

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eighty-Second Session  
June 1, 2023**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 9:02 a.m. on Thursday, June 1, 2023, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine  
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant  
Assemblyman Ken Gray  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy  
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch  
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca  
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby  
Assemblyman David Orentlicher  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong  
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Vice Chair (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager  
Aaron Klatt, Committee Secretary  
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Leisa Moseley-Sayles, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center  
Nick Shepack, Nevada State Deputy Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center  
Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Department of Sentencing Policy  
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association  
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office  
Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
Pamela Del Porto, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Zach Bucher, Government Affairs Officer, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas

**Chair Miller:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Good morning, everyone. Welcome to Assembly Judiciary. We only have one bill and one work session on the agenda today. We are going to go ahead and start with the bill hearing. Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint) will be presented by Victoria Gonzalez, the executive director of Sentencing Policy, Leisa Mosley-Sayles, state director of Fines and Fees Justice Center, and Nick Shepack, deputy director of Fines and Fees Justice Center. With that, your hearing is open, please proceed when you are ready.

**Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Nevada Sentencing Commission within the Department of Sentencing Policy. (BDR 14-308)**

**Leisa Moseley-Sayles, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center:**

We want to provide a brief introduction and overview of the misdemeanor system and explain why we brought Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint) forward today. What we refer to as the misdemeanor system in the state is a component of a much larger system that includes misdemeanors. This larger system is made up of courts, judges, service providers, prosecutors, and of course, individual members of our communities. As you can imagine, with so many components of the misdemeanor system, data at times can be inaccessible and incomplete.

One of the greatest and most harmful misconceptions about misdemeanors is that they are minor and have little or no impact on the individuals who are charged with them, their families—particularly the children—and their communities. We often refer to them as low-level or minor. In her book, *Punishment Without Crime*, Alexandra Natapoff writes that every year in the U.S., 13 million individuals are charged with misdemeanor crimes. Traffic crimes such as seat belt violations, driving a vehicle with an expired registration—which we have talked about in this Committee before—broken taillights, and air fresheners or other items dangling from a rear-view mirror; in the case of homeless or unhoused individuals, misuse of a park bench, possession of drug paraphernalia, disorderly conduct, et cetera. All of these are misdemeanors that people are impacted by in this state.

Misdemeanors make up the vast majority—about 80 percent—of our nation's criminal cases. Here in Nevada, they make up about 60 percent of criminal filings. These so-called low-level misdemeanor charges clog jails and courts and create crushing caseloads for public defenders, prosecutors, and judges. The consequences of misdemeanors have long-term effects that can cause harm to individuals for years, long after they have been convicted of a misdemeanor. Through this process, individuals can lose their jobs, their children, their housing, their health, finances, and, ultimately, their freedom. A misdemeanor conviction in many cases can disqualify an individual from receiving social services. It can even prevent individuals from obtaining admission to medical school or law school.

It is time for Nevada to take a long, hard look at the system that we call misdemeanors. It is time for us to evaluate whether such a system is the most effective way to deal with these kinds of crimes in our state. With this in mind, we are asking this body to authorize the Nevada Sentencing Commission (Commission) to conduct a full review of the state's misdemeanor system. Such a review would serve to collect data on how misdemeanors are used in the state. This data would include, but not be limited to, what are the most common misdemeanors individuals are charged with, how they are adjudicated, and which misdemeanors are law enforcement most often enforcing. With that, I am going to turn it over to Deputy State Director Nick Shepack; he has a PowerPoint presentation [[Exhibit C](#)] that I think you will all find most interesting.

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

I am not going to run you through every slide on this presentation [[Exhibit C](#)], but just the first couple that have the numbers, because I feel the visual is very important. For context, we began looking into the misdemeanor system following the last legislative session. I thought it was an undertaking where I could gather an understanding of what is happening in our courts and what is happening in different jurisdictions through public records requests, and communication with courts, court administrators, and judges. What I quickly found was, in many cases, the data was either unavailable or in a very raw format; a format with far more information for one individual to be capable of understanding in any meaningful way. With that being the case, we began looking for a group that could actually study this system, and we landed on the Nevada Sentencing Commission, as they do amazing work with data and allow you all to make data-driven decisions.

Let us put into perspective what we are looking at with the misdemeanor system. When we are talking about the last year that we have complete data for, 2021, total criminal filings in Nevada consist of 72,488 misdemeanors, only 6,087 gross misdemeanors, and 37,709 felonies [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)]. This is a giant system, and it is the part of the system that we understand the least in this state. Here it is represented in a chart [page 3]. Over 62 percent of people who come into contact with the criminal justice system do so through misdemeanors.

It was not until a couple of months before this session started that there was a compiled list of all misdemeanors in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). It took the Legislative Counsel Bureau well over a year to find every NRS that was a misdemeanor and put them into a list. It is about 88 pages worth of misdemeanors. What we know is that some are obsolete at this point; for example, there is a misdemeanor to own a machine that scans the bones in your feet if you sell shoes. There are many things on the books such as that which could simply be removed to clean up the system and ensure everybody can understand it. We also found that there are essentially duplicate laws on the books, both at the local level and at the state level. Further, in different jurisdictions, you may be charged under a different NRS simply because the laws look similar. A review of the NRS would allow us to find all those instances.

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) does a great job of compiling criminal justice data every year, and what ends up happening is misdemeanors fall into 11 categories: crimes against persons, domestic violence, older and vulnerable person abuse, protection order violations, crimes against property, drugs, weapons, public order, motor vehicle driving under the influence, motor vehicle reckless driving, and finally a category labeled as "other" [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)]. When we look at trends in this data, we might see that "other" crime is going up, but what does that tell us as a state? How do we address a rise in "other" crime? If we see that public order crimes are decreasing in an area, how do we try to figure out what that jurisdiction is doing correctly? The data is so incomplete that we are not able to draw any logical conclusions to make any data-driven recommendations to this body or any other body.

Finally, I would like to show you an example of why we need a body like the Commission to be the one that looks into this. I sent public records requests out to all the courts to try to understand their misdemeanor systems, and to the credit of Henderson Municipal Court, they quickly got back to me with a lot of data. However, that data was 79,000 rows by 21 columns of individual data [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)]. It did have all the data necessary to analyze everything from arrest, to adjudication, to what actually happened after the crime; for example, did the person end up paying? Was there a plea deal? Did they end up with a failure to appear warrant? However, without a data analyst looking at this type of data, there is no real way that an organization such as ours or any other could take 79,000 rows from court after court and use it.

Therefore, what we have landed on here—and I will pass it over in a moment to Executive Director Gonzalez—is a way for Nevada to begin to systematically look at the largest part of its criminal justice system to bring you the data necessary to make data-driven decisions on the crimes and punishments that impact the most Nevadans. With that, I will pass it over to Ms. Gonzalez to run you through the bill.

**Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Department of Sentencing Policy:**

I will start by walking you through the bill, beginning with section 3. When we were approached about what it would take to have our department, the Department of Sentencing Policy, and then the Commission study and analyze misdemeanors, one of the things that immediately limited us was our statutory duties for the Commission. The Commission is specifically required to study gross misdemeanors and felonies in the state, and thus, what you see in section 3 is a streamlining of the duties. First, this ensures we do not have to keep coming back to the Legislature to make sure we have the statutory authority to study the criminal justice system—that should just be what we are doing already, which we are—and this keeps us consistent with that.

These duties came from different iterations of commissions and committees over time, and it made sense for us to really think about the future and what we are looking for from our department and the Commission. The duties that you see deleted does not mean we will not be studying those things. There is legislative intent, and if you go to the beginning of our sections in NRS, you will see that they provide all those same policy priorities. Therefore, we do not need them restated in the duties because it makes sense for us to take on anything related to the criminal justice system; even though it is specific to sentencing and corrections, this touches everything. That is what you see here with the change in the duties, and that reference in the bill, in section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a), to NRS 176.0131 is where that public policy is for those priorities. Therefore, this makes it easier for us to just continue to take on information, analyze studies, and collect data that is important for you and for the rest of the stakeholders in the public to make data-driven recommendations.

With that in mind, we will now go back to the beginning of the bill to discuss sections 1, 1.3, 1.5, and 1.7. Over time, what we decided in talking to stakeholders and thinking about sustainability, we decided that studying misdemeanors is not a one-off effort. As we have taken on studying felonies as an ongoing effort, it makes sense to study misdemeanors in the same realm. Therefore, over time, what we have come up with is creating a subcommittee of the Sentencing Commission. I want to make it very clear on the record, it is not my intent to come back and create multiple subcommittees within the Commission. I do not think that advances the work, but I think because misdemeanors are so large and cover so many jurisdictions, and if we truly want to have sustainable data and reliable analysis, we need to have something like a subcommittee and not just a study. That way everyone will know that the Commission and our department is studying all aspects of the criminal justice system.

This creates a subcommittee that specifically studies misdemeanors and provides who should, at a minimum, be on the subcommittee. The members you see listed here are stakeholders that have to be appointed, but it is not the limit. The expectation is that anyone that the chair, stakeholders, and the members of the Commission think are appropriate to be on the subcommittee can be appointed. However, we at least need these stakeholders to make sure we have a balanced discussion and all aspects of studying misdemeanors represented. As you can see here, the chair of the Commission will be responsible for appointing those members of the subcommittee, and then the subcommittee will then have its chair. The subcommittee will also be able to appoint working groups which will provide opportunities for the stakeholders to provide their perspectives. One of the issues that came to our attention as we started vetting this bill was how all the stakeholders from all the jurisdictions wanted their voices and their perspectives represented. This is how we will make sure to do that.

As we have made it clear before this body, the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy is nonpartisan, and by making sure we have all these voices here, when we come back before the Legislature or any other public body to present our findings, you can rest assured that what has been done and what is being presented represents all aspects of the criminal justice system. It would not be advancing a specific policy but presenting all the information so that you can make the decisions from a data-driven perspective on which policies you would like to advance. Additionally, the subcommittee will be required to submit a biennial report to the Commission. The Commission has a comprehensive report that it submits every other year to the Legislature, the Supreme Court, and to the Governor. Thus, this additional report will be included with that comprehensive report.

Finally, I want to mention a couple of changes that we have proposed for the Sentencing Commission itself, which is in section 2 of the bill. As we expand our studying of everything with the criminal justice system, we want to make sure we have additional voices represented on the Commission. Again, I do not want to come back here and add anyone else to the Commission. We already have 24 people; we do not need many more. However, this makes sure we have the rural perspective represented from both the district attorneys and the public defenders, which is going to be important for understanding all aspects of the criminal justice system.

Additionally, we are adding someone from the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History; as you know, criminal history is sent there, and that is vital to analyzing the criminal justice system. Therefore, having a representative from the central repository appointed to the Commission would not only provide us insight and expertise when it comes to data collection and analysis, but specific to that aspect of data collection and analysis, is how that should factor into how we are analyzing crimes and anything related to the criminal justice system in our state. Then regarding the member that is appointed from either University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) or University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), that is something we already have in practice. This just codifies it to make sure we always have that academic perspective on the Commission. In practice, that person has been appointed by the

Governor, but it is not required by statute. Therefore, by having that, we can ensure we have the different voices to have all these perspectives when analyzing the criminal justice system. That concludes my summary of the bill.

**Leisa Moseley-Sayles:**

Madam Chair, we are ready for questions.

**Assemblyman Gray:**

This was kind of new to me when I came to Nevada 20-something years ago now—maybe it is historical, maybe it was eliminated, I do not know—but do we have a subset less than misdemeanors, such as infractions? Many states have infractions which can still proceed up the chain, but I am wondering why we do not have a system that is less than, which would help clear the courts out and allow for other systems. Then, if you do not do what you are supposed to do, it can be elevated.

**Nick Shepack:**

That is a great question, and I think that the state is moving in that direction with the decriminalization of traffic tickets. It has set up a civil system where you can now have a noncriminal infraction. This body has yet to choose to move any crimes outside of traffic into that system. That is a possibility in the future, and it is possible that the misdemeanor review leads to people making those sorts of recommendations. What we saw in Colorado, which has done a comprehensive review, is they in fact moved certain misdemeanors down into something that is a type of civil infraction. They also moved some things up, but that would have to be a choice of this body to create that type of system. We believe it has been built and could be used through the one that exists in traffic.

**Assemblyman Orentlicher:**

On the additions to the Commission regarding the faculty member, you mentioned it has been in practice and has been somebody who has the right expertise. However, this does not bind the Governor, and I noticed in section 1.5, subsection 1, paragraph (c), talking about an attorney for the subcommittee, it says an attorney "experienced" to make sure they have the right expertise. Therefore, did you think about saying something about what kind of expertise you wanted from this faculty member to ensure it is not a misguided appointment?

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

That is a great question. I had not considered that until just now when you brought that up because you are right. In practice what has happened is, the person who held the seat previously would recruit another professor of criminal justice to then serve on the Commission. Then from there, we may collaborate with the Office of the Governor about what would make the most sense for the appointment. Therefore, we could absolutely incorporate that to make it clear we are looking for an academic who is in the field of criminal justice, since we are looking to codify that specific perspective for the Commission. That would absolutely make sense.

**Assemblywoman Hardy:**

I have one quick question about the biennial report. Is there a certain date that report is required to be submitted? I ask because I am assuming the goal here would be to have enough time to have all the meetings and then come to the Legislature with the recommendations and reforms by 2025. To that point, I am just wondering when those reports are due.

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

This specific biennial report does not have a date on it. As I said, the intent would be that it is submitted with the comprehensive report that the Commission submits, which is January 1 of each odd-numbered year, and that is in preparation. What we have been doing in practice is to make regular reports and presentations to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary and communicate with legislators throughout the interim. If it is the appetite of the Committee, we could ensure that this report is submitted with that comprehensive report. We could either say that it is to be submitted in time for it to be included in that comprehensive report or we could make it its own report and have a different deadline, if you want to make sure you have the time frame.

I am thinking it could also align with when the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary concludes so that any presentations that were made related to this, this could be a separate report that is submitted with that. That way everyone has time to vet the ideas from what was explored and studied during the interim. Then the Sentencing Commission and our department could summarize all that and have a comprehensive report. I see some nods. Therefore, I think something in between—maybe at the conclusion of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary efforts but before session, to get the comprehensive report submitted so the legislators have all this information.

**Chair Miller:**

I may add, maybe not at the end of interim; there may be proposals for committee bills that we would like to move forward, therefore, it should be perhaps at least a month before the end of the interim.

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

Chair, perhaps we could look at the bill draft request deadlines and align something with that. That way it helps you prepare for those deadlines for submitting those recommendations. It could be presented at the work session, perhaps a preliminary draft, but we could talk more about what would make more sense.

**Chair Miller:**

The deadline is much further out past the end of the interim, but interims also will be starting earlier this year, as early as September 1. Therefore, we will have time to figure that out. However, I know that the two people sitting next to you are also going to hold you to these dates.



**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Regarding the new members of the Commission, I wanted to talk about the higher education member. As it reads, it is UNR or UNLV, which I know are our research institutes, but what about, for instance, Nevada State College, which offers a bachelor of arts in criminal justice? I just feel this may be limiting for someone who might not be at UNLV or UNR, but who would be very beneficial to have.

**Leisa Moseley-Sayles:**

That is a great idea. I hope that we can explore that. As someone who has attended Nevada State College, it would be an honor to have someone possibly from Nevada State College on the Commission.

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

I want to clarify, they would still be a faculty member, correct?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Actually, when I was looking at this, I was thinking, Maybe there is a PhD candidate who is doing studies that would be beneficial from UNLV, UNR, or Nevada State College, and I assumed that you specifically chose a faculty member on purpose, but either way.

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

Absolutely, we could broaden it so it is a person from a higher education institution. I am not quite sure what the terminology would be, but we could change it so that it accommodates that possibility and broadens, like you said, the pool of who could be appointed to the Commission.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I would suggest even the Desert Research Institute (DRI). We think of DRI as being science-based, and you could possibly have a researcher there who is doing research in data collection and maybe that would help you at a certain time. To cover everyone, I would suggest putting it in there as Nevada System of Higher Education.

**Chair Miller:**

With that, we will go ahead and open it up for testimony. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint)?

**John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

We are in support of S.B. 103 (R1).

**John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:**

We are in strong support. My friend, Ben Graham, had his bench ceremony this year; he tells a story about when we were originally crafting our criminal code, Assemblyman

Bernie Anderson sent him into the Woodshed and said, Figure it out. They did the best they could at that time, but now that we have Executive Director Gonzalez and we are using data, I think we are moving in a much more positive direction. This is another step in having a data-driven system where we make good decisions based on data.

**Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:**

We support Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint). I have been in the NRS and messing with the misdemeanors for 17 years now and those books are getting bigger and bigger. If we can spend some time to do some data analysis and potentially make process improvements, I think that is always a good thing.

**Pamela Del Porto, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:**

I have worked with Ms. Gonzalez for a bit, and we fully support S.B. 103 (R1). It is a great effort.

**Zach Bucher, Government Affairs Officer, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas:**

We are here today in support of the bill and would like to thank Ms. Gonzalez, Ms. Moseley-Sayles, and Mr. Shepack for their work. We appreciate having a seat at the table, and it is a good bill.

**Chair Miller:**

Is there anyone wishing to provide opposition testimony to S.B. 103 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony for S.B. 103 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will welcome the bill sponsors up for any final remarks. There are no final remarks, so I will go ahead and close the hearing on Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint).

With that, we are going to move into our work session. We have two bills to work session today. We will start with Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Thornton, please walk us through the work session items for S.B. 389 (R2).

**[Senate Bill 389 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to crimes. (BDR 15-133)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint) applies the same penalties for facilitating sex trafficking against a child to a person who commits the crime against a peace officer posing as a child [[Exhibit D](#)]. There are three proposed amendments to the measure. First, Senator Scheible proposed removing the word "contingency" from the name of the "Contingency Account for Human Trafficking." Second, the Silver State Coalition to End Violence in the Sex Trade proposed deleting sections 1 through 3, 3.5, and 7 of the bill. Lastly, the Assembly Committee on Judiciary proposed amending section 4 by striking the word "identification" and inserting "determination"; and amending section 4 to include the

collection of additional data including: the age, gender, and race of the perpetrator and the victim of the trafficking, the zip code of arrest, and the zip code of residence for both the perpetrator and the victim of trafficking.

**Chair Miller:**

Members, are there any questions? Not seeing any questions, I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG MOVED TO AMEND  
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 389 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN GRAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement that we will never hear to Assemblywoman Considine. The next bill that we will work session is Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint) that we just heard. Ms. Thornton, please walk us through S.B. 103 (R1).

**Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Nevada Sentencing Commission within the Department of Sentencing Policy. (BDR 14-308)**

**Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint) is sponsored by the Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary. This bill revises provisions governing the Nevada Sentencing Commission within the Department of Sentencing Policy.

**Chair Miller:**

Ms. Gonzalez, we just want to confirm that you are going to accept, as a friendly amendment, the suggestion to add a student from a Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) institution or broaden it so it includes them for the research component.

**Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Department of Sentencing Policy:**

Just so I understand, would it still be a faculty member from any NSHE institution?

**Chair Miller:**

Yes.

**Victoria Gonzalez:**

Yes, that works for us.

**Chair Miller:**

Okay, thank you. Please continue, Ms. Thornton.

**Diane C. Thornton:**

There would be one amendment to the bill and that would be to broaden the scope of it, so the academic member would be from a faculty member from any NSHE institution.

**Chair Miller:**

Members, any questions? Not seeing any questions, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 103 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG MOVED TO AMEND  
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 103 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN YUREK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, are there any comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement that we are never going to hear to Assemblyman Orentlicher. The last thing we have on our agenda today is public comment.

[There was no public comment.]

We are expecting some bills to be referred to us; therefore, we are scheduled for 9 a.m. tomorrow. If anything changes, you all will be the first to know. Nonetheless, we are scheduled, and we are anticipating bills to be referred to us. With that, I will see you all tomorrow. This meeting is adjourned [at 9:38 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Aaron Klatt  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Fines and Fees Justice Center," submitted and presented by Nick Shepack, Nevada State Deputy Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center.

[Exhibit D](#) is a Work Session document for Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint), submitted and presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.