MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-Third Session
April 7, 2025

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 9 a.m. on Monday, April 7, 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 Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sitara Reganti, Youth Legislator, Nevada Youth Legislature, Senate District No. 15
Sabrina Schnur, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association
Addison Clark, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Nicholas Shepack, Board Member, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada
Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Harrison Epstein, Legal Extern, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Tessyn Opferman, representing National Association of Social Workers
Denise Bolaños-Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada
Sebastian Rios, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Elizabeth Florez, Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Washoe County
Ali Banister, Chief, Juvenile Services, Carson City, Nevada
Jeffrey S. Rogan, representing Clark County
Heather Plager, Chief, Juvenile Services, Elko County
Brandon Bird, Director, Teurman Hall-Detention Center, Juvenile Justice Center, Churchill County
Tamara Morris, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department
Carissa Pearce, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance

Chair Miller:
[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will begin with the work session and then have two bill hearings. I will be taking the bills out of order when we get to the bill section. We will begin with Assembly Bill 490, then Assembly Bill 167. We are going to begin our work session, so I will turn it over to our policy analyst.

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

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
I would like to note that as nonpartisan staff I can neither support nor oppose any of the measures that come before this Committee.

The first bill on the work session today is Assembly Bill 55 [Exhibit C], which is sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Office of Traffic Safety of the Department of Public Safety. It was heard on February 18, 2025. Assembly Bill 55 revises provisions concerning data collection and analysis related to motor vehicle crashes. There is an amendment that was submitted by Amy Davey, Administrator of the Office of Traffic Safety, which proposes to amend section 1 by removing specific timelines for postmortem blood draw reporting to instead requiring findings to be reported upon receipt. It also proposes replacing the requirement to test for specific prohibitive substances with a broader analysis of commonly abused drugs as determined by the examiner. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Are there any questions? Not seeing any, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 55.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GRAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblymember Cole.

Assembly Bill 58: Revises various provisions relating to gaming. (BDR 41-297)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Next bill, Assembly Bill 58 [Exhibit D], is sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Nevada Gaming Control Board. Assembly Bill 58 makes various changes concerning Nevada's gaming laws. There is an amendment submitted by Sebastian Ross, Senior Policy Counsel of the Nevada Gaming Control Board, which proposes to delete section 1 from the bill which revises the term "associated equipment." That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Any questions? Not seeing any, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 58.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER NADEEM SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Dalia.

Assembly Bill 76: Revises provisions relating to cannabis. (BDR 56-286)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next bill is Assembly Bill 76 [Exhibit E], which is sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Cannabis Compliance Board. There is an amendment submitted by James Humm, Executive Director of the Cannabis Compliance Board, which includes, but is not limited to, clarifying the definition of "synthetic cannabinoids," amending confidentiality provisions, reinstating the Board's authority and enforcement and disciplinary actions, refining regulations on cannabis packaging and advertising, modifying limits on cannabis products, and addressing procedures for cannabis transportation and public health hazards. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Are there any questions? Not seeing any, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 76.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER COLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS GRAY, HANSEN, AND HARDY VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Orentlicher.

Assembly Bill 119: Revises provisions relating to paramilitary activity. (BDR 36-191)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 119 [Exhibit F] is sponsored by Assemblymember Yeager. It was heard on March 12, 2025. Assembly Bill 119 establishes the provisions authorizing the Office of the Attorney General to investigate alleged paramilitary activity. There are three separate amendments to this bill. The first is from Assemblymember Roth, proposing to add herself as a cosponsor. The second is from Mary B. McCord, Executive Director, Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection, and Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, and proposes clarifying paramilitary activity requires individuals or groups to be armed with dangerous weapons.

The Clark County Public Defender's Office proposes prohibiting the Attorney General from using information obtained through investigative demands on criminal cases. I would note to the Committee members the public defender's amendment includes a proposal to add that the

provisions regarding the paramilitary activity do not apply to any lawful expression of the First Amendment. However, this amendment was not accepted by the bill sponsor. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Members, any questions or comments?

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I want clarification on the public defender's amendment. Are we voting on just the first part of it, but not the second part of it?

Chair Miller:
Right. The second part was not included in the amendment. Any additional questions or comments? [There were none.] With that, I will take a motion to amend and do pass.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 119.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any additional comments or questions? [There were none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, GRAY, HANSEN, HARDY, AND YUREK VOTED NO.)

I will go ahead and assign this floor statement to Assemblymember Roth.

Assembly Bill 137: Revises requirements for the advertising of a sale of personal property to satisfy the lien of an owner of a facility for storage. (BDR 9-183)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next bill is Assembly Bill 137 [Exhibit G], which is sponsored by Assemblymember Torres-Fossett. This bill revises requirements for advertising the sale of personal property to satisfy a lien held by the owner of a self-storage facility. Assemblymember Torres-Fossett did submit an amendment which is to add Assemblymember Hansen as a cosponsor to this bill. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] Is this a friendly amendment?

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Yes.

Chair Miller:
With that, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 137.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign that floor statement to Assemblymember Torres-Fossett.

Assembly Bill 197: Enacts provisions strengthening certain protections for certain activities under the First Amendment. (BDR 19-136)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 197 [Exhibit H] was sponsored by Assemblymember Backus and was heard by this Committee on February 21, 2025. Assembly Bill 197 enacts provisions to strengthen protections concerning the confidentiality of personal information related to nonprofit organizations. Assemblymember Backus submitted an amendment for this bill, which is to amend section 2 of the bill, including replacing "nonfinancial support" with "in-kind services or goods," clarifying confidentiality exceptions for nonprofit donor information, expanding investigative exceptions, revising definitions related to nonprofits and donors, and adding Assemblymember Hafen as a cosponsor. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Do we have any questions or comments? Not seeing any, I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 197.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GRAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign this floor statement to Assemblymember Backus.

Assembly Bill 246: Revises provisions relating to offenders. (BDR 16-686)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 246 [Exhibit I] is sponsored by Assemblymember Considine and was heard on February 27, 2025. This bill revises provisions concerning food-related operations within Nevada's Department of Corrections (NDOC). Assemblymember Considine did submit an amendment to this bill to require NDOC to conduct a comprehensive study on food services, establish a vocational farm program to the extent money is available, adopt regulations for independent inspections by a registered dietician who is neither an employee of NDOC nor affiliated with the contracted food vendor, and limit contract terms with the current food vendor during the study. Additionally, the amendment requires NDOC to request cost proposals from multiple food service entities and publicly release study findings. That is all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Are there any questions or comments? Not seeing any, I will take a motion to amend and do pass.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 246.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MOORE SECONDED THE MOTION.

I see no additional comments or questions.

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblymember Considine.

That concludes our work session. We will move on to the next item on our agenda, which is the bill hearing for Assembly Bill 490. Assembly Bill 490 revises provisions related to the courts and will be presented by Assemblymember Yeager.

Assembly Bill 490: Revises provisions related to courts. (BDR 0-870)

Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:
It is an honor to present Assembly Bill 490 to you this morning. Assembly Bill 490 is about public access to our state's most important court cases. Under existing law, the First Judicial District Court here in Carson City has exclusive jurisdiction over certain cases. This means that these cases cannot, by law, be heard anywhere else in the state. I suspect the First Judicial District was given exclusive jurisdiction because the court is located here in Carson City, which is Nevada's capital. While exclusive jurisdiction might have made sense when various statutes were enacted, it does not make sense in our modern world. Unfortunately, many judicial districts in Nevada, including the First, have not modernized to a point where the public has meaningful access to what is happening in those courts.

This means documents are not easily accessible nor are the hearings easily accessible for the public to watch. For instance, there is no online access to documents, greatly slowing down the process of obtaining documents from these courts. There is no online access to hearings, meaning neither the press nor the public can watch proceedings without traveling to the courthouse and watching them live and in person. This leaves Nevadans in the dark about what is happening in these cases. The result of this is the media and the public are largely left in the dark, and again, these are some of the most important matters in our state, matters like petition initiatives and election-related challenges and issues.

According to Tabitha Mueller, a politics reporter at the *Nevada Independent*, "Accessing court information quickly and efficiently is essential for informing the public. The current setup often results in delays, hindering our ability to provide timely and accurate reporting." Katelyn Newberg, a reporter at the *Las Vegas Review Journal*, said at a panel on the issue that wider online access would ensure court documents are not limited to just a handful of people who learn over time how to navigate the system and learn the right person and time to call a court. "Having an open court system lets us follow these cases through the system, continue to report on them, and give people access to information, which really is a basic foundation of both journalism and . . . our democracy as a whole."

In addition, when courts have fewer than three judges, each litigant can preempt a judge, meaning the judge who might hear the case will typically be a retired senior judge who does not have to face the voters in the next election. This is contrary to Nevada's current public policy of electing our judges and making them go before the voters. The lack of modernization results in a lack of confidence in the judicial system and judicial proceedings, especially when it comes to contentious election cases, which we have had a number of in this state over the past few years.

The bill itself is relatively straightforward. Section 1 of the bill is a technical change that actually implements the bill. Section 2 of the bill requires any reference to the "First Judicial District" in statute must be interpreted to include a "qualified district court." Section 3 defines what a "qualified district court" is. It is a court in which there are three or more judges; also, there is electronic filing, storage, a reproduction process, and electronic access to its documents and hearings.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
I understand about the kinds of cases where the First Judicial District Court has exclusive jurisdiction over other courts, but looking at the digest, it sounds like regular criminal or civil cases that are in the First Judicial District Court, because that is where the case arose, can also now be heard in other courts. Is that right under this bill?

Assemblymember Yeager:
This is where section 2 comes into play. Section 2 of the bill says, "Except as otherwise expressly provided in a particular statute or required by the context." To answer your question, if jurisdiction is in the First Judicial District Court because a civil or criminal case originates there and is not otherwise specified by statute—for instance, a criminal case

originates in the justice court here or there is a justice court civil case that is appealed to the district court—that would stay the same. We are going to keep that tracking, so if it does not originate through statute but just on the basis of where the event happened, it will stay in the First Judicial District Court.

To your point, there are some things expressly listed in the digest on the bill about certain actions, including certain criminal petitions and certain disputes relating to property. Those are things specified in statute as jurisdiction being in the First Judicial District Court. These are specialized types of criminal challenges or property challenges. It was not listed out. Here is how I tried to figure out what cases are encompassed. I went to our great legislative website and the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and did a search in quotes for "First Judicial District Court." I got about 16 to 18 hits, which were specific kinds of cases. For instance, listed here are final decisions made by the Office of the Secretary of State, Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), or Commissioner of Insurance findings.

For those that are listed expressly in statute, you would be able to go to any qualified district court, but we are not trying to disrupt it. For instance, if you committed a crime in Carson City, your case is going to stay in Carson City, and if you filed an otherwise normal civil suit here in Carson City, it would stay in the First Judicial District Court.

Assemblymember Cole:
My question is tied to that. Can you give us a list of those 16 to 18? I guess my question is in section 3. Is there any concern that you will sweep somebody into a court that is not close or convenient to them because of the qualified court aspect?

Assemblymember Yeager:
I can get you that list, but I do not have it with me. I do know some of the cases are listed in the digest by statute. When I looked through the highlighted cases, the ones that caused me to bring this bill were elections, petition initiatives, NDOT final approvals, Commissioner of Insurance, but I can get that list for you. I was just not able to get that pulled together this weekend.

To your question, I suppose there is that issue because one of the questions that has not been asked yet is, which courts would qualify under this bill. I think the easiest way to look at it is the requirement of three or more district court judges. Right now, only three judicial districts in the state have three or more district court judges: the Second Judicial District in Washoe County, the Eighth in Clark County, and the Fourth in Elko County.

I am certainly willing to have a conversation with the First Judicial District Court about whether they ought to have an additional judge; they have two right now. By default, they would not be able to take these cases. That would exclude them. If you were otherwise in Carson City, you would have to go to Clark County or Washoe County. If you are in Clark or Washoe Counties, you are already physically coming to Carson City, not only to file documents but also for the hearing. The difference is, if you are located outside of one of those judicial districts, you have access to online filing. You do not actually have to pay

someone to go to the courthouse and file the document. You can pull documents offline, and the members of the public would have the chance to participate. Obviously, if you are going to argue in court, you are going to have to go there in person no matter which court you are in. I am willing to have those discussions.

For me, the concern behind this bill is that electronic filing is more a convenience for lawyers and also for the media. To get documents you have to actually come to the court, fill out the paperwork, and talk to someone on the phone, so this is really for the public.

Unless you are able to come to Carson City to hear an argument, we have to wait until somebody reports on a case. We have had some pretty significant election cases over the last two presidential elections. And then our petition initiatives almost always get challenged no matter who brings the petition initiative. It is important to me the public have the ability to watch those proceedings without having to travel to Carson City. I will concede there is the possibility someone is still going to have to travel, though online should help.

Assemblymember Gray:
Never having filed a case or been a party to a case, is there a possibility of filing a case in a court that may be perceived as more friendly, or manipulating the system so the venue could be changed to a more friendly jurisdiction?

Assemblymember Yeager:
There is probably a lot of different answers to that question depending on whom you ask. Attorneys typically do try to file where they feel it is a little bit more friendly. It is hard to say if that is going to be the case. I will add a little bit of context because I think the First Judicial District is pretty unique. We have had turnover where we now have two new district court judges here in the First Judicial District. The two prior judges were here for a very long time, and they had developed expertise in these kinds of cases. They had to because they were the only ones in the state who heard these cases. We do not have the same consideration anymore because we have had complete turnover within the last year, year and a half, or maybe more recently. The two prior judges retired, and there are two new judges. My concern is we do not want to lose the expertise, but now we are not going to lose it.

These cases should be open to all judges because all district court judges in the state, at least in theory, are competent, were elected, and are able to do research and provide rulings on these cases. Under this bill, if this were to pass, a litigant would have an option: Do I file in Washoe? Do I file in Clark? Do I file in Elko? If they meet the other requirements of the bill with electronic filings, or if we were to give another judge to the First District Court, they could file there. That would be up to the attorneys. I do not know if in these cases there is any track record for someone to look at and say one court is more favorable than the others due to the two retirements in the First Judicial District Court. There are no published decisions by the judges who would be hearing these cases. That is always a consideration, but I am not particularly concerned about it because of the turnover we had in the First Judicial District.

Chair Miller:
I do not see any additional questions, so I will open it for testimony beginning in Carson City. Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 490? Not seeing anyone, is there anyone in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Will you open the phone lines, please? [There was no one.] I will open opposition testimony beginning in Carson City. Not seeing anyone here or in Las Vegas, will you open the phone lines, please? [There was no one.] I will open it for testimony in neutral, but not seeing anyone here or in Las Vegas, will you open the phone lines for testimony in neutral. [There was no one.] Assemblymember Yeager indicates he has no final comments, so I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 490.

Next, we have Assembly Bill 167. I am going to open the hearing.

Assembly Bill 167: Revises provisions relating to the use of corrective room restriction. (BDR 5-769)

Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen, Assembly District No. 32:
I am going to take just a moment to make an introductory remark and then introduce the guests at the table. It has been my privilege to become affiliated with Sitara Reganti, who is the youth legislator for Senate District 15. It was from participating in and helping with the Youth Legislature this fall that I got to know Sitara and got familiar with the legislation she was bringing forward. It was the session in which the legislators brought forward the youths' bill ideas. There were about seven that made the final round. As we listened to each of the presentations—Sitara did not make the final cut—I was impressed because she was dealing with the idea of corrective room restrictions for juveniles in the state of Nevada, and we as a legislative body had dealt with the adult population in solitary confinement reforms. It caught my attention, so I took the time to talk with Sitara afterward and told her I would like to visit if we do some similar reforms in the juvenile population.

After the holidays, we got to know each other better, and before you today is a heavily amended version of the bill. I think Sitara has learned you have ideas and then you start working with stakeholders. The good news is we have found some good things going on and good work being done by those who work in the juvenile system here in Nevada. That does not mean, however, there is no room for improvement.

I am going to turn this over to Sitara, but first, also at the table is Tom Clark. He is a personal friend, and his daughter is Sitara's best friend. We will turn it over to Sitara.

Sitara Reganti, Youth Legislator, Nevada Youth Legislature, Senate District No. 15:
I would like to thank Assemblymember Hansen for offering to carry Assembly Bill 167 and guiding me through this process. Earlier this year, the Nevada Legislature asked each of us to propose a bill. I remember spending hours reading through legislation and thinking about the kind of impact I wanted to make. That is when I started to reflect on juvenile justice, an area that is not always in the spotlight but is incredibly important. I distinctly remembered

meeting a woman in Washington, D.C., a few months prior who was involved with the Center for Children's Law and Policy. She was also familiar with the Stop Solitary for Kids campaign, which led me to look into Nevada's policies regarding corrective room restrictions.

I started researching what corrective room restrictions looked like in our state and across the nation. I learned Nevada allows up to 72 consecutive hours in confinement with minimal mental health involvement. It became clear that "wall confinement" may sometimes be necessary for safety, but it should not be where the support ends. It should be where it begins. That was the origin of A.B. 167, which initially aimed to reduce the maximum hours of consecutive room confinement from 72 to 24. But after thoughtful conversations with stakeholders, including detention officials, I realized there was a more effective way to meet the same goal.

I would like to speak to the amendment [Exhibit J] today and not to the original bill. I want to speak to the amendment that centers on one thing we can all agree on: the mental health of our youth is vital. I will now go through the amendment section by section. Section 1, subsection 5, and section 2, subsection 5, require any juvenile placed in corrective room restriction must be seen by a licensed mental health professional within 48 hours. These sections also require that, after the juvenile has met with the mental health professional, the provider must document their observations and recommendations in writing. This report includes an explanation as to whether the juvenile could remain in room confinement or should be moved to a less restrictive environment. This promotes accountability and provides a road map for staff and guardians to understand the juvenile's needs. It ensures mental health is part of the decision-making, not an afterthought. Finally, the written recommendation must be shared with the juvenile's guardian or caretaker if applicable. This helps families stay informed about the juvenile's rehabilitation process.

Section 1, subsections 6, 7, and 9, and section 2, subsections 6, 7, and 9 will remain unchanged. Section 1, subsection 8 and section 2, subsection 8 will be removed. These changes streamline the bill while maintaining the core protections. This amendment does not remove the tool of room confinement. It just makes sure that during those moments, kids are not left alone in the dark. It brings in support and structure.

To me, this bill is about more than just mental health. It is about recognizing that, even when juveniles are confined, they are still juveniles, they are still someone worth supporting, someone with potential. I am 17 years old. When I recently visited a correctional facility in northern Nevada, I had the opportunity to briefly speak with two juveniles currently in room confinement. They were both also 17 years old. They explained why they were in room confinement, and it reinforced my belief that this bill is necessary. I am proud to bring A.B. 167 forward with this amendment, and I hope you will join me in supporting it.

Chair Miller:
Our questions will, of course, be directed to the bill sponsor. As many of us often do, we have assistants and copresenters at the table with us because they may be able to respond to questions that we cannot, but our questions will be directed to the bill presenter.

Assemblymember Gray:
Excellent presentation. My question is on the amendment. It says they have to be evaluated within 48 hours of being placed in solitary. Is that to address the underlying reasons they are being put in solitary or for their continuation in solitary? The reason I ask is, if it is within 48 hours and they are evaluated after an hour, you are not going to get a true sense of whether they should continue in confinement. That is what I am getting at.

Sitara Reganti:
It is mainly to address any underlying issues the juvenile may be facing when they are in room confinement. However, if after their evaluation and speaking with the juvenile the mental health professional feels they might not be able to remain in room confinement, they can take it to the facility staff. The reason we made it within 48 hours is, we understand there might be some delay in getting a mental health professional to those kids.

Assemblymember Nadeem:
My question is whether the mental health evaluation is for all the convicted juveniles or specific ones?

Sitara Reganti:
It is for the juveniles who are placed in corrective room restriction. The mental health professional will come to see them and evaluate them and do a check-in.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
Thank you for the passion you bring to this and for the research I know went into it. If a mental health professional is coming to meet with a child within 48 hours, they do not have to wait in confinement for the mental health professional, correct? They could be in confinement for two hours, get out, and then meet with the mental health professional the next day. Is that what you are envisioning?

Sitara Reganti:
While it is not explicitly defined in the amendment, the goal is that while the child is in room confinement, a mental health professional will come visit them.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
In the chart that was provided of the data [Exhibit K], I noticed the majority of confinements are two hours or less. What I want to confirm is that a child who is confined for two hours or less is not going to be stuck in the room waiting for the mental health professional to come before they can get released from the room. That is what I am trying to confirm.

Sitara Reganti:
The juvenile will not be waiting in the room. It is just if they remain in the room within 48 hours that a mental health professional must come to see them. They do not have to wait in the room for the provider to come see them. It is just if they are already there.

Chair Miller:
If a child was in confinement for two hours and then the mental health professional shows up in an hour, eight hours, or during hour 12, since it sometimes takes that long for someone to appear, will they still receive that evaluation?

Assemblymember Hansen:
The intent of the bill is to protect children who are in these corrective room restrictions for a long period of time. The good news is, as we can see from the chart, the majority of kids are not in these room restrictions much longer than two hours. Depending on the availability of the mental health professional—and that is what we are going to hear about in some of the testimony—some of them may take longer. That may take juggling for some of the jurisdictions.

Again, the intent of the bill is if a child is in there up to 48 hours, which is the longer end, then certainly we would like to have a mental health assessment or evaluation, but not necessarily in the shorter term. Later, when we have someone with expertise at the table, we might ask what the process looks like when they first come in. Is there a mental health evaluation at all when they come in? However, this legislation applies to those who are in these corrective room restrictions for long periods of time to have that check in.

Chair Miller:
As noted, when this data was shared, it was very encouraging since this type of data often shows the youth are not being held for the maximum time, which also means it is appropriately being handed out.

With that, back to my original question. You are stating that, if a juvenile is in restrictive room confinement, they will absolutely receive a mental health evaluation with someone within 48 hours because the reality is someone may not be able to appear within a two-to-four-hour window. We are not saying they will not receive a mental health evaluation. The mental health evaluation could still occur even though they have been released. Is that correct? Or is that the intent?

Sitara Reganti:
I believe that is the intent just in case there is a delay in getting a mental health professional to the child. Suppose they have been in there for 24 hours and the mental health professional arrives just as they are released, we still want to make sure they are receiving the proper care.

Assemblymember Cole:
I think it is interesting and important for us to look at what is happening with the juveniles. My question is probing all the same areas these folks are. I guess tighten up the language and make it clearer. I am not an expert, but I am not sure just two hours in placement would require a mental health evaluation. Tighten up the language to make sure it is very clear there is a limit of over two or four hours. It has to apply. Maybe it is a "will" or a "may" situation if it is under the two hours. I do not know. Just my thought.

Sitara Reganti:
We will definitely look into making that amendment tighten the language to ensure it encompasses all your questions.

Assemblymember Roth:
My question is regarding the 15 hours. I am curious how you came to that number. I know there is research around solitary confinement for adults, and I assume that exists for juveniles as well. Fifteen hours seems like a really long time for a kid to be confined, so I am curious what research that was based on.

Sitara Reganti:
Does that refer to the original bill that discusses the number of hours juveniles can be placed in room confinement?

Assemblymember Roth:
Well, yes, but it also contemplates section 1, subsection 6, "A child who is subjected to corrective room restriction for more than 15 hours must be provided . . . ." I am curious how you got to 15 hours.

Sitara Reganti:
After conducting research based on what other states are doing and looking into their policies, 15 hours seemed to be a very common number, so we based it off that. I can also get you the research regarding the 15 hours.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing any additional questions, I will open testimony beginning in Carson City. Is there, anyone wishing to come forward to testify in support of Assembly Bill 167.

Sabrina Schnur, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association
We are in support of A.B. 167, which limits confinement for youth in the juvenile system. I would like to read an excerpt from the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry on the use of solitary confinement of juvenile offenders:

> The potential psychiatric consequences of prolonged solitary confinement are well recognized and include depression, anxiety, and psychosis. Due to their developmental vulnerability, juvenile offenders are at particular risk of such

adverse reactions. Furthermore, the majority of suicides in juvenile correctional facilities occur when the individual is isolated or in solitary confinement.

Solitary confinement should be distinguished from brief interventions such as "time out," which may be used as a component of a behavioral treatment program in facilities serving children and/or adolescents, or seclusion, which is a short-term emergency procedure.

Seclusion should only be used for the least amount of time possible for the immediate physical protection of an individual in situations where less restrictive interventions have proven ineffective.

The Joint Commission specifically prohibits the use of seclusion "as a means of coercion, discipline, convenience or staff retaliation." A lack of resources should never be a rationale for solitary confinement.

The United Nations (UN) Rules for Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty establish minimum standards for the protection of juveniles in correctional facilities. The UN resolution was approved by the General Assembly in December 1990 and supported by the United States. They specifically prohibit the use of solitary confinement for juvenile offenders. Section 67 of the Rules states: "All disciplinary measures constituting cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment shall be strictly prohibited, including corporal punishment, placement in a dark cell, closed or solitary confinement, or any other punishment that may compromise the physical or mental health of the juvenile concerned." In this situation, cruel and unusual punishment would be considered an Eighth Amendment violation of our *Constitution*.

The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry concurs with the UN position and opposes the use of solitary confinement in correctional facilities for juveniles. In addition, any youth that is confined for more than 24 hours must be evaluated by a mental health professional, such as a child and adolescent psychiatrist when one is available.

Addison Clark, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am here to testify in support of Assembly Bill 167. I am here because I am a teen mental health advocate in northern Nevada. I work with multiple nonprofits in northern Nevada and throughout the state. I have clinical suicide prevention training for adolescents. The reason I am here is the first and foremost thing we were taught in that training is when students and teenagers feel isolated and alone, their mental health takes the hardest hit. One of the things I learned during my training—and being a teenager myself—was to feel supported and connected with my community and with other people in my environment, I need to have access to people. I understand that room confinement is regulated and that there are different

things that come into play here, but the overall important thing to understand is when teens feel alone and isolated, that is when they struggle with their mental health the most. That is why I am here in support of Assembly Bill 167.

Nicholas Shepack, Board Member, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada:
I have had the absolute pleasure of working on solitary confinement issues since the 2019 Session. In our extensive research it has become abundantly clear there are few things that happen inside correctional institutions, whether that is adult or juvenile, that are more detrimental to the individuals than being held in solitary confinement and isolation. This bill takes a very measured approach, and as the sponsors mentioned, we have some really good facilities doing things the right way now. But without proper laws in place, all it takes is one bad actor for an individual to be held in this type of situation that has irreparable damage for the rest of their life. We should have the strictest laws possible surrounding youth isolation, and this bill moves us one step closer.

Angela Knott, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:
Solitary confinement can have devastating effects on juveniles due to their still developing brains and heightened vulnerability. Isolation can lead to severe mental health issues, including depression, anxiety, paranoia, and even suicidal thoughts. According to the Child Crime Prevention and Safety Center website, half of all suicides occurring in juvenile facilities occurred while the minor was in solitary confinement, and 62 percent of those who committed suicide had a history of being placed in isolation. Research and common sense show children are different from adults. Isolation can cause serious psychological, physical, and developmental harm to young people who need age-appropriate services and programming for their healthy growth and development. Normal human contact and a range of age-appropriate services and programming are essential for the development and rehabilitation of young offenders. Assembly Bill 167 is smart legislation that will help limit isolation and hopefully address any underlying mental health issues a juvenile may be suffering.

Harrison Epstein, Legal Extern, Clark County Public Defender's Office:
Subjecting children to corrective room restriction inflicts a massive psychological toll. On that note, we would like to echo the words of the Nevada Psychiatric Association and all of the previous speakers.

Guaranteeing access to mental health treatment for children after they have been released from these corrective rooms is also a measured step in lessening those psychological impacts. Dropping the maximum time these children can be placed in solitary confinement is a step in the right direction. This is a valuable piece of legislation seeking to lessen the already high negative impact incarceration can have on children. No child should ever be placed in solitary confinement, but if it continues to exist as an option, it should be measured, only used as a last resort, and the children subjected to it should be given the best possible mental health access afterwards. Being more thoughtful with how we treat our children and focusing on rehabilitation instead of punishment alone will lead to better outcomes overall.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:
We represent over 3,000 kids in foster care between the north and the south. A lot of those kids also have juvenile justice charges. I want to ditto the comments. I will be brief; I agree with everything that has been said.

Tessyn Opferman, representing National Association of Social Workers:
We too will do a ditto and echo everything that has been said. We are in full support of this measure. We are very concerned about the use of solitary confinement for children. We support any legislation that will limit the amount of time children are in solitary confinement and would like to work to end solitary confinement as a whole when possible.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing anyone else in Carson City, and I do not see anyone in Las Vegas, would you please open the phone lines in support of Assembly Bill 167?

Denise Bolaños-Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada:
Return Strong! is an organization that fights for the rights and dignity of incarcerated people and their families in Nevada. We support A.B. 167 because children should never be subjected to solitary confinement as punishment. We made important changes to solitary confinement for adults in Nevada. Children and youth should not be the exception. Solitary confinement, regardless of what it is called, has devastating effects on people's mental and emotional development. This is a commonsense, compassionate step forward. It ensures if solitary confinement is ever used, it is as a last resort, time limited, and monitored. We are here to support A.B. 167 and to protect our youth from this deeply damaging practice.

Sebastian Rios, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am testifying before you today in my personal capacity to express my support for A.B. 167. I hope to share key takeaways and points for the legislation I feel would positively and strongly impact the community here in the state of Nevada.

To begin, I currently serve in the Youth Legislature alongside Youth Legislator Reganti. When Youth Legislator Reganti first brought her bill to the Youth Legislature, I was happy to support her efforts because, as she has shared, it is an extremely important issue of solitary confinement we are tackling here, and youth are struggling with this issue today, right now, as we speak. As youth legislators, we have had the opportunity to conversate with youth and hear their stories as well as educate ourselves on the top issues facing youth today. Solitary confinement can be counterproductive to the goal of reducing recidivism if youth are not provided with the proper care. Having positive social interaction during the time of solitude can improve results. Ensuring fair and accountability-directed practices is important for the sake of our youngest citizens.

Our goal for juvenile justice should be to reduce the amount of crime committed by the youth community. We know mental health plays a role in determining whether youth commit a crime, especially when it comes to their mindset and intent. The purpose of our juvenile

justice practices ought to be to mold our youth into good, law-abiding citizens. An effective way to do that is to provide them with individual guidance. Providing these youth with mental health services would ensure they are making positive progress towards improvement and change and ensure the confinement is not damaging progress. Many of these youth still have the capacity to do good things in their communities. Recidivism is avoidable, so it is just about providing them with the tools they need to succeed.

To conclude, our juvenile justice system has the capacity to reduce recidivism and implement positive practices. The more chances we can provide youth to improve their mentality toward change, the better. Together we can build a more active, positive, and success-driven youth community and ensure service and not crime is the first priority of youth exiting the justice system. With that all being said, I hope A.B. 167 will pass. These changes can create real impact.

Chair Miller:
With no other callers wishing to testify in support at this time, I will open testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 167 if there is anyone in Carson City who would like to oppose.

Elizabeth Florez, Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Washoe County:
I want to start by thanking Assemblywoman Hansen and Youth Legislator Sitara Reganti for encouraging dialogue regarding A.B. 167 to address my concerns. But unfortunately, those concerns have not been resolved.

For some historical context, in 2013, juvenile justice professionals worked collaboratively with the American Civil Liberties Union on Senate Bill 107 of the 77th Session, which created standardized practices for the use of corrective room restriction, now codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 62B.215. At the time, the term "solitary confinement" was not used by juvenile justice professionals because it did not accurately describe what was happening in juvenile facilities. In fact, most facilities had already moved toward best practices even before the bill was passed. Senate Bill 107 of the 77th Session brought accountability and consistency to the system. When used appropriately, corrective room restriction actually helps reduce the use of force and prevents violent situations from escalating. Kids, even those who are in their rooms for longer periods of time, are not "left alone in the dark." Contact occurs throughout the day to return to the general population as soon as possible.

As to the bill presenters' concerns about mental health, no one is more attuned to the needs of these youth than the hundreds of facility staff in Nevada who provide 24/7 supervision and care. Detention staff are required under Nevada law to complete extensive training in areas like signs of suicide, suicide prevention, trauma-informed care, juvenile rights, the proper use of room restriction, and controlling the behavior of children. Staff are responsible for the health, safety, and welfare of all youth.

The proposed amendment would require a mental health professional to respond to every youth in room restriction within 48 hours. This simply is not feasible. Many facilities do not have clinicians on staff and rely on outside contractors. Those that do have staff would need to hire additional personnel or expand already strained contract providers, creating a significant fiscal impact. In addition, mental health professionals are not trained in the safe operation of detention centers, especially those who are contracted providers.

In closing, we remain committed to our community and youth-serving missions. Any policy change must consider the operational facilities—

[Exhibit L, written testimony from Elizabeth Florez, was submitted and will become part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
Your two minutes are up, but if you have something written, please submit your comments, then we will have them in their entirety on the record.

Ali Banister, Chief, Juvenile Services, Carson City, Nevada:
I am here today to express my concerns regarding A.B. 167, specifically the 48-hour mandate for youth to be seen by a mental health professional when placed in corrective room restriction.

As someone who works on the front lines of the juvenile justice system, I can tell you the implementation of this bill would create significant challenges, particularly in rural jurisdictions. In many of these areas, mental health professionals are not readily available within the required 48-hour period. The staff in these rural areas often do not have clinicians on-site and must rely on contracting services which introduce both logistical and scheduling challenges. Accessing mental health professionals within such a brief time frame is not always feasible in these smaller jurisdictions. The realities of our rural communities must be considered when establishing such mandates. In these areas, it is common for mental health professionals to have schedules that are limited or stretched thin. The idea that every youth placed in corrective room restriction must be seen by a mental health professional within 48 hours could inadvertently result in delays or in some cases an inability to meet this mandate.

I want to emphasize the work being done in Nevada's juvenile justice system, especially in our detention centers. The staff at these facilities take the safety and well-being of our youth very seriously. When a youth is placed in corrective room restriction, they are not left isolated and/or without oversight. These youth continue to be monitored regularly by trained staff, and mental health evaluations are conducted on an as-needed basis, especially if there are concerns about suicidal ideation or self-harm. Our priority is always the mental and physical health of the youth. While the thought behind A.B. 167 is well intentioned, it does not reflect the practical realities of delivering timely mental health care in every jurisdiction. In addition, the juvenile justice system does not use solitary confinement like the adult system.

Lastly, I want to highlight the major fiscal impact this mandate would have, especially for counties that do not have on-staff mental health clinicians. [Exhibit M, written testimony, was submitted and will become part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
Your time is up. Please submit your comments in writing.

Jeffrey S. Rogan, representing Clark County:
Clark County is in a little bit different position than every other county in this state. We do have a cadre of mental health professionals consisting of licensed professionals, as well as postgraduates who are on their way to licensure and participating in their postgraduate experiences that are required by law in order to earn their license. Those folks actually do evaluate some of our children who are in corrective room restrictions.

We have concerns about the amendment, and we have been speaking with the proponents of the bill as well as the Assemblymember with regard to these concerns. First, as some of you have raised during your questions, we believe every time a child is put in corrective room restriction, there should be a mandatory requirement they be seen by a mental health professional. You heard some testimony to that today from the Nevada Psychiatric Association that it is only those children who are in corrective room restrictions for 24 hours or more who should be mandated to see a mental health professional. That is an amendment we proposed to the proponents.

Second, because we utilize postgraduate interns in our facilities, we would like to see the expansion of the bill a bit to not only be limited to licensed professionals but also those folks who are on their way to licensure. It would have an effect on us if we were unable to use those qualified postgraduate interns to assess the child.

Last, we also have some concerns about the appropriateness of a mental health professional being the one making a recommendation as to whether a child should remain in corrective room restriction as the amendment seems to suggest. That is a decision that really needs to be left to the professional staff in our juvenile justice system who need to make that determination considering other factors based upon security needs as well as the mental health condition of the children.

We look forward to working with the Assemblymember as well as Ms. Reganti on these specific issues.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in opposition here in Carson City? Not seeing anyone here or in Las Vegas, will you please open the phone lines?

Heather Plager, Chief, Juvenile Services, Elko County, Nevada:
I want to express concern over the bill and amendment to require every youth placed in corrective room confinement be seen by a licensed mental health professional within 48 hours. While the mental health of youth in detention is undoubtedly important, the practical implications of this requirement in a rural setting like ours are significant and warrant careful consideration. We face severe limitations when it comes to accessing mental health professionals. The resources in our area are scarce, especially after hours or on weekends, and the availability of a licensed professional who can respond to an emergency situation is highly limited. This creates a situation where meeting a 48-hour timeline could be incredibly challenging if not impossible.

Moreover, the additional costs associated with bringing in a mental health professional after hours, particularly in urgent situations, would place an undue financial burden on our agency. These professionals are not readily available, and after-hours or weekend rates are significantly higher, putting extra strain on already limited budgets. It is important to recognize NRS 62B.215 already includes detailed and comprehensive guidelines regarding corrective room confinement. These regulations ensure confinement is only used after less-restrictive options have been exhausted and is done with the child's safety and well-being in mind. Facilities are required to conduct safety and well-being checks every ten minutes and to document all actions involving corrective room confinement. There are strict limitations on the duration of confinement and requirements for ongoing reviews, all of which ensure children are being treated fairly and humanely.

In conclusion, while we all want to ensure children in our care receive appropriate mental health treatment, we must balance those needs with the realities of limited resources and the practicalities of rule setting. Mandating mental health professional involvement, especially within a 48-hour requirement, would further strain our already limited resources without providing substantial benefit in terms of improving the care of the children in our facility. The current regulations are already robust and offer adequate safeguards.

Brandon Bird, Director, Teurman Hall-Detention Center, Juvenile Justice Center, Churchill County:
I want to speak with you today regarding the resources of kids who have been placed on CRR [corrective room restriction]. We do not participate in solitary confinement. That has a negative connotation, and I think we need to paint a broader picture and a more accurate picture of what it is we do. When we have a kid who is acting out, and they are a safety threat to themselves or others, there are times when we need to put them in a place where they are isolated and away from other youth. Once they are placed in this location, we place them per state mandates on ten-minute checks. We continually check on them every ten minutes, trying to find a way to pull them out of the room in which they were placed.

One other aspect I would like to bring up to you is we, in a rural county, have to contract with licensed clinical social workers and counselors. They are not always available; they take vacations and time off work. We have two, but what happens when they cannot be reached?

What about when they are not available? I know Reno Behavioral Healthcare Hospital has been brought up, but they do not do assessments like that. They do acute assessments looking to help youth who are in an immediate state of health.

Tamara Morris, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department:
I want to express my concerns about this bill. We currently do not employ a mental health provider in our juvenile detention center, and it would be challenging for us to find a mental health provider to respond in a short amount of time. As others have mentioned, we also contract. This would be especially difficult on a weekend. If we were to find someone, there would be a larger fiscal impact for us as well. *Nevada Revised Statutes* currently requires many protections for the youth in corrective room restrictions, and our detention staff undergo extensive training to meet the needs of the youth. We always have a mental health provider available for assessments should a youth express suicidal ideation or other mental health concerns.

I understand the reason for this bill, and I do believe the needs are being met already through NRS and through the training that we put our staff through. As others have mentioned, we do not use solitary confinement. They are placed in their room for essentially a time out, and at times they even request to go to their room to spend some time alone.

[Exhibit N is written testimony and a proposed amendment in opposition to Assembly Bill 167 submitted but not discussed and made part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
With no other callers, I will open it for neutral testimony here in Carson City.

Carissa Pearce, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance:
Children's Advocacy Alliance is an independent voice for Nevada's children with a mission to ensure every child in Nevada thrives. We appreciate the thoughtful direction of this bill and commend the sponsor for taking meaningful steps to protect the well-being of youth in detention facilities.

The bill's reduction of allowable time in corrective room restrictions and the addition of oversight mechanisms represents significant progress. The requirement that youth held in room restriction beyond 15 hours must be provided with access to medical and mental health treatment is a critical safeguard that recognizes the impact isolation can have on a young person's psychological and emotional health. Assembly Bill 167 addresses an urgent need we have in Nevada, and we believe it could be even stronger if aligned more closely with Arizona standards, which are regarded as humane and developmentally appropriate. Arizona, for example, prohibits placing youth in isolation solely based on risk status, such as risk for victimization, and ensures educational and recreational opportunities continue uninterrupted.

Finally, Arizona emphasizes isolation must be a last resort and only for the minimum time necessary. While A.B. 167 moves in this direction, this bill could benefit from even stronger language around the exhaustion of all other options prior to confinement. We very much appreciate the intent of A.B. 167. We will share these resources from Arizona with the sponsor and would urge the Committee to consider any additional protections to strengthen the bill and further protect Nevada's children.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Carson or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral? Not seeing anyone, will you open the phone lines? [There was no one.] I will close testimony and welcome the bill presenters for any final remarks.

Assemblymember Hansen:
Thanks to all of those who have testified in various ways, whether in support or in opposition. We can, hopefully, be able to work with them further and see what we can do. We want to make sure we address their concerns while still protecting the intent of the bill. I would like to turn this over to our youth legislator.

Sitara Reganti:
I would also like to thank those who have testified today and have shown they truly care about juvenile mental health. The ACLU was referenced today. I would like to mention the ACLU has released a tool kit that explicitly outlines the harm solitary confinement or corrective restrictions can have on children, including psychological damage, increased suicide rates, and stunted development. Additionally, I would like to mention A.B. 167's main goal today is to strengthen the partnerships between facilities and mental health professionals. Assembly Bill 167 only requires a mental health professional to complete a check within 48 hours and no longer reduces the number of consecutive hours of corrective room restrictions.

Additionally, it is important to note these juveniles are the future of Nevada. We need to protect their mental health and ensure we are focusing on rehabilitation. I look forward to working with people like Jeff Rogan from Clark County on the amendment and to establish a definition we can both agree on. The end goal is to have someone who knows enough about juvenile mental health checking on them and making sure they are doing okay.

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

Chair Miller:
With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 167.

Last on our agenda today is public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to make public comment? Not seeing anyone here or in Las Vegas, I will open the lines. [There was no one.] With that, I will close public comment. We have completed all the work before us today on our agenda. We will adjourn and begin tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. We are adjourned [at 10:17 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 55	C	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B 58	D	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 76	E	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 119	F	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 137	G	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 197	H	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 246	I	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 167	J	Sitara Reganti, Youth Legislator, Nevada Youth Legislature, Senate District No. 15	Conceptual amendment
A.B. 167	K	Sitara Reganti, Youth Legislator, Nevada Youth Legislature, Senate District No. 15	Supplemental information
A.B. 167	L	Elizabeth Florez, Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Washoe County	Written testimony in opposition
A.B. 167	M	Ali Banister, Chief, Juvenile Services, Carson City	Written testimony in opposition
A.B. 167	N	Pauline Salla, Director, Humbolt County Juvenile Services	Proposed amendment and letter in opposition