MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-Third Session
February 18, 2025

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 8:01 a.m. on Tuesday, February 18, 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:

Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel
Aaron Klatt, Committee Manager

Nicholas Fischer, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patrick Conmay, Colonel and Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Nathan Peterson, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Martin A. Mleczko, Lieutenant Colonel, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson
John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Dan Gordon, President, Nevada Police Union
Jeffrey S. Rogan, representing Clark County
John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Harrison Porter, Lieutenant, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Tessa Laxalt Robinson, Director of Government Affairs, Nevada Trucking Association
Ryan Beaman, representing Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada Local 1908
Isaiah Berke, Legislative Intern, representing Nevada State Tow Association
Arlene Felix, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Anne Carpenter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender’s Office
Angela Knott, Government Affairs Liaison and Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender’s Office
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts
Amy E. Davey, Administrator and Highway Safety Director, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety
Laura D. Knight, M.D., Chief Medical Examiner and Coroner, Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner’s Office
Melanie Rouse, Coroner and Director, Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner
Jan Brooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Andrea Raney, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jennifer P. Noble, representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Adrian Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Chair Miller:
[Roll was called. Committee protocol was explained.] We have three bills that we will hear today. There are some proposed amendments, members, if you are looking those up. We will take today's agenda in order. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 54.

Assembly Bill 54: Revises penalties for failing to take certain precautions when approaching a traffic incident. (BDR 43-244)

Patrick Conmay, Colonel and Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:
Good morning, Chair and members of the Committee. Joining me is Lieutenant Colonel Martin Mleczko, along with Captain Nathan Peterson. We are also supported by key members of our leadership team both here and online in Las Vegas, ready to assist with any questions. Today, we present Assembly Bill 54, a promise to protect those who protect us. Assembly Bill 54 stands as a commitment to ensure that negligence on our roads has meaningful consequences. I will now turn this over to Captain Peterson to make the presentation.

Nathan Peterson, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:
I am going to do my best to keep this to about six minutes. I appreciate the opportunity to be here to present this today. Today we stand together to address a life-or-death issue, the safety of our responders and roadside workers on Nevada's roads. Assembly Bill 54 is more than a bill; it is a commitment to those who serve. Today it stands in honor of Nevada Highway Patrol Sergeant Michael Abbate and Trooper Alberto Felix, who tragically lost their lives after being struck while working roadside during a traffic incident. Their sacrifice—along with those of countless other first responders and roadside workers—reminds us of a hard truth: we can and must do better. Today we take a stand to protect those who protect us. This presentation will serve as your road map to A.B. 54, its necessity, its purpose, and its impact. We will cover A.B. 54 language and definitions, Nevada's roadside safety issues, the reasons behind the bill, and the proposed legislative changes [page 2, Exhibit C]. We will conclude with references and supporting data and demonstrate why A.B. 54 is essential and how it will save lives.

In A.B. 54, the term "traffic incident" refers to any vehicle, person, condition, or hazard on or near a roadway that poses a danger. It also includes individuals responding to such hazards, such as a first responder [page 3]. The bill defines "first responder" to include individuals responding to traffic incidents such as those involving stopped emergency vehicles with flashing lights, tow trucks with amber warning lights, and public utility or Department of Transportation vehicles.

Every day, responders face extreme risk while roadside and attending to traffic incidents [page 4]. In 2023 alone, 46 first responders nationwide were struck and killed by vehicle incidents, including 18 law enforcement officers, 20 tow truck operators, and 8 fire and medical personnel. Nevada's "Move Over" law is clear: drivers must slow down and move over when approaching an emergency scene or roadside workers. It is not a suggestion; it is

the law. Yet drivers continue to ignore the law, and the consequences are often deadly. When a driver fails to move over, and that violation results in the death or serious injury of a responder, the outcome is catastrophic. However, current penalties fail to reflect the behavior and the severity of the harm caused. This is not about intent, it is about responsibility, and the Move Over law sets a clear legal requirement. When a driver violates that duty and someone is killed or injured, accountability must follow. This is not just about Sergeant Abbate and Trooper Felix, it is about protecting every responder, tow operator, paramedic, firefighter, and highway worker who risk their lives on our roads.

Under Nevada's current law, drivers approaching a traffic incident are required to do the following: reduce their speed to a reasonable and proper level, proceed with caution, and be prepared to stop; and avoid the adjacent lane unless unsafe to do so [page 5]. This is a law that is simple and clear, but compliance remains dangerously low. Assembly Bill 54 makes one critical update: if a driver fails to move over and their actions cause the death or serious injury of a responder, they will face a category B felony. Why is this a necessary enhancement? Well, A.B. 54 is not a new law. It is an update to ensure that the penalty reflects the harm caused when a driver disregards their legal duty.

Assembly Bill 54 is about negligence. It applies when a driver's careless violation of the Move Over law results in death or serious injury. It targets behavior that awareness campaigns alone have failed to change. Without stronger penalties and better awareness, the cycle of tragedy will continue. Assembly Bill 54 ensures that Nevada law deters negligence. It promotes accountability and specifically protects those who serve and protect us. When a life is lost due to a failure to follow the law, consequences must reflect the loss.

Under A.B. 54, the Move Over law will be strengthened by amending *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 484B.607 to include increased penalties for violations that result in severe injury or death of a first responder, reclassification of the offense from a misdemeanor to a category B felony, and mandatory sentencing guidelines which include 1 to 6 years of imprisonment and fines between $2,000 and $5,000 [page 6]. This enhancement is specific. It applies only to violations of the Move Over law. It holds drivers accountable when their negligence causes catastrophic harm. Assembly Bill 54 sends a clear message that failing to move over is not a minor offense; it is a dangerous and deadly one.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Move Over laws exist in all 50 states [page 7]. Yet, first responder fatalities and struck-by incidents are rising nationwide. This includes a tragic incident that took place yesterday involving a Nebraska state trooper. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, there were approximately 16,800 roadside injuries reported due to struck-by incidents in 2023 alone. The Move Over law remains one of the most ignored traffic laws. This is more than a Nevada issue. It is a national crisis, and A.B. 54 aligns Nevada with proven measures that save lives.

First responders risk their lives on Nevada's roadways every day. Assembly Bill 54 is about more than penalties. It is about prevention through accountability. By enacting A.B. 54, we

will protect those who serve, increase public awareness, and prevent unnecessary deaths. Again, this is not just about Sergeant Abbate and Trooper Felix, it is about every first responder who stands on our roads to protect and serve the public. The time for action is now. We urge you to vote in favor of A.B. 54 because waiting until another responder is struck and killed is not an option. Thank you for this opportunity. I will turn the presentation back to Colonel Conmay.

Patrick Conmay:
We thank you for your time, energy, and support. Chair, on this slide [page 9] you will find my contact information and a few of the names of those who made this presentation possible. Should the Committee need anything at all, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Chair Miller:
We will begin our questions with Assemblymember Gray.

Assemblymember Gray:
A lot of times on accidents, you will get a lot of first responders stop who are off duty. Would it be your intent—and also—could this law be applied to those guys as well? You get a lot of lookie-loos who could easily take somebody out in that situation also. I am sure it does, but I would like to make sure that this applies even to them. As soon as that accident happens, that scene should be protected.

Patrick Conmay:
I believe our intent is to ensure that when there is an incident, this Move Over law applies. Now, if there is a bunch of people standing in the roadway, we have to have some reasonable, rational discussion about what applies and who is at fault. Those are all things that I think we would have to look at case by case. What we are trying to get to here is a responsibility for those drivers that come upon those incidents to move over, slow down, and make the scene safe no matter what might be happening there. We are targeting our focus on those first responders who are there because they need to be there and need to make the road safe again.

Assemblymember Roth:
My heart goes out to your community. I think everyone up here is very aware of how traffic issues and fatalities are affecting our constituents, but I do have some questions regarding the purpose of the bill. If I am able to give you a little background: Last session, we addressed reckless driving enhancements, and a lot of thought and care went into enhancing certain conduct when we are dealing with reckless driving. For example, we increased penalties for where a person is driving more than 50 miles per hour over the posted speed limit and then proximately causes the death of another. That was under the same section in the NRS. My concern with this bill is that this conduct is already covered, because the situation you have explained to me is covered under the reckless driving statute. Reckless driving causing death is a felony, 1 to 6 years.

My question is in regards to how we ensure that those who are driving recklessly—who can be anyone, let us say a 16-year-old girl who just got her driver's license, who happens to look down and see that she got a text and not move over from a scene—how are we ensuring that they are not wrapped up into this statute when that conversation was already had and covers this conduct you are now bringing forward?

Nathan Peterson:
I appreciate the comments and the back history on this. The difference between reckless driving and the Move Over law and its requirements. Reckless driving is a willful and wanton disregard for the safety of the public, whereas the Move Over law and the enhancements tied to it would apply more so to the negligence associated with the action or inaction of that driver. That is where it separates itself. We have all seen vehicles driving at high rates of speed, splitting traffic, driving on the shoulder; that is considered reckless. The Move Over law has a number of different things tied to it, and it is a law that already exists. You must slow down, you must move over, you must proceed with caution, and those that fail to do so are neglectful in what their responsibilities are as they approach a traffic incident. That is where the difference lies for us.

Assemblymember Roth:
I hear what you are saying, but my concern remains with this bill that this conduct is already covered. Proof for reckless driving would include the violation of the traffic law. How does this not fall under the current statute?

Nathan Peterson:
The difference is intent from a standpoint of willful and wanton disregard. The reckless driving statute covers it in that language. Again, we have a Move Over law that currently exists and failure to abide by that is negligence. That is where there is some difference.

Martin Mleczko, Lieutenant Colonel, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:
Assemblymember Roth, you bring up some very good points, and we have had those discussions. It comes to intention. When a driver speeds, that is an intentional act that somebody is in; they are deciding to speed. You can have a violation of the Move Over law, and you can strike a first responder and have reckless driving, but then we would not be charging them with the Move Over law violation. This is separate. This is somebody who just has inattention, carelessness, and is negligent in following the law. They have a duty to act. When somebody gets behind the wheel, they choose whether or not they are going to speed; they do not necessarily choose that they are going to strike and kill a first responder that day. That is really the significance between the two.

Chair Miller:
I am going to give members the opportunity to ask more questions, and if it is not asked, I may come back with some clarifying questions on the difference of intent as well.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
Captain Peterson, I want to ask a question about something you said toward the end. If I am remembering correctly, this bill will align with proven measures in other states that save lives. You said proven measures, so I wondered if that meant there are other things besides what is in this bill that can address the problem?

Nathan Peterson:
Certainly. To give the group some history on this, this bill was initiated in 1996 in South Carolina. Since that time, all 50 states have enacted some version of this. It has changed and morphed over time from state to state, and we are in the process of continuing to analyze and review, as well as working with news outlets and different social media campaigns to push this message out, knowing that we still have this problem on the roadway where people are negligent and continue to disregard this particular law. For us it is, number one, getting this bill through, increasing awareness for the public, and knowing that the actions here—specifically failing to move over and causing catastrophic harm—will have consequences.

Assemblymember Hansen:
I think all of our hearts are heavy for the incredible things that you must see and deal with and the tragedy of these officers. In full transparency, I myself have been caught in a quandary on the highway where I cannot move over and I am trying to be especially careful because I know there is a situation occurring on the side of the road.

You mentioned that you think the public—or you maybe know because of data—is not even complying with the original law of moving over. I am curious, are you collecting data? Are there officers on the side of the road who are seen? And then in instances like my situation where I want to move over, but there are three tractor-trailer-rigs, and I cannot move over. Now I am going right alongside the accident. I am just curious how we are parsing out and knowing the campaign for Move Over is not working and if there are a lot of accidents that are occurring that you saw after investigation where people had not moved over. Thank you for the clarity on that.

Nathan Peterson:
To make sure I got this right, there were two questions. One is specific to the statute, and one is, are we collecting data and what are we seeing out on the roadways? Is that fair?

[Assemblymember Hansen acknowledged it as fair.]

We understand that there are times when it is impossible to move over. We think about hitting a hillcrest or rounding a curve, maybe there is a tractor trailer to the left of me. The law specifically addresses that, and I will just read it really quickly if possible.

This is A.B. 54, paragraph (d) of section 1: "If possible, drive in a lane that is not adjacent to the lane or lanes where the traffic incident is located unless roadway, traffic, weather or other conditions make doing so unsafe or impossible." So that is covered, and as someone who has

stood roadside and seen these scenarios as they approach me, we take that into account. We know there are variables that we can and cannot control, and we also understand that the drivers who are making their way from point A to point B sometimes do not have the ability to move over. What they do have the ability to do is slow down; that is our ask.

Specific to stats as they relate to our vehicles moving over, et cetera, I had my team pull some numbers yesterday, and we are enforcing this statute. We have over the last number of years. What I can tell you is, oftentimes it is difficult for us because we are on a scene and are managing an incident where we cannot just leave to go pull that driver over. Unless there is another trooper available—or officer or whoever—we do not have the ability to go necessarily take enforcement action because we are already there tending to something.

There was—I would have to go back to my notes—somewhere around 16,000 struck-by incidents where individuals were on the scene and they were struck by passing motorists who failed to abide by the rules of the road. It is a real concern for us. It is not just a concern here in Nevada, it is a concern for all of the states throughout the country. Hopefully that answers your question.

Chair Miller:
I think my question was answered as well. Thank you for your presentation. At this point, we are going to open it up for testimony. We will begin here in Carson City. Is there anyone here in Carson City who would like to testify in support of A.B. 54?

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:
The City of Henderson supports A.B. 54 and believes it will enhance the safety of all first responders while they are working on traffic incidents. We believe that the Move Over law is good public policy.

John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:
I am here on behalf of the Nevada District Attorneys Association, and I, too, am here in support of A.B. 54.

Joshua Martinez, Captain, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
I am here with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. I want to echo our support as well for A.B. 54.

Dan Gordon, President, Nevada Police Union:
I have the privilege of serving as the president of the Nevada Police Union, representing state law enforcement professionals across Nevada. I stand before you today on behalf of the men and women who put their lives on the line daily to protect our communities. These professionals are first responders and work under extreme and often dangerous conditions,

especially when responding to roadside incidents. Assembly Bill 54 is not about politics, it is about protection—protection for those who serve, for those who sacrifice, and for the families who pray their loved ones come home after every shift.

The tragic deaths of Sergeant Michael Abbate and Trooper Alberto Felix are a sobering reminder that failing to move over and slow down is not a minor traffic infraction. It is a decision that can cost lives. Law enforcement officers, firefighters, paramedics, tow truck operators, and highway workers all deserve to do their jobs without constant fear of being struck by a vehicle simply because someone was too distracted, impatient, or reckless to follow the law. Nevada has an opportunity to send a clear message that we will no longer tolerate negligence that results in the injury or death of first responders.

Assembly Bill 54 introduces commonsense, life-saving measures that bring accountability to those who ignore the Move Over laws. This bill is about responsibility, deterrence, and ultimately saving lives. On behalf of the Nevada Police Union and our membership across the state, I strongly urge you to support A.B. 54 and ensure that those who serve us receive the protections they deserve.

Jeffrey S. Rogan, representing Clark County:
On behalf of all of the first responders that are employed by Clark County, we urge your support on this important bill.

John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:
We support this bill.

Harrison Porter, Lieutenant, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association:
We are in favor of this bill.

Tessa Laxalt Robinson, Director of Government Affairs, Nevada Trucking Association:
I am here to support our friends in law enforcement, as well as our member tow car operators who are acting as first responders in order to help clear crashes efficiently to keep Nevada moving.

Ryan Beaman, representing Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada Local 1908:
We are here in full support of this bill.

Isaiah Berke, Legislative Intern, representing Nevada State Tow Association:
I am here to speak in support of A.B. 54 on behalf of the Nevada State Tow Association and echo the testimony of the Nevada Trucking Association.

Chair Miller:
I am not seeing anyone else here in Carson City to provide testimony. We will move down to Las Vegas.

Arlene Felix, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
My name is Arlene Felix, and I am here today with a heavy heart as the widow of Trooper Alberto Felix, a dedicated public servant and a loving husband and father. On November 30, 2023, my world shattered when my husband was taken from us. Not in the line of battle, not in a dangerous pursuit, but on the side of the road where he was simply doing his job helping keep others safe. Alberto was not just a trooper; he was my partner, my best friend, and the father of our three children. He was a protector, not only for our family but for everyone who traveled Nevada's highways. In a single, preventable moment, the state of Nevada lost two dedicated public servants. Sergeant Abbate and Trooper Felix's lives were stolen from us because someone failed to slow down and move over. The pain my family carries is unimaginable. Every day I wake up knowing that Alberto will never walk through our front door again. Our children will grow up without their father. Birthdays, holidays, and milestones will forever carry the ache of his absence.

Today I speak not only for my family, I speak for every first responder and their loved ones who live with the fear that they, too, could receive the gut-wrenching call or knock on the door that changes everything. Assembly Bill 54 is more than legislation, it is a lifeline. It is a chance to prevent other families from enduring the heartbreak that we live with every day. Stricter penalties will not bring Alberto back, but it will make roads safer for everyone. They will save lives, the lives of those out there saving our lives. They will remind every driver that a moment of carelessness can mean a lifetime of pain for a family like mine.

Alberto gave his life to protect others. I ask you now to honor his sacrifice by protecting those who continue to serve. Please pass A.B. 54. Do it for my husband, Trooper Felix; do it for Sergeant Abbate; do it for every first responder who stands on the roadside, vulnerable but committed to protecting the public; and do it for every family who should never have to experience the loss that mine has suffered. Thank you for your time, your compassion, and your courage to act.

Chair Miller:
Thank you so much for being here today. Thank you for your courage to speak. We are immensely sorry to both families, and this loss is not just to your families but to our communities as well. Thank you for sharing today.

Anne Carpenter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I had the honor of serving our great state for over 27 years, culminating in being the 25th colonel of the Nevada Highway Patrol. Today I appear before you not just as a retired law enforcement executive, but as someone deeply committed to the safety and well-being of our dedicated first responders. Throughout my career, I witnessed firsthand the unwavering devotion of our law enforcement community: our firefighters, our emergency medical personnel, and our tow truck operators, to name a few. These brave men and women risk their lives daily to ensure our safety. Yet, the dangers they face—especially during roadside incidents—are profound and ever present. The tragic losses of Sergeant Michael Abbate and Trooper Alberto Felix are seared into our collective memory. These were not mere accidents; they were preventable tragedies resulting from a moment's inattention or negligence. Such

incidents not only rob families of their loved ones, but also send ripples of grief through our entire community.

Assembly Bill 54 is more than just legislative text. It will save lives. By strengthening the Move Over law, we send a clear message that the safety of those who protect us is paramount. Elevating penalties for violations that result in harm to first responders is a necessary step to deter negligent behavior and underscore the gravity of these situations. It is not just about enforcement, it is about fostering a culture of respect and caution on our roads. Let us honor the memories of all fallen heroes by enacting measures that ensure such tragedies are not repeated.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phones? [There was no one.] With that, I will open it up for testimony in opposition to A.B. 54, starting first in Carson City.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:
We oppose this bill because it creates a strict liability situation where if substantial bodily injury or death occurs to a first responder, then the context does not matter. We cannot criminalize behavior without the context, especially when we are talking about traffic—traffic where mistakes can happen, accidents can happen, and situations outside of our control can happen. This bill as written would criminalize accidental behavior, and we cannot create accidental conduct as a felony.

A 16-year-old kid just got their license, their tire blows out, they lose control of the car and accidentally injure a first responder. They are now a felon. A 50-year-old gets a heart attack while driving, they lose control of the car and accidentally injure a first responder. They are a felon. Now you are driving to the Reno airport after a long week at the Legislature. It has been snowing and raining, snowing and raining. You are driving over the Washoe pass, there is a sheet of black ice, you lose control of your car, accidentally injuring a first responder. You are now a felon. These are just some examples where there are plenty of others, but importantly, what the bill is describing—the conduct they are trying to encompass here—is encompassed under the reckless driving statute.

You heard today that the reckless driving statute just includes a willful disregard to any duty of traffic laws, but that is not what the law says. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 484B.653, section 9 defines reckless driving and includes neglectful behavior—what they are trying to encompass here in the statute. We have a proposed amendment, and our proposed amendment mirrors that reckless driving statute language in order to add the context back to these accidents. If the amendment is accepted, then we would withdraw our opposition.

Sergeant Michael Abbate and Trooper Alberto Felix should be alive today. That was a horrific, horrific accident. I remember first hearing about it when it happened, and the context there is that driver was intoxicated. That driver chose to drive drunk, and he was

punished for it. He was convicted of two DUIs resulting in death and was sentenced to the maximum amount of time in prison, 16 to 40 years.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:
While we understand the sensitive history of A.B. 54 proposed amendments, we must oppose the bill as presented. Assembly Bill 54 removes discretion and context of the acts described in section 1. It removes the why; why did this accident happen? Was it just that, an accident, or was it willful and wanton disregard for safety? If it was willful and wanton disregard for safety, that law already provides a criminal penalty, the category B, 1 to 6 years. Assembly Bill 54 shifts the burden to a defendant to prove the absence of proximate cause and presupposes the wrongfulness of the act. Basically, you will be sending a person to prison for an accident. Assembly Bill 54 will not deter accidents. If the amendment we proposed is accepted, we will remove our opposition.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phones?

Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:
I am calling in opposition to the bill. Fear mongering should not facilitate the passing of bills and make certain that certain titles create protected citizens, when the average community member should have equal protections under the law from reckless police. Until there is a bill that holds law enforcement accountable for killing innocent bystanders with reckless police-initiated cases, I cannot support this type of bill.

Chair Miller:
Are there any other callers? [There were none.] I will open it up in testimony of neutral. Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Are there any callers? [There was no one.] I will close testimony and welcome the bill presenters back up for any final, brief remarks you would like to make.

Patrick Conmay:
I want to again thank the Chair and the Committee for their time and energy. We appreciate the consideration. We feel this is an important bill and ask for your support.

Chair Miller:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 54. Our next hearing is on Assembly Bill 55.

Assembly Bill 55: Revises provisions relating to motor vehicle crashes. (BDR 43-250)

Amy E. Davey, Administrator and Highway Safety Director, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety:
I am joined at the table here and in Las Vegas by some of my colleagues: Adam Anderson, who is our state FARS [fatality analysis reporting system] analyst; Kevin Tice, who is our

state traffic records program manager; and Lacey Tisler, who is our Chief State Traffic Safety Engineer from the Department of Transportation (NDOT). Joining us by phone, we have Dr. Laura Knight, the Chief Medical Examiner and Coroner for the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office; and Director Melanie Rouse from the Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner. We are going to be providing an overview of the changes proposed in Assembly Bill 55. The slide presentation is short, and we are happy to take questions as we work through the presentation or at the end.

There are two primary components to A.B. 55 which focus on improving motor vehicle crash data collection [page 2, Exhibit D]. Much of what is requested in A.B. 55 is already occurring in practice, and the proposed language is meant to update *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), describe current processes, and align with required standards. There are two components: first, including drug toxicology testing and reporting for car crash victims; second, clarifying the methods and timelines associated with filing crash reports and acknowledging NDOT's role in the safety data partnership. *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 484E describes how, when, and to whom crash investigation reports must be made, and NRS Chapter 484C deals entirely with driving under the influence of alcohol or a prohibited substance.

In the following slides, I will explain each of these components, but first I want to give an overview of crash data, why it is collected, and how it is used. Through the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Nevada is the recipient of several million dollars in federal funds intended to address transportation safety needs on our roads. Concurrent with the allocation of federal dollars are many types of requirements, including those that require state agencies such as the Department of Public Safety (DPS) and NDOT to track safety data, report crash data through the fatality analysis reporting system, set safety goals, and build and execute plans and programs to improve safety on our roads. In addition to federal reporting, crash and citation data is used by a myriad of partners such as Nevada's universities; hospitals; law enforcement and first responders; regional transportation commissions; local governments; nonprofit organizations; and state agencies such as the Department of Health and Human Services, NDOT, the Department of Motor Vehicles, DPS, and policymakers such as the Legislature. We constantly review, report, and analyze safety data to build the best programs we can to keep all of us safe on our roadways.

First, A.B. 55 proposes changes to NRS 484C.170, which currently requires a coroner—or other public official performing like duties—to test deceased victims of car crashes for the presence and concentration of alcohol, by adding testing for the presence and concentration of prohibited substances [page 4]. The term "prohibited substances" is defined in NRS 484C.080 as seven types or categories of drugs. Adding language specifying toxicological testing for drugs both supports existing practice and aligns our statutes with requirements to report impairing substances to the FARS system.

An analysis of a full year of records received on deceased victims shows that 90 percent of the reports we currently receive include testing results for impairing substances in addition to

alcohol. Again, we are currently receiving 90 percent toxicological testing reports in addition to blood alcohol, which is about 90 percent of crash victims we receive blood alcohol on; the practice is already occurring. Toxicological testing is being done. In one year, we show that 373 tests for alcohol were conducted and 366 included testing for drugs. Roughly 10 percent of reports that we receive that do not include testing results are often due to a time lapse between the time of the car crash and the time the victim passes away, that is individuals who are in the hospital prior to death, rendering additional testing by the coroner's office ineffectual. In a small amount of cases, we are unable to collect information from the public agency.

As we developed the language for A.B. 55 we used the term "prohibited substances" as this term is already defined in statute. In subsequent conversations we have had with the Washoe County Medical Examiner's Office and Clark County Coroner's Office, they have suggested instead the term "commonly abused drugs," which allows postmortem testing panels to be determined by the coroner's office, flexibility as drug trends change, and maintains testing within the funding available to them. Additionally, it is noted that the prohibited substances list currently in statute appears somewhat outdated. It does not include drugs such as fentanyl opioids, benzodiazepines, et cetera. Additionally, contained within the amendment are the removal of the eight-hour testing requirement and 30-hour reporting requirement, neither of which is current practice. This information has been submitted in the form of an amendment [Exhibit E]. As mentioned earlier, we have Doctor Knight and Director Rouse available by phone to answer questions specific to testing practices.

This is a sample report that we currently receive from the Clark County Coroner's Office that depicts toxicological test results for a deceased car crash victim [page 5, Exhibit D]. The federal FARS reporting system contains codes for hundreds of substances and stipulates that we include all data available from the testing. In sections 2 and 3 of A.B. 55, we suggest minor clarifying changes to NRS Chapter 484E to align with current practice and to describe current distinctions [page 6]. In section 2, subsection 1, we acknowledge that crash reports are received by the DPS through an electronic crash-reporting system rather than paper forms. Additionally, we clarify that crash reporting must begin within ten days after the date of the crash or after the date of death of a person in the crash. We call this early notification, and this is a federal requirement for us. It also clarifies that the initial report of the crash need not wait until a full investigation is completed.

In section 2, subsection 2, we identify NDOT as a primary stakeholder and collaborator in our crash data system. This acknowledges both NDOT's fundamental role in providing support to the crash system—such as updates to the state street file, and street map assistance with geolocation of crashes, analysis of safety data—and it acknowledges NDOT's federal requirements to have access to this data. Simply put, NDOT is the largest consumer of this data and is a critical component of the system. Naming NDOT as a collaborator in the system facilitates agency cooperation and shared responsibility. Subsections 3 through 6 make minor conforming changes that recognize that the DPS uses an electronic crash-reporting system where the crash report form template is maintained and accessed. That concludes our presentation this morning. Our final slide [page 7] has my contact information.

Assemblymember Roth:
If I could get some clarification, I thought it said in the presentation [page 4] that it was removing the eight-hour and 30-day requirement. Can you touch on that a little bit?

Amy Davey:
In speaking with the Washoe County Medical Examiner's Office and the Clark County Coroner's Office, they both noted that those timelines were really not possible to meet. Those are in current statute. We are not sure what the thought process was when those timelines were initiated; these statutes have been in place for many years. Both medical examiners have indicated that they are not necessary and they are not achievable. They requested that as part of the amendment. That would make their reporting and their testing more practical, more functional, and would align with the process they currently use.

Assemblymember Gray:
When you say victims of the accident, the deceased victims, is it going to be all deceased victims or just those believed to be the drivers?

Amy Davy:
The statute identifies any individual who is deceased as a result of the car crash, including pedestrians.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
My question is on workload. If we were originally analyzing just for alcohol content and now we are adding a whole panel, how much is that going to increase the workload of the folks doing those tests, if at all?

Amy Davey:
I would like to also invite Doctor Knight and Director Rouse to provide some input if they would like to. We pulled data from our reports that are received by my office, and as I indicated, 90 percent of the time individuals are being tested for blood alcohol content and 90 percent of the time they are currently being tested for a basic postmortem toxicological panel. I want to invite my guest speakers to the phone to give any additional information.

Laura D. Knight, M.D., Chief Medical Examiner and Coroner, Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office:
The Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office serves 14 counties in northern Nevada. Our office already performs more complete testing that is relevant to drugs that are currently being abused, that are specified in law. This would not create additional workload; this would bring the law more in conformance with what we are already doing and what I understand the Clark County Office to also be doing—we are using the same toxicology laboratory and ordering the same panels.

Melanie Rouse, Coroner and Director, Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner:
I will second that notion as director of the Clark County Office of the Coroner that covers the southern half of Nevada. We currently practice—as part of our standard accreditation that we are required to complete—postmortem testing on decedents involved in crashes. This does cover those additional substances that are interested in this bill. I do think it is important to also note the feasibility of the timeline. The eight hours that is currently written into statute is often not achievable. There are many cases in which we are not even able to access the decedent within that eight-hour period, either because it is a difficult extrication from the vehicle, or the scene is not secured yet or has not been completely processed. I think that is important for the Committee to know as well.

Assemblymember Moore:
Are other states already doing this? If so, are they also using the term "commonly abused drugs" as determined by the medical person?

Amy Davey:
One way that Nevada stands out in our process is that Nevada is the only state in the country that does not have a centralized forensic toxicological testing laboratory. We rely on our local partners to conduct the toxicology testing of deceased car crash victims. This also confounds us when we are trying to collect data from drivers that are not deceased. We do not have a centralized database of this kind of toxicology testing other than our federally required FARS database. When you ask if other states are doing this testing, every state in the country has a state highway safety office. In order to qualify for the federal funds, there are standards and practices that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration requires for reporting car crash data and toxicological testing and blood alcohol count. Those are standards that are given across every state as a condition of the federal funding.

As to the exact practices of each state and the types of panels that are conducted, I have not surveyed that information specifically, and I am unsure if our coroner's offices are aware of whether or not that is standard practice across all states.

Melanie Rouse:
It will depend on the accreditation requirements and if the office is accredited or not. Offices that are accredited are required to complete standard postmortem testing on decedents involved in motor vehicle accidents.

Assemblymember González:
I was just curious—because this is in my line of work—when it says in section 1, "Any coroner, or other public official," at the bottom it says, "as determined by the public official." I was wondering who that would be and who would be performing those duties?

Amy Davey:
There are some circumstances in rural counties where another individual may be performing a coroner's duties. You heard our two representatives from the coroner's office speak about

how they are primarily performing those duties, even for rural locations, but there are some circumstances where a sheriff may be the coroner of a rural county, or another public official. That is a very small number of cases that we see, but we do see those cases.

Assemblymember Roth:
This is actually a follow-up to my question regarding the eight hours. I think it certainly makes sense when practical. I am curious how the dissipation of alcohol or drugs in your system is dealt with. Is it retrograde extrapolation? How does that play into this thought process?

Amy Davey:
I would like to invite our medical examiner and our director of the coroner's office to comment on the eight-hour time frame and what effect that may or may not have in the testing.

Laura Knight:
It is a common concern when talking about postmortem toxicology testing. Will the results be the same as when the person passed away? Yes, they will. Basically, at the time of death, metabolism in the body—breakdown of drugs and alcohol—ceases; the liver ceases to function. Those levels will be stable for a good period of time after death. We do see some changes, called "postmortem redistribution," which is where we can sometimes see some small alterations in levels of certain drugs—and not typically alcohol—in the short range after death. We know to interpret for those if the time after that has been long. In these traffic cases, the difference between 8 hours and 24 hours, and even 36 hours, is not a big difference.

There are some issues that come up that Coroner Rouse already mentioned. When we just cannot access the body that quickly, or if we are talking about some of our rural sheriff coroners who are going to send the body to the medical examiner's offices for autopsy, there may be a delay in transporting the body. Those practical things such as the blood draw may not happen until 24 hours, and that is okay. It does not significantly change those results for the toxicology testing, and it provides for a potentially better result because the blood specimens are being drawn in a controlled environment in the autopsy room, not on the side of a road trying to meet a particular time frame that does not really have a scientific basis. I think that was our point in wanting to change that eight-hour rule. We did not know where it came from in the first place because it is not really scientific.

Chair Miller:
I have a few questions around the request to change from prohibited substances to commonly abused drugs. For me, what would constitute a prohibited substance would be very clear in the law. Could you explain how—or who or when—are commonly abused drugs defined?

Amy Davey:
When we first proposed the language in A.B. 55, we did use the term "prohibited substances" because it is defined in law. As I indicated in conversations with our coroner's offices, they

expressed some concerns about some of the substances that are defined in law—and those substances being tested for—and the cost of those certain substances when they are not commonly seen or found in drug panels. They requested the term and suggested the term "commonly abused drugs." I would like to invite the medical examiner and coroner's office to comment on that term and what that means to them.

Melanie Rouse:
We often see drug changes, so we watch in our community as the drug trends shift. We know that what we have experienced in the last few years is a dramatic increase in the number of fentanyl-related cases. Those are currently not defined in statute. We have also seen drug trends where we experience substances that are new to the market, new to the decedents, that we are seeing in our case volume. To us, it means to really track and evaluate those drugs as the drug market changes and as those drug trends shift.

Chair Miller:
Thank you for that because that was actually part of what I was curious about, because we do know that drug trends shift. We also know that drug usage or abuse can be determined by different demographics and factors as well, whether it is age, or income, community location—there are a lot of things. When we do see these trends and these differences in abused drugs, who then determines that? It is such a wide net with "commonly abused drugs," and please do not take this as I am being flippant, but a commonly abused drug is caffeine. A commonly abused drug is nicotine. We know that is not the intent of this bill. Who is defining, and when is this, Okay now, this illicit drug is the issue; We see a decline in this; or This age group is not using this. Who puts those parameters in place? This would also, I imagine, capture prescribed drugs, so prescriptions. How do we determine that as well?

Amy Davey:
Doctor Knight, would you like to talk a little bit about the term "commonly abused drugs" and the suggestion that we use that terminology?

Laura Knight:
This term really encompasses a less specific list. The list that is in the law of prohibited substances right now is very limited, and it is not reflective of modern toxicology testing in the postmortem realm. I will tell you the list: it is amphetamine and methamphetamine as one, cocaine, heroin, LSD, PCP or phencyclidine, and marijuana. For the postmortem testing that we do on deceased individuals, we are looking not only at traffic accidents, but a wide range of individuals who die, including people who die of drug-related deaths, and so our testing has to be much more thorough than that.

For example, fentanyl—which we all know is currently a scourge in our community—is not included in the list of prohibited substances. It has to be included in our postmortem testing, or we would be missing hundreds of opioid-related deaths annually. We use the same basic panel as our minimum level of testing on all deceased individuals. It includes benzodiazepines—which are drugs like Xanax that can be very sedating. It includes fentanyl

and other opioid drugs that are not included in the prohibited list—such as morphine and codeine—and so it is more complete. We are always going to be doing more complete testing than this list because our testing has more purposes than just this data collection. We are also looking to monitor what drugs are present in people who are dying that may be dying of those drugs.

Chair Miller:
I see no additional questions so we will open it up for testimony. Those interested in testifying in support of A.B. 55 in Carson City, please come forward. [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 phones? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in Carson City who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 55?

Jeffrey S. Rogan, representing Clark County:
Under committee rules we are technically in opposition, but we are working with Ms. Davey in the Office of Traffic Safety on an amendment which we are in support of. If there is any language that you would like tightened up, as indicated through some of the testimony, I am willing and able to work with you on that as well.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] On the phones? [There was no one.] I will open it up for testimony in neutral. Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify? [There was no one.] On the phone? [There was no one.] I will ask the presenters if there are any final brief remarks they would like to make.

Amy Davey:
Thank you to the Committee for your thoughtful questions, and thank you to the Clark County Coroner's office and the Washoe County Medical Examiner's Office for their testimony this morning.

Chair Miller:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 55 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 111.

Assembly Bill 111: Revises provisions relating to certain traffic violations. (BDR 43-161)

Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13:
Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 111, or as we refer to it, "Jaya's Law." In December of 2023, I was put into contact with a constituent who was looking for some help. Andrea Raney was in search of assistance and thought I might be able to help her. Andrea told me that on December 9, 2023, a crash occurred on U.S. 95 in the area of Durango interchange in northwest Las Vegas, which is in Assembly District 13. This crash involved multiple vehicles and people; three of those people died as a result of their injuries: the at-fault driver whom I will not name; Karen Foote of Assembly District 31; and Andrea's three-year-old granddaughter, Jaya Brooks, of Assembly District 13.

The at-fault driver was driving southbound in the northbound lanes of U.S. 95. Subsequent investigation would reveal she entered the freeway at the Kyle Canyon interchange, traveled past the Sky Canyon and Durango interchanges, almost making it to the Elkhorn overpass before causing the catastrophic crash. This is a distance of more than 2.8 miles, and this was at approximately 3:15 p.m. on a sunny, clear day. In an effort to answer your questions before you can ask them, the standard toxicology test performed by the coroner showed no presence of alcohol or drugs in the at-fault driver's system. At the request of the Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) investigator, the coroner performed an expanded toxicology test that revealed the presence of an obscure prescription drug. However, it is unknown if this particular drug contributed to the driving behavior.

After Andrea explained to me the circumstances of the crash that took her granddaughter, she asked what can be done to fix this so nobody else has to go through this. After conducting research, I told her the first thing we should do is make wrong-way driving a crime. As of January 1, 2023, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 44B.227—the wrong-way driving statute—is a civil infraction. Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session made a wide array of traffic offenses civil as opposed to criminal; NRS 44B.227 was one of those. When I discuss this bill with people, they almost always say something along the lines of, Well, are they not all drunk or high? Obviously, no. Lawyers will usually say we can just charge people with reckless driving. Now ask any prosecutor how difficult it is to prove the elements of reckless driving in court.

Assembly Bill 111 simply makes driving the wrong way on a divided highway a misdemeanor. Nothing more, nothing less. If a prosecuting attorney feels that a particular case should not be treated as a criminal offense, they still have the option of reverting it to a civil matter as described in Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session. Even if the wrong-way driving results in an accident, it remains a civil matter unless there is substantial bodily harm or death. I think this is one we got wrong. We hear all the time about wrong-way driving on the news. I could tell you about other cases that have happened in my district, but this law is not about those cases. It is about the ones you do not hear about.

I asked Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) and NHP to pull some stats for me on reported wrong-way drivers. Using a keyword search in the dispatch system, LVMPD found 634 reports of wrong-way drivers for calendar year 2024—634. That was just in LVMPD jurisdiction; it does not include the cities of North Las Vegas or Henderson. The Nevada Highway Patrol responded to 731 wrong-way driver calls for service in their jurisdiction in 2024. This was statewide and included 123 wrong-way crashes, with 24 of those crashes resulting in 49 fatalities. As you can see, this is not a small problem.

You will hear that making this a criminal offense again will do nothing to combat this problem. I disagree. The media exposure this issue has gotten so far has put this out in the public eye and forced people to have discussions about it. If returning NRS 44B.227 to a criminal offense makes even one person more cognizant of their driving behaviors, then I think it will be worth it, and "Jaya's Law" will be a success. I will stand for your questions.

Chair Miller:
Assemblymember, we do not have any questions. I will open it up for testimony in support of A.B. 111. We do have the pictures and everything you included.

Jan Brooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am the father of Jaya Brooks. I am standing here on behalf of my little angel, Jaya, and the 600 other people affected by countless acts of reckless drivers. Every day when I woke up, I looked forward to spending the day with my daughter. Making our food, getting her ready for gymnastics, watching her grow, just being there being the best dad I can be to her, she deserved that. Due to a wrong-way driver, that was taken away from me at three years old on December 9, 2023.

I cannot explain the impact—or express in words—how special I felt knowing I was spending the rest of my life with this person. I cannot explain, I cannot express enough how much pain I walk around with that will never go away. You never want to see things like this happen to anyone, but especially kids, the most innocent people in the world. The impact she had on me is the reason why I am who I am today. She changed me for the better. I honestly was the one who was truly blessed to be able to be around such a beautiful soul and person, inside and out. I will forever spend countless nights crying, thinking, and asking why. Jaya literally won my heart the moment I saw her. I always knew she would live her life with purpose. She was the best thing that had ever happened to me at that time. I will not get another birthday or another second to spend with her. She was my perfect person.

Chair Miller:
Thank you so much for being here and we are deeply sorry for this unimaginable tragedy.

Andrea Raney, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
Jan is my son and I am Jaya's grandmother. As Assemblymember Hibbetts said, he explained the day of the crash. We are also here with Ray Foote, who is the husband of Karen Foote, the other innocent victim of the wrong-way crash. December 9, 2023, is a day that forever tragically changed so many lives. My son Jan and his daughter Jaya were six minutes from home. They were on their way home—six minutes from home—when they were involved in a crash at the hands of a wrong-way driver. Karen Foote and the wrong-way driver lost their lives immediately. Four hundred thirty-five days ago, December 11, 2023, Jaya also passed from her injuries. One crash involving four people, three families, three deaths, forever impacting our worlds to navigate life without our loved ones from one person's reckless decision. Jaya was a three-year-old bundle of love and light. She meant so much to all of us. Karen Foote was a special education teacher and a school psychologist from Sparks. She was visiting family in Las Vegas with her husband Ray. She also leaves behind many loved ones. We all feel the impact of them daily without them in our lives.

Jaya and Karen should be here. The dangers of wrong-way driving leads to devastation and loss of life. The consequences for their decisions may be a ticket or fine if they get caught—maybe—and if they do not pay the ticket, it goes to a debt collection agency. The real consequences unfairly fall on the innocent—like Jaya, Karen, more recently Officer

Pulsipher—and their loved ones forever with certainty, impacting families, friends, and communities forever.

A study by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reported wrong-way crashes are often more severe than regular accidents. Wrong-way drivers are usually traveling at high rates of speed down freeway entrance ramps, resulting in head-on collisions. I recently viewed the clips from those five wrong-way driving systems that we have in Las Vegas, and I can attest to that only two out of all those clips safely pulled over, adhering to the flashing signs. The rest of them were flying down the freeway ramp onto the freeway off-ramp. Who knows what was waiting at the bottom? No stopping in sight. Stricter penalties and laws for wrong-way driving can discourage this dangerous action, prompting people to think twice before breaking rules and keeping Nevada's roads safer. Committing a crime that could include jail time can serve as a strong deterrent. By making the consequences clear, Nevada can create a culture of responsibility on the highways leading to safer travels for everyone.

In conclusion, we are here advocating for change in honor of our loved ones, Jaya Brooks and Karen Foote. Wrong-way driving poses a threat to everyone on our roads. In implementing wrong-way driving as a misdemeanor crime, Nevada has the opportunity to significantly reduce the number of crashes, lost lives, and potentially the cost the state spends on emergency services caused by this reckless behavior. Please take action to protect all drivers and passengers on the road. A safer Nevada is a responsibility that everyone can share.

Chair Miller:
As a grandmother, I know that not only did you lose your grandbaby, but having to watch your son suffer as well is not easy.

Andrea Raney:
And she will never know her new sister, who is outside. Stuff like that is just like Jan said—the first of everything—I think about it every day.

Chair Miller:
Absolutely. Thank you for being here and thank you for speaking on behalf of the Foote family. Is there anyone else here?

Harrison Porter, Lieutenant, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association:
We are in favor of this bill.

John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:
I represent the Las Vegas Police Protective Association with Metro officers who patrol the area of Las Vegas. Where Jaya died is my area of town. I travel that road every single day. I see the stains of the accident on that road every single day. I have seen her face in the news. As soon as her dad walked in, I knew who he was. For that reason, we support this bill. Cops complain all the time. They see people driving like crazy on the roads, and a lot of these bills

and a lot of these traffic crimes were decriminalized. This bill makes sense; for that reason, we support.

Jennifer P. Noble, representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:
We are here in support of this piece of legislation. Our hearts go out to the Brooks and Foote families, and to Jaya's grandmother and her father.

Adrian Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
We are in full support of A.B. 111.

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:
We want to thank the sponsor for bringing this important bill. We are in full support, and we believe this would be a very worthy change to the *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

Dan Gordon, President, Nevada Police Union:
We fully support this bill.

Ryan Beaman, representing Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada Local 1908:
We are in full support of this bill. As first responders, we unfortunately have to go on these types of crashes and see the incidents that take place. Something that is also not reported are the ones where we get called out, the wrong-way drivers, and the ones that do not happen. There are a lot more of these that fortunately did not have a crash.

Chair Miller:
We will move to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of A.B. 111? [There was no one.] On the phone? [There was no one.]

I will open it up for testimony in opposition beginning here in Carson City. Not seeing anyone. Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] On the phones? [There was no one.]

I will open it up for neutral testimony 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.] On the phone? [There was no one.] I will close testimony on A.B. 111 and welcome Assemblymember Hibbetts back up for any final remarks.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:
Thank you, Chair.

Chair Miller:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 111. Our last agenda item today is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment here in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there

anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to make public comment? [There was no one.] On the phones? [There was no one.] I will close public comment.

Thank you, everyone, for the presentations, and members for your work today. I will adjourn this meeting [at 9:33 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Nicholas Fischer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 54	C	Nathan Peterson, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety	PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Highway Patrol Sergeant Michael Abbate and Trooper Alberto Felix Move Over Law Enhancements"
A.B. 55	D	Amy E. Davey, Administrator and Highway Safety Director, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety	PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety"
A.B. 55	E	Amy E. Davey, Administrator and Highway Safety Director, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety	Proposed amendment