



NEVADA LEGISLATURE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE

(*Nevada Revised Statutes* [NRS] [219A.130](#))

DRAFT MINUTES

October 22, 2024

The fifth meeting of the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL) for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Tuesday, October 22, 2024, at 2 p.m. in Room 165, Legislative Office Building, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2135, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Nevada Youth Legislature'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).

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Youth Legislator Sebastian Rios, Chair
Youth Legislator Ethan Cohen, Vice Chair
Youth Legislator Elver Alvarez Flores
Youth Legislator Sophie Cain
Youth Legislator Matthew Chen
Youth Legislator Eric Conyers
Youth Legislator Mackenzie Coughlin
Youth Legislator Kathleen McCarthy
Youth Legislator Jolie Nguyen
Youth Legislator Daniel Obstgarten
Youth Legislator Joshua Park
Youth Legislator Alexa Walsh
Youth Legislator Toren Wolf

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Youth Legislator Kyle Allen
Youth Legislator Owen Chang
Youth Legislator Jordan Chong
Youth Legislator Sitara Reganti

YOUTH LEGISLATORS ABSENT:

Youth Legislator Tyler Breeden
Youth Legislator G'Yanna Perry
Youth Legislator Phillip Rosas
Youth Legislator Hannah Villatoro

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT TO
ADMINISTER THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE MEMBER PRESENT:**

Valerie Wiener (Ret.), Chair

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Tina Ashdown, Constituent Services Analyst/Program Facilitator, Constituent Services Unit,
Research Division
Bruno Moya, Research Analyst, Constituent Services Unit, Research Division
Destini Cooper, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Seana McManus, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Melissa Jimenez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
David Nauss, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Cohen:

[Vice Chair Cohen called the meeting to order and reviewed meeting and testimony guidelines.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Cohen:

[Vice Chair Cohen called for public comment; however, there was none.]

AGENDA ITEM III—SELECTION OF TWO YOUTH LEGISLATOR BILL DRAFT REQUEST PROPOSALS TO BE HEARD BY THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE AT THE NOVEMBER 20, 2024, MEETING

Vice Chair Cohen:

That brings me to Item III, the selection of the two bill draft request (BDR) proposals, which we will refer to as BDR proposals, from the seven proposals chosen at our October meeting. A list of these BDR proposals is in your meeting folders and is available on the meeting page (Agenda Item III A). At this time, I would like to ask each of the seven Youth Legislators to please give an explanation of your proposed BDR. You will have five minutes. After each presentation, Youth Legislators will have four minutes to ask questions about the BDR proposals. We will take each of the BDR proposals in numerical order. Youth Legislator McCarthy, would you please start by providing an explanation of BDR proposal 3?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about my BDR again. First, I want to give you all a refresher on my BDR. My BDR establishes procedures for teachers and administrators to address suspected or confirmed drug use in students. By suspected, I mean behaviors consistent with drug use. By confirmed, I mean teachers witnessing drugs in the possession of the student or positive testing for drug impairment. When a teacher makes a report, administrators will hold a conference with the student, parent, and teacher involved. All parties will get to explain the situation. If the child has a drug problem, resources will be given to the parents. If, and only if, the parent or parents are unable to address the problem, law enforcement and other authorities will be contacted. I know this information is familiar to you, so with the rest of my time, I want to talk about the main parties involved with this BDR moving forward: me; you all; and the Legislature.

I will start with me. My birthday is in three days. I will be turning 17. Yesterday was a good friend of mine Daniella's birthday. Thirteen years ago, we had a joint birthday party. We were turning four, and we celebrated together. This year, that is not the case. While I am going to be turning 17 this week, Daniella will never be 17. Three years ago, on October 13th, she overdosed on opioids laced with fentanyl and died alone in her room. To say it came as a shock would be an understatement. Her death was some of the most horrific pain I had experienced at that point in my life. All these years later, her death still feels like it was preventable. I have talked to many students who went to school with her and knew her better than I did in our later years. They talked about her routinely skipping

class, having trouble doing work, speaking of participating in risky behaviors, and in general, seeming like she needed help. I wonder to this day why did she not get any?

I do not want to associate blame on any one specific person as no teacher, parent, or friend is singlehandedly at fault. I do not think any one person should take responsibility for a collective failure to give her the support she needed, because it was just that, a collective failure. It was systematic negligence that allowed her and many other kids in Las Vegas and Nevada to die from drug use. Her death led me to other stories of drugs taking children much too soon, to other families that were impacted by this, to law enforcement officers that are constantly fighting unseen battles with drugs, and how they impact the Las Vegas community and the greater State. Her death led me to my BDR, to my passion for this legislation. Her death led me to speak in front of you today.

You are the next people I need to address in this story. As I said last time we met, 4.7 percent of Nevada teenagers aged 12 to 17 meet the criteria for illicit drug use disorder, which is basically a fancy way to say they are using drugs. That 4.7 percent equates to about 10,000 adolescents in our State. I want all of you to close your eyes please if you can; picture 10,000 individuals. Think of your school population. For me, it is fairly small, around 1,400 students. I see seven times the number of students who go to West Career and Technical Academy (West Tech) routinely using drugs. For Youth Legislator Chen, who attends Sierra Vista High School, one of the largest schools in the District with 3,600 students give or take, that is almost three times your school population—three times. For all of you in between, 10,000 of your peers. That is how many adolescents at minimum could benefit from my legislation.

Even so, you may find flaws in my BDR. You may not see the power of mandatory reporting, even though it holds quite a lot. That is where I turn to one of your BDRs. Youth Legislator Park, I apologize for singling your BDR out, but I wanted to mention it. Your BDR had tremendous potential. It stated, in essence, what needs to happen in Nevada if we want to truly solve our addiction crisis. We need outreach centers that offer counseling and treatment services to children and families who are facing drug addiction, because what happens when a parent finds out their child has a drug problem? I have spoken to many parents, and many have sent their children to out-of-state treatment centers. While this solution benefits the child in the long run, it is concerning that we, as one of the states with the highest drug use rates in the country, do not have teen treatment centers. I believe it is because of the high cost.

How does that relate to my BDR? As my BDR summary says, each of the reports made by teachers will be filed at the school. The number of reports and the steps taken to follow up with the student and parent will be information that can be brought before the Legislature. I hope the immediate effects of my BDR follow through, but I also want the future number of reports to be evidence to push for funding for the creation and staffing of drug resource centers or treatment centers in the State of Nevada.

On the topic of funding, that brings me to the final piece of this puzzle—the Legislature. If you have looked at the history of the NYL BDR that passed since 2011, all have included no fiscal note. It is clear it is quite advantageous to be able to tell the Legislature you are not looking for more money. If my BDR is selected as the NYL BDR, we will hopefully be able to tell them that. That is because of a free training program for teachers offered by Drug Impairment Training for Educational Professionals (DITEP). [They] offer a free one- or two-day training on these skills for teachers. The training was piloted in three states, Arizona, Kansas, and New York; and is now being expanded to others. Thank you for your time. I hope I can count on your support.

Vice Chair Cohen:

I will now open the floor to any questions. Youth Legislator Chong.

Youth Legislator Chong:

Why not alcohol? Why is that not included in this BDR? Alcohol is a drug. It is one of the most widely abused drugs, and I bet it factors a lot into that 4.7 percent figure you gave us. It is a harmful and deadly drug sometimes, so I am wondering why is that not included in this BDR?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

It actually does not fall into that 4.7 percent. That 4.7 percent is only drugs, not alcohol. I got it from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and they qualify alcohol and drug use as two different things. That 4.7 percent is illicit drug use disorder. I originally did not put alcohol into this BDR because it did not hit home the way drugs did. I see your point, and if my BDR is selected by the NYL, I would love to hear all your opinions on including alcohol as well. Obviously, alcohol laws are a little different, so it may alter some things, but I would be open to including it. It is not included in that 4.7 percent.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

I think this BDR has great potential, and it has good meaning behind it. I want to touch on something you said at the end. You said the program you have been talking about—I forget the exact acronym—had been piloted in three states. How effective was it in those three states at doing what you intend it to do?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

Those three states obviously did not have my law. It is only the training, and they do not keep record of all the times it is used in those states. Drug Impairment Training for Educational Professionals is under the International Association of Chiefs of Police. They decided to expand it after 2023 and update all the trainings that had been established in Arizona, Kansas, and New York. It is joining Colorado and maybe Missouri right now. They deemed it successful enough that they should expand it to other states. With my BDR, the training is on how the teachers can identify students with drug impairment. Then we would get actual numbers, if we were to implement it. There are teacher testimonials on the DITEP website on using it if you would be interested in seeing those in the future.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

You talked about in your BDR that you would like to schedule a conference with the student and staff. How do you think this will not overburden public schools? You said in the State of Nevada, public high schools can reach almost 4,000 students. They are already overburdened with 504 meetings with expansion of mental health services, et cetera. How would you not overburden the staff with this proposal?

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

It is something to take into consideration. Ten thousand does sound like a lot, but divided between all schools in Nevada, the hope is that it is not hundreds at each school, it is a few. Those few do add up, but the main way I justify it—hopefully this speaks to you—is that

these meetings already occur for mandatory reporting—like child abuse, bullying, and all those things—have been added over time. The cyber bullying and bullying procedures and mandatory reporting came after child abuse mandatory reporting was established. We have always found a way for teachers and staff to be able to do it. I have spoken to teachers. One who taught at West, Mr. Harder, only ever used mandatory reporting three times in his multiple year career there. Hopefully, it would not be overburdening. Drugs might be more prevalent than those other things, but hopefully administrators would be able to work it out.

Vice Chair Cohen:

We are going to move on to BDR proposal 6, submitted by Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

The last time I presented this BDR to you, I shared terrifying incidents of minor deaths in Nevada. These incidents happened several years ago; however, firearm deaths of youth in Nevada that result from parental negligence is not an outdated concept. Unfortunately, it is still ongoing. In 2017, in Las Vegas, a three-year-old boy accidentally shot and killed himself with his father's firearm. The officers responding to the scene said, "It is imperative, as gun owners, you store your firearms in a safe way. It does not matter how old your kids are. It does not matter where your kids are. Firearms should be locked up at all times, so tragedies like this do not happen in our community." Even when law enforcement makes a statement about responsible gun ownership about minors in Nevada, these incidents keep happening. For instance, in 2018, in Las Vegas, a four-year-old boy accidentally shot and killed himself with his father's gun. The friends of the father said, "It was not his fault, and even if it was the father's gun, it was still ultimately the boy's fault"—a four-year-old boy. I could continue to review the instances of firearm deaths due to parental negligence from the Sparks shooting all the way to present day, but we would be here all afternoon.

This February, in Henderson, a 12-year-old boy was shot and killed by his 14-year-old brother. The 14-year-old killed his brother with a gun his parents carelessly left around the house. When confronted by the police, the father was, "Very forthcoming and acted as if it was a normal situation for his minor children to handle a loaded firearm." The parents legally purchased the firearm, so they knew it was negligent but did not care. They knew there would be no criminal charges for their negligence. Even worse, since we last spoke in September, another child in Nevada has died. A teenage boy was shot by his 15-year-old friend as they played with a firearm that had been left out by a negligent parent. This was last week. What were you doing last week? Were you shopping for homecoming? Were you catching up on homework? Today, on October 22, 2024, you can remember what you were doing on October 16th. You can remember. The teenage boy that was accidentally shot by his 15-year-old friend with his parent's legally-owned firearm cannot. He cannot remember because he is dead. Too many are dead.

What about the 42 Nevada children who killed themselves with firearms in three years? Where did they obtain the guns? They certainly did not buy them themselves. They were able to access those firearms from their parents. Forty-two is an entire classroom. Imagine middle school. You start sixth grade, and over the next three years of middle school, an entire class of your friends have killed themselves. It is a sad reality. Nevada youth are dying from firearm accidents at the hand of their siblings, friends, through suicide, or even a school shooting. However, there is one constant: parents' legally owned firearms landing in the hands of their children with no criminal consequences for their negligent actions. You can change that. It does not have to be this way. My BDR will remove the specific conditions that have to be in place for a parent to be held liable for their minor using their firearm.

Those conditions currently being if the minor is known to commit violent acts; the parent explicitly authorized use of the firearm; or the minor had already been previously found guilty of a criminal offense.

In every case I listed today, none of those conditions apply. If you vote for my BDR, we can hold parents accountable. Parents need to safely lock up their firearms if we want Nevada youth to be safe. This is not a new idea. When a Michigan teen shot and killed four of his classmates in 2021, his parents were arrested and found guilty, because it was their gun their son used to commit murder. Recently, in Georgia, the father of the teen that shot and killed two of his classmates and teachers was indicted, because the teen used the father's firearm. The document indicting the father cited the reason for it was "criminal negligence" as he let his minor have access to a firearm and ammunition by not properly locking up his firearm.

My proposal is not anti-gun. My mother is a legal firearm owner. I do not know where that firearm is—as it should be. She has a responsibility to keep her firearm safely stowed away from me—as does every parent who owns a firearm in the State of Nevada; however, if that parent were to fall short of that responsibility, as it stands now, they would only get a slap on the wrist—a fine. You can change this. The BDR I am proposing would make this a class B felony, which is punishable by 1 to 20 years in prison. This is a broad enough law to give courts leeway and sentencing guidelines depending on the crime.

I know the big objective on your mind right now is, "I want to vote for the BDR that will make it through the 2025 Legislative Session." I can confidently say this BDR can do so for three reasons. One, there has already been precedent for a law like this. We have seen it in Michigan and Georgia. Two, there is no fiscal impact attached to this BDR. Three, if there is anything I have learned over the past year and a half is that I am speaking before 20 hardworking and forward-thinking young people who want to serve the youth of Nevada.

As we have learned, once the BDR is voted by the NYL, it is no longer the author's BDR. It is the entire Youth Legislature's. You are all change makers who can make this BDR go further than I ever could alone. Protect the youth of Nevada. The hard reality is, these deaths are preventable, but without any change in the law, they will keep happening. We must act. That is why I ask for your support for my BDR. Let us keep our classmates, siblings, and friends safe. Vote BDR 6.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Do we have any questions about BDR proposal 6? Youth Legislator Chong.

Youth Legislator Chong:

This is a BDR focused on the parents rather than the students. Parenting in this day and age is harder than ever. It causes parental stress and mental health crises. It is even a top priority of the United States Surgeon General. Do you worry that prosecuting grieving parents, such as in the Sparks case you mentioned the last meeting, will only add to parent stress and make it harder to be a parent in Nevada? You mentioned there are 42 kids that died in the last 3 years, which was tragic—if I am getting that statistic right. There are 700,000 people under 18 in this State, so there is clearly a disproportionate impact on parents who own a gun. Most of them, maybe 99 percent of them, will not have their kid negligently use them.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

To clarify, that 42 number is specifically children who have killed themselves from 2017 to 2020 in the State of Nevada with a firearm. The number of parental negligence with a firearm is much more. Like I said, it would take all afternoon. Talking about grieving parents, in every case that has to do with criminal negligence of a parent, for example, if a parent leaves their child unattended in the bathtub and the child drowns, or they leave their baby in a hot car and the kid dies, they are still criminally liable. It does not matter that their child has died. The courts still pursue that case as they are criminally liable. You said it might be focusing too much on the parents. This BDR would be a strong reminder for parents. For example, when I was talking about these cases, most of them were accidental shootings or suicide. These are not inherently evil people. They do not want their children to die. I bet you when they were kids, they would put their babies in a car seat. They would baby proof everything. They would put a seatbelt on them because it is law. They need the law. That is a reminder for them. It is a law to put your child in the car seat. It is a law to have a seatbelt on in the car. Parents know they could face criminal charges from not putting their baby in a car seat or putting a seatbelt on them. That is their reminder. This would add that same logic to a firearm, because in reality, it makes no sense that we are letting there be leeway with deadly weapons of force.

Youth Legislator Cain:

I like your BDR. Do you have an idea on the fiscal note for this BDR? I think the State would have to pay for the prosecution of the parents. If the parents did not have lawyers, they would have to pay for the parent's legal representation as well. Do you have a proposed figure?

Youth Legislator Walsh:

That is all in theory. That is theoretical. The point of this BDR is to make it accessible, so if there are cases like this, they could be prosecuted. Of course, it is a case-by-case basis. If the courts do not want to pursue it, that is a completely whole other thing. There is no exact number because it is all theoretical. Right now, they cannot be held criminally liable. Think about it this way, Nevada children are dying. They are dying from something that could be easily prevented. I know it sounds like, "Yes, there is that fiscal impact," but when you think about it, money [versus] children dying. It is a theoretical number. We do not know how much, but it is a problem. Currently, for example, my mom is a legal firearm owner. If I took that firearm, and I shot any one of you, she would never be held criminally liable, because I have never been convicted of a criminal offense, and she did not explicitly authorize the use of that firearm. That is why I would be removing those requirements. Even if I did fulfill those requirements, she would still only get a fine. She would only be civilly liable. I wanted to remind you of that.

Vice Chair Cohen:

We are going to move on to BDR proposal 7, submitted by Youth Legislator Allen.

Youth Legislator Allen:

Good afternoon, my fellow Youth Legislators as well as anyone attending online or in person. I appreciate the role you are playing in this decision-making process. When we were here in September, my BDR, BDR 7, touches on providing more support for English Language Learners (ELLs) as well as teachers in the classroom. By three means outlined in the language provided to you in your meeting materials: (1) through in-person translators;

(2) paraprofessionals; or (3) the prioritization of teaching students English before other academic courses of study.

With this, I want to break down some of the questions. I want to talk to you directly because I value that communication, and I want to clear up one of the biggest burdens being the financial cost associated with my BDR. The first priority of this BDR is to acquire and attain more paraprofessionals in the classroom for students. In Nevada, in Fiscal Year 2023, paraprofessionals were paid \$59,475 on a high end. On the low end, they were paid \$20,800. That median comes to \$33,280 according to talent.com. What this is substantiating is this is attainable for school districts when we consider increasing their budget. This allows for more opportunity for growth when we discuss the pay of paraprofessionals, especially when we consider their role in the classroom in knowing multiple languages and being able to apply themselves, especially to their students.

When we look at live translation technology in the classroom, there are multiple platforms and multiple companies that would work to further provide this service to students in the classroom. With that, in the language [of the BDR] it is up to each school district assigned by the State Board of Education (SBE) to decide. Some of the top [platforms] especially pertinent to school districts are SPF Audio, Trados, Plant-Tours, and Bureau Works. The most attainable and the most affordable I found during my research was Bureau Works. The great thing about this is it allows different plans to be used. School districts choosing this plan have opportunities to choose what is most applicable to them, and what is going to provide them the greatest service. Carson High School here in Carson City is not going to need the same requirements and services as schools in Las Vegas. With that, there are different plans and different options that range from \$0 to \$1,680 a month. That is apportioned by the SBE, and again, it is up to the school district. We could talk plan after plan, but by doing a simple Google search, there are lots of opportunities in attaining this. These numbers are not out of reach, especially when we consider budget requirements that already exist for school districts when it comes to ELLs, as well as the possibilities for the State and school board to provide more funding to each of our school districts.

Finally, it branches off, but another possibility outlined in the [BDR] language is there is translation software that is quite similar to technology. That is hardware versus software. With this, it does come at a significantly lower cost. What I am outlining here to you is there is value in doing this research. There is value in the resources that are out there. This BDR is possible, especially when we consider the limitations and the requirements each school district has.

With that, there were a few final notes I wanted to touch on. I know this is one of the only BDRs that has a financial burden, but students are struggling in the classroom. The story I mentioned in September in which I watched a student in my anatomy class struggle, she is doing a lot better, because we have increased resources in the classroom. The financial burden is there, but it is important that we start prioritizing our youth and start prioritizing students in Nevada classrooms. I want to briefly touch on a prior BDR from the last session that focused on three areas: ELLs, gifted education, and special education. We need more funding that is directly apportioned to ELL. Finally, we need similar legislation to be enhanced, and we can do that with my BDR.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any questions? Youth Legislator Walsh, and then I will go to Youth Legislator Obstgarten.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

In your BDR you said you would require more in-person translators. I was wondering how you would get those people, because we already have many teacher vacancies in Nevada. We are already trying to get social workers back on campuses. What would be your plan to get in-person translators, a high-demand job in general, for schools?

Youth Legislator Allen:

I will expand that a little, and I will branch that to in-person translators as well as paraprofessionals—translators simply doing translating services, but paraprofessionals doing translation and also working one-on-one with students. Like I mentioned, there is room for improvement when we discuss the salaries for interpreters as well as paraprofessionals. There is room for that to grow. I would suggest that varying by district because needs are different. I would not say there needs to be a 5 percent increase across the board; that is going to vary by district. Additionally, we have to understand this is a different classification aside from teachers. Working in this position, there is a different salary that is already implied. There is room for improvement. We are seeing less of a struggle in hiring paraprofessionals, but when we have opportunities to hire more based off an increased budget, there is room to grow both of those roles in the classroom.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

Throughout your speech and in that answer, you were saying we would be paying people, and we would need more funding. Where would we be getting this funding from? As I understand it, right now, the budget for the Clark County School District (CCSD), at the very least, is already stretched thin. Where would it be coming from, essentially?

Youth Legislator Allen:

It would be pulling from another State budget because it would be the State who is allocating more to the SBE. I have not come to the greatest conclusion on where to pull that from. I think that would be best assigned after further research and from an official or expert who would come in November. As for further research and where there is room, a big area, for me, is decreasing the emergency fund. That would be county by county. There is room to pull from there. For instance, running for reelection, Carson City Mayor Lori Bagwell has discussed increasing the County Emergency Budget, but then there is room there to pull from that to allocate it more toward education. That is the top of my list, but there is room for growth. I would be open to engaging in a conversation about where to pull that from in the State budget.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.]

Moving on, we are now going to talk about BDR proposal 8, submitted by Youth Legislator Chong.

Youth Legislator Chong:

I provided a handout for BDR 8 in your folders (Agenda Item III B-1). Following my previous speech on BDR 8, I would like to dive deep into the importance of this BDR. To start, let me demonstrate the horrors of its target, deepfake pornography. The NYL is a public committee, and every one of our faces is on the Internet. If any Internet user wanted

to harass any one of us, they could plaster a face into artificial intelligence (AI) technology and create nude content of any Youth Legislator. To demonstrate, I made deepfakes of myself. Here is a photo of my face, here is a photo of me on the red carpet, and here is a photo of me eating spaghetti (Agenda Item III B-2) [Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us.] Each of these photos only took me around three minutes to make, and it would take the same amount of time to splice my face or someone else's face on another image, such as a nude photo. What is next is up to them. In many cases, they go as far as to post it on public forums, and suddenly, a fake, defamatory nude photo of you becomes available to millions of people. It is a remarkably effective harassment technique. These videos may fulfill sick fantasies, but they are most often used to ruin lives.

We know all too well that it has happened to celebrities, but it has also happened to people who have the courage to speak out. It happened to at least four Nevada teenagers who I spoke to while preparing this BDR. They told me they had been targeted by their own classmates or peers in other areas of their lives who had often physically harassed them and often discussed their bodies as if they were objects. They were the types to openly catcall girls in class and discuss their favorite porn stars. Then, in all cases, one of their peers decided to cross the line into public humiliation creating fake, deepfake images or videos with nudify apps. Although they did not know who created the first image or video, they know the content spread in online friend groups. Although blame can only be assigned to the predators themselves, Internet pornography surely contributed to their actions. It is a self-evident and evidence-backed truth that pornography causes mental health issues, sexual violence, and objectifying views, which harm oneself and others. A teenager who is addicted to pornography might want to see everybody sexualized, or they might want to torment one of their own peers but not get in trouble, so they resort to creating and posting fake porn. This is why it is important that BDR 8 stops minors from accessing or uploading sexual content.

The victim's videos or photos started to spread and eventually the victims found out. Sophia, a high school student in Clark County, described bewilderment, humiliation, and ostracization from most of her community. For the victims, the mental harm caused recession from public activities, falling grades, and lost friends. The videos died out, but they never disappeared. It was a cycle that fed into itself and became worse and worse. It was pure destruction. These victims' stories answer why you should choose BDR 8. It is the reason why sexual deepfake production and distribution becomes a category C felony. Of course, with many similar sex crimes, this is not to lock people up, because the damage will remain with or without prosecution. Instead, it prevents people from doing this in the first place, and it will work because for similar kinds—like child pornography—the law is an incredibly effective deterrent. A civil action must be authorized to at least partially compensate victims for the real-world impacts of the predator's actions.

Making those deepfakes of myself was quick, but it was not easy to figure out. I cannot imagine it as anything but a serious, intentional crime to make real deepfake porn. Bill draft request 8 does this all with zero fiscal impact. The State does not require additional staff to prosecute or adjudicate deepfake crimes. They also do not have to assist porn sites in age verification.

I want you to remember that these victims' excruciating situations could happen to any one of us and any one of the 700,000 young people in the State. It almost definitely has. It has happened to me. Imagine how many were too hurt to speak out. To finish, here is something Sophia told me, "I wish I had some way to stop it. I was drowning in the

consequences of my classmates' actions. It felt like I was burning alive." If we do not have the courage to pass BDR 8, then this onslaught will continue.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any questions for BDR proposal 8? Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I appreciate the issue you are trying to tackle; however, as I was hearing your speech and reading over the handout you gave us, it seems like—do you have more specific numbers on the amount of young people in Nevada that have been affected, like victims of deepfake pornography? You are talking a lot about adult victims, and you only have numbers on adult victims. You said some are too scared to speak out, but without the numbers, it seems more ambiguous. How much does this affect youth in Nevada specifically?

Youth Legislator Chong:

There are no official figures on this, because again, it is a humiliating crime. I was able to talk to four people, and that was just through public outreach, so I suspect there are dozens or hundreds of young people in Nevada who have been victimized by deepfakes. You need to understand that the deepfake of one person affects a lot of people. It does not just affect that one person. It affects their friends, it affects their families, because they are all ostracized from this community. It does affect people, and it is a big problem that needs to be solved with BDR 8.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

As Youth Legislator Walsh said, I think it is a great idea for a BDR proposal. There is one small thing that is not so much impacting children, but more impacting adults. It says on your handout that anybody who attempts to view or upload sexual material would have to verify their age with government identification (ID) or public records. In theory, would that not potentially create a privacy hazard? If, say, one of these sites was to have all this data get hacked by somebody, and they have all that data spread outward. How would you solve that one specific problem? I think the rest of the BDR is great.

Youth Legislator Chong:

To solve that problem—first, we need to remember I am deriving this age verification requirement from other states' bills. There are at least 20 states that require basically the same thing with government ID or by verifying via private and public government records. I know that some porn sites already implement age verification. The way those work is they delete all the information after they verify the age. In that case, it would not be able to be hacked. Obviously, it could negligently happen, but watching and uploading porn is also not a requirement. It is a choice. Yes, these age verification software have terms of service where they outline what they do. If they were to violate the terms of service, obviously, if information got leaked, the people who were leaked could get a class action lawsuit—potentially.

Youth Legislator Chang:

You mentioned in your handout that the no fiscal impact comes from community reporting. How would we follow up with these reports? If I am a responsible adult, and I find that

genericpornsite.com is not using age verification, and then I report that to the State, how would the State ensure genericpornsite.com then does use age verification?

Youth Legislator Chong:

It is like investigating any other kind of crime. If you can imagine, a site is hosting child pornography, for example, and they are not taking the steps required to remove and report that, someone would report it to the State or the State would find out, and they would investigate that with their own staff. It is all happening within the State with their own staff, so it does require maybe more work, depending on the number of violations, but it does not require more staff. We are already equipped to deal with these kinds of cases.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Any other questions? [There were none.]

With that, we will move to the next BDR proposal, BDR 12, submitted by Youth Legislator Cain.

Youth Legislator Cain:

Thank you for the opportunity to present my BDR to you today (Agenda Item III C). My BDR proposal is a pilot program to put metal detectors in schools based on the number of guns found on campus. Were any of you ever bullied in school? Statistics show 25 percent of middle and high school students experienced some type of bullying in those years. In 2016, Kyler Nipper, who was a student at Coronado Middle School in Las Vegas, was stabbed in the middle of his hallway after being bullied for wearing worn out shoes. Ensuring metal detectors are in schools would help guard against not only gun violence, but also peer-to-peer and peer-to-teacher violence with other weapons such as knives.

Metal detectors are a deterrent for kids bringing weapons to school in the first place. If a student knows they will get caught for bringing a weapon on campus, they are far less likely to do so. If they have seen their peers and friends reprimanded for bringing weapons on campus, it is almost impossible they will do so. A WJNO News Radio study found that students were 43 percent less likely to attempt to bring a weapon on campus once they implemented metal detectors. This BDR is about stopping school violence before it happens and not deterring it by dealing with it after the fact.

Implementing metal detectors will improve students' mental health. Kff.org tells us that firearm homicides occurring within adolescent communities have been linked to anxiety and depression among adolescents, particularly for females. In my school, a constant conversation during lunch and passing periods is about school violence. It causes anxiety, and it makes it harder for my peers to concentrate during class. Students who witness gun and knife violence often develop post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). As I told you, Kyler, who was stabbed in his middle school hallway, was never able to return to Coronado Middle School to finish out his education and will still not set foot on that campus to this day. It is hard to sit in the same classroom or walk around the same school where you experienced such horrible violence.

Putting metal detectors in schools will result in more people willing to be teachers. According to krmg.com, 71 percent of teachers say they have experienced physical violence from students at least once. University of Chicago tells us that one in five people would encourage a child or juvenile they know not to become a teacher specifically because of

school violence. Without teachers, students cannot learn. Nevada is already one of the lowest ranked states for education. My brother, who was formerly a student at West Tech, was constantly dealing with revolving substitutes in his classes. This affected his ability to concentrate and understand certain concepts. Children need consistency, and making our school safer is a step toward more willing teachers.

This BDR would receive a lot of possible support in our Legislature. The gun lobby would support this BDR because it would cut down on school violence, which would end negative Second Amendment publicity. Teachers would possibly support this BDR because it would make their jobs easier and safer. Parents of Nevada students would possibly support this BDR, because it would keep their students safer. I know your parents want you to stay safe, and I am sure all Nevada parents want the same.

The fiscal note on this BDR is not as high as many of you would assume. Currently, CCSD is using metal detectors at football games. They have already purchased 43 metal detectors at a cost of \$3.7 million according to KTNV Channel 13 Las Vegas. We cannot put a price on children's safety in schools, especially when a school is a place you are supposed to be able to feel comfortable, concentrate, and learn. Weapons found in Nevada school districts statistics are as follows: Fox5 Las Vegas tells us that 330 total weapons were found in CCSD from 2023 to 2024, 204 of which were knives and 30 of which were guns; most recent Washoe County reports, according to the Reno Gazette Journal, tell us that in 2021 and 2022, 16 firearms were found on their campuses. If these are the weapons they found, imagine what they missed. If we put metal detectors on campuses, we can ensure we are finding all weapons being found on campuses and crack down on all student violence. KTNV tells us that last year, from the beginning of the school year until February, there were 5,300 calls for service from police. There were 111 arrests and 585 criminal citations for on-campus violence with knives. On-campus violence with any weapon is a massive issue, and metal detectors would help stop this. KTNV cites the lack of school security for the amount of violence on campuses. This BDR would not only address violence in schools, but the anxiety students and teachers feel, and would prevent a situation like Kyler's from ever occurring again.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any questions? Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I appreciate what you said in your speech. On your handout you gave us, you use Richland School District in Pennsylvania as a comparison, and how metal detectors are useful. A quick Google search tells us the school district is like 13,000 students. Clark County, and just Clark County, is the fifth largest school district in the country with over 300,000 students—that is not including the entire State of Nevada. I was wondering if you have a number or a comparison on a bigger scale about efficacy of metal detectors. Also, talking about the fiscal note, you said CCSD has enough metal detectors, but what about the other school districts, since this will affect Nevada statewide?

Youth Legislator Cain:

Since this is a pilot program, it would most likely take place in two to three schools maximum, so the numbers of Richland would be equivalent to the numbers that would be in my pilot program. Additionally, the school violence in Washoe County and smaller counties is a lot smaller. If necessary, metal detectors could be purchased for this BDR. Part of the

goal of this BDR is making sure metal detectors are in all schools because the pilot program will be effective, that would possibly inspire Washoe County and other counties to get metal detectors, but it is highly possible they would not need them in my pilot program.

Youth Legislator Chang:

Great BDR. My question was about the definition of weapon in your BDR. There are obviously lots of things that are made of metal that could hurt people. At the same time, there are also lots of harmless things that can be defined as weapons. For example, a couple years ago, one of my schools had a student suspended for having nail clippers brought to school, because they said that would be a weapon. Furthermore, scissors, would I be allowed to bring scissors to school, or would that also be considered a weapon?

Youth Legislator Cain:

In the Clark County weapons reports, they only report handguns, BB guns, knives, of that nature, so that would be what is covered in my BDR. If you could see the proposal, you can see it covers knives and all types of guns—BB guns, long guns, handguns, that type of thing. A nail clipper or scissors would not be considered a gun in the scope of my BDR.

Youth Legislator McCarthy:

You did not mention it this time, but I believe last time you said for time constraints it takes about three seconds to walk through a metal detector. I did the math quickly. For my school, obviously, there would be more than one metal detector, but I started with a base of one metal detector. That three seconds would be over an hour. If we have three, that is 20 minutes. If we have five, that is ten minutes. If we keep increasing the number, then eventually—if this pilot program moves on—they need to buy more and more metal detectors. If we do not increase that number, are we increasing school times? Are we rearranging bussing schedules? Again, that three seconds does not include if they have to take things out of their backpack, like a computer. Most kids take a computer to school, and as the airport tells us, you have to take that out of your bag and then put it back.

Youth Legislator Cain:

As we all know, not all students arrive at school at the same time, so the three seconds would be three seconds per child walking through the metal detector. Additionally, CCSD metal detectors that are currently purchased are of the evolved system in which you can walk through the metal detector with your backpack on, and it only detects things of a mass material, and shape of a gun, or weapon such as a knife.

Vice Chair Cohen:

We will now move on to BDR proposal 17, submitted by Youth Legislator Reganti.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

Before I begin, I want to give a brief trigger warning, the topic of suicide is discussed throughout my BDR. My BDR focuses on limiting the use of solitary confinement, which is legally referred to as corrective room restrictions, in juvenile detention facilities. The goal is simple to ensure the methods we use to discipline children do not end up traumatizing them, and instead, work toward rehabilitation.

The proposal sets a maximum limit of 15 hours for confinement. This limit can only be extended in exceptional cases, and if it is, the child must be provided with educational materials or other forms of mental stimulation to keep them engaged. This might present a fiscal impact; however, it can be as simple as a pen and pencil writing down what you did and explain why what you did was wrong. The confinement should never exceed 24 hours under any circumstances. After hearing Youth Legislator Walsh's comment last meeting, if my BDR is decided, I believe we should reduce the maximum that was originally proposed by my BDR. Additionally, if a juvenile is placed in solitary confinement more than seven times within a month, they should have the right to request a review of the confinement reports. This review would be conducted by an official who was not involved in the original decision, preferably a mental health professional. This ensures confinement decisions are fair, justified, and are not driven by punitive motives. Most importantly, no child should be punished for advocating for the right of requesting such a review.

The ultimate goal of juvenile detention should be to rehabilitate, not to punish; yet, when children are incarcerated at the age of 17 or younger, 71 percent of them end up rearrested within three years of release according to the Department of Justice. Why have we not made a change? Many of these children come from environments that do not provide them with a clear understanding of right from wrong. These children need to learn and develop skills for the future, not be subjected to punitive measures that do nothing to address the underlying issues. Corrective room restrictions do not rehabilitate, instead, they traumatize. The Juvenile Law Center has pointed out that solitary confinement can cause permanent psychological damage and may lead to self-harm, psychosis, and even suicide. Is this how we want to rehabilitate the children of Nevada, through means that can have such devastating, long-term consequences? Many of these children have disabilities or traumatic backgrounds, and we need to recognize that corrective room restrictions do nothing to address the root causes of their behavior.

I want to bring your attention to the handout that was presented to you in your packet. (Agenda Item III D) For reference, these quotations do not have the actual names of who said them for safety reasons. From Kyle B., who spent time in solitary confinement under the age of 18, "Being in isolation to me felt like I was on an island, all alone, dying a slow death from the inside out."

According to Paul K.:

The hardest thing about isolation is that you are trapped in such a small room by yourself. There is nothing to do, so you start talking to yourself and getting lost in your own little world. It is crushing. You get depressed and wonder if it is even worth living. Your thoughts turn over to the more death-oriented side of life. I wanted to kill myself.

After listening to those quotations, how can we continue down the path we have been?

Now, let us talk about the data. In 2021, there were 805 instances where solitary confinement was used in county detention facilities and 622 instances in State detention facilities. These numbers are not going down. Despite reforms and discussions about rehabilitation, the use of corrective room restrictions in juvenile detention continues to persist at troubling rates. This is an issue we can no longer afford to ignore. On the fiscal side, the impact of my proposal would be minimal. As I mentioned before, education materials, for instance, can be as simple as a paper and pencil. The goal here is not to add unnecessary burdens on the system, but to focus on solutions that prioritize the mental well-being of these children while keeping costs in check.

Lastly, we all want our BDRs to make it through the legislative process and ultimately become law. I believe this proposal has a real chance, especially considering Governor Lombardo recently signed a bill limiting solitary confinement in adult prisons. We are talking about children here, children who deserve our protection and guidance as they navigate through the difficult moments of their life.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Are there any questions? Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

I appreciate you decided to lower the number of hours for solitary confinement. My question is if you have a percentage of Nevada youth that are currently in the juvenile system? With the quotes you listed, were these quotes from Nevada youth that have been in solitary confinement, or were these quotes of young people in a different place with a different juvenile solitary confinement system, like they had different conditions than we did?

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I do not have the exact percentage of the amount of Nevada youth that were incarcerated. I have the exact numbers. As for the quotes, they are from children from around the country who have been in corrective room restrictions. Still, the feeling of being in that corrective room restriction does not change. Children are still feeling traumatized by the experience.

Youth Legislator Obstgarten:

The first part of my question was already answered when Youth Legislator Walsh asked her question. In the data, you have 805 instances in county detention facilities and 622 in State detention facilities, which adds to 1,427 total instances. Is it 1,427 different youth, or is it a total compounded number? Say, one youth was in a corrective room 12 times, then that would count as 12 instances.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

This is a summary from the juvenile detention system themselves. It does not clearly specify, but my assumption, since it states instances, is it is not the amount of children, but how many times people in general were placed into solitary confinement. For all we know, there could be one child that was placed in solitary confinement over five times within a month or within the year. That is why my BDR also goes into the fact that if children are placed in corrective room restrictions exceeding seven times, they have the right to request a review of their reports, because some of these instances can be repeats.

Youth Legislator Chen:

I wanted to know if there were specific improvements that made you select the corrective room restriction limit of 15 hours, or if that is a reduction, and any reduction is a good reduction, and that is the number you settled on.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

That was more like any reduction is a good reduction. After hearing from Youth Legislator Walsh, I believe we should reduce that. After looking at some of the data, on average,

children are not placed in there for over 20 hours, but that should be reduced in general. That is where we pulled that number from.

Youth Legislator Chong:

Of course, paper and pencil you can learn with, but it is obviously not an ideal thing for young people learning. I am wondering if you would support any proposal for Nevada's Department of Education (NDE) to provide grade-level materials for educational purposes to provide to these students in solitary confinement, or if there could be another way to improve the quality of educational materials.

Youth Legislator Reganti:

I 100 percent agree. We can look toward improving the quality of education materials provided, but I did not have a chance to talk to someone in the NDE that had a good idea regarding that, so that is why I started with something that had little to no fiscal impact. We can look toward changing that if my BDR is selected.

Vice Chair Cohen:

With that, we are going to move on to the final BDR proposal, BDR 18, submitted by Chair Rios.

Chair Rios:

My fellow Youth Legislators, thank you for your time and attention today and hearing about BDR 18 for the second occasion. Simply put, BDR 18 works to expand the participation of our Nevada youth in community service. In the last presentation, I highlighted the positives the BDR would provide for students and schools. Each would gain specific advantages from changes to current language found in NRS 389.165. Those are outlined through the handout each of you received today (Agenda Item III E). To summarize, the BDR would provide Nevada students with the opportunity to earn one semester, or 0.5 elective credit, for the successful completion of between 35 and 60 community service hours. The exact number to be determined by each district.

In terms of fiscal impact, this legislation would have a relatively minimal fiscal cost. There would be a fiscal impact for State government, primarily from NDE requesting overtime pay for a staff member to work on creating the regulations prescribed by the legislation. That amount being approximately \$2,500. There may be a \$2,500 amount added, which would pay for overtime for a staff member to examine changing the number of required hours for other credits. This legislation would open the door for the community service hour requirement to be changed by districts, and therefore, other elective credit hour requirement may be revisited. Those factors being considered, the approximate fiscal impact would be in close proximity to \$5,000. That all being said, it was recognized by the NDE, they may not submit a fiscal note at all because of the smaller individualized nature of the administrative costs compared to other pieces of legislation. This funding is expected to be taken from a general allocation fund the NDE would utilize to pay its employees for matters like these, with those funds being placed in a budget account that would be utilized for the work of this legislation. It is important to note, this is a general regulation change estimation, so it is a common fiscal note attached. This legislation is not expected to utilize any extraordinary funding or any school-specific funding, as it would amend current legislation that certain schools utilize already. It would not require any new paid positions at the school or NDE level, only extra time in excess of what is expected of the Department.

Now, I hope to dive into the importance of this piece of legislation, and the impacts it could have on the entire youth community we represent. This BDR has a simple objective to provide Nevada high school students with an opportunity, an incentive, and encouragement to complete community service. It accomplishes this by making community service relevant for students, making elective credit available for students to complete the service, and by providing schools with information on how they can get their students excited to serve. Community service is exceptionally important for the youth community. It is proven to provide positive effects for individuals of all ages. When we are in school, we are building healthy habits to succeed throughout high school and beyond. Building a service-oriented mindset can benefit a student throughout high school and beyond. Those items are as important as key habits such as time management and leadership skills.

Bill draft request 18 works to solve a prevalent problem. Throughout town halls I participated in or led, and speaking with students, educators, and school leadership, one of the major education related concerns that came up was student apathy. The Student-Centered World organization offers a clear definition of student apathy as it explains it as, "A lack of interest, motivation, and engagement from students through their schoolwork and learning environment." In a report discussing student apathy, *Education Week*, a news organization explained, "Nearly half of teachers and 58 percent of high school teachers say that their students showing little to no interest in learning is a major problem in their classroom." Student apathy is a nationwide problem, and in today's world, there are more distractions than ever. With more distractions growing, it has become easier and easier for students to ignore their futures and their academics. Students are missing the connection that what they do today will benefit them in the future. It would be beneficial to reconnect them with their communities. Building student relevance into the education system can begin by implementing community service and providing students with the means of applying what they are learning in the classroom with what they will be doing after high school, as well as provide them opportunities to connect with organizations and groups they can work with outside of school to continue exploring their passions and endeavors.

Student apathy has a negative effect on so many other issues outside of education, including mental health, and students feel they lack a sense of purpose or direction for their futures. Community service is a remedy to the issue of student apathy as it provides students with an opportunity to take ownership of their success and build a strong work ethic that provides them with a self-directed and self-motivated approach. Having spoken with educational professionals and students from across the State, I have learned about the importance of community service in building excellent, compassionate, and effective student leaders and students that go on to become active citizens. As an example, [it is something] we all share in common. At our first NYL training, we all shared impactful examples of public and community service. We each had our own unique and positive experiences that helped shape us into the leaders we are today. Bill draft request 18 would work to ensure that Nevada high school students have the opportunity to have similar impactful experiences to those we have had.

To conclude, BDR 18 would allow for positive changes in our law to grow community service participation in students. I humbly ask for your consideration of this legislative proposition. That all being said, thank you all for your time and consideration today. I am now ready for any questions you may have.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Is there anyone who would like to ask a question? Youth Legislator Walsh.

Youth Legislator Walsh:

You talked about student apathy. If I am an apathetic student who is short an elective credit—I do not care about school, I do not like it, I am not engaged—how would your BDR incentivize students? You talk about community service, and they want to get leadership, but if I am an apathetic student, I do not understand that; I do not get that. Since it is an elective credit, I would have the opportunity to take an easier class and pass and get my credit. What would you be doing specifically to target apathetic students? What kind of plan do you have for that?

Chair Rios:

I appreciate that question, because this whole BDR came out of that student apathy conversation through different educational forums and speaking to students, parents, and teachers. It is a prevalent issue. Included in the \$2,500 cost they are building these regulations around, part of that would be for NDE to come up with specific solutions on how to basically bump this community service elective credit, because you are right. There are plenty of ways for students to get elective credit, work-based learning, different elective classes, speech and debate classes, and different states do everything differently. The main purpose would be through those types of ideas. I have my own ideas on ways to get students involved, different campaigns schools could run, or different items counselors can do to push these apathetic students to this community service credit. That is also thought of in the BDR as a clause. This all goes into revising the current legislation. That is an addition I had in mind if this BDR were to move forward, which would be working with NDE to come up with those exact solutions with the districts.

Youth Legislator Chen:

How would this fit in their schedule? Would they have an open period and are expected to work on their community service credit in their own time? With that, if they have some sort of open period, can they complete this credit at any grade, or is it if they have a credit missing?

Chair Rios:

Yes, based on what NDE explained to me, it is an open credit much like a work-learning credit. It would be either a pass or fail credit the student would accomplish, and they would keep those hours. Schools may do it differently. Certain counselors may do it differently. Included in those outlines on the handout, schools are going to be provided information on the parameters for what counts for community service, and how a school is to track and certify those community service hours. Those were the main two that answer that part of the question. There are ways we can do it. I have my own ideas on whether it should be a pass or fail credit, but that is part of NDE's work, and their administrative fee is going to be working through that answer and figuring out what we want our schools to do. Do we want to set a hard rule? Districts are also going to play a large role in this. It is in the draft for the revision to the legislation that districts will also have a say in deciding how their students are tracking these hours.

Youth Legislator Allen:

Do you have any numbers or data to support there is a general interest in this way to receive credit through volunteer hours?

Chair Rios:

Yes, to provide a bit of history, there is current legislation, NRS 389.165, that allows for some credit. I spoke to different districts about this. It is low right now. Lowering that credit number and allowing districts to lower it will boost that number.

Vice Chair Cohen:

Thanks again to all the Youth Legislators for your BDR proposals and your presentations. Now that we have heard the BDR proposals, I would like to give our Members a three-minute recess to privately review and consider the information that has been presented. I would also like to remind the Members that we adhere to the Open Meeting Law, so we cannot discuss the BDR proposals during the break. Youth Legislators, please take this time to consider the BDR proposals you have heard today. After the recess, I will ask the secretary to call roll to determine the two BDR proposals that will receive hearings at the NYL meeting on November 20, 2024. At this time, we will take a three-minute recess.

The NYL will now come back to order. As I stated before the recess, we will take a roll call to determine the two BDR proposals that will receive hearings at our next meeting.

Ms. McManus, please call the vote.

Ms. McManus:

Youth Legislator Allen—BDR 7
Youth Legislator Alvarez Flores—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Cain—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Chang—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Chen—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Chong—BDR 8
Vice Chair Cohen—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Conyers—BDR 8
Youth Legislator Coughlin—BDR 3
Youth Legislator McCarthy—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Nguyen—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Obstgarten—BDR 8
Youth Legislator Park—BDR 3
Youth Legislator Reganti—BDR 17
Chair Rios—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Wolf—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Walsh—BDR 6

[Youth Legislators Breeden, Perry, Rosas, and Villatoro were absent for the vote.]

Vice Chair Cohen:

The two BDRs to be considered at our next meeting are BDR 3 and BDR 6.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Cohen:

[Vice Chair Cohen called for public comment; however, there was none.]

AGENDA ITEM V—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Nevada Youth Legislature, the meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Seana McManus
Research Policy Assistant

Tina Ashdown
Constituent Services Analyst/Program
Facilitator

APPROVED BY:

Youth Legislator Sebastian Rios, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item III A	Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Handout: Bill Draft Request Proposals for the Nevada Youth Legislature 2024
Agenda Item III B-1	Youth Legislator Chong, Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL)	Handout: Bill Draft Request Proposal 8
Agenda Item II B-2	Youth Legislator Chong, NYL	Pictures Due to copyright issues, the handout is on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or email to: Library@lcb.state.nv.us .
Agenda Item III C	Youth Legislator Cain, NYL	Handout: Bill Draft Request Proposal 12
Agenda Item III D	Youth Legislator Reganti, NYL	Handout: Bill Draft Request Proposal 17
Agenda Item III E	Youth Legislator Rios, NYL	Handout: Bill Draft Request Proposal 18

The 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>.