets, so your driver's license can be suspended or your insurance is going to go up if you get too many points due to your driving. A court has contempt power, so if someone is truly in a position to do community service and does not do it, the court would have the ability to hold that person in contempt in some fashion. Essentially, you are violating a court order. The court is telling you that you have to do community service and you are not doing it. There are some protections that go along with that process, such as getting an attorney. The court does have at its disposal things that it can do if there are people who are just not taking their obligation seriously and disregarding what they should be doing. This bill speaks about the driver's license suspension piece.

Are there any other questions from Committee members on A.B. 151 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass

A.B. 151 with the caveat that we are going to add Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong as cosponsor.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 151.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KASAMA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I like so much of the bill and agree with the intent. I am a yes, but I will reserve my right. I like the Texas and Arizona models. That gave me a lot of comfort with the revenue side of things and seeing some good outcomes. Again, I am a yes, but I will reserve my right just to clarify a couple of things.

**Assemblywoman Krasner:**

I like several portions of the bill. I have some concerns with the fact that there is no penalty for failure to appear. I know in some other counties there is no penalty for failure to appear and in a sense they are allowed to thumb their nose at attorneys and courts. I do not know if we want to go down that rabbit hole. I will vote yes to get it out of Committee and reserve my right to change prior to the floor.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I have some concerns, but I will vote yes, but I will reserve my right to change for the floor vote.

**Assemblywoman Hardy:**

I, too, think this is a good bill. I want to clarify some concerns myself, so I will vote yes out of Committee and reserve my right.

**Chairman Yeager:**

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman González.

**Assembly Bill 157: Authorizes a person who is the victim of certain discriminatory conduct relating to an incident involving a peace officer to bring a civil action under certain circumstances. (BDR 3-227)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 157 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and was heard in this Committee on March 3, 2021 [[Exhibit N](#)].

This bill authorizes a person to bring a civil action for damages if another person—because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, physical or mental disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression of the person—knowingly causes a peace officer to respond to a location with the intent to: (1) infringe on the constitutional rights of the person; (2) cause the person to feel harassed, humiliated, or embarrassed; (3) cause the person to be removed from a location where he or she is lawfully located; or (4) damage the reputation or economic interests of the person.

There is one amendment proposed by Assemblywoman Danielle Monroe-Moreno. She is proposing to add a cosponsor to the bill and to add the language "without reasonable cause" to the bill regarding a person who may bring a civil action for damages.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 157 as detailed in the work session document?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I was initially opposed to this bill, but want to thank Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for the small amendment change. It made a world of difference to my consideration of the bill. I just wanted to extend my appreciation.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I was very worried that this bill would cause people to not call the police, although I do see the need for the bill itself. I want to thank Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for the amendment and bringing me to the other side, so I am going to say yes.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other questions about A.B. 157? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 157.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 157.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller.



**Assembly Bill 202: Revises provisions relating to charitable lotteries and charitable games. (BDR 41-581)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 202 was sponsored by Assemblyman Yeager and was heard in the Committee on March 11, 2021 [[Exhibit O](#)].

This bill provides that the regulations adopted by the Nevada Gaming Commission must not impose an annual fee that exceeds \$10 on a qualified organization if the total value of the prizes offered by the qualified organization in the same calendar year is not more than \$100,000.

There is one amendment proposed by Michael Morton, with the Nevada Gaming Control Board. This amendment provides that a qualified organization that offers prizes under \$100,000 annually would have to register with the Nevada Gaming Control Board as a qualified organization once per year and pay the annual fee of \$10.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Before I take questions, I will take a moment to explain the additional amendment. In consultation with Mr. Morton at the Gaming Control Board, we decided it probably did not make sense to have an organization only have to pay one fee, but have to register for each separate charitable event that they were doing, so the amendment basically says they have to register one time and pay one fee and that will cover them for the entire year. It should save on some paperwork from the qualified organizations as well as the Gaming Control Board.

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 202 as detailed in the work session document? [There were none.] I am looking for a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 202.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 202.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to myself.

With the work session behind us, we have one bill left on the agenda, and I will be presenting that bill. I will hand the virtual gavel to Vice Chairwoman Nguyen.

[Assemblywoman Nguyen assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 219.

**Assembly Bill 219: Revises provisions governing the sealing of criminal records.  
(BDR 14-137)**

**Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:**

Assembly Bill 219 is intended to improve the record sealing process to allow greater access to justice. For those of you who have been on this Committee over the past few sessions, you have heard that record sealing can be an extremely difficult, burdensome, and daunting process. Many interested persons in the community, including the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law, the public defender's office, and legal aid providers, all work tirelessly to make sure record sealing is as accessible as possible, and they assist community members with the process. To be honest, there are still major barriers in having records sealed.

Assembly Bill 219 does three things to make this process a little easier. It streamlines record sealing for people who have received a pardon, it clarifies the role of the prosecuting attorney in the record sealing process, and it allows a petitioner to appeal a court's denial to seal a record. With respect to pardons, currently receiving a pardon does not automatically seal your criminal record. Right now, it is a painstaking and confusing process for someone to seal their record after they were granted a pardon. Many people who are pardoned have no idea that their records are not automatically sealed. I believe that a pardon should be an indication that the person is eligible for a record sealing and the petitioner, the courts, and all parties involved should not have to expend resources to relitigate the record sealing issue when the person has already received a pardon.

Additionally, we would like to fix some issues that have come up since we codified the presumption that criminal records in Nevada should be sealed. We codified that presumption in the 2017 Session. There have been some concerns with the statute being applied differently in different parts of the state, and we want to close those loopholes as well as modernize the appeal language.

Currently, a petitioner can apply for two rehearings in front of the court, but they cannot appeal the decision. The rehearing language having two rehearings does not appear anywhere else in statute and is unlikely to change the outcome of the proceeding. We are proposing to delete the two rehearing options and instead note that if your petition is denied, you would have the right to appeal it as you would any other final order so that an appellate court can review the denial. There is one amendment provided on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit P](#)].

**Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:**

As Assemblyman Yeager pointed out, the record sealing process can be extremely burdensome and arduous, and I appreciate Assemblyman Yeager's also working to turn the

slow wheels of justice to improve the process. We are back again with a few more fixes, and I will walk you through the bill piece by piece. Section 1 requires the court to grant a record sealing petition without relitigating the merit for someone who has received a pardon from the State Board of Pardons Commissioners. This not only eliminates the burden on the petitioner, but all the parties who expend resources in this process.

There is some confusion in that people do not realize a pardon is different from the record sealing process and that one does not necessarily accompany the other. A problem we run into in this area is that people assume their records have been sealed, and it becomes a problem when they then do not think they need to disclose it or it still shows up on a background check and it is something they are unaware of. The Pardons Board can send copies of the pardon to the court and the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History after the pardon has been granted and, if that happens, we will do an automatic sealing. For prior cases or if that does not happen, section 1, subsection 2 lays out the process for the individual to initiate that record sealing process in a streamlined fashion. Sections 3, 4, and 5 clarify the law regarding what happens when the district attorney does not respond to a record sealing application. Right now, the statute is not clear on the role of the district attorney. If you look at section 3, subsection 4, the law says if the prosecuting attorney stipulates to the sealing, a hearing is not required, and the judge can just review that file and order the record sealed without a normal hearing. If the prosecuting attorney objects, a hearing must be conducted. The law does not say what happens if the prosecuting attorney does not respond, but it also does not specifically compel a response. This has left cases in a precarious position in some of our courts in the state with no real statutory path forward.

This bill will provide clarity by specifying that if the prosecuting attorney does not file a written objection within ten days, then the court can proceed. I want to note that we are still talking about that timeline language and will be working with the stakeholders going forward after this hearing. The City of Henderson reached out, and we are going to work with them on that timeline because the process works a little differently in municipal court than it does in district court. In district court, the prosecuting attorney reviews the petition and decides whether or not to sign off before it is ever filed with the court. For those who do end up getting set for a hearing typically because the prosecutor did not sign off, we believe ten days is a reasonable time frame to then file that objection because they know it is coming.

It is now my understanding that the process works differently in some municipal courts, and they actually do not see it until that first window of time when it has been set for a hearing, so we are going to work with them to make sure we can remedy the issue and they have enough time to review. I would note that the Washoe County District Attorney's Office has also asked to discuss that timeline.

Section 5, subsection 7 will also streamline the process for someone who has been acquitted and for whom prosecution has been declined or for whom charges were dropped, requiring that the court shall seal their records as well. Lastly, I will refer you to the conceptual amendment for section 6 [\[Exhibit P\]](#). This piece allows a person to appeal the decision if

their petition is denied. As Assemblyman Yeager explained, we believe these judicial decisions should be subject to a regular appeal as is standard in any area of law.

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

Concerning the discussion on ten days, is it calendar days, judicial days, or something else?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

We will make sure that it is clearly calendar or judicial when we rework that timeline.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

Do you have any idea which way you will go?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

I believe we intended judicial, so we can make that note.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

When I was working several years ago for the Department of Public Safety, the Central Repository was under my purview, and I will say that this was a problem because people did not know and they were calling in complaining, thinking that they got a pardon and thinking that their records were sealed. It is a decent bill, and I appreciate Assemblyman Yeager's bringing it forward. I wish that he had asked if other people could sign on because I would like to.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

As you might have noticed, I have not asked anyone to sign on with most of my bills because I have been rushing to get them down to the front desk. I would certainly welcome anyone else to sign on to the bill. Since we are doing an amendment anyway, we can do that through the amendment process. I will add you, and if there is anyone else who would like to sign on, please let me know.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I would like to make a recommendation as a consideration that instead of 10 judicial days, possibly consider doing 14 calendar days like the judicial district rules are moving toward. Hopefully, that will get us some consistency for practitioners.

**Bailey Bortolin:**

The Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure have that opposition 14-day timeline, and this is something I was going to bring up when we meet with the stakeholders to see if we could all agree on a timeline.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

Help me understand the difference between unconditional pardons versus regular pardons in section 1, subsection 2. If you have an unconditional pardon, it would be an automatic, versus the regular pardon. What makes a pardon unconditional versus conditional?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

I am not a pardons attorney, but we do have some criminal law attorneys that could speak to that when they speak to the bill. If you do not get an answer, I will follow up with you.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I understand it is important that it be an automatic sealing when it is unconditional, but when it is not, what issues or crimes are we considering when they are going to ask for the sealing?

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

The difference between a conditional pardon and an unconditional pardon is that when it is conditional, you do not have your gun rights back and you have to complete some terms that the Pardons Board may require. However, usually the conditional pardon is only that you do not have your gun rights. The unconditional pardon is that you have all rights back to you as a citizen.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

If someone could clarify for me the filing of an objection by the prosecutor and what the purpose is? I would like some further understanding.

**Sophia Romero, Attorney, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:**

When someone petitions to seal their records, there could be two different processes depending on when they are filing that petition. If you are in the district court and you have charges in Henderson or charges in North Las Vegas, that petition gets sent to the North Las Vegas or Henderson city attorney first, and that attorney has the opportunity to review it and decide on whether or not to sign off on, Yes, this person should have their records sealed, or No, we do not agree that this person should have their records sealed. When they choose not to sign off, the petitioner is still allowed to file with the district court, but that means there will be a hearing set and the district attorney or city attorney will then have the opportunity to file an objection with the court and put on the record why they believe this person should not have their record sealed. That is what the objection is for. It is for the prosecuting agency to get a chance to put on the record why they believe the record should not be sealed for this individual.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Without this clarification and the time-certain set, what is happening right now if there is an objection? Does the person who is asking for the sealing get an answer? What is going on now that is making you clarify this language?

**Bailey Bortolin:**

I want to note that it is working in many places in the state. In many counties and courts, we are always receiving one or the other. There are courts where this is not a problem. There are other courts where it is a practice and a choice that the statute sort of does not address what is done if the prosecuting attorney does not choose to respond. Individual judges have had to handle what they believe the next step is based on the statutes before you. As you can see, it is not completely clear what the path forward is if they do not receive a response one way or the other. It has caused some confusion and delay due to that lack of clarity. It has caused inconsistent results depending on which court you file in. We believe that by passing this bill, we would have a consistent response across the state so everyone receives the same judicial process regardless of where they file.

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will open it up for testimony in support of A.B. 219.

**Kristina Wildeveld:**

I am here as a private attorney and on behalf of Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice. I would like to thank Assemblyman Yeager and this Committee for hearing such an important piece of legislation this morning and appreciate the opportunity to work on this bill to ensure that many of those people who want to seal their records have the ability to do so and that the process is streamlined as much as possible. Specifically, at the direction of Justice Hardesty, we looked at the sealing process for those who have been pardoned. However, this bill works to help all individuals, even lawyers, I might add, who have difficulty navigating the sealing system currently set up. As Assemblyman Yeager indicated, it is a difficult process. It is also a process that a lot of attorneys actually get bar complaints about and find themselves in trouble because it is not as simple as one might think it is to be.

This bill would help streamline the sealing of criminal records for certain individuals including those who have been pardoned and those whose cases have been dismissed or denied. This issue recently came to the attention of the Pardons Board when those who were wrongfully convicted still had to seal their record of their arrest for that offense including DeMarlo Berry, Fred Steese, and Frank LaPena. However, it also addresses those who have been pardoned but continue to have to explain their criminal history or hire an attorney to navigate the sealing process following their grant of a pardon. In addition, those who have been arrested but their cases have been denied or dismissed are also left in the position to have to continue to explain their history whether the arrest was valid or not in the first place.

The mere fact of an arrest actually shows up on your criminal record. All these classes of individuals, as well as the legal system, including the district attorney's office and each individual court, benefit by the bill because the court is able to seal a criminal record without review from a prosecutor as long as the records being sealed have already been pardoned or the case denied or dismissed, hence requiring less navigating of the legal system, which makes the record sealing process statutorily defined and not left to each individual involved's

discretion. There was a question earlier about the objections and when a prosecutor might object. I will give a specific example.

If a case was negotiated with the forward thought of actually sealing a record at some point—most sex offenses cannot be sealed—if a case was negotiated so that you could eventually seal your record and then, when that statutory time ends and you go before the court to seal your record, we have actually had judges who, *sua sponte*, call for a hearing on the case and say that they object to the sealing of the record based on the underlying original offense. This takes the discretion away from the judges when those cases should be sealed. It was contemplated that the record would be sealed by all parties involved—the defendant, the defense attorney, and the prosecutor. But each individual judge feels they have to make a record as to why they object to it and then they deny the sealing process when all parties had agreed previously. It takes the discretion out so that it is statutorily allowed rather than discretionarily allowed and so that the judges do not have as much of a problem sealing the record because it is pursuant to statute.

There is no rational basis for the way the current system operates when it comes to these classes of cases. The classes of cases are the denied, dismissed, pardoned, or any of the cases that might raise an objection. It is a miscarriage of justice to allow the criminal records of these individuals whose cases are dismissed to have the offenses remain on the record. Requiring the courts to grant the sealing of the case without a hearing if all statutory requirements are met will allow for a more just and streamlined criminal justice system. Once pardoned, a person should not be forced to reenter the legal system just so that they may have their criminal record sealed or have to hire an attorney to get that job finished.

This provides each of the classes with the opportunity they need to engage with their community without the fear of their criminal past being used against them in the future and without having to fight the system again to argue the case should be sealed or wait the often lengthy time to be served.

This is an important bill and a step in the right direction towards positive criminal justice reform, and I strongly urge your support of A.B. 219.

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

Criminal records have been a pet project of mine since 2017, and I am grateful for all the progress that the Legislature has made over the last two sessions in this arena. This is another step in progress, and I want to explain why it is necessary.

I represented Mr. Reginald Mason at his sealed records hearing, and the Clark County District Attorney's Office opposed. They opposed Mr. Mason's record sealing even though he was pardoned in 1998 and he had spent 13 years in prison for a crime he did not commit when he was 14 years old. You may remember this man from a February 12, 2021, article where he was awarded money from the state because of his wrongful conviction. Nevertheless, even though he was pardoned, and the state opposed his pardon, they then

opposed his record sealing in 2016 and made it very difficult for Mr. Mason to move on with his life. Luckily, the judge did not agree with the Clark County District Attorney's Office and allowed him to seal his record and move on from a terrible chapter in his life from a 14-year-old young man spending years in prison for a crime he did not commit.

Giving someone a fresh start in life is a big deal, and this bill moves that ball forward. We ask that this Committee pass this piece of legislation.

**Nicholas Shepack, Policy and Program Associate, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

As we know, criminal records can stick with a person for life. A felony conviction can create permanent barriers that stand in the way of people's ability to move on with their lives. These records are kind of a scarlet letter that people with convictions carry for life. Pardons are designed to help those who are deserving of relief. This body worked hard in 2019 to create a path of sealing past marijuana convictions. We were not alone. In the same year, 27 states and Washington, D.C., enacted new laws creating, expanding, or streamlining record relief. Because of the difficulties in navigating these systems, from eligibility criteria that is frequently complex and unclear, to court proceedings that can be intimidating, burdensome, and expensive, many potential beneficiaries of these record sealing laws find it hard to navigate. These and other barriers to access have been shown to discourage the laws' intended beneficiaries. This bill is a great step towards streamlining the records sealing process and ensuring that those who receive pardons not only have access to the sealing process but can understand it.

The appellate process added by the amendment is also a welcome addition to this bill. We urge you to support this bill for the reasons I stated and the reasons stated by our colleagues before us and to continue towards more reforms to the record sealing process to make it more efficient and accessible.

**John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:**

Justice Hardesty asked me to call in today to put the Supreme Court's support of this measure on record and also to indicate that this measure will be helpful in executing the sealing of records for those people whose pardons were granted for minor marijuana convictions.

**Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

This is a bill that has been long overdue. It has affected so many people's lives who have been exonerated and who want to clear their name and move forward. I would like to echo the comments made by the previous callers.

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

I want to thank Assemblyman Yeager for championing this crucial issue over this [unintelligible] with legal aid to work towards clarifying this incredibly arduous and confusing process. This bill provides our citizens with an easier way in order to receive the



benefits of sealing their records that they have earned. It is incredibly impactful to hear from those who are directly impacted by this issue with exactly how important the sealing process is. For those in the Committee who have some concerns, I would urge you to read or at least watch the Committee hearing on March 28, 2019, where DeMarlo Berry testified about the terrifying situation that he was in any time he was pulled over by law enforcement—as soon as they checked his record, the concern and confusion it would create just by having his paperwork and certificate of innocence. This is an incredibly important tool to provide a second chance to allow people to rebuild their lives. Studies have shown that recidivism rates have decreased when a person has had the ability to seal their record. We urge the passage of this crucial bill.

**Christina Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

I would like to echo the sentiments of those who spoke before me. Having a criminal record can impact employment, housing, access to student financial aid, and even being able to volunteer in your child's classroom. Assembly Bill 219 helps clarify the process for record sealing, and we urge your support.

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

Is there any other support testimony? [There was none.] Is there anyone who would like to give opposition testimony on Assembly Bill 219?

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

I am testifying on behalf of the Nevada District Attorneys Association. Pursuant to the Committee rules, I am testifying in opposition because we have a few suggested changes to this bill, but I would like to thank Assemblyman Yeager and Ms. Bortolin for hearing our concerns, and we look forward to working with them so we can get to a position of support regarding A.B. 219.

We have a few concerns about some of the language in section 4, subsection 6. Our first concern is with the ten-day time period, as was referenced during the testimony, and which might be a little too short given the number of sealing petitions we have seen in recent years because our Legislature has opened up that option for a lot more people in previous sessions. For example, in Washoe County, we have a local rule that gives us 21 days to respond. It is my understanding that in Clark County there is a 14-day rule. A uniform rule would be good, and we would like to see it more than ten days, given the increased numbers that we have been seeing in recent years. We would like to give prosecutors a little more time to object where they think it is appropriate.

We are also concerned about the section 4, subsection 6 requirement that sealing be automatic if no prosecuting attorney attends the sealing hearing. It removes the important element of judicial discretion, and it overlooks the statutory requirement that any person having relevant evidence may testify regarding the petition. Our Nevada Supreme Court has explained that sealing orders are intended to permit individuals previously involved with the criminal justice system to pursue law-abiding citizenship unencumbered by the records of

any past transgressions, and it is an important step in allowing these deserving individuals to contribute to society unencumbered by that. While eligibility for a sealing is prescribed by statute, we would like to trust our judges to exercise their discretion in determining whether or not sealing is just in a particular case. Even if the prosecutor does not attend the hearing, *Nevada Revised Statutes* 179.245 allows for any person having relevant evidence as stated to attend and present evidence at the hearing on the petition. Those people could include law enforcement, victims and members of the community, and they can all help inform the judge's ultimate exercise of their judicial discretion.

Finally, I apologize to Assemblyman Yeager and Ms. Bortolin because we just caught this concern this morning, so I have not discussed it with them yet. We are a little concerned with section 4, subsection 7, paragraph (b) regarding sealing records where prosecution was declined or charges were dismissed. In certain cases, we are not able to initially file charges based on the information that is given to us by law enforcement, so we may initially decline to prosecute and then perhaps prosecute later. In others, we may have an issue that causes us to dismiss without prejudice. This does not mean we are not going to pursue charges in the future. It can depend on a number of factors, including our ability to locate witnesses, evidence, et cetera. We still have the remaining time allowed by the applicable statute of limitations to pursue those charges. The way it is drafted—I do not think this is the intent—but this section may apply to persons investigated or arrested for charges not ordinarily eligible for sealing or with no statute of limitations such as sexual assault or murder, and certain crimes against children. We ask that we apply a period of time commensurate with the statute of limitations applicable to the particular offense or offenses that are being considered to that section.

As always, we appreciate your consideration of our concerns, and we are looking forward to working with Assemblyman Yeager, Ms. Bortolin, and all the stakeholders on this important bill.

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

Is there any other opposition testimony? [There was none.] Is there anyone who would like to give testimony in the neutral position? [There was no one.] At this time, I will welcome Assemblyman Yeager back to the virtual table to see if he has any closing remarks.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

Record sealing is an issue that we have been working on for a number of years. It is overly complicated in the state of Nevada. I think this helps move the process forward. I want to thank Ms. Bortolin, who has done tremendous work on this issue, along with Ms. Noble. The district attorney's office has been a very willing partner to talk about these issues, and I understand we had a very tight turnaround from when the bill was introduced to when we are hearing it. I appreciate her expressing those concerns and a willingness to work together. I believe we will be able to find some common ground to hopefully make this process a little simpler for those who deserve to have their records sealed.

**Bailey Bortolin:**

I would echo that we appreciate Assemblyman Yeager's always making progress in the area and the Committee's willingness to look into this. We hope to come back with something that everyone agrees is a workable step forward.

**Vice Chairwoman Nguyen:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 219, and welcome back Chairman Yeager to conclude this meeting.

[Assemblyman Yeager reassumed the Chair.]

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will open the meeting up for public comment.

**Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:**

Thomas Purdy was killed by Reno police, hog-tied for 40-plus minutes, and asphyxiated to death by Washoe County Sheriff's Office while still hog-tied and put in the prone position while several deputies got on his back and neck area.

I would like to thank all the Committee members for their hard work. I see a lot of bills coming down the pipeline that look good. I just wanted to mention that I sent an email to the sponsor of Assembly Bill 243. I think that the person directly impacted by police violence should be on that committee that is being suggested.

Today I want to talk about Roy Anthony Scott, who was killed March 3, 2019. In a time when George Floyd's death took national headlines, I think it is time to acknowledge Nevada's own George Floyd, Roy Anthony Scott, who was killed on March 13, 2019. He had called police saying there was an armed man outside his home. When police came, he initially would not open the door, told them to kick it in and when they ended up going to leave he came out then and they attempted to handcuff him and that is when he became resistant, asking, Why are you doing this to me, and that is when he too was placed in the prone, face-down position. Las Vegas police then put their knee on his back and neck; 63 times he pleaded, Please, 63 three times in a matter of eight minutes. Please support bills that promote transparency and accountability. Please do not support bills that protect police any further than what is protected by the police officers' bill of rights.

**Anthony Thomas Jr., Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am an ambassador with Make It Work Nevada and a member of the Nevada Housing Justice Alliance. Nevada has one of the fastest eviction processes in the country, and this process is disproportionately impacting Black and Brown families. We need a hearing for Assembly Bill 161 in order to protect Nevada families and keep them in their homes and ensure they have a right to due process.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else who would like to give public comment? [There was no one.] Are there any comments from our Committee members? [There were none.] I know it was a really long week and a long meeting. I wish I could promise you that things would slow down, but I think things are going to get busier from here on out as we continue to get more bills. Next week I anticipate we will have meetings every day with likely starts of 8 a.m. The meeting is adjourned [at 10:40 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Traci Dory  
Recording Secretary

---

Linda Whimple  
Transcribing 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 to [Assembly Bill 212](#) presented by Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated March 12, 2021, submitted by Paloma M. Guerrero, Member, Legislative Committee, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, in support of [Assembly Bill 212](#)

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 214](#), presented by Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18.

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter dated April 12, 2021, authored by Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, and submitted by Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, in support of [Assembly Bill 214](#).

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

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 33](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 60](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 64](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 115](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 145](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 151](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 157](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 202, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to Assembly Bill 219, dated March 12, 2021, presented by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9.