MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-second Session
April 4, 2023

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 2023, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Senator Dallas Harris, Vice Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator Jeff Stone

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Edgar Flores, Senatorial District No. 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Counsel
Jan Brase, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Mendy Elliott, Nevada Rural Housing Authority
Angela Escalera
Melanie Arizmendi
TaShika Lawson

Andy Romero, Make the Road Nevada
Silvia Buenrostro
John Solomon
Lisa Lynn Chapman, Battle Born Progress
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Shelly Speck, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada
John Sande, Nevada State Apartment Association
Tiffany Banks, Nevada Realtors
Dylan Keith, Vegas Chamber
Jeff Rogan, Clark County
Kirk Johnson
Roger Wu
Barbara Paulsen, Nevadans for the Common Good
Melissa A. Saragosa, Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4, Clark County
Kent M. Irvin
Alexandria Cannito, CAI Nevada
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Shawnyne Garren, Recorder, Douglas County; Recorder's Association of Nevada
Jamie Cogburn, Nevada Justice Association

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will open the meeting with Senate Bill (S.B.) 335.

SENATE BILL 335: Revises provisions regarding real property. (BDR 3-883)

SENATOR JAMES OHRENSCHALL (Senatorial District No. 21):
We have been working with all parties to assure S.B. 335 is a balanced piece of legislation. A friendly amendment (Exhibit C) has been submitted by Mendy Elliott for the Nevada Rural Housing Authority. The bill is a work in progress, and I appreciate everyone who has worked with me. Nevada has been struggling with various housing problems for several years, including foreclosure, affordability and lack of supply. Regarding S.B. 335, last year, the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary studied the subject of the State's eviction process. However, the Interim ended with the various parties unable to reach consensus on solutions to a serious problem for our State.

Jonathan Norman is with me to assist in presenting S.B. 335. Mr. Norman has been working diligently on this subject since joining legal aid organizations. He

has taken part in hours of discussions and worked tirelessly to help find a way to fix an eviction system that is not working for our constituents. Our eviction process does not work for tenants, for landlords or for our judiciary. Mr. Norman will present a brief overview of the ways S.B. 335 can improve our eviction process, how the eviction process currently works and what changes in the bill and proposed amendment were developed with Ms. Elliott.

JONATHAN NORMAN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):
Our organization includes Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Northern Nevada Legal Aid and the Senior Law Program of Northern Nevada. Heard last week as introduced by Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong, Assembly Bill (A.B.) 340 tracks language in the first portion of S.B. 335 with the addition of what I will call the 486 defense—A.B. No. 486 of the 81st Session. I will describe this defense during my testimony.

ASSEMBLY BILL 340: Revises provisions governing certain actions and proceedings relating to real property. (BDR 3-77)

The Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada and the Civil Law Self-Help Center see between 300 and 500 people a day for summary evictions. Some days we see more than 500 people. That is just in Clark County.

The fundamental subject we are changing in S.B. 335 requires that a landlord file the complaint in a summary eviction action. We have provided two handouts. The first outlines the existing summary eviction process in a flowchart (Exhibit D). The second is an overview of the summary eviction process in a flowchart (Exhibit E) as proposed in A.B. 340. At a glance, they look similar. The significant difference is that under statute, when the tenant gets a seven-day notice to pay or quit, he or she must file an answer to the eviction, vacate the premises or pay the amount of outstanding rent within the stated time. If the answer is not filed within that period, a lockout notice can be issued. Suggested language in A.B. 340 provides that the landlord file a complaint after seven days, and the tenant will have a period to respond to that complaint with the court. This provision tracks every civil procedure I am aware of in the State and the Country. I am not aware of another proceeding where the answer is the first pleading filed with the court. Simply put, the first part of this bill requires a complaint to be filed as the first step in the process.

I will highlight the differences provided by A.B. 340 and S.B. 335 with a step-by-step description of summary evictions as outlined in the presentation (Exhibit F). Step one, the landlord serves the eviction on a tenant. I will refer to the seven-day notice to pay or quit because it is the most common. Within the notice period, the tenants have options. They can comply with a notice by vacating. They can pay their rent and cure the lease violation. If they do that, there is no eviction.

Step two, after the notice period, we suggest the landlord file a complaint to request eviction. In this case, the first document filed with the court is a complaint for eviction, and they serve the tenant.

Step three, after the service of complaint, the tenant has ten days to file the answer with the appropriate justice court, in which case a hearing is set and tenants can argue their cases. The judges will decide whether eviction is granted or denied. If they deny, the court will review the pleadings, make sure everything lines up and that the party was properly noticed and then issue the default eviction notice.

Step four, the tenant can appeal to district court. If at the appeals hearing, the court determines the tenant has legal defenses against eviction, the court will require further proceedings to be conducted pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 40.290 through NRS 40.420.

Section 2 sets out the new procedure for summary eviction; notice to the tenant, what should be in the notice; how the landlord goes about filing an affidavit of complaint: what must be in the complaint, including the ten-day response for filing an answer; and the consequences for failing to file an answer. Section 3 spells out notice for service delivered pursuant to subsection 3 of section 2. Section 4 sets out time lines for a constable to act upon receipt of order of removal. Sections 5 and 6 reorganize NRS 40.253, the statute affected by governing NRS references in both S.B. 335 and A.B. 340. Section 7 lays out new processes for other types of eviction in NRS 40. Section 8 lays out the same procedure for commercial premises found in NRS 40.2542. Sections 20 through 21 are conforming changes. Section 22 enacts the effective date of the bill.

Assembly Bill 340 does not address the defense from the Eighty-first Session. Assembly Bill No. 486 of the 81st Session allowed for a stay of eviction for

tenants who have pending rental assistance applications with the county or local government. The eviction stay remains in place until the application is adjudicated. The bill sunsets on June 5, 2023. Senate Bill 335 would allow an extension of that affirmative defense. The two key pieces of S.B. 335 require the complaint to be filed first and the continuation of the 486 defense as proposed in section 9.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Nevada Rural Housing Authority):
The proposed amendment, Exhibit C, addresses section 9. A tenant who has a pending application for rental assistance is qualified for an affirmative defense. The concern of the housing authorities is with the term rental assistance. The proposed amendment to section 9, subsection 7, excludes those who have applied for a Housing Choice Voucher, income-based rental assistance, from eviction stays. We want to be clear, pending housing voucher applications cannot be used as a defense against eviction if this amendment is adopted.

MR. NORMAN:
This is a work in progress. We anticipate an amendment to A.B. 340 which will make clear the intent of the legislation. The goal is to protect tenants and landlords who are acting in good faith.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Concerning section 9, subsection 4, the language does not place limitations on the length of stay. Presently, stayed eviction cases may take as long as six months to settle. I have some concerns about good landlords in this situation.

MR. NORMAN:
This Body and our federal government stepped in during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic and rolled out massive rental assistance. This program was successful. In Clark County, $400 million was distributed to landlords, and 70,000 Clark County families remained housed. Nevada aided an additional 20 percent of vulnerable individuals. By any measure, that is a success.

I recognize landlords should not have to wait months to be made whole. We are unlikely to see a Clark County CARES Housing Assistance Program (CHAP) COVID-era level of rental assistance. In October 2022, the Interim Finance Committee designated an additional $15 million to Clark County. Neither Washoe County nor the rural counties requested funds because they had

existing rental assistance available. Additional rental assistance funds may be available to Clark County though the figures are significantly reduced from $100 million to approximately $22 million. As CHAP applications diminish, the hope of community partners is to reallocate resources and easily process remaining claims.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Concerning potential amendments and clarifying language, will timelines be updated? Delays of three or four months are uncomfortable. While we have many corporate landlords in the State, there are many individual landlords as well.

MR. NORMAN:
We are open to time lines on when rental assistance applications need to be submitted. We have held discussions with stakeholders on the subject. In some instances, people are submitting multiple identical applications and delaying the process. We are not looking to protect those people. We are open to requiring a definite timeline along with other protections. I would point out landlords facing foreclosure have the right to submit a petition. I do not know how often petitions have been filed, but it was effective during the pandemic.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Section 9, subsection 3, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) state if a landlord files the motion described in subsection 2, the court may refer the designated eviction proceeding to mediation, hold a hearing on the motion or maintain the stay. This is different than what would typically happen with the filing of a legitimate motion. Affirmative defenses are heard by the judge before going to mediation. To me, this reads that when someone properly files a motion, there is a chance the motion will not be heard and will be directed into mediation. Is that what was intended?

MR. NORMAN:
We want judges to have discretion. We never want people in mediation who do not want to be there. That is a recipe for no progress. We can clarify language to allow flexibility for judicial officers.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
When a motion is properly filed, the judge should hear the motion and decide whether other aspects of the issue apply. I am not aware of existing procedures

when properly filed motions are not heard and people are diverted immediately into a mediation program.

MR. NORMAN:
During the pandemic, the funding for the mediation program that came along with the 486 defense was exhausted in December 2022. In Clark County, a pilot eviction diversion program was launched in February 2023 for the Las Vegas Justice Court. When meeting with a social worker to discuss an applicant's case and available rental assistance, the applicant is assessed and screened by a Legal Aid Center advocate. The goal is to understand all the reasons for not being able to pay rent. Is there another path for the tenant? Court rules allow willing parties to voluntarily be referred to neighborhood justice centers for mediation. The program started on February 6, 2023. I am not aware of a system where a judge is ordering people into mediation when they do not want to go.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Section 9, subsection 5 addresses damages to award tenants for landlords' refusal to provide relief from rent while tenants are applying for assistance. This addresses bad players. Can you give examples of what this would look like and what you are seeing in the community where this would apply?

MR. NORMAN:
We have had landlords who refused to participate. Typically, the landlord wants the tenant out of the property. We have not seen instances of awards of damages. This may be because of the volume of landlord/tenant cases under consideration. During the pandemic, when a landlord has been uncooperative and tenants receive assistance following eviction, they use funds to find a new apartment.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Senate Bill 335 will require every landlord to participate in the rental assistance application process under all circumstances. Is that correct?

MR. NORMAN:
Yes.

SENATOR STONE:
I moved my real estate holdings to Nevada in 2017. My wife and I worked throughout our lives to purchase properties and manage the properties ourselves. I like to consider ourselves compassionate landlords. During COVID-19, people were not able to pay rent. Landlords seeking evictions were prohibited by the State moratorium, which amounted to unfunded mandates. Our accounts receivable approached $100,000. We are working with CHAPS to help our clients. I am proud to say that even after CHAPS expired, we have never evicted a tenant. We have always worked with our tenants. We have given them credits for the COVID-19 period knowing times were difficult.

I am speaking more for smaller landlords and not the corporate landlords. When tenants cannot pay rent, landlords are obliged to continue paying taxes, insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) assessments. I am concerned that while trying to give the tenant the benefit of the doubt and of having more steps before the eviction process, landlords face significant consequences. The smaller landlords may have financial difficulties because of these delays and appeals. I am concerned the flowchart, Exhibit E, for summary eviction does not allow for the process accommodating landlords pursue before eviction. Despite these efforts, tenants may fall behind by three to four months and are not fulfilling their part of the bargain. Some landlords are left with no choice but to begin the seven-day notice eviction process. We have a tenant waiting for CHAPS approval who is $8,000 behind in rent. She is an excellent tenant, and we expect she will be able to catch up. I am worried these delays could cause financial harm to smaller landlords. Corporate landlords adhere to policies and procedures. They file notices and go to court. Tenants are numbers to them, but to me they are human beings. We help our tenants complete rental assistance applications and find services.

I request that you provide an estimate of the number of units this bill would apply to and whether mortgages are held by small or corporate landlords. How can the provisions be tailored to assist compassionate landlords who struggle to pay their obligations?

MR. NORMAN:
If all landlords ascribed to the Senator Stone management style, I probably would not be sitting here today.

We are talking about two issues, changing the complaint process and the 486 defense. Concerning changing the process, we are working with stakeholders to find an opportunity to create a system that flows with every other judicial proceeding where a complaint is filed first. We are exploring changing notice periods from judicial days to calendar days. This would provide landlords time on the front end. We also want to provide tenants opportunities to have more meaningful engagement from social services and legal service providers.

Concerning the rental assistance stay from eviction, we are trying to avoid somebody being evicted on a Friday and receiving rental assistance the next week. Having a time limit could be important. That puts the onus on our local governments to process those applications. Clark County has done an excellent job standing up programs and keeping people housed, especially considering the size of the caseload.

Establishing a time line makes sense, and I am open to those discussions. I do not want to be in a situation where clients are coming into the Civil Law Self-Help Center because they are being evicted while applying for rental assistance.

Senator Stone, in response to your question regarding considerations for small landlords, our position is that we should make good policy for all Nevadans.

SENATOR STONE:
I understand, we need to be fair to the tenant and the landlord. We do not want to put landlords at risk of losing their properties. It is not fair that landlords must wait six or eight months for payment. It is not fair that tenants could be evicted when they know funds are coming.

Two reasons to potentially evict somebody for either not paying rent or becoming problematic. In our development, we had somebody indecently exposing themselves. We had another person shooting up heroin in the gym. Those are cases where you may want to expedite an eviction. Does this legislation differentiate between financial and public safety issues?

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
Since introducing S.B. 335, I have spoken to landlords who are working with tenants facing medical issues and unemployment, trying to help them get back

on their feet. I talked to many mom-and-pop landlords who tell me they would like to keep good tenants. We are working to produce a balanced bill. Section 9 does have a procedure for a landlord to request an exemption. If a threat of losing the property to foreclosure exists, there is also the motion to abut the affirmative defense. I do want the bill to be balanced, protect tenants and not cause harm to landlords.

As a native to Las Vegas, I have seen my city change from the 1970s. I have never seen an unhoused population as numerous as it is now. Many bills in the Legislature this Session address the issue of preserving peoples' homes. This legislation is like A.B. 340. This is an important issue for our State.

MR. NORMAN:
In all summary eviction proceedings, we are contemplating the complaint with an answer. When someone is creating a harmful situation for the other tenants on the premises, landlords are expected to act. That is an ongoing part of the discussion.

SENATOR STONE:
Is it fair to say the bill does not differentiate between the two reasons one would want to serve a seven-day notice and ultimately evict a tenant?

MR. NORMAN:
Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR HANSEN:
During the Seventy-sixth Session and the mortgage crisis, the Legislature was involved in finding resolutions to the resulting housing emergency. Now, 12 years later, looking back, legislation did not accomplish much. In fact, we made things worse in the long run.

You mentioned one of the big problems is the rising price of rents. You mentioned the Las Vegas area is worse than ever. Meanwhile, we have more government intervention in the market than ever. Ultimately, all the costs, whether paid by the tenant or paid by a future renter, are passed onto the renters. Costs are going to constantly go up if we allow processes like this to go for several months before eviction, meaning the landlord must come up with funds for all costs. We are witnessing the demise of small landlords and the rise of corporate ones. We see fewer available rental properties because landlords

are losing money when evictions are delayed for an indefinite time. To have a good tenant is a dream come true. In processes like this, have you seen a decline in the price of rent?

MR. NORMAN:
This bill does not lower rents or create more affordable housing. It creates a judicial process that tracks every other process I am aware of in Nevada and in the United States where complaints are filed first.

In the last year's rental market, we saw an over 20 percent increase in prices, far outpacing inflation. Does this bill deal with those macroeconomic issues? Does it deal with people moving in from California? It does not. It does not solve those problems. It does allow for social services to intervene further upstream, which saves our local governments money. I do not expect landlords to exit the market when rents are rising at present rates. That is a roundabout way of saying S.B. 335 does not build more affordable housing. It provides a process to file complaints first and to support meaningful social services and legal engagement, thus leading to better outcomes.

SENATOR HANSEN:
Thank you for clarifying. In Nevada, we have people making $15 to $20 an hour and trying to pay $2,500 a month for rent. It has become a major problem. My goal in hearing bills like this is to get as much affordable housing and rental units available as possible. The marketplace itself will help bring those costs down. My concern is when you expand eviction time frames and make the process more cumbersome, ultimately, costs go up. People who can least afford rising costs will be the ones who bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

Senate Bill 335 is a rewrite of existing law. In the absence of evidence from other states demonstrating substantially improved tenant-landlord relationships and lowered rental prices, I am leery of the bill.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
What happens in the case where a landlord files the complaint but never serves it on the tenant?

MR. NORMAN:
We are working through those procedural steps, including the question of when a notice becomes stale. We are asking, what happens when the landlord files a complaint but does not have a return of service? Tentatively, we are envisioning the notice becoming stale after either 15 or 30 days. The landlord will be required to proceed with that complaint.

Assembly Bill 340 addresses return of service and the constable filing with the court. There are a certain number of days from the notice of service to file their complaint or the case will be dismissed and sealed. We are working through those things with input from the Judicial Branch as to how the process should flow.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I want to clarify. You worked on an amendment in the Assembly that you have not presented here.

MR. NORMAN:
We are working with stakeholders on an amendment that would address the same process issues in both bills.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
The specific situation I am concerned about is when an individual is frequently moving, has multiple open eviction cases and when the landlord has filed an eviction notice, the tenant moves and nothing ever happens. After a year or two of this, there might be five eviction complaints on record. Is it up to the tenant to clear the record or is it the court?

MR. NORMAN:
That rests with the court to seal them after a certain number of days. In Las Vegas, I understand it is done by local rule. We would be looking to put that process in statute and make the timeline clear. We ask, what is the timeline where complaints can linger before the court steps in and closes them?

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I have questions about pending rental assistance applications triggering a stay of eviction. Does the court verify the existence of a pending application? If so, what is the process?

MR. NORMAN:
The court contacts social service organizations for updates. The cumbersome process was part of the CHAP program. When the tenant files the answer, he or she is checking boxes. Once tenants are in diversion court, they are accompanied by social workers and court personnel. It warrants some thought as to how it will function outside of Las Vegas Justice Court. For instance, eviction diversion court is not an option in North Las Vegas. Though in those jurisdictions, there is communication between County social services and the court regarding application status.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
How are we going to handle cases when tenants apply for assistance, their eviction is stayed and then the assistance is denied?

MR. NORMAN:
That can happen under the system. I would have to follow up to see how it is handled and whether they are screened out early in the process. Applicants who do not meet the criteria during the screening process are immediately denied.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
Are you referring to applicants who do not meet the criteria for rental assistance or for diversion?

MR. NORMAN:
Diversion court applies to Las Vegas Justice Court. Rental assistance is a countywide program. Both types of applications are filed through the Clark County portal for rental assistance. The system screens for qualification. An applicant cannot proceed to the next screen when criteria is not met.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
Is one of those criteria not already exhausting your rental assistance eligibility?

MR. NORMAN:
I would have to walk through the new program; of the two programs that exist, in one you are only eligible for a total of two months. The other considers imminent rental increases, tenants on fixed incomes and tenants who have faced a rental increase in the previous 12 months. I will investigate the screening questions for those two programs.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I understand the policy purpose. We do not want people being evicted while rental assistance is pending. The programs and policy changes for CHAP assistance during COVID-19 made sense. If we are going to continue that policy and allow people to stay their evictions while they have pending applications, we need to bring it up to date with the norm going forward. That is what I am trying to understand. In the post-COVID-19 era, how are we going to ensure that we do not set everybody up for failure by extending eviction processes for those who will ultimately be denied rental assistance?

Part of my concern is expecting the courts to take on the burden of determining whether people have applied for rental assistance and where they are in the process. Tracking applicants' progress makes me nervous. It is not appropriate for a judge who is overseeing an eviction to be responsible for determining the likelihood of an approved application. We need a more structured system. I want to be clear; I am not saying people should not be able to stay their evictions while they have an application pending. I want to make sure we have a clear understanding of the process for informing the court of the status of tenants' rental assistance applications. This is important in the decision to stay an eviction. During the pandemic, the courts were communicating with social services. You described the process as cumbersome, and we do not want to continue a cumbersome process. We may require tenants to submit a copy of their application to the court. A piece of the process is missing.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
Section 9 addresses the affirmative defense a tenant can claim regarding the pending application. The language could be clarified. Could we determine what constitutes adequate documentation for a tenant claiming that affirmative defense? I may need to submit an additional amendment.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I do not practice in eviction court and small claims. When filing motions in criminal court, there are dropdown menus for a motion to revoke bail or for a motion to suppress evidence, for example. Are the courts set up for the new types of filings required in Senate Bill 335?

MR. NORMAN:
That is probably going to vary. It is a new process. Former Chief Justice James W. Hardesty has been discussing the need to switch the filing order. It is

familiar to our jurisdictions around the State. Clark County is positioned to transition. In Las Vegas Justice Court, it is possible to file online, and we anticipate that court being able to accommodate a complaint. In both North Las Vegas and Henderson, it is possible to generate online documents using Las Vegas Justice Court's website and then submit for filing. It does create an additional barrier for the courts and landlords in those jurisdictions that may have to go to the court multiple times to complete the different filings, whether for return of service or filing the complaint.

ANGELA ESCALERA:
I am a former Culinary Union member and support S.B. 335. I am a mother of six, have one granddaughter and another on the way. I have experienced summary eviction. I had nowhere to go. I was living in a studio with my six kids and my granddaughter. I was paying $1,000 a month for the studio. It was the only place I could afford. During the pandemic, I was not working and was surviving on my savings.

One day, my daughter called and told me the landlord was giving us five minutes to move out. It was a rainy day, the kids were crying, my granddaughter was in the car seat, and I had to leave immediately. I went to court of file for a stay of eviction. It was not successful. My landlord kept my belongings. Because of my poor credit, I could not find another place to live. We had to live on the streets. Nevada needs to protect tenants like me.

MELANIE ARIZMENDI:
I am a political intern with the Culinary Workers Union Local 226. Culinary Union members have not recovered from the effects of the pandemic, and thousands are struggling with housing and security. The Culinary Union is a member of the Nevada Housing Justice Alliance (NHJA). A survey of Culinary Union members released on May 22, 2022, reveled 21 percent have experienced rent increases of $500. In addition to rent, 15 percent said that they pay more than $100 in fees each month. Rent increases have outpaced wage growth from the first quarter of 2019 through the second quarter of 2020to market rate. Rent in Las Vegas increased 33 percent while average weekly earnings only grew 21 percent in 2021. Investors bought approximately 18 percent of available homes in the Las Vegas metropolitan area. In some areas, purchases by metro investors accounted for as much as 26 percent of homes sold.

Nevada must change the filing order for summary evictions because tenants should have the right to due process when threatened with losing their homes. Nevada's summary eviction process is a flawed and confusing public policy. Every Nevadan deserves an affordable stable home, and eviction should never be a surprise.

The State must ensure rental assistance programs keep Nevadans in their homes. Tenants should not be evicted because the government is late cutting checks or has not processed applications for assistance. The Culinary Union believes that every Nevadan deserves to be treated with dignity, and that housing is a human right. Nevadans should not have to decide between having food on the table or a roof over their head. The Culinary Union urges the Committee to support and pass S.B. 335.

TASHIKA LAWSON:
I support S.B. 335. I remind the Committee we are here to protect our constituents. There are more tenants than landlords among our constituents. Many landlords will be listening to the meeting today. When we are listening to people like the mother who just spoke, keep in mind there are certain things that we must be able to protect. The American dream is disappearing for many people because of rising rents. These protections are meant to get us to a national level and on the same playing field with every other state. We need these protections.

When there was no emergency rehousing, and all the government agencies and rapid rehousing clinics were closed, a family called me. They had to sleep on my couch. They had a disabled grandmother, two autistic children and a two-year-old who had just been diagnosed. We should not be focusing on the things that cause us problems. I can tell you as a person who interacts with the government all the time, government action is lagging on these critical issues. We are asking for consideration of the tenants who are in need and hurting. They are our constituents and are our neighbors. We must be able to protect them. If we cannot stand together, then I do not know why I am sitting here, while you are sitting up there.

ANDY ROMERO (Make the Road Nevada):
I am housing organizer for Make the Road Nevada. I am also a member of NHJA. I support S.B. 335. As you know, the summary eviction process can be incredibly stressful and burdensome for the tenants in Nevada. Many Nevadans

are unaware of the summary eviction process. Eviction notices are long and include legal jargon that is difficult for many of us to understand. We hope this bill will ensure better processes for tenants. This bill will make a significant difference in the lives of countless Nevadans who are struggling with housing insecurity.

SILVIA BUENROSTRO:
I have been a member of the Culinary Union for over 27 years and am a union organizer. I am a single mother of five. My children were all born and raised in Nevada. We have struggled through the years in different situations. Our children are struggling to keep a roof over their heads. Senate Bill 335 will help renters. I lost my house during the economic downturn in 2009, and it has been difficult to recover and become a homeowner again. It is unfortunate that more renters do not have compassionate landlords like Senator Stone. I have suffered through the eviction process myself.

Ten years ago, when my son was seven years old, he was in the hospital with an asthma attack for seven days. I have been dealing with an asthma problem, and it was a difficult time for me and my children. When we saw a seven-day eviction notice on the door, I applied for economic assistance, which took a long time. When I received a 24-hour notice, I still did not understand the process and was unable to contact my landlord. The process was difficult and confusing. In the years since then, nothing has changed. I support S.B. 335.

JOHN SOLOMON:
I support S.B. 335. I am a member of Faith in Action Nevada. There is a golden rule in all faiths—treat others as you wish to be treated. I am a landlord, and summary evictions allow me to treat tenants differently in the legal system than I expect and believe I should be treated. I can post a notice on a tenant's door. If the tenant does not respond to the court with the appropriate defense in a short period of time, I can go to court for relief. The tenant does not need to attend and can be evicted.

If a tenant were allowed to treat me this way, the tenant could post a notice on my door saying I owe $1,500 for damages due to my neglect. He could start the collection process in seven days and would not be required to inform me of my legal options. Clearly, summary evictions are fundamentally flawed as to the allowed defense for tenants applying for rental assistance. I consider this to be good for me as a landlord. Evictions are always expensive. It is costly to

transition from one tenant to another. It is also a brutalizing process for tenants, putting them in an impossible situation due to the lack of time to find a new place and often resulting in homelessness. Senate Bill 335 offers a solution other than eviction. This allowed defense is a win-win situation for both the landlord and the tenant.

LISA LYNN CHAPMAN (Battle Born Progress):
We support S.B. 335. Families facing summary eviction are not afforded proper due process. The existing process is contrary to civil procedure at a time Nevada is facing a housing and homelessness crisis. Working Nevadans are struggling to get by and are just recovering from the pandemic. We need to do everything possible to provide relief. We ask you to support S.B. 335.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):
I am a founding member of the NHJA and support S.B. 335. Every Nevadan deserves an affordable and stable place to call home. If the summary eviction process allows landlords to entirely sidestep the judicial system when trying to evict residents from their homes, the burden is on tenants to initiate a court case. They hope to have the due process of the court hearing and judicial oversight afforded to tenants everywhere in the Country. Evictions and economic displacement impact us all by putting more economic burden on our communities and increasing demand on social services, need for shelters and hospitals by families who become homeless and incur other costs associated with the disruption caused by housing instability. By contrast, those living in stable homes have educational opportunities for children and economic opportunities for families. Nevadans can save for a home purchase, pursue new employment options and open new businesses. During the past two years, our coalition has conducted community outreach and educational trainings on tenant law. We have assisted in filings for bankruptcy and responding to summary eviction notices. Too often, a tenant was connected to us for support when time had run out on a summary eviction notice. This is inexcusable. The time is now to update our summary eviction process, and we urge your support of this bill.

SHELLY SPECK (Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada):
We support S.B. 335.

JOHN SANDE (Nevada State Apartment Association):
We have been in constant dialogue about this bill with others and appreciate their willingness to work with us and hear us out on some of our concerns for the purpose of this bill. In particular, Committee members have a good handle on our concerns. We see housing as an ecosystem. We have housing affordability issues in our State. I disagree with some of the ways the eviction process has been characterized, but the existing process was codified originally in 1985, and has been amended. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 40 is a cumbersome statute and difficult to understand. Considering about half the evictions are initiated by smaller landlords, it is important to understand that the process is difficult for them, and the added cost of attorney fees contributes to the cost of the entire system. Ultimately, the expenses will be reflected in rental increases. We are all trying to avoid that. We are willing to work with the proponents to streamline the process and implement protections so long as they do not result in higher costs. Evictions are emotional and stressful for both landlords and tenants. We are hopeful we can arrive at an outcome that will move us forward.

TIFFANY BANKS (Nevada Realtors):
We support a fair and balanced approach for both landlords and tenants. It is our understanding that most states do have an informal eviction process. I will touch on a few of our concerns. It is not clear whether section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (b) is meant to notify a tenant that failure to act may result in summary eviction or to explain the summary eviction procedure. It is crucial that tenants have a clear understanding of the meaning of the notice. The more confusing a notice, the harder it is for the tenant to understand the action they need to take. This ultimately defeats the purpose of the bill.

Nevada Revised Statutes 40 as it exists is confusing. Section 2, subsection 3, uses language required by NRS 40.280 and states a landlord shall attempt to deliver personally in the presence of a witness or a constable who is a licensed process server. If service is unsuccessful, this bill as drafted eliminates the ability to serve on a person of suitable age and discretion. Section 2, subsection 6, identifies no method of service. It appears section 2, subsection 6, paragraph (b) adds an additional ten days to an already extremely lengthy process. Section 2, subsection 7, should read "require that the tenant raise any legal defense they may have in the answer as well as any stay of execution of an eviction order." The answer also includes any defenses to be considered.

Some issues need to be worked out from the legal, technical and policy perspective. I covered a few of those today. We will continue to work with the bill sponsor and legal aid organizations to address these issues.

DYLAN KEITH (Vegas Chamber):
We oppose S.B. 335 as written and echo concerns of the Nevada Realtors.

Evictions are not an easy or timely process. This bill will alleviate some issues tenants face. When tenants and landlords can find a solution before engaging with courts, everyone benefits. We expect this bill will remove the mediation period between the parties, will extend the length of time for evictions and, in turn, increase the cost on landlords and tenants. We will continue to work with the sponsor on this bill.

JEFF ROGAN (Clark County):
We are testifying in limited opposition to S.B. 335. We have been working with the bill's proponents and local justice courts to make improvements to the bill drafts of A.B. 340 and S.B. 335, which are similar.

I have heard several questions regarding Clark County's process and the rental eviction assistance programs. Though I am not prepared to answer, we may have testimony later which will address the Committee's questions. I can make a social services subject matter expert available to Committee members. It may be helpful as you decide regarding a time line.

Section 9 of S.B. 335 is problematic. It takes several months for a rental assistance application to be processed in Clark County, delaying summary evictions. We have encountered tenants who are gaming the system by filing multiple successive rental assistance applications without a change in circumstances that would justify such a subsequent filing. This creates problems not only for our courts and their scheduling but also for social service workers who are processing applications and must evaluate each successive application as a new one. From those two perspectives, section 9 needs a lot of work, and I am happy to be of assistance.

KIRK JOHNSON:
I am an attorney in Reno and have practiced in the commercial landlord-tenant field, including evictions, for 30 years. I represent both landlords and tenants. I have experience with evictions in the commercial setting. I am testifying today

to urge you to amend S.B. 335 and eliminate its application to commercial landlord-tenant situations. I request the deletion of section 8. It is a solution looking for a problem when it comes to commercial tenancies. All the testimony today has focused on residential tenancies. There has not been testimony of concern or explanation for including commercial landlord-tenants and their evictions into this process.

In my 30 years, I have found the process works well in commercial settings. In a residential situation, most people are neither represented by lawyers nor sophisticated. In the commercial setting, most tenants are corporations or limited liability companies that require representation by attorneys when they appear in court. Most commercial tenants are sophisticated, and some are skilled at abusing the process.

Unfortunately, subsection 6 of section 8 would require that the landlord file the landlord affidavit after five days have elapsed, and the tenant is given an additional ten days thereafter to respond. This will triple the process time to 15 days in commercial tenancies. Now, from the date rent is due to the date a tenant is noticed for eviction is 21 to 28 days, at which point the next month is just a few days away.

ROGER WU:
I am a property manager in Las Vegas. We hired an attorney to assist with a summary eviction in February 2022. The summary eviction and the CHAP application were initiated in February 2022. The process was not completed until March 2023. During the past year, the tenant submitted three separate CHAP applications in response to our three separate summary eviction attempts. Each eviction attempt was stayed based on provisions of A.B. No. 486 of the 81st Session. The tenants had CHAP approval for all three applications but each time the tenants refused to issue payment to us without explanation. The judge put us in contact with the CHAP supervisor during our most recent attempt. That did not help. We had no notification from CHAP when the applications were denied. We had to wait months to go back to court and find out from the judge. The tenants lied and gave us false information. They told us the application was still being processed. We learned the application had already been denied from the court and the judge at that point in time. The total amount owed when the tenant was evicted was $78,000. I cannot support any bill that will allow something like this happen.

The CHAP program needs to be responsible for notifying landlords of tenants' application progress.

BARBARA PAULSEN (Nevadans for the Common Good):
I have submitted written remarks (Exhibit G). I am a member of the Boulder City United Methodist Church, which is a member of Nevadans for the Common Good. This situation seriously needs to be addressed. We have had countless conversations with tenants who do not understand what the notice for eviction means, and they do not know how to access the court. Some have attempted doing so, but they find it difficult, some for a variety of reasons. I do not want to approach the court and prefer to self-evict rather than deal with the complex system. This not only leaves many people in a vulnerable position but also prevents the courts, social services and housing advocates from knowing the true volume of evictions in our community. We support S.B. 335 and A.B. 340 because they require that landlords initiate the complaint. Landlords bring the process forward, so they should be the first to go to court.

We have concerns about section 2, subsection 6 and would like it expanded. This section tells the tenant what to do in terms of responding to the court. It clearly tells them what they are being given that they will have filed a stamped copy, know what court they are in and the deadline they have in terms of guidance on how they should respond. The only guidance is it should be written. We already know that tenants are hesitant to approach the court. They have a difficult time understanding how to do so. With no clear guidance on what to say and how to respond, it sets up a system that is not going to be successful for the tenant, even if there was a short form allowing a specific response to what the court wants to have or an available helpline. To engage more tenants in actively addressing the eviction and doing what they are supposed to do in responding, S.B. 335, must be greatly expanded. Otherwise, the bill will not be successful; and therefore, we speak neutral on this bill.

MELISSA A. SARAGOSA (Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4, Clark County):
I have 15 years of experience working with summary evictions through the Las Vegas Justice Court which handles about 75 percent of the State's summary evictions. I am neutral on S.B. 335 because the court takes no position on policy issues and leave that within your jurisdiction. Certain areas impact the administration of the court, and I want to bring them to your attention.

A previous testifier, Mr. Rogan, shared some of my comments and concerns over procedural issues. Chair Scheible questioned the time required to serve a complaint and what happens to the case if there is want of prosecution? These matters are addressed through an amendment to A.B. 340. I will work with Jonathan Norman and Senator Ohrenschall to convey those same concerns for S.B. 335.

My comments focus on section 9, highlight some of the administrative problems and the impact A.B. No. 486 of the 81st Session has had on the court. It has been crippling to the courts' resources. There is no other way to paint the picture.

I want to reiterate; we have no position on the policy of staying cases pending rental assistance applications. One of the fundamental problems with S.B. 335 is the way it flows through the court. The biggest problem is that the court has no cross flow of information from county social services, those working on the rental assistance applications, and the court. The court is required to take certain action whether the application is denied or approved. The problem is we do not know when it is approved or when it is denied. We do not know unless we go through a rudimentary process of sending an email with a list of cases multiple times through the life of a case. Social services staff must look up each case individually and inform the court of the status of the case, which can change daily.

Changes in cases occur for a number of reasons. Because the application is pending, existing language allows a tenant to renew or make a new rental assistance application at any point in the proceeding. If in the middle of the proceeding, it is denied and we get information from social services of an application denial before we can get to the hearing, tenants may file a new application and things change all over again. It is impossible to keep up. Having some finality to the case is critical for the court to manage the caseload.

Regarding cases not related to nonpayment of rent, statute only exempts eviction in the case of nuisance. Nuisance is a limited definition under NRS 40.140. It does not cover violations of the lease agreement. Those could be anything. It could be nonpayment of HOA assessments. It could be having a dog without permission. It could be not watering the lawn or not cleaning the pool or any violation within the covenant or condition of the lease. If tenants are conducting an illegal business on the property, having unauthorized occupants

or violating certain provisions of the Uniform Controlled Substance Act, under S.B. 335, these tenants in violation are still protected when they stop paying rent. If the tenant is behind or stops paying rent and has applied for rental assistance, the eviction can be stayed if the landlord works within the confines of this language and cooperates with social services. Let us say the rent is paid; it does not resolve the other problem. It does not resolve the underlying lease violation. No provision in this language as it exists allows the court to address the issue. Statute mandates that if a rental assistance application is approved, the court must dismiss the eviction case. The landlord does not have an avenue to come to court to address all those other violations.

In Clark County, when a landlord accepts rent payment, as required under S.B. 335, the language of the contract signed with the county mandates the landlord not to bring a new eviction for any basis for 60 days. Not only is the lease violation not addressed by the court, but the court is powerless to adjudicate the issue. There must be a mechanism for a multipronged eviction process. The court should be allowed to rule on a set of infringements, even though the rent has been paid.

Senate Bill 335 does not address a situation when rental assistance does not cover the full amount of owed rent. The court has no idea, based on existing language or section 9, what to do in that scenario. We have tenants exhausting their 18 months and still owing three- or four-months' rent. If the landlord proceeds and the renters file a rental assistance application, that rental assistance application will never cover the full amount, even if it is approved. There is no guidance to the court on what the Legislature expects the court to do in that scenario. Are we to treat this as if it has been paid in full? Require the landlord to file a new process? Fees for the process will be tacked onto what the tenant owes. These are the majority of issues we need to work through to accomplish policies for finality to cases and guidance for the court.

MR. NORMAN:
I appreciate all the discussion. We have put in a lot of work behind the scenes with many stakeholders because it is a complicated amendment. We are working to incorporate resolutions to the issues raised by Judge Saragosa.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I will close the hearing on S.B. 335 and open the hearing on S.B. 368.

SENATE BILL 368: Revises provisions relating to real property. (BDR 10-989):

SENATOR DALLAS HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 11):
I am presenting S.B. 368 and a proposed amendment (Exhibit H) as a follow-up to S.B. No. 117 of the 80th Session. In testimony, former Senator Julia Ratti, Kent Irvin and I went through the long history of the discriminatory provisions often placed in housing documents preventing certain people from buying homes or living in certain communities. At that time, we created a new form that a homeowner could fill out and place his or her displeasure on the record with the discriminatory language. The form would then be recorded with the housing documents.

Senate Bill 368 is a mechanism to remove discriminatory language from housing documents in the future. History is important, and the existence of the language will not be scrubbed from history. Original documents with this language will not change, but homeowners will now be able to petition a judge. The judge will then decide whether the language they would like to have struck is void and unenforceable. The judge will issue a court order to the recorder's office to redact the voided language. Homeowners will be able to have documents without that language. I have been working with the recorders' offices to make sure we get this right. The proposed conceptual amendment makes the intention clear.

We are not going to redact the original written document. We are going to make sure that the county recorder records this new restrictive covenant modification form for no fee and also make clear we are redacting offensive language from all future versions of the written document.

The restrictive covenant modification form is not the same as the declaration form created in the Eightieth Session. It is a form modeled from one used in California. The form allows recorders to index the original form to the new document with redactions. Lastly, S.B. 368 outlines what the restrictive covenant modification form will look like. We will ensure county recorders maintain the original instrument as a public record. Those petitioning the removal of language will be required to provide the county recorder with a certified copy of the document from which they are requesting redacted language.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
In the previous Session, we created these forms that people could fill out. Would the number of people who completed those forms be a good indicator of the number of people who will be petitioning the courts for revised documents?

SENATOR HARRIS:
Only 19 of those forms have been recorded. Senate Bill 368 provides the ability to proactively file this petition and remove it from homeowner associations' covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs). Then we can apply the new language to all properties in an HOA. The bill provides the University of Nevada, Reno, the ability to file. They have identified numerous restrictive covenants all throughout northern Nevada. Truthfully, most of them are in northern Nevada and the only ones recorded to date have been in Washoe County.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
Do you have any concerns or have concerns been alleviated about a rush of people coming to the courthouse the day this passes, asking judges to spend all their time hearing these petitions and making decisions on racially restrictive covenants.

SENATOR HARRIS:
In a perfect world, there would be a rush, but I do not anticipate that is what we will see. We anticipate public education about this new option. I will be encouraging HOAs to proactively begin the process as soon as possible. Judges have many options to summarily grant these petitions if there is no opposition from the homeowner. And it is clear that the language is, in fact, void and unenforceable. I worked with the Administrative Office of the Courts on the structure of the petition process. They have not expressed concerns about a burden on the courts and also are willing to make the petition cost-free.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I was a cosponsor on the original bill in the Eightieth Session. I expect S.B. 368 will make it easier to remove offensive language. I am looking forward to the day we bring another bill that gets rid of this kind of language entirely. We can keep it in the history books so we can remember it in the museums but not in these public documents.

KENT M. IRVIN:
I am a homeowner in Reno. We bought our 1930s-era home in 2015. I read the fine print and saw that the original CC&R stated homeowners cannot make moonshine or run a funeral parlor. Then I read the property cannot be owned, occupied or used by any person other than those of the Caucasian race—obviously offensive. Even though such restrictions have long been illegal and unenforceable, we still had to sign the covenant stamped read and accepted to close the sale.

I worked with former Senator Ratti and Senator Harris to pass S.B. No. 117 of the 80th Session. The bill was cosponsored by then Assemblywoman Krasner. The bill seemed like a good solution, but it turned out to be insufficient. First, many of the racist covenants apply to whole subdivisions. We thought one homeowner could file what is called a declaration of removal of discriminatory restriction, and it would apply to the whole subdivision. That turned out not to be the case. I did not fully understand that you must ask the county recorder.

Second, as Senator Harris noted, the declaration of removal is included in the documents during purchase as is the original racist language. Senate Bill 368 will fix these problems.

The conceptual amendment preserves the original historical document which is important but will redact the copies moving forward. With the help of student interns from American Civil Liberties Union Nevada, from Senator Krasner who recruited the first intern, and Washoe County Recorder Kalie Work, we started a project to identify racist covenants in Washoe County before the pandemic delayed the process. Interns examined over 200 historical subdivision covenants and identified 31 with racist provisions. Each identified subdivision has tens to hundreds of homes, meaning thousands of tainted properties. These provisions are not subtle. The interns had no trouble identifying them once they found the old dusty volume and the right page number. Please support S.B. 368.

ALEXANDRIA CANNITO (CAI Nevada):
We support S.B. 368.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):
I speak today with an official policy position from our Board of County Commissioners in support of S.B. 368. Senator Harris worked with our

County Recorder Kalie Work to address the procedural concerns with the implementation of this bill. This is an important issue for our community, and we urge your support.

Speaking in my personal capacity, I found this type of language on the deed of my home. When I learned the bill enacted last Session did not accomplish the desired results, I procrastinated doing something about it. If S.B. 368 passes, you have my commitment that I will go door to door in my neighborhood and encourage a rush to the courthouse to get this done.

SHAWNYNE GARREN (Recorder, Douglas County; Recorder's Association of Nevada):
We are neutral as to the intent of S.B. 368. We will carry forward the orders as they come to our office and redact those documents as directed. We appreciate Senator Harris's efforts in working with the State recorders to make sure we have the right information and mechanisms in place to ensure consistency across our offices.

SENATOR HARRIS:
It is important that I recognize Committee Counsel Karly O'Krent for her efforts in taking feedback and turning it into legislation.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I agree with your comments, Senator Harris. We have received one letter (Exhibit I) in opposition to S.B. 368. We will close the hearing on S.B. 368 and open the hearing on S.B. 401.

SENATE BILL 401: Revises provisions relating to punitive damages. (BDR 3-686)

SENATOR EDGAR FLORES (Senatorial District No. 2):
Senate Bill 401 addresses a loophole in NRS 42.010. Exemplary and punitive damages are focused on doing two things. We want to punish a certain bad actor and/or we want to deter certain conduct. Exemplary and punitive damages are only triggered in certain instances as described in NRS 42.005. However, NRS 42.010 addresses necessary elements in triggering these damages. Under the statute, if an individual causes harm while under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance and is knowingly operating a vehicle, the term "knowingly" allows for loopholes. An impaired individual who

drives a vehicle and causes harm could argue having no intention to drive when he or she started drinking.

I researched the legislative history and found that S.B. No. 83 of the 61st Session, a large comprehensive bill but with little conversation about NRS 42.010. I make that reference because it was difficult for me to understand the source of the knowingly get-into-a-vehicle language. I wanted to provide some history and then draw a contrast. The last time we engaged meaningfully in that statute was in 1981. Now we are reopening the conversation and asking how do we correct a loophole?

An individual who is drinking or under the influence of a controlled substance and operates a vehicle should automatically trigger the conversation about exemplary and punitive damages. I do not have anecdotal data of how often this defense has been used, but it is problematic.

JAMIE COGBURN (Nevada Justice Association):
From 2017 to 2021, there were 486 DUI-related deaths. Families want to be able to hold intoxicated individuals not only criminally responsible but, ultimately, civilly responsible as well. As Senator Flores has indicated, a loophole in statute allows immunity from punitive damages to those convicted of a DUI and causing death or severe bodily injury. As background, a court approves punitive damages, a jury awards punitive damages, and the court affirms the award based on statute. Striking the language in section 1, subsection 1 stating "knowing that the defendant would thereafter operate the motor vehicle" would clarify the statute's intent.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Are punitive damages always awarded, or is it something this would allow to be awarded? How does that work?

MR. COGBURN:
They are rarely awarded and rarely filed. Punitive damages are used as punishment, and the threshold for proof is high.

SENATOR STONE:
I want to understand the legalities of what you are trying to accomplish here. We have murder, and we have premeditated murder. In the case of a DUI with

an injury or death, you want to allow for damages without regard to a defendant's premeditated intentions. Am I correct?

SENATOR FLORES:
That is correct. While in most cases a jury may be trusted to recognize the flaw in the statute language, S.B. 401 would provide clarification and close the loophole.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I want to clarify, NRS 42.010 is not the criminal statute around DUI death or substantial bodily harm. This is a civil statute that utilizes the same elements of that crime. It is like a sister statute. It goes along with the criminal statute. Changing NRS 42.010 does not change the criminal law. Is that correct?

SENATOR FLORES:
That is correct. Criminal laws are covered under NRS 484C.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
Having nothing further to come before the Committee, we are adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

____
Jan Brase,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

____
Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

DATE:______________________________

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 335	C	2	Mendy Elliott / Nevada Rural Housing Authority	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 335	D	3	Jonathan Norman / Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers	Summary Eviction Flowchart
S.B. 335	E	3	Jonathan Norman / Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers	Summary Eviction Flowchart with A.B. 340
S.B. 335	F	4	Jonathan Norman / Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers	Presentation
S.B. 335	G	22	Barbara Paulsen / Nevadans for the Common Good	Written Testimony
S.B. 368	H	25	Senator Dallas Harris	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 368	I	28	Steve Dover / Nevada Land Title Association	Opposition Letter