

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eighty-second Session
May 1, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 1:01 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 2023, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Senator Dallas Harris, Vice Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator Jeff Stone

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Counsel
Kelsey DeLozier, Counsel
Pat Devereux, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Stavros Anthony, Lieutenant Governor
Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Tray Abney, National Federation of Independent Business, Nevada Chapter
Dylan Keith, Vegas Chamber
Winnie Dowling, State Director, Nevada Small Business Development Center
Vinson Guthreau, Nevada Association of Counties
Jeff Rogan, Clark County
Mike Cathcart, City of Henderson

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 2

Tom Clark, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Terry Graves, Nevada Trucking Association; Nevada Manufacturers Association
Isaac Hardy, Urban Consortium
Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy
Erica Roth, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
John J. Piro, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Adam Cate, Nevada District Attorneys Association
Jason Walker, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Beth Schmidt, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Greg Herrera, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 14.

ASSEMBLY BILL 14 (1st Reprint): Creates the Business Licensing Working Group. (BDR S-405)

STAVROS ANTHONY (Lieutenant Governor):

I support A.B. 14. My predecessor, Lieutenant Governor Lisa Cano Burkhead, requested a bill to help ease the regulatory burden on small businesses. My Office oversees the Office of Small Business Advocacy. Its representatives have talked with many small business owners who expressed the need to make their licensing process less confusing and burdensome.

Assembly Bill 14 will create a Business Licensing Working Group during the 2023-2024 Interim. The Group will study and make recommendations to facilitate an easier startup process for businesses, especially small businesses.

I will work with Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar on this legislation. We share a desire to help small businesses succeed in Nevada. As outlined in section 6 of the bill, the Secretary of State will chair the group and I will be vice chair. As per section 5, the Group will include many stakeholders involved in business licensing from local governments, chambers of commerce and other business interests.

Our goal is to streamline the licensing process for business owners by creating a one-stop shop at the Office of the Secretary of State. A prosperous business community is critical to the success of our State.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 3

GABRIEL DI CHIARA (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):

I am here on behalf of Secretary of State Aguilar. The Secretary has started businesses and helped others start businesses for much of his career. He has a firm understanding of the difficulties involved.

Since taking office, Secretary Aguilar has made it a priority to do whatever he can to simplify processes for Nevada's small- and microbusiness owners. SilverFlume Nevada's Business Portal was originally conceived as a one-stop shop, the kind of portal the legislation aimed at creating. However, in the decade-plus since SilverFlume came online, many technical and logistical barriers that prevented its mission from coming to fruition.

Secretary Aguilar and Lieutenant Governor Anthony believe these business barriers need to be crossed sooner rather than later. We can begin laying the framework for what the one-stop shop will look like by gathering all necessary requirements for its implementation. We are confident these conversations will bring us closer to our goal of making Nevada the most convenient and accessible State in the Nation to start a business.

SENATOR HANSEN:

Did we not have something similar not that long ago? Was that when the whole idea of the SilverFlume came into being, or is this a brand-new concept?

MR. DI CHIARA:

Yes, the original intention of SilverFlume was to create a single, Statewide one-stop shop for all business licensing. As I am sure representatives from the cities and counties can tell you, it is a bit more complicated than just the Office of the Secretary of State collecting the money and then sending the business owner a check. There are a lot of steps along the way to start any number of businesses in Nevada.

SENATOR HANSEN:

Will the Office of the State Comptroller be part of the Working Group? You get your business license from one State agency, you get a voucher from a different agency, your payment from a third one down through the State Comptroller. Not one individual will reach out to you. Is there some way to streamline that process?

MR. DI CHIARA:

No, the Group does not include the Office of the State Comptroller. When we talk about streamlining the process, there is the licensing side of it and then, for people to do business with the State, the fee collection side. It is convoluted; you end up going through several different branches of government to get all these things arranged to start a small business. I had people reach out to me to try to get that process streamlined.

SENATOR HANSEN:

Is that what the Working Group would be working toward?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR ANTHONY:

Section 5 of A.B. 14 outlines exactly who is going to be on the committee; the Comptroller is not included. As vice chair of the Group, in addition to the official Working Group, we will bring in people as kind of expert witnesses. We will have the Comptroller come in and get some of his ideas. This is going to be a serious group.

SENATOR HANSEN:

A good piece of advice is keep the Group as small as possible to get something accomplished. If you have 25 people, you will be spinning your wheels and never get anything accomplished. That is a little observation from dealing with bureaucracies—including the Legislature.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Our House and Committee are sometimes reluctant to approve additional working groups, task forces, commissions, committees, et cetera, because they often become unwieldy and turn into a kind of consolation prize for people who cannot get their bills passed.

Let us say I want to open up a business selling Melanie Scheible Widgets. When I go to register, incorporate and license it, there is a maze of local, county and State agencies from which I need to get permits and licenses. The problem we are trying to solve is to cut back the red tape and make it easier for individuals to open small businesses in Nevada. Am I right?

MR. DI CHIARA:

Yes, that is correct. Links on the website for the Nevada Department of Business and Industry tell people where to go. However, that process can be

difficult for someone to navigate, even to figure out exactly which licenses you need. Finding everything you need can be tough even if you already have a State business license and are just trying to figure out what your county, city or municipality requires.

The goal is to establish a single portal at the Office of the Secretary of State's website to accomplish all that licensure. You could also pay all your fees, which the Office would distribute to each of the jurisdictions so you do not have to visit multiple offices or click on multiple websites.

I understand your position, the position of this Committee and that of others. This is a difficult process to legislate because the portal would come into contact with not just whatever statutes govern it but also whatever rules and regulations each city and county has. Figuring out how to navigate all of that without a legislatively mandated group would probably be difficult. We want to make sure we have the right people at the table having the conversation about how we can get there.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

As I read the bill, there is nothing required that cannot already be done without statute. Nothing prevents the Secretary of State from sitting down with members of the Nevada League of Cities, someone from a city with a population of less than 100,000 or someone from a city with a population between 200,000 and 500,000. Nothing stops the State from convening a working group to get all these people into one room to talk about solving the problem we are trying to address.

You have already identified the ultimate goal of the solution: create a single portal. I understand getting from point A to point B requires some sort of portal to input information. I would like to see a bill with more goalposts in mind. That could include what the Secretary of State needs from each county to build the portal. Is the problem the Secretary of State does not have a list from every county of the type of licenses they offer? Is the problem the Secretary of State does not know how much each of those licenses cost?

I would rather see a working group to think and talk about the problem a bit more. There should be a bill with the goal that municipalities and counties provide the necessary information to the Secretary of State. Then in 2025, 2027 or whatever the goal, we know what it is we were trying to do. We are

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 6

trying to create a portal unauthorized by law because we do not have the mechanism in place for people to pay the State and the State to disburse those fees back to the municipalities and counties. Does the Office of the Secretary of State have that power, or does it lack the legal authority to do so?

MR. DI CHIARA:

I do not know the answer, but I will find out for you.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I do not want this to be misconstrued to suggest I do not want to help small businesses and get this portal off the ground. I just want to make sure we are not spinning our wheels in the Interim.

TRAY ABNEY (National Federation of Independent Business, Nevada Chapter):

The average employee count of members of the National Federation of Independent Business, Nevada Chapter, is about four to eight. Certainly, as the smallest of the small, we support the effort in A.B. 14.

With my own small business, I had to go to the Secretary of State, city and finally the county for a fictitious business name statement—and then to the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and the Department of Taxation. It can be a laborious process for somebody who does not know how to navigate all those different departments. We support anything that helps bring everybody and all those pieces together in one room to figure out a solution. To your point, Chair, if this bill does not pass or if there is a better way to do this, we would support that as well.

DYLAN KEITH (Vegas Chamber):

While the Office of the Secretary of State is developing the updated SilverFlume, it is important we take into account business voices and other interests to make sure the process is truly the one-stop shop we are trying to develop.

WINNIE DOWLING (State Director, Nevada Small Business Development Center):

The Nevada Small Business Development Center supports A.B. 14. We have 12 offices around the State and have been here since 1985.

All businesses must interact with the SilverFlume portal. About 43 percent of our clients are startups and have lots of questions. They are confused about

which licenses they must pay for and which taxes they do not or in what order. Sometimes, they need help in Spanish. We provide that assistance. Once you are in business, you have new questions because you must maintain your license. You maybe have license amendments, change your resident agent or something like that.

The Nevada Small Business Development Center is thrilled to be part of the Working Group. We will bring to the table lots of input to answer questions, issues or concerns. Mostly we just want to make the process a lot easier for businesses so it is a positive experience.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Nevada Association of Counties):

The Nevada Association of Counties supports A.B. 14, especially section 5. I want to thank the sponsors for engaging with counties and including them in the Working Group.

JEFF ROGAN (Clark County):

Clark County worked hard with the Offices of the Lieutenant Governor and the Secretary of State to conceptualize what it means to integrate businesses in the State, counties and cities. It is a difficult conversation because counties and cities do things differently from one another.

The best way forward is to take time over the Interim to figure out what that looks like. We could not do it during the Legislative Session, so that is why we need this. We anticipate this will be a productive Working Group, taking input from large and small cities and small counties to ensure the process works for all businesses within our community.

MIKE CATHCART (City of Henderson):

My colleague from Clark County said it best. The bill will be a good way for all cities and counties to come to the table to talk about their experiences with licensing.

Above and beyond that, having the Secretary of State and the Lieutenant Governor at the table with us will be beneficial. It goes to Senator Hansen's question about horizontal integration across State agencies. We see that at the local level quite often when businesspeople come in person or call us. A lot of the questions are about things they need to do at the State level to get their local licensing process started. Having that horizontal

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 8

integration as well as vertical integration down to the cities and counties will make things much easier for the business community.

TOM CLARK (Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

The Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce strongly supports [A.B. 14](#). Chair, you make a good point: why do we need to do this statutorily?

There is a lot of turf to be covered. There are a lot of personalities and reasons why efforts like this have failed. Sometimes, you need a statute to say, "Look, all of you are going into a room. Let's figure this out." It is for the benefit of small, medium and large businesses to have one place where we can do this efficiently and everybody gets what it is they deserve to know about fees, turf or whatever.

TERRY GRAVES (Nevada Trucking Association; Nevada Manufacturers Association):

I represent 500-plus members, many of whom are small businesses or owner-operators. We applaud the intent of [A.B. 14](#). Ultimately, it could result in a more efficient time-saving operation for customers of government services.

ISAAC HARDY (Urban Consortium):

The Urban Consortium is made up of the Cities of Reno, Sparks, Henderson, Las Vegas and North Las Vegas. We want to echo other support comments for [A.B. 14](#).

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 14](#) and open the hearing on [A.B. 32](#).

[ASSEMBLY BILL 32 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes relating to criminal justice. (BDR 14-263)

VICTORIA GONZALEZ (Executive Director, Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy):

[Assembly Bill 32](#) is another data-driven bill affecting our criminal justice system. I have a lot of data in my presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). I will identify the purpose and the goals of [A.B. 32](#) to provide background information for sections 4, 5, 7 and 8, the data-driven portions.

The goal of the bill is the Nevada Sentencing Commission and Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy (NDSP) want to help lawmakers and stakeholders make advanced data-driven recommendations for our criminal justice system. Assembly Bill 32 will improve implementation of A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session. Other sections are intended to improve sustainability of NDSP and the Sentencing Commission. Page 3 of [Exhibit C](#) shows the breakdown of the difference between parole and probation supervision. Many sections of the bill are duplicative because probation is covered in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 176A and parole is addressed in NRS 213.

Page 4 of [Exhibit C](#) outlines the consequences of being on supervision. Parole and probation are both supervision, depending on where you are in the criminal justice system. When you are on supervision, you can violate it in three ways: through technical violations, committing a new offense while on supervision or absconding. The consequences for violating supervision are a temporary revocation for a technical violation and a matrix of graduated sanctions. If a new offense is committed, you can serve a penalty for the new charges or be revoked from supervision. If you abscond, the penalty is revocation.

Assembly Bill No. 236 of the 80th Session had specific provisions to implement “swift, certain and proportional sanctions,” page 5 of [Exhibit C](#). What NRS 176A.510 and NRS 213.15101 did were establish a statutory definition of technical violation. That definition is a negative since it exempts what is not a technical violation.

The response to technical violations created by A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session was a matrix of graduated sanctions, page 6 of [Exhibit C](#). The chart shows sections that apply to both probationers and parolees. The sanction for the first finding of technical violations is a temporary revocation of 30 days, 90 days for a second, 180 days for a third and a full revocation for a fourth or subsequent technical violation of supervision.

If someone is put on supervision, whether it is parole or probation, the Division of Parole and Probation (P&P) of the Department of Corrections (DOC) uses graduated sanctions to respond to technical violations. If there are enough technical violations, P&P will seek a first temporary revocation. The parolee or probationer could face up to 30 days revocation. That escalates each time the offender has technical violations on supervision. This process may be repeated until the person reaches the fourth violation, page 6, [Exhibit C](#).

The process gets complicated for parolees, page 7, [Exhibit C](#). This chart shows the process parolees face for technical violations of supervision. The parolee is arrested by P&P and placed in jail. The P&P holds a probable-cause inquiry within 15 days of the arrest and then submits a report of retake warrant to the State Board of Parole Commissioners based on the outcome of the inquiry.

If the Board decides the retake warrant is appropriate, another hearing must be held to determine whether technical violations have occurred. The retake warrant is then sent back to P&P. The parolee is transferred from jail to DOC while waiting for a hearing to determine whether he or she violated supervision.

The Board is required to hold the revocation hearing within 60 days of admission to DOC. The Board then orders time to be served based on the technical violation. Once the parolee has served that time, he or she must be released just as another offender would be from DOC.

Several months after A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session went into effect, several criminal justice agencies brought to my attention concerns about the implementation of the process specifically for parolees. I realized we need to collect data to understand what is actually happening. I understood how long a parolee has to sit in jail, be processed by DOC and then wait for a hearing.

Our initial data collection was for temporary revocations from July 2020—when A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session went into effect—to February 2022, page 8, [Exhibit C](#). This first dataset was limited in the elements collected, which we presented to the Sentencing Commission. The parolees were in jail up to 30 days waiting for the probable-cause inquiry and transfer to DOC. There were an average of 45 days between the readmission and actual hearing. The majority of parolees who served 30 days for a temporary revocation served more than 30 days in DOC. That does not include time waiting in jail.

We have expanded the scope of data collected and analyzed it, pages 9 to 14, [Exhibit C](#). The data is from July 1, 2020, through January 31, 2023. You can see how many temporary revocations have been imposed, page 9. The number of 30-day replications increased dramatically from 2020 to 2022, page 10. The data are broken down based on the offense group and number of days people were serving on page 11, [Exhibit C](#).

Data showed parolees are spending more than 30 days incarcerated for their first temporary revocations. If the average is 45 days waiting in jail and serving the 30 days for the temporary revocation in DOC, that is a lot of time, almost pushing the next level of 90 days.

Page 15 of [Exhibit C](#) outlines the goals of [A.B. 32](#). If the intent of A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session was to advance policies that impose “swift, certain and proportional sanctions,” data findings show that is not happening. For DOC to effectively process parolees is burdensome because its facilities are not designed to process short stays. Its inability to process parolees quickly in and out results in a delay in them being able to get back out on supervision. The bill’s intent is for these temporary allocations to provide people additional opportunities to be successful on supervision. The length of time they could spend waiting for hearings could result in the loss of their job, housing or other support that promotes success while on supervision.

The solutions on page 16 of [Exhibit C](#) are based on data from other states. We want to create an intermediate sanction for both probationers and parolees before the temporary revocation; graduated sanctions would still be applied. The intermediate sanction would be an additional opportunity for somebody to check in on a sanction for what is happening on supervision.

[Assembly Bill 32](#) authorizes P&P to impose jail sanctions of 1 to 10 days in the aggregate to not exceed 30 days or electronic monitoring in response to a technical violation, page 16 of [Exhibit C](#). The next step would be to remove the 30-day temporary revocation only for parolees because data indicate they are not even serving that period. It is impossible for them to serve that time under the “swift, certain and proportional sanctions” law.

As per the chart on page 17 of [Exhibit C](#), we decided to leave the 30-day revocation for probationers as it provides another level and opportunity to be successful on supervision. The Sentencing Commission approved our recommendation for the accelerated temporary revocation.

I created three fact sheets ([Exhibit D](#), [Exhibit E](#) and [Exhibit F](#)) to help navigate [A.B. 32](#). Section 1.7 revises the requirements of the NDSP executive director. The goal is to ensure the Sentencing Commission can establish qualifications appropriate to run NDSP. Section 2 revises the membership and certain

appointing authorities of the Sentencing Commission. It empowers those authorities to appoint the appropriate person to the Commission.

Sections 3 and 6 revise the type of risk assessment used for sex offenders. It clarifies that different risk assessments are needed for sex offenders. We want to make sure statute is consistent with an evidence-based risk assessment.

Sections 4 and 7 authorize P&P to use the aforementioned intermediate sanctions for probationers and parolees, respectively. Electronic monitoring is part of graduated sanctions. Sections 4 and 7 also revise the definition of technical violation to exempt certain conditions for sex offenders. All conditions for sex offenders were considered technical violations because of the old definition. We worked with P&P to ensure those conditions are consistent with technical policy violations. [Exhibit E](#) lists which conditions are technical.

Section 8 removes the 30-day temporary revocation for parolees only. We want to make sure credit is applied for probationers and parolees waiting for hearings so they can serve their time and get back out on supervision. Inmates need to work toward success and satisfy any "swift, certain and proportional sanctions."

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I want to clarify what you described as an intermediate sanction between the graduated and temporary revocations. I understand better how it would apply to parolees because currently P&P does not have the statutory power to sentence somebody to any length of time in jail or detention. It only has the ability to send parolees to prison on their underlying sentence. Is that correct?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

If a parolee is alleged to have violated supervision, he or she must be sent to DOC to await a hearing from the Board, as per statute.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

[Assembly Bill 32](#) is almost creating a way for that person to instead stay in the local detention center and serve a shorter period and be then released immediately. Is that correct?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

Yes.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

This makes sense to me for parolees; I am a little bit confused how it applies in the probation setting. Somebody on probation will be waiting in jail for his or her hearing in front of a district court judge. Is the idea the probation officer can make that choice? If somebody has a technical violation, the officer can say, "We are going to send you to jail for ten days then when you come back out, you'll still be on probation. Or we are going to seek a temporary 30-day revocation, which means you go to jail for an unspecified number of days until you can get that hearing." Is that correct?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

The intermediate sanction would kick in first. The P&P has a matrix of graduated sanctions, as per the bill's draft version. Statute provides graduated sanctions must be exhausted before seeking a temporary revocation of 30 days. Jail time of one to ten days and electronic monitoring would now be part of graduated sanctions.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Currently, which graduated sanctions must be exhausted?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

They are based on risk level. I could provide a table to the Committee to help you understand.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

What kinds of graduated sanctions are currently in place—loss of privileges, monetary fines, drug testing?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

Graduated sanctions are based on risk level and violation severity. Let us say you have somebody with a low-risk level and violation severity. The responses in the graduated sanctions matrix would be a verbal or written warning, curfew imposed, loss of certain privileges and an incident report.

Now, let us jump to someone who is high-risk with a severe violation. He or she would have increased treatment and get a verbal or written warning. Under A.B. 32, the probationer might now face electronic monitoring or a flash incarceration of up to two days.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

My concern is we crafted the language of A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session carefully to ensure the two-day flash incarceration, but for anything longer than that, you would be entitled to a hearing. Now it sounds like we want to give P&P the authority to incarcerate somebody for ten days without a hearing.

Ms. GONZALEZ:

The proposed language about the two days was not in A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session. If someone violates supervision, he or she is arrested and goes right to the hearing and then would face 30 days.

Assembly Bill 32 proposes one to ten days as a sanction. When probationers sign their agreement, they will be subject to flash incarcerations of one to ten days based on the matrix. It is an opportunity to quickly serve less time, rather than having to sit in a hearing and face more time for violations.

SENATOR HANSEN:

Is DOC onboard with this program?

Ms. GONZALEZ:

The DOC first came to me with this issue. We reached out to P&P, the Board and all the stakeholders, meeting every month or so during the Interim to develop and explore ideas.

ERICA ROTH (Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

To answer your question about flash incarcerations, Chair, on the probation level, clients often spend at least 15 days waiting for a hearing. A lot can happen during that time; they can lose their job or housing. Sometimes, the hearing must be extended for court reasons, and there can be litigation around that.

Assembly Bill 32 may cut down on the wait time if there is a mechanism to serve just a weekend to correct the problem instead of having people wait in custody for that entire time.

JOHN J. PIRO (Clark County Public Defender's Office):

The Clark County Public Defender's Office supports A.B. 32. It could definitely put the State on a better track than it has been on for a long time.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 15

ADAM CATE (Nevada District Attorneys Association):
The Nevada District Attorneys Association supports A.B. 32.

JASON WALKER (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):
Jails are an integral portion of A.B. 32, so we support the bill.

BETH SCHMIDT (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department supports A.B. 32. Jails are impacted by P&P technical violations. The bill would enhance data-based policy decisions moving forward.

GREG HERRERA (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):
Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association supports A.B. 32.

Ms. GONZALEZ:
The jail discussion is one that we have wanted to keep in mind from the beginning. In developing section 8.7, one of the things we discussed is conducting an ongoing analysis of jails. Our initial analyses indicated there should be no effect based on how much time those with alleged violations are serving in jail. By doing this ongoing study over the Interim, we can report back to the Legislature if it needs to make adjustments to address the impact on jails.

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

Senate Committee on Judiciary
May 1, 2023
Page 16

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 32. Seeing no more business before the Senate Committee on Judiciary, this meeting is adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Pat Devereux,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 32	C	8	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	NDSP Presentation of AB 32
A.B. 32	D	11	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	Revise Response to Technical Violations
A.B. 32	E	11	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	Technical v. Nontechnical Violations for Sex Offenders While on Supervision
A.B. 32	F	11	Victoria Gonzalez / Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy	Revise Temporary Revocations Summary