MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-Third Session
February 19, 2025

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 8 a.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 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:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General
Alissa C. Engler, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Prosecution Division, Office of the Attorney General
Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General
Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Jaimie Stilz, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Post-Conviction Division, Office of the Attorney General
Heather D. Procter, Chief Deputy, Post-Conviction Division, Office of the Attorney General
Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
Leslie Turner, Deputy Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and representing Public Safety Alliance of Nevada
Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Tatiana "Tia" Smith, Policy Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Ryley Svendsen, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
Harrison Porter, Lieutenant, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Yesenia Moya, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Tara Webster, representing Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Katherine Stocks, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts
Tom Clark, representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts

Chair Miller:
[Roll was called. Committee protocol was explained.] We have three bills today. Two will be presented by Attorney General Ford. I will open up the hearing for Assembly Bill 34, which revises provisions relating to certain crimes. I welcome Attorney General Ford, and we are ready whenever you are.

Assembly Bill 34: Revises provisions relating to certain crimes. (BDR 15-443)

Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General:
I am here to present Assembly Bill 34 for your consideration. As you have already heard me say earlier this session, one of the guiding principles of my office is criminal justice and reform. Assembly Bill 34 is sound policy that will aid prosecutors in bringing violent and sexual offenders to justice as well as help victims know they can be safe from being revictimized in the future, as I have stressed both in this Committee and elsewhere, ensuring that public safety and reform are not competing values. I believe in accountability for those who harm others as well as a justice system comprised of human dignity and fairness. I am proud to say that my staff and I have successfully prosecuted dangerous criminals, ensuring a safer Nevada for all. I am also quite cognizant of a prosecutor's duty to the victims of crimes that are committed. No two victims are alike and those individuals who are the most vulnerable in our communities, namely children and those with mental illness, need additional assurances that they will not be revictimized by those convicted of violent offenses against them.

Currently, existing law prohibits a court from deferring judgment in the case of a defendant who has been convicted of "a violent or sexual offense." This bill expands the definition of "violent or sexual offense" to include other crimes in which the victim is a child or a person with mental illness. Additionally, this bill expands the list of crimes for which probation, or a suspended sentence is not an option for courts to contemplate if the defendant has committed the crime of attempted lewdness with a minor and their psychosexual evaluation returns as a "high risk to reoffend."

At this time, I would like to turn the presentation over to Alissa Engler in the south, who is my chief of prosecutions at the Attorney General's Office, to provide a brief section-by-section overview of the bill.

Alissa C. Engler, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Prosecution Division, Office of the Attorney General:
I will take this opportunity to explain the intent of this bill and answer any questions the Committee members may have. Section 1 of this bill adds the following offenses to the list of violent or sexual offenses under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 202.876: subsection 12 will be expanded to include NRS 200.727, which is the use of the Internet to control visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a person under 16 years of age; and NRS 200.730, which is possession of visual presentation depicting sexual conduct of a person under 16 years of age, which are both category B felonies; subsection 16 adds NRS 201.540, which is sexual conduct between certain employees of a school or volunteers at a school and a

pupil, a category C felony; subsection 17 adds NRS 201.550, sexual conduct between certain employees of a college or university and a student, a category C felony; and subsection 18 adds NRS 201.560, luring a child or person with mental illness, a category B felony.

By adding these offenses to the list of violent or sexual offenses under NRS 202.876, the court is not allowed to defer judgment against an individual convicted of these crimes under NRS 176.211. This bill adds to the list of already existing crimes against children and persons with mental illness where deferred judgments are not allowed. Deferred judgment should be reserved for nonviolent, nonsexual offenses for which these added offenses are not.

Additionally, by adding these offenses to the list of violent or sexual offenses under NRS 202.876, the court would now be allowed to extend the probation period for these offenses to not more than 60 months. Under current law, NRS 201.540 and 201.550 are category C felonies with a maximum probationary period of two years under NRS 176A.500; NRS 202.727, NRS 200.730, and NRS 201.560 are category B felonies with a max probationary period of three years. With this law, the court can grant probation not to exceed 60 months or 5 years for those stated offenses which will allow parole and probation additional time to monitor these offenders.

Some additional benefits will include an extended length of the no contact or stay-away orders for the victims which often accompany probation. It will also give sex offenders additional time to complete sex offender treatment or other court-ordered therapy beyond the 12 months that is already built into statute. Additionally, by adding these offenses to the list of violent or sexual offenses, parole and probation is no longer obligated to recommend an early discharge from probation if the conditions of NRS 176A.840 are met. I will note that under subsection 2, it still gives the court discretion to grant an early discharge for these crimes. For example, if a defense attorney files a motion requesting early discharge and the court is persuaded by the argument, they can still grant the early discharge. Lastly, by adding these offenses to the violent or sexual offenses under NRS 202.876, there is now a mandatory duty to report an incident of this type if the reporter knows or has reasonable cause to believe that a person has committed these added offenses to a child who is under the age of 12.

Lastly, moving on to section 2, this bill adds the crime of attempted lewdness, which is a category B felony, to NRS 176A.110. This precludes a court from granting probation if a defendant returns as a high risk to reoffend on their psychosexual evaluation. Under current law, this crime is not listed as an offense that would preclude the court from granting probation under these circumstances. Thank you for the opportunity to explain the intent of this bill, and I will now turn it over to the Committee members for questions.

Chair Miller:
We will begin with questions from members.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
As a teacher, I find the acts that you are trying to capture here absolutely abhorrent, and I appreciate what you are trying to do. My question is on sections 16 and 17, where we are talking about conduct between employees of a school and a pupil. Obviously, we want to capture that, but there are other situations where children are taken advantage of by group leaders or church leaders or coaches or in other places. How are we capturing that portion where children are being victimized?

Attorney General Ford:
I am going to defer and refer to my colleague in southern Nevada. I do know we have entertained the question before relative to bills of a similar nature but let me allow my colleague to respond to your question.

Alissa Engler:
To answer your question, the conduct you are referencing we can find under subsection 18, which is luring a child. That does not have to distinguish, it can be a teacher, a coach, a church member; anytime you are luring a child away from their family for any sort of sexual gratification, that is covered under NRS 201.560. Additionally, there are already existing crimes under NRS 202.876 that are defined, that would be covered for the conduct you are referencing. Although there is not a specific crime listed like the sexual conduct that we see in subsections 16 and 17, criminal conduct can be covered under subsection 18, which is luring a child.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I appreciate that we are capturing that because I know your intent is not to leave anything out. Then why do we need to explicitly include those carve-outs for schools? Was there some loophole or some way they were slipping through that is not currently covered?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General:
I will pass it down to Chief Engler, but just wanted to do as a reminder, last legislative session our office brought forth, and this Committee heard, a piece of legislation which established in section 1 the sexual contact between certain employees within the school setting. That was the bill heard last session in which we had a lot of this conversation. We worked with the district attorneys and Clark County School District. Clark County School District's investigators brought forth certain instances, cases, and behavior they found very disturbing that they wanted to be able to codify into statute as being able to take action on. A lot of that conversation about why we put them into statute just to memorialize those as crimes was had last session. I will let Chief Engler speak more about why we wanted to make it neat and tidy in terms of closing it on this end.

Alissa Engler:
The intent of this bill is to add these to the violent and sexual offense so that we can expand the monitoring for the specific type of crimes. What we were hearing from the prosecutors who were handling this is that individuals who were accused of these crimes would be getting off of probation after a short period of time and, given that these crimes involved

children, we wanted to be able to give the Division of Parole and Probation and courts the option to extend the period of time. It is not automatic; it is still at the court's discretion but to have that option to monitor them. Specifically, these are the crimes that are already codified in statute and that is why we are looking to add them to NRS 202.876.

Chair Miller:
I do not see any additional questions. I will open it for testimony in support of Assembly Bill 34. We will start here in Carson City, then move to Las Vegas, and then move to the phones. Is there anyone wishing to make testimony in support?

Jennifer P. Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:
I would just like to thank the Attorney General for bringing this important piece of legislation which will help ensure appropriate accountability and monitoring for those offenders who abuse positions of power in our schools and positions of trust by victimizing Nevada's children. We appreciate this bill, and we hope you take it into serious consideration.

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:
We are in support of Assembly Bill 34.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing anyone else here in Carson City, is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? Not seeing anyone, we will open the phone for support testimony. [There was none.] I will open it up for testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 34. Not seeing anyone approach here in Carson, is there anyone there in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition? Not seeing anyone, we will open the phone for opposition testimony. [There was none.] I will open it up for testimony in neutral on Assembly Bill 34. Not seeing anyone here in Carson City, is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify? [There was no one.] I will open it up for testimony in neutral to Assembly Bill 34. [There was none.] The Attorney General has waived closing remarks. I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 34.

Our next bill this morning on behalf of the Attorney General is Assembly Bill 63. This revises provisions relating to civil actions for wrongful conviction. Members, I trust that you have pulled and reviewed the proposed amendments [Exhibit C] to Assembly Bill 63 as well. The hearing is open; you may proceed when ready and please introduce everyone presenting with you today.

Assembly Bill 63: Revises provisions relating to civil actions for wrongful conviction. (BDR 3-440)

Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General:
Thank you for allowing us the ability to present Assembly Bill 63. I am accompanied by my colleague, Heather Procter, the chief of our post-convictions division, who will assist in presenting this bill. I also have Jaimie Stilz in southern Nevada, who will, likewise, be assisting me in presenting this bill.

In 2019, the Legislature created the wrongful conviction compensation statutes now codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 41.900 through 41.970, authorizing a person who is not currently incarcerated for any offense and who was wrongfully convicted and imprisoned by the state to bring an action for damages and other relief in state district court. The Office of the Attorney General has worked with claimants in balancing the state's obligation to be fair and just with its responsibilities to ensure that it is not overwhelmed with enormous monetary liability. To that end, the office ensures every claimant complies with NRS 41.900 and establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that they did not commit the crime for which they were convicted.

The intent of the wrongful conviction compensation statutes, as addressed in the 2019 legislative history, is to provide monetary support for persons recently released from prison or parole to permit them to begin rebuilding their lives and to reenter society, and for the state to do what it can to restore their dignity in life after years lost from being wrongfully convicted. An award does not place blame or find fault. Rather the person is provided support to begin living a normal life with a certificate of innocence that allows that claimant to move forward without the wrongful felony conviction looming over their record and compensation to aid in rebuilding their life. Assembly Bill 63 seeks to clarify the existing law on a few points. For that section-by-section analysis, I will turn the presentation over to Senior Deputy Attorney General Jaimie Stilz in Las Vegas.

Jaimie Stilz, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Post-Conviction Unit, Office of the Attorney General:
As Attorney General Ford mentioned, the purpose of A.B. 63 is to clarify the existing law. First, section 2 of A.B. 63 seeks to amend NRS 41.950, which governs the awards and benefits a person may seek in a wrongful conviction compensation action. This section has distinct changes.

Initially, a person who receives an award for wrongful conviction compensation is entitled to a monetary award of damages based on the number of years served in prison and/or on parole. Separately, a person may also receive other monetary benefits such as assistance with tuition, housing, counseling, and health insurance. Both the damages award and benefits are paid upon approval of and by the State Board of Examiners (BOE). As detailed in NRS 41.950, subsection 2, paragraph (b), the statute specifies the BOE provides payment for the cost of these benefits. Section 2 alters the term "payment" to "reimbursement." This change reflects the original legislative intent as borne out by the current practice of the BOE

to reimburse for actual expenses the person already paid for such benefits rather than direct payment to third parties.

Further, in 2021 the Legislature created subsection 6 of NRS 41.950, which applies a maximum to the benefits outlined in NRS 41.950, subsection 2, paragraph (b) that a person can receive. The cap is set at $100,000 per calendar year for a length of time equal to the period the person was wrongfully imprisoned. The cap was intended to include all monetary benefits. In other words, all money expended in such cases, other than the initial damages award and attorney's fees. However, that amendment contained a clerical error, as the miscellaneous provision "any other relief" should have been included in that cap under subsection 2, paragraph (b). The 2021 amendment inadvertently created a separate category of reimbursement. The proposed amendment corrects that clerical error by moving the catchall "any other relief" within the $100,000 cap for benefits reimbursed in any calendar year.

Next, the Attorney General's Office has submitted a proposed amendment [Exhibit C] to section 1 of A.B. 63. That amendment makes two changes. First, the amendment reverses the alteration in the existing section 1 of the bill and returns to the original language in NRS 41.900, subsection 1, of "incarcerated," and instead adds a definition of "incarcerated" to subsection 6 to mean a person who is in jail or prison. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 41.900, subsection 1 is a preliminary requirement that a person must meet before filing a wrongful conviction compensation complaint—that they are not currently incarcerated. The reason for this requirement again goes to the intent of the statute to permit those wrongfully convicted to resume a normal life outside of prison. A person who is currently incarcerated as defined in the proposed definition does not face the same difficulties as a person who was released to society and must rebuild a normal life.

The term "incarcerated" appears only in this portion of the wrongful conviction compensation statutes. All other references regarding custody status use the term "imprisoned." The term "imprisoned" is largely accepted to refer to a person under a sentence in the Nevada Department of Corrections. There has been some confusion among parties and judges as to whether incarcerated means the same thing as imprisoned. This distinction is critical, again, as this section of the statute sets forth the basic requirement a person must meet to even file a complaint seeking compensation. To clarify the law, we now define incarcerated to mean a person who is in jail or prison at the time they seek to file a complaint. In doing so, the intent of the statute remains intact to limit compensation to those wrongfully convicted who are actively attempting to rebuild their lives anew in the world.

Finally, our proposed amendment to section 1 of A.B. 63 addresses the standard a person must meet to qualify for wrongful conviction compensation. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 41.900, subsection 2, paragraph (d) requires a person meet one of three criteria. The issue we have found in litigating these cases, though, is that the requirements in subsection 2, paragraph (d), subparagraphs (1) and (2) are not clear. In practice, under these provisions a person must have their judgment of conviction vacated, the charges dismissed, and the basis for the dismissal of the judgment was not legal error. This reading of the current statute is in line

with other provisions of NRS 41.900, which require a person to prove that they are actually innocent of the original charged offense and any acts associated with that original offense. If a judgment is reversed for a legal error, that does not mean that the person is innocent of those charges. We therefore propose to amend subsection 2, paragraph (d) to clarify the distinction between the first and second criteria as they exist in the current law. We believe this clarification will assist recently released persons, their attorneys, and the courts in understanding the criteria required to qualify for compensation.

This concludes our presentation of A.B. 63 and our proposed amendment [Exhibit C]. We are happy to take any questions the Committee members may have.

Chair Miller:
We will open it up for questions.

Assemblymember Roth:
My question is in regard to the language regarding custodial status moving to incarceration. I understand the intent is to clarify that there has been some misunderstanding or disagreement among judges, but I am wondering if this language also captures those who are on parole and probation.

Aaron Ford:
A great question, and I want to be certain you are referencing the amendment we provided because I think you are referencing the original language of "in custody." Is that right?

Assemblymember Roth:
No, I apologize. I am looking at the amendment and it crossed out "in custody" and put "incarcerated."

Attorney General Ford:
The original language in the bill was "incarcerated." We initially tried to change it to "in custody," but because of the concern you just raised how in custody can encompass a lot more than simply being in jail or in prison and it can include parole; for example, we went back to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and asked for a better way to describe the circumstances we were trying to address. The fact is, we had people who were in jail trying to file these petitions, and that was not the intent of the bill. We want to cover that, and the idea was to simply just define incarcerated to mean either in jail or in prison. That is what the amendment provides in this regard. But allow me to offer either Ms. Stilz or Ms. Procter an opportunity to augment what I have said or even to correct it if I am wrong.

Assemblymember Roth:
Just for clarification, because I want to make sure I am looking at the right thing, it does not include those who are on parole and probation.

Attorney General Ford:
You are correct.

Assemblymember Gray:
I am going to tie this one in, as Assemblymember Roth had a good segue for me. If somebody is exonerated of a crime yet they are incarcerated for something else, why would we deny them that right, especially if they are incarcerated? It is still going to make their lives better and—it has also been stated by your own staff—when they are attempting to rebuild their lives. There is an assumption there that they may wind up back in trouble again. A lot of times that is just a result of them spending time in prison.

Attorney General Ford:
I will defer to Ms. Stilz if she wants to chime in on this. But I will say that is a policy question for the Legislature, frankly. When this bill initially passed, it was not intended to allow those who were still either in jail or in prison to pursue this remedy. It is for those who are in society attempting to rebuild their lives, irrespective of what other crimes may be involved or engaged. If you are in jail for another crime, you are not in society trying to rebuild your life, and therefore, at least at that juncture, are not eligible to apply for wrongful conviction relief under this particular statute. That was, as I understood it, the initial impetus or the initial rationale in 2019 when this initially passed, when then-Chairman Yeager sponsored the bill. Ms. Stilz, do you want to offer anything additional?

Jaimie Stilz:
Attorney General Ford is correct. That was the original intent as far as we understand it, which simply is to assist with people who are out in society. Frankly, what we have seen is that people who have attempted to file wrongful conviction complaints while still incarcerated in jail or in prison have not been reentering society. Once they do release, they do have the option to pursue this type of action. Once they have the ability to try and rebuild their lives, they will be able to bring a complaint. It is just simply during the time period while they are incarcerated, they are just not entering society. We believe that this is not the intent of the statute—to not allow them to file one of these until they are trying to rebuild their lives outside of an institution.

Assemblymember Gray:
This is a question that you just brought up. The intent of this law is to help them rebuild their lives. It is not the intent to make them whole for prosecutorial misconduct or a wrongful condition. I mean, usually when you bring an action, it is to be made whole, not to reestablish your life.

Attorney General Ford:
The short answer is that no, this bill is not intended to make them whole. That is what we call a Section 1983 action, a civil rights complaint, which will be filed generally in federal court to do exactly what you have just talked about. This was intended to provide some level of recompense for the wrongful actions that our state undertook in prosecuting someone and wrongfully convicting them.

Assemblymember Gray:
Do the members—I will use the term victim in this case—of the victim's family have standing since they have been injured as well?

Attorney General Ford:
The answer is no; this is only for the defendant. Ms. Procter, do you want to jump in?

Heather D. Procter, Chief Deputy, Post-Conviction Division, Office of the Attorney General:
The monetary award is intended for the defendant. There are additional benefits that the defendant can apply for, and there is a certain level that the family members can also receive, such as counseling, through those benefits. But the primary monetary award, the certificate of innocence, is intended for the defendant.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
You might not have this number right off the top of your head, but I just wondered how many people have been found factually innocent since the inception of the statute?

Heather Procter:
I would defer to my colleague in Las Vegas for those numbers.

Jaimie Stilz:
At this point in time, we have found and issued eight certificates of actual innocence and awarded damages and benefits to those eight claimants. We have five pending active cases as well.

Chair Miller:
In terms of time, the process, we know this is a lengthy process. Do we know—and I know we just have a handful of cases so far—how long it takes for us to not just identify the wrongful conviction, but also then to actually start and proceed? I know we had one of our first cases in the state, it was almost 20 years if I recall. But now that this process is in place, do we have an average time frame?

Attorney General Ford:
We are going to refer that to my colleague, Ms. Stilz, in southern Nevada.

Jaimie Stilz:
Unfortunately, we do not have an average at this point in time. Each case is so unique and different. We have several cases that moved fairly quickly, that I believe were resolved within about six months after all the appropriate documentation had been provided, the attorneys established all the paperwork and agreed on the documentation to be submitted to the courts. We have other cases that have been pending for several years because of different questions and concerns about whether the statutory requirements were actually met. It is really a very distinct, unique, fact-based situation for each separate case.

Assemblymember Hansen:
This was probably one of the most fulfilling sort of votes I ever made in 2019 as a freshman, and I will never forget DeMarlo Barry and his story and his grace and his forgiveness. To revisit this just brings up a couple of things to clarify. In section 2, where we go from "payment" to "reimbursement," I just want to make sure I understand it correctly. It is that the reimbursement, the victim or the person who has been compensated, they pay it directly. The compensation is not going to go directly to a vendor of some sort. Is that how it was playing out?

Heather Procter:
That is correct. The practice has been with the BOE to reimburse the defendant for these costs rather than establishing for the BOE to pay these third-party vendors directly.

Assemblymember Hansen:
It is on page 4 of the bill. It is now in section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (b), subparagraph (7), where you strike out "any other relief" under the medical care paid. Are we just moving "any other relief"? I am just trying to understand why it is being moved up under programs for assistance. It is under financial literacy, then "any other relief." Does that not tie to any medical care? Are we striking that, or is it all encompassing and we just moved the section?

Heather Procter:
It is all encompassing. If you look to the provisions of section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (b), where we are moving this, it includes coverage for medical care, insurance benefits, counseling, all of those benefits. The other relief is intended to be part of paragraph (b) and within the $100,000 cap per calendar year.

Assemblymember Gray:
It is not uncommon when you have a claim pending before the federal government and it is even founded that if the individual dies, the claim goes away, it is not paid to the estate, it just goes away. In the case of either a posthumous exoneration or somebody who dies while they are waiting for their claim to be adjudicated, what happens? Does the estate get to finish it out?

Attorney General Ford:
You have us stumped on that one. We do not know what the survivability issue is, what the response would be from a survivorship perspective on this particular case. We have never had to deal with that at this juncture, and frankly would have to research to ascertain what the intent was of this body at that time.

Assemblymember Gray:
I appreciate that, and I am interested in the posthumous exoneration.

Heather Procter:
Just to clarify, the intent of the bill is to assist the defendant in regaining their hold once they have been released from prison. It is not intended for a posthumous award for the certificate of innocence. If you are asking what happens if the individual dies once they have been granted a certificate of innocence, that is the question we are not able to address at this time.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing any additional questions from members, I will open it up for testimony in support of Assembly Bill 63. Is there anyone wishing to come forward here in Carson City to support Assembly Bill 63? Not seeing anyone, is there anyone in Las Vegas? Not seeing anyone, we will open the phone lines. [There was no one.] I will open it up for testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 63. Not seeing anyone in Carson City, is there anyone in Las Vegas? Not seeing anyone, we will open the phone lines. [There was no one.] I will open it up for testimony in neutral. Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? Not seeing anyone here in Carson City or in Las Vegas, we will open the phone lines.

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
The Advocates for the Inmates and Innocent are in neutral right now. I would like to thank some of the members for their questions, particularly Assemblymember Gray, dealing with posthumous exoneration. I have some questions. How many people have passed away prior to being judicially exonerated or filed a petition for exoneration have passed away; who have been on parole and probation and have passed away prior to the compensation being paid? As a person who has had a loved one spending 21 years in prison for a crime he did not commit and was about to file a motion for new trial and bail based on newly discovered evidence and passed away prior to the motions being filed, I just want to say that I think if we are going to fix this, we need to include the decedents in this posthumously. Because even though they may have passed away, their families have moved on and they are unable to move on. Some have families, some of them have struggled their whole lifetime because of what happened to their loved ones. They should be compensated.

If you listen to some of the audios that I sent, or about to, from those who have been wrongfully convicted, when asked how they felt about if they had passed away prior to being exonerated, they would say they wanted their names cleared. They should be compensated; their family should be compensated. These are some of the questions. We are in neutral. Thank you so much for bringing this forward. I love the questions you members have asked, and please include posthumous exoneration compensation for this. Just because they are dead, it should not stop there.

Chair Miller:
Are there any other callers to testify at this time? [There was no one.] I will close testimony and invite the presenters to make any final comments. [Presenters waived final comments.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 63. I will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 218. Assembly Bill 218 requires the court administrator in each court in the state to establish a program to send certain communications regarding court proceedings by text message.

I will give the presenters, including Assemblymember González, a few minutes. When you are ready, please proceed.

Assembly Bill 218: Requires the Court Administrator and each court in this State to establish a program to send certain communications regarding court proceedings by text message. (BDR S-535)

Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:
I am happy to be here presenting Assembly Bill 218. With me today, I have Nick Shepack, Nevada state director of the Fines and Fees Justice Center, and Leslie Turner, deputy director of the Fines and Fees Justice Center.

Assembly Bill 218 addresses a critical need to improve court appearance rates and compliance through modernized communication methods. Missing a court appearance can result in serious consequences such as fines, fees, warrants, and even jail time for those who fail to appear. It also costs the court and the opposing party, time, money, and resources. Various municipalities and judicial jurisdictions have already implemented these programs. One notable one is Colorado, which recognizes the need for such measures and implemented a similar text reminder program as recent as 2022. We have other examples that we will get into in the presentation.

I also want to note that Assembly Bill 218 seeks to adopt evidence-based strategies for Nevada. Assembly Bill 218 includes several key components designed to enhance the efficiency of court communication across our state. I will now turn it over to Mr. Shepack and Ms. Turner, who will go through the bill section by section.

Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:
The Fines and Fees Justice Center is a nonpartisan nonprofit that seeks to address issues in the criminal legal system any time fines, fees, or other monetary sanctions come into play. We have worked on many bills with many of you through different legislative sessions. Today we are excited to present this bill to you. I will pass it over to our Deputy Director, Leslie Turner, for a brief presentation, and then I will walk you through the conceptual amendment [Exhibit D] we have, and then we will be happy to take your questions.

Leslie Turner, Deputy Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:
I am going to walk through the slides quickly [Exhibit E]. First of all, court reminders is a pretty basic concept. I think we all get text reminders from our doctor's office or any other appointments we might have from the Department of Motor Vehicles. I think it is backed by science. I think that is really important here. It is based on human behavior—even up to the number of texts you get and when. It is all based on science. I know we are going to provide a lot of that data to you all. The Pew Research Center and ideas42 have done extensive research which will be sent over to you all.

Essentially, it saves money, and it saves time [page 2]. Each missed court date can be $1,400. If we multiply that by the number of people who have missed court that we can document through failures to appear (FTA), we could save the state over a million dollars. Assemblymember González already spoke to the consequences related to this issue. People get bench warrants, people can get arrested, but also people's time is wasted. Victims have to change their court dates. I think that everybody in this situation can benefit.

This is just some of the data that we were able to collect [page 3]. We were able to survey six of the courts here in Nevada: Sparks Justice Court, Henderson Justice Court, Henderson Municipal Court, Sparks Municipal Court, Reno Municipal Court, and North Las Vegas Municipal Court. Those were the courts where we were able to collect FTA data. A lot of the other courts did not have that data available, but just based on those courts, there were 4,200 failures to appear. Again, if we are able to save $1,400 for each court date that is missed, that could be over a million dollars saved for the state just with people going to court.

Again, there is extensive research, which we will send over from Pew and ideas42, that shows once we start sending text messages, there is a 20 to 40 percent increased rate in people going to court [page 4]. I think there is a conception that people just do not want to go to court, and a lot of times people do forget. I like to give the example of a doctor's appointment I had the other day where I literally forgot about it until they texted me a couple of hours before the appointment. It is very common that people do just forget. There are obviously other barriers to going to court. But again, nationally, it is showing a 20 to 40 percent increase in people going to court once they start getting consistent text messages. Colorado, New York, and Texas have all seen major decreases in their failures to appear. Again, that is what the aim is for Nevada.

Nick Shepack:
We have been working diligently with the courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to craft an amendment [Exhibit D] to this bill. When we initially wrote this bill, we put in all of the best practices. One of the issues that came up was being over prescriptive to how courts set their processes may raise some constitutional concerns. Through conversations with the AOC, we also realized that if we added a best practices or research-based amendment, instead of being overly prescriptive in statute, as information changes, as courts develop these programs to find out what works and what does not, it will give the courts ample flexibility to continue to grow their programs, especially as technology and information becomes available.

To run through the sections briefly, section 1, subsection 1 simply requires courts to establish a text reminder program. As Ms. Turner mentioned, these programs are evidence-based. They are being implemented across the country. They see huge reductions in FTAs. Court time is wasted when somebody does not show up, police time is wasted, people end up in jails—our jails have high rates of people on FTA warrants. Victims show up for hearings

where they are expecting the victimizer to be prosecuted, and that individual does not show up. Every stakeholder from the public defenders to the prosecutors benefit from these programs.

In subsection 2 we added a provision that says it is an opt-out program. Essentially upon arrest, a defendant provides their information, or when they get a citation; it is in the bill that it is required. It is one hundred percent on the defendant to provide accurate information. If they provide false information or no information to law enforcement, that is on the defendant. But they have to choose to opt out of these programs. When Colorado switched from an opt-in to an opt-out program, they saw a massive jump, as much as 61 percent in one county, in reduction of failure to appear. These opt-in programs are the most scientifically based.

At the request of the courts and the AOC, we essentially scrapped subsection 3, which was outlining the current best practices for court reminders, replacing it with, "Court reminder programs shall be established based on research and best practices." Of course, that language, because it is just conceptual, will go through the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to match similar types of requirements in the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. Again, this gives courts the ability to continue to learn, grow, and change their practices as they move forward.

We deleted subsections 4 and 5 in their entirety. This again was at the request of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The research program appeared to be overburdensome. When we talked to friends who had worked in Colorado, they found that a lot of the court data that was actually collected did not end up being helpful. There has not been a well-designed statewide program to do the research on this. So, instead of copying something that does not work, we essentially removed that.

Section 2, which is how information is gathered, we are leaving that the same—essentially, at time of arrest or citation the officer conducting the arrest or the citation or the booking officer will take down the defendant's information.

We have been working very diligently with all stakeholders on this amendment. This morning, I found out that some positions may have changed without our knowledge until just before this, that constitutional concerns may continue; that, in fact, some individuals may believe that you all do not have the right to tell the Judicial Branch to implement these types of programs. I am not a lawyer. However, in our research, we disagree with this stance due to the fact that you all set the penalties for what happens when somebody does not show up to court, whether that is a warrant for arrest with a "shall be arrested" or whether that is a driver's license suspension. We believe it is also the duty and responsibility of the Legislative Branch to set up processes that ensure people have the best opportunity to make it to court so they do not face these consequences.

Bills like this have passed in other states. As mentioned, the most recent one was in Colorado, which was significantly more prescriptive than what we are attempting to do here with the amendment. We would be happy to take any questions you may have.

Chair Miller:
The idea that we do not have the right to create laws is still ringing in the air. I have a quick clarifying question on your removal from subsection 3. You said removing the best practices and allowing LCB to come up with the language. Are you expecting or anticipating that language would be provided creating the policies around it?

Nick Shepack:
No, the language is court reminder programs shall be established, using research—it allows the courts to determine what available research there is and then base those programs on that. The LCB or the Legislature will not be prescripting what those best practices are.

Chair Miller:
Then my concern is that we all know inconsistency is often an issue. Have you thought of how we could address any inconsistencies on how each different court or municipality delivers?

Nick Shepack:
I agree fully, Chair. Having an ununified court system tends to lead to a variety of practices in all parts of our judicial system. We believe that working closely with the AOC, who has a court management program—and they can correct me if this number is wrong—but that I believe 35 courts are currently using, that the AOC would set essentially what best practices are. We would hopefully anticipate that most courts would follow these processes. We, as full-time Fines and Fees Justice Center members, would be working diligently with courts through the implementation process. Again, we are not opposed to prescriptive language in the legislation. However, we do feel that this addresses the concerns that were held pretty unanimously by all stakeholders in the judicial system.

Chair Miller:
Thank you. I do appreciate the position of permissive rather than prescriptive. It is also trying sometimes to address inconsistency so that justice is not delivered depending on which city you are in. We will open it up to member questions.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I think this is an important issue. In talking to court employees around Washoe, where I am, some are trying to send text messages. I think the issue is, obviously, it is inconsistent. But when I talked to them, they spoke to me about an issue of carriers not allowing certain terms to be sent via text—specifically, things about drugs or alcohol or firearms. As they are trying to remind folks of their issues surrounding those topics, they were being banned by the carriers. I know this is probably a left field question. Is there a way we can work with carriers, or has Colorado figured out a way of getting around that so that we can get the information that people need on a regular basis?

Nick Shepack:
Yes, there are many courts that have figured this out. The best practices for sending out these messages and what is in them, it does not have to be overly prescriptive about what your charge is. It is that you have a court date. It is the consequence for missing that court date. It is a link to the website in case you need to contact the court because there is some reason you are unable to make that court date. It is sent three times ideally: seven days, three days, and one day before. You would avoid those types of terms in these messages, and it would be simple; very similar to your Olive Garden reminder that lets you know that you have scheduled dinner, or my favorite is the Carson Valley Hot Springs [*sic*] has a wonderful text reminder program.

Assemblymember Hardy:
It is an interesting concept. You mentioned that upon arrest or citation, the individual can say, yes, I want to participate and provide the information or no, I do not. Elsewhere it says if they have any changes, like they change their phone number or whatever, I am just wondering if they do change their phone number and the court sends messages to the other number, is it on the person to update the court? And if they do not, the court is not going to be trying to find them and figure out if their number is different.

Nick Shepack:
Yes, correct. The onus is on the individual. If there is a change in the individual's contact information and they want to update that, the onus is on that individual. Some people will inevitably fall through the cracks, they will get a new number, they will not update, and they will unfortunately not receive these messages. This happens with certain indigent individuals and especially our homeless population who tend to have a high turnover. Unfortunately, no one has figured out how to fully address that issue. But what we know is that when we establish these programs, take those numbers at the time of citation and arrest, consistently we see a 20 to 40 percent reduction in failures to appear. While we cannot really address every single nuance in a piece of legislation like this, we can have a significant impact.

Assemblymember Gray:
I do not know who would forget a court date. Honestly, if I had a court date, I would be awake for days and suffering a nervous breakdown. However, there are those people. Can this be expanded to other key players in the trial, like maybe the victim, the law enforcement officer, or other people who need to be there?

Nick Shepack:
I was actually talking with some victim's rights advocates. We would love to see it expanded. The question is capacity, and we would have to have that conversation with the courts. But ideally in a perfect-type system, everybody who is due to be in court that day would get notified. I do not have a good answer based on how we collect the information. As it is currently, at time of arrest and time of citation is where most people collect that information. It may be a question that courts who already have text message programs could answer, but ideally those individuals would be included.

Assemblymember Cole:
In section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (c), where we talk about the juveniles who are in the court system, you are asking for the telephone number of the child. I am just wondering if you should also include the telephone number of the adult or the guardian who the child was released to; that might be helpful.

Nick Shepack:
I think that is a great idea, Assemblymember Cole, and we would be happy to amend that to include parents and guardians.

Assemblymember Moore:
I know that we are going with text messages and other states have adopted this. Do you know, or are you aware, if any other states are emailing folks to remind them about their court dates?

Nick Shepack:
Yes, other states are, absolutely, and so are we. Nothing in this is intended to bar courts from using as many forms of communication or any form of communication they are already using. However, all of the research shows that text messages are the most effective. If your inbox on your personal email looks anything like mine, I am not seeing things the same way I am on my phone. We originally had in there, if you do not have a phone number, maybe you try the email. Many courts are already doing this. We simplified the bill to use the most effective means, but we encourage all courts to use multiple forms of communication when available and when practical.

Chair Miller:
That concludes questions from members. I will open it up for testimony in support of Assembly Bill 218, beginning first in Carson City. I do not see anyone in Las Vegas, so we will go to the phones after Carson City.

John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and representing Public Safety Alliance of Nevada:
We are in support of this bill. As I was sitting here, I was Googling the different programs that the government can use to text you—if Discount Tire can text you that your car is done; if Veterans Affairs can text you; if my daughter's doctor can text me—surely we can figure out the bureaucratic processes to get this program started. For that reason, we support it.

Paloma M. Guerrero, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:
We are in very strong support of this bill. Every day we see clients who missed their court date, not because they are trying to avoid justice, but simply because they forget, misunderstand, or have lost the small, sticky note-sized notice of when their next court hearing is. Many of our clients face housing instability. They have multiple jobs and have kids to care for, which makes it really easy for these court dates to just fall through the cracks. This bill is a simple act that is going to have great impact on our clients. When

someone misses court, they risk a bench warrant, they risk arrest, and they risk unnecessary incarceration. This bill ensures that people can take care of their case and also stay with their families.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:
We are in support of Assembly Bill 218. This is a simple tool, and it will have a significant impact on all of our clients.

Tatiana "Tia" Smith, Policy Attorney, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:
The American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada supports A.B. 218.

Ryley Svendsen, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:
We thank the Fines and Fees Justice Center for their work to include victim-survivors in this legislation and look forward to continuing working with them through this process. For victim-survivors of domestic and sexual violence, court can represent a time to heal. However, it can also be extremely retraumatizing, triggering, and anxiety-inducing. Victim-survivors are forced to face their abusers, are subject to cross-examination that is too often mired in victim blaming and must relive the abuse that they experienced. Because of this, leading up to a court hearing, victim-survivors may spend weeks if not months emotionally preparing for the day. So often there is so much pressure put on court hearings which are looked to as beacons of hope, an opportunity to share one's experience, to receive some sense of solace, safety, and closure when one has been living in fear for far too long. This can only happen if the defendant shows up. Having a proven system in place to remind defendants of upcoming court hearings can help with the closure, healing, and safety of victim-survivors, and because of this, I encourage you to support A.B. 218.

Harrison Porter, Lieutenant, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association:
I would just like to echo our support for this bill.

Chair Miller:
We will open the phone lines for testimony in support.

Yesenia Moya, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am speaking in support of A.B. 218. This is a commonsense measure that improves government efficiency by implementing text message reminders. As folks have already said, these show that people will come to court, reduces failures to appear, and leads to fewer warrants and fewer people in jail. I know firsthand how difficult it is to keep track of a court date, especially if it changes. Many people do not have the navigational skills to understand the different scheduling and how to look it up online. Court notices can be confusing; even missing a date by accident can have serious consequences. On top of that, just getting to court can be expensive, from parking fees to taking time off work. A simple text reminder would make a huge difference for so many of us just trying to navigate the system. I do not

believe this is about interfering with judicial discretion, but it is about providing courts with a proven tool that improves attendance and reduces administrative burdens. In fact, if you simply Google "how to implement a court text reminder," you will find toolkits from across the country and other national organizations that provide a clear blueprint for courts to set up these programs. Assembly Bill 218 ensures the judicial system runs more efficiently, reduces unnecessary costs, and benefits the entire community. I urge your support.

Tara Webster, representing Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:
On behalf of the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN), I am calling in support of A.B. 218. This bill addresses the economic burden and inefficiency of the current court reminder system. It also creates a pathway for everyday citizens, particularly those from marginalized communities who we represent at PLAN, to avoid severe consequences including going to collections, losing their driver's license, incurring additional fees, or facing criminal charges. Again, on behalf of PLAN, we urge your support for A.B. 218.

[Exhibit F and Exhibit G were submitted in support of Assembly Bill 218 but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the hearing.]

Chair Miller:
Are there any other callers to testify in support? [There were none.] I will open it up for testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 218.

Katherine Stocks, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:
Thank you for the opportunity to be here. It is always a little rough being on the other side here. The reason I am here in opposition, I am the state court administrator and based on the comments that have already come from the delivery of the bill, this is a good bill with good intentions. The reason we are here in opposition is based on the mechanisms. As Mr. Shepack said, there was a proposed amendment cutting out sections 3, 4, and 5, which were of concern about the autonomy of the judiciary.

However, I am here with another a piece of information. The AOC has a case management system that is deployed in our smaller jurisdictions across the state. We have been doing text messaging since 2022. We have sent over 190,000 texts out as court reminders. Those are both before your court date; they are also about payments due if you are on a payment plan, a reminder that you have a payment due on your payment plan. We are already doing the work of the intention of this bill, and we are really proud of ourselves for being ahead of that. With that, if there are any specific questions about the content and text within those, I am happy to provide that. But I am also going to try to keep this a little bit shorter than my prepared remarks.

Because some of our courts are already addressing the intent of the legislation, we are coming to the table in opposition with a proposed solution. We do say thank you to the work that has already been done up until today, and we hope we can continue that work going

forward. Our proposed solution though is, rather than imposing a statutory requirement, the desired outcome of improved litigant communication can be achieved through a review or revision of existing court rules. For example, we recently—

Chair Miller:
We are already over time. I would love a shot clock in here, but they keep saying no every time I ask. If you could just wrap it up, thank you.

Katherine Stocks:
Just like our ADKT [Administrative Order] where we had the Virtual Advocacy Commission, that is our proposal of allowing this to be done through court rule. We know the money committee is not the purview of this, but that is also asking if there could be an appropriation for an effective rollout. [Additional testimony was submitted Exhibit H.]

Tom Clark, representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction:
We are in opposition because of the bill as it is written. However, I give Mr. Shepack a lot of credit. He has worked very closely with us as stakeholders in this deliberation. We also work very closely with the AOC, and we look forward to really getting this to a final determination as to how we can best ensure that these systems are implemented by each of the individual courts going forward.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing anyone else approach for testimony, I will open the lines to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 218. [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in Carson who would like to testify in neutral? Not seeing anyone, we will open the lines for neutral testimony. [There was no one.] I will close testimony and welcome the bill sponsor up for any final brief remarks.

Assemblymember González:
Thank you to everybody who is working on this piece of legislation. I learned of opposition this morning, and so I look forward to continuing the conversation on the work that we have been doing. Assembly Bill 218 is a commonsense measure designed to improve core efficiency, reduce failures to appear, and ensure individuals have information they need to navigate a very complex court system. I urge you all for your support, and thank you so much for the opportunity to present A.B. 218 to you this morning.

Chair Miller:
I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 218. The last item we have on today's agenda is public comment. We will begin here in Carson City. Not seeing anyone here in Carson or Las Vegas, we will open the phone lines for public comment.

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
I am coming back under the public comment for a couple of reasons. First off, under the public comment, when you submit a document or anything else you do not know what is going to happen during testimony that is given; for example, today, we were unable to see the amendment to A.B. 63, so we came in as neutral.

We have provided you a document that we had sent to the Attorney General's Office a few weeks ago with our friendly amendment to Senate Bill 66 [Exhibit I]. It is a factual innocence posthumous petition, and S.B. 66 is dealing with petitions, and it is sponsored by the Attorney General's Office. I am asking, Madam Chair, to please accept our document for the public record, our amendment, and the email because we have to provide according to the 24 hours in advance. Well, we do not know public comment, what is going to be said, what is going to be presented, what is going to be the amendments, or anything else. We cannot give a comment 24 hours—we can during the testimony but not under public comment.

I am bringing it this way, and again, you know the history of what happened. There are other people out there. I have sent you some audios of the exonerees who testified at the pardons board. It really surprises me with Attorney General Ford—him not wanting to do this. When you look at his past history on wanting to do everything for those who have been wrongfully convicted, why is he stopping this one from not moving forward? It should be included in that bill. Again, like I said, just because one passes does not mean that justice for them should not stop there. Look at everything they lost, the families who have lost everything. And again, we do not have the statistics on those who have been judicially exonerated and have not received compensation or who are about to who are on parole—

Chair Miller:
Ms. Brown, we are over time.

Tonja Brown:
I appreciate it and please take it to heart that we are advocating for justice.

Chair Miller:
To clarify on that technicality—individuals, groups, people, everyone—you are able to submit testimony as well as public comment up to 24 hours after the hearing as well. The requirement for submitting, if you want something to be part of an exhibit or a proposed amendment or a presentation, certainly, that is 24 hours before, because the expectation is that is going to be part of the presentation. But absolutely, we know that the whole purpose of the hearing is for people to make decisions, understand the issues, and take their positions, and sometimes that does not happen until during or sometimes even immediately after a hearing. You do have up to 24 hours after a hearing to submit comments or testimony.

Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:
I would just like to echo my colleague Ms. Brown's previous comments. We need posthumous exonerations; the stigma that these families carry of family members of the wrongfully convicted. I have personally witnessed what family members have to endure with the stigma that they carry around when their loved one has been wrongfully convicted. And you have tried every avenue that is supposedly available to you to clear your loved one's name, and you get nowhere. We need it by law—posthumous exonerations for the wrongfully convicted. The ultimate miscarriage of justice is dying in jail or prison an innocent person.

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

Chair Miller:
We will go to the next caller. [There was no one.] I will close public comment. That concludes our work for today in this Committee. Thank you, members and presenters. I will see you all tomorrow at 8 a.m. This meeting is adjourned [at 9:27 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Traci Dory
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 63	C	Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 218	D	Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fees and Fines Justice Center	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 218	E	Nick Shepack, Nevada State Director, Fees and Fines Justice Center	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB 218 - Court Reminders"
A.B. 218	F	Mathilda Guerrero Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada	Letter in support
A.B. 218	G	Theresa J. Yancy-Benson, Private Citizen	Letter in support
A.B. 218	H	Katherine Stocks, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts	Written testimony in opposition
	I	Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada	Document titled "Friendly Amendment Senate Bill No. 66-Committee on Judiciary"