MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-third Session
May 9, 2025

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 10:33 a.m. on Friday, May 9, 2025, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 6 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Senator Edgar Flores, Vice Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall
Senator Roberta Lange
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John Ellison

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senatorial District No. 6
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole, Assembly District No. 4
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen, Assembly District No. 32
Assemblymember Gregory S. Koenig, Assembly District No. 38
Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett, Assembly District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Michael Scully, Committee Counsel
Jan Brase, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Goldwater, Self Storage Association
Daniel Bryant, Self Storage Association
Tom Clark, U-Haul
Teddie Craig
Kami Dempsey, Nevada Press Association
Scott Sibley, Nevada Press Association; *Nevada Legal News*
Jamie Griffin
Ben Rowley
Benjamin Lipman, *Las Vegas Review-Journal*
William C. Horne, SafeNest
Serena Evans, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
Joshua Martinez, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Paloma Guerrero, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Brigid Duffy, Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Harrison Epstein, Legal Extern, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Nick Vassiliadis, Nevada Resort Association
Michael Alonso, Caesars Entertainment
Virginia Valentine, Nevada Resort Association
Chelsea Capurro, MGM Resorts International

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will open the work session on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 17, A.B. 18, A.B. 30, A.B. 97, A.B. 150, A.B. 153, A.B. 329 and A.B. 518.

ASSEMBLY BILL 17: Revises provisions relating to writs of garnishment. (BDR 3-416)

ASSEMBLY BILL 18: Revises provisions relating to the electronic filing of certain documents. (BDR 5-469)

ASSEMBLY BILL 30: Revises provisions relating to records of defendants who have been found incompetent. (BDR 14-293)

ASSEMBLY BILL 97: Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 14-499)

ASSEMBLY BILL 150 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the criminal justice system. (BDR 15-157)

ASSEMBLY BILL 153 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the education of incarcerated persons. (BDR 16-234)

ASSEMBLY BILL 329 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to victims of crime. (BDR 16-1050)

ASSEMBLY BILL 518: Revises provisions relating to the interstate placement of children. (BDR 11-807)

SENATOR HANSEN:
Did we hear A.B. 518? I couldn't remember the hearing, and it's an [Assembly] Health and Human Services bill. Is it supposed to be on our docket today?

JERED MCDONALD (Committee Policy Analyst):
Assembly Bill 518 revises provisions related to the interstate placement of children. This was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services, heard in this committee on April 24 and presented in our committee by Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Assembly District No. 27.

If you'll recall, the bill adopts and enters into a revised version of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children. The revisions make certain administrative changes requiring each participating state to establish a central state compact office with an executive head appointed by the governor. There are no amendments on this bill.

I will continue with a presentation of work session bills. The following bills will be considered on a consent agenda: A.B. 17, A.B. 18, A.B. 30, A.B. 97, A.B. 150, A.B. 153, A.B. 329 and A.B. 518.

I will read the bill descriptions from their respective work session documents (Exhibit C, Exhibit D, Exhibit E, Exhibit F, Exhibit G, Exhibit H, Exhibit I and Exhibit J).

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 17, A.B. 18, A.B. 30, A.B. 97, A.B. 150, A.B. 153, A.B. 329 AND A.B. 518.

SENATOR FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
We will open the work session on A.B. 387.

ASSEMBLY BILL 387 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing guardianship of minors. (BDR 13-869)

MR. MCDONALD:
I will read the summary of A.B. 387 from the work session document (Exhibit K).

SENATOR LANGE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 387.

SENATOR NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I will close the work session and open the hearing on A.B. 137.

ASSEMBLY BILL 137 (1st Reprint): 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)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SELENA TORRES-FOSSETT (Assembly District No. 3):
Assembly Bill 137 modernizes the lien sale notification process for self-storage facilities by eliminating the outdated requirements to publish notices in printed newspapers and instead allow notices to be posted on a publicly accessible

internet website. This is a commonsense update that reflects how people actually receive information today. While modernizing how advertising for the unit is conducted, we made sure to preserve all the consumer protections that were in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) originally. We heard a few concerns from the Assembly hearing. I wanted to address the concerns directly at the start of this hearing.

First, some have asked if a person does not have internet access, how would they then be notified? It is important to note A.B. 137 does not eliminate the direct notices required to the occupant. Under existing law, storage operators are required to notify a tenant multiple times before a lien sale, including directly to an alternative contact provided by the tenant. The public advertisement is not intended to alert an individual tenant. It is intended to alert potential bidders of the sale opportunity.

Even for those without internet access at home, public libraries across Nevada offer free access. I would argue the internet today is more accessible than newspapers. As the youngest member of the Assembly, I can tell you I have never had a newspaper delivered to my home, and I generally do not have newspapers available. What I do have is the newspaper app on my phone. I also read the news on the internet or X [formerly Twitter]. That is how most people get information. In many ways, I think this is just a modernization that allows us to access information and update outdated statutes that prevented us from accessing information in a way that makes sense for us today.

The second concern raised was about transient workers such as union journeymen who might move frequently. One of the consumer protections in the current law allows tenants to provide an email address and a secondary contact. Email travels with the tenant, and the alternate contact provides another layer of protection before any sale is conducted. Additionally, those same individuals would have access to the internet in whatever part of the world they might be traveling. It is probably a better bet they have access to the internet than have access to the local newspaper once they have moved out of a certain area.

We have heard arguments about the importance of the website <https:/www.nevadapublicnotice.com>. Respectfully, the evidence tells us few people actually read that site. In California, survey data confirmed that newspaper notice websites receive minimal engagement. In fact, I am not even sure they existed until I started preparing for this hearing today.

Assembly Bill 137 allows the use of other more functional and accessible online platforms that serve the same purpose—getting the word out. Someone said that $45 per advertisement is a small price to pay for additional notice, but context matters. Storage operators often recover only 25 cents or 30 cents on the dollar during a lien sale. If a tenant owes $1,000 and the sale brings in $200, an $80 newspaper fee adds 40 percent tax. That's not a small price; it is punitive.

Lastly, there is a suggestion that removing newspapers is like letting the fox watch the henhouse and owners can't be trusted to comply with the law without newspapers acting as some sort of watchdog. That's just simply not accurate. Storage owners have a strong economic incentive to ensure maximum exposure. More views lead to more bids and better sale prices. Newspapers are not investigators. They do not verify the accuracy of timelines of notices. They perform administrative tasks and print what is submitted—sometimes late, incorrectly or only once a week. Assembly Bill 137 replaces an inefficient and costly relic of the past with a more effective, more accessible and more affordable solution.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER ALEXIS M. HANSEN (Assembly District No. 32):
This bill modernizes the advertising requirements for lien sales by allowing notices to be published online or in countywide newspapers rather than being limited to judicial district publications. This update is particularly beneficial for Nevada's rural and northern communities, many of which I represent, where access to traditional print media is often limited. Furthermore, keeping costs down for the tenants and the owners is of particular concern in the rural and northern communities. As a tenant of a storage unit in rural Nevada, I can attest that when you sign up, you have to provide your email address; you have to provide a secondary address and an emergency contact. If, for some reason, the unit owners need to get in touch with you, they have ample methods in place to reach you.

In regard to access to the internet in rural Nevada, Starlink has provided some incredible resources for people to have internet service. We have a very remote location in northern Elko County, and Starlink provides us the internet that we are not normally able to access. More of the urban areas in my rural districts do have broadband and are able to access websites. By embracing digital platforms and broader publication options, A.B. 137 ensures that residents in remote areas receive timely and accessible information about storage lien sales.

This not only enhances transparency but also promotes greater participation in these sales, potentially leading to better outcomes for both storage facility owners and the community. Assembly Bill 137 reflects our commitment to equitable access to information for all Nevadans regardless of geography. Even with the limitations of general circulation newspapers in parts of my district, we have an electronic option. I urge your support for this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

DAVID GOLDWATER (Self Storage Association):
The goal of this bill was just to kind of explain how the system works and to tell you that we're just modernizing solely the advertising portion of where the lien bill affects people, keeping all the other consumer protections in place, including all the notices and the written notices. As you can see in our PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit L contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.), self-storage is a place where, just like they do with apartments, people can rent a space, sign a contract, put their stuff in and usually pay for the term of the contract and then leave. Sometimes, they leave without paying what they're contracted to, and then there are steps in the law to take care of what happens.

Today, what's happening is when tenants don't pay, their goods are sold. You probably see *Storage Wars*. Inside every storage unit is, potentially, a forgotten Picasso and everybody is going to be rich. That is hardly the case. Usually, it is somebody that just moved out, didn't want to pay anymore and left their things for other people to move out. There are steps that you go through in the law, and there are costs those landlords end up incurring, including the cost of advertising and all the rest. I put the legislative history in your packets (Exhibit M). One of the burdens is that in 1983 there was not an internet so that was not an option. In A.B. 137, we say you can still advertise in a newspaper of general circulation as defined in statute, or you can advertise in a more modern way that makes sense to people, reaches more people and gets more visibility to the people who are selling the contents which, in the end, reduces cost to the customer.

Some ask, is this a trend across the country? What are other states doing? Yes, of course, it is. Most states are moving toward a digital model if any advertisement is required at all. That is really important.

Under current law, it is a costly [process]. Under proposed law, it is better and way more efficient. Imagine what we do with everything on the internet. It seems just bizarre that we are still requiring advertising in a newspaper of general circulation. Only ten states still require two publications in printed media —that is moving to less than ten—and most states allow for some alternatives. Six states require none at all.

DANIEL BRYANT (Self Storage Association):
I am Legal and Legislative Counsel to the national Self Storage Association based in Alexandria, Virginia. I want to zoom out a little bit to make sure to put A.B. 137 into the context I think it needs. The presentation provides a flow chart that outlines the various steps currently required by the law. As you can see, step six is the only piece that would be amended.

As a threshold matter, every self-storage owner-operator in the State is required to present a written agreement to every customer that must be signed and executed. A number of provisions in the law have to be included for it to be an enforceable agreement and to ensure owners have lien rights if and when a customer should default. For the overwhelming majority of customers in the State, that is the end of the story. Everybody will get the benefit of the opportunity to utilize the space. Rent will be timely remitted for an agreed length of time. Everyone will be happy with the transaction.

If and when there is an issue and a customer continues to utilize the space but declines to make timely payments, the process starts and the law kicks in. The owner will send a first notice of default with an opportunity to cure. If the default is cured, there's no issue and you go no further. To the extent that first notice is sent and the default is not cured, then there is a second required notification to the customer. In particular, I want to highlight that with the second notification owners are required to send what is called a "declaration in opposition." If a customer receives the notice, basically, all they have to do is send it back to the owner-operator. The tenant would say, "I oppose this lien sale," which immediately kicks you out of the self-help remedy of the law and into the court system. Beyond that, every owner-operator really does go above and beyond to try to make contact.

These [processes] truly are not moneymakers by any stretch of the imagination. Every owner-operator we represent will make every contact possible up to and including phone calls, text messages, additional direct mailings, additional direct

emails and so on. At this time, the penultimate step to the extent you have gone through the exhaustive process is a requirement that the unit be advertised in the newspaper. What we are proposing here is a small modification while keeping the newspaper option to the extent the owner-operator believes it is the best and most effective way to market the unit. However, if they believe that perhaps more updated technologies would be beneficial, the opportunity to put the unit on a publicly accessible website would be the additional option here.

Just to put a fine point on it, there is no change to any of those other direct notification provisions. That is something all of our members follow to the letter and even go above and beyond.

The question then becomes where will these be advertised? What are the websites? There are a number of them, but I asked the marketing department about one of the largest companies providing these services to our members. As you can see on the next slide, the numbers speak for themselves. These websites have an immense amount of traffic. People go there specifically looking for these units and the opportunity to bid on them. The one additional benefit relative to current newspapers is that it actually can provide in real time the number of views. Obviously, newspaper technology is not capable of providing this information, which is an additional benefit in shifting to these online platforms.

We want to provide a general example of some of these lien sales and, generally, what kind of money we are talking about. For example purposes, when the outstanding debt at the time of auction is $1,000, the auction may bring in about $200. As a threshold matter before you have even gotten to the advertising costs, you are already out about 80 percent of what is lawfully owed to you. When the owner continues through the process and adds those publication fees, you are really talking about, in my estimation, adding a tax on a loss. We are really just trying to update the law to provide some additional options for self-storage owner-operators in the State. As Mr. Goldwater indicated earlier in the presentation, this is something widely accepted across the country, and the rest of the states are headed in this direction.

MR. GOLDWATER:
In summary, most of us are members of a very unique generation. We remember a time when there was no internet and there were newspapers—let

me just say on a personal note, I love newspapers. I miss the days of getting the paper, sitting down and reading something physically in my hand. I still do it if I can. Unfortunately, the world is moving away from us. If we want to access eyeballs here, access people and get the most value, relieve as much as we can and make something efficient, we can't continue to subsidize a dying technology with these sorts of government mandates. That is why we are suggesting modernizing the process.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I have a few concerns about the bill. I told you this yesterday when you we met in my office. The point here is not everybody has access to the internet, and not everybody thinks the easiest thing to do is use an app. In fact, I represent a lot of senior citizens who do not even know how to use an app and do not have internet access. They do rely on the newspaper, and they do subscribe to the newspaper. It is great that we have options. Some people can use the internet and apps. Some people can read the newspaper. I subscribe to the newspaper. I enjoy reading the newspaper, but that is just my personal choice.

In this bill, we're talking about notice, while someone's opinion might be it is just notice to the people who want to come out and rummage through somebody else's nonpaid storage facility. The primary purpose of notice is to formally communicate information to individuals, informing them about events or actions that may affect their rights or interests; ensure due process under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; provide awareness; and allow for informed action or response.

In a legal setting, notice is crucial for due process, guaranteeing individuals are informed of legal proceedings that could impact their rights or property. This allows that person to exercise their rights and defend their interests. So we are talking about notice that is reasonably calculated to inform people of their rights, inform them everything they put into their storage facility is going up for sale and [be] taken from them. I just feel it is really important that we have different mechanisms, for instance, maybe one [notice] in the newspaper and one online. I want to make sure the notice is reasonably calculated to give everybody who is going to be losing their property notification.

MR. BRYANT:
In my estimation, the statutory structure is set up in such a way that there are multiple forms of direct notification already required. In addition, to the extent

you have an individual who would like to disclose an alternative contact, not only is that notification going to go directly to the occupant but then also to any designated friend, neighbor or relative. I do appreciate your concern relative to the newspaper and whether folks might be getting that or not. I guess for that hypothetical to play out, somebody would have to be nonresponsive to the multiple forms of direct notification sent to them. They may then just by happenstance pick up the one newspaper on the one day of the week in that one particular publication, see their name is there, which then prompts them to go down to the facility and pay the debt that is owed.

That is certainly something, admittedly, possible [but] in our estimation is not something that happens with much frequency. We are trying to expand the universe of platforms utilized for these things. Some of these platforms get a tremendous amount of activity. That is our intent here, certainly not to prevent anyone from being notified.

MR. GOLDWATER:
To provide a finer point and answer a finer legal point, I appreciate your citing the legal definition of notice because it is an important one. In this case, we are not talking about notice. We're talking about advertising. This is an advertising piece. As you can see from the slide, notice requirements exist in steps 1 through 5 and 7. In this case, we are talking about where this [advertisement] is publicized. I do not want to conflate the two terms because they are distinctly different legal terms.

SENATOR KRASNER:
Well, what is it that you are advertising? Notice that their property is going to be sold?

MR. GOLDWATER:
It is advertising that the contract has been violated, the rent has not been paid. The consequence of that nonpayment of rent is the sale of these items; the proceeds will then be deducted from the tenant's liabilities.

SENATOR KRASNER:
That sounds like notice to me. That sounds like all the things that are required in a notice. So it is a notice. You said you give multiple notifications to the lessee. How many notices go directly to the owner or lessee of that space?

MR. BRYANT:
The law requires a minimum of two direct notices. Every owner-operator will ensure there are two notifications to comply with the law. As I mentioned earlier, beyond that, everybody will send multiple forms because the objective here is to make contact to resolve the payment dispute in a way that does not require the sale of the unit.

SENATOR KRASNER:
The law requires two direct forms of notice. What are the two direct forms of notice?

MR. BRYANT:
Are you asking about the specific line items that need to be included in the notification?

SENATOR KRASNER:
Is that direct notice a letter or a notice taped on their facility they rent?

MR. BRYANT:
That is a direct notification that would be sent either to their mailing address or their email address. That's an option they [lessees] would have to disclose and request specifically, either that it be mailed to them directly at a physical address or to an email address. Those notifications would be provided to them in that fashion.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I guess I am feeling really old today. Was anybody else in the room a paperboy? A few of us have been, which is more than I expected. I love newspaper. I would love to be sitting here right now, going through the paper like we used to do in the old days. We would go out on the porch in the morning and pick the papers up. Assemblywoman Hansen worked for the *Sparks Tribune* and had a column while she was in high school. I had a column for 17 years in a Sparks newspaper—so nothing against newspapers.

The reality is what you guys are addressing here today. The trend is clear that these types of advertisements and notices are issued electronically. Why? Because virtually nobody does what we just described anymore. The idea of them [lessees] seeing in the legal ads in the back of the newspaper and

happening to catch the fact their property may be auctioned off—that is their first exposure to the fact—just does not happen anymore.

To me, this bill is just commonsense reality. The number of people who still actually exclusively read newspapers and have no connection to internet and things like that is small. There are just so few of them anymore. It is really ridiculous to not allow this because this does not eliminate the ability to choose to use a newspaper—you still can. This is just an option. The trend is clearly there. Is there anything you guys already do additionally? This is not really the first time they'd be exposed to the fact their property may come up for auction. Is that correct? They would have already had two notices. Why would there be any opposition to this other than we are trying to preserve a type of industry so antiquated that literally nobody even has paperboys anymore. I mean, we are talking like horse-and-buggy days compared to what we do today.

MR. GOLDWATER:
I totally agree. I wish we as a body would subsidize print newspapers in the various ways we spend money in this State. Having a printed Fourth Estate is something I think would be of value and something worth public money, but mandating we publish—there are tax notices and default notices which are mandated to be printed in public. You guys discuss those bills that come up. Let's subsidize them [newspapers], but let us not do it on the backs of different industries like self-storage. The costs accrue to the tenant. They are not relieved of their obligation; and all these administrative costs are borne by them eventually and end up as part of their debt.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I remember in this building when there used to be a whole bank of pay phones where you leave the building in the front. Should we have subsidized payphone industries? No, everybody's got cell phones now. Nobody even knows what a pay phone is. They are almost like an antique thing. I think we are kind of [at] the same step with newspapers. Unfortunately, while I kind of like the nostalgic aspect of subsidizing them, I would be very uncomfortable using tax dollars to do so. Also, I remember when there used to be stacks and stacks of newspapers delivered to this building, and there were big tables on the Assembly and Senate side of every major publication in the State, every day. That is gone. I have not seen a physical newspaper in this building in a long time. I think the bill is completely reasonable.

SENATOR ELLISON:
On page 2, section 1, line 10 says "For a period of 10 consecutive days." Is that under NRS 108.477, or is it something I need to know? There are so many ways to get to people. I have the paper delivered every day, and when I get done with it, I take it to my employees. When they get done with it, I give it to a friend who uses it to start fires in his fireplace. You can't do that with a computer. I will tell you, former Assemblymember John C. Carpenter used to have a computer in this building, and he used it for a doorstop.

The problem is it should be up to the individual. When they sign a contract to, for example, rent a building for so many months, can the form include options of notification in the event of default? We could ask whether they would rather be notified by computer, internet or the paper. We look at the paper all the time, and we see stuff you're not going to find on the internet unless you look for hours and hours and hours.

I am a supporter. I am a definitely a newspaper guy, but we also use computers every day. In my office I can't keep my staff off of them, but I think it should be an option to the individual. Again, I think there should be a default notification option in contracts. It seems like to me it would end a lot of this stuff. I would like to see if there could be an amendment to allow that. I think it should be addressed in the contract.

MR. BRYANT:
In terms of where the ten consecutive days language came from, it was really our effort to expand out. As the law is presently written, the requirement is once a week for two weeks. That is just two times, which could run on a Tuesday and then the subsequent Wednesday. Our effort really here is to expand the notice requirement and say two times does not seem to be sufficient. Why not increase that significantly to ten consecutive days, which is literally five times the current requirement? The idea being, if it runs a little bit longer on the internet, hopefully there will be a few more individuals who might be able to see the unit, individuals who potentially would be interested in the unit and bid on it. This may drive up the ultimate sale price, which benefits both the self-storage owner and, by extension, the consumers. It is going to reduce their debt obligation.

To your second point relative to a provision in the contract that would provide the occupant with the ability to make a notification election, that is not how this

particular statute was set up. We envisioned making a small modification to existing law. However, we would certainly be happy to look into it.

MR. GOLDWATER:
So there's no confusion, when tenants sign contracts, they do have the opportunity to choose a method of notification. They choose how they would like to be notified. They can be notified if they owe money by email or by regular mail. This statute exists for times when there has been no response and it finally goes up for sale. This is an absolute last resort.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I agree, but I think the ten days kind of limits the paper. I am just looking for an easy situation to help everybody. I think there are options here to make it work.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
Is the internet website to notify renters of a storage site existing in any states now? Does it exist in states that still require publication in a newspaper? Does it exist in Nevada? I just wonder if you could talk about nationally and in Nevada if there is an internet website like this to notify consumers?

MR. BRYANT:
There are multiple platforms presently offering these services for owner-operators across the country. There is, not necessarily, a single central website or repository. Most of our member companies probably utilize somewhere between five to six online auction companies. I certainly would be happy to provide a list of those companies. Again, the law presently permits owner-operators to conduct lien sales online in addition to in person at the facility. Assembly Bill 137 expands and permits those platforms to be utilized for the advertising element as well.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
For those states that have this internet website notice, is the renter of the storage unit given the website when they sign their paperwork to rent? How are they notified to check that website?

MR. BRYANT:
The short answer is every state law is a little bit different in terms of what needs to be provided. Some say you have to include it in the default notice that needs to be sent. Others are silent on the matter. Similar to what presently

exists for the newspaper notification, there's no requirement the specific newspaper that will be utilized be disclosed in either the rental agreement or any subsequent direct notices sent to the occupant.

TOM CLARK (U-Haul):
I am here on behalf of U-Haul, you know, the company known for its big trucks and its moving equipment and trailers. The public storage space has also become a big part of U-Haul's business simply because the movers using our trucks wanted to be able to easily store their materials at the facility. In my conversations with them, less than 1 percent of the tenants in the public storage space are actually in default. A big reason is because of the efforts they make to find the tenant and find out why they are not paying. Their ideal solution is to capture the tenant in the first four steps of the graph.

It is very expensive to hold the auction, to advertise and get the materials out. If nobody bids on the auction, sometimes the facility is so messed up and gross, a cleaning has to take place. I say all that because their [owners'] primary objective is to find the tenant. They will search the obituaries; they will look at social media; they will not just send the email and the letters of notice on the contract. They truly want to find out if this is a bereavement issue. We want to make sure the family gets the materials back. If this is an issue where the person just has said, "You know, I do not care for it. I stuck it in there because I had to move out of my apartment quickly." By default, they give up on it.

We do not see this legislation as a war between newspapers and the internet. I am one of those fossils. I will not go to prehistoric times, but I did have three paper routes. I love the feel of ink on my fingers. But this is not a war between the newspaper industry, which we love, and the internet. This is just a way of saying if this option were here, owners would likely put some level of notice in the newspaper so potential buyers have an opportunity to see it is for sale and come help. U-Haul can recover some of their costs for the loss they are going to take on the default.

TEDDIE CRAIG:
My problem with this is a little bit different. I had a storage unit, and in the process of changing houses, I left half my stuff there and changed my lock. When I went back, my whole lock was changed. I am talking about four days later. They did not inform me. They did not let me know they were putting another lock on my unit. I had put a zip tie on the door and the manager said,

"Well, the lock was gone so we figured you had left us already." My storage is still paid today; a month later. I paid it in advance. So what do I do in that type of situation? I was not informed, and no one told me anything. They just took away my storage, and all of my stuff is gone. That is just a question to put out there. My stuff is gone because I changed my lock and did not have a lock on there. What do I do?

VICE CHAIR FLORES:
For the sake of clarity, I don't believe that testimony was in support of this bill. Are you in support of this bill?

MR. CRAIG:
I don't know whether to support a bill saying that they're going to advertise and say they're going to send this out to tell you that your storage is gone when that did not happen to me. I would support the bill because we need to know that you're going to get rid of our stuff, but it did not happen to me. I mean, four days before my stuff was gone and there was another lock and another tenant in my storage [unit] when my bill is still paid a month after.

KAMI DEMPSEY (Nevada Press Association):
I appreciate the very thorough presentation, and I appreciate the discussion about whether print or online is the best way to communicate with our constituents. I think it is an ongoing discussion which we at the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* and on the Nevada Press Association have had ongoing discussions. The Press Association also believes we are a trusted source. It is where everybody goes for these notifications. As we all know, there are multiple websites where everybody can try to navigate to figure out where their information is coming from, but it is something that is absolutely vital. So when you are talking about people's personal belongings, should they have to navigate many websites to go there? Should they not be allowed the notification to actually see it?

I have been in multiple situations where my father has asked me, "Did you see this in the newspaper? You actually have property" because it was notified. So I think notification is absolutely vital; it's key, and in this day and age, it's still important. So I appreciate your opposition to A.B. 137.

SCOTT SIBLEY (Nevada Press Association; *Nevada Legal News*):
I come here today in opposition to A.B. 137 because it will reduce the chances that someone losing their personal property can save it. As many of you here are attorneys and understand due process and property rights, this bill shouldn't sit well with you. I've always been an advocate for "more is better." In Nevada, all notices placed in a Nevada newspaper are placed on one searchable, statewide website for free, run by the Press Association. The notices stay there in perpetuity.

When someone is losing their property, whether it's their house, their car or their most valuable family heirlooms in a storage unit, we can't do enough notifications. The difference between an apartment eviction and a storage unit is residential evictions are handled by the courts with the judge and notice. In Nevada, we don't use the courts for storage evictions. Now they don't even want to publish the notice to take an eviction on a storage unit. I want to talk about costs for a second.

They [the Nevada Self Storage Association] entered an exhibit, Exhibit L, the other day that had costs in here and it talked about "our cost*." If you read down at the bottom, on 11 units that was $654, [roughly] $65 per unit, but that includes mailing, publication, canceling a unit on Storage Treasures after the unit has gone live in auction, and it also includes dumping fees. It's not just the publication fees.

Today, I brought an advertisement for U-Haul, one of my clients. In the last ad that they ran, they had 135 units in one ad. The cost for the advertisement was $335. The incremental cost per unit was $2.33 to notice these people that they are going to lose their family possessions. These auctions are also featured on storage war shows. Assembly Bill 137 would allow a select few to know when sales are taking place. There are approximately 461 storage facilities operating in Nevada. Tracking auctions on 461 individual websites will definitely allow the big guys to win at the storage wars and purchase people's family heirlooms with less competitive bidding to save $2.33. I urge you to protect Nevadans and their families' heirlooms and vote no on A.B. 137.

SENATOR HANSEN:
As I understand it, this is not about a legal notice. This is actually an advertisement for the sale after the person who rented the unit has received two legal notices. This states, as I understand it under section 1, subsection 2,

the owner of the property shall advertise the sale. This isn't a legal notice. You mentioned notices and worry about property rights. They [owners-operators] have already done that twice. This is not a legal notice for the person. This is actually a public advertisement about the potential sale of the contents of a unit after the person who owned the storage unit has been notified legally. Are we confusing it? You mentioned legal notice; this is not a legal notice as I understand it.

MR. SIBLEY:
I am not an attorney so I can't give legal advice, but I will tell you as the publisher of *Nevada Legal News*, the ads all start out to say notice of sale is hereby given, usually in accordance with the statute, the sale is taking place. It is no different than a foreclosure notice of sale, no different than an auto notice of sale. I believe the interpretation is this is notice. When they go to court and challenge—like the gentleman who was here and said he did not get any notice—they [owners-operators] most likely will provide an affidavit signed by me stating I, as publisher, published this notice on these two dates to meet this statutory requirement. Then they will be able to explain to the gentleman how these notices were done, and that they were given properly. My interpretation, an as I said, I am not a lawyer, but I believe it is proper legal notice.

SENATOR HANSEN:
I guess the question should go to our Legal Counsel. This is obviously a legal notification of an advertisement of sale, but the tenant already received at least two legal notices under Nevada law prior to this advertisement of the sale. Is my understanding correct?

MICHAEL SCULLY (COMMITTEE COUNSEL):
Yes, Senator Hansen. We believe your interpretation is correct. Legal notice would have been given previously to the person utilizing the unit. This would be for the public advertisement of sale.

SENATOR HANSEN:
Very good. Thank you.

SENATOR ELLISON:
An individual I know well had a heart attack. He was in the hospital for about two weeks. Next thing you know, they fly him to Salt Lake City. A month later, he comes back and then he is bedridden at home. He has no computer. He's an

older guy. Finally somebody told him his stuff in your storage unit is gone. So when he got healthy enough to go up there, everything he owned was gone, all his tools and other belongings were gone. If it would not have been in the newspaper, the guy next door would not have noticed it. Unfortunately, it was too late. I think the newspaper has valid points in some areas. Not everybody has the internet. He lives in a camp trailer, the poor old guy. Not everybody has a computer.

MR. SIBLEY:
That's one of the reasons my family funded the website for the Press Association as a charitable donation because I believe you need to put notices everywhere, in the newspaper, in the mail and on the internet. People need their stuff. People have a right to be noticed, and we need to try to find them the best we can.

JAMIE GRIFFIN:
I am calling today to urge you to oppose A.B. 137, legislation that would remove legal storage notices from newspapers. Let me tell you my story. A few years ago, I was going through the darkest time of my life. I just lost my husband unexpectedly, and I was left to care for my two children alone. We were struggling emotionally and financially. In the middle of the chaos, I had fallen behind on payments for a storage unit holding nearly everything that mattered to our family: baby books, photos and my husband's belongings, things that can never be replaced. I had no idea that the unit was going to be auctioned off. No one called me. No one emailed.

The only reason I found out in time is a friend happened to read the public notice section of the local newspaper. He frantically called me and said, "Jamie, I think your storage unit is listed for sale." Because of that newspaper notice, I was able to rush over to pay the balance and save my children's memories. If it weren't for that public notice in print, something that people still read, especially the elderly, low-income or those in transition without stable internet access, everything would have been gone without warning.

These notices are not just legal formalities, they are lifelines. They are sometimes the last chance people have before losing everything. Moving these notices exclusively online will not make the system more fair or transparent. It'll make it easier for companies to sell people's belongings without giving them a real opportunity to respond. Not everyone checks a website, not everyone has

regular internet access, but we still pick up newspapers. We still read what's happening in our communities. Please do not take that away from us. I sincerely ask you to vote no on A.B. 137.

BEN ROWLEY:
I am the owner of four weekly newspapers in Nevada. Assembly Bill 137 represents a significant erosion of consumer protections, public transparency and individual property rights. The bill would eliminate one of the few statutory tools providing meaningful oversight in an industry granted extraordinary authority—the ability to seize and sell renters' personal property without a court order. Historically, Nevada law required both personal notice to renters and public notice and newspapers to act as checks and balances on this power. Assembly Bill 137 would dismantle that balance and allow facility owners to provide notice solely via their own websites or other commercial and reasonable means, thus reducing public access and transparency. Key reasons for my opposition to this bill are due process and public oversight.

Public notices and newspapers which are also published on <https://www.nevadapublicnotice.com> ensure transparency in the absence of judicial review. Removing them invites secrecy and increases the risk of abuse, fraud or self-dealing by facility owners. Newspaper notices are an impartial third party before private assets are forfeited. For critical consumer protection for renters who miss mail or email notices, a newspaper ad may be their last opportunity to learn of an impending auction to recover their belongings, often including confidential documents or irreplaceable personal items.

Others with interest in the property, including heirs, spouses of lienholders, business partners and others with a legal personal interest in the stored property, may never know their property is at risk without a public notice. Many of these individuals are not parties to the storage contract and receive no direct communication from facility owners. The newspaper and subsequent online notice publication provides a passive notice opportunity for family and friends to see the notice before their elderly parents or deployed service members lose their possessions. For fair auctions and higher returns, broad public notice increases bidder participation, helping secure better sale outcomes for renters.

Many states recognize that when a facility owner becomes an auctioneer, they owe fiduciary duty to obtain the best possible price. Public notice is vital to that process. [Concerning] equity and one-sided contracts, storage contracts are

typically standardized, written by the industry and leave renters with minimal bargaining power. Eliminating public notice further tilts the scales in favor of facility owners.

[Concerning] potential conflicts of interest in states where facilities may retain unsold property or keep surplus proceeds from options, there is a financial incentive to suppress turnout, and weakening notice requirements make it easier for such conflicts to arise. [Concerning] community accountability, public notices allow journalists, community members and advocates to monitor facility practices. This accountability is essential in an industry that operates with little regulation or oversight. The current notice system works. It ensures that when a renter falls behind, there is an opportunity for transparency, fairness and recovery, not just for the renter but for the community and for the market itself.

BENJAMIN LIPMAN (*Las Vegas Review-Journal*):
I am here to speak in opposition to A.B. 137 because the self-storage industry is already granted a rare legal privilege. It can seize and sell a renter's belongings without ever going to court. That's why lawmakers have historically required both personal and public notice before any option takes place. The public notice in a newspaper serves as a crucial check, ensuring transparency, accountability and fairness in an otherwise one-sided process. This notice is not just a formality, it serves several critical functions. It increases auction visibility and participation to ensure a fair price. It alerts family, friends or lienholders who may have a legal interest in the contents, and it provides oversight in the absence of legal review.

If a facility simply posts notice on its own website, the odds of anyone else knowing or intervening drop dramatically. Public notice is often the last chance for a consumer to discover their property is at risk. Without it, auctions happen in silence, belongings disappear and due process evaporates. This safeguard must remain in place to prevent secretive unregulated seizures to put all Nevadans at risk.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN:
I have been on the Assembly Committee on Judiciary since 2019, and I personally would never be a party to any sort of legislation that violates due process. We are not touching noticing. We are talking about an advertisement. We have five steps in place for an ability to try to make good faith efforts to get

in touch with the tenant. I want to make sure we understand the difference between notice and advertisement.

MR. GOLDWATER:
The anecdotes of people who found things in the newspaper are wonderful, they do happen, they also happen more often online because it seems to be a growing trend. Further, the definition of "newspaper of general circulation" is not limited solely to the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* or the *Reno Gazette-Journal*. There are other publications that meet this definition, including *Nevada Legal News*, where you can publish an advertisement; and unless you are sitting on your porch with the *Nevada Legal News* on a Sunday, you would not see it. That is one of the important clarifications I thought we might make as well.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
The Nevada Self Storage Association submitted a letter of support (Exhibit N) for A.B. 137, and the Nevada Press Association submitted a letter of opposition (Exhibit O). We will close the hearing on A.B. 137 and open A.B. 193.

ASSEMBLY BILL 193 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to certain victims of crime. (BDR 16-984)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GREGORY S. KOENIG (Assembly District No. 38):
At this point in Nevada state law, there is certain assistance given to victims of sexual assault. What we are doing with A.B. 193 is providing the same advantages and assistance to victims of domestic violence. We are just extending what is available to victims of sexual violence.

WILLIAM C. HORNE (SafeNest):
SafeNest is our State's largest provider of services for survivors of domestic violence and for children affected by domestic violence. They even provide treatment for domestic batterers. This bill is designed and brought forward to provide survivors of domestic violence [a] police report they oftentimes need for various reasons, such as protection against eviction or loss of a job. These compounded problems for victims of domestic violence make it worse when [it is difficult to get] a police report and [they] are charged for the report. A police report may help them assume some semblance of their life before the battery. Again, A.B. 193 basically allows victims of domestic violence to obtain a police report the same way a victim of sexual assault does.

Section 1 provides that victims are entitled to free, unadulterated reports within a month of the assault. Of course, law enforcement would be able to redact personal information as necessary.

SENATOR HANSEN:
When there is a victim of domestic violence, does there have to be a conviction before the report is made available? I am picturing this report occurs after a conviction of a domestic act. Am I understanding that correctly?

MR. HORNE:
This report would be available to victims prior to a conviction. Imagine a person is living with their significant other or spouse, and they have to file a report. We would not have the victim have to wait through an entire judicial process to be able to obtain it because of the problems I mentioned in my remarks; a possible eviction or loss of employment may happen long before we figure out whether this person is going to be convicted of the allegations. This would not wait until after conviction occurs.

SENATOR HANSEN:
That makes sense because it does say they can make redactions. Because the main point of this law, as I understand it, is to make these cost-free to potential victims. Does the current law allow police reports at a charge?

MR. HORNE:
Oftentimes, we at SafeNest are aware that many of these survivors are charged for reports by law enforcement agencies. I do not know whether agencies have the discretion of not charging. Often nonprofits such as SafeNest can help with monetary issues such as this, but we do not believe they should have to. We believe you should be able to get this free. We are just putting them at the same level as we do with victims of sexual assault. We believe it is a crime where a person needs assistance because they may not have the funds they need. We should not need to wait for a conviction [to request free reports].

SENATOR HANSEN:
That seems completely reasonable. If you are a victim and you can't afford to pay but need information, it seems unfair you would be charged.

I have a question for Legal. Currently, is there anything in Nevada law preventing people from getting police reports or getting them without payment? Is this an entirely new concept?

BRAD WILKINSON (Committee Counsel):
This is not a new concept. This exists for survivors of sexual assault in NRS 178A.280 which has almost identical language. Assembly Bill 193 would extend those protections to victims of domestic violence. I do not know that law enforcement agencies' policies are consistent in regard to report availability and cost across the State for victims of domestic violence.

SENATOR HANSEN:
The bottom line is we want to provide police reports to victims of domestic violence at no cost and in a timely manner.

SENATOR ELLISON:
If law enforcement receives a report of domestic violence, one of [the parties] is going to go to jail. Is that correct under Nevada law?

MR. HORNE:
Yes, if there is probable cause, an arrest [can be] made. Also, the perpetrator needs to be on scene when that happens. The perpetrator is not always on scene when law enforcement arrives to effectuate an arrest. I will not speak much past that. I am not a police officer, but putting on a different hat, I used to be a criminal defense attorney, and that was the practice. If somebody is there and there is evidence of domestic violence, an arrest is made. It is not uncommon for the alleged perpetrator to not be on scene and no arrest is effectuated, but it does not mean a crime did not occur, and the victim would still need these documents.

SENATOR FLORES:
In working with victims and survivors, we have had instances where law enforcement has an internal policy, and it differs in various jurisdictions. In my experience, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department has been the easiest to work with. However, I have had instances when victims are trying to get a copy of the police report, but because it is an ongoing investigation or the agency has some internal policy, the report is not released. Have you had those experiences? I am assuming [given the bill] as written, that internal policy would not disallow a victim from getting a copy of the police report.

MR. HORNE:
Personally, I have not had the experience of having that difficulty in my past profession. I am not saying it does not happen. As this bill is written, they [agencies] would have 30 days [one month] after the request regardless of whether it is a closed case. We would not want a victim waiting that period of time.

SENATOR FLORES:
I appreciate that. I just want to get the intent. I mean, as written, it does not say their internal policy can supersede what we are doing here. But I do know for a fact we have had that headache with particular jurisdictions and ongoing investigations. "You're the victim. We know, but we can't give it to you, yet." It is an absolute headache when they are already going through a thousand different things. This is an important piece of paper that should be provided as soon as possible.

SERENA EVANS (Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence):
We are appreciative of any efforts to reduce barriers and align NRS with other types of victimization. We are very thankful for the bill sponsor and are in strong support of A.B. 193.

JOSHUA MARTINEZ (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
We support A.B. 193. This would lift some of the barriers for victims of crime. It would give them a police report they need in order to accomplish the business they need the report for. Obviously, we would redact some of the important information, things such as social security numbers and other information related to the suspect. I know there are some questions on the process. When the victim gets a copy of the report, we currently have fee structures and charges. This would be in line with the process for sexual assault victims. There would be a time frame for receiving a free report.

PALOMA GUERRERO (Clark County Public Defender's Office):
We are a very soft opposition to A.B. 193, which is just about the language. It is a great bill. We understand the need for free police reports for domestic violence cases. The concerning language is about the bill being complete and unaltered copies of all reports before a case is closed or plea is taken. People have a right to a fair trial and at trial, we want witnesses' testimony to be their own. We want a person to get on the stand and tell their side of the story without it being tainted or influenced by outside sources. When law

enforcement responds to domestic violence calls, they write up a police report, but they also do a very thorough investigation where they talk to everybody involved. There could be other reports as well, such as other witness statements.

When we are talking about complete and unaltered copies of all reports, it would include other witnesses' reports. That gets to the issue of fairness here because if a victim is reading everyone else's statements, reading past the police report before a case is closed, they could learn something new, they can learn some new piece of evidence or a lack of evidence. Even if they do not consciously do this, it could still influence their own memory of what happened. We have no issue with free police reports being furnished; the issue is with complete and unaltered copies of all reports. If we can ensure the language is only after a case is closed or a plea is taken, then we would have no opposition at all.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
We are looking to align this with what is happening for sexual assault victims. It is working well, and there have not been any issues. We want to put something forward that aligns with domestic abuse. If you have an approach that is a little bit different for various types of crime, it gets fairly confusing.

MR. HORNE:
This bill basically allows sexual assault victims and victims of domestic violence to be treated the same. The concerns the public defender's office has about creating some type of unfairness in the process of prosecution is unwarranted in that we already do this for sexual assault victims and can do it for domestic violence victims. Moreover, the very things they are concerned about are that when the prosecutorial process is going on you have discovery, and these documents are provided to all sides. They would be able to see these documents anyway with the prosecuting attorney preparing their witnesses, the victim and others. We believe the objections are unwarranted, and we ask you to support this piece of legislation.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I am assuming the amendment (Exhibit P) proposed by the public defenders is unfriendly.

MR. HORNE:
Yes, the amendment proposed basically calls for waiting until the close of the case, which we think is too long for a victim. It is an unfriendly amendment.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 193 and open the hearing on A.B. 384.

ASSEMBLY BILL 384 (1st Reprint): Requires the Chair of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to solicit input regarding certain subjects relating to juvenile justice. (BDR 5-1053)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LISA K. COLE (Assembly District No. 4):
As a member of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, I know we often hear bills related to juvenile justice, and that is an essential part of our overall criminal justice system. The genesis of A.B. 384 came from an incident watched around our State a few years ago when a juvenile intentionally drove into retired California Police Chief Andreas Probst while he was riding his bike in my district. The juvenile could be heard on bodycam after being arrested, laughing because as a juvenile, he knew would be out within 30 days. This statement highlights a need to take a look at how we are supporting youth to rehabilitate, rather than the juvenile justice system being a joke to youth who are dangerous to our community.

With a lot of stakeholders input, we landed through compromise on the bill before you which focuses on services we offer to youth offenders in the juvenile justice system. Our system is rooted in rehabilitation as opposed to punishment and for good reason. It uses targeted and evidence-based programs to help our youth offenders. The focus is on understanding the root causes of bad actions, teaching coping skills, providing counseling and mental health treatment as needed, and to prevent them from entering into the adult criminal justice system, which is a much, much harsher system.

The goal of A.B. 384 is to create a group of community stakeholders and juvenile justice advocates to work on increased access to wraparound services for our youth upon discharge. We originally also wanted to include the development of an individualized case plan for each child paroled, similar to the process required for juvenile probation pursuant to NRS 62E.507. That process includes regular monitoring and review of the youth's progress and includes input from the child's school, treatment providers, workforce training providers,

the parent or guardian and the child. However, because of fiscal considerations, we removed that section, but we hope to work on it in the next session.

BRIGID DUFFY (Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission):
I have been an appointed member of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission (JJOC) since it is inception shortly after the passage of the bill in 2017. I chair the data subcommittee for the Commission, and I am a member of the Strategic Planning Committee. On our Strategic Planning subcommittee meeting on April 30, the subcommittee voted to take the recommended 2025-2026 strategic plan to the full Commission for vote in a few months. If you are on the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission and listening today—a little spoiler alert. I am going to talk about parts of the strategic plan complemented by A.B. 384.

Our strategic plan, which we hope will be adopted by the full Commission, would recommend we focus on, among other things, four things around services for children. We would assess current practices and determine the number of evidence-based practices or programs we provide to children in the system. We would work to strengthen our evidence-based practices. We would engage children and service providers in doing so and create a family engagement subcommittee. That is part of the strategic plan we are taking forward and where I think we will complement it with A.B. 384.

I will walk you through section 9 of the bill which starts by amending NRS 62B with subsection 1 requiring the chair of the JJOC to solicit input from persons, organizations and entities with knowledge of and experience in wrap-around services for children who are or were in the juvenile justice system—including kids on probation, those children released from state facilities or from regional facilities like our camps in the North and the South.

Subsection 2 defines the type of input the Commission would want, including the availability of services, what services are offered to children and families, including evidence-based home and community-based services, evidence-based reentry programs or services, mentorship and other necessary service needs. I would summarize those as being job trainings, art services and extracurricular services to keep our kids busy—gym programs and any other matters related to wrap-around services deemed relevant by the chair.

Subsection 3 requires a report on or before March 1 of every year to the Commission and the Legislature. The report would include, without limitation, a

summary of actions performed pursuant to sections 1 and 2 [section 9] and findings and recommendations related to wrap-around services or the juvenile justice system in general.

We definitely have a need for more service providers in our State, especially in rural areas. Our system is ultimately rooted in rehabilitation and improving community safety through rehabilitation. We need to ensure services we are providing to families are based on evidence to get the best results for children in our communities. Assembly Bill 384 is a great complement to the current JJOC and our strategic plan goals.

SENATOR KRASNER:
These people will be reaching out not just to agencies but also to children about services that might be avail available to them. What if the children do not want the services? What if they have been released, they have done whatever time they need to do, and they do not want these services? Are they forced to interact with law enforcement?

MS. DUFFY:
In the juvenile justice system, we offer services through the courts. So it would be part of their court orders to complete services. The important part of wrap-around services is an element requiring child and family engagement. It is not a one-size-fits-all program. We would not send every child to the same programs. It would be assessed for this child's needs in order to address their behavioral issues that have caused them to commit delinquent acts and ensure we address those things.

A simple example would be when a child who is committing a lot of batteries or beating a lot of people up. There would be an assessment. We have assessments required under NRS 62B that assess the child's risks and needs to the community. We would refer that child and family out for the services needed to address the things identified in those assessments. The issue is we are missing a piece because our services are lacking in the State. We need to make sure the services we offer have meaning. To ultimately answer your question, the court would require the child to do the services as part of their probation or parole. If they did not do the services, it would be a violation of their probation or parole. Then they would end up continuing to spin in the system. Of course, we have kids who do not participate.

SENATOR KRASNER:
To clarify, this bill would kick in only when the court has ordered that the juvenile have interaction with law enforcement. Once their parole or probation is over, they no longer would have to participate. Is that correct?

MS. DUFFY:
That is a correct statement, but it is not what I believe the bill does. The bill, within the JJOC under NRS 62B, has a subcommittee formed to work on assessing the services we have in the State, finding where we have gaps in services and making recommendations on improving the services we have. So, when a child is in court for committing a delinquent act and the judge is ordering the child into anger management or a coping school class, we want to be certain we are sending them to a class that will actually address the issue. The Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission will make recommendations to ensure the courts have the right services in place for our children. This bill does not require the courts to do anything. It is the outside stakeholders that would be creating these lists and strengthening our services with evidence-based practices the courts could use.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I am still trying to understand. From my reading, it appears it is even after the parole and probation of a child has ended, you could still contact them and ask them about their thoughts of wrap-around services or other questions. Some people might see that as harassment—they did their time and may not want any more contact. Is the bill trying to contact people after their parole and probation has ended?

MS. DUFFY:
I understand what you are saying. [Section 9], subsection 1 states:

> The Chair of the Commission shall solicit input from persons, organizations and entities who have knowledge and experience in matters relating to wrap-around services for children who are or were in the juvenile justice system, including, without limitation, children who are … on probation.

If that is the section you are talking about, it would relate to the service providers, persons or organizations who have experience in working with children, whether they were actively on probation or perhaps finished with

probation but are now doing a program for culinary. They [service providers, persons or organizations] may say, "I have worked with kids who have come out of Spring Mountain Youth Camp and successfully completed probation. I want to offer some input to the JJOC to talk about how my evidence-based program helps these children rehabilitate."

Nothing in this bill, in my opinion, would require children who are off parole or probation to participate in anything, although we do have at least two slots on the JJOC for kids to voluntarily have input if they want to help make the system they went through better. Nothing in A.B. 384 would have us reaching out to anybody to get input after juveniles are done with parole or probation. It would always be service providers.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
I have worked with Ms. Duffy for many years and have personally seen her intervene—trying to help children, trying to get them connected with services and not end up back in Delinquency Court or even worse, in the adult system after they turn 18 years of age. I definitely take my hat off to you for all your work and your care about the kids who appear in Delinquency Court and for your service on the JJOC.

My question has to do with the new language in section 9, subsection 2, paragraph (b), subparagraph (3) which addresses connecting kids with mentorship or other necessary services relating to the needs of children who are or were in the juvenile justice system and their families. This week was the anniversary of the passing of our friend, former Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, and mentorship was something he cared about so much, but it seems like sometimes it is a real struggle to find mentorship programs for youth in the delinquency system.

The kids we see in Delinquency Court are lucky to have even a single parent in the home. Could you talk about where we are in terms of mentorship programs, wrap-around services and, hopefully, with the JJOC what this bill will get to?

MS. DUFFY:
I agree. We are at a loss. When it comes to mentoring programs, there are long waitlists for the ones we have and the ones that are good. In Clark County—I do not know what Washoe County is dealing with in terms of mentoring

programs. I am sure the rural counties have limited resources. This bill really is a way of gathering all of that information and using what we know.

For example, I know because I serve on [former] Assemblymember Thompson's mentoring commission, and one of the things we do is give out stipends to mentoring programs to help kids. We gather lists of mentoring programs available across the State. As a member of the JJOC or as a public member, I could give input or invite the mentoring commission to come and give input. These are all of the mentor programs they have collected across the State. This group created by A.B. 384 under the JJOC would make sure the programs are evidence-based and worthwhile for our children, currently or previously in the juvenile justice system, to participate.

The purpose of this is to get the information and get it out there. We do have, under NRS 62B.635, the evidence-based resource center—we call it the Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation. There are many programs listed. I have reached out to them recently as part of my strategic planning work to see if we have them actually. It [the program] talks about a whole bunch of evidence-based services like aggression replacement therapy. The truth is they are the programs we need, but we do not necessarily have them. Part of the subcommittee created by A.B. 384 would be to let us figure out how we do that. If you recall, for competency, recently, we did not really have any providers.

When we don't have the ability to complete competency evaluations, my office and the HJD [district judges] work together to bring experts from across the country and say if you attend this training, you will be eligible for a contract to offer competency evaluations to serve our youth. Washoe County followed suit and brought the same training in to help build up providers. I see it is something we can make recommendations for to bring in evidence-based programs and experts to train people who want to work with our kids while making sure they are giving the right services.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
Thank you very much for all your hard work, Ms. Duffy, in this area, trying to help kids and carrying on Tyrone Thompson's mentorship legacy.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER COLE:
In my experience in my day job, I work very closely with a lot of large development companies and with jurisdictional bodies mostly in Southern Nevada but some in Northern Nevada as well. My plan would be to assist in finding those mentorship opportunities so we have a more robust program.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
One thing I have found with a lot of kids I represented is that sometimes the allegation of a delinquent act could seem really scary to someone who might consider mentoring them, working with them or even letting them do community service. It is not really the child; the label is on the delinquent act. I appreciate that.

HARRISON EPSTEIN (Legal Extern, Clark County Public Defender's Office):
Children are our future. Children also make mistakes. We as a society need to ensure children are given every opportunity to succeed. We appreciate and support the work of all of the experts on the JJOC, of course. Soliciting input from the wider community will bring more ideas to the table. Listening to additional stakeholders who can provide data suggests evidence-based solutions and offers of mentorship for justice-impacted youth will only help the system work as intended. The more ideas there are and the more conversations we have create a better system for juveniles. We support this effort to strengthen Nevada's work in creating a true, rehabilitative system for children.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER COLE:
I think when you have a district attorney presenting with the cosponsor and having public defenders coming forward for support, you have done a good job.

VICE CHAIR FLORES:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 384 and open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 459.

SENATE BILL 459: Revises provisions relating to gaming salons. (BDR 41-1164)

SENATOR NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO (Senatorial District No. 6):
By way of background information, this particular statute was originally created in 2001 and provided that gaming salons are private, enclosed gaming facilities within a resort hotel requiring nonrestricted licenses. They are accessible to patrons based on financial criteria set by the license holder and approved by the

Nevada Gaming Control Board (GCB). The idea for S.B. 459 came from a Control Board workshop last December that explored ways to expand the customer base and make use of the salons accessible to the public when not being used by what we would refer to as high rollers.

Senate Bill 459 provides commonsense updates to state law that will allow licensees to provide guests with more customized experiences while also helping to attract valuable players who may be choosing to play in other states. The bill modernizes the provisions of NRS 463 relating to gaming salons to allow for additional and greater flexibility for gaming properties to adapt to the current trends and preferences of individuals who participate in salon gaming.

The bill does two things. First, it lifts the mandate for gaming salons to include table games giving casino operators greater flexibility in how those spaces are used and configured. Second, it removes a $500 minimum wager requirement on slot machines inside salons, allowing casinos greater flexibility to set their own minimum wager requirement with approval from the GCB.

You will note, there was a proposed amendment (Exhibit Q) also on this bill. It should be available to the committee members and also available on NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System]. The amendment does one very simple thing which changes the effective date to allowing this bill to be effective upon passage and approval.

NICK VASSILIADIS (Nevada Resort Association):
There are a few important things I think the industry would like to get on the record. The impetus for S.B. 459 started with a GCB public workshop. Through the workshop, several items were listed that could help make a destination a little bit more attractive from a gaming-specific standpoint. Several changes are things that can be done and accomplished through further workshops and through regulations changed at the Gaming Control level. The industry will continue to work with both the Board and the Nevada Gaming Commission on those specific items. However, as it pertains to this specifically, it became obvious after that December workshop that these changes we are asking for today in S.B. 459 would require legislation. That is when we reached out to Majority Leader Cannizzaro for help with this bill.

A couple of important, stringent requirements around gaming salons are not going away with this bill. First, any casino owner wanting to open and operate a

gaming salon must obtain a separate nonrestricted gaming license in order to have a gaming salon irrespective of whether their casino already has a license in place to operate a casino sports book, pool, race book or other licenses. They must file an additional application, pay all filings and go through the investigative process before the Control Board, the Gaming Commission and public hearings. None of that is disappearing. Once the gaming license has been issued, the casino must work with the Control Board through the regulatory requirements and standards to operate a gaming salon, including having the salon patron meet financial criteria for the gaming salon. They must provide clear diagrams of the interior of the salon or salons, adopt administrative and accounting procedures required by regulations for the operation of gaming salons, and provide robust surveillance and security systems for the gaming salons.

They must establish a log containing the name of each gaming salon patron as well as the times each gaming salon patron enters and leaves the gaming salon. Those logs have to be maintained as prescribed by the regulations. They must ensure that at all times the gaming salon is open to a patron to play, and one or more gaming employees must be physically present in the gaming salon in addition to any dealer or dealers present to operate table games. The gaming employee must be actively monitoring and supervising the operation while it is open and while patrons are there.

Any change to the size or location of any approved gaming salon, alteration of the salon's physical characteristics, changes to the number or types of games or the configuration still must be approved by the GCB and in accordance with requirements established by the GCB before implementing any such changes.

As noted earlier, some of the changes we believe should be made in statute include the current law requiring a table game in the gaming salon and slot machines. The industry believes times have changed, and in order to stay competitive and attract these high-end customers, casinos should have more flexibility in what is offered in the gaming salon based on what the customers are actually requesting. Poker is one of these instances. We believe gaming salons should be able to offer poker and other card games that are not considered table games in current NRS. We understand there are high-stakes poker games held in people's homes in California and New York, and we believe the industry is missing out. We would like to be able to offer these games in Las Vegas and Reno where a nonrestricted licensee is so we can attract them

[players] and keep them here in Nevada. A quick note on poker, although the game might not bring in as much revenue as certain table games, it is the ancillary spending of these players that really drives economic activity in casinos around these poker tables.

We also believe that a licensee should be able to offer only slot machines in the gaming salon if that is what the patron or patrons want. This ties directly into that $500 minimum. We believe the $500 minimum is a bit outdated. At the time this was set in place, most of our high-roller celebrities, athletes and stars were recognizable people. They would often come to Las Vegas by themselves or with a family member or two, or maybe with a friend, another celebrity or a fellow athlete. What we are seeing now is more of an entourage effect. They are bringing lots of friends or family members. The $500 minimum could be a disincentive to having those folks come into the salons and spend money. When they do come in, even though the $500 minimum was setting a certain threshold, we believe the multiple bets you can make on a slot machine at a single moment will actually end up balancing and accruing to a greater total number than these current minimums.

Another important factor we all know and readily recognize, especially in this body, is the changing landscape of privacy and security. When these salons were first established, it was prior to being able to hold a cell phone, take a picture, post it on social media and blast out any of our VIPs who are on the casino floor at any given moment. Most of these folks would prefer the privacy of being able to gamble either by themselves or with their friends, their family and their colleagues in a safe and secure manner.

In summation, as Senator Cannizzaro pointed out, S.B. 459 does two things. It clarifies that regulations of the Commission must provide that games offered may include table games and any other gambling games or combination thereof as requested by a patron. Second, it does remove that $500 minimum. However, any minimum that the licensees request to GCB must be approved by that oversight body.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I have a couple of questions. Is this strictly for large casinos or any salon?

MICHAEL ALONSO (Caesars Entertainment):
I am here on behalf of Caesars Entertainment in support of S.B. 459. Any nonrestricted casino in the State can have a gaming salon, though it is a process, and an additional nonrestricted gaming license for the gaming salon is required of the casino. Currently, there are gaming salons only on the Las Vegas Strip, and part of that is what we are trying to address in this bill because of the minimum financial criteria required. The Gaming Control Board is looking at it now. Removing the $500 minimum might allow other casinos in Northern Nevada and neighborhood casinos in Southern Nevada [and] across the State to utilize gaming salons.

SENATOR ELLISON:
For a while, the GCB would not allow anything outside of a casino or a slot machine area unless they sold food, such as little stores. They were limited by what they could do. The Gaming Control Board started shutting them down because they were not selling food or did not have 1,000 square feet. Is that still in effect?

MR. ALONSO:
I think you are referring to restricted locations that are 15 machines or less in bars, taverns, saloons, drugstores or grocery stores. This would not affect that at all. You have to have a nonrestricted gaming license in order to even apply for a private gaming salon license. It would not affect those smaller locations at all.

SENATOR ELLISON:
The problem was, a gentleman came to me and said, "I have this building. It is a local business and I want to put a couple of slot machines in there." He said the GCB said, "Not unless you are selling food." I called Gaming and they said, "It is restricted to little stores." They [the friend] is limited to what they could do. They do not sell food. You have answered my questions. Can you explain the $500 limit again?

MR. ALONSO:
We are trying to reduce the minimum $500 bet inside of a private gaming salon. If this bill were to pass and the licensee could determine what the minimum amount bet should be, if any, it would have to be approved by GCB. We are hoping it would be based on geography. In The Strip, it might be a higher

minimum than in Northern Nevada or somewhere else in the State. It would be up to the business opportunity the licensee would have.

VIRGINIA VALENTINE (Nevada Resort Association):
I am here on behalf of the 73 resorts we represent and in support of S.B. 459. This measure is aimed at modernizing the State's gaming regulations as they pertain to gaming salons. I would like to thank the Senate Majority Leader for taking up this issue. This bill will provide greater flexibility in terms of gambling games or any combination thereof conducted in a private salon. It will allow licensees to offer a variety of gambling products that appeal to customers. The ability to offer any game, including poker, will translate to incremental taxable gaming revenues and generate the activity as well as food and beverage, entertainment and hotel stays—all of the things that go with those people who want to have gambling experiences in private salons while giving operators discretion, with the approval of GCB, to establish minimum wagers for slot machines, the opportunity to [promote a] broader segment of and wider classic licensed gaming establishments.

To the question regarding members in Northern Nevada, what is considered a high roller on The Strip is not necessarily a high roller in Northern Nevada. They would like to avail themselves of the opportunity to operate salons when it makes sense to them. Ultimately, gaming salons will need to be reviewed and approved by gaming regulators. Senate Bill 459 does not change that. Nevada is the gold standard for gaming regulation. The agility and ability of our gaming industry to adapt to the evolution and changes in customer demographics and preferences is due in a significant part to our State's public policy that has allowed gaming operators to be nimble, flexible and innovative. I believe S.B. 459 will be a continuation of that public policy. As each of you are keenly aware in today's environment, it is imperative we do all we can to ensure we are not losing gaming guests and we are attracting new guests.

CHELSEA CAPURRO (MGM Resorts International):
We support S.B. 459.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:
I will close the hearing on S.B. 459. There being no public comment and with nothing further to come before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, we are adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jan Brase,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 17	C	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 18	D	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 30	E	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 97	F	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 150	G	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 153	H	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 329	I	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 518	J	3	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 387	K	4	Jered McDonald	Work Session Document
A.B. 137	L	7	David Goldwater / Self Storage Association	Presentation
A.B. 137	M	7	David Goldwater / Self Storage Association	Self Storage Collateral: Legislative History
A.B. 137	N	23	Senator Melanie Scheible	Letter in Support: Nevada Self Storage Association
A.B. 137	O	23	Senator Melanie Scheible	Letter in Opposition: Nevada Press Association
A.B. 193	P	27	Senator Melanie Scheible	Proposed Amendment: Clark County and Washoe County Public Defenders Offices
S.B. 459	Q	35	Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro	Proposed Amendment: Nevada Resort Association