



NEVADA LEGISLATURE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

(Section 6 of [Assembly Bill 443](#), Chapter 392, *Statutes of Nevada 2021*, at page 2505)

DRAFT MINUTES

January 14, 2022

The first meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary for the 2021–2022 Interim was held on Friday, January 14, 2022, at 9 a.m. Pursuant to [NRS 218A.820](#), there was no physical location for this meeting.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chair
Senator Dallas Harris
Senator Keith F. Pickard
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola
Assemblyman Philip (P.K.) O'Neill
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Diane C. Thornton, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Julianne King, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Karly O'Krent, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
James Malone, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS

Chair Scheible:

Thank you. I will now call this meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary (JISCJ) to order. It is wonderful to have everybody here virtually. I am sorry that we cannot be in person, but of course it is more important that we all stay safe and healthy. I thank you all for being here promptly. For those of you who are joining us online, I cannot see you, but you can see me. There will be a public comment period. I am always happy to have people joining us virtually, because the more people get involved now, the better our work product will be at the end of this interim. With that, let us go ahead and get started. First, our secretary will call the roll.

At this point, I would like everybody to do a brief introduction. I think most of us have met before in person who are on the Zoom, but for those who are joining us virtually, I want them to know who everybody is, including our staff and our members. I will go last, but let us go ahead and start with our vice chair. Please tell everybody your name, your position, and maybe some things that you plan to do during this interim.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Hi, this is Vice Chair Rochelle Nguyen. I represent Assembly District 10. I was the Vice Chair of Judiciary during the 81st Legislative Session as well as the Chair of Health and Human Services. I am looking forward to this interim. I know we have a lot of substantial topics that we are hoping to address over the next nine months. I look forward to working with you all.

Senator Pickard:

I am Keith Pickard. I represent Senate District 20. I am a practicing lawyer, and I hope we can get something substantive done. I am looking forward to it. Thanks.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

Thank you. My name is Elaine Marzola, and I represent Assembly District 21. This is my first interim committee, and I am excited to be here. I am a lawyer as well, so hopefully I can learn a lot, but give a little bit of my experience to everyone as well. Thank you, Chair.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Shondra Summers-Armstrong. I am the Assemblywoman for Assembly District 6 in the center of Las Vegas. I am a freshman and just finished my first session. This is also my first interim committee. I sat on Judiciary during the 81st Session and enjoyed it immensely. I am not an attorney, unlike others here, but I think my life experience and my experience in the community will hopefully help me bring some interesting perspectives to the committee. I am excited about the work that we have ahead of us, and I am hoping that we can get a lot done. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Good morning. I am Lisa Krasner. I am the Assemblywoman for Assembly District 26. I have served for three regular sessions and three special sessions in the Nevada

Legislature. Each of those sessions I have served on the Judiciary Committee. I have a bachelor's degree and a juris doctorate degree. Thank you.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Good morning. I am P.K. O'Neill representing Assembly District 40 in Carson City, parts of Washoe County, and soon to include Storey County. I have served on Judiciary during the last session and back in 2015. I look forward to being with you all these next four months as we work on some interesting topics.

Chair Scheible:

I would like to get introductions from our staff. I hope I am not putting you on the spot if you weren't expecting to speak today, but please briefly tell us who you are, and why you are here. I will have Patrick go first.

Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division:

Good morning, everybody. This is Patrick Guinan. As the chair mentioned, I am one of the two committee policy analysts on the Committee from the Research Division. I have been with the Division for going on 20 years and for the last several sessions and interims. During the sessions, I have staffed the Senate Judiciary Committee, and during the interim I have staffed the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice (CWJJ), which this Committee has now taken over. I am looking forward to it, and I think it is going to be a very productive and busy interim. I am honored to be Committee staff.

Diane C. Thornton, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division:

Thank you, Chair. I am Diane Thornton, and I am also an analyst. Like Patrick, I am the counterpart on the Assembly side, and I have been with the LCB for about 14 years. The last several, I have staffed Assembly Judiciary. Thank you.

Karly O'Krent, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division:

My name is Karly, and I will be the legal counsel for this Committee. I have been with LCB for about ten years and have staffed various committees during the legislative sessions. This will be my first interim doing Judiciary, and I am looking forward to it.

James Malone, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division:

I am James Malone, and I work in the Fiscal Division at the LCB. I started with LCB back in 2018. I have been through two legislative sessions and have been Fiscal Division staff for the money committees during session and the Interim Finance Committee during the interim. Major assignments for our team include the Department of Public safety (DPS) and Nevada's Department of Corrections (NDOC). This will be the first policy committee that I have staffed during the interim, and I am looking forward to assist in any way that I can.

Chair Scheible:

Thank you so much. That leaves me. My name is Melanie Scheible, and I am the senator for Senate District 9, which covers Spring Valley and the southwest part of Las Vegas. I served as the chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the 2021 Session, and I was on the Committee in the 2019 Session. I love the Judiciary Committee and all the great work that we have been able to do over the last four years. I also chaired at least one joint meeting between the Senate and the Assembly Judiciary Committees, so I have had the pleasure of

meeting all the members who are here. I am looking forward to a very productive but very busy interim. I am also an attorney, and I have been in Las Vegas for about the past six years; however, I am originally from northern Nevada, so both hold a special place in my heart.

I will give you guys a little bit of perspective on how I expect this Committee will function this year. We are in uncharted territory. Not so much with Zoom – that is old news – but with the new interim committee structure. There is no longer an Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice (ACAJ). There is no longer a Sentencing Subcommittee. There is no longer a CWJJ. So, the Judiciary Committee is going to be taking over a lot of those responsibilities. As you may have noticed, there are only a few of us. There are only eight members on this Committee to cover all those topics. You may have seen the work plan that was emailed to all of you. There is also a work plan available online that generally gives an overview of topics that we will be covering at each meeting. The purpose is to allow members and nonmembers to allow members of the community, other members of the legislature, other stakeholders, and your constituents to come together and have conversations about the topic areas that we are looking at in between the meetings and then come to the meeting with policy proposals, updates, and road maps for the discussions that we need to be having here in the Committee.

Here are just couple of ground rules. I like to start on time. We started very close on time today, and I really appreciate that. I will be starting our meetings at 9:00 a.m., with or without you. It is not a big deal if you are not on time, just know that you will be coming into a meeting that has already started. We also try to be very inclusive and respectful. I know that you guys have all done a fantastic job of that over the last two years since we started during the regular session. One way that we do that in the Judiciary Committee is that you can just call me “Chair” or “Chair Scheible.” There is no need to put “Madam Chair” in front of it. I will not be offended if you do, but I am just trying to move away from some of those gendered titles that we use. You will hear me calling the members of the Assembly “Members of the Assembly” sometimes instead of “Assemblywoman” or “Assemblyman,” because I think it still captures the scope of their job.

With that being said, I am happy to answer any questions that members have about the structure of this Committee or the plan moving forward. If you look at our agenda, we are going to go through the committee brief and the committee work plan, so that might be a more appropriate time for those specific questions; however, since we are not in an in-person setting, I just wanted to open it up briefly in case there are initial questions from any members. I see none.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Scheible:

That will take us to public comment.

Chair Scheible reviewed testimony guidelines.

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

On behalf of myself, State Director Lisa Moseley, and the Fines and Fees Justice Center (FFJC) staff, we want to wish everyone a productive and meaningful interim. Fines and fees are impacted at every level of the criminal justice system, from who we arrest and charge, to how we handle corrections, to how we deal with court supervisions and beyond. We look

forward to actively working and learning with you all this interim. We are excited for the next eight months and wish you all the very best.

Quentin Savvoir, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada:

We deeply appreciate this standing interim committee addressing many of the issues that so many Nevadans are continuing to face. I want to let you all know that on the housing front of the work that we are doing, [Assembly Bill 486](#) (2021) has absolutely been helpful. It definitely helped curb the tsunami of evictions that we were expecting at the end of the last moratorium; however, it did not stop landlords all across the state from following the advice of the Apartment Association when they said raise the roof on rent back in August. Rent costs have continued to soar for every single person that we have talked to at Make It Work Nevada: seniors, nonblack people, Black folks, and Latinx folks. Everyone's rent has gone up, and they are crying out for our legislators to do something about it. We look forward to the Committee's work around studying the ban of summary eviction and how we can bring greater parity and justice to all Nevadans. I also want us to consider a conversation around the creation of some type of rent stabilization so that families are not having to make their dollars stretch even further as rents are going up dramatically. I am thinking about one elderly woman, who is a retired paralegal and said her rent went up \$300. Where is she supposed to get it? She is not earning any more money. Please keep those real-life experiences in mind as you all are governing. We will be watching, and we deeply appreciate your leadership. Thank you so much.

Sonya Williams, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II A).] My name is Sonya, and I am a member of Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated. At the October 2021, Board of State Prison Commissioners meeting, Dr. Naught, the acting Medical Director at Nevada's Department of Corrections, informed the board that NDOC had enough vaccines and boosters available to accommodate inmate requests, yet our members report not being able to obtain the vaccine or boosters for the last couple of months, with little to no explanation as to why or when the vaccine and/or booster will be available. They have been told to fill out a kite to request the booster, then could not get clear information if there would be a co-pay required to get the vaccine, and then were told that there would be no boosters available until February 1st. There is a wide variety of stories coming from different facilities, but the thing they have in common is a lack of clear communication.

At the same meeting, Dr. Naught stated that hundreds of thousands of personal protective equipment (PPE) face coverings had been handed out to staff and inmates. Again, our incarcerated members continue to inform us that the staff are not wearing the PPE face coverings as required. Worse than not wearing them, many of the staff who do not want to wear PPE taunt members by coughing at them, coughing into their lunch bags, and refusing to mask when asked. Even at visitation, while inmates and families are required to wear masks and are told that their visit would be ended if the masks were removed, most staff is walking around unmasked or with their masks hanging under their nose. This is not just coming from letters at every facility, it is happening right in our faces, on camera. It is not difficult to verify, yet no one holds them accountable.

The number of NDOC staff who have tested positive for COVID-19 in the past two months is alarming, and yet, the vaccine mandate requiring certain state employees, including NDOC staff, to be fully vaccinated was not implemented. Staff are dismissive of the mask mandate and are openly defying it. For two months, staff-positive numbers in the prison rose, causing staffing shortages and even more inhumane conditions for incarcerated people, and

now NDOC has said that due to the rising numbers of positive cases, they again closed visitation. Just for the record, to visit, you must have a negative rapid test before entering the facility, you have to sit six feet apart behind plexiglass, you must be masked, and you have no contact, not even the hug or kiss hello or goodbye. No contact. Our concern that we would like to have a public discussion about is about prison policy when it comes to the pandemic. We have learned so much that has been applied to practice in the free world, yet we are not applying any of that to people in prison. Despite the director's claims of doing such a great job managing the pandemic, Nevada received an "F" for their handling of the pandemic by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Our second edition of the Silenced Voices of the Incarcerated, researched by a researcher at the University of London, will be released in late March, with triple the sample size. Let us set aside space to discuss prison policy in terms of the pandemic by the study of what has already come out in these reports as well as other research by the Prison Policy Institute, Crime and Justice Institute, The Vera Institute, the ACLU and The Marshall Project.

Denise Bolaños, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II B).] I am an activist with Return Strong. My husband is incarcerated on a wrongful conviction here in Nevada. He has been in the appeals process for almost 11 years, all while serving time for a crime he did not commit.

One of the things that drew me to Return Strong was their fight for justice. I was just one person trying to figure out how I could help my husband, or how I could contribute to somehow making things better for others in the same situation of having a loved one incarcerated and all the hurdles that it comes with. When I came across this group, I realized just how many of us there are that are so impacted by injustice in some way, shape, or form. I remember when all this happened with my husband, we really believed in the justice system. We believed that truth would prevail and that in the end, justice would be served. I think that innate belief in the system made the conviction all the more heartbreaking.

Today we are no longer those people. Today we no longer believe that justice and equality can happen without a fight. Today, I am here to ask you to consider initiating a conversation about a sentencing review board.

While Nevada offers the State Board of Pardons Commissioners and clemency, it does not come close to addressing the changes to sentencing and the shifts that have occurred over the past few years to address the injustices that have occurred in sentencing. We are all aware of them. I do not think anyone can deny the historic problems that are reflected in Nevada's prison population.

There is a ridiculously high number of elderly people who have spent 30, 40, and more years in prison for crimes that have had sentences changed. Yet their sentences, that are knowingly excessive, have never been reviewed. People were sentenced under mandatory minimum laws and habitual criminal laws, laws that have now changed, but we have never retroactively reviewed those sentences to address or correct what was an excessive sentence in the first place.

I reviewed cases of women who were charged as a co-defendant in a crime of which, they were very often abused by the actual perpetrator of the crime, and out of fear or under the influence of another person, they drove a getaway car or lured someone into a robbery by their abuser only for that to result in a murder that they did not commit and did not have a

choice in making, yet they languish in prison with life sentences for 30 plus years. Often, that is longer than the person who committed the murder under Felony Murder One laws, which require no intent.

We should be reviewing the cases that should have been considered retroactively under the passage of [AB 236](#) (2019) but were not because of the financial impact to the state. Yes, the pardon and clemency process exists, but it is so limited that it can never correct the sentencing issues that have resulted in excessive incarceration for decades. Let us talk about that. Let us start looking for solutions. Let us be a leader in justice, and not the last state to do the right thing, dragged in kicking and screaming.

Beth Rohde, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II C).] My name is Beth, and I am an activist with Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated.

In October 2021, "*The Silenced Voices of the Incarcerated*" preliminary report was published, highlighting the inhumane living conditions of those incarcerated in NDOC facilities. Many individuals incarcerated within NDOC suffer from medical neglect, abuse, lack of mental/physical stimulation, and unsanitary living conditions, which was only exacerbated by the pandemic.

Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated has asked NDOC numerous times to hold regular meetings to discuss the issues within their walls and work together with the loved ones of the incarcerated towards resolutions. NDOC has not come to the table to meet with Return Strong, nor have they been willing to work with the families to secure the needs of the incarcerated.

For almost two years, we have been forced to use public comments to tell our story in two-minute segments in order to be sure that the conditions inside Nevada's prisons are on public record. While NDOC has had the privilege to share their half-truths and public relations version of a story that does not exist at the table with every governmental group, including the Legislature, the Board of State Prison Commissioners, and the Nevada Sentencing Commission, no one is asking the right questions or the hard questions.

I want to share a quote by Howard Zinn from *A People's History of the United States*. He says:

"The cry of the poor is not always just, but if you do not listen to it, you will never know what justice is."

We have letters from incarcerated people who share horrific stories of the trauma that is happening behind those walls. They end their letters with the scrawled handwriting that you would see on a car window of a person in danger, "Please help." "Help us!" "Please help me." It is letter, after letter, after letter begging for help.

We are asking that you listen to us. Give Return Strong a seat at the table and allow us to give an actual depiction of what is happening inside Nevada's prisons. And then demand real answers from NDOC. The vast majority of the incarcerated are going to be returning to our communities, and they are traumatized. The memories of the past two years will not go away. They will not forget, and we will not allow anyone else to forget. Thank you for your time.

Keisha Gibbs, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II D).] I am an activist with Return Strong and part of an impacted family. My brother was incarcerated at a very young age for his participation in a robbery that resulted in a death. While he was not the person that committed the murder and he was not given a death sentence, he was given consecutive, extremely long sentences as a teenager. Sadly, after serving 17 years, he was diagnosed with cancer and passed away in prison last year. His story, and many others, paint a picture of the inhumanity that occurs in Nevada when your loved one is ill. Not just the living conditions and inhumanity, but the neglectful medical care. My brother's care was delayed for so long, and he was getting sicker by the day, that he punched himself in the face and gave himself a bloody nose to trick medical staff into taking him to the hospital, where he was diagnosed with stage four lung cancer. Getting information on his medical condition and care, even once he was in hospice, was a nightmare. It was a fight every day to get NDOC to communicate with us at all, and when they did, half the time it was not accurate or truthful. He suffered all day, every day, not just because of the cancer, but because of the lack of care, concern, or medical treatment. His story is not an isolated incident. Sonya, who is here today too, had a very similar experience. Both of us were denied visitation with our loved ones and never got to say goodbye to them. Sonya and her six-year-old daughter were kicked out of a visit because the little girl ran to her father and hugged him when they brought him out in the wheelchair. They threw them out of visit, suspended visits for six months, and gave him a write up. He died a few days before Christmas, and that child never got to see her father again. She had not seen him since before COVID.

The thing is, it does not have to be this way, and Sonya, I, and Return Strong have vowed to not let their deaths be in vain. We will use their stories and others to make sure that no one can hide from the truth of the human depravity that is occurring through NDOC. Families from Return Strong have been working on revisions to a national Prison Family Bill of Rights that would make basic human rights and communication possible for Nevada prison families and their incarcerated loved ones. Basic things will be included, like being treated with respect by prison officials and staff, being notified in a timely manner of a loved one's illness or hospitalization, and being given extended visits in cases of hospitalization. During COVID, people were dying in hospitals, and the families were not even made aware that their loved one had been moved to a hospital or were in the intensive care unit or on life support until they got a call stating their family member had died. We would like space to present our Prison Family Bill of Rights that we are planning to bring to the Legislative Session and hope to roll out here. This is not a partisan issue. This is about family and community, and the ethical treatment of human beings both incarcerated and free. Thank you.

Jodi Hocking, Founder and Director, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II E).] Good morning, my name is Jodi Hocking, and I am the founder and director of Return Strong. We are very excited about the Interim Judiciary Committee meetings, and hopeful that we will be able to have space to talk about some of the issues that we are bringing to the table today. I know there are so many things that could be discussed and that time is so limited. We understand all of that and appreciate all of you who care about the things that are happening in real life to our families and to our loved ones, and how that impacts our collective communities.

Today, I want to touch on something that has been a constant frustration for us, and I honestly do not know if there is an answer, but ultimately, our question is this: How do we hold the government accountable? Specifically, for us, NDOC, but generally too.

During the 81st Session, we all unanimously passed a bill, [AB 241](#) (2021), which provides credits to offenders for the time that they were losing due to the pandemic, not due to anything within their control. The bill was supposed to give credits to people retroactively and proactively if programming did not resume.

NDOC was taking each of those days, five days a month, away from people because they could not program, which is, again, no fault of their own. Since the bill was passed, NDOC applied credits. But NOT according to the legislative intent of that bill. There are multiple types of credits. Days (which is how they took them away) and meritorious credits, which are the equivalent of approximately 31 percent of a day, which is how they gave them back to incarcerated people. So instead of 60 days, they got back about 20, and even though programming has not resumed, they never applied the days going forward.

Every single hearing, piece of testimony, discussion, and the passage of the bill showed clear legislative intent on what the bill was designed to do. NDOC found a loophole around the word credit and has applied that incorrectly.

In addition, they have interfered in due process by blocking grievances on the issue so that incarcerated people cannot get the issue to court due to the Prison Reform Act. Even crazier is the fact that during the legislative session, NDOC and the governor both acknowledged that they could fix this without legislation. The director has the authority to give seven days a month credit (not five) without any other consent needed. However, he does not voluntarily do it. They block it from the courts and literally we cannot get it corrected. As a result, people are spending more time in prison than they ever should have.

We cannot find help anywhere. I emailed everyone about this issue back in July and August, and while a few people were concerned, no one had answers. It baffles me that a law that was passed has no means of enforcement if the law breaker is a state agency or the director of a state agency. While I understand our question of who holds the director accountable if the governor will not, is not really that the purpose of this committee? The answer remains who holds the government accountable? The courts cannot? Legislators' hands are tied. How is it possible that this issue, and many others, are just left unaddressed while our loved ones and our families are suffering. It cannot continue, and I hope someone, anyone, hears us and will try to help us find solutions because these things are a travesty.

One more Howard Zinn quote for today...

"The memory of oppressed people is one thing that cannot be taken away, and for such people, with such memories, revolt is always an inch below the surface."

Not just because of AB 241, or deductions, or sentencing, or medical neglect, or being denied due process, or the trauma that has impacted incarcerated people through the mishandling of the pandemic.

They will never forget, and we will never forget how so many of our cries for help have been unanswered.

Ayanna Simmons-Oglesby, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated:

[Read from (Agenda Item II F).] Good morning. I am here today with Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated. I know that today you are working on identifying issues that you will work on during the interim session, we came today to bring some ideas that we would like to have considered as part of your work this year. This statement is about one of them. Over the past year and a half, we have talked to hundreds of incarcerated people who have applied to the State Board of Pardons Commissioners. Many of them have applied multiple times, year after year after year, were not denied a board, but were never even given an opportunity to be added to the agenda or have their case heard, and never received a response as to why they did not get chosen. We understand the sheer volume of applications that are put before the Board. It is daunting to review them all and pick the worthiest candidates and then to also respond to all those applicants, but imagine being on the other side of that, and sitting and waiting and never understanding why you were not chosen when you spent 20 years trying to do only the right things to atone for your crime.

We have observed and studied every single pardons board for the past year and a half to gain an understanding of what is involved and how it works. We have studied all the eligibility rules and looked for the inherent bias that exists in the pardons board process. Ultimately, we have found so many broken pieces that we believe there needs to be a public conversation and a full study on the pardons board process. The pardons process is supposed to give people a second chance, but at the moment, it is so wrought with the same inequity that exists in the criminal justice system that second chances never come for many worthy candidates. Certain attorneys are "guaranteeing" people seats on the agenda two years in advance. Families are expected to pay between \$15,000 and \$50,000 for an attorney to represent them at the board. At the last board, one attorney who sets their fee at \$50,000 had five people on the agenda. How is that even possible? That same attorney is promising seats months and years before the agenda is "decided." How is that possible? Yet, when we have approached people to get a sponsor, we were told that we cannot circumvent the process. Our question is: What process? Money? Power? Privilege? The entire process reeks of secrecy, privilege, racism, and injustice. A process that is supposed to equalize injustices and give true second chances does anything but. We are asking to open that discussion and to consider making this a study during session. We need a full 50-state study on the pardons process and to build toward a just process in Nevada. Let us start that discussion here.

Chair Scheible:

Before we move on to the next agenda item, I want to take a moment to discuss my vision for the JISCJ this year. Return Strong has knocked it out of the park with public comment. I heard a lot of important topics and good ideas. I just made you know a quick list of reviewing the pardons board process, the prison response to COVID-19, creating a sentencing review board, and creating a Prison Family Bill of Rights. As I think you all can appreciate, that is just more work than one person can do and also more work than this Committee can do on Zoom for a couple of hours on a Friday morning. In our work plan, we have a meeting coming up in March where we are going to talk about corrections. I am hoping one member of this Committee will really take the lead on the corrections issues and, between now and that March meeting, have some of those conversations with members of Return Strong, NDOC, other stakeholders, other members, and me, so that by the time we get to March, we are so much further along in this conversation and we are not just talking about a sentencing review board but we have come up with a proposal; we have

looked at different states; we have considered different approaches to a piece of legislation and have done some of the work that cannot be done in small segments once a month but has to be done over a period of time. I hope that it is clear that the purpose of doing this is to create more participation, not less. It is not supposed to be some kind of threshold to overcome to get on to the March agenda meeting, but to serve as a way for this Committee to do ongoing work between our meetings by having different members of the Committee appointed as points of contact or point people on different topics, corrections being one of them. We will get to the rest of them in Agenda Item IV. I really think that it could be a productive way for all of us to get involved and engage our constituents and other stakeholders so that at every single meeting from here on forward, we come to the table with as much information as possible and ideas that are as fully developed as possible with the opportunity to continue those discussions. I hope that makes some sense and resonates with some of you.

Tonja Brown, Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent, submitted (Agenda Item II G) for the record.

AGENDA ITEM III—REVIEW OF COMMITTEE BRIEF AND DUTIES UNDER NEW INTERIM STRUCTURE

Patrick Guinan:

Thanks, Chair Scheible. Again, this is Patrick Guinan. Diane Thornton and I are going to split up this portion of the discussion. Given that everybody on the Committee has served on Judiciary and or been in the Legislature for a while and is familiar with committee briefs (Agenda Item III), we are not going to do a real deep dive into the brief, but there are a few points that we do want to make. We will be happy to answer questions now or later on. I am just going to try to go through this fairly quickly, and then I will turn it over to Diane.

The first thing for us to note is a reiteration of the fact that we are nonpartisan staff. We work for the entire Committee, and we are here to help with all the Committee needs for each member. We also do our work entirely confidentially, so you can have complete confidence that the work that we do for you is not going anywhere but to us. Please come to us with any questions or concerns or research requests that you might have.

As the Committee will remember, [AB 443](#) of the last session revised interim structure and essentially combined the two judiciary committees into one smaller interim committee and sort of covers the jurisdictions of both those committees from session, which were slightly different, depending on which house you were in. We will not go over the jurisdiction of the committee right now. It is vast. We can provide you with documentation on what chapters the community covers, but the brief covers a little bit more than I will right now.

One thing that I want to note, that the Chair already mentioned, and which I think is going to be a big part of our workload, is that the ACAJ is no longer in existence, so a lot of those responsibilities have come over to this Committee. We will touch on a couple of them later today, but that is a big portion of our work, as is the elimination of the CWJJ. I think the members probably are aware, though the public might not be, that the Judiciary Committee is now in charge of the juvenile justice portion of that prior committee, and the Health and Human Services Committee is now in charge of the child welfare portion. There may be some crossover between the committees at some point, and we may have a joint meeting, but that is ultimately up to the chairs. Those two issues have been separated, so if you are a child welfare advocate or interested party in any way, you may want to just keep an eye on what Health and Human Services is doing.

This Committee has eight meetings scheduled throughout the interim. They are on the second Friday of every month from now until August, at which point we will be holding our work session. I would just note that, from a staff perspective, while our work plan does show we are going to focus on certain topics on certain dates, that August work session, as the Committee members are aware, will be the point at which we are actually going through requests and plans from the Committee members and stakeholders and approving bill draft requests (BDRs). While you may have a presentation that comes up in March, that does not mean that you must have your idea fully formed and your BDR ready to go in March. It means that you have provided the information and started the discussion, and we will continue to work on those issues all the way until August. I do not want anyone to feel like you have got to do all your interim work in a month or two.

Next, I would just note that we have 15 BDRs for the committee, 5 of which are dedicated to juvenile justice subjects. The brief also contains a list of agency and other contacts, and we will continue to update that list throughout the interim as we hear from more interested parties and experts from around the country. If you see something missing from the contact list that you would like us to add, please let us know, and if you have an interest in a subject and there is no contact on the contact list, please ask us and we will help you run down whoever it is that you need to find.

Lastly, you have also been provided a list of relevant reports that come to the Legislature. Some come to Judiciary, some go to other places. We think that list and areas where those reports go to is worthy of review, so I am going to turn it over to Diane to go through some of that information.

Diane C. Thornton:

Starting on page 3, there is a list of relevant reports. This includes everything from legislative committees, Nevada Judiciary, Executive Branch agencies, and the Research and Audit Divisions. I just wanted to bring to light a couple of reports, ones that were supposed to go to the now-defunct CWJJ, ACAJ, and also the Committee on Industrial Programs, which our committee is now responsible for.

Next, you will see there are several bills from last session that required reports from the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), and those all have due dates this year, so we will be reviewing those reports. On page 8 of the committee brief, you will see at the top of the page there is a report due from the fund for new construction of facilities for prison industries. They must submit, before expending any funds, a proposal of expenditures to this Committee.

On page 9, I wanted to highlight a couple of reports that are due from NDOC. One specifically is on [AB 241](#) (2021), which you heard during public comment about the credits due to prisoners. Another one is supposed to be submitted to the CWJJ, and that was relating to juvenile detention and trends and other information, and the other one is related to housing youthful offenders.

On the last pages of your brief, you will find some contact information for some of the agency contacts that you will be hearing from during this interim.

Chair Scheible:

Thank you both so much. I think that gives us a good overview and an appreciation for the breadth of this Committee and how much we have to cover. Unless there are questions on that point, I think we can go ahead and move onto the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM IV—DISCUSSION OF PRIORITY TOPICS

Chair Scheible:

This agenda item is our predecessor to the fun part, which is Agenda Item V, when you all get your assignments. I am going to let the staff give a brief overview of some of the topics that we came up with and that you guys came up with. Some of them are directly from members of this Committee. They are not exhaustive, but I just thought that this covers five or so areas that we have to discuss this interim. We will move on to expand it to anything and everything and figure out how we are going to get it all done. Mr. Guinan and Ms. Thornton, please go ahead and start the review.

Patrick Guinan:

We broke this up into specific areas of priority, and again, Diane and I will both be talking about some of these topics. Corrections is a great example. You have heard from several speakers this morning about issues that need to be addressed in corrections, so what I am going to do is just add a couple more issues to that, beginning with corrections. These are primarily in response to bills that were passed last session. We have [Senate Bill 22](#) (2021), which were changes made to inmate charges and accounts based on how NDOC had dealt with Marsy's Law expenses. That was a long discussion last session, and it ultimately got worked out with some new formulas for accounts and charges, but that is something that the Committee will probably want to review. We have a Nevada Sentencing Commission report on reinvestment savings that is going to be coming and that is required for [AB 236](#) (2019). I know that the Nevada Sentencing Commission has already reached out to the Committee and is eager to work with us, so I imagine we will be hearing from them shortly. [Assembly Bill 241](#) (2021) relates to sentence credits, which we have covered at length today, so I will not go over that. [Assembly Bill 443](#) (2021) is the Committee on Industrial Programs that Diane mentioned, which is now our oversight responsibility. Our Fiscal Division staff will be making sure we address that committee appropriately and do not hinder their work in terms of their requests for funding or improvements on projects. That is it for corrections. It is a short list, but I think you can all see that that list is going to grow.

The other subject that I am most familiar with is juvenile justice, so I am going to run through a few of those, some of which Diane has already mentioned. We have [AB 132](#) (2021), which required a new Miranda Warning for juveniles in custodial interrogation, so the Committee may want to look into how that is working out. We have [AB 158](#) (2021), which reduced penalties for minor drug and alcohol infractions, so I imagine we will want to look into that. [Assembly Bill 251](#) (2021) deals with the sealing of records for juveniles, and there may be some issues to look into there for persons who are between the ages of 18 and 20, and how that process is working out, and whether it needs to be reviewed or amended. [Assembly Bill 443](#) (2021) requires the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to report on the program for juvenile sex offenders by the end of this month, so we will want to take a look at that. [Senate Bill 108](#) (2021) requires implicit bias training for juvenile justice employees, and we will be looking into that one as well. We also have several reports and studies that were assigned outside of the Legislature for other institutions to do. [Senate Bill 356](#) (2021) requires the Juvenile Justice Oversight

Commission (JJOC) to report on housing alternatives for youthful offenders. That grows out of some CWJJ work from the previous interim, which looked at the way our system handles young offenders between the ages of 18 and 25. [Senate Bill 357](#) (2021) requires NDOC to report on how much of the budget that Lovelock, and NDOC generally, allocates to youth who have been tried as adults and who are housed at Lovelock. That was never previously broken down, so we will be getting that information. We have another report from DCFS on the effectiveness of front-end diversionary programs for youth, and I believe that is primarily focused on whether funds are being spent in an effective way on those programs. Finally, I will just note that the JJOC is also going to give us their five-year plan update, which normally would have been reported to the CWJJ in the past. That is it for juvenile justice issues. I am sure more will pop up as they did with corrections, but that gives you a sense of just how much there is out there in juvenile justice, and that is just scratching the surface.

The last topic is sex offender registration. This is kind of a long succession of events, but [SB 161](#) (2021) from last session did away with the Advisory Committee to Study Laws Concerning Sex Offenders, which was housed in the Office of the Attorney General, and sent those responsibilities to the ACAJ. Then, we did away with the ACAJ, so we now have the responsibility of continuing or doing away with the specific area of study on sex offender registration. That would require reaching out to the Attorney General's Office, and perhaps the previous members of that committee and other stakeholders, to determine if there is more work to be done on the way Nevada deals with sex offender registration. That is it for my update on topics of interest. I will turn it over to Diane for more.

Diane C. Thornton:

With reports of human trafficking on the rise, and Nevada not being immune, the Legislature has passed a myriad of bills the last several years to address this topic. Last session we passed [AB 143 \(2021\)](#), which provided a continuum of care and services for all victims of trafficking and also requires DCFS to develop a statewide plan for the delivery of those services. The bill also goes on to create the State of Nevada Human Trafficking Coalition to help maximize resources for local task forces. One of the other bills that was passed was [AB 182](#) (2021), which provides that a person who owns, leases, operates, controls, or manages any business or private property is guilty of the crime of advancing prostitution. We will also be looking at [AB 113](#) (2021), which extended the statute of limitations to prosecute sex trafficking crimes. We extended law enforcement's ability to prosecute these crimes as well with the passage of [AB 64](#) (2021), which grants concurrent jurisdiction to the attorney general to prosecute a person for facilitating sex trafficking, engaging in prostitution, or soliciting for prostitution. In a better effort to distinguish between those who illegally solicit prostitution and those who may be victims of self-trafficking, [SB 164](#) (2021) revises Nevada law by separating provisions relating to the prohibition against prostitution from those concerning the solicitation for prostitution. These will be topics of focus for this Committee, and the Committee can either follow up on the implementation of these bills, and also look at other policies to protect this vulnerable population.

The next priority topic deals with summary evictions. According to testimony from last session, Nevada has the greatest mismatch in the nation in supply and demand of affordable housing. There was a lot of talk about the summary eviction process last session. To give a little background, there are two ways to initiate an eviction action in the State of Nevada. The first is filing and serving a formal civil eviction known as an unlawful detainer, and the second is using the summary eviction procedures, which is generally a simpler and quicker process than the unlawful detainer. Just note that summary eviction cannot be used

against tenants of mobile home parks; it can only be used when the only issue to be adjudicated by the court during the proceeding is possession of the rental unit. We did pass [SB 141](#) (2021), which required the courts to automatically seal records relating to summary evictions during the pandemic. Another bill, which failed the deadline, would have studied this topic, and that bill would have looked at the laws and rules of other states relating to evictions. It was going to look at any requirements relating to the serving notice of actions for evictions and the oversight provided by the courts, the circumstances which trigger any action for eviction, including those actions related to no-fault evictions, the ability of tenants and landlords to initiate and defend actions for summary eviction, and the deadlines mandated by the actions for summary evictions. Those are some of the issues that the Committee may wish to examine on that topic.

The next topic I am going to talk about is sexual assault. Last session, [AB 214](#) (2021) was passed, which required the ACAJ to appoint a subcommittee to conduct an interim study of laws governing sexual assault. By default, that is now under our jurisdiction. That committee was to study the laws governing sexual assault in the state and also the laws in other states and territories of the United States, and it was also required to get recommendations and input from attorneys, victims, and any other stakeholders concerning the necessary changes to the laws governing sexual assault.

The last topic is the implementation of previous legislation. This looks at things that were passed in previous legislative sessions and that we may want to review and amend. The first one is [AB 236](#), which you all might remember from the 2019 Session, and this took a significant step forward in our criminal justice reform. Of course, with such a massive bill, there are always refinements, and last session the Legislature passed [AB 393 \(2021\)](#), which finetuned [AB 236 \(2019\)](#). Those revisions included changes related to pre-sentence investigation reports, parole and probation, vehicle embezzlement, cannabis, and sex offenders petitioning for release from lifetime supervision. In addition, the bill required the Nevada Sentencing Commission to calculate, with the assistance of the Department of Sentencing Policy, the costs avoided each fiscal year, and then the Commission has to prepare a biennial report with any of those savings. The Committee will also be able to follow up on these issues and any other needed adjustments to the law concerning [AB 236 \(2019\)](#). Another bill that made some major changes to the law last session was [AB 116 \(2021\)](#), which makes most minor traffic violations civil, rather than criminal, infractions. Essentially this just means that breaking a minor traffic law in Nevada is no longer a criminal offense. The law defined which traffic and vehicle violations are misdemeanors and establish court procedures for processing civil infractions in traffic and related offenses. It also made some appropriations to DPS to make system upgrades, so the Committee will have the opportunity to get updates on the implementation of this law and any other matters. That is the last topic.

Chair Scheible:

Those are just a few things for us to do this interim, which is absolutely doable by one or two people. I hope that the record will reflect that was well-intentioned sarcasm, because we have a huge workload. However, I know that we are up to the task, and people have already been reaching out to me about projects they would like to work on. I would like to open the floor up for the members to start giving us some ideas of what they would like to take the lead on, and we can get some of that in writing and start planning for the rest of the interim (Agenda Item V).

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I would love to take the lead on arranging and looking at some of the topics on May 13th, which includes like the courts, the Nevada Sentencing Commission, and bail and pretrial release. I might, if at all possible, try to follow up with [AB 236](#) (2019), which I think goes in line with the Nevada Sentencing Commission and some of the work that it is doing there, as well as looking at some of the implementation problems, issues, or concerns with [AB 116](#) (2021). I also have an interest in gaming general updates and some gaming topics that I think would be useful for our Committee.

I know that we have talked, and you had a wonderful idea that if members are taking the lead on these, think about presenting them in terms of the way you would present a pseudo-BDR during a normal committee hearing. I think that would be really helpful so that when we get to our August work session meeting, we have a better idea of what those bills would actually look like.

We got a lot of great ideas in public comment, so I think that gives all the members some ideas and some people to reach out to in order to start the process of showing what those BDRs might actually look like. Chair, I appreciate you working through and talking about those ideas with me, and I would encourage the other members to do that. Do not everyone raise their hands at once. I know that Chair Scheible and I will call on you because we know people that are destined to take on some of these bigger topics.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Thank you, Chair Scheible. I would be most interested in working on the summary eviction topic that is going to be on the June 10th agenda. I am not biting off more than I can chew since I am a newbie, but this is really important in my community. I would appreciate help from anyone who would be interested in helping with that. I would also like to back up whoever is going to be on some of the NDOC issues. One that we discussed earlier was the changes to the credits and some of those other topics that have to do with how our funds are being taken care of under Marsy's Law. I can take on a few, not too many, but a couple of things, and I would like to help out where I can. Thank you very much.

Chair Scheible:

Thank you. I think it would be great if you can take the lead on the summary eviction process and bring as many people into the conversation as you can.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

I am interested in a few things on February 11th, such as human trafficking, sexual assault kits, and domestic violence, so pretty much everything relating to February 11th. I am also interested in the summary evictions and anything I can do to help in that arena.

Chair Scheible:

I will assign you as our point person for the sexual assault study and human trafficking. When I say study, I mean conversations about changes we might want to make to the sexual assault definitions. I know that is something the Coalition to Prevent Sexual and Domestic Violence was very interested in last session, and I am sure that you have worked with them before to review some of that, as well as the human trafficking component, which I would be happy to partner with you on. I will expect you to help out Assembly Member Summers-Armstrong with the summary eviction conversation. We appreciate it.

Senator Harris:

Thank you, Chair. I am happy to work on anything that is a straggler at the end, once people express their preferences. I am most interested in working on law enforcement and the corrections issues and possibly assisting Vice Chair Nguyen on bail and pretrial release, since that is something we have been working on together for quite some time now.

Chair Scheible:

I think that would be fantastic. I will ask you to be our point person for the corrections community, and also to work with Vice Chair Nguyen on bail and pretrial release. Let us see who else might be volunteering before they are "volun-told" to take on something.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I would like to "volun-tell" Assembly Member O'Neill. I think he would work well on some of these law enforcement topics that are currently scheduled for July 8th.

Chair Scheible:

Assembly Member O'Neill, you and Senator Harris will be taking the lead on our law enforcement topics coming up in July. Maybe I will see if Assembly Member Krasner would be interested in taking on some issues related to juvenile justice and record sealing.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I would be very happy to help out with the juvenile justice issues and the sealing of records. Obviously, I am interested in all of these topics. They are all very important, and that is why I am on Judiciary and have been for the past three sessions.

Chair Scheible:

Also, the work plan is not set in stone. If there was a reason to move a topic from one day to another, we can do that.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I am also very interested in the sexual assault issue. You talked about maybe one or a group of people sitting down with survivors of sexual assault or those who are knowledgeable about sexual assault and asking them what issues they see that need to be changed or modified. That would be something I would be very interested in.

Chair Scheible:

If you and Assemblywoman Marzola want to put your heads together on how best to do that, that would be fantastic.

I am missing a couple of people. Senator Pickard, are you interested in taking on one of these projects for the interim?

Senator Pickard:

I appreciate the offer. I can do whatever is necessary, wherever the need is. I was looking, actually, at the June 10th topics. I have practical experience in all of those, but that is the one meeting I may not be able to attend. I am happy to help in any other way I can. I am

happy to participate in those, but again, that may be a meeting I have to miss. I currently have a trial set for that day. Who knows if that trial will go forward, as you well know, but I will not be available if it does, so I am happy to support in any other way.

Chair Scheible:

Like I said, they are not set in stone, so that would be a perfect reason to adjust our schedule. It would be great if you would be willing to work with our Esports Commission and bring back any updates that they have. That is the main one that sticks out to me.

Senator Pickard:

I used to represent litigants in summary eviction proceedings. I am the president this year of the National Council of Legislators from Gaming States, and I have some experience there. Esports and the charitable events are wrapped up in that as well. In any event, I am happy to do whatever we need to do.

Chair Scheible:

Great. I am going to ask you to follow up on all of those topics and report back with other areas we might need to explore and other agenda items we might need to add for future meetings. Like Assemblywoman Nguyen said, maybe come up with something of a BDR policy proposal, if there is a need.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

If you want to meet, I think there is some flexibility in those dates. We can always potentially swap other things with other topics if necessary, but I will reach out to you as well.

Senator Pickard:

Thank you.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I think corrections probably dovetails into law enforcement. They are related, just as the courts and sentencing law are. I am really here for your service, Chair, and what you would like.

Chair Scheible:

I appreciate that, and I will ask you to work with Senator Harris on both the corrections issues and the law enforcement issues. I think that generally covers what we have. Senator Harris and Assembly Member O'Neill will work on corrections. Assemblywoman Krasner will be working on juvenile justice. Assembly Members Marzola and Krasner will be working on human trafficking and sexual assault. Assembly Members Summers-Armstrong and Marzola will be working on summary evictions. Senator Pickard will be working on gaming issues, charitable events, and Esports. We had a couple of other topics come up during that conversation that I failed to note, but that are kind of related to those issues. Assembly Member Nguyen and Senator Harris will be working on pretrial release and bail. Mr. Guinan and Ms. Thornton, did I miss anything that we had previously outlined as something our Committee is responsible for covering?

Patrick Guinan:

I do not believe so. I think it would probably be prudent for Diane and me to review the list and minutes from today and the assignments that everyone got. If there is anything that fell through the cracks, we can alert you to that.

Chair Scheible:

Again, this is not a set-in-stone list either, so I hope as we dive into these topics, you will find other topics of interest or focus in more narrowly. I will caution us about adding things to our agenda, because it already is very large; however, if there is something that you want to explore and you are willing to take on that responsibility, I am happy to offer the JISCJ as a platform and as a structure for vetting ideas for you or any other member of the Legislature who has a topic that they want to vet through the Committee.

Ms. O’Krent, I was hoping that you could give us a little reminder about the Open Meeting Law (OML) as we work through these topics. It is my intent to include more people in this process, not to exclude people in this process. I just want you all to keep in mind that while it is good to be working with stakeholders and community members, it is not good to be having meetings among legislators without properly notifying the public.

Karly O’Krent:

As you are all familiar with, the Legislature is not subject to the OML, but it is important to the work of this Committee to comply with the spirit and intent of the OML. As a friendly reminder, the OML applies to meetings at which a quorum of members is present to deliberate toward a decision or take action. When you are exploring these topics that you have been discussing, I would encourage you to consider that in the absence of a quorum, members are allowed to privately discuss public issues or even lobby for votes. However, if a quorum is present or is gathered by something called serial communication, which is when one of you is emailing and another one is emailing, and so on and so forth in a manner that includes a quorum, you want to make sure that you are complying with the OML and not deliberating toward a decision.

Chair Scheible:

Thank you. I know that all our members always strive to comply, so if you have any questions or run into any concerns, please feel free to reach out to me or to our staff, and we are happy to clarify. Well, I am not the expert, but I am happy to get someone to clarify OML questions for you.

Assemblyman O’Neill:

Thank you, Chair. To clarify, would these discussions, such as the ones Senator Harris and I will be having with various stakeholders, be announced ahead of time and scheduled for certain dates and times? Would the Legislative Building be available or at least Zoom meeting staff be available to coordinate these meetings? Exactly how do we plan these discussions? I need some clarification.

Chair Scheible:

That is an excellent question. As with everything at the Legislature, our resources are limited. Certainly, if there is a larger meeting that you plan to have and you want to notify the public in advance and have lots of testimony, we could talk to our staff about setting up

a meeting like this or at the Legislative Building. However, for the most part, these would be smaller discussions. As Ms. O'Krent said, they are not aimed towards coming to a decision. I think that is the main difference between a violation of the OML versus a productive discussion. As long as you are working with people to talk about what is the problem and what are some various solutions, that is all fine and can be in a conference room or private Zoom meeting or however you choose to communicate. The problem is that if you start going through options and say, "This is the one that we are going to do," or email me and say, "Hey Chair, I think that this is the bill that we should pass." As long as we are bringing a number of options to the table so that this body can discuss, in a democratic fashion, which proposals we are going to move forward, and that is all done publicly, that complies with the spirit of the OML.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Will travel funds be available for the members? Because I am up north, and Senator Harris is down south. In order to actually get together face to face with these various community of interest groups to discuss the options, will there be funds available?

Senator Harris:

Assemblyman O'Neill, I have lots of ideas about how we can coordinate and work together. As you mentioned, since you are up north and I am down south, we will likely have to do a lot of virtual meetings. I am happy to come up north and possibly meet with you in person at least once as we work through some of these issues, but let us start off with exchanging our contact information and we will chat offline about different ideas. There is only two of us, so we are not anywhere close to a quorum and do not have to worry about violating the OML or the spirit of the OML. I have got lots of ideas of how we can get started.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I appreciate that, and I look forward to meeting with you. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM V—OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Chair Scheible:

Thank you all. Agenda Item V is a review of the committee work plan (Agenda Item V). For the sake of our record, I want to make sure we hit every agenda item. I think that we have covered everything. Again, the work plan is available to members and also to the public on our website. It is an exhibit to the meeting. As I mentioned before, it includes some general topics and is not set in stone, but the purpose of giving everything a date was to make sure that we did not get to August and forget something or run out of time for anything. Are there any questions, comments, or suggestions on the work plan? I do not see any. Is there anything else the Committee would like to discuss before we go to public comment? No, okay, we will go to public comment.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Scheible:

Broadcast and Production Services, are there any callers on the line?

BPS:

Thank you, Chair. There are no callers for public comment at this time.

Chair Scheible:

Having no other business before the Committee today, our next meeting will be on Friday, February 11th also at 9 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM VII—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julianne King

Research Policy Assistant

Patrick Guinan

Senior Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II A	Sonya Williams, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II B	Denise Bolaños, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II C	Beth Rohde, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II D	Keisha Gibbs, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II E	Jodi Hocking, Founder and Director, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II F	Ayanna Simmons-Oglesby, Member, Return Strong Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated	Public comment
Agenda Item II G	Tonja Brown, Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent	Public comment
Agenda Item III	Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), and Diane C. Thornton, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	Committee brief
Agenda Item V	Patrick Guinan, Senior Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB, and Diane C. Thornton, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	Work plan

These Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.