

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

**Eighty-Second Session
February 8, 2023**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 8:01 a.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 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.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Vice 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:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary
Aaron Klatt, Committee Secretary



Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services
Peter Handy, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services
Chris Arabia, State Public Defender, Department of Indigent Defense Services
Thomas Qualls, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services
Tyler Klimas, Executive Director, Cannabis Compliance Board
Karalin Cronkhite, Division Chief, Inspection and Audit, Cannabis Compliance Board

Chair Miller:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol was explained.] I forgot to introduce our broadcasting staff during yesterday's meeting. They have been integral—especially through the pandemic—in ensuring that Nevadans have access to all of the work that is going on in the Legislature by enabling people to actually call in and testify and make public comment on the phone. I would like to introduce Starr Litton, control room supervisor, and Amerika Young, broadcast technician. As I mentioned yesterday, there are so many people that we do not see but who are still vital to the operation of the Legislature.

We have two presentations today. The first one will be from the Department of Indigent Defense Services.

Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:

With me today are my deputy directors, Thomas Qualls and Peter Handy. We also invited the Nevada State Public Defender, Chris Arabia. To give you a little bit of a road map of our presentation, we will tell you a little bit about our Department, why we came about, what we are doing, introduce you to the State Public Defender, and also introduce you to the *Davis* lawsuit and some concerns that our court-appointed monitor has with the stipulated consent judgment.

I provided the vision, mission, and goals of our Department [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)]. As you can see from our organizational chart [page 3], we have a very lean department. Our Department sits within the Board on Indigent Defense Services. We have two management analysts and the three of us along with two administrative staff. We also oversee the State Public Defender, Chris Arabia.

The Department of Indigent Defense Services came about 60 years ago; the United States Supreme Court in *Gideon v. Wainwright* [372 U.S. 335 (1963)], held that the Sixth Amendment to the *United States Constitution* guarantees the right to competent counsel be provided [page 4]. In the 1970s, Nevada was a leader of indigent defense services by creating the Office of the State Public Defender and providing those services to the rural counties. Washoe and Clark Counties each created their own public defender's offices,

which they were required to do by statute. At the time of the 1970s, the funding structure was a little bit different, where the state funded about 75 percent and the counties picked up the remaining 25 percent. Over time the funding structure shifted a little bit, and ultimately the counties were required to pay 75 percent of the costs and the state paid 25 percent. Counties felt that they could provide services better and for a less expensive price, so they pulled away from the State Public Defender. Many of the counties either formed their own public defender offices, which are county offices, or they contracted with independent contractors to provide these services. Ultimately, the counties felt that this was a less expensive way than opting into the State Public Defender.

Fast forward to 2018, when the American Civil Liberties Union in *Davis v. Nevada* sued the State of Nevada, and they named individuals in those rural counties where they contracted with indigent defense service providers as the plaintiffs. This was allowed to be a class action lawsuit, and they challenged the constitutionality of Nevada's practices regarding indigent defense systems in Nevada's rural counties, which were defined as Churchill, Douglas, Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, and White Pine. These are the counties that had pulled away from the State Public Defender's Office and, rather than forming a county public defender's office, had contracted with independent contractors to provide these defense services.

To remedy this situation, in 2019 the Legislature created our Department of Indigent Defense Services in Assembly Bill 81 of the 80th Session. This is now codified in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 180. The Legislature placed us under the Board on Indigent Defense Services and told this Board to create certain regulations and gave them rulemaking authority. Shortly thereafter, in 2020, a *Davis* "Stipulated Consent Judgment" was signed wherein the State of Nevada agreed to comply with certain requirements on a certain time frame. The link to see the *Davis* Stipulated Consent Judgment and those requirements are provided in the presentation [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)]. You will hear later in the presentation that we do have a court-appointed monitor in the *Davis* case, and she has some concerns which we will present to you later. With that, I will turn the presentation over to Peter Handy to discuss the programs that our Department administers.

Peter Handy, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:

There is a long list in the presentation [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)]. I am only going to hit a few of the highlights to keep this brief and hopefully a little more detailed. Primarily, we have been spending a lot of time serving as counsel administrator for rural counties. Currently, the Department serves as a counsel administrator for nine rural counties pursuant to the passage of Assembly Bill 480 of the 81st Session, where things like billing and selection of counsel passed to the Department. There are six counties that have local counsel administrators. There are designees that sit in those counties and serve those functions with the oversight and supervision of the Department. We have selected counsel in more than 2,100 cases in 2022. We reviewed and approved more than 400 bills in trial cases and over 400 bills for post-conviction cases in 2022.

We provide ongoing review of attorney training, experience, and qualifications. As part of the regulations that have been promulgated by the Board pursuant to statute, we are required to ensure that all of the attorneys that are practicing indigent defense in the rural counties in Nevada are qualified to do so. We have certain experiential requirements to ensure they have the correct amount of training, that they have the right amount of casework behind them, and they are experienced to handle the cases they are going to be handling wherever they might be practicing. Some attorneys are only qualified to handle misdemeanor cases; others are qualified to handle capital cases. We also provide comprehensive training to all of these attorneys and provide monthly trainings. We put on an annual conference for those attorneys and all the indigent defense practitioners in the state. Last year, we held our first in-person conference with over 55 attendees. For reference, we manage the list of over 110 qualified attorneys. Approximately half of those showed up to our training. We also disseminate and receive client satisfaction surveys. We provide client satisfaction surveys to attorneys to hand out to their clients. We receive those back and then review them to determine any trends in attorney practices.

We provide case management and data collection; LegalServer is our case management system being utilized to collect data across all the rural counties for practitioners practicing indigent defense. If you are practicing indigent defense in those counties, you are required to use this system unless you have received some kind of waiver for some reason. This provides us with a lot of information, including caseloads, time that is being utilized by the attorneys in their caseloads, and amount of time being spent on certain case types. We are trying to collect as much data as we can to create trends to be able to predict whether an individual attorney needs more training or more experience, whether attorneys in certain areas need more training or experience, whether more funds need to be allocated to certain areas, or whether attorneys might be needed in certain areas to help cover increasing caseloads or workloads based on the increased amount of times.

I am sure you have heard a lot about the maximum county contribution formula [page 6]. The Department receives quarterly financial reports from the counties based on what they have expended for indigent defense in the previous quarter. Over the last fiscal year, the Department actually reimbursed over \$1.9 million for the rural counties in Nevada, including *Davis* and non-*Davis* counties. That is pursuant to this formula. Counties back in 2017-2018 submitted their budget allocations to the Department. There was some math magic that happened after the math magic cap was created. We are like a high deductible health insurance plan. Right now, counties have to spend a certain amount, and once they reach the cap for that amount, then the state starts reimbursing them for the expenditures they make for indigent defense programs. In reviewing those quarterly reports, we are reviewing to see if they are actually making expenditures on indigent defense, that the funds are not being spent in some other area. We are ensuring how it is being spent, whether that is a contract attorney, whether that is a county office, whether it is on some other function like experts and investigators, or some other fees that are related to indigent defense. We do work with the counties proactively to remedy any situation. They have actually been very responsive over the last six or seven months in getting us more detailed information. Some have even modified their accounting practices to give us better information backup for these reports.

We do review county indigent defense plans for provisions of indigent services that are required by statute to be provided. Previously, only Washoe and Clark were required to have those plans. After A.B. 81 of the 80th Session was passed and the Department created, all of those counties needed to then start producing plans. Right now, all 17 of Nevada's counties have plans for provisions of indigent defense services. We worked with all those counties to help not only to build those, but also to improve those over time. We see those as continuing works in progress because, as county needs change and indigent defense service needs change, those plans also need updating. We do work with counties to avoid corrective action. Corrective action would be if the county is failing to meet the standards or provision of indigent defense services; there is a mechanism by which the Department would intervene and work with the county to change the system. We have not had to move to that step. The counties, again, have been very responsive in working with us to help avoid that kind of a situation.

We are working on developing pipelines into indigent defense services [page 7, [Exhibit C](#)]. Like most professions in the state, Nevada is short on attorneys. Most of the state is what is considered a legal desert by the American Bar Association (ABA), including Nevada's rural counties. We are working with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas William S. Boyd School of Law to help develop and sustain a law student to the public defender pipeline. We have had a stipend program for this year and last year where two students from Boyd have been able to extern with a rural indigent defense office. They receive stipends of \$6,500 each to help cover their relocation and living costs over the summers. We are also hosting interns or externs from Boyd during each term. We had three last summer, two in the fall, and we have two legislative externs this semester. They have been fantastic externs, and if you are seeking any externs, I would look to the Boyd School of Law.

We are also providing grants application and management [page 7]. We do have limited resources for this right now. We are managing three grants, the first being the grant that provided a stipend to law students who practice in the rurals, provided by the State Bar of Nevada. We are also facilitating the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, which is a subgrant administered by the Department of Public Safety to help rural attorneys attend our annual conference. We are also administering the John R. Justice Grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U. S. Department of Justice, whereby we can help repay some attorneys for some student loan costs they have incurred. Those three grants can be a difficult process for us to manage; they require frequent reporting, new applications every year, and program modifications or extensions. The three of us are lawyers and not finance people.

In addition to those duties, Ms. Ryba serves as secretary for the Board on Indigent Defense Services [page 7, [Exhibit C](#)]. We work with them to prepare their meetings as well as ensure that all of their needs are met. In addition to that, we maintain the website and do other administrative tasks like building the Department's budget, taking phone calls, and everything else that needs to be done by the Department.

I will move on to some of the Department's achievements [page 8]. As I mentioned earlier, all 17 counties have created approved plans for the provision of indigent defense services; that is the first time in the state's history. Since A.B. 81 of the 80th Session, these are all a requirement. The counties were very helpful in working with us to get these plans finalized and delivered. The Department received annual fiscal reports from all 17 counties, and we were able to obtain reimbursement through the Interim Finance Committee of over \$1.9 million for several counties.

We have implemented A.B. 480 of the 81st Session; we serve as the counsel administrator in nine counties and have local counsel administrators in six of those counties. The Department is sitting in the shoes of judges for a lot of those situations. We are reviewing what is happening in individual attorneys' cases when they are seeking experts and investigators to ensure that those are reasonable and necessary costs being incurred by the counties or ultimately the state, depending on where their costs are at for the year.

We provide continued training and resources. We held our first in-person training networking conference in Las Vegas on May 26 and 27, 2022. We had over 55 providers attend. We are planning on hosting that again this year in Reno on May 3 and 4. You are welcome to attend if you are interested.

We rolled out our case management software in 2021 and provided thorough training and technical support to all indigent defense providers in the 15 rural counties. This is how we build our quarterly and annual reports and publish our data on our website.

The Board produced permanent regulations on the indigent defense services, and those were adopted by the Legislative Commission on October 25, 2021. There is a link to those regulations on page 8 [[Exhibit C](#)]. I have the pleasure of introducing the new State Public Defender of Nevada, Chris Arabia.

Chris Arabia, State Public Defender, Department of Indigent Defense Services:

We currently provide all indigent services for Carson City and Storey County [page 9]. At full staffing, we would have nine attorneys—we are three short right now—two investigators and four administrative staff. It is an exciting time for the Office of the State Public Defender as, over the next two fiscal years, we are going to be expanding. We will be providing all indigent services in White Pine County, and we will be launching a complex litigation team, which is a fancy way of saying we will be responsible for death penalty representation in Churchill, Humboldt, and Lander Counties. We will be providing appellate representation for Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lander, and Lincoln Counties; and providing pardons and parole representation for Churchill, Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lincoln, and Lyon. I am excited to be here and am looking forward to improving the quality of indigent defense services.

Thomas Qualls, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:

I just want to talk to you for a minute about some of the *Davis* monitor's comments. As we discussed, there is a court-appointed monitor to ensure that all of the requirements in the

Davis Stipulated Consent Judgment are being accomplished and complied with by the Department. The monitor produces a quarterly report. We check in with her regularly. We send her oversight reports from the road as well as reports on everything from our data collection to surveys of our attorneys and the counties that we do regularly.

I would note that all of the accomplishments that Mr. Handy discussed, virtually the entire history of our Department, has been during the pandemic. With our very tight staff and under very unusual circumstances, we were essentially launched and have done all of the team building that we have done across the state and complied with *Davis* to the extent possible. To the extent that it has not been possible, I will discuss three current challenges that the *Davis* monitor consistently names, and these particular ones are from her latest report.

The first one is insufficient Department budget for oversight and other functions [page 10, [Exhibit C](#)]. We are tasked with boots-on-the-ground oversight of the 15 rural counties in Nevada. Right now—and historically with the restrictions of COVID-19—it has been Ms. Ryba and me on the road, in addition to doing the higher-level policy work and day-to-day running of the Department. We have a limited travel budget. We have visited all of the counties, doing face-to-face team building, working on building their plans, inspecting courthouses and jails, making sure that there are places for attorneys and clients to meet, observing court proceedings, et cetera. It is pretty much impossible for us to do the kind of oversight that *Davis* mandates with just the two of us. That is a concern of the monitor. She notes that there is insufficient staff for adequate oversight and annual reviews, and insufficient funding for required support training and mentorship of certain attorneys. Her proposed solution is to increase the Department staff to include policy analysts, oversight positions, and additional funding.

The second challenge noted by the *Davis* monitor has to do with workload standards and the insufficient number of qualified attorneys [page 11, [Exhibit C](#)]. As has been discussed here today, there is a shortage of indigent defense attorneys in the state, primarily in the rurals. It is not unique to Nevada; this is happening in a number of different states. It largely has to do with unsustainable caseloads and low pay. Different states are creating different solutions to this problem. Additionally, the only caseload/workload standard that we have to go off right now is from the ABA, which is from the 1970s, so it is about 50 years old. The RAND Corporation has been working for some time on an updated workload standard. To our understanding, it was completed sometime around June of last year but has been in peer reviews since then.

We have contracted, as required by the *Davis* case, with the National Center for State Courts to conduct our own workload/caseload study. It was informed by a number of different things. The first one was our caseload management system, which we rolled out to collect data from all of the counties. Never before have we had any kind of data in Nevada on caseloads and workloads from any of these counties. The National Center for State Courts conducted what is called a Delphi study, which is long interviews with practitioners in the field in various different categories over a long period of time. They are currently waiting

for the RAND study to be released so that they can incorporate that into these findings. Once we have that study released, the counties actually have 12 months to comply with the new caseload/workload standards under the *Davis* case which is, in practical terms, going to look like fairly dramatic increases in the number of indigent defense attorneys in each of these counties. We are in that position where there is already a shortage. We are working with the counties to build sustainable and effective solutions to these, including pay parity with prosecutors and bringing the levels of salaries and contract amounts up to an amount that will attract qualified attorneys and again make these systems more sustainable.

Mr. Arabia pointed out earlier that his office is down 33 percent right now in attorneys and that has to do, in part, with the fact that the State Public Defender attorney salaries are not very competitive right now. This is not something that any of you do not know. I am sure that this is a repeated complaint in departments across the board. So, in short, the solutions that she recommends are public defender pay parity with prosecutors; increased hourly rates under NRS 7.125, that is for individual appointed conflict counsel; and to ensure that our Department and the Nevada State Public Defender are adequately funded.

The last challenge, as noted by the *Davis* monitor, has to do with the maximum contribution funding that we have discussed [page 12, [Exhibit C](#)]. To recap, the counties have a cap on what they have to pay for indigent defense services and over that, the state is required to reimburse them. The way it worked in the last session is that that money is not in the Department's budget. We have to go through the Interim Finance Committee to request those funds. There is a delay of two to three months in doing that after the counties have spent this money and then reported to us, and then we go before the Committee. It takes up a lot of time and resources. The monitor suggests that this money be put into our Department so that we can more efficiently handle this and the counties can receive their disbursements in a more timely manner. I will turn it back over to Ms. Ryba for discussion of [Senate Bill 39](#).

Marcie Ryba:

[Senate Bill 39](#) is our policy request that we have submitted, and we will be introducing this tomorrow at the Senate Committee on Judiciary [page 13, [Exhibit C](#)]. You have heard that we are doing that counsel administrator position for a lot of the counties, and when they ask for experts and investigators, we need to find out if it is reasonable and necessary. We are asking them to let us know a little bit of their thinking, write down why it is necessary for their case, and we want to make sure that that is protected. We want to make sure that we maintain that attorney-client privilege and that an individual could not request those records from our Department to try and see what the public defenders are asking for and why they are asking for it. They are also required, under *Davis* as well as our regulations, to provide data, and the attorneys have expressed concern with the names of their clients coming over in our case management system. They want to make sure that attorney-client privilege is protected, so we did submit [Senate Bill 39](#) as our policy request. With that, we would take any questions.

Chair Miller:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Orentlicher:

I am glad to hear our Boyd students are doing such a good job. Do other states have funding policies that are more sustainable? Is there a model out there for how you raise funds for this—whether it is a fee that lawyers pay as part of their admission to or renewing with the State Bar of Nevada, or some other way to make sure this is not a chronic problem?

Marcie Ryba:

I think when you look at what each state is doing, each state has their own way of providing resources to indigent defense services. Some are charging attorneys and taking funds from IOLTA [Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts] accounts to help support indigent defense services. Some are coming from a general fund, and it depends state-by-state how the state is set up. The state of Nevada is very specific because the Legislature set forth the requirement that our Board create that maximum contribution formula. The Legislature said you need to almost do this like high insurance health care where the counties pay up to a certain amount and after that point, the remainder is reimbursable by the General Fund. When we look to any other state that is comparable to that, we could not find any other state that has a maximum contribution formula, but there is a mixture. Some are 100 percent state-funded, some are county-funded, and some are a mixture like the State of Nevada.

Chair Miller:

Because these presentations are educational for the members and in every committee we use so many acronyms and so much jargon that we assume everyone understands, can you just briefly explain what an IOLTA account is to everyone?

Marcie Ryba:

An IOLTA account is where private attorneys have to take funds when they have taken on new clients and put them into a separate account. This is an interest-bearing account, and that interest goes to the state bar to be used for certain resources. It is not kept with the attorney as a way to be able to arguably make additional funding off those amounts.

Chair Miller:

Am I correct in adding that that interest is what actually helps pay for the public defenders when someone needs their services?

Marcie Ryba:

In the state of Nevada, that IOLTA account goes to the State Bar of Nevada to administer, and those funds are going to civil appointments, pro bono appointments, to be able to reimburse those. They do not go to indigent services.

Chair Miller:

They go for the public defender?

Marcie Ryba:

Not the public defender.

Peter Handy:

Those are Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts. These are funds that are held in trust by attorneys for their clients to use in paying later. The interest from these accounts then gets deposited into a fund that is specifically earmarked for 501(c)(3) legal services entities or corporations like Nevada Legal Services. Those are the recipients of those funds.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

You spoke specifically about the parity between public defender pay and prosecutor pay. I have two questions. What is the difference? And what are the current staffing levels comparatively between them so that we can get an idea of why we cannot seem to keep public defenders?

Thomas Qualls:

I can answer at least part of that question. Public defenders represent indigent persons who are charged with crimes, anything from a misdemeanor to a high-level felony. A prosecutor is like a district attorney who brings that case on behalf of the city, county, or state to prosecute those crimes. In a perfect world, that is a level playing field because you have advocates in the same case on opposite sides of the "V" in the case. The resources, salaries, and access to investigators and experts ought to be the same and on parity so that you have equal justice.

Marcie Ryba:

I can answer the other part of that question as to what the prosecutor salaries are compared to the State Public Defender at this point in time. As Mr. Arabia said, the State Public Defender provides those services in Carson City. Although on paper, the deputy district attorney looks on par with what our public defenders make, in the area of about \$102,000 to \$107,000, we have done a data study where our data analyst has pointed out that state employees are required to contribute 15.5 percent of their salary to the Public Employees Retirement System of Nevada, where at the county level, they are not required to make that contribution and the county makes that contribution for them. Another area where we have seen disparity is the chief deputy district attorney in Carson City makes up to \$156,000. A chief at the State Public Defender's Office makes up to \$120,000. The assistant district attorney in Carson City makes \$184,000. The State Public Defender makes \$133,000, which shows the distinction.

We are also seeing a distinction even between the Office of the Attorney General and our Department. For example, the Attorney General's Office has something called a senior deputy attorney general. This allows for growth within the Attorney General's Office and allows individuals that have been there for a long time to move up to that senior level. That increases their pay salary up to \$120,344, which is similar to our chief. But the distinction is that when you look at the forms on what type of work is required for that reporting, you can see that our chief is required to do administrative work, where the senior attorney general is just listed as a professional. There are additional duties that are required to be put forth by our public defenders in that chief position. The chief deputy attorney general makes the same as what our State Public Defender makes even though they do not have that statewide

representation that Mr. Arabia is required to start. Once counties start opting in, he will be required to set up those offices in any counties that would like it and provide that oversight. We have a compensation analysis and recommendations on our website that was done by a data analyst, and I could also provide that to the Committee.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

I have to say that is a statement we probably do not think we would hear very often that we do not have enough attorneys. We always say we do not need any more attorneys, please. If you would not mind sharing what the current caseloads are: I know they are going to be dramatically different for, say, rural as compared to Clark and Washoe, but if you could share what their caseloads are currently, and what the current recommendations are to compare. Obviously they are going to change when you come out with the new reports, but I would be interested to know those.

Marcie Ryba:

We publish caseloads on a quarterly basis so we can provide you copies of those. We do not actually collect data for caseloads for Washoe and Clark. At this point in time, they are excluded because the focus of our data collection has been in the rural counties. We also have not set a workload other than what is set forth in the Sixth Amendment, that you need to be able to provide competent representation for your client. If you feel you are not able to do so because of your workload, you should be withdrawing. Once our weighted caseload is released, which we hope to be released this year, counties will have within 12 months to be able to comply with that and have the appropriate number of attorneys for the appropriate cases.

The distinction in the rurals is, it is not just cases, it is travel time. Some of these courts are so far away. Mr. Qualls and I had a very interesting experience where we drove to Goldfield and left to go to court in Tonopah when two semis jackknifed and closed the road, and no one else could get out of Goldfield after that. So there are these little specifics for the rural counties that we are hoping to take into consideration in our workload: if you live in a larger county, you have traffic and other things to get to court, but you do not have hours on the road to be able to get to where your client is. Our workload, once it is published, will take that into consideration and it will not just be numbers of cases, it will be travel time that is required as well.

Chair Miller:

What about electronically, that we can communicate, but then we have the connectivity issues out in some of our remote rural areas as well. Is that correct?

Thomas Qualls:

Fortunately, all of the rural counties have virtual court capabilities. It is one of the things that the pandemic gave us, and most of them are very accommodating, especially for the newly enacted 48-hour initial appearance hearings. They allow those, especially on the weekends and holidays, to be virtual. There are a lot of rural courts where, if it is not a substantial hearing, they will allow virtual court; and right now there is a committee that is working on

a statewide standard or statewide administrative order from the Nevada Supreme Court regarding what hearings are going to be allowed to be virtual and which ones are not. That does ameliorate some of the travel time. But again, there are many instances in which the contract public defender in Tonopah has to drive from Las Vegas to Tonopah at least weekly for hearings.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Can you talk about the virtual accessibility with your clients who are in the jails and prisons? Are they being accommodating for you?

Marcie Ryba:

This is county by county. It is up to the jail how they provide these resources, but our understanding is the rural counties are very open to having any sort of access that is possible so long as it has been budgeted. We have heard from some White Pine County public defenders who actually bought an iPad and brought it over to the jail during COVID-19 so they could communicate with their clients. They had a lot of success in that. Others have not been able to communicate and are limited to telephone. Some of these rural counties are doing a great job with the virtual appearances in court. They set up different rooms where the clients can confer with their attorneys, and then they will be entered into the courtroom, so they have that attorney-client privilege time. It is run by the sheriff as to what access they provide there. We have not necessarily heard that individuals are not allowed to contact their clients as freely as they would like.

Assemblyman Gray:

Has there been any thought given to the rurals coming up with an indigent defense office amongst three or four counties where they could at least pool resources? It will not affect the caseload, but it would be one office, multiple attorneys, with one location to manage, and in-depth assistance. I know in my home county it would just be hard to even get more office space at this point for another attorney, much less attract somebody to Yerington.

Marcie Ryba:

If you read our regulations, counties are allowed joint plans for the provision of indigent defense services and enter into these plans together and share office space. No counties have chosen to do that even though it has been offered to them. A possibility that would be similar to that would be the State Public Defender. Every county can opt into the representation of the State Public Defender, and it is automatic. Once the county opts in, the State Public Defender has to provide those resources for that county in that next biennium. That is why we are seeing White Pine come into the State Public Defender's representation.

Thomas Qualls:

Additionally, we are working on making sure that there are offices in all of the places there need to be offices. For instance, we are working with Storey County right now to get a space for a public defender office up there because, right now, the situation is if you have a trial or any kind of substantial hearing there, you essentially have to travel from Carson City where the State Public Defender's Office is. Their clients are not able to come to an office in Storey

County and meet with the attorney. You are forced to talk to them in the courthouse. There are no computers, printers, or the ability to do the things that are necessary. We would actually like to see more offices and more places for accessibility and for purposes of attorney-client communications.

Chair Miller:

With that, I do not see any more questions from members. Our next presentation will be from the Cannabis Compliance Board.

Tyler Klimas, Executive Director, Cannabis Compliance Board:

I would like to take the opportunity to introduce my incredible team who are with me: Deputy Director Michael Miles, Chief Karalin Cronkhite over audits and inspections. Behind me is Chief David Staley of investigations, Chief Steve Gilbert of administration and licensing, and Tianna Bohner, our Public Information Officer.

We appreciate the opportunity to be here today to give you an overview of the Cannabis Compliance Board (CCB), our operations, what we do, and then answer any questions that the Committee may have. This is possibly one of the most important slides [page 2, [Exhibit D](#)] for us. In 2019, the Nevada Legislature set forth the public policy that would ultimately guide our agency in all of our operations. We take this public policy very seriously as it dictates how we perform our duties, our regulatory decisions, and ultimately, our core mission and purpose. You will see here on this slide [page 2] that the Legislature, at the time, recognized that the "continued growth and success of the cannabis industry is dependent upon public confidence and trust," two words that are also very important to the CCB, and that "public confidence and trust can only be maintained by strict regulation of all persons, location, practices, associations, and activities related to the operation of cannabis establishments." This is all in state law. If this language is familiar, it is because it is taken almost verbatim from the same public policy that guides Nevada's gold standard gaming regulation and oversight. The CCB was created to mimic that same regulatory oversight that we have for gaming but for the cannabis industry—and for the same reasons.

At the top here [page 3], our mission statement reflects those same principles. The CCB in its responsibilities oversees Nevada's 760 medical and adult-use operational licenses. We enforce statutes and regulations that guide the industry, and we focus many of our efforts on what may be our most important responsibility, which is to protect the public health and safety of our many medical patients, adult-use consumers, residents, communities, and visitors to our state. Our agency is managed by a five-member, part-time board, currently chaired by former Nevada Supreme Court Chief Justice Michael Douglas. We hold monthly board meetings where the board presides over disciplinary matters, licensing approvals, management service agreements, or new or revised regulations, among other things. The CCB prides itself on accountability and transparency and, through our public meetings, we encourage robust public participation and engagement. Our agency has 93 full-time employees, and we have four divisions within the agency: Administration and Licensing, Inspections and Audit, Investigations, and Enforcement.

Also created alongside the CCB was the Cannabis Advisory Commission, which I chair in my position as Executive Director. This Commission is made up of 12 members and is designed to mimic the Nevada Gaming Policy Committee. Therefore, the Commission meets at the request of the Board, the Governor, or the Legislature to study cannabis-related issues when they come up and make recommendations to the Board at its request. The most recent example of this was around consumption lounges, which passed last legislative session.

When we were first authorized in July of 2020, we had 50 full-time employees [page 4, [Exhibit D](#)]. Since then, our agency has continued to grow now into the 93 full-time staff we have currently authorized. Along the way, we have identified many operational efficiencies and addressed many issues that plagued the previous oversight body, working to automate much of what we do and through reconfiguration of resources and functions, work through all of the backlogs we inherited or that were created as a result of the transfer of oversight responsibilities.

This gives you a snapshot of our distribution of licenses as well as some other facts on license holders, agent cards, and the types of facilities that we regulate: cultivation, production, laboratories, distribution, retail dispensaries, and now, or soon to be, consumption lounges [page 5]. You will see, we have over 18,000 active cannabis agent registration cardholders in the state.

This is taxable sales information and sales data spanning the last three fiscal years [page 6]. This is the first year since cannabis was legalized in Nevada for adult use that we have seen a decline in yearly sales. We are down about 4.5 percent fiscal year over fiscal year and about 14.5 percent calendar year to calendar year. This trend is consistent with more mature cannabis marketplaces across the nation, and the result of a number of market dynamics. For one, we have experienced extreme year-over-year growth since 2018, when we legalized adult use. The numbers were always going to stabilize at some point and begin to provide us a baseline, and then the pandemic hit. People were at home, received stimulus money, and had sizable discretionary income, and we saw an almost 50 percent increase in sales from 2020 to 2021. Today we are coming back to earth a little bit. The pandemic restrictions are ending; people are back at work; discretionary income is falling as inflation continues to affect the economy; and we have competition from the illicit market. What we are seeing in Nevada is consistent with what our counterparts are seeing in other states. If anything, given our tourism economy, our prices have not fallen as much as some of the other states, at least not so far.

Our agency is funded a little uniquely. We do not take any General Fund money. We are fee and tax funded with the remainder of what is deposited into our account transferred to the State Education Fund. As you can see, this past fiscal year, we generated just over \$8 million in licensing fees, time and effort assessments, agent registration fees, and fines and civil penalties [page 7, [Exhibit D](#)]. There was also just over \$63 million collected from the 15 percent wholesale tax. That wholesale tax money is then combined with our agency-generated revenue, and from there, we take care of our operations, send \$5 million to the local governments, send \$250,000 to the Department of Health and Human Services,

Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and then transfer the remaining balance to the State Education Fund. This fiscal year resulted in just under \$59 million transferred.

For your awareness, that \$59 million is not the only revenue stream from cannabis that flows to the State Education Fund; there is also a 10 percent retail tax on cannabis sales at the retail level. That amount also goes into the State Education Fund in its entirety but does not pass through the CCB. In the most recent fiscal year, the state collected over \$89 million in that retail tax, plus the \$59 million combined for \$147 million transferred all into the State Education Fund for fiscal year 2022. Also important to note here, the CCB does not handle tax collection on the wholesale or retail side. That duty is the responsibility of the Department of Taxation.

I will highlight our four divisions briefly to give you an idea of what we do [page 8, [Exhibit D](#)]. The first division is Administration and Licensing. It maintains a database of all license holders and ownership records. It processes and reviews all license applications and renewals and collects all related fees. This Division is also in charge of managing the cannabis agent registration card program, which, through the efforts of the Administration and Licensing Division, has seen a reduction in wait time for agent cards by over 98 percent. Processing new cards for industry employees in the industry used to take up to 45 days and now takes 1 business day. Administration also works closely with the Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation on agent card background checks, as well as the Department of Taxation on collecting unpaid taxes and fees.

Recently, we successfully facilitated the first licensing round for consumption lounges in Nevada [page 9]. This was a significant accomplishment both for the CCB and the State because there had not been a licensing round in Nevada since 2018, which, if you remember, was highly litigated. It is still going on in the courts and nearly brought this industry to a standstill. We implemented a random selection process for this round, which allowed us to hold a randomized drawing for licenses at a public event to ensure total accountability and transparency of the licensing round. This licensing round was also the first time that the State allowed for individuals who were not already in the industry to apply for a cannabis license. Up until this point, all licensing rounds prior applied only to those who already had cannabis establishments. Furthermore, this licensing round facilitated Nevada's first ever social equity licenses. This was a component of Assembly Bill 341 of the 81st Session. Ten lounge licenses were available only to those individuals who were deemed to have been negatively impacted by prior drug policy. This is the first step in a very significant step towards greater equity and inclusion in the cannabis industry in our state.

The Inspections and Audit Division [page 10, [Exhibit D](#)] agents visit all Nevada's cannabis licensees at least once a year, and in many cases more than that, to perform routine audits of inventory and inspections of facilities. Inspections and Audit agents also conduct preopening inspections, facility modifications, and spot checks, usually around major holidays and events. Our CCB Inspections and Audit agents ensure facilities and establishments remain in compliance with rules and regulations. They track all inventory from facilities through

METRC, which is our seed-to-sale tracking system. They also inspect Nevada's ten testing laboratories to ensure laboratory standards and appropriate procedures are being followed.

When our agents finish an audit or inspection, they either issue a statement of deficiency or a statement of no deficiencies, depending on the results of the inspection or audit [page 11]. As you can see, in calendar year 2022, out of 427 notices issued, we had about 56 percent receive statements of deficiencies, which means we identified violations or instances of noncompliance. About 44 percent received a statement of no deficiencies, which means it was a clean audit or inspection with no compliance issues found. Roughly half of our inspection and audits in a given calendar year have no compliance issues to report on. That is a good thing, and we would like to see that number grow. Just because you receive a statement of deficiency does not mean you will be fined or a complaint will be filed. Many times, these are minor deficiencies that can be corrected by submitting a plan of correction back to the CCB agents, which we review and approve. When a violation does rise to the level of potential disciplinary action, we transmit the details of the violation to the Attorney General's Office. They review the case and recommend to us either to proceed with the complaint or not. Only at that point, and if the Attorney General's Office agrees with our recommendation, do we then proceed with disciplinary action. There were 23 complaints authorized by the CCB board members in 2022 as a result of violations identified. Out of 427 audit inspection notices in calendar year 2022, the Board authorized 23 complaints.

Recently, and of note, the CCB introduced what we call "letters of concern." This provides our agency with a tool that sits somewhere in between a statement of deficiency and a complaint. It allows us to issue an official letter in lieu of a disciplinary complaint, and it serves as an informal warning that does not come with an official complaint or financial penalty. This process has allowed us to provide an extra layer of education with the industry to address the violation before such conduct escalates to a disciplinary complaint.

Additionally, the CCB and the Attorney General's Office take into account self-reporting as a mitigating factor in our disciplinary process [page 12, [Exhibit D](#)]. These mitigating factors are usually noted in any settlement agreement and presented as part of that settlement agreement to the Board before the Board approves any final action. These settlement agreements are also posted online for the public to view. We receive hundreds of self-reporting incidents every year and a multiple on a daily basis. Most do not rise to a disciplinary level, especially if the licensees take immediate action. In fact, there have only been a few cases—exactly five cases in our history as an agency—in 2.5 years that a self-reporting violation resulted in a disciplinary action or financial penalty. Those cases, however, dealt with subject matter that the Board along with the United States Department of Justice considered to be the most important pillars of keeping a safe, effective industry that remains free from any potential federal intervention. Those include sales to a minor, diversion of cannabis out of a facility, and hidden ownership, which has potential to invite criminal elements into our industry. Three of the five self-reporting incidents that have resulted in a fine dealt with one of those topics and carried a significant financial penalty as a result. The other two dealt with selling more product than what is allowed to a single consumer in a transaction. Although we consider that a serious issue, they were subsequently

pled down to a financial penalty significantly lower than what could have been assessed. All of these actions are decided at a public meeting, are totally transparent, and are posted online for anyone to view.

Our Investigations Division investigators are tasked with processing all transfers of interest [page 13, [Exhibit D](#)]. These are sales of licenses to new owners or if a licensee sells a percentage of ownership to new or existing owners. This process includes a complete vetting of all potential new licensees and affiliated owners, officers, and board members. It includes sit-down interviews with applicants and a full suite of background checks and financial analysis on potential entrants into our industry. This process was modeled after how the Gaming Control Board vets potential licensees in the gaming industry. The CCB Investigations Division has been a large success, especially in efforts to uncover hidden ownership to ensure we know exactly who is in our cannabis industry. The results of these investigations are presented in public to the Board, and potential and current licensees must appear in front of the Board to answer questions about the vetted transaction. Our CCB agents have uncovered a number of instances of hidden ownership within the industry, along with potential bad actors and individuals unsuitable to participate.

Finally, the CCB's small but mighty Enforcement Division is made up of eight Nevada Peace Officers' Standards and Training-certified enforcement officers [page 14, [Exhibit D](#)]. In addition to supporting complicated and/or contentious facility inspections, our enforcement agents investigate criminal complaints as well as participate in multi-agency law enforcement actions to address illicit market activity, like outdoor cultivation sites and illegal sales of cannabis. The CCB hosts quarterly law enforcement meetings where we invite all local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in a closed-door meeting to discuss cannabis-related issues and share operational opportunities and challenges.

This legislative session, we have three bills that we are carrying that will eventually, I believe, come before this Committee [page 15, [Exhibit D](#)]. They are mostly housekeeping in nature. [Senate Bill 31](#) authorizes cannabis establishments to move jurisdictions outside of Clark and Washoe Counties if they receive approval of the receiving local government. [Senate Bill 33](#) is a very large housekeeping bill that cleans up a number of provisions contained in Title 56 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* now that we have had a couple of years to live in those statutes. And finally, [Senate Bill 69](#) creates another tool for CCB agents to address smaller violations as well as memorialize the disciplinary process that the Board is currently utilizing by further involving the CCB's administrative law judge into our hearing process.

Some additional thoughts to consider, challenges that we see for this year are: sales are down and tax revenue is down; federal inaction on cannabis-related matters continues to hamper both regulators and the industry; limited access to banking keeps the industry, or at least a percentage of the industry, all cash-based; and the federal tax code also continues to prohibit certain tax write-offs for cannabis businesses, which increases overhead costs and places an additional economic strain on these businesses. Additionally, there is the constant threat or possibility of federal action to reschedule or legalize cannabis at the federal level.

We know it is coming, we just do not know when it is coming, but obviously that would significantly change the landscape of the marketplace here and across the nation [page 16, [Exhibit D](#)].

Looking ahead, we will start to see consumption lounges open likely towards the end of this year and into next year [page 17, [Exhibit D](#)]. We are also commissioning a market study that will review and analyze the cannabis marketplace, including examining supply and demand, any need for new licenses of all license types, as well as trying to analyze the breadth and scope of the illicit market here in our state. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. We are here to answer any questions that the Committee has.

Chair Miller:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

My question is really about the unlicensed businesses. I am floored when I see billboards that are clearly, blatantly unlicensed. I am wondering if you are collecting civil fines or anything from these businesses? And to that end, are you in the Governor's budget? Are you asking for staff members specifically for that? Because I see that as being one of the biggest issues, quite frankly.

Tyler Klimas:

You are absolutely right. The greatest competitor to our licensed market is the unregulated market. It is not specific to Nevada. It is every state that has a legalized marketplace. There was this common thought that if you legalize cannabis for adult use, it is automatically going to squash the illicit market because people can go buy it legally. Well, that did not happen. It did not happen anywhere. If anything, it grew the illicit market in some way. They have a smokescreen to hide behind in a way. We see the billboards. We see illegal delivery operators, who are really hard to distinguish from licensed delivery operators. I think there is some greater coordination needed around the prosecution side of this. We are working, and I think we are doing a lot better now, at coordinating with state and local law enforcement. We implemented the quarterly meeting. These are the discussions that we are having. I think resources are needed across the board, but again, we have to have these conversations about how we are going to move forward in prosecuting this, because we can find them, we can identify some illegal operations, but we need that last piece.

We have had some additional conversations with the Attorney General's Office and very productive conversations about potentially proceeding with some prosecution on some of the CBD and delta-8 issues that we are seeing, which is basically illegal cannabis. Our hope is that kind of starts to dovetail into a greater operation on combating the illicit market. The market study will be very important for us because as we sit here today, we do not know how big the illicit market is. Most states do not; it is very hard to figure out, especially with a lot of the tourism that we see; that will make it even harder for us to figure out exactly how big that illicit market is. But we need to know that first before we can start to address it and see if we are being effective or not.

Assemblyman Orentlicher:

The \$150 million or so you mentioned that goes to the State Education Fund, do you know how that compares to projections at the time this was debated and adopted?

Tyler Klimas:

That is a great question. I do not know. That would have been in 2017, which predates me. I do not know what the projections were then. I do know that we have seen 30 percent growth year over year in taxable sales, and that includes taxable wholesale transactions and then 50 percent in the pandemic year. Whatever they projected, I think we have exceeded that. But again, because of that, it was a little bit artificially inflated how much it grew, and now we are coming back a little bit. That did not answer your question at all, but there is some extra context in there for you.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Could you just explain what delta-8 THC is and what the concerns are about it?

Tyler Klimas:

Absolutely, and I will gladly hand that over to our resident scientist, Chief Cronkhite, who heads up the Inspection and Audit Division for the CCB.

Karalin Cronkhite, Division Chief, Inspection and Audit, Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board:

Delta-8 THC is a very similar molecule to that which causes psychoactive effects in cannabis. What you normally would consume would be delta-9 THC. Delta-8 is almost the same. It is just a carbon molecule that is connected at a different spot, basically. It is made synthetically. What they do is take CBD, typically, and mix it with an acid catalyst, and that converts CBD into a psychoactive substance, which is delta-8. These are synthetic cannabinoids. There have been several reports of people becoming very ill from consuming them, and we do not know what those byproducts produced during that conversion are.

Tyler Klimas:

These delta-8 products are not being created in our licensed cannabis establishments; this is outside of our licensed cannabis establishments. You can go on Amazon right now on your computer and order highly concentrated delta-8 products and they will be at your door tomorrow. We have no idea what is in them, and they have not been regulated. We addressed the issue as a State last session, and I think we are in a very good position because of it, when we made it illegal to produce synthetic cannabinoids unless it is approved by the CCB. As long as there is an online marketplace that exists like it does now, it is impossible to enforce.

Assemblywoman Newby:

I was tangentially involved in the Clark County process for the licenses; I remember a lot of those licenses going to in-state, local Nevadans. I have heard since that a lot of those licenses or ownership has since changed to corporations located outside of Nevada, and that

the Nevadan base of ownership has really shrunk. In your experience with these transfers, is that correct? How much has it transferred away from Nevada-based ownership?

Tyler Klimas:

I think that is pretty accurate. We are seeing nationwide and in Nevada a lot of consolidation, a lot of acquisition. We have quite a few publicly traded companies (PTC) in Nevada. We have had more through the last couple of years. These are multi-state operators with operations in many states. It seems the last year or two, trying to predict federal legalization, these PTCs are in a massive kind of acquisition posture. They are trying to buy up as many licenses as they can. We have a lot of PTCs in the state. We have had a lot of our Nevada licensees sell to these organizations. We are starting to see, at the last board meeting for example, I think out of the five transfers of interest that we had, we had a PTC purchase a couple of licenses. We had an investment fund from Colorado come in and buy a cultivation and production only. We are seeing that pretty consistently.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

As you said, the last few years it has been quite interesting to learn about all of this as it has grown and become more a part of Nevada. As you discussed some of the challenges these operators have, the decrease in revenue, the illicit market, et cetera, do you anticipate or are you seeing fewer applications for licensees now? How do you see that? Do you think it will increase or will people continue to apply or not?

Tyler Klimas:

I am going to answer your second question first on the health of the market. We are still seeing a ton of investment. Cannabis is still thought to be a very lucrative industry across the nation. Back to those examples of who we saw come in and purchase licenses last month, these are well-capitalized fund companies that are coming in—they are not coming in to lose money—so they obviously see that there is still a huge economic benefit here. Generally speaking, the dispensaries are the moneymakers in Nevada and in most places. We are seeing investment even into cultivation and production-only facilities. Obviously, they see some benefit in there.

As far as new applicants, we have not had consumption lounges, which we facilitated that licensing round for 20 licenses at the end of last year. That has been the first licensing round in Nevada since 2018. We have not added any cultivation facilities or production facilities, and dispensaries are capped in state law. If we were to open them up, I think we would get a lot of applicants. We had over 100 applicants for the consumption lounge process, and that was a nonrefundable application fee and you were not going to be guaranteed the license. You had to put up that money and then enter that randomized drawing. We still saw quite a few people apply for those. I think the market study that I mentioned is something I think we all need collectively as a state to have before we make a decision to say, Let us have more cultivation production licenses. What we do not want to do is upset the supply-demand balance. You see some states like Oregon or California that have this overabundance of product; they are bursting at the seams. We want to try to avoid that.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

Are the cannabis establishments getting better in terms of compliancy? Are you seeing a decrease in fines from year to year, or are you seeing an increase?

Tyler Klimas:

We still see pretty significant compliance issues. I like to think that we are beginning to weed out—and these are not intentional puns, but we are starting to get out—the folks that this industry is just simply not right for. We are moving towards a place where we can direct our resources on those that are noncompliant. We are seeing our facilities that do focus on compliance, that take compliance seriously. They build compliance into their operating procedures and really rise to the top. We are starting to see where our buckets are after 2 1/2 years. In the last month, if you have seen in the press, we had a facility utilize an unapproved pesticide that affected 8,000 pounds of product in the state. We showed up to a facility that we eventually had to suspend. We knocked on the door and they opened the back door and six people ran out the back. They started hiding plants in the attic and under boxes. It is all on video because you have to have surveillance. Those are really little things. If you are focusing on compliance and it matters to you, you are not doing that. We are still seeing it. That is why I try to provide some of those statistics of our audits and inspections that go out there. We are seeing that roughly half have clean audits and inspections. I hope next biennium, we are reporting on a greater number than we did this session.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

I know that 20 licenses for consumption lounges were given. How many actually applied?

Tyler Klimas:

We had 99 completed applications for the 20 licenses available.

Assemblywoman Marzola:

Do you know when the second round is going to be, because I believe you are allowed 40, correct?

Tyler Klimas:

We are allowed 40, but 20 of those are retail-attached. That was not a competitive licensing round. Any dispensary, even if they have multiple dispensaries, had the opportunity to have one consumption lounge. It could have been 40 or 50 applied; 20 of our dispensaries paid the \$100,000 fee and got a consumption lounge license. Then we had that randomized drawing for the other 20, which we had 99 applicants for those 20 independent lounge licenses. We will start the lounge program with 40 originally.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for the presentation. Members, you may reach out if you have any additional questions. I will open it up for public comment. [Public comment was heard.]

Members, tomorrow we will have three presentations from the Clark and Washoe County Offices of the District Attorney, the State Board of Parole Commissioners, and the Department of Public Safety beginning at 8 a.m. This meeting is adjourned [at 9:29 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Traci Dory
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 "Department of Indigent Defense Services," presented by Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services; Peter Handy, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services; and Thomas Qualls, Deputy Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services.

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board, Assembly Judiciary Committee," dated February 8, 2023, presented by Tyler Klimas, Executive Director, Cannabis Compliance Board.