MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-second Session
April 7, 2023

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 1:04 p.m. on Friday, April 7, 2023, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, and 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 LEGISLATOR PRESENT:

Senator Dina Neal, Senatorial District No. 4

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Counsel
Sally Ramm, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kirk Widmar, Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of Corrections
Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy
Nick Shepack, Fines and Fees Justice Center; Board Chair, Return Strong
Erica Roth, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Ashley Gaddis, Return Strong
Pamela Browning, Return Strong
Tonja Brown, Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent
John T. Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association
John Carlo
Mercedes Maharis
Frank Ideano
Caleb Green
Jason Walker, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Mike Cathcart, City of Henderson
Christopher Ries, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Greg Herrera, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Annemarie Grant
Christina Ivanoff
Kasey Rogers
Josh Hicks, Nevada Homebuilders Association; Southern Nevada Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada
Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada
Susan Proffitt, Vice President, Nevada Republican Club

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 413.

SENATE BILL 413: Revises provisions relating to credits to reduce the sentence of an offender. (BDR 16-313)

SENATOR DALLAS HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 11):
The 2021-2022 Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary heard testimony about how sentencing credits are earned. I did a lot of research with my colleague Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill. What became clear is nobody understands how sentence credits work.

Family members have no idea when people are incarcerated or, if so, when they will be released. People who are incarcerated are confused about why they earned credits and whether that moves their release date up or back. Inmates submit appeals because they think their credits are calculated wrong, but courts usually calculate credits correctly.

I have four college degrees but when I saw the worksheet on how sentencing credits are calculated, I did not understand it then or now after months of studying it. Victoria Gonzalez will explain the credit history sheet (Exhibit C) and how the credit history system works. The system needs substantial reform. Ms. Gonzalez did a lot of diligent science- and data-based analysis on the best way to make the system more transparent for everyone: victims, people who are incarcerated, the families on both sides and the Nevada Department of Corrections (DOC).

KIRK WIDMAR (Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of Corrections):

The Offender Management Division oversees sentence management and sentencing calculation for DOC.

VICTORIA GONZALEZ (Executive Director, Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy):

The Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy will continue to work with Senator Harris toward developing data-driven recommendations for our criminal justice system. The credit calculation sheet, Exhibit C, is provided to any incarcerated person upon request.

People are sentenced to a minimum and a maximum period that determine eligibility for parole. Everyone has credits calculated against the maximum sentence; that determines when inmates are done serving their full sentences.

Calculating credits with the minimum sentence is more complicated because certain individuals—categorized as felons usually with drug or property offenses—can earn credits off their minimum. The already complicated credit scheme gets even more convoluted when we try to figure out when these individuals are eligible for parole.

The sentencing credit sheet, Exhibit C, lists projected credits in blue. You have my presentation (Exhibit D) on sentencing policy. Page 2 lists questions asked to determine the credit scheme: how many credits were not earned? What does that credit mean? Since the release date keeps moving forward, when is the offender eligible for parole after a judge hands down the sentence? What does the sentence actually look like? When is a person eligible for parole and likely to be released to supervision?

Let us say an individual is looking toward parole eligibility, page 3 of Exhibit D. When are his or her credits subtracted from the minimum sentence? Month 1, he or she shows up and there is a parole projection. Good-time and work credits are projected to determine a parole eligibility date as a starting point after someone serves his or her first month. Then the actual good-time credits he or she earned are applied, in addition to projected good-time credit. Whether the person worked is deducted from the credit sheet.

How does someone lose credits? The additional earned projected credits are added to determine the parole eligibility date. From month to month, it can change, while the parallel liability date can move farther out. There are opportunities to earn additional credits through education. In Month 5, if the person earned his or her GED, he or she would get additional credits.

How does that factor into parole projections? The eligibility date would move back a little bit. But if the person could not work and there was a disciplinary issue, that pushes the parole date back. The date is moving because of these factors, plus there are other credits that could be earned. This is—believe it or not—a simplified version of what the credit scheme looks like. The chart, page 3 of Exhibit D, is not to scale on dates so do not try to identify specific earned updates.

This is a problem that impacts everyone: district attorneys, victims, judges, the incarcerated person. We began researching the problem and discovered Nevada has one of the most complicated credit schemes in our part of the Country. Some states use a percentage to determine parole eligibility. The percentage is considered part of when sentences are handed down. It is directed to everyone that at a certain percentage, as long as you have exhibited good behavior, we anticipate you can be released to parole.

We pondered what our credit scheme would look like if we converted everything to percentages, page 4 of Exhibit D. We divided the time served before being released to parole by the minimum sentence to get to the percentage. We analyzed releases from 2017 to 2022, focusing only on new commitments. The data set does not include anybody who came back from parole and then went back out on parole or who had to serve revocation time. This data set only includes one offense in the booking. Individuals with multiple sentences being served concurrently or consecutively are not included.

The fictitious sentence start date includes the retroactive date—jail credits that might have been applied while people are waiting for the outcome of his or her sentence—in the determination. We did a study across all offense groups and felony categories, pages 5 and 6 of Exhibit D. I will only discuss Categories C, D and E felonies in the drug and property offenses because those offenders get credit off their minimums, which is the most complicated part of this. However, we have data for all offense groups and all felony categories.

To analyze the data, we worked with the most typical average we could think of. We added up the possible percentages that someone had in each felony category, page 6 of Exhibit D, and then divided it by the number of instances in that dataset. On page 5 of Exhibit D, the drug and property offense Category C is 71 percent, the Category D is 72 percent, and Category E is 75 percent. How do you decide where to start?

We took all occurrences and then added up every average and then divided that by the total to come up with the 75 percent starting point.

What I want to educate the Committee about as we engage in data-driven policies and data analysis, we use the phrase "slice and dice." When you have a data set, there are many things you can do to slice and dice. Are we looking at averages? Are we looking at occurrences? Are we looking at what is most common? What has been lacking with previous data presentations is you only get one slice and one dice; you do not get the full picture.

To make a truly data-driven decision, you must see all versions of slicing and dicing that could be done. On page 8 of Exhibit D, we combined all Categories C, D and E with drug and property offenses to look at what percentage they served. The numbers on the chart on page 8 on top of each bar are the number of individuals who served that percentage. Across the chart's bottom is the percentage showing what offenders served. We did not include every occurrence. There are a few below and a few above this dataset.

After we break it down, who makes up that 75 percent after we have combined everybody? There is no single percentage everybody is getting because of our complicated credit scheme. You can see what that percentage looks like when looking at the average. We need to ask a lot of questions about what that average actually looks like. What does it mean when we find this is the most

common data point? When you make data-driven decisions, you need to consider all the slicing and dicing that has been done to get the data before you.

The chart on page 6 of Exhibit D represents 1,712 offenders in the Category C, D and E felonies in the drug and property offenses. On page 7, those individuals served 47 percent to 105 percent of their minimum sentence upon release to parole. Of those people, 54 percent served 65 percent or less of the minimum sentence before being released to parole. That is 920 of the 1,712, with 1,841 in the initial dataset. Once we slice the numbers differently, this is what it looks like.

If we now slice in the middle—the most common demographic—it is just below 65 percent. A proposed amendment (Exhibit E) to S.B. 413 would adjust the percentage from awarding 25 percent credit to 35 percent. This is what results look like when data-driven. Which average and part of the occurrences do you use? We do not have one common occurrence here. In order to fix the credit system, we have to start somewhere: the data in Exhibit D.

With the charts on pages 6, 8 and 10, the percentages allotted to the incarcerated persons are clear. We have transparency and know what we can expect in a sentence based on the projected percentage. In the amendment, Exhibit E, that would become 35 percent. We have a privilege ability of any length when individuals are doing everything they are supposed to do with their case plan. If they have been on good behavior, that eligibility has not changed. The only thing under the scheme proposed in the amendment, Exhibit E, that would change the eligibility date is a disciplinary issue, page 9 of Exhibit D. The DOC has a regulatory scheme for dealing with such issues.

Good-time credit for doing what you are supposed to do while incarcerated is set: it is not going to change under the proposed amendment, Exhibit E. It wipes out all existing credits in favor of the percentage. The only thing that could change the credit are disciplinary issues. We are not trying to compete with a projection like we were in that original scheme in which we tried to figure out how the number of dates affects the projected parole date. The DOC is clear on how the number of days based on the type of violation impact inmates.

The consequence is you can clearly see the carrot and the stick when it comes to how we motivate people and determine success for incarceration. I also have data for those serving their maximum sentence. If we slice and dice it in the

same way, the majority is 65 percent or lower. The data include those who have been released to parole and then came back, because they also earn credits while they are on parole. The percentage in the proposed amendment, Exhibit E, would be consistent with what inmates would earn in DOC but they can always earn more while on parole.

The intent of S.B. 413 is to codify what is already happening. The Department of Sentencing Policy and what I do is nonpartisan; we do not have a policy agenda. We want to assure the Committee data-driven recommendations and data-driven policy are at work in our criminal justice system. Our intent is to keep the status quo so we can promote transparency so everybody with sentences will know exactly what to expect.

The existing credit scheme is untenable. We are at a breaking point, or that point is coming soon. If more credits are added or if credits are adjusted, it would be unclear to anybody what was happening. We are moving toward a truly data-driven criminal justice system. You have an opportunity to make this change so you and future Legislators will be in the right place to make data-driven adjustments that are clear and transparent to everyone.

SENATOR HARRIS:
I wanted to clarify the change from 75 percent to 65 percent in the proposed amendment, Exhibit E. After significant discussions with Ms. Gonzalez, we started to think instead of the mean percentage, we should use the median. Somebody has to lose, and some people get to win. It makes more sense as a policy to use 65 percent.

People we see on the tail end of the data set are serving 100 percent of their sentences, largely due to disciplinary issues. They will continue to serve a decent amount of their minimum percentage, depending upon the Division of Parole and Probation and DOC assessments of their behavior. There is nothing in S.B. 413 to allow people who are perpetually being disciplined to be guaranteed an earlier release than they would otherwise have.

We do not want to punish people who are incarcerated who will serve longer under good behavior. The 65 percent number makes more sense for where we have stuck this nail. If we switch to the new scheme, it will be easier any time this Body would like to consider harsher punishments. Let us increase the amount of time inmates have to serve, knowing the soonest they will be

released is whenever we consider the right amount of years or punishment to associate with any of the many new crimes we may create in a Session.

The bill brings transparency. If you are sentenced but have that light at the end of the tunnel, you are probably more likely to exhibit good behavior. You know if you just hang in there and do what you are supposed to do, you have a tangible release date. The victims know they have a date they must show up for the parole hearing if it arises and there are no additional disciplinary issues. This is something we need to move on.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I have worked in this area for 21 years, and it is a disaster for people. When you go to the DOC website, there are constantly changing release dates. It is impossible to understand. I have had people with credit calculations of 210.23 days. What is the point of the 0.23 day? Where did DOC get that kind of credit determination?

I agree with Ms. Gonzalez that we are at a breaking point and have been there for a while. I appreciate seeing the full data set because often people come in here and present a slice of data that promotes and supports a particular stance on a particular issue.

We can look at whether using the mean or median is appropriate for data points. Ms. Gonzalez talked about how, under the new structure, you would see your release date right away. Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 209.4465 and section 3 of S.B. 413 are some of the additional credits you may earn outside of good-time credit, working or gaining 60 days for obtaining your GED or 90 days for high school diploma. It is obviously important we reward positive behavior. How would that be calculated under the bill? Would you just be able to subtract those days? Would they be readily apparent under the new scheme?

SENATOR HARRIS:
The reason that will remain in statute is people who are currently incarcerated would be able to choose which scheme will best benefit them. If you were sentenced under the existing scheme, we are not going to change the scheme so you would serve longer than otherwise. After everyone now incarcerated leaves, those things would go away under the new scheme. The DOC would have the discipline tool to make your time longer, but we would not have a

system in which getting a GED would take time off the minimum sentence. You would have to serve at least 65 percent to be eligible for parole.

However, while all the things Senator Nguyen mentioned will be taken into account at parole hearings, we cannot go below the minimum sentence. I am looking at mechanisms for if you have been disciplined, yet want to earn some way to get back down to your minimum, I am open to making that happen. But the minimum will be the minimum; you will not be able to drop below that.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I love the idea of increased transparency. I agree the bill is not just for people who are incarcerated and their families. This Committee has heard multiple times we have a hard time getting housing for people granted parole. Sometimes that has to do with inadequate support systems on the outside: nonprofits, reentry programs or family members. Families have ever-changing dates of when their loved ones might be eligible for parole. Sometimes that can vary between one month to eight months or even a year.

I would like to see some sort of benefit because we need a way to encourage people to better themselves. Someone who gets his or her GED or high school diploma could find a way to get an associate's degree after release. A person who is not causing discipline problems but is not doing any of the added credit steps does not incentivize others to pursue programming to gain credits.

MS. GONZALEZ:
The data I presented represents any credits that anybody earned. We did not distinguish between the type of credit someone earned and how that impacted his or her percentage. In an attempt to level the playing field for everybody, the data include all possible credits available to anyone, plus what inmates earn and programs taken advantage of.

The data reflects why all separate credits would be abolished under the proposed scheme and just the percentage would be factored in. The second piece of S.B. 413 says offenders are required to comply with their case plans based on their risk and needs assessment. When someone is admitted to DOC, a risk and needs assessment is conducted, with specific evaluations. What should this person be working on while in DOC care? Does he or she need to pursue more education? Does he or she need the credits program? Should he or she participate in what is laid out in the evidence-based case plan?

To your point, Senator Nguyen, credits should not be for those following their case plans versus others who must work on things specifically tailored for them. Under the bill, all would be working on the same percentage point credits. The amendment, Exhibit E, would require DOC to provide an evaluation of the programs and requirements in case plans. Which plan makes the most sense to make you successful while incarcerated? What was available to you and what were you actually able to participate in? The person is not penalized further if he or she was supposed to pursue a program that was never available in the first place.

SENATOR HARRIS:
Mr. Widmar will explain about the carrots inmates have available for the type of above-and-beyond behavior that may be outside of their case plans.

MR. WIDMAR:
Under DOC policies, we can use the disciplinary process for major violations of penal policies. We can remove 60 credits for things like assault, murder or arson. Under the new scheme, that will add 60 days toward the mean percentage, taken away from the 65 percent out of 100 percent of the mean.

If the offender continually engages in disciplinary problems, we modify the case plan and say, “Hey, we’re going to need you to take anger-management classes and a few of these things to help address behavior you continually demonstrate that we need to modify.”

We have the ability to restore time taken away. The benefit under the new scheme for dealing with this is inmates are clear as to the whys; the reason is transparent if we need to take 60 days away from the maximum sentence.

The next level is subtracting 30 days for more minor offenses; the lowest is 15 days subtracted. Let us say an offender loses 15 days. After a period of positive behavior change, he or she can appeal to a full classification committee and request those 15 days to be restored.

SENATOR HARRIS:
Under the current scheme, you can only earn so many good-time credits. Once you earn that amount, it does not matter how you do. There will always be some threshold whereby people are unable to continue to demonstrate good

behavior and get time off. It is around 42 percent to 50 percent credits. You are never going to drop below that under the current scheme.

Senate Bill 413 seeks to do something similar, but flips it on its head by giving people the benefit of the doubt they are going to work through their case plans. If not, there will be an extension of their release dates, as opposed to, "You worked your plan this month; you did not work your plan next month. You were back to where you started; you then got your GED and are up again." The bill tries to take into account all the things people are doing and the credits they could potentially earn.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Does this just apply to nonviolent Category C, D and E felonies, or does it also include Category B felonies?

MS. GONZALEZ:
It is just for Category C, D and E felonies under the current scheme. We are proposing to retain only that change—the calculation to a percentage. No additional changes have been made to the scheme.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Most Category C, D and E felonies are nonviolent, but a couple are. So, does it include all of those felonies, despite the type of charge?

MS. GONZALEZ:
Those who qualify for credits toward their minimum are Category C, D and E felons who did not commit sex violence; others stay the same. We took what exists and changed it to percentage.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Under the current structure, if you were sentenced to a range of 12 to 48 months and then in DOC you get approximately 42 percent off of those front and back numbers, is that an average?

MS. GONZALEZ:
The opportunity to go down 40 percent is there; data show that is within the average range. A drop of 25 percent to 35 percent is what you are looking at in this bill. That is a common amount for people serving time for those offenses

under statute. We have data for all other offenses so could tell you how far past their minimum inmates were when released to parole.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
I have been practicing in juvenile court for a while. When I represented adult clients, people in DOC did not have certainty as to what release dates they were working toward. It became a lot harder psychologically to participate in credit programs or finish educational degrees. Senate Bill 413 has the potential to help people be more successful while they are away from their families and incarcerated, plus accelerate their releases and succeed once they return to the community.

SENATOR HARRIS:
I have never been incarcerated, but I can imagine how discouraging it must be when you are trying your best to work your through a program and your date keeps moving in all directions. It probably leads to thinking, "What am I even doing this for?"

SENATOR KRASNER:
As hard as it is for Senator Harris to understand the sentencing scheme, it is even harder for me. The first thing we must always keep in mind are the victims of crime and their families. In the United States, we have due process. If law enforcement has done its job and the district attorney prosecuted effectively, the person has received a fair trial and now is incarcerated. You said the new scheme would apply to Category C, D and E felonies. Would it apply to crimes of violence and sex offenses?

MS. GONZALEZ:
I do not know about the crime of lewdness with a child.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I do not understand the 65 percent to 75 percent/25 percent to 35 percent credit system. Senator Harris, you said it would be changed to 65 percent to 75 percent in the amendment, Exhibit E, but it says 25 percent to 35 percent. Could you please explain that?

SENATOR HARRIS:
You must serve 75 percent of your time; the bill would implement the 25 percent number. If we wanted to say you must serve 65 percent of your

time, the amendment would implement a 35 percent number. As originally drafted, the bill had 25 percent; now we are proposing to make it 35 percent.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I am confused like everybody. Ms. Gonzalez, in your presentation, the mathematical calculations in the charts and bar graphs were based exclusively on drug and property offenses. Is that correct?

MS. GONZALEZ:
Yes. The data presented were the averages, plus the number of occurrences of Category C, D and E felonies for drug and property crimes. I showed the percentage of minimum sentences offenders served before release to parole. We have data for all the offenses, but it did not apply since we were talking about the minimum.

SENATOR HANSEN:
In Senate Bill 413, Category A and B felonies are for sex offenses and so forth. I want to make sure we are only dealing with property and drug offenses. My biggest concern is turning people back out on the streets. There is a reason they were given certain sentences. However, we definitely do not want to keep people one day longer than they need to be incarcerated. I also do not want to release people who could harm the people I am here to represent. They expect me to be diligent in keeping the bad guys where they belong.

SENATOR HARRIS:
We all agree with you. The bill is about when the soonest you are eligible for parole—but with no guarantee of when you get out. The parole board system will remain whereby victims can make their thoughts heard. Nothing in the bill requires the Parole and Pardons Board to release you right at your term, nothing that prohibits DOC from adding time to your parole eligibility date.

The bill will benefit victims because they will know when they need to show up at parole hearings. If someone is eligible for parole right at his or her original minimum, victims will know to be there. They will know that date from the moment the person goes into DOC. Judges will be better equipped to immediately know how long a person is actually going to serve. Now, it is anybody's guess according to the sentence guidelines. You may serve anywhere from 42 percent to 108 percent of your original sentence.

SENATOR HANSEN:
Listening to Senator Nguyen's questions, it is obvious I have no knowledge whatsoever of how the sentencing process works. It sounds like a convoluted mess. Senator Harris, is your goal simply to streamline the process and make it much more transparent for everybody involved? Does this have anything to do with Marsy's Law?

MR. WIDMAR:
It is important for the Committee and primary stakeholders to understand the goal of the bill, as it relates to credits, is the transparency that has developed based on Nevada data. They do not reflect a national trend. What was important to DOC when working closely with Director Gonzalez was we need to be careful the data we present reflects what is actually going on under our current sentencing scheme.

Given the DOC staffing shortage and some other issues, including areas in the Committee's jurisdiction, we cannot afford to do something extreme. One way or the other, the law must reflect what is going on in DOC. The bill reflects the data policy-wise. If I am allowed to give a little advice to the Committee, do not stray from what the data tells you because our budget, population number and staffing are associated directly to it.

Over the last 40 to 50 years, DOC has used credits and the complicated system. Whatever side of the policy you are on, we are at the point we need to make a turn. We must give DOC a chance to be transparent about what we do so once the judge signs that judgment of conviction and applies jail credits, the rest is easy. The moment the offender leaves the courtroom, he or she understands exactly when the parole eligibility date is. The victim, district attorney and defense will understand that; it will be as clear as day. The only thing that can affect parole eligibility is discipline lapses.

Under the bill, all types of projected credits are gone; they are built into the percentage. There is a direct movement of days towards parole. Once that is established, we publish it on the DOC website. Victims, district attorneys, judges and—most important—the offender serving the time can have a clear picture. From the DOC's point of view, however Committee members vote on this bill, please stick to the neutral data.

SENATOR HARRIS:
That is impressive.

MR. WIDMAR:
As to Senator Hansen's question, DOC has never had to notify a victim pursuant to Marsy's Law, so I am not familiar with how easy or difficult that is. I have heard it is not fun to have that responsibility. Senate Bill 413 will make it easier for whoever ends having to do that job. Victims can be sent a link to the DOC website with offenders' up-to-date information. The spokesman for the Nevada District Attorneys Association will be better equipped to answer that question.

SENATOR STONE:
As a nonattorney, what we have today is an archaic maze of uncertainty for everyone, especially for Mr. Widmar. I do not know what kind of a sentence calculator he has, but it must be a complicated one. This is the way I see it, much more simplistically.

Ms. Gonzalez, you made it clear the current baseline is 42 percent and under the bill it is going to 65 percent. Is that right? Based on your presentation, this gives an inmate the incentive to behave better and be able to see the forest for the trees to get to his or her parole hearing after which maybe they can become a productive member of society.

SENATOR HARRIS:
I want to note 42 percent is not what most people are getting; it is the best someone could get.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I do not know if it has been properly conveyed how complicated our current sentencing model and system are. There have been a lot of complaints to the Office of the Attorney General and unnecessary litigation around good-time calculations because no one understands them. Do you anticipate S.B. 413 would eliminate this? How much of your job is dedicated to explaining the convoluted system to families and the courts? I have had cases in which I have had to come in multiple times for the judge to explain what the sentence was because it did not fall into our weird model of calculation.

MR. WIDMAR:
During the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary, I testified in the hot seat trying to explain this. Senator Harris, Senator Scheible and other members of the Committee ran me through the wringer trying to explain the system.

The important thing to understand is during the Interim Committee hearings, I tried to educate judges, Department of Health and Social Services staff and public defenders about what we are doing. The DOC tends to be successful in litigation because if we have the opportunity to sit down and explain it, there is an understanding of what takes place.

I was recently subpoenaed to appear in federal court and testify about a DOC emergency motion. From the beginning, the federal magistrate recognized the court did not have the authority to make a ruling on a State issue related to parole. However, the magistrate tried to understand Nevada law to determine if harm had been done, even though she fully recognized she did not have the authority under her jurisdiction. I spent the next four-and-a-half hours in the hot seat explaining to the magistrate how DOC calculates sentences to ensure we did not harm the offender, which would be under her jurisdiction.

My hardworking staff does a great job of trying to explain the sentencing maze to people. It is important to understand those manhours are uncountable. They involve hundreds of phone calls a month, plus staff in the field trying to answer questions. Litigation abounds out of ignorance, out of not understanding what we are doing when put on the hot seat. Sure, we can explain it all, but that is not fair to what we do as a State or what we represent as a Department.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Senate Bill 413 could bring a lot of clarity and transparency to a convoluted system. We do not want DOC to waste resources or force the Attorney General to take it to court. We do not want you being subpoenaed in a federal district court to explain our system. However, the fact it took you more than four hours to explain the sentencing process should tell us everything we need to know about it.

SENATOR STONE:
You hear of cases in which convicts say, “Hey, this is bias. You’re discriminating against me and giving me more time because of the color of my skin.” Could they claim the sentencing decisions DOC makes are arbitrary and

capricious? Instituting the system in S.B. 413 would be much more transparent and explainable. The DOC could better defend itself against the type of accusation I mentioned.

SENATOR HARRIS:
We are trying to do something here that makes sense. Is there a perfect number? I do not know; we can always argue that one way or the other. As to Senator Hansen's point, the chart of page 8 of Exhibit D shows 54 percent of inmates are on the left side of the average line we picked, with 46 percent on the right. We tried to find something in the middle to represent what is happening. As to Senator Nguyen's point, it is not my intention to put anybody out of a job, just to make that job a bit easier.

NICK SHEPACK (Fines and Fees Justice Center; Board Chair, Return Strong):
At the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary hearing on sentencing, we shared a sense of mass confusion. The looks on everybody's faces in that hearing told us all we needed to know.

One of the top complaints we hear from Return Strong members is they are confused about when they are being released. Their families do not know either; they think it is going to be now, but it is later. The bill could provide a data-driven solution.

The sentencing system favors you if you are a high-IQ, native English speaker. Such inmates have more opportunities for a variety of jobs and education. Somebody who speaks another language while incarcerated does not always have the same opportunities to earn release credits even though he or she may be a model inmate. By treating people who are not causing problems the same, we move toward a more equitable system everybody can understand, from victims to the incarcerated to their families. This bill is long overdue.

ERICA ROTH (Washoe County Public Defender's Office):
When you started throwing around numbers today, I thought of the joke lawyers cannot do numbers or math whenever a client asks them. When a client asks me what his or her good-credit score is, I say, “Well, that is prison math and we definitely can't do that. It is very confusing.”

The 65 percent figure in the S.B. 413 amendment, Exhibit E, is a fair compromise. It is not exactly what I would have asked for; however, when you

look at the data, it is a reasonable place to meet in the middle. This issue is incredibly confusing. People simply do not know when they are getting out. The bill will provide clarity to my clients and victims of crime.

ASHLEY GADDIS (Return Strong):
I have been incarcerated at the Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center. I have been in and out of DOC facilities since 2000. I have fought many battles with DOC regarding time computation and release dates that resulted in neither resolutions nor explanations. That makes sense as the current statute is so confusing.

The fortunate side is I have become familiar with NRS 209.4465, added to NRS 209 in 1977. When entering the DOC, we were given precalculated probable release dates based on good time and work time. That means you must continue in the work program and stay free of disciplinary issues to keep those release dates since those days had given us credit. They can and are taken back if the requirements are not met.

The requirements have become unrealistic and even obsolete in some institutions due to the lack of jobs available to the prison population, lack of programming and constant random lockdowns. While all the above may vary based on the institution, what does not vary is the end result: loss of good-time and work-time credits initially calculated, which affects the projected release date.

Not having a solid release date upon entering prison is a defeating and hopeless feeling. After that, disappointment comes from telling your family you will not be home for events like Christmas based on the projected release date. It is also dispiriting to know you have done nothing wrong to lose those days. You lost them through no fault of your own because of missing class or work due to lockdowns or for whatever reason except your own misconduct.

Senate Bill 413 will calculate good time and work time using a percent that pretty much guarantees a release date unless there are disciplinary issues. The world and other state prisons continue to evolve. There is no reason why Nevada cannot evolve into a system that works better and makes sense.

PAMELA BROWNING (Return Strong):
One of the reasons I became involved in Return Strong is not only the sentencing structure, but other crazy things going on within DOC institutions. I was incarcerated in a different state. When I was sentenced, I knew when I was coming home. My loved one in DOC never knows when he is coming home.

I know what it is like when you are trying to do right but cannot see light at the end of the tunnel. Senate Bill 413 will give people something to look forward to and work toward. It could help cut down on a lot of disciplinary issues.

TONJA BROWN (Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent):
Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent supports S.B. 413. This is a typical application for new nonviolent offenders, and what we call the Department of Corruption should be the first to apply. I want to echo the comments made by previous people who have made good suggestions about how to improve the sentencing structure.

The DOC should be the mechanism to correct disciplinary actions. Some of you are unaware of this, but I am privy to it. There are disciplinary actions in inmates' files submitted to the Parole or Pardons Boards. The Board has no way of knowing whether those disciplinary actions were ever totally grieved. They were upheld on appeal but had not been litigated in favor of the inmates. The inmate should have this information, but it is not referenced in the DOC file. The Board sees disciplinary actions that should have been removed.

If the DOC had the mechanism to remove the disciplinary charges that would free up and return all those credits back to the inmate, who would more than likely be given a favorable parole recommendation. Over the years, there have been a lot of discussions about the credits and how the sentencing structure changed after *Nevada Department of Prisons v. Bowen*, 103 Nev. 477, 745 P.2d 697 (1987). It is complicated, but S.B. 413 tones it down and gives us a better understanding.

JOHN T. JONES, JR. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):
The Nevada District Attorneys Association opposes S.B. 413. Truth in sentencing to DOC is when a judge sentences someone to 12 months at a minimum and he or she serves 12 months. It is not when a victim is told a

defendant is going to serve 12 months and he or she serves 12 months. The Association understands this is not the sentencing structure we have.

I will say something I do not say often here in Senate Judiciary: I completely agree with Senator Harris. Our sentencing structure is an absolute mess. Defense attorneys, defendants, victims, prosecutors, judges—nobody understands it or likes it. However, we must be careful about what we replace it with. We have a "better the devil you know than the devil you do not" sort of argument here.

I was close to testifying in support when I read the bill as drafted with the 75 percent number. I was a little dismayed when I saw the amendment, Exhibit E, had reduced it to 65 percent. Our prison population has been trending down in recent years. I can confidently say people placed in DOC are those whose offenses or criminal histories warrant them being there.

With that in mind, I do not necessarily think picking the lower of the median or mean is the best approach to—quote—codifying our sentencing system. It is a little more complicated than that. We are committed to working on making truth in sentencing happen in Nevada.

SENATOR HANSEN:
Can you address the Marsy's Law question? I do not know if the bill will affect the Law in any way.

MR. JONES:
It is my understanding this will not affect a victim's right to participate in a parole hearing since it is his or her constitutional right. Generally, how we do that now is through the Victim Information and Notification Everyday system, in which victims can request electronic notification when a parole hearing is coming up. Nothing in S.B. 413 would affect that.

Our sentencing system is confusing to victims who, much like defendants, have no idea when a person is going to be eligible for parole. District attorneys want a truth-in-sentencing model. If a judge sentences you to 12 months then you must serve 12 months. It is easy for everybody to know how much a defendant is going to serve: that 12-month period.

SENATOR HANSEN:
That is something many people like. Maybe our sentences are too long and that is why there is a lack of reasonableness in the process. Maybe we can clean that up. I cannot tell you how many times I have heard people say, "Well, the sentence is for two years. They should serve two years, damn it!" You mentioned the population of our prisons is trending down. Is that true for the entire State, not just Clark County? What is the crime rate doing, though?

MR. JONES:
I do not have those exact crime statistics in front of me, Senator. From my understanding, crimes are trending up.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I remember the whole "three-strikes-and-you're-out" sentencing fight from the mid-1990s. As the prison population went up, we saw a significant decline in crime rates. We want to have a happy medium. Back to my question on the crime rate, how many of those are drug- and property-related versus more serious violent offenses?

MR. JONES:
I do not have those statistics in front of me so do not want to speculate.

JOHN CARLO:
It is within the jurisdiction of this Committee to impose harsher punishments on criminals and bring down the crime rate in Clark County. The cost of living is associated with crime. Can you add that to S.B. 413?

We have not allowed corporal punishment in our schools for a long time. I was raised in the South and got spanked; there are still states doing that. Here, teachers are getting attacked, which is not going on across America. You are arguing about the money. Jesus said capital punishment is a biblical stance.

MERCEDES MAHARIS:
You have my statement (Exhibit F) of opposition to S.B. 413 because these days nobody is going to get credits who has Category A, B, C or D felonies, crimes of violence and sexual and DUIs offenses. You have a diagram of one such inmate's sentencing (Exhibit G). These individuals have not been treated for mental and physical illnesses, which brought them to prison and

caused them to commit their crimes. This is overt discrimination and wrong, so I cannot support the bill.

In fact, I do not know why sexual and DUI offenders would be included in the bill's sentencing category. Reports on recidivism say alcohol and sex addiction inmates are the least likely to reoffend. This is discrimination against unfortunates who have not had education or treatment. It is wrong, wrong, wrong. Chaos in individuals' lives concerns changing dates of release, impacting peace and prosperity for all.

FRANK IDEANO:
When someone has a minimum sentence, they should serve it. If we make longer sentences for crimes, there will be less crime. When I was in Asia, I was looking for my kids and somebody said, "Oh, don't worry, nobody is going to touch your kids." I said, "What are you talking about?" The person said, "The penalty for kidnapping them—not even do anything else to them just for kidnapping—is death."

When people are faced with severe penalties, they think more seriously about whether to commit a crime. Will there continue to be sick individuals who commit crimes? Absolutely. There are going to be a lot of people who are deterred if there are stronger sentences. The biggest problem I have with the bill is it is trying to get rid of minimum sentences given by judges.

SENATOR HARRIS:
Senate Bill 413 does not provide a guaranteed release date. When you are eligible to go before the Parole Board, it will determine whether you are released. Nothing changes about how that process works.

I did not pick the 65 percent number simply because it is lower than 75 percent. I picked it because it better reflects what is happening today. We do not want to discourage people from good behavior and craft something that results in good folks serving longer than they would have. Conversely, we do not want to let bad folks out sooner.

When you see inmates on the other side of the 65 percent line, they will stay there because they have disciplinary issues continuing to push out their release. People are serving 208 percent of their mean sentence; they earned the extra

108 percent because of poor behavior. Nothing will pull those people closer to the 65 percent.

That is not how the bill will work in practice. Sixty-five percent will be the best you can get if you exhibit best behavior, but we will not calculate these averages anymore moving forward. As someone who has sat on this Committee a long time, Senator Hansen, I promise you will never see another bill with the good-time credit in it.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 413 and open the work session.

PATRICK GUINAN (Policy Analyst):
Senate Bill 63 was a Committee bill that was brought on behalf of the Nevada Supreme Court.

SENATE BILL 63: Revises provisions relating to the Judicial Department of State Government. (BDR 1-435)

The amendment in the work session document (Exhibit H) retains statutory provisions regarding judicial disqualification and adds provisions to better manage disqualification filings and replies to such by judges. It clarifies the provision of resources for the Supreme Court is the duty of the State. It revises provisions in section 27 to clarify the obligations of a county to provide resources to a district court. Part-time judges may practice law in a firm or with a partner as long as certain conditions are met. The amendment adds a new section to include full-faith and credit provisions regarding orders for protection against high-risk behavior as exists for other types of protection orders.

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 63.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
I will vote to support S.B. 63 in Committee but reserve my right to change my vote on the Floor. I have questions about the disqualification part.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 103 from the work session document (Exhibit I) revises the membership of the Nevada Sentencing Commission to include the chief of staff to the governor or designee, a district attorney, a representative of the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal history, a member with expertise in sentencing policy and practice or a member of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

SENATE BILL 103: Revises provisions governing the Nevada Sentencing Commission within the Department of Sentencing Policy. (BDR 14-308)

The bill allows the Commission to establish working groups, task forces and other entities to assist in its work. It revises the Commission's duties to clarify it must evaluate and study practices and policies related to sentencing. It requires the Commission to conduct a study of sentences imposed for misdemeanor offenses and report its findings and recommendations to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary and the Legislative Counsel Bureau before the Eighty-third Session.

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 103.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 129, as per the work session document (Exhibit J), revises provisions relating to civil actions involving sexual assault.

SENATE BILL 129: Revises provisions relating to certain civil actions involving sexual assault. (BDR 2-573)

I will read the summary of Senate Bill 129 from the work session document, Exhibit J. It sets forth guidelines for an adult victim of sexual assault to bring a civil lawsuit. It provides such a lawsuit may be brought at any time after the assault occurred. If the plaintiff's alleged injury was a result of two or more sexual assaults, the plaintiff is not required to identify which of the assaults specifically caused the injury. The provisions of the bill apply retroactively to any act constituting sexual assault, regardless of any pertinent statute that was in effect at the time of the assault.

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 129.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
I will read the summary of Senate Bill 153 from the work session document (Exhibit K). It requires the director of DOC, with the approval of the State Board of Prison Commissioners, to adopt regulations governing each institution and facility of DOC addressing the supervision, custody, care, security, housing and medical and mental health treatment of offenders who are gender nonbinary, gender nonconforming, intersex and transgender.

SENATE BILL 153: Makes various changes relating to corrections. (BDR 16-126)

Generally accepted standards of care and best practices must be followed, including use of respectful and up-to-date terminology that accounts for and protects those offenders' rights and prohibits discrimination. The bill requires training and cultural competency for interacting with these populations be included in staff training programs.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 153.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS HANSEN AND STONE VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
I will read the summary of Senate Bill 172 from the work session document (Exhibit L). It provides that a minor may give express consent to a physician, physician assistant, registered nurse or pharmacist for the provision of health services to prevent sexually transmitted diseases, including prescribing, dispensing or administering a contraceptive drug or device without the consent or notification of the minor's parent or legal guardian.

SENATE BILL 172: Revises provisions governing the ability of a minor to consent to certain health care services. (BDR 11-654)

The bill provides a physician, physician assistant, registered nurse or pharmacist who is an employee or volunteer at a family resource center that has received grant funding is authorized to examine and treat without consent of a parent or legal guardian a minor who is suspected to have been infected with a sexually transmitted disease.

An amendment in the work session document, Exhibit L, revises language in section 1 to clarify a minor may give express consent for the services in the bill. It revises language for consistency between subsections 1 and 2. Section 1 adds a physician assistant and registered nurse to the list of those who may examine and treat a minor for sexually transmitted diseases.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 172.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR STONE:
I will vote no because I cannot support a minor getting any kind of health care without the consent of his or her parents, including immunizations.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I find any law that allows medical treatment “without the consent or notification of parents, parents or legal guardians of the minor” unacceptable. There should

be no medical practice or any medicines issued to a child when the parents are not notified. Exceptionally serious consequences can happen, irrespective of the question of sexually transmitted diseases, abortions and so forth. The bill goes way too far.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS HANSEN, KRASNER AND STONE VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
I will read the summary of Senate Bill 211 from the work session document (Exhibit M).

SENATE BILL 211: Revises provisions relating to marriage. (BDR 11-656)

The bill provides if a marriage was solemnized in this State and a spouse changes his or her name via court order, the county clerk or recorder must issue a corrected marriage certificate, including the spouse's new name, upon receipt of a copy of a court order, an application from the spouse and an affidavit of correction of the marriage certificate, plus any applicable fees. The clerk is to maintain the original marriage certificate and the corrected certificate as a public record.

The amendment in the work session document, Exhibit M, provides a county clerk or recorder can accept a court-ordered name change from any state to amend a marriage certificate and changes the term "corrected certificate" to "amended certificate." It adds an affidavit of amendment must be notarized as prepared by the county clerk and executed by the married couple. It adds "county recorder" in section 2 where necessary and adds provisions in section 2 mandating an uncertified marriage certificate shall be given to the married persons and prescribes the form to be used.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 211.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 243, as per the work session document (Exhibit N), revises provisions relating to catalytic converters.

SENATE BILL 243: Revises provisions relating to catalytic converters. (BDR 15-37)

Committee members are familiar with the bill so I will not read the summary in the work session document. There is an amendment in the work session document, Exhibit N.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 243.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HARRIS:
I will vote yes today but want to give the amendment a fresh look. I reserve my right to vote no on the Floor.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
I will read the summary of Senate Bill 266 from the work session document (Exhibit O). It relates to entry fees for participation in a contest or tournament being excluded from gross revenue for the purposes of gaming license revenue.

SENATE BILL 266: Excludes certain portions of entry fees for participation in a contest or tournament from the gross revenue of gaming licensees for certain purposes. (BDR 41-943)

There is one amendment in the work session document, Exhibit O.

SENATOR STONE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 266.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 289, as per the work session document (Exhibit P), expands the definition of a provider of health care for certain circumstances.

SENATE BILL 289: Revises provisions relating to crimes against providers of health care. (BDR 15-996)

There are two amendments in the work session document, Exhibit P.

SENATOR STONE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 289.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HARRIS:
I am not a fan of increasing penalties, although I understand why we want to ensure there is equal amount of treatment among hospital workers. I will vote yes today but reserve my right to change my vote on the Floor.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
I will read the summary of Senate Bill 316 from the work session document (Exhibit Q). It adds the name of the defendant and the associated case number to a report a district attorney must submit to the Attorney General annually concerning cases that included charges of murder or voluntary manslaughter.

SENATE BILL 316: Makes various changes relating to criminal law. (BDR 14-132)

Proposed Amendment 3551 is in the work session document, Exhibit Q.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 316.

SENATOR HARRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 368, as per the work session document (Exhibit R), relates to real property.

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

The bill deals with restrictions or prohibitions based on discriminatory factors. There is an amendment in the work session document, Exhibit R.

SENATOR KRASNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 368.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. GUINAN:
Senate Bill 382, as per the work session document (Exhibit S), removes the appointed counsel for an adverse party in an action against a juvenile.

SENATE BILL 382: Revises provisions relating to juveniles. (BDR 1-795)

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
There has been a new amendment, as per the work session document, Exhibit S, since the hearing. It includes juvenile delinquency proceedings in the criminal proceedings because those are the proceedings that juveniles go through and are the subject of the bill.

SENATOR HARRIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 382.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will close the work session and open the hearing on S.B. 362.

SENATE BILL 362: Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 15-289)

SENATOR DINA NEAL (Senatorial District No. 4):
Senate Bill 362 does three things. Over the 2021-2022 Interim, we saw interactions with police in which a person said he or she could not breathe and might have had a medical issue or incident. Section 1 of the bill would codify what may be existing police policy to ensure a peace officer must render medical aid to a person saying he or she cannot breathe.

During the Interim, there were stories in the media in which people were not able to breathe and had underlying medical conditions that created that inability. These included hidden diseases such as sickle cell anemia, lupus and other diseases. In 2006, Martin Anderson died in a detention center in a prison boot camp in Panama City, Florida, after saying that he could not breathe while being forced to run. He had a sickle cell anemia reaction that constricted his blood flow. The prison officers thought, “He ran, right? Therefore, he must be able to breathe.” This is an excuse for not knowing the underlying condition a person may be harboring because not all diseases are seen on the surface.

In the Seventy-fourth Session, a law was passed that allowed us to imprint information or a code on a driver’s license indicating the holder suffers from a

certain disease. There were six or seven diseases put in statute. I looked at ways to modernize the 2007 statute so during a police stop, if a person has a medical symbol on his or her license indicating an underlying disease, officers may need to ask some additional questions. I sought a clear way to promote safety on both sides, for the person who was stopped and the peace officers, during the stop.

Senate Bill 362 allows a person to voluntarily ask for his or her medical information to be uploaded into the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) website. During a traffic stop, an officer can pull up the code indicated by the symbol on the person's license. You have a copy of the proposed symbol (Exhibit T). It will allow a conversation about if someone voluntarily has told DMV he or she has one of the underlying diseases listed in section 6, subsection 2, paragraph (b).

If a person cannot talk, he or she is allowed to pull out the license with the symbol and medical code to show officers. The officers can say, "Oh, it looks like you are deaf or have suffered a stroke" that disabled speech.

I have had constituents who were driving and had a seizure. No one at the scene could identify if it was an epileptic episode or a seizure in general. My neighbor had a seizure and ran his car ran through a red light. The only person who knows my neighbor's underlying condition is potentially not able to vocalize or express what happened.

If my neighbor's driver's license had had a symbol, the officer could have said, "Hey, I pulled the code. It is showing he has epilepsy or some other underlying condition." Correct action would ensue because what we do not want to happen is a death we can prevent.

We know the protocol: if you know someone is having an emergency, you call emergency responders. Many of us have been trained in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other methods to render preliminary aid if we know what is going on.

We have seen an increase in mental health crises in Nevada, be it a teenagers or adults. Senate Bill 362 could help law enforcers treat such situations differently because now they have gained wisdom from the driver's license, telling them the person may have other things going on. Now officers can consider the

medical condition they are faced with and maybe have a different response and approach. That is what sections 1 and 4 of S.B. 362 are trying to get at.

In 2007, Senator Tick Segerblom proposed a six-digit medical code for drivers' licenses. I decided to do something simpler and create a symbol, Exhibit T.

CALEB GREEN:
I am an intellectual property attorney. As it relates to officers' use of copyrighted material, section 2 of S.B. 362 would prevent what many legal scholars call the "weaponization of copyright law" by peace officers.

The Committee was given publication examples of purposeful use or misuse of copyright law by police officers throughout the Country. It has been on the rise since summer 2020. This way of restricting copyrighted material is not intended to censor the sharing of lawful recordings of law enforcement playing or causing copyrighted music to be played while they are being lawfully recorded by an individual.

In Santa Ana, California, a councilman was awakened in the middle of the night. He heard Disney film music being played and saw several police cars across the street. The councilman asked the officers why they were playing Disney music. They pointed to an individual on the corner with several cameras and his cell phone out. They said, "If that person tries to post anything he is recording, they'll get a copyright infringement complaint, and we will get the footage taken down and removed."

The purpose of S.B. 362 is to prevent purposeful misuse of copyright law by peace officers. This becomes sticky because people are at the mercy of technology due to social media sites. We have all been somewhere and thought, "Oh, what is that song?" You pull out your phone and an app like Siri tells you the song title, artist, et cetera.

Social media sites use these same technologies to scrub their websites. If they detect a post with unauthorized copyrighted music in it, the post is removed. That is where censorship comes into play. The conceptual amendment (Exhibit U) to S.B. 362 would change the language somewhat in section 2 to require law enforcement agencies to adopt a written policy restricting this misconduct by police officers.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I am fascinated you brought up the copyright issue; I have never heard of anything like that. The Legislative Counsel Bureau cannot post simple things on its Nevada Electronic Information System anymore, even government agency things, because of alleged copyright violations. We used to do it all the time. Is there some new expansion of copyright law such that if I record someone else's music, I can be accused of a copyright violation?

MR. GREEN:
Are you asking if there has there been an expansion of copyright law as it pertains to someone playing musical works then being liable for copyright infringement? There has not been an expansion but a targeted use of copyrighted music by certain peace officers.

The end of 1999 and beginning of 2000 saw the dot com boom. This made copyright infringement difficult for Internet service providers because any user of sites like Twitter or Facebook can upload infringing content. Who do you go after: the user, the Internet service provider or both?

Congress developed the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. It gave safe harbor for social media sites that act swiftly to remove infringing content on their platforms. The sites will not be held contributory liable for infringing material posted by users.

Now, a loophole comes into play. I would not characterize the new restrictions as an expansion, but copyright has become an extremely complex area. Certain websites and Internet service providers are trying to avoid infringing materials from being posted on their websites by taking proactive steps. If someone posts something with copyrighted material in it without authorization, it will be automatically removed from those social media sites.

SENATOR HANSEN:
Yours sounds like a complicated and lucrative field of law. I am intrigued by the whole idea; I have never heard of such a thing before.

SENATOR KRASNER:
Is this type of copyright infringement going on in Nevada?

MR. GREEN:
I have not uncovered any instances. One thing that is important to know is just because there have not been reported instances, that does not mean it does not necessarily happen. When you are specifically focusing on social media sites, that is when we see certain shared recordings by police officers. They have internal mechanisms to stop repeat infringers.

Some websites have a kind of "three-strikes-and-you're-out" rule; others have a looser policy. For example, someone may want to post a recording but already has strikes against him or her. He or she does not want to upload the material because his or her account could be banned. Sometimes the automated removal process kicks in. Unless regular citizens have an intellectual property attorney to help them, they do not have the means or know-how to protest the removal. This has a chilling effect that is certainly relevant.

SENATOR STONE:
Will what I would probably call a Nevada caduceus, Exhibit T, be displayed on drivers' licenses? Section 6, subsection 2 of S.B. 362 lists a lot of medical conditions. Would you consider adding under anticoagulants "as a condition of hemophilia"? People have bleeding disorders that somebody would probably need to know about, especially if there is some type of a traumatic accident or the person is scraped. Am I correct in assuming there is already some type of HIPAA compliance at DMV with respect to dissemination of medical information strictly governed as to its distribution?

SENATOR NEAL:
That is why compliance is voluntary. People are not mandated to disclose a medical condition to the DMV, as per NRS 483. I assumed since compliance is voluntary, the HIPAA issue would be dealt with. The person is willingly allowing the medical information or at least the code in the DMV system with the symbol on his or her license.

SENATOR STONE:
I worry about dissemination whether or not permission is given voluntarily; it is still personal information. I would assume the DMV has got that covered.

SENATOR NEAL:
Since NRS 483.863 was enacted in 2005, I do not know whether DMV has encountered any HIPAA violation. I am modernizing the statute's methodology and adding more diseases.

SENATOR STONE:
I wanted to make sure we are protected as a State.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
I am glad you are building on Senator Segerblom's work and taking it where it needs to be.

MS. ROTH:
Bryan Stevenson wrote,

> We don't need police officers who see themselves as warriors. We need police officers who see themselves as guardians and parts of the community. You can't police a community that you're not a part of.

We can accomplish this when we provide officers with the tools and information they need to keep our communities and themselves safe. We expect a lot from officers but do not always give them those tools and information about the people they will be coming in contact with. The bill makes us all safer.

The officers here today can attest they are trained that a traffic stop is one of the most dangerous situations they will encounter. If you are told that over and over, you will approach a traffic stop with danger in mind, right? If we can give officers in those situations additional information about the people with whom they are interacting, it will make the community safer.

To that end we also need to hold officers accountable and ensure there is transparency in policing. That would preclude those videos from being uploaded. My understanding is that has not occurred in the State. Senate Bill 362 is an opportunity to say Nevada police are a role model in this respect and such downloads will not happen here moving forward.

JASON WALKER (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):
I support S.B. 362 as amended. I am proud to say the Washoe County Sheriff's Office has policies that closely mirror the bill regarding the care and custody of arrestees. It starts with our use-of-force policy then works into our handcuffing and restraints policy. When those policies are used, officers also have medical considerations, followed up with our duty-to-intercede policy: "Any deputy present and observing another deputy using force that is clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable shall intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force." We practice and preach that every day. The medical symbol portion of the bill is another tool to help bridge any gaps in communication or assist us in our duties.

MIKE CATHCART (City of Henderson):
The City of Henderson supports S.B. 362 as amended. Specifically, we support section 1. Rendering medical aid is common practice and an operating policy of the Henderson Police Department. The Department's policies on transporting arrestees, tactical incident response and use of force all have medical aid components.

CHRISTOPHER RIES (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department supports S.B. 362. Our use-of-force policy and our five-year, use-of-force report can be viewed on the Department's website.

Our policy is clear on summoning medical attention whenever an officer applies "a use of force option upon a subject that results in either observable signs or complaints of injury or difficulty breathing." We recognize the importance of continuing to monitor the topic and update medical personnel on any changes of the subject's condition.

People who have a prolonged struggle with an officer are at an increased risk of medical distress. We proactively request medical attention even if the person does not ask for it or advises us of his or her difficulty breathing. We place the subject in a recovery position once it is safe to do so.

We worked with Senator Neal and Mr. Green on a proposed conceptual amendment to S.B. 362 requiring each agency to develop a policy preventing misuse of copyright laws to prevent videos of officers being shared on the Internet.

GREG HERRERA (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):
The Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association supports S.B. 362. Having any medical indication readily available to officers provides information to move forward as quickly as possible. Knowledge of any underlying medical condition is an absolute benefit we strongly support.

Law enforcers across Nevada are armed with naloxone kits, tourniquets and AIDS-response equipment to render aid in rapid fashion.
As for the copyright violations and full disclosure, in the early 1990s, in an effort to give inmates a movies-and-popcorn night, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office and former Deputy Greg Herrera violated copyright material belonging to Blockbuster. We did not have permission, so I could have used Mr. Green's services back then. That was all in good will; the examples Mr. Green provided today are not. We are in full support of rectifying that through policy.

ANNEMARIE GRANT:
I am calling in support of S.B. 362. My brother Thomas Purdy was hog-tied and asphyxiated to death by Reno police in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. I would like to remind everybody policy is not law. Had the bill's provisions been codified into law in 2015, my brother would hopefully be alive today.

Back then, it certainly was not the policy nor practice of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office to get medical attention for someone who indicated he or she could not breathe. Thomas was one of three men asphyxiated by Washoe County deputies within a year. All of them told officers they could not breathe and none of the deputies attempted to render medical aid.

Before my brother's heart stopped from four deputies kneeling on his neck and legs while he was still hog-tied, he pleaded and begged for clemency from the deputies and for an ambulance while telling them he could not breathe. The deputies thought it was reasonable to smother my brother; not one of the multiple officers at the scene intervened. They had all the equipment to save my brother, yet they willfully chose not to.

I remember vividly walking into the ICU to see my big brother, my best friend laying lifeless in a hospital bed connected to all kinds of machines and wires and a tube down his throat, keeping his heart pumping. I became physically ill at the condition my brother was in at the hands of law enforcement. I remember the

violent retching in my stomach. I remember seeing my dad cry and—worst of all—question what he had done wrong for this to happen to his son.

In actuality, those who claim to protect us were to blame for the guilt and grief every one of my family members carry because we could not save Thomas from law enforcement. This bill will save lives if police choose to follow it.

Every summer, I go to the Washoe County Jail. If anybody would like proof that the officers are using copyrighted materials, I can provide it. I filmed a deputy walking by blaring music from his radio in his phone because he knew that was copyrighted material.

MS. BROWN:
Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent strongly supports S.B. 362, echoing the comments made by Ms. Grant. I have seen the video of how her brother struggled and pleaded for his life, calling out for his dad to help him. He says deputies are killing him and that he has a lung condition for which he had surgery.

Things such as that horrific video must be seen by the Committee to persuade you to make the changes in S.B. 362. Thomas should have been given proper medical care right then and there, not have his hog-tied body tossed into a cell and left there. Deputies then made comments about how quiet it was now he was nearly brain-dead. This needs to stop; officers need to be held accountable. The bill will help future families from going through the agony of Ms. Grant's family.

CHRISTINA IVANOFF:
I support S.B. 362 because officers support it, which tells me it is going to make their job easier. If I find something I do not like in it, I reserve the right to express it. The officers' support and the story of Thomas Purdy are enough for me.

KASEY ROGERS:
Senate Bill 362 extends the tracking stuff everybody is trying to do right now. It is a safety thing. If an officer gets into a squabble with somebody, it is not going to come down to whether the person has a medical condition—it is just going to be a squabble. The bill is another example of how personal rights and liberties are being cut away in our current political climate.

SENATOR NEAL:
Senate Bill 362 is voluntary. I put provisions in it to make sure DMV lets people know the symbol option exists if they can choose to take advantage of it. It will enhance safety on both sides and help provide officers with additional discernment during traffic stops.

MR. GREEN:
The bill is a great way to tackle a complex issue and loophole that is quite relevant. It is a wonderful opportunity for Nevada to be a leader on what policing should look like. I hope it will never be the case here that copyrighted materials represent weaponization by peace officers.

VICE CHAIR HARRIS:
We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 362 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 395.

SENATE BILL 395: Revises provisions relating to real property. (BDR 10-288)

SENATOR DINA NEAL (Senatorial District No. 4):
I will make some public policy statements before I get into what S.B. 395 seeks to accomplish. Over summer 2022, I had a series of conversations with realtors, developers and representatives of the Securities Division, Office of the Secretary of State. I seek to limit corporate investment within the State.

In order to enact legislation, Legislators must be clear on what the State is actually trying to examine and deal with. The central public purpose of the bill is to allow families to purchase homes without having to bid against investors. It will limit the number of investors' transactions within a year to free up property so individuals can purchase it.

We are in a housing crisis. The U.S. Supreme Court's understanding of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, the Equal Protection Clause, basically says state economic legislation is constitutional as long as it is rationally related to legitimate state purposes. That state purpose is our ongoing housing crisis.

The Commerce Clause refers to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. It is typically invoked when people wonder if there is an undue burden on interstate commerce relating to investors. State police powers

are not restricted by the Commerce Clause when it is tied to legitimate public policy purposes, i.e., protecting state residents from a particular activity considered harmful or enhanced to the crisis level.

In 2015, when we were at the end of the Great Recession, I was a member of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs. We had a conversation about construction, talking about using the power of the State to create more jobs. We put a 50 percent minimum on the number of jobs that had to go to Nevada residents. Our goal was to make ensure Nevadans who were out of work during the Great Recession would be allowed to find jobs.

The question arose as to whether that violated the Privileges and Immunities Clause: Article IV, Section 2 of the Constitution. No, because we were attempting to protect people for a short period of time until we could rightsize them.

The inherent policy power of the Fourteenth Amendment is broad. Rational basis is one of the lower standards that must be met to determine whether due process has been followed. States' power under the Fifth Amendment comes into play because, in a wide context, the government may execute laws and programs that adversely affect economic values without those actions constituting a taking.

That is where we get into those issues of zoning laws: how health, safety, morals or general welfare are promoted by prohibiting a particular or contemplated use of land. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld land-use regulations that destroyed or adversely affected real property interests. In many instances, restrictions that served a substantial public policy purpose have been upheld.

I tell you this to establish the framework and the foundation of why I am bringing a bill to limit aggregate purchases. The public policy purpose of the housing crisis issue gives power to the Legislature to weigh in to protect residents.

Senate Bill 395 is not about rent control. In the aforementioned conversation, we talked about hedge fund investors playing the market by siphoning up property and driving up prices. This prevents people from entering bidding wars with corporate investors. Potential buyers cannot bid on a property because

they do not have cash since they have Federal Housing Administration loans versus conventional loans so are unable to compete with investors.

Potential homeowners cannot find properties because they are priced out of the market. This is happening in Reno and Washoe County; we certainly know it is happening in Clark County. In my dad's neighborhood, a home built in 1965 is worth $368,000; its initial price was $65,000. During the Great Recession of 2008 to 2013, an onslaught of investors came into the market because of massive foreclosures after balloon payments came due. In the pre-COVID-19 environment, investors also played the market. It went on steroids when we entered COVID-19 with investors siphoning up new construction.

Senate Bill 395 talks about the Securities Division maintaining a registry of corporations and LLCs that own real property, excluding family trusts and Nevada Housing transactions. Initially, the bill was only focused on hedge fund investors. However, when the Division looked at who was playing the market, there was a potential for fraudulent activity, and it wanted to keep the net broader by establishing the registry.

Section 1, subsection 2 mandates the corporation or LLC must register with the Division before purchasing residential real property. We want to know who is playing the market so we could create an aggregate or limiting policy: economic regulation. It made sense for that to happen at the Secretary of State level because the Office does similar work. Section 1, subsection 3 lists a nominal fee required to do the registration to cover administrative costs.

A conceptual amendment (Exhibit V) to section 1, adds subsection 5, protecting against the aggregate purchases and limiting purchases to 1,000 housing units per year. How did we come up with that number? There is no caselaw that gives you a number. Several states have some restrictions on corporate housing, a foreign residency tax or some other barriers on the number of dwelling units. No state has an aggregate policy.

I asked how I could constitutionally protect the policy to make sure it is in the right framework. I began thinking about due process, Fifth Amendment takings and the Fourteenth Amendment. I looked at the policy from the viewpoint of stakeholders outside of the conversation I had with realtors, Securities Division and the Real Estate Division, Nevada Department of Business and Industry. We

considered a foreign investor tax to charge investors, but I was not interested in doing that.

Section 2 of S.B. 395 outlines what happens when investors register and purchase property and then it goes on record. In the amendment, Exhibit V, section 2, subsection 7, line 22 replaces "clerk" with "recorder." We told a county recorder,

> All right, if we bring this bill, we need to change the deeds because right now a deed does not allow you to check a box that says "institutional investor." No. 2, we need to make sure the recording that happens at the Secretary of State's Security Division matches when you go down to record.

We needed to make sure there was some kind of documentation representing the form from the Office of the Secretary of State when the deed is recorded. The majority of those transactions are not loan but cash transactions. The filings must match because there were questions from county clerks and recorders, such as what to do if the filers' names are different? Legally, we had to make sure the names match the documentation, such as when a subsidiary is involved. It is a secondary check because then the Security Division is certain which entity is going to operate under the aggregate limit.

It seemed simpler to do it that way versus having three layers of documentation. I looked at whether to involve the Clark County Department of Business Licenses as a third check to make sure corporate investors' names matched and everything aligned. Ultimately, we decided to place everything within the Security Division.

On the securities webpage of the Division is a form we felt met the qualifications of something we could amend to meet the criteria of S.B. 395 because it deals with a certain type of investor or hedge fund.

VICE CHAIR HARRIS:
Is it your intention the bill would only apply to institutional investors who own 1,000 or more units?

SENATOR NEAL:
In the aggregate, the bill would limit the purchases to 1,000 units over a 12-month period.

VICE CHAIR HARRIS:
Is the bill's provision not about to whom it would apply but about how many units an investor or corporation would be able to purchase in one year?

SENATOR NEAL:
The idea was if we are in a housing crisis with people trying to figure out how to purchase their first homes, data indicate we have a mixed market of large and small investors. That is why I excluded family trusts since you could potentially acquire a second property after creating a trust to protect it. Then there are corporate entities buying swaths of property.

You have the presentation (Exhibit W) from Shawn McCoy, who works for the Lied Center for Real Estate at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We talked to him over the summer to get an idea of who has been collecting information on home sales. Mr. McCoy examined assessors' records to figure out how many investors were in the market. There were companies that had purchased 200 or more homes under a single registered name that included groupings of ten names.

I used this data to help me figure out a reasonable economic regulation. If I say 500 homes purchased, is that a reasonable figure for the State to limit buying behavior under its policy powers? So, I went with the 1,000-homes limit. I pulled out my constitutional law book to reacquaint myself with the wealth and the breadth of caselaw on the topic. Every state is doing something different than what I am proposing,

SENATOR HANSEN:
Senate Bill 395 addresses a legitimate problem; however, whether it provides a solution, I do not know. I have never heard of foreign investors potentially coming here and buying up huge blocks of homes. According to Mr. McCoy, that is about 10 percent of the market, which is huge.

My fear is Chinese investment. Is that where the money is coming from? In the 1980s, Japan had a huge trade surplus and its investors were literally buying up the island of Hawaii. Are we seeing a similar circumstance in Nevada now?

SENATOR NEAL:
In my original bill draft, I had language concerning the Securities and Exchange Commission because typically when you file with it, you must provide additional information: where your corporation is principally established, if you are out of the Country, what business practices you engage in. If the bill passes, the signal will be sent that you need to register with the Securities Division, so it knows who is playing the market in the State. It already knows who may be engaged in fraudulent activity.

SENATOR HANSEN:
There are a lot of economic questions to consider. For example, if you are selling your home, obviously you want to get the maximum dollar amount. As per the example you gave, Senator Neal, your dad's house was $65,000 when purchased in the 1960s and is now worth $400,000 or more. The normal market price would be $300,000 or $400,000 but let us say somebody offers you $550,000. It is tempting to say, "Well, even though they are a corporation, hey, I will take the extra $150,000."

The bill is a great idea because I have watched my kids trying to buy homes in the Reno/Sparks market but the market has inflated so much beyond normal inflation adjustments would create. The bill is a skeleton form for trying to get a grasp on what the problem potentially could be. We must develop solutions to prevent excessive levels of foreign investment causing home prices so high local people cannot afford them anymore.

SENATOR NEAL:
Some people are probably going to say S.B. 395 is a baby step because it just limits aggregate purchases. People cannot now save $15,000 cash down payment and expect to get into a home. I have met childless young people who make $78,000 and cannot find a house. They cannot make a bid because they do not have the money. The market is so out of their price range. No one wants to pay $3,000 a month for a first home. This situation is unsustainable.

Although the homebuying flurry is now just simmering, the idea was to put something in place for the next wave. I want to make sure what happened in 2019 through 2022 does not happen in the future and we have some kind of protection to prevent swaths of property from coming off the market. Families cannot compete with cash-wielding corporate hedge funds.

JOSH HICKS (Nevada Homebuilders Association; Southern Nevada Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada):
A lot of S.B. 395 targets already built homes going up for sale as opposed to newly built homes. Section 1 mandates if corporate entities purchase or own residential real property, the bill does not distinguish between property with a home on it or raw land. Maybe that should be clarified to exclude things like raw land zoned residential, which is often owned by homebuilders before something is built on it.

The amendment to section 1, subsection 1, Exhibit V, would exclude family trusts. Perhaps intercompany or affiliate transfers might be appropriate to include because homebuilders sometimes transfer things around before homes are sold to an end user. Projects are done in phases.

With respect to the 1,000-home annual limitation, the concern is the extent to which the bill applies to new-build construction, how a seller or homebuilder complies with the limit and how it is enforced to make sure they are not inadvertently violating that number.

The conceptual amendment, Exhibit V, talks about an exclusion for a sell date being the same as the construction date. If the exclusion was for new-build construction, we would support that.

MS. IVANOFF:
I am not happy about 1,000 units for people coming here to buy and compete with potential homeowners if only a small number of people can afford a house. When so many companies, even from out of the Country, want to invest in Las Vegas, 1,000 houses per company is too high. If you are an investor from out of State, you should have to pay more taxes.

GABRIEL DI CHIARA (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):
The Securities Division is one of several divisions within our Office that oversees and administers provisions of the Nevada Securities Act, NRS 90. The Division is responsible for registering and licensing all investment products sold in Nevada and the people who sell or recommend them. We also enforce the antifraud provisions in NRS 90. The Division has criminal and civil law enforcement divisions.

The Office of the Secretary of State is neutral on S.B. 395 but stands ready to assist with its implementation. Our Office is devoted to investing in technology to provide overall better access to data for the State and its residents.

WIZ ROUZARD (Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada):
Americans for Prosperity-Nevada is neutral on S.B. 395. Our overall long-term concern is like boiling a frog: you must slowly cook it. When talking about legislation, how do you disrupt the market? Sometimes that slow cooking ends up hurting individuals.

Property rights extend to those seeking to access economic opportunity. We want to make sure those in the process of selling property are able to access the market and get as much value as they can for their homes.

SUSAN PROFFITT (Vice President, Nevada Republican Club):
I own property in Florida so have some experience with the issues in S.B. 395. I constantly get calls from people with a Chinese accent about selling my Florida property. I see a need to protect Nevada residents from that.

I am concerned about the extra expense of adding and creating a new registry within the Division and the cost to homebuyers involved. I would like to know how Senator Stone feels about this as I consider the fiscal responsibility and security aspects of the bill. We do not want to do something that is heavily burdensome on small investors like me. The bill could really be a problem for anyone who owns 5 to 25 homes. How are you going to accommodate them?

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

VICE CHAIR HARRIS:
We have received one opposition letter (Exhibit X) from the Henderson Chamber of Commerce on S.B. 395. We will close the hearing on S.B. 395. Seeing no more business before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, we are adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

____
Pat Devereux,
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. 413	C	3	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	Sentencing Credit Examples
S.B. 413	D	3	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	Presentation: State of Nevada Sentencing Policy
S.B. 413	E	6	Senator Dallas Harris	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 413	F	21	Mercedes Maharis	Opposition Statement
S.B. 413	G	21	Mercedes Maharis	Johnson Parole Timeline Diagram
S.B. 63	H	23	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 103	I	24	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 129	J	24	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 153	K	25	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 172	L	26	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 211	M	27	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 243	N	28	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 266	O	28	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 289	P	29	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 316	Q	29	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 368	R	30	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document
S.B. 382	S	30	Patrick Guinan	Work Session Document

S.B. 362	T	32	Senator Dina Neal	Proposed Nevada Medical Logo
S.B. 362	U	33	Caleb Green	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 395	V	42	Senator Dina Neal	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 395	W	44	Senator Dina Neal	Investor Data Summary—Lied Center for Real Estate, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
S.B. 395	X	48	Aviva Gordon and Emily Osterberg / Henderson Chamber of Commerce	Opposition Letter