

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

**Eighty-Third Session
May 2, 2025**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 8:30 a.m. on Friday, May 2, 2025, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Joe Dalia
Assemblymember Cecelia González
Assemblymember Ken Gray
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Hanadi Nadeem
Assemblymember David Orentlicher
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4
Senator Jeff Stone, Senate District No. 20
Senator John C. Steinbeck, Senate District No. 18

Minutes ID: 1027



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel
Aaron Klatt, Committee Manager
Claudia Pierrott, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Zach Bucher, Manager, Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas
Kimberly Fergus, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Garrett D. Gordon, representing Community Associations Institute
Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas
Metropolitan Police Department
Taylor R. Avery, Manager, Political Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Paul Rich, Realtor, Henderson, Nevada
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County
Public Defender's Office
Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public
Defender's Office
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach & Policy Director, Nevada
Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Ben Iness, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Housing Justice Alliance
Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Erika J. Castro, Organizing Director, Nevada Immigrant Coalition
Nick Vassiliadis, representing Nevada Resort Association
Wesley Harper, Director, Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas
Kanani Espinoza, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation
Daniel Stewart, representing Wynn Resorts
Virginia Valentine, President, Nevada Resort Association
Jason Gray, Vice President, Government Affairs, MGM Resorts International
Karlos R. Lasane II, Vice President, Government Relations, Caesars Entertainment

Chair Miller:

Today, we do have three bills we will hear. I will take the bills in order. I will go ahead and open the hearing for Senate Bill 121 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions governing common-interest communities. Senator, your hearing is open. Whenever you are settled and ready to begin, please proceed.

Senate Bill 121 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing common-interest communities. (BDR 10-80)

Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4:

I am here to present Senate Bill 121 (1st Reprint). Senate Bill 121 (1st Reprint) is basically a homeowners' association (HOA) bill. I am making a baby step into trying to figure out how homeowners can have more of a say in certain areas involving their home on which they are paying a mortgage. I am not going to do this whole presentation. I am just going to jump right into the sections and then you can ask me questions.

In section 1, the reasoning behind placing this information in here, where I am going to deal with the actual landscaping in the backyard, is when you typically buy a home, initially you have 180 days in which to landscape the backyard. When you move in, most people have spent most of their money on the refrigerator, the blinds, the furniture, and they actually do not have the funds. I want to try to give wiggle room to homeowners who are moving into their first home, trying to figure out how they are going to pay for it, and then give them some flexibility. Basically, this provision allows that they have to do a layer of rock within 18 months after they close escrow, and then in 36 months, they have to do the full landscaping in their backyard. The reason why I put this in here is because, if you have ever tried to landscape your backyard—the wonderful design you may be considering, it is, at a minimum, sometimes \$17,000 to \$27,000 for you to actually put into your backyard. I was trying to allow homeowners number one, time; two, control; and three, the ability to make a decision on how they can plan to move forward.

In section 2, this particular provision came up around the late fees not being more than 30 days because if any of you stay in an HOA, the late fees sometimes are 10 days, 15 days, but it is not in alignment with—the late fee is going to pop up on your HOA in 30 days. The provision in here also says it cannot be reported to a credit collection agency. It is super important for me just to have some kind of alignment around when you expect to get a late fee when you are late. There were issues in my particular district where they were saying, How is it I get a late fee on 10 days, and then this other HOA, I can get a late fee 15 days later? Why is it not just a standard Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 30 days? So that is what the provision is going after.

On page 5, section 3, this is related to the oil stain. This also popped up in the district where folks are parked out in front of their house—this is not a driveway—where you have an oil stain on the asphalt, the black asphalt. Then you are being told you need to go scrub the asphalt and get the oil stain off the asphalt. When I saw the reprint, I thought, Is that really saying what I want it to say? But it is. Basically, it is saying a tenant or invitee who comes to your home would be responsible if they committed the oil stain entirely in the driveway. The way it was written is, it was written in the reverse. When I first read it, I thought, this is wrong. I want you to say it is the asphalt and they were like, no, but if it is entirely in the driveway, clearly you are responsible. Go get your cat litter and clean it up.

The next provision in the bill, on page 6, is dealing with the commercial advertisement. It also has the size and weight of a vehicle, and it has some exceptions. What prompted this particular section of this bill was basically, I have always supported small business owners. Most small business owners park their car in their driveway or there are employees who get the blessing of having a work vehicle they can take home. There are certain HOAs that have covenants, codes, and restrictions (CC&Rs) that basically say, if you have any kind of advertisement on the car, you need to cover it with a magnet. If you do not cover it with a magnet, then you are at risk of being fined and potentially towed.

This actually happened in my neighborhood where their work vehicle was towed because they were parked on the street. They did not know or remember because if you moved into your house 14 years ago, how many of you are going back and say, what did my CC&Rs say when I first moved in? You probably do not remember. What they found out was, their CC&Rs said no advertisement and they are required to put a magnet on the car in order to prevent them from being towed. The car was towed. They went to the HOA ombudsman and found out the CC&Rs said you have to cover the vehicle. You are also responsible for paying this tow fee and to go get it out. So, they had to find magnets that matched the color of the car, and every night, while they were working for their employer, cover it up. You know, running through this anxiety like, oh my God, it is midnight, and I forgot to put the magnet on.

A couple of things, right? I thought that was crazy, and two, I really think this is a little bit too intrusive. I started thinking, Well, what if you are a small business? What if this is your car, and you are parking in front of your house you are paying a mortgage on, and then all of a sudden you feel like you cannot park in front of your house? I wanted to create an exception in the law. Number one, you are not being mandated to put this magnet on your car.

Now, there are exceptions in this section. When I talked to the management companies down south, we got into a conversation around, what if it is pornographic images? What if it is marijuana? And I was like, OK, all right, these are the two exceptions that are actually in the bill. But we cannot keep falling down this line of all of these other things you would like to put in here or else it is going to eliminate what I am really going after. I actually do not want anybody who has a small business or who is working and has a car from their employer, being forced to have to cover up the side of their vehicle.

The next section of the bill, which is on page 9, came about because you could have a management company that terminates, meaning you now have a new management company, and you would like to have notice. What has happened, the issue that popped up was an HOA management company transferred, and they did not know. When they went to pay the dues, ultimately, they discovered this management company was no longer over their community. They were like, Well, who is over my community? They did not know. I was trying to make sure there is a timeline for when you are going to terminate that you actually let those community members know you are going to terminate.

The provision on the last page of the bill came up in my conversation with the community managers. They were saying it is a common problem that when they terminate, they are also not transferring accounts, records, and books so that you know what the dues are and what the different things that were not paid are, so you can have an idea. That provision said, within 30 days of the termination, you must then turn over the books, records, and everything associated with that community. Those were some of the commonsense provisions I was looking at.

Some of the complaints that popped up in the provision on page 9, on the posting—in my mind, most of us who live in an HOA have a community mailbox. Post it on the mailbox that you have terminated, and you have moved on. You have gone from company Acres to company Misty. Put it on the mailbox so I know who to pay—really simple. But everything that is simple in this building, as you have learned, people will overthink it to death and say, I do not know what a common area is, and maybe this common area, maybe I have a sliver of a common area, I do not know how I am supposed to post this notice. And you are like, well, Jesus Christ, come find me. I am saying, find the common area, post it up, and let somebody know you have transferred the HOA, so we are not paying the wrong person. However, it was still, and it still is, a conversation about the common areas. But basically, that is what the bill does, and Madam Chair, I will open myself up for questions. I may or may not have jokes somewhere in between.

Chair Miller:

You already got one joke in. We will try to enable you to get a few more in this morning. I do have a question before we go to member's questions. You presented off of the reprint of your bill. I know there was an amendment submitted, and I am just wondering if you are accepting it.

Senator Neal:

Madam Chair, I have not decided if it is friendly or not. There are provisions I appreciate and there are provisions I do not.

Chair Miller:

As a dais full of bill sponsors, I think we appreciate and understand that. Then at this point, we will not consider or ask questions regarding that amendment. I look forward to your final answer as a bill sponsor on which direction you will be moving. Our first question comes from Assemblymember Cole.

Assemblymember Cole:

I hope my question gives you an opportunity for another joke on a Friday. I appreciate that. My question is related to the collection process with HOAs. It has recently come to my attention there are property management companies or HOA management companies that also have created their own collection agencies. They are doing agreements between each other and not disclosing necessarily. I am wondering if there is a way for you to maybe add

something into the bill that says, a property manager, if you are going to accept a bid and enter into a contract with a similarly owned company for collection purposes, that you have to disclose it at least, or maybe even prohibit it. Would you be willing to do that?

Senator Neal:

That was something that was brought up to me the other day. It is something I am thinking about because I actually did not know that existed, that they had created their own debt collection agency. I was wondering if the language that was in the bill would prevent them. I am interested in that because I do see it as a conflict of interest. But I just wanted to make sure, number one, I research that a little bit more so I can get more documentation. Because if it is not something they are disclosing, it is not like we are all of a sudden going to be in this committee hearing and we are going to get HOAs confessing. Maybe we will. But that would be nice and then I would be, bingo, got you. It is in the bill. All right, but I will definitely consider it. It was Assemblymember Gallant who brought that to my attention.

Assemblymember Gray:

Good to see you back here and in rare form. I am in no way a big fan of homeowners' associations, but people typically move there for a reason. I am wondering, I mean, they get absolutely crazy sometimes enforcing the rules, but a lot of those homes are bought by people with small businesses. The provision in there about signage on vehicles and stuff, that one just kind of gets me a little bit. Do you think that one might be going a little too far since those are in and out? They are not full-time display. I think we are trying to fix a problem that is really not there.

Senator Neal:

Meaning, you do not want them to have to? You want them to cover their cars with a magnet?

Assemblymember Gray:

Maybe I read it wrong. But no, I do not want them to have to cover their cars with a magnet. I mean, the other parts, cleaning the driveways, the asphalt, absolutely. But I mean I do not think there are that many, I do not think that I have seen in the communities I have been in. But maybe I read the bill wrong.

Senator Neal:

The provision on page 6, section 4, subsection 3, paragraph (c), lines 36 through 44, and it kind of continues on the back page, was making sure they do not have to cover the car with the magnet.

Assemblymember Gray:

My mistake. I have got to work on my reading comprehension at three o'clock in the morning.

Assemblymember Marzola:

I appreciate the jokes in the morning. My question is on section 1, subsection 2. You stated earlier that, I buy a home, within 18 months I need to lay rocks, and then within three years, I need to do my backyard. If I choose that I do not want any rocks in my backyard and I want plants and grass or what have you, now I am having to pay to take out those rocks and redo my backyard again. Why not just give the new homeowner three years to do their backyard, period?

Senator Neal:

That is how I started off. But, over the summer, when I was meeting with the management companies, there is a very strong interest in backyards, apparently. They want some form—they talked about when you have the dust in the Vegas Valley, the dust moving, and not having some kind of rock or some kind of layer over it to prevent dirt from flying up in the air and then just having some level of landscaping. They felt very strongly about that, and that was my negotiation. Now, I mean, as all things in this building, it is up to this Committee to decide if there are some changes they want that will allow them to move this out of this Committee. I agree with you. I just want a window, I want wiggle room, but that is some of the things they came up with. I personally have had a huge problem with whoever the neighbor is who has decided they want to peek over your back wall because they do not have anything better to do. I feel that has gone too far. But it is up to this Committee. It is probably going to put this back into conflict because I did work with folks in the summer to come to that particular section. But it is the pleasure of this Committee at this point. I mean because you have an amendment that also has a different time period, 12 and 24 months.

Assemblymember Marzola:

I do not want to blow up your bill. I know you have worked hard. But I think if the thought process is, I am buying a home, I am putting all of my life savings in purchasing that home, and now I am having to pay double the money to get my backyard fixed. I do not see how that is advantageous for the homeowner. But I will defer to you, Senator. I just want to clarify; I just want to see what the thought process was in that section.

Senator Neal:

Chair, can I just add something in? On the other side, in the Senate hearing, you would be amazed at the belief systems around houses. Because what popped up in the Senate hearing was, if you do not believe in an HOA, you do not want to landscape your backyard, then you should get up, you should move, and you should find another home that is not an HOA. There were also things on the record about folks being lazy and they are like, Well, clearly they are too lazy to actually go out and landscape their backyard, not actually considering you are just financially strapped after just moving in. Not everybody is sitting on a bag of gold and can just turn around and landscape their backyard, because they are focused on the inside. There were very interesting comments on the Senate side that I felt were just very "classism." I do not know what you are going to get in opposition over here, but that is what happened on the Senate side for this particular section. They objected to it, generally.

Assemblymember Marzola:

I appreciate that, Senator. I can tell you I am not lazy. But I am a single mom who, when I bought my first home, I did not have a dollar left in the bank and definitely could not have done my backyard in a year, two years. It is sad to hear that happened in the Senate hearing or that it happens in this building.

Chair Miller:

I think the hardest part for me is when I hear all the isms that happen in this building from people who are supposed to be protecting the people of Nevada or the hypocrisy.

Assemblymember Nadeem:

I want to ask a question related to what the Assemblymember just said about the backyard. Thank you for bringing it up because right now, it is so expensive to do the landscaping for the backyard, especially for a new house. I want to ask you what is the time frame as of now, if these changes do not occur or when they will happen? But what is the time frame for now?

Senator Neal:

Most of the CC&Rs have 180 days, six months.

Assemblymember Nadeem:

Ok, that is six months. That makes sense because if they are not able to establish it in six months, then they have to pay fees after fees, penalties after penalties.

Senator Neal:

You will get a notice saying that your backyard has not been landscaped. They typically will offer you to do something, but you have to turn in a plan on what you are going to do. If it is the one layer of rock, then you need to establish this one layer of rock, and then you need to take a picture of that and then turn it in. But sometimes even just going to get the dump truck, go to Home Depot or Lowe's, and then go get that layer of rock, then get it dumped into the backyard, sometimes you cannot even afford that within the six months. We are assuming everyone is financially equal when they move into a home. Homeownership is very important, achieving the American dream is very important, but not all people are walking into a home with the same amount of money in their bank account. Sometimes even that simple task is actually very expensive.

Assemblymember Nadeem:

That is so helpful.

Assemblymember Cole:

My question is really more for Legal, I think. So, understanding that CC&Rs are covenants that run with the land and the restrictive covenants in most parts, how does that interplay with *Nevada Revised Statutes* when we make a change like this? Does that affect just CC&Rs going forward for new CC&Rs or does it impact those that are in existence right now and supersedes those?

Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel:

I would think from a contracts perspective, it would be moving forward.

Assemblymember Hansen:

God bless you; HOA bills are difficult. As a freshman, I was naive enough to bring one. My question, and I am not sure you are going to have this information, but just to lay a little groundwork, I certainly feel for what these burdens are. I can remember my husband driving all the way down to Las Vegas in a panic because my sister was being charged \$100 a day because her sprinkler system was not in, and she was in a financially tight position. Not everybody has the ability to call their brother-in-law in another part of the state to come do that work.

I have a problem with the fines. I have a problem with some of the onerousness of it. But what I am wondering is, this plays to the whole idea that, why in the world are we dealing with HOA issues at the state level? I have for a long time said this needs to be more at a municipality thing, but here we are. In the Las Vegas area, I know in the southern part of the state, there are a lot more HOAs than there are here in the north. I am in real estate and when I am dealing with buyers, this is a big consideration: where are they going to buy, how much can they afford, and what can they do? But I do not know in the south. Do we know what percentage, or could we get that information? What percentage of housing is in an HOA or maybe has CC&Rs that are really restrictive like this?

Senator Neal:

I actually do not know. I know a lot of the new neighborhoods have an HOA. Most of the older neighborhoods do not. Typically, a new development has an HOA. Some of the municipalities in the planning process and the planning commission, they ask the question, is there going to be an HOA? Some municipalities want there to be an HOA. I personally do not. Going back to your original comment about it going to the municipalities, I do not know if I would ever want the municipality to have control over this because they are squirrely as it is. I think we would fall into a whole different category of what they believe and think. But I do not know; I could probably find out. Or maybe somebody who is coming in opposition, maybe they know?

Assemblymember Hansen:

I appreciate that. The reason I bring up the municipality idea is, I think there would be far more feedback from homeowners, to be able to go to a county commission or a city council meeting versus they are not able to come here and their ability to voice their frustrations. That was maybe a thought I had. Yes, if somebody in the room or at some point we could make—

Chair Miller:

We actually do have that answer. Also, I would say we are also more accessible than our municipalities because we offer the telephones. We still are accessible to our Nevadans. I would also suggest, on a personal level, we are going to hear the actual numbers but ask southern Assemblymembers. Because in our off time when we are doing some door-to-door

work, everyone kind of knows their own district. How many HOAs, how many gated communities, and guard-gated. Obviously, there are trends, but yes, some of us, pretty much everything is an HOA. But we do have the actual response here.

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

There is an article from *Nevada Current* that came out on January 13, 2025, which states Nevada has 3,711 HOAs which represent the owners of 623,917 housing units, half of the state's 1.3 million homes.

Chair Miller:

But like I said, when you break that down per district, you really see the differences. I believe that was our last question. We are going to go ahead and open it up for testimony. We will begin here in Carson City with support testimony for Senate Bill 121 (1st Reprint).

Zach Bucher, Manager, Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas:

I am representing one of the squirrely municipalities that was referenced earlier. I am here in support. Even though local governments do not oversee these HOAs, we do receive a lot of calls, and we are aware of the problem. We appreciate Senator Neal addressing this and trying to get ahead of it, and that is why we are here today in support.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else here in Carson City in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] I will open it up for opposition testimony beginning here in Carson City. [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines?

Kimberly Fergus, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I did real estate for over 15 years in Nevada, and I retired in 2016. However, I do have a lot of experience with HOAs and buying, selling, whatever. I have changed my testimony so many times that I do not want to bounce all over the place. But just let me tell you this: when builders build in a community, sometimes per their contract, per their loans, per a lot of stuff, they are forced to have the community with standards like the yards being built within a certain amount of time. The builders, they own the land until you have over 25 percent, 50 percent sold before an HOA ever takes place. Sometimes when we used to do those apartment conversions into condos, you could never get a loan until you had over a certain percentage of owner-occupied and yada, yada, yada. I am going way back because I did this 15 years and I have been retired from it for 10. However, builders, they own that, they have the rights. When you are buying a new house and you know what is expected of you to do, you are aware of it. My advice to you is a little harsh but, you know what? If you cannot live up to what the HOA is going to ask, then do not buy in an HOA. I mean S.B. 121 (R1)—

Chair Miller:

Excuse me, ma'am. Your two minutes are up. If you have any additional comments, please submit them. Next caller.

Garrett D. Gordon, representing Community Associations Institute:

We advocate for homeowners' board members and affiliates. We advocate for over, as you heard earlier, the 3700 homeowners' associations in Nevada. I apologize for not being there in person. I had a family obligation this morning. Community Associations Institute did have considerable opposition to the bill in the Senate, but I do want to thank Senator Neal for working with us on the amendment that was mentioned earlier in the hearing this week. Given those negotiations, I have personally asked the association to stand down in their opposition while we work in good faith with Senator Neal. Again, I want to thank her for her consideration.

For the record, we are a hundred percent in agreement with section 2 in that associations should never be reporting homeowner information to collection companies; that is absolutely inappropriate. I appreciate Senator Neal making that change in law. We do still have some concerns about sections 1, 3, and 5, and hopefully we will continue to work with Senator Neal and get to some common ground before work session.

Finally, I will just address the municipality question if I might. In fact, when municipalities approve planned unit developments, known as PUDs, municipalities really require developers to create HOAs because the HOAs take over responsibility for maintaining the roads, for snow removal up north, for maintaining the parks and playground equipment, for security, and for landscaping. There was a study done years ago that saves these municipalities quite a lot of money, I mean, hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars in maintenance obligations that are now shifted to the HOAs and homeowners and taking that obligation off the books. I really appreciate the time this morning. Senator Neal, I will certainly find you next week and hopefully we can continue working together.

Chair Miller:

Next caller? [There was no one.] I will open it up for neutral testimony beginning here in Carson City. [There was no one.] I am not seeing anyone approach in Las Vegas. Please open the phone lines. [There was no one.] I will welcome the Senator up for any final remarks.

Senator Neal:

I want to thank the Assembly Committee on Judiciary for hearing this bill. This is my baby toe into trying to go after real covenants. I will see you guys probably again next session.

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and close the hearing on S.B. 121 (R1). Next, I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to real property. Senator Stone, are you presenting alone or with Senator Steinbeck? You are presenting alone. Ok. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint). Whenever you are ready, please proceed.

Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to real property. (BDR 15-729)

Senator Jeff Stone, Senate District No. 20:

Forgive my voice, I am a little bit under the weather. I am representing from Mesquite, including Henderson all the way southerly to Laughlin. I am presenting this bill on behalf of Senator Ellison, who could not be here today.

As you know, it is a criminal offense to unlawfully enter a residence with the intent to occupy it or another person to live there without the property owner's permission. Additionally, it is considered unlawful occupancy for an individual to reside in a dwelling if they know or have reason to believe such a residence is unauthorized by the owner. As amended, Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint) expands these provisions to address situations where an individual presents or uses a false or forged rental agreement to allow someone to break into or occupy a dwelling. The key element here is the intent to establish residency either for themselves or another person. This bill is designed to prevent unauthorized occupation of properties regardless of if they are empty or temporarily uninhabited.

The bill also revises timelines related to someone's ability to contest an eviction and how long the owner of the property must store the personal property of someone who has been evicted in an instance of an unlawful occupancy. The bill provides clear guidelines for law enforcement and property owners.

Section 1 revises provisions related to housebreaking to include using a false or forged written rental agreement to gain access with the intent to live in a dwelling or let someone else do so. Section 2 also expands the crime of unlawful occupancy to make it unlawful to take up residence in the dwelling if a person knows or has reason to believe such residency is without permission of the owner of the dwelling or an authorized representative of the owner.

Section 2.3 provides definitions for the term "squatter" and "tenant" for certain purposes relating to summary proceedings for obtaining possession of real property, a recreational vehicle, or a mobile home, and clarifies a squatter is not a tenant for such purposes. Section 2.5 reduces from 21 days to 5 days the period for which an unlawful, unauthorized occupant who has been locked out of a dwelling has the right to contest the matter by filing a verified complaint seeking reentry and the time the owner of the dwelling is required to store the personal property of the unlawful or unauthorized occupant. Section 2.7 clarifies the process by which an unlawful or unauthorized occupant has been locked out may seek the return of his or her personal property. I am happy to answer any questions.

Assemblymember Roth:

You said the intent is to prohibit someone from establishing residency for themselves or another person unlawfully. I think that is a little bit of a sticking point for me, especially when we are looking at somebody subletting, and the person who is subletting then unknowingly enters into some sort of false agreement, and they are not aware of that. Can you speak to that intent a little bit? Especially with the definition of "squatter," does that apply to somebody who would unknowingly enter into some sort of subletting situation?

Senator Stone:

I actually had a personal experience with this in one of the units that I have. I had an elderly couple who had a son, and they had requested the son be allowed to live there. I said that would be fine. We amended their lease to such an effect. Then the son came up with false leases and actually ended up leasing out to three or four more people and actually, almost forced out the elderly people from living there. I had to go through the complete eviction process. Unfortunately, not only did the squatters become evicted, but also the elderly couple was evicted as well.

Assemblymember Roth:

To clarify, somebody who is unknowingly subletting would be considered a squatter and thereby subject to criminal penalties.

Senator Stone:

They would be a squatter if they originally were given a fraudulent lease, for example, and unknowingly signed that lease and became a victim, if you will, of the person who did the fraudulent lease. Then it became apparent to them when the owner came forward and said, this is not this person's property. This is my property. If they continue to stay knowing they did not have authorization to be there from the owner, then they in fact would be a squatter because they knowingly knew, after the fact if you will, they did not have permission from the original owner to stay in that unit.

Assemblymember Roth:

I do not see a knowingly provision in here under the definition of squatter. That is where my concern is.

Senator Stone:

The definition of squatter: Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, "the term includes, without limitation, a person who enters onto or intrudes upon real property without the permission of the owner and continues to occupy the property without title, right, or permission of the owner, or authorized representative of the owner," so, if they continue to occupy knowing they did not have a valid lease or permission from the owner to occupy the unit.

Chair Miller:

I have a question, and I want to bring it to the opposite side of that. We are talking about leases. Obviously, it is already criminal to create a fake lease, or to try to lease or sell something that you do not have the legal rights to. But in those situations, when we are talking about someone living on someone's property, what about protection for those arrangements when there is no legal, no documented proof of an agreement? It could be even someone letting their brother-in-law live in their camper or their boat and you can park it on my property. I own the property. That is just the family agreement. He has lived out there and his camper has been parked out there for years on my property. Would there be protections in those situations for those people? Because while we may have definitions of "squatters" and things like that in this bill, what triggered me is seeing the words, "recreational vehicle" or

"mobile home." So, I am wanting to protect those individuals whose recreational vehicle, mobile home, whatever is actually their home—would there be protections in those situations for those individuals?

Senator Stone:

Yes, I believe there would be protections. Obviously, if somebody goes into a mobile home unlawfully, the owner of the mobile home could go through the traditional eviction process.

Chair Miller:

I am trying to protect them from the eviction process. That is what I am saying. If they have been given permission to live there, yet there is no written documentation, there is no lease, there is not anything to prove it, it has just been a friend or a family agreement, are they protected? Is this still considered their home?

Senator Stone:

I believe it is. It would certainly be adjudicated to the courts if necessary.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

My question is on sections 1 and 2, the addition of this new language. I am trying to get a better sense of what differentiates these because under the original law, I think it makes sense, if somebody enters forcibly into an uninhabited or vacant dwelling, they are guilty of housebreaking. If somebody, in section 2, takes up residence without permission, they are guilty of unlawful occupancy. But now in both of these, we have added the same language with an "or" statement. If you enter a vacant dwelling or you intentionally procure a false or a forged written agreement; and in the other one, or you intentionally procure a false agreement, that "or" statement makes it seem like we have the same crime twice. How do I know which one you would be charged with? Because it is not an "and" it is an "or." Does that make sense? I can explain again if you need.

My question is, in section 1, subsection 1, you can be charged with housebreaking if you enter an uninhabited or vacant dwelling or if you get a false written rental agreement. So, either one of those you would get charged with housebreaking. But in section 2, if you take up residence without permission or you get a false written rental agreement, you are now charged with unlawful occupancy. If somebody got a false or forged written rental agreement, are they going to be charged with both unlawful occupancy and housebreaking? That is my question.

Senator Stone:

I believe the person in the unit who is there unlawfully because they signed a lease agreement that was fraudulent, is not going to be accused or prosecuted for unlawful breaking and entry, if that is the gist of your question.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

Yes, that is the gist of my question. I am just wondering what is going to prevent that, because all it requires is they have a false agreement and then they qualify under this section for being guilty of housebreaking.

Senator Stone:

They would be guilty of housebreaking if they were the ones who broke into the house. They are the ones who had the fraudulent lease agreement. If somebody is the beneficiary of a false lease agreement and it has been brought to their attention by a property owner that their lease is invalid, then they would not be held accountable for housebreaking.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

Maybe we could at some point get some clarity from Legal if I may be misreading it. I just want to make sure we are not creating duplicate crimes in two sections.

Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel:

It seems to me as if the crime for which a person would be prosecuted would be a matter of prosecutorial discretion. But in section 2, the disjunctive rather than the conjunctive reading, I think, might be slightly off, at least from what I am hearing from your perspective. But as with respect to section 1, I think, if a person forcibly enters is different than the latter situation. The prosecuting attorney would determine based on the facts of each individual circumstance which applied.

Chair Miller:

We will go ahead and open it up for testimony beginning here in Carson City with support testimony.

Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are here in support of S.B. 202 (R1) today. This current law allows for law enforcement to take action on the unlawful occupancy of residents. I actually just worked with some members of our community with reference to a vacant home, a home that is at issue within a residential area. We were able to go in and charge a person currently with an unlawful occupancy.

What I think this is going to do, too, and help clarify, is in section 2, reference the new language, when a person procures or offers a false or forged written rental agreement, which you do see often, which could be covered under forgery as well, with current laws. But this would help clarify a little bit as well, because what you see is properties being offered up on the Internet, or Craigslist, or any other platforms that are out there today. Then a person will forge the document or go down and create their own document when they locate a house they know is either for sale, or vacant, or has not been lived in for some time. This would help clarify some of that. We are in support of this bill.

Taylor R. Avery, Manager, Political Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Chamber is in support of S.B. 202 (R1). The bill defends small property owners from fraudulent activity and ensures homes are not taken advantage of by bad actors. This bill expands laws against the use of fake rental agreements, which is a needed update to address evolving methods used by squatters and scammers. The bill supports much-needed housing stability by giving landlords tools to protect their properties and return them to the market quickly for Nevada's families. We would like to thank the bill sponsor for bringing the bill forward. Thank you for your consideration.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else here in Carson City in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas in support? Yes, please come forward.

Paul Rich, Realtor, Henderson, Nevada:

I am here on behalf of the Nevada Realtors. The issues of squatters have been an issue in Nevada for some time. However, the impact of these unlawful acts has become more frequent and more impactful for property owners. The changes to allow for a crime to be charged against those who create or procure a false rental agreement is an important step to highlight that these actions are a crime. The new definitions of "tenant" and "squatter" to highlight the differences between these groups is important to ensure the changes proposed in the bill will not impact the rights of legal tenants. The shortened timelines from 21 down to 5 calendar days for removal of squatters and timelines for any of their personal property to be held or retrieved helps ensure legal property owners are supported and reduces the burden on these victims. We ask that you support S.B. 202 (R1) to help address these crimes and enable property owners to regain custody of their property.

Chair Miller:

I am not seeing anyone else there in Las Vegas wishing to testify. Is there anyone on the phone lines?

Kimberly Fergus, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint). This long overdue legislation gives property owners, law enforcement, and our courts the tools to address the growing crisis of squatting and fraudulent occupancy, fake leases, and loopholes. For far too long, bad actors have used phony rental agreements to game the system, delay eviction, and create chaos for homeowners. Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint) makes it a crime to procure or offer a false lease, a critical step to shutting down fraud and protecting legal tenants. Squatters are not tenants. This bill draws a clear line. A squatter is not a tenant. No more abuse of tenant rights by individuals who never had legal occupancy; that is justified for real tenants and landlords alike.

Number three, restoring property rights quickly: Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint) reduces the window for unlawful occupants to contest lawful lockouts and limits how long owners must store abandoned property. It has been said earlier, and I echo a lot that has been said, this protects property owners from ongoing harm and stops the financial drain of housing

individuals who broke it illegally. This bill is not about denying housing. It is about defending property rights, restoring the rule of law, and ending the free-for-all that squatters and their enablers have exploited for far too long. I urge you to pass S.B. 202 (R1) and send a message that fraud, forgery, and illegal occupation will not be tolerated in Nevada.

Chair Miller:

Next caller. [There was no one.] I will move to opposition testimony beginning here in Carson City.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

No one likes squatters, but it is generally the people on the margins who get tricked. They may meet somebody through Facebook Marketplace, they will give them a fake lease, and they are the ones who become the victims at that point. We do have concerns about the definitions on here for "squatters" and "tenants" because all it would really take is for a landlord to just falsely brandish somebody as a squatter. Unlawful occupancy is a gross misdemeanor. This body has already done good work on that. But our main concern here is the reduction from 21 calendar days to 5 days in section 2.5, to contest whether someone is actually an unlawful occupant. We want any homeowner to be able to remove squatters on the property as fast as possible. But we also know there are some landlords who are not the best actors and can use this process to get a lawful renter out faster. The 21 days gives both sides a chance to put forth their rights to being on the property.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

Just to continue on a little bit from what the Clark County public defender just stated, five days is just not enough time when you have that innocent person who does not understand the lease is not legal for them. Listening to the presentation, they said when the landlord or the owner comes and tells them the lease they have is invalid, did that person still only get five days to remove their life that they did not know about? They did not know and now they have five days to remove all their personal property? With this bill, there seems to be no notification by the landlord or the owner to this innocent person when you address them. Is there some kind of form they can give them that says, Hey, you have this timeline to go down to the court and start this process if you need more time or if you think I am being unreasonable. I think there needs to be a little give and take here. I think the five days is too long [*sic*] and I think there should be some notification by the landlord to this person that they are trying to kick out, especially if they are an innocent person.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach & Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:

I did not have an issue with this bill in the first house, but the definition of "squatter" and then the presentation today makes it unclear to me if someone who is an innocent renter, who was conned by a fraudster, who has moved their whole family into, say, a three- or four-bedroom house, are they a squatter once the owner of the property comes and says this

is my property? Where are they relative to their rights there? If you think about the timeline to move a house like that, and that person would have lost their security deposit, any last month's rent would be gone.

Also, on the subletting situation that was brought up, we have had scam artists in Clark County rent from multiple houses and then sublease individual bedrooms without permission from the property owner. Are they going to be in the position of being a squatter once they are on notice the person did not have the right to enter into that agreement? Also generally, in an oral lease wherein the leasing agreement where the person has paid cash and has not gotten a receipt, will they be in the same position if an unscrupulous landlord wants to get them out? How are they going to show evidence that they are a legitimate tenant? I think it goes back to how do people know who has the legitimate authority to rent a property?

This is a systems issue. A system solution is having a landlord registry run by the state government or local municipalities where any tenant can look up any property and know exactly who they should be speaking with. This fraud is allowed to persist because you have vacant properties and people are able to take advantage of that. If every person in Nevada could look up who is responsible for each individual property—I know people can say, SilverFlume. That is only if they have a business license. It is very hard for people to navigate. I think it is a system solution to this problem that would protect landlords and protect innocent tenants.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in opposition here in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines?

Ben Iness, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Housing Justice Alliance:

We are a statewide coalition of grassroots organizers and community advocates who work with tenants for meaningful and lasting tenant protections so that folks can stay stably housed. I am calling in opposition to this bill. I think the growing anti-squatter sentiment is a bit of a scapegoat for the real, large, bad actors, interstate housing crisis, which is the corporations that are cannibalizing our communities and neighborhoods. But more specifically, calling in to ensure everyone's collective efforts on this bill reduce any unintended consequences. Much of these have been touched on by a lot of my peers already and it speaks to that situation that I believe Mr. Norman spoke to. We saw this throughout 2024 with our Eviction Court Watching program throughout the Las Vegas Valley. The situation is where, again, to reiterate, tenants have taken occupancy due to fraud perpetrated by fake duplicitous landlords. In these cases, tenants have done nothing wrong. They have signed what appears to be a valid lease, they have been paying bills and have often even moved utilities to their names as well. The current language does not capture the possibility that the tenants may be as much victims as the true landlord. We would not want to see those victims suffer these collateral consequences of being labeled squatters and really suggest a simple and small amendment to consider such cases, so no one has to fall victim to that five-day timeline.

Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

I am calling in opposition to Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint). This proposed legislation fails to really address the ongoing housing crisis, the need for affordable housing, or protection of tenants' rights. Instead, it really appears to be motivated by an unsubstantiated fear that individuals are en masse taking up residence in empty homes. Our worry at Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada is the language in S.B. 202 (R1) unfairly targets and penalizes tenants. This bill overlooks bad actors and unethical landlords who are renting and subleasing properties without ownership or proper rental permits. These landlords might attempt to bypass standard eviction procedures by falsely labeling tenants as squatters to remove them from their homes. Tenants have rights, and we must continue to work to uphold and strengthen those safeguards. We urge you to vote against Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint).

Erika J. Castro, Organizing Director, Nevada Immigrant Coalition:

I am here in strong opposition on behalf of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition. At a time where we are seeing increased xenophobia and targeting of immigrant communities, we are deeply concerned this bill could be used by bad actors to target immigrant tenants and their families. Many immigrant community members can often fall victim to fraud due to their status or language barriers. Under this bill, an abusive landlord could merely allege the tenant is a squatter or occupying the premises under a fraudulent lease to then take advantage of the fast-track eviction process, even leading to criminal charges. We urge you to oppose this bill and not further criminalize tenants or immigrants in our state. I also want to echo Mr. Norman's sentiment that this is a system issue, and having a landlord registry could help avoid fraud and ensure we have a stronger rental process for all involved.

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

Chair Miller:

Next caller? [There was no one.] I will open it up for neutral testimony beginning here in Carson City. I am not seeing anyone here in Carson or in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] I will welcome Senator Stone back up for any final remarks.

Senator Stone:

On behalf of Senator Ellison, thank you for hearing the bill. We are very happy to work with the opposition on some of the valid points they brought forward.

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and close the hearing for Senate Bill 202 (1st Reprint).

Next, I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to crimes. Senator, your bill hearing is open. Whenever you and your copresenters are all settled, you may proceed.

Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to crimes. (BDR 15-908)

Senator John C. Steinbeck, Senate District No. 18:

I appreciate this opportunity to present Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) today, which revises provisions relating to crime. I would also like to add that Senator Fabian Doñate is a cosponsor of this bill, and Mr. Nick Vassiliadis is presenting with me here today. Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) was amended from its original text before passing the Senate. Last session, the Nevada Legislature passed Senate Bill 412 of the 82nd Session, which added a look-back period for trespass warnings: any person who willfully goes or remains upon any land or in any building after having been warned during the previous 24 months by the owner or occupant they are not to trespass is guilty of a misdemeanor. This bill we are presenting today will extend the look-back period from 24 to 36 months.

The Nevada economy is still, and always will be, heavily reliant on our tourism. It is what we do the very best in the world. This bill is intended to increase our safety and security for our visitors and our amazing workers in our resorts. A crime committed in our resorts not only affects the direct victim but threatens the livelihood of all Nevadans. I would now like to turn it over to Nick Vassiliadis for additional information.

Nick Vassiliadis, representing Nevada Resort Association:

I am honored to be here with Senator Steinbeck to help present S.B. 371 (R1). I would also like to thank Senator Doñate for signing on to this bill. After more than 30 years with the Clark County Fire Department, nearly 5 years as Chief, Senator Steinbeck knows almost better than anyone the situations firsthand that first responders and law enforcement face every single day and night in our state's tourism districts. His experience has been invaluable in providing insights on why this legislation is necessary. Together, we will explain why Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) is critical to ensuring the safety of the 366,000 Nevadans who work in leisure and hospitality across the state, nearly half of whom work directly in hotel casinos.

There is no higher priority for the resort than safety. Resort employees want to feel safe at work while walking to and from their workplaces to their cars, to their rides home, a feeling that is essential to their well-being. Safety is also vital to the industry's efforts to attract and retain talent. I know it is a reality this body knows all too well, but the industry is always one bad headline away from causing economic strain in the state of Nevada. I would like to make it abundantly clear, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro), the Reno Police Department, and many local, state, and federal law enforcement partners are doing an excellent job at keeping tourism districts safe. The resort security teams work closely with law enforcement and act as a force multiplier having a visible and effective presence to deter criminal activity and protect team members and guests. Further, we appreciate the important role the district attorney's office plays in prosecuting these offenders. However, there remains those who are not deterred, and despite all our collective best effort, they continue to perpetuate crimes.

Over the past few years, the resort industry has worked with law enforcement, district attorneys, and local jurisdictions to address recidivism in resort areas. While strong tools have been put into place, S.B. 371 (R1) adds another necessary layer to stop chronic trespassers who repeatedly commit crimes in tourism areas despite being trespassed or arrested over and over again. This legislation will update *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to extend that trespassing look-back period from 24 months to 36 months.

Why 36 months you might ask? Our experience over the past two years shows that 24 months is simply not enough time to provide a complete picture. Increasing the time frame allows law enforcement, prosecutors, the courts, and resort security to identify specific patterns of behavior by chronic offenders and make more informed decisions in terms of consequences, including the appropriate charges and sentencings needed to end this repetitive cycle. Law enforcement and resort security have witnessed firsthand a person trespass at one location, move to another location down the street, continue illegal conduct there until they are caught there, and continue this process over and over again. Further, if a person is not convicted, they are simply not subject to the order-out corridors. We know from practical experience they will return to continue their activity. Oftentimes when this activity goes unchecked, it tends to increase behavior, escalating into felonies.

It cannot be overstated how this becomes a morale blow to our employees, to guests, but specifically employees when they see the same pattern of behaviors going on and just completely going unchecked. Given that S.B. 371 (R1) will address those circumstances where habitual offenders slip through the systems, committing crimes unchecked, we think there is a lot at stake with this bill and we would urge this Committee's support, especially as we face volatile and uncertain economic times on the horizon. Please keep in mind as you consider this bill, the tourism district is a workplace for hundreds of thousands of Nevadans and that this industry is the economic driver of the state. We believe this is a commonsense effort and measure that you can support.

Senator Steinbeck:

We stand ready for any questions.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for your first presentation in Assembly Judiciary. We will begin questions. Our first one will be from Assemblymember Roth.

Assemblymember Roth:

If you could just provide some clarity. I believe last session we established that 24-month period as a look back. Correct me if I am wrong, but what I heard in the testimony is, it was not enough time to establish a clear pattern or a full picture. What data do we have that suggests moving it from 24 months to 36 months is necessary? Do we know how many people have been removed and then have returned in the last two years?

Nick Vassiliadis:

Assemblymember Roth, we will try to get you exact numbers, but we also believe raising it from 24 to 36 months brings it in line with several other statutes such as driving under the influence (DUI). If you were looking for specific data, we can get that back to you. But we do believe this brings us in line with other elements of NRS.

Assemblymember Roth:

Can you clarify that with the DUIs? I do not believe there is any two-year look-back period for DUIs.

Nick Vassiliadis:

I will find that for you, and I will bring that to you.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

My question is about when this law went into effect, and now we are looking at changing it. I do not have the date of when it originally went into effect, but I would imagine it was not May 2023. I would imagine it was probably July or January after. It has not been 24 months of this being in effect. My question is, how do we know this is not working when we have not actually even gone through that whole time period yet, prior to altering it again.

Nick Vassiliadis:

This came from the guidance from our security teams and law enforcement professionals in working with the community. We think this just provides us better context in terms of those habitual and repeat offenders.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

I know, and I appreciate that. I am just wondering what you are basing that on, I suppose. Are people not listening? And they are being kicked out and then they are just coming back immediately? If that is the case, how does 36 months help? And if that is not the case, what is it we are basing this change on?

Nick Vassiliadis:

I would like to follow up with you on that specific answer, if that is okay.

Chair Miller:

I remember the bill from last session. Looking at it now and, of course, with this conversation, it just says building upon any land or any building. So, we are hearing this from the perspective of the Resorts Association, business, and tourism. However, a building is a building, and we have many, many, many—they do not get advertised—but it happens more than people think in our public buildings. When we are talking about the assaults and challenges and the number of people who need to be trespassed for everyone else's protection from schools, from hospitals, both public and private, and other public buildings where people have been trespassed, will they be included in this bill?

Senator Steinbeck:

I believe so. I guess that would be a question best for Legal. Unfortunately, while I am bringing this bill forward, I am not an expert on the history of it or exactly on everyone to whom it will pertain. Maybe Nick can answer that, and then maybe Legal can answer that. But I believe so, ma'am.

Nick Vassiliadis:

Yes, Chair. It is our understanding it would apply broadly in that sense. This was a discussion that took place on the Senate side, and I think the industry was initially okay with limiting it to just resort hotel corridors and resort properties. However, Senators on the Senate side showed an interest in having this apply to all businesses because trespassing and repetitive trespassing is an issue for many businesses, not just the resort corridors.

Chair Miller:

Are you saying that was part of the sections that were amended out because you are saying you wanted to limit it to just the Resort Corridor? I am saying, I am concerned about our public facilities. The Senator is saying, he believes it covers, and then now you are also stating that it would be more than just the Resort Corridor, but all businesses. Because these concerns happen everywhere, which is it? Is that what was initially intended but has since been amended out?

Nick Vassiliadis:

I am sorry if my answer was confusing. But no, I think our answers align in that it would apply broadly to all businesses. I was just stating the industry was not opposed necessarily to having a more limited view. But through conversations in the Senate, it appeared Senators would have preferred to have this apply more broadly versus very specifically because trespass is an issue for more than just resort areas.

Chair Miller:

I am asking, because it is an issue in more than just resort areas, about our public facilities and our public employees.

Nick Vassiliadis:

I would defer to Legal if it would apply to public employees in public buildings.

Karly O'Krent:

There is no limitation that is prescribed by the bill. I think in answer to your question, yes.

Senator Steinbeck:

Which, Madam Chair, is good news because those facilities deserve, and those employees and the people in them deserve, every bit as much protection.

Chair Miller:

You, of course, with your professional background, understand it is just a point I do not think we stress enough here. We also do have the date the bill went into effect, which was July 1, 2023. It has not been quite two years yet. I think that is what my colleague was asking about, when it went into effect. I do not see any additional questions. We are talking about the last bill. I will go ahead and open it up for support testimony beginning here in Carson City for Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint).

Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are in support of this piece of legislation. It will give us the opportunity to deal with the repeat offenders we see, as you said, Chair, not only in the Resort Corridor but also at other buildings and businesses throughout our community.

Wesley Harper, Director, Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas:

We believe this helps to bring safety to all workers and people who occupy buildings within our city and therefore we are in support.

Kanani Espinoza, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation:

We thank Senator Steinbeck for bringing this measure. I would like to echo the comments of the Nevada Resort Association with the presentation by Nick Vassiliadis. We support S.B. 371 (R1), as the safety of our guests and team members are of utmost importance to us and this gives law enforcement an additional tool to be able to deal with the repeat offenders.

Daniel Stewart, representing Wynn Resorts:

We would just like to say ditto, we support the bill.

Chair Miller:

Anyone else here in Carson City? I am not seeing anyone here in Carson or in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone lines?

Kimberly Fergus, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint). I echo what everybody else has said. However, to me, this bill makes a small but meaningful change extending the period of trespassing warning remaining valid from 24 months to 36 months and it is long overdue. Right now, under NRS 207.200, a property owner must reissue a trespass warning every two years just to protect their own land from repeat offenders. That is an unnecessary burden on landowners, business, and law enforcement. Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) simply gives property owners more time, three years instead of two, to act on prior violations without restarting the process. This matters especially in rural areas or in cases where individuals repeatedly test the boundaries of the law, knowing prior warnings expire too quickly. It also means law enforcement officers do not have to verify and reverify the timeline every two years to enforce an otherwise valid trespass. This saves time, money, and resources.

Let us be clear, this bill does not expand criminal penalties. It strengthens an existing law to better protect property owners and occupants who follow the rules, post proper signage, maintain fences, and issue lawful warnings. Nevada has seen rising issues in all unlawful entry, squatting, and property abuse. This bill gives landowners more certainty, and it tells would be trespassers that warnings carry weight. I urge you to pass S.B. 371 (R1) and stand with property rights, common sense, and law enforcement.

Chair Miller:

Next caller? [There was no one.] I see three individuals down in Las Vegas. Are you in opposition or support? Support. Then we will go back to Las Vegas for support testimony. Please proceed.

Virginia Valentine, President, Nevada Resort Association:

I am here to speak in support of S.B. 371 (R1). I would like to thank the bill sponsors, Senators Steinbeck and Doñate. As you heard from their presentations and Mr. Vassiliadis's, employee and guest safety are our top priority for us. We strive to create a safe environment for our team members and our guests. This bill is important to reduce recidivism by identifying and deterring employees' trespass for crimes against people and property. I do wish we had more data for you. The security chiefs and the properties see repeat trespassers. They have seen an increase. Unfortunately, we do not have data from the courts. We do have some data from Metro, and we look forward to providing you with that. This bill is important for reducing recidivism by identifying and deterring individuals who have trespassed for crimes against people and property.

Yesterday, the Economic Forum [World Economic Forum] forecasted challenges ahead for the state and the tourism industry. It is more important than ever that we have every possible tool to prevent repeat offenders from returning. This tool should help by identifying repeat offenders who move from property to property in between jurisdictions. That means in addition to deterring repeat offenders, we are training employees to identify and assist victims of human trafficking. We are working very hard to fulfill our commitment to the state and local governments in our partnership to complete the Campus for Hope, which will provide 900 beds for transitional housing of the unsheltered in southern Nevada. In closing, we support S.B. 371 (R1). It will help deter repeat offenders and assist in keeping destinations safe for employees and guests.

Jason Gray, Vice President, Government Affairs, MGM Resorts International:

I am here to testify in support of Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint). At MGM Resorts, our highest priority is the safety and security of our team members and guests. With approximately 45,000 team members based in Las Vegas who spend on average 25 to 30 percent of their daily lives with us, we are dedicated to creating an environment where everyone feels safe and protected. We are equally committed to providing a safe and enjoyable experience for all of our guests. Public safety at resort hotels and tourism assets is of existential importance to our destination and to the state. It is crucial that our visitors continue to view Las Vegas as welcoming and safe.

Relative to S.B. 371 (R1) specifically, as has been stated, we face ongoing challenges with repeat and, in some cases, habitual trespassers whose conduct over time can escalate in severity and consequence, underscoring the need for more effective measures to address and prevent unlawful behavior to ensure the safety of our team members and our guests.

Extending the look-back period to repeat trespassers not only enhances our ability to address security challenges more effectively but also provides our partners in the justice system with a longer window with which to assess patterns of behavior, which will substantively inform their decisions relative to charges, sentencing, and rehabilitation. Put simply, this helps everyone involved understand how long we have had issues with specific individuals, allowing for more informed decision-making relative to habitual offenders.

This bill will help create a safer environment for our team members, guests, and the broader community. We thank Senators Steinbeck and Doñate for their sponsorship, respectfully urge your support, and welcome and encourage continued dialogue and policy measures to improve public safety throughout our community, including in areas of highly critical economic activity.

Karlos R. LaSane II, Vice President, Government Relations, Caesars Entertainment:

It is always an honor and a privilege to have the opportunity to testify before the Legislature, particularly in support of the thousands of employees who work in the gaming and hospitality industry and the millions of guests who choose to come to Las Vegas, the entertainment capital of the world.

I am before you today to ask for your support for S.B. 371 (R1). Our employees should be able to work in an environment that is safe and not have to worry about being assaulted in a stairwell, or while cleaning a guest room, or having their tips stolen from them during the shift by habitual offenders. Our guests should not have to worry about their safety when visiting us. Simply put, crime is a significant issue on the Strip, at our surrounding resorts, and at our public buildings. We need to do all we can to protect our employees, our guests, our citizens; and our reputation is on the line.

Over the last few years, Caesars Entertainment has spent close to \$10 million at our properties to enhance security measures for the protection of team members, providing personal panic alarms, a shock detection system we share with the Metro Department and a facial recognition and weapon detection technology. The tourism industry is the financial lifeblood of Nevada. We need to do all we can to protect our citizens, employees, and our guests. I urge you to support S.B. 371 (R1), and a huge thank you to Senators Steinbeck and Doñate for their support.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else down in Las Vegas wishing to give support testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to opposition testimony beginning here in Carson City.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

In 2023, Las Vegas created a special court called the Strip Corridor Court [Resort Corridor Court] where, if any offense was committed on the Strip Corridor, it went in front of two judges. I practiced in that courtroom for over a year and that courtroom was dissolved in November of 2024. But that courtroom, along with a new crime called "violation of the order out," created a cycle of incarceration for mostly our unhoused population. What happened is people would be charged with mostly misdemeanor offenses like trespass. Then they would be ordered to stay out of the Strip for about six months. If they were found on the Strip, they would be charged with a new crime for a misdemeanor called "violation of the order out." But again, most people were unhoused.

As some of you may know, and if you do not know, we have a huge population of unhoused people in Las Vegas who live in the tunnels under the Strip. Those entrances to those tunnels are on the Strip. People were often found on the Strip and then brought into jail. Again, it created the cycle with people just being incarcerated for longer and longer and longer times. Because we also have no resources or treatment options for people, we created a cycle without giving people a way out. Two years for trespass is already a really long time. At this time, we simply cannot afford to make changes without research or evidence that will actually improve public safety and will only serve to incarcerate more people.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I am testifying in opposition to S.B. 371 (R1). During the presentation and the comments, we heard a lot about repeat offenders or habitual trespassers. I am concerned we do not have enough time with this 24-month rule to determine how many people are waiting the 24 months plus one day before they trespass. These repeat offenders or habitual trespassers are not waiting 24 months. They are already trespassing within that 24-month time. If they are arrested for trespass within that 24 months, their 24 months starts over again. It is not like they can have as many free trespasses in that 24 months. If they trespass after 6 months, the two years starts over again, and they have another 24 months to maintain off the property. For those reasons, we are in opposition.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in opposition here in Carson? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] I will open it up for neutral testimony beginning here in Carson City. [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will welcome the presenters back up for any final remarks.

Senator Steinbeck:

I would like to respond to some of the opposition. It was mentioned about the drainage channels that are underneath the Strip, and there are people who live under there. It is very sad. They live under there. They live throughout drainage channels throughout Clark County

and way too many of them. Unfortunately, I am familiar with every inch of those channels. You do not access those channels from the Strip property. That is not accurate. You access those from public areas off the Strip. They do go down into there, but they do not open up and onto the properties. There are some areas that are very close to the rear of one property in particular. But that is not accurate. It goes a long way up underneath this Strip corridor, which is all underground. I want to make sure it is understood. It is not like people have to access into the drainage channel and then they are on a Strip property, get a trespass warning, and then have to go back in there just to be covered from the sun or to be protected. Those are all quite a ways off all of our resorts.

I have rescued everybody underneath there from when the rain starts and had to pull them out many times. I have also gone under there when there are medical issues and, unfortunately, other crimes that have occurred.

Also, specifically over the last ten years, I have spent a huge amount of my time making sure our Resort Corridor was safe for our normal days and also for large events. That has been working closely with law enforcement and every other public agency and, of course, all of our resort properties. A continuous theme has been that it is the same people they have the same problems with all of the time, and that is their main safety concerns. Also, the issue is they escalate. We get to a point where it goes from minor offenses to escalating, and that is the properties and the security personnel, which is their concern. They want to keep the employees safe, they want to keep our visitors safe, and they want to make sure the people who mean them harm are kept away.

Now to Assemblymember La Rue Hatch and Assemblymember Roth, I do commit to try to come with some data if it exists. Again, most of what I know about this particular issue is testimony from the people who do the planning and provide the security and the law enforcement. I have asked Mr. Vassiliadis if he has anything else to close.

Nick Vassiliadis:

Chair, thank you for allowing us to present this bill. I think the only thing we would like to put on the record is, it is not the intent of the industry to just arrest and prosecute the unhoused. I believe last session the industry committed a substantial amount of private capital to build a state-of-the-art facility that would help the unhoused get into better situations and help break what situations they are in or even the cycle of addiction. I just want to make clear our intent here is not to just throw the unhoused in prison. Our intent here is to go after those repeat offenders and those habitual trespassers, when gone unchecked, it does escalate into more dangerous behavior for both employees and for guests.

Chair Miller:

I am requesting the data on these increased occurrences of people re-trespassing, whether it is the same person coming back over and over in the same building or going to different buildings. We heard in testimony of these increased occurrences and if there is any data to support that, even though it has not been the 24 months yet since the original bill was

enacted—what data or assumptions support that by increasing it another year, what results would occur. So as soon as you can, because as you know, Senator, we are on a time crunch at this point for committee passage. Please submit all of that data to the Committee.

Senator Steinbeck:

Absolutely, ma'am. That is our homework assignment. We are on it.

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and close the hearing for Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint). Next item on our agenda is public comment. Again, public comment is not to make any comment on any of the bills that were heard today, but for anything else that is under the purview of this Committee. I will invite anyone here in Carson City who would like to come forward and make public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to make public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] I will close public comment.

We have concluded our business for today. I will adjourn this meeting and see everyone back at 9 a.m. on Monday morning. We are adjourned [at 10:11 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Claudia Pierrott
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 202 (R1)	C	Andie Stephenson, President, Nevada Housing Advocacy Coalition	Letter in opposition
S.B. 202 (R1)	D	Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada	Letter in opposition