

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

**Eighty-Third Session
May 30, 2025**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 9:01 a.m. on Friday, May 30, 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 Zermeno Moore
Assemblymember Hanadi Nadeem
Assemblymember David Orentlicher
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fran Almaraz, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum
Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Susie Martinez, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO
John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Terri Laird, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada
Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Steven Cohen, Legislative Liaison, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services
Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community Engagement, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Max Gakh, Associate Professor, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Noehealani Antolin, Director, Grants and Research, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut
Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
Tatiana "Tia" Smith, Policy Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
John J. Piro, Assistant Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Denise Bolaños Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada
James E. Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections

Chair Miller:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we will have three bills we are hearing, as well as some items that will be work sessioned. We will begin with our work session. I will turn it over to our policy analyst to walk us through the work session items for this morning.

Senate Bill 35 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain offenses relating to prisoners. (BDR 16-444)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first bill on the work session today is Senate Bill 35 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions governing certain offenses relating to prisoners. This bill is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Attorney General [[Exhibit C](#)]. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 35 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 35 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER COLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any additional questions about the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign that phantom floor statement to Assemblymember Cole. I say "phantom" because again, we are not making floor statements, we are passing bills.

Senate Bill 62 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to crimes. (BDR 16-507)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 62 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions relating to crimes. This bill is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Attorney General [[Exhibit D](#)]. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 62 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 62 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NADEEM SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Nadeem.

Senate Bill 76 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to securities. (BDR 7-486)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 76 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions relating to securities. It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Secretary of State [[Exhibit E](#)]. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 76 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 76 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember González.

Senate Bill 263 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to pornography involving minors. (BDR 15-520)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 263 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to pornography involving minors. This bill is sponsored by Senators Cannizzaro, Pazina, Dondero Loop, Nguyen, and Doñate, and Assemblymembers Dalia, Hardy, Gray, Yeager, and Marzola [[Exhibit F](#)]. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 263 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 263 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MOORE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, any additional questions or comments?

Assemblymember Hansen:

I will be yes in Committee to get it out, but I am hoping maybe we could have a little work. I still have some concerns over section 1, subsection 2, dealing with 18 years and older. Yes in Committee and see how things go by floor.

Assemblymember Gray:

Ditto.

Chair Miller:

Anyone else? [There was no one.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Moore.

Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Department of Indigent Defense Services. (BDR 14-492)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to the Department of Indigent Defense Services. This bill is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary [[Exhibit G](#)]. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 407 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DALIA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

That concludes our work session for now.

We will move into our bill hearings. Our first bill today is Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint) on behalf of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum. This bill revises provisions governing crimes committed against older or vulnerable persons. I understand we have some copresenters here in Carson City as well as in Las Vegas. Please proceed.

Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing crimes committed against older or vulnerable persons. (BDR 15-342)

Fran Almaraz, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum:

Good morning, Chair Miller and Committee members.

Chair Miller:

Do you have an additional microphone because there is an echo?

Fran Almaraz:

I will start over. I represent Senate District 21 as a Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum member. I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to present Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint) on behalf of the Forum. Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint) increases protections for seniors and vulnerable individuals against financial and physical harm by deterring criminals from targeting them. Before I begin, I would like to introduce my copresenters. Sitting next to me is Ashlee Kalina, research analyst in the Research Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB); and joining me in Carson City is Julianne King, policy analyst with the Research Division of the LCB. Both have provided nonpartisan staffing services to the Forum over the past several years. Additionally, before I begin, I would like to point out one exhibit that was provided to the Committee and uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) [[Exhibit H](#)]. This is an informational memorandum about the Forum.

As a brief overview, the Forum was created in 1997 to identify and act upon issues of importance to aging persons. It is comprised of 21 members who must be 60 years of age or older, nominated by state senators, and appointed by the Legislative Commission. The Forum may submit one bill draft request to each regular legislative session.

In recent years we have seen a disturbing rise in elder abuse, both in the form of physical mistreatment and financial exploitation. Far too many seniors are victims of fraud, scams, theft, and even physical abuse. It is imperative we take action to protect them. According to Nevada crime statistics, as of November 2024, crimes against elderly people in Las Vegas alone were up more than 50 percent compared to 2023. During a February 2024 meeting of the Forum, representatives from the Office of the Attorney General's Bureau of Consumer

Protection provided an overview of the work and services accomplished by the Bureau, particularly its efforts to protect seniors from scams and fraud in our state. Alarming, they highlighted that Nevada ranks third in the nation for seniors becoming targets of fraud and scams. In 2023 alone, Nevada seniors lost over \$113 million because of fraud.

Several Forum members also expressed an interest in greater protections for the physical well-being of Nevada seniors. Specifically, they referenced news reports of seniors being severely injured during violent home invasions that took place in 2024 when individuals forcibly entered the homes of senior Nevada residents without consent.

The Forum held its final meeting and work session in August of 2024. Based on a recommendation from the Forum vice president, Dr. Marilyn Jordan, and me to address these threats, the Forum voted to request the drafting of S.B. 60 (R2). The intent is to prevent physical harm and reduce scams and fraud targeting Nevada's senior citizens by deterring such crimes committed against older adults and other vulnerable individuals through enhanced criminal penalties.

As S.B. 60 (R2) progressed through the Senate Committee on Judiciary, an amendment was made to the bill that removed certain provisions that would have expanded the list of crimes eligible for additional penalties when committed against older or vulnerable persons. Instead, the amendment expanded the list of crimes to include certain forms of theft. Subsequently, S.B. 60 (R2) was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, where the bill was further amended by applying the additional penalty to deceptive trade practices committed knowingly or intentionally against older or vulnerable adults.

This version before you today is the second reprint. With your permission, Chair Miller, I will briefly summarize the bill's key sections. Section 1 of this bill expands the list of crimes against an older or vulnerable person that require the imposition of an additional penalty to include certain forms of theft. Section 1 also applies to the additional penalty to a criminal deceptive trade practice pursuant to subsection 3 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* 598.0999 when committed knowingly or intentionally against an older or vulnerable person. Section 6 adds these forms of theft and deceptive trade practice crimes to the list of crimes for which a person is also liable for a civil penalty which may be recovered by the Attorney General.

In conclusion, by standing up for our senior citizens, we honor their contributions to our economy and society and reaffirm our commitment to a community that looks after its most vulnerable. Let us be the generation in Nevada that ensures our senior citizens are not only cared for, but respected, protected, and empowered to live their lives with dignity. Thank you for your time and consideration of S.B. 60 (R2). I am happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Assemblymember Nadeem:

What is the most committed crime against seniors as of now? Is it physical assault or money fraud? What is number one right now in Nevada? If you have any data, please.

Fran Almaraz:

I would like to allow Ms. King or the committee counsel an opportunity to provide a response.

Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel:

I think we would have to ask somebody who is in either the district attorney's office or law enforcement to answer that question. I am not sure.

Chair Miller:

I would also like to know if it is more physical crimes against the person, property, or with such an increase in phishing and everything else that goes on online, I guess that is definitely where—I see Lieutenant Walker shaking his head. Do you have anything to add?

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

In our experience, what we are seeing is more of the fraud-type crimes. Somebody gets an email that says, Hey, your Amazon's been hacked, your whatever has been hacked, please take these gift cards to the bitcoin ATM. In my memory, over a million dollars in those fraud-type crimes. You still have some of the violent crimes against the seniors, and that is more in a domestic incident, something like that, where that is an enhancement; you get a domestic violence call or something like that. But what we are seeing is more of the phishing, fraud, and bring-me-your-money type crimes. Again, that is only from Washoe County. I cannot speak for any of the other counties that are out there.

Assemblymember Roth:

Based on that, my question is in regards to the knowledge aspect, especially when we are talking about these kinds of phishing or things like that. Do we know, with those, if they are actually targeting seniors?

Julianne King, Senior Policy Analyst:

That was also a concern in the Senate Judiciary Committee, so language was added to the bill that someone must knowingly and intentionally commit a deceptive trade practice crime against an older or vulnerable person to address those concerns.

Assemblymember Roth:

That makes sense. Then what about in situations of petty theft? If we are talking about a 60-year-old, they may look younger than that, they may look older than that. At what point do we—how do we deal with that?

Karly O'Krent:

It looks like the bill distinguishes between crimes that are punishable as misdemeanors and crimes that are punishable as felonies. I think the same logic would apply with respect to the intent. It is just that the additional enhancement is equal to the amount of time if they are in jail, and it is a misdemeanor offense. Then there is a separate process and considerations if it is a felony offense.

Chair Miller:

I still have some questions about knowingly and intentionally because it is different depending on what the crime is. Our policy analyst also has some stats he pulled up for Nevada.

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Chair is correct. There is the Nevada crime statistics, nevadacrimestats.nv.gov. It does have statistics for the last couple of years for crimes against the elderly. This website tracks the abuse, neglect, exploitation, isolation, and the abandonment against persons 60 or older. For year 2025, it is tracking 3,211 cases, which is currently 68.55 percent lower compared to 2024. The type of offenses it is tracking, 86.3 percent of the offenses are abuse and 13.7 percent of the offenses are exploitation. Again, this is just for the calendar year 2025. It is just January, February, March, and April.

Chair Miller:

We are looking at abuse and exploitation. Would that support what Lieutenant Walker said about most of it is more domestic than—can you extrapolate that, or are there any additional details? Okay. We will go on to our next question from Assemblymember Cole.

Assemblymember Cole:

How often are these crimes being prosecuted now? Will this actually make it so they are prosecuted more? I feel, if they are not big crimes, people are busy, prosecutors are very busy, and they are prioritizing what they actually go after.

Julianne King:

I do not have the specifics of that information at the moment. I am happy to get that information to you after the hearing. I do have some information from the Federal Trade Commission: in the year 2023, there were 46,000 total reported frauds, and the median fraud loss was about \$649. However, I am not sure about the prosecution rate.

Chair Miller:

There is no doubt we have people in certain different groups become more vulnerable to certain offenses merely because they belong to certain groups. I have to say, this is a bill that personally, it is hard to refer to elderly when we are talking about the age 60. It is hard to refer to, what is the term I saw, vulnerable persons when we are referring to the age of 60.

I mean, there are many people in this room who are 60 or above. I see the hands going up. Again, if anyone wants to try to take down Lieutenant Walker because they think he is older and vulnerable, I mean, have at it. I would say that would be my first question. Again, we are trying to celebrate the fact we are living longer, staying stronger, and staying healthier as humans than we ever have. Where did the age 60 come from? Because many folks, 60 just is not the 60 that many of us grew up seeing. Sixty is, like I said, there are a lot of 60 in this room. Where did we get the age 60 from to decide? I guess I should ask the Silver Haired Forum. When we look at the Silver Haired Forum, we know you can be silver-haired at 27. What is the age for that Forum?

Fran Almaraz:

The guidelines for the Forum are you must be 60. Where we got the age of 60 for this bill, it came from the Attorney General's Office as what they consider an elderly person. I hope that answers your question.

Chair Miller:

It does. Most of us here just do not consider that elderly anymore. But I understand it is consistent and aligns with what is existing law. Then too, I am thinking of, again, different crimes; there are crimes where they are physical or violent crimes. I am taking away from domestic relationships, that is a whole different level of abuse. But let us just talk about strangers. If someone decides to rob you and making that decision, I will assume with people, some crimes are often out of opportunity, or someone appears more vulnerable. We have had a lot of questions this session about how we prove "knowingly and intentionally." So knowingly, we have 60-year-olds who appear much younger. We have younger people who appear much older. We just had a bill yesterday talking about age is not always just determined visually. Could you speak to that? How would this bill apply in those situations?

Julianne King:

I am not sure I am able to answer that question. I am not an attorney. I am wondering if maybe the committee counsel may have some thoughts on that, how that would be used.

Karly O'Krent:

Sure. Chair, would you mind repeating your question?

Chair Miller:

I guess the question is, an enhancement for attacking or robbing someone 60 years or older, again, this is nothing to do with domestic relationships. Let us just take the typical characterized crime of a person who is walking down the street and someone decides to rob them. The person who commits the offense may have done it out of opportunity. A lot of opportunities of vulnerability had nothing to do with their age or what they thought their age was because again, you cannot just look at a person and determine whether they are 60 or not. We have people who are 40 who look over 60. We have people who are 70 who look 50. How would this bill—I know obviously that would be a major part of the defense in the courtroom. But again, it is because we are looking at putting enhancements on something that is very subjective and may not have anything to do with the reason why the crime was committed.

Karly O'Krent:

I think the answer to your question is likely that the court would be in a position to decide whether or not the criteria for the enhancement have been met.

Chair Miller:

Okay, because enhancements, just like hate crimes, they are very difficult to prove.

Fran Almaraz:

I would like to give you an observation. Most of the Forum members are well past 60 and they have, in their communities, seen elderly people who are vulnerable. The lady might have her purse over her shoulder, walking in a parking lot. You can tell she is elderly, and someone runs by and grabs that bag. That is intentional. I think once the crime is in the courtroom, they will decide if it is indeed intentional. I do not know if that helps.

Chair Miller:

Yes, again there is no question about the vulnerability of older people, especially with a lot of the fraud and the online stuff. But again, it is the challenge to prove it because a lot of these phishing schemes are just sent out to everybody. I know many of us, in our personal lives, we are always trying to remind folks like someone just said, none of us paid our toll bridge fees this week. We have all gotten how many texts this week that say we did not pay our toll even though there are no tolls in Nevada. Any additional questions, members? [There were none.] I will go ahead and move on to testimony in support. We will begin with testimony in support of Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint) starting here in Carson City.

Susie Martinez, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO:

I just wanted to invite you guys, when I turned 50, I actually got my AARP magazine. That is what happens when you start getting a little older. We are here in full support of the bill. We have many union members who get to retire. One of the things we always advocate for them not only when they are in the workforce, but also when they finally get the chance to retire, we want them to be safe and enjoy their retirement. So that is why we are in full support of the bill.

Chair Miller:

Ms. Martinez, you remind me that a better question we should ask is, what is our oldest person who is in the Silver Haired Forum or even in your union? Do you know that one?

Susie Martinez:

I do not know, but we can get back to you.

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

We are in support of S.B. 60 (R2). Chair, I do apologize, I missed the bulk of the presentation, but I do want to try to answer at least a few questions with respect to Assemblymember Cole's question about how much we see this. In Clark County we do have two deputies whose job it is solely, along with a few other responsibilities, to handle these elder exploitation and elder abuse cases. I do not have the exact stats on me, but I can get those if you are interested. But we do have two full-time deputies.

Additionally with respect to theft, in Nevada, we are unique; we have both common law crimes of embezzlement, obtaining money under false pretenses, and larceny itself. But then we also have a comprehensive theft statute, which is essentially the exact same crimes rolled

up into comprehensive theft. What S.B. 60 (R2) does is allow us to seek an elder enhancement on the comprehensive theft offense because we can already do it on the common law offenses of embezzlement, obtaining money under false pretenses, and larceny. This just clarifies, yes, we can do it in both the common law offenses and the current comprehensive theft crimes.

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are supporting S.B. 60 (R2). By expanding this list and increasing penalties, I am hopeful this would be enough of a deterrent to prevent the continuance of these crimes from being committed against our senior citizens.

Chair Miller:

Anyone else here in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of S.B. 60 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is anyone on the phone lines?

Terri Laird, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada:

Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair Marzola, and Committee.

Chair Miller:

I am sorry, Ms. Laird. We are having trouble hearing you. There is a lot of noise in the Committee room right now. Could you please go ahead and restart.

Terri Laird:

We have nearly 7,000 members statewide in 17 chapters. I would say the bulk of our members are 70-plus, several are in the mid- to late-80s. Some are nearing 90. I do know of several who are victimized by a phishing scam online. Many are widowed, living alone, and whenever the phone rings, they are quick to answer in the hope of having someone to talk to. This leaves them very vulnerable to being taken advantage of. If crimes against seniors were treated more seriously, maybe the criminals and scammers would stop. I myself turned 69 this month and also have silver hair, but like many, I do not consider myself elderly. However, I am computer savvy and of the opinion I do not trust anyone, especially when phone calls come into my cell phone. I never answer them. We do support this Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint) and would like to ditto comments from Fran Almaraz, President of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum, today, as well as her comments posted online on NELIS.

Chair Miller:

Next caller, please. [There was no one.] Then I will open it up for opposition testimony here in Carson City.

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

Our only opposition today is with the intentionally and knowingly aspect. The way I am reading this second reprint, is the intentionally knowingly is only applying to the deceptive trade practices and not the theft. Our suggestion would be the intentionally knowingly also for the theft because there are instances where you might not know the person is over the age of 60. You are running by, you take their cell phone, and you go. Should not happen, but it does. If you are targeting them specifically, absolutely get the enhancement. But I think you need to have the knowingly and intentionally apply to the theft.

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

We read this the same way. I think if you are talking about an enhancement, that is 1 to 20 years. We need to have that knowingly and intentionally element on there.

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I ditto the previous comments. I personally know of people who have been victimized who are over the age of 60. They did not look at all their age and the defendant had no idea at the time either. You have heard of Ms. Annemarie Grant has called in; I met her a few years ago and she is pushing 45, and to look at her, you would think she was barely 30, just to give you an idea.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone there in Las Vegas in opposition? [There was no one.] Is anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will open it up for neutral testimony. I am not seeing anyone here or in Las Vegas. Is anyone on the phone lines?

Steven Cohen, Legislative Liaison, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am testifying in neutral this morning because of the definition of vulnerable person appearing to not be in there at all unless it is referenced somewhere that I am not reading; also, because I would love to see people with disabilities classified in there, albeit probably not till next session at this point, but I am happy to work with the stakeholders on that.

Chair Miller:

Next caller? [There was no one.] Then I will go ahead and welcome the bill presenters back up for any final remarks.

Julianne King:

I believe President Almaraz has had to leave, but I wanted to thank the Committee for its time today. Also put on the record, that as nonpartisan staff, I cannot advocate for or against any measure, including S.B. 60 (R2).

Chair Miller:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 60 (2nd Reprint). Next, I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to public safety. Whenever you are ready, your hearing is open, please proceed.

Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 43-490)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

I am happy to be here talking to you this morning about Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint) along with my friend Leo Benavides from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint) extends a study program we started two years ago between law enforcement agencies in the state of Nevada and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas to understand traffic stops and gather data about enforcement of traffic law. The study has been going, I would say, well, for two years. Law enforcement agencies have been collecting data when they stop people for traffic violations. They have been sending that data to the UNLV medical school [Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine] in order to analyze it so we can make better-informed policy decisions.

At this point in time, the program has been running for over a year. We have almost two years' worth of data. The UNLV medical school are serious professional scientists who are unable to draw conclusions with only two years of data. It is kind of like if we are trying to do a survey of Nevadans and we only picked 100; that would not be a representative sample. Having just two years of data is not enough for the UNLV School of Medicine to make reasonable inferences about any patterns that may or may not be emerging from the data they are collecting. So S.B. 85 (R1) proposes extending this study, and UNLV estimates they will probably need between one and two years' more data in order to be able to draw statistically significant conclusions from any patterns. The purpose of doing all of this is so we can better enforce our traffic laws and prevent fatalities in traffic and increase public safety.

The types of questions we are trying to answer with this are, where are the most fatalities happening? Where is the most enforcement happening? Are those two places the same? Are there places that we are missing? Are there types of enforcement that seem to be underutilized, overutilized, leading to decreases in traffic accidents and fatalities, having no effect on traffic accidents and fatalities—so when we come back to the Legislature and continue to work on traffic safety laws and bills, we can make informed decisions about which policies we should be continuing to develop, which ones might not be effective anymore or effective at all. By passing S.B. 85 (R1), we will be continuing that program, allowing the law enforcement agencies to continue providing data in the same way they have for about the last two years for one to three more years in order for them to be able to make statistically significant inferences about the trends and patterns in traffic stop data. I would like to turn it over to Mr. Benavides very briefly to provide some additional information.

**Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community Engagement,
Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada,
Las Vegas:**

We also have on Zoom available for any questions and answers from our stop team, Dr. Max Gakh. We are here and ready to answer any questions you might have on this.

Assemblymember Yurek:

It sounds like from what you just offered is, we are just short on data; we need a little bit more. The concern, by the way, I think in talking to some of the other stakeholders of the law enforcement agencies, they are talking about some logistical challenges with the Brazos system, and getting this data is proving to be a little bit more difficult than I think people would like. With the idea that it would only be another couple years of data, the bill right now suggests just ending it and keeping it in perpetuity. That I think is causing some consternation, not for fear of the actual results of the data, but the logistical challenges. My question is, would you be amenable to an amendment that might give it another two years and then have it sunset, or working with those stakeholders to get you the data you need without creating this long-term problem?

Leonardo Benavides:

Yes, we have spoken with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department previously on requiring or at least extending for the biennium. I think that would make sense if that were the case; we do need at least another two years of data in order to make sure we have those significant statistics.

Chair Miller:

I would like to mention this is a Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary bill. Senator Scheible and I chaired both houses. This was flushed out, had a lot of discussion and opportunity during the interim. That is where the bill came from.

Assemblymember Nadeem:

Thank you for bringing such an important topic. This is very important that we need to know what the reason is. My question is the data we have right now for two years, what are any results coming out from there? Is there any rough draft or some information? I would love to know more about that.

Leonardo Benavides:

I will direct this to Dr. Gakh over Zoom.

**Max Gakh, Associate Professor, School of Public Health, University of Nevada,
Las Vegas:**

Great question. We have currently produced two annual reports, and they are available on our project website, publicly available. We have in those reports high-level, descriptive information. But what is really difficult to do without more data is anything that involves statistical analysis that would be more complex or sophisticated. But we do have the two reports already online that have descriptive information in them.

Chair Miller:

I am not seeing any additional questions. I will go ahead and open it up for support of Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint) beginning here in Carson City. [There was no one.] I do see someone there in Las Vegas. Please proceed with your support testimony.

Noehealani Antolin, Director, Grants and Research, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am here in support of S.B. 85 (R1). I am a member of the Nevada Statistical Transparency of Policing project team. Through this grant-funded initiative, UNLV partners with the Nevada Department of Public Safety's Office of Traffic Safety to analyze traffic stop data across the state. We use this data to identify patterns, support enforcement strategies, and reduce serious fatal crashes on Nevada's roads. Data-driven enforcement improves transparency, accountability, and public safety. Over the past three years, our team produced two reports, providing a baseline overview of traffic stop data. We are now working on our third report, along with a public-facing dashboard, to make the data accessible.

Our team has conducted extensive research and collaborated with others doing similar work. One key insight is multiple years of consistent data are essential to uncover meaningful patterns through advanced statistical analysis. Long-term data collection enables nuanced findings that strengthen enforcement and reduce citations, crashes, injuries, and deaths. This project relies on traffic stop data collected by Nevada law enforcement officers as required under state statute. These requirements were designed to be efficient with minimal reporting burden and were supported through electronic data systems to streamline processes and enhance roadway safety. However, these requirements expire at the end of 2025. Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint) removes that sunset provision to ensure traffic stop data collection continues. With that, extending data collection is necessary for ongoing, high-quality analysis and to inform evidence-based policy. Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of S.B. 85 (R1).

Chair Miller:

I am not seeing anyone else there in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will open it up for opposition testimony beginning here in Carson City.

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

Up to the date, last-minute texts regarding—and it was brought out in presentation—the first reprint as drafted has no end date. It sounds as if the presentation wants to just go an additional two years to get that information we are looking to hit. In conversation with my other law enforcement partners, we are amenable to that, but just for the rules of the Committee, soft opposition as of right now and willing to work with the bill sponsors to get that amendment out there and agreed upon.

Chair Miller:

Just so you know, we are the bill sponsors.

Jason Walker:

Yes ma'am, just wanted to get that out there. We would like to get two years-plus amended into that.

Chair Miller:

Anyone else? I am not seeing anyone else here in Carson City. Is there anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will open it up for testimony in neutral. Anyone here in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will welcome the bill presenters back up for any final remarks. [Final remarks were waived.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint).

Next on the agenda is Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to offenders. I see you have a copresenter on Zoom. Your bill hearing is open. Please proceed when you are ready.

Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to offenders. (BDR 16-709)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

I am thrilled to be here presenting Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint). It is an absolutely fantastic bill with only an even more fantastic story behind it. My copresenter, Max Grinstein, was a youth legislator during the 2023 Session when we implemented this pilot program. He has agreed to come back and help me with this bill even though he is now in college at Yale, incredibly busy, and he gets no class credit or any pay for this. But he has been just a tremendous advocate and I could not possibly speak to the bill better than he can. I will turn it over to Mr. Grinstein now.

Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut:

I am a former Nevada youth legislator and a graduate of the Davidson Academy in Reno. While I am in Connecticut for college, I appreciate the opportunity to present this morning virtually. Given the end of the session is rapidly approaching, I will keep my remarks today short. At the same time, I think it is valuable to provide an overview of how S.B. 323 (R1) found its way to this Committee. Two years ago, Senator Scheible and I drafted Senate Bill 234 of the 82nd Session to create a pilot program to provide free, daily, 15-minute phone calls to the inmates at Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center, allowing them to stay in touch with their families on the outside [[Exhibit I](#)]. While Senate Bill 234 of the 82nd Session passed both chambers unanimously and was signed into law by Governor Lombardo in 2023, the pilot program that it created has since run its course. So, I am back this session with a simple ask for the Legislature to extend a program that has kept hundreds of Nevada families together over the past two years. The statistics about the thousands of free phone calls that have been placed through the pilot program are impressive in their own right. But more persuasive than that are the voices of Nevadans who have benefited from S.B. 234 of the 82nd Session. In fact, we have received several letters from incarcerated Nevadans who have been able to foster renewed relationships with their children because of the program.

I want to share excerpts from two of the letters that have been most meaningful to me. One woman at Florence McClure wrote, when she first called her 3-year-old daughter after the pilot program was enacted [[Exhibit J](#)], she asked her daughter if she knew whom she was talking to. Her daughter's response, No. Her daughter lit up when learning she was speaking to her incarcerated mother, exclaiming over the phone, Wait, you are my mom. Now, because of the free phone calls provided by the pilot program, this woman writes that she has been able "to have consistent, daily communication with my 3-year-old daughter so she can get to know her mommy even though I am unable to be there."

Another woman incarcerated at Florence McClure wrote to us in the summer of 2023 shortly after Governor Lombardo signed S.B. 234 of the 82nd Session into law [[Exhibit K](#)]. "I feel lost and alone without my family," she wrote. "My small tribe is the pulse in my heart, but it is a faint pulse since I cannot even contact them . . . My family who are financially crippled, cannot afford phone time," she continued. "However, in the past three days, I have talked to them every day." Her letter ended with one final ask, "Please turn this pilot program into a permanent practice, please, and thank you. God Bless."

So, echoing that woman's words, I, along with Senator Scheible and the rest of S.B. 323 (R1) sponsors and cosponsors, would like to ask the Committee to not let a program that has benefited so many Nevada families die.

Pursuant to the original language of S.B. 234 of the 82nd Session, the Department of Corrections completed a report evaluating the successes of the pilot program. That report, released in February 2024, blew me and Senator Scheible away. According to the Department of Corrections, 93,394 free calls were placed in total at Florence McClure between July 2023 and January 2024. The total number of calls, both free and billable, during the pilot period increased communication with family and friends by 23 percent. Perhaps most importantly, the report found the population in general felt happier, less stressed, and had a greater sense of well-being. "Having daily interaction with loved ones," the report goes on to state, "improved daily functioning quality of life and stability for everyone at Florence McClure."

I should also add that the Director of the Department of Corrections, James Dzurenda, testified about S.B. 323 (R1) a few weeks ago before the Senate Finance Committee. He noted the pilot program from last session had actually led to a reduction in violence at Florence McClure. "When you have something that means this much to those offenders, they take it more serious," he said. "You start seeing reductions in violence and reductions in incidents so they do not lose their phone calls."

I appreciate this bill requires an appropriation of approximately \$250,000 a year from the State General Fund. I know, especially in this session, there are constraints on the State's limited budget. At the same time, I want to draw the Committee's attention to something Senator Titus said when she very graciously rose to support this bill on the Senate floor on Monday. She said S.B. 323 (R1) is a, quote, "small investment compared to the social improvement it generates. As the strong fiscal conservative that I am," she continued,

"I believe in this bill. It has made a difference." Needless to say, I very much appreciate Senator Titus's viewpoint on this bill. The bill has a cost, but it will save the state more costs in the long run—savings from avoiding recidivism, savings from deterring children with incarcerated parents from becoming offenders themselves, and savings associated with improved behavior in prison. Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint) passed unanimously in the Senate, and joining your Senate colleagues and supporting this bill, the Assembly would be promoting an affordable, accessible, and fiscally responsible policy, not to mention enabling Nevada children to hear their own parents' voices. I am happy to answer any questions the Committee might have.

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

Chair Miller:

Thank you so much for your well-developed presentation. Although I will say we are much more focused on—especially if you are a parent or a child or both who have experienced being separated from your parent at any point for any reason in your life, or separated from your child at any point for any reason in your life, we know the utmost importance of being able to be connected and communicated. But we appreciate your details, your data, research, and well-developed presentation as well. We will start questions from members.

Assemblymember Yurek:

I would like to echo the Chair's comments about a very great presentation. As I have been here, we hear a lot about studies. I do not often—probably because I am still new—hear the results of these studies, and how well this went is really encouraging. I am going to confess; I am fully supportive of the policy aim of this bill. But I do have kind of a nuanced question, and at the risk of being Toby downer here, regarding the scope of the bill, a potential challenge with equal protection. I am sure you have probably thought that through, but because on its face, this is kind of gender-based towards resources directed towards a women's correctional facility, it is likely to face some intermediate scrutiny. I am just curious, how have you addressed that or how might that concern, or a claim of an equal protection violation, be addressed?

Senator Scheible:

Mr. Grinstein can answer this question.

Max Grinstein:

This is actually something we have discussed extensively. I am glad you have brought it up in this setting. I have prepared, actually, a memo for the Office of the Governor that Senator Scheible and I submitted. I am happy to submit it for your review and for the Committee's review after this meeting.

I think, just generally, S.B. 323 (R1) passes the intermediate scrutiny test for two main reasons. The first is that ostensibly, the bill is completely gender-neutral; there is no language in the bill that has anything to do with classifying inmates based on their gender. If you read the bill, the only language that is classifying inmates is based on institution and that

institution is ostensibly, like I said, gender-neutral. It just so happens Florence McClure is Nevada's main women's correctional center. But the bill does not include language that classifies inmates based on gender.

Just for some historical overview about why that is the case, why this bill is specifically focused on female offenders at Florence McClure, Senator Scheible mentioned this bill started in a different form: S.B. 234 in the 82nd Legislative Session in 2023. Originally we wanted to draft a bill back in 2023 that would provide free phone calls between children and their incarcerated parents. But we spoke with Director Dzurenda, we spoke with the Department of Corrections, and we realized for a number of reasons that would not be possible. One of the big reasons the Department raised is the state does not have the phone call infrastructure at every facility to be able to support an increased volume of calls from offering free calls. We settled, as sort of an intermediary solution until that infrastructure can be installed and until offenders have tablets, to limit the scope of the program to Florence McClure. I think that is sort of the first equal protection response that the bill is completely neutral. We are just classifying inmates based on institution, not gender.

The second way I would address this question is there is an existing disparity in the programming that is offered between men's facilities and women's facilities in Nevada. Last week I dug up the data and I am happy to share with you after in the memo. There are really an extensive number of programs that male offenders have access to that female offenders do not, which itself is an equal protection problem that this bill sort of seeks to rectify. I hope that answers sort of the gist of what you were asking.

Assemblymember Yurek:

I really appreciate that thoughtful analysis. If you can send me that, I would be really grateful because I have even thought through some ways to help keep this and address that concern, if I have concerns with that data.

Chair Miller:

Assemblymember Yurek, I am happy to accept an amendment to include all male prisons as well if the funding was there, because we know a parent and child are so important. I do not see any additional questions at this point. I will open it up for testimony in support beginning here in Carson City for Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint).

Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:

I have been working with Max over the past two sessions, which has been one of the absolute highlights of the last two sessions. He is an amazing individual and has put together a program that is wildly successful, reducing the cost of phone calls, making them free. Allowing people to talk to their kids has had an extremely positive impact. It is a program that we need to keep. I will echo his comments. We often do institutional-specific programming; certain things get offered at one facility that are not offered at others. There are also women held outside of this facility; Jean Conservation Camp, Casa Grande Transitional Housing, and they are not eligible for these free phone calls. So just like if we

have a trucking training at one facility and not in any of the others, this would be a program that we are offering at one single institution, so we do think it passes muster there. But anything we can do to keep this amazing program would be fantastic.

Tatiana "Tia" Smith, Policy Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

We are very excited about this bill. We are in full support, and we urge the Committee to support it as well.

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

We fully support S.B. 323 (R1). We believe this will be an important step to help prevent recidivism when someone is released from incarceration. We have heard throughout this whole session how important family support is when you are released. We believe it provides stability, emotional strength, and accountability. You want to prove to your family that you are a better person, and you want that better life. This is just one step to get you there.

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

I would like to thank Chair Scheible and Max for bringing this bill forward. Last session, we were incredibly impressed with Max. He went through the Nevada Youth Legislature process, did not get his bill selected, and still brought this bill last session, presented it to this body, got it approved, and now we see the results that it is working. I am grateful for them bringing it back. Max is an amazing representative of Nevada. We hope he comes back to the state after Yale. If he ever decides to be a lawyer, the public defender's office would definitely hire him.

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am with Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent, and we would like to thank the presenters. This is a wonderful bill, and we ask that you continue funding this bill. Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint) reduces emotional strain. Many incarcerated women experience isolation. Regular communications with their loved ones can and does provide emotional support and stability. Family ties during incarceration can and does improve mental health and is instrumental in reducing recidivism rate. Well done to the presenters.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] I do not see anyone in Las Vegas. Is anyone on the phone lines? [There were technical difficulties.] If they are able to tap in at some point while we are still in testimony, I will accept their testimony. I will go ahead and move to opposition testimony. I am not seeing anyone here in Carson City or Las Vegas. Is anyone on the phone lines?

Denise Bolaños Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada:

My testimony is actually in support, but I was unable to connect just now. Thank you, Chair Miller, for still accepting my testimony. We are in support of S.B. 323 (R1). Family connection is essential for a successful rehabilitation and reintegration. Half of incarcerated

people are parents of minor children, and for many, this single phone call is their only link to their families. This bill is an important step towards a system that values people over profit. We urge you to pass S.B. 323 (R1). We thank Max and the bill sponsors for championing this call.

Chair Miller:

Again, that was our support testimony. We are still in opposition. I will accept any phone calls in opposition to Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint). [There were none.] Then I will open it up for neutral testimony.

James E. Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections:

When you look at the mission for the Nevada Department of Corrections, providing tools for the offenders so they succeed in the community once they are released, the reason for that is because of the recidivism rates. Most—I would say probably all—of the country's prisons and jails get most of their evidence-based programming from what is called the National Institute of Corrections. National Institute of Corrections does the studies that provide the best and the most successful evidence-based programming so that states can refocus their programming to areas where you can make the best bang for the buck, for the money, because you will get the most results out of what you are doing. They identified family reunification, family support, and community support as one of their top ten categories of making offenders more successful when they get back out into the community. That is all I have.

Chair Miller:

Director, I ran a prisoner reentry program years ago before coming to Nevada. Family reunification was a major component of that program. I am so glad we do not have to have family reunification if we never have family disconnection. I am so glad we are at this point where we are trying to keep families together, connected. That means my question is, this is not a finance committee, this is not a money committee. I am assuming it got out because it is here. But my question would be, are there ways the Department could, if there was not as much funding available or needed, or if at some point during the biennium something happened with the funding, do you feel this bill offers flexibility to still—it may not be daily but—to offer some flexibility to where the Department would still be able to work within the financial means to still make something happen from a program point of view?

James Dzurenda:

There are two pieces I think would be able to work in this. When you talk about finances, we talk about revenues. Revenues that come into the Department of Corrections through the tablet program will exceed more than what is actually needed in an offender store fund or an Inmate Welfare Account. The Inmate Welfare Account pays for the staffing that is still left, not part of the General Fund. It pays for programs, equipment, basketball equipment, that type of stuff for the offenders. So, everybody can benefit from it. There will be more than what is necessary or needed. There are ways you can identify the revenues that come in for that to pay for certain things like this. But it probably will not be as large of a scope as doing the whole state. But it could actually be narrowed down to be immediate family or identified

certain specific individuals that can prove certain categories that we would want to have approved to bring the cost down. There is that way. But also, there are grants. Grants go towards funding for programs. This is actually, even though it does not look like it, this is a program for reentry. There are ways we can get certain grants that we can focus on for this purpose as well.

Chair Miller:

Additionally, it reminds me, sometimes we have women—hearing the story about the little girl—sometimes it is not kids. We have women who literally birth babies and then have to surrender those babies. In those cases, I know that obviously there are strict guidelines around who—ensuring this is a family member in those instances where it is my infant or someone who is not able to actually talk on the phone with me, could be even a child with special needs. That child is not able to actually maybe necessarily communicate back to me. I know they hear mothers, but they may not be able to verbally communicate back. Is this program, does it enable the caretaker, the guardian, the whoever has custody and is taking care of that child, to speak to the mother?

James Dzurenda:

Yes, but there is an issue we have to look at to make sure they are not codefendants in cases. We are making sure they are not victims of the crime. That has to happen first because it does happen between family members with domestic violence. But also, what was not brought into this, too, is we are offering now video visiting through those tablets as well. A lot of the communication is not just going to be verbally. It will be through—because somehow I have family members who are not even in this country, but it will actually connect through a video as well.

Chair Miller:

I will go ahead and open up the telephone lines for testimony in neutral. [There was none.] Then I will close testimony and welcome the bill presenters back for any additional comments.

Senator Scheible:

Thank you so much for hearing this bill this morning. I will turn it over to Mr. Grinstein for any closing remarks. Also, we are happy to answer any questions that may have come up during the testimony.

Max Grinstein:

I will just ditto what Senator Scheible and the people who testified noted. I will say I am happy to answer any questions the Committee might have before the end of the session. I will share that memo we discussed with the Committee.

Chair Miller:

Excellent. Thank you so much, Mr. Grinstein. I am going to ask you to stay on Zoom right now. I am going to go ahead and close the hearing on Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint). We are going to go ahead and move into a work session. The Speaker has given us permission to waive Assembly Standing Rule No. 57, section 4, which is our 24-hour rule. We are able to immediately work session a bill.

Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to offenders. (BDR 16-709)

Chair Miller:

I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 323 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 323 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion or questions?

Assemblymember Yurek:

As indicated by my question in the hearing, I will vote yes to get this out of Committee but want a chance to review the material the presenter will send to me. I will reserve my final vote for the floor.

Chair Miller:

Any other discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember La Rue Hatch.

Mr. Grinstein, your bill is headed to the floor. Thank you so much, and we wish you the best and hope to see you again. Mr. Piro has a job for you when you get back.

We are going to go into public comment now. Anyone here in Carson City wishing to make public comment?

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I know it is the end of the legislative session and I just want to say thank you very much for your hard work.

Chair Miller:

Thank you so much for your activism and participation in the process. I am not seeing anyone in Las Vegas. Is anyone on the phone lines? [There was no one.] Then I will go ahead and close public comment.

Just to give members an idea what is happening today, I am going to recess today. We are not coming back into Committee, most likely. I mean there is no hundred percent ever, especially, but my plan is not to come back into Committee. I am just waiting to possibly work session another bill today, but we could do that behind the bar. So that is why I am just going to recess. We have done public comment. We could work session that last bill behind the bar and then I will adjourn from the floor. We are in recess [at 10:31 a.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 11:41 a.m. behind the bar of the Assembly.]

Chair Miller:

I am going to return our meeting back to order for the reason to work session Senate Bill 275 (1st Reprint). I will give you a few moments to read, even though we heard this bill yesterday. I know this is the first you see the work session document. Now that we all have had a few moments to read it, I will turn it over to our policy analyst to open up the work session to Senate Bill 275 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 275 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to domestic relations. (BDR 11-541)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 275 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to domestic relations. It is sponsored by Senator Cannizzaro [[Exhibit M](#)]. There are no amendments.

Chair Miller:

Members, any questions, concerns, or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 275 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 275 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any additional comments or questions? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hansen. That concludes our work session. I will close the work session.

[The meeting adjourned behind the bar of the Assembly at 11:43 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. 35 (R1)	C	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 62 (R2)	D	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 76 (R2)	E	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 263 (R1)	F	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 407 (R1)	G	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 60 (R2)	H	Julianne King, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Memorandum outlining the makeup and mission of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum
S.B. 323 (R1)	I	Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut	Document titled "Nevada Department of Corrections Report on Free Phone Call Pilot Program at Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center, February 2024"
S.B. 323 (R1)	J	Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut	Document titled "Nevada Department of Corrections Offender Services Voluntary Questionnaire Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center Free Phone Call Program"

S.B. 323 (R1)	K	Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut	A letter to Jodi Hocking and the Return Strong! team, dated July 4, 2023, signed by Autumn Murry
S.B. 323 (R1)	L	Max Grinstein, Private Citizen, New Haven, Connecticut	Document titled "Supplemental Resource List"
S.B. 275 (R1)	M	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document