

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

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

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 9 a.m. on Monday, May 1, 2023, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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.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
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Senate District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel

Minutes ID: 975



Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Aaron Klatt, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Cevan Louie, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protection Association
Alfredo Alonso, representing Alliance for Automotive Innovation
Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Terry K. Graves, representing Nevada Trucking Association; Nevada Manufacturers Association; Enginequest, North Las Vegas, Nevada; and Western Metals Recycling, Sparks, Nevada
Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Isaac Hardy, representing Nevada Pic-A-Part, Las Vegas, Nevada; SA Recycling, North Las Vegas, Nevada; and Urban Consortium
Jake Matthews, representing Copart, Reno, Nevada
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Nick Schneider, Policy Analyst, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Michael Alonso, representing American Telephone & Telegraph Company
Chelsea Capurro, representing MGM Resorts International
Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Greg Herrera, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson
Leisa Moseley-Sayles, Nevada State Director, Fines and Fees Justice Center
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Adam Cate, Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Tom Clark, representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction

Chair Miller:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Good morning, everyone. Welcome to Assembly Judiciary, and welcome back on this bright Monday morning. Our presenter for both bills today is tied up in her committee right now, and they are about to vote. Therefore, let us take a ten-minute recess.

[Recess to the call of the Chair at 9:02 a.m.]

We will come back to order [at 9:12 a.m.]. We have two bills scheduled, and we are going to take the agenda out of order. We will start with Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint). Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) is presented by Senator Nguyen. With that, Senator, your hearing is open. I see that it looks like you have a couple of copresenters, so please be sure to introduce them and then proceed when you are ready.

**Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to catalytic converters.
(BDR 15-37)**

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Senate District No. 3:

With me today, I have Detective Christopher Ries from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro), as well as Cevan Louie. As many of you know, I think it is always important that our bills solve problems in our community and in our state, and I like to incorporate the people that bring the problems and solutions to me in this process. That is why I have Detective Ries here, and especially on this AANHPI [Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander] Lobby Day, it is always important to bring in the next generation of advocates to be a part of this political process, so we have sophomore Cevan Louie here, and I am going to let her begin.

Cevan Louie, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am pleased to come before you today to present Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) alongside Senator Nguyen and Detective Ries from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. We are here today to help curb what is increasingly becoming a serious and expensive crime, catalytic converter theft. Before I go over the bill, I think it is important to go over some brief context to help you understand why this is so important and why we need legislation here in our status quo.

According to Carfax, last year in the U.S. there were as many as 153,000 catalytic converters stolen. In the case that you may not know what a catalytic converter is, if we think about our automobiles and their exhausts, what it essentially does is convert the amount of emissions that come out of our exhaust. It translates emissions such as carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide into water vapor, making emissions significantly less potent and reducing the impact of those emissions that are emitted.

These parts are being stolen because they contain rare metals that are used in a whole host of products. They are made out of metals like platinum and palladium, which are in high demand, extremely expensive to produce, and are in limited supply. This is what makes stealing these catalytic converters so lucrative. Catalytic converters are also relatively easy to steal because they are so exposed under a vehicle. They can be removed very quickly; in fact, catalytic converters can oftentimes be removed in minutes. State Farm Insurance Companies, the largest automobile insurer in the country, reported that between July 2021 and June 2022, catalytic converter thefts grew nationally by 109 percent, and in our status quo, it is up 400 percent. This not only impacts those who are direct victims of these thefts, but also anyone who has car insurance with the increase in rates, as well as our environment from the pollutants that are emitted because these cars do not have catalytic converters

anymore. I will now turn this over to Detective Ries to talk more about the local impacts and what this looks like in our own valley. Then, Senator Nguyen will walk you through the sections of this bill and why it is important.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

First, I would like to thank Senator Nguyen for this opportunity to present alongside her, as well as for sponsoring this important legislation. In 2022, there were over 2,500 reported thefts involving catalytic converters in Metro's jurisdiction. To be sure, this is just the reported thefts, and does not include the victim that notices their catalytic converter was stolen and just repairs it without notifying law enforcement. Furthermore, from 2019 to 2022 catalytic converter thefts increased over 1,200 percent.

An experienced thief can remove a catalytic converter very quickly with equipment easily found at a local hardware store. The cost to the victim can easily be thousands of dollars, not to mention the time, energy, and stress that it also causes. Nearly every one of your constituents has either been affected by catalytic converter thefts or knows someone who has. Nonprofit organizations, rental car companies, school buses, even the beloved Oscar Mayer Wienermobile have been victims of this crime.

Currently, stealing catalytic converters is difficult to prosecute for several reasons. Many of our arrests are from individuals caught in the act of stealing or attempting to steal a catalytic converter. However, if that person was not actually seen stealing the catalytic converter and was just observed with the catalytic converter in their possession, the likelihood of bringing that person to justice is minimal. For example, if a patrol officer stops a person with five catalytic converters, experience tells us that person stole those and did not obtain them legally; however, the officer typically cannot arrest on the thefts and rather would arrest on possession of burglary tools or injuring/tampering with a vehicle. This law will allow us to arrest on both the theft of the stolen catalytic converter and/or the possession of the stolen catalytic converter. Even further, this will allow us to better track the thefts of those catalytic converters. Without any changes in our current statutes, we can expect to see the continued rise in thefts of catalytic converters.

Senator Nguyen:

Thank you to my copresenters for presenting some background information. You can tell that Ms. Louie is a state and national debate champion based on her speed and the timing of the presentation. I will try to slow it down just a little bit here to go through some of the aspects of this bill. We heard some of the reasons why we need this bill, but I will start off with the following questions: what does this bill do to address the problem and why do we not have laws in place to already correct or prosecute this type of crime? As you heard before, this is a unique and quickly performed crime. Often police are unable to catch people in the act of stealing a catalytic converter because it happens so quickly.

Imagine you see someone outside of the neighborhood and they have a shopping cart full of catalytic converters and there was a whole neighborhood of houses that were hit with catalytic converter theft. If they do not have that person on camera footage that clearly

identifies them and they do not catch the person in the actual act, there is not much that can be done. Furthermore, nothing on that catalytic converter can be used to show where it came from because there are not any distinguishing marks on a catalytic converter that links it to the car it was stolen from. I know that a lot of our law enforcement partners have done things to try to correct this. On the national level, there are efforts to require manufacturers to print vehicle identification numbers (VIN) on them, but right now, we do not have that. I know there are places up here in northern Nevada where you can go and have your VIN number heat stamped or heat painted onto your catalytic converter, and there are also other devices that you can buy to help secure the catalytic converter. But I will be honest with you, even with some of those security devices in place to help prevent your catalytic converter from being stolen quickly, it still only adds minutes or seconds to the theft. Therefore, we are not catching people in the act of this, and there is no way to attach the victim's catalytic converter to the victim's car.

We heard stories when I presented this in the Senate of people posting on their neighborhood social networking pages, such as Nextdoor and Facebook, pictures of people walking through their neighborhood with a shopping cart full of catalytic converters. When I talked to Metro and our local law enforcement partners around the state, I asked them what they would be able to charge that person with, and unfortunately, their answer was possession of stolen property for the shopping cart, not the catalytic converters.

I think it is also important to understand who is being victimized in our community. Much like all of us, when you are talking about the bills you are working on, you are talking to people about unassuming partners. I have talked to law enforcement, to my neighbors, and most of my district is not contained within walls or HOAs [homeowners' association], and there is a lot of this type of theft because people do not have garages. For example, in my neighborhood, no one has garages, so people are parking their cars in carports or on the streets. Therefore, some of the solutions proposed to simply park their car in a garage are just not available to a lot of members of our communities.

I have talked to nonprofits. I think it was the Boys and Girls Club of America, or it may have been the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association] that had over \$75,000 in catalytic converter thefts to their vans and buses, to the point where they had to start parking their vehicles in their gymnasium or across the street at the fire department to avoid that loss. You will hear from auto dealers, rental car agencies, the resort industry; basically, anyone with a parking lot is experiencing this, and we are also experiencing it inside our communities and residential neighborhoods.

There are a couple of things that this bill seeks to address. First, it allows our law enforcement agencies to act consistently as with other types of theft. While this is a new crime, for the possession of more than two used catalytic converters, there are defenses that are built in; for example, if you are a scrap dealer, a mechanic, or if you have a legitimate business reason to have more than one used catalytic converter, you are not included in this. It is to target those crimes that we are unable to prosecute at this time. I say that it is consistent because many people know that I have been a criminal defense attorney, acting as

a public defender for most of my 21 years in that field, and I do not think we should just make new crimes just to make new crimes because I do not think that solves anything. What this does is solve the problem that we are not able to capture. If this person was caught in the act of stealing this catalytic converter, it would be a felony theft. Therefore, if you are caught with multiple of these in your possession, you have no legitimate reason to have them, and you cannot trace them to a vehicle that you own or possess, then that should also be treated similarly.

Second, this also has accountability for those people who are purchasing these catalytic converters. It is my opinion, that people probably would not steal these if there was not a market to sell them. I have worked a lot with the scrap metal industry, and there are a lot of players in that industry who do not even engage in this type of sale. On the other hand, there are people that advertise with big vinyl signs outside of their businesses that say, "We buy catalytic converters." This addresses that as well as, in the last part of the bill, making sure that there is accountability on the buyer's side. They must adhere to simple reporting requirements that are similar to the collection of other types of scrap metal that is routinely stolen like copper, or at a pawn shop where you have to provide some other type of documentation. Then there is an accountability section where they will have to provide some of that information to local law enforcement to give them the ability to prosecute, as well as provide information to the Legislature to make sure that this bill is actually having the intended effect of stopping catalytic converter theft. With that, I can go through the bill and the reprint, or I can be open for questions, whatever is your pleasure.

Chair Miller:

Yes, please briefly take us through the policy and the actual components of the bill.

Senator Nguyen:

I will start with section 2 of the bill because it defines the offense of catalytic converter theft as someone who is in possession of two or more used catalytic converters who is not properly licensed as a business that regularly deals with catalytic converters or who cannot otherwise prove through documentation that he or she is the lawful owner of the catalytic converters. Therefore, it creates the definition in the framework for this new felony charge of being in possession of a used catalytic converter. Section 3 goes on to prohibit the purchase of catalytic converters from anyone other than a properly licensed business or a person who can prove ownership of that converter. In relation to this section, I will make it very clear, and you will hear testimony during support, but it is not typical to take a used catalytic converter and put it on another vehicle. The purpose of taking off a catalytic converter is to extract those precious metals and sell it. There are very limited circumstances where you would even have these readily available to use.

Section 4 sets out the penalties associated with illegal theft, possession, and sale of the catalytic converter. You can see that there is a difference in penalty for the person who has two of these as opposed to someone who has ten of these. I think that is consistent in showing that this would be for a person who has committed this theft multiple times and therefore victimized multiple people in the community whom we may not be able to identify.

Furthermore, those penalties for theft are consistent with other theft charges that we have here in the state. Most of the time with our theft charges, the distinguishing mark between a petty larceny misdemeanor and felony theft is that \$1,200 threshold. When you steal one of these catalytic converters, you will hear that it routinely costs around \$2,500 to replace, and that is how we came up with those penalties that are consistent with other theft charges.

Section 8 sets forth provisions governing which entities a properly licensed business is allowed to purchase used catalytic converters from. This mirrors provisions that have already been discussed early on regarding who can legally possess and sell used catalytic converters that are in those first two sections. Section 9 requires scrap metal processors to keep detailed records of every catalytic converter purchase they make, including information on the date and place of the purchase, the identity of the seller, a description of the vehicle delivering the converter, a description of the vehicle from which the converter came from, and if applicable, a copy of the title vehicle and its VIN number. Similarly detailed information must be provided by the seller and included in the record, and if one scrap metal processor sells a catalytic converter to another, detailed records of those sales must also be made and kept for no less than two years. Part of the reason for this was in order to create a verifiable paper trail for all of these types of transactions.

Section 10 also provides that some of these steps can be avoided in the case of a processor and seller having a prior written agreement in place regarding the transactions, as long as there is a log kept that makes identifying catalytic converter in the scrap metal processor's inventory possible. Section 14 of the bill adds used catalytic converters to the list of scrap metal items that law enforcement may require information gathered by scrap metal processors, and this information largely mirrors those requirements in section 10. Furthermore, the statistics used for catalytic converter will also be added to the list of reports from law enforcement that are submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau. This is to ensure all of us legislators can review those reports and determine the effectiveness of this legislation.

Finally, section 15 sets forth penalties for those who violate relevant provisions of this bill. Those misdemeanors range in fines of \$1,000 to \$4,000 for the first to a third and any subsequent offenses. That is on the part of the people purchasing those in addition to any potential criminal penalties they might suffer as well. With that, I will open myself up to any questions your Committee may have, Chair.

Assemblyman Gray:

It is funny, I am a YouTube junkie—and some people like TikTok, but I like my YouTube—and there was an advertisement on there last night for a business buying used catalytic converters. Since it is obviously being done through the mail, I am wondering if there is going to be some way to cut out somebody who is not in this state. Maybe we need to get the U.S. Postal Service involved, or whoever, to keep this from happening because they are just going to find the next buyer that is out of state that is not bound by our laws.

Senator Nguyen:

This is a very real problem, and if we were to pass Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint), it would be a groundbreaking piece of legislation in our state. I think it would become something that states surrounding us would look to. I know California recently passed a series of bills that were aimed and targeted at catalytic converter theft, so our neighboring states are all addressing this. I think there was legislation started in every single state in the west and across the country because this is not a unique problem to Nevada.

I know that collecting this information and making it more difficult here may encourage people to go and sell to other states. I have read in the paper that the U.S. Attorney for the District of Nevada, Jason Frierson, was part of an operation that brought to justice a bunch of people that were selling used catalytic converters as well. Therefore, I believe this is something that would help here, and hopefully other people around us will take any legislation that we pass and show that it can be successful if we all enacted it collectively as a country.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

My question is going back to the definition in section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (e). When I hear this bill, I know what we are trying to achieve, and I think that is important, but I think of people like my dad and his friends down the street who are the type of guys that have workshops and garages filled with three versions of every tool you would ever want. All the guys in the neighborhood know they can come to them if they ever need a tool for fixing something around their house or on their car. How are we not including people like that who just happen to have a lot of stuff and like to repair things? Also, what about the people who may be on the fringes where they do get some items that they maybe should not have, but they are people who repair cars out of their houses or something like that, but they are not specifically buying things that are illegal? I guess that is two parts, but if you could address that please.

Senator Nguyen:

It is a very good question. It is definitely something that we thought about when we were drafting some of these definitions and who would be included in them. You can see we started off with some of the obvious things like an automobile wrecker, scrap metal processor, manufacturer, distributor, dealer, rebuilder, and any other licensed business that may reasonably be involved. Then paragraph (e) was intended to be that catchall section that allowed for the tinkerer, the person who may have multiple cars, and the person who goes to auctions and buys junk vehicles for parts; and part of the reason we said including, but without limitation. Therefore, if you have a legitimate reason to have used catalytic converters—say for example, you bought them—then you will have documentation of that. Or perhaps you are in a desperate situation where you want to cut off your own catalytic converter, take it in, and sell it to make \$500 to \$750, the same way you would if you were pawning off an important piece of jewelry or something, that is the intention of that definition section, to say we understand that some people are going to have these. Some people may want to even cut them off their own vehicles and sell them because they need the money. This gives them the ability to show ownership of those catalytic converters.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I appreciate that, but I also do wonder about the people who may not be able to prove proper ownership, especially because a lot of these people will keep things for many years and maybe they had proof at one point, but maybe now they do not. Perhaps they acquired one year ago and did not realize that there was a black market and thought the guy they were getting it from was legit. I am just worried that those people are going to get caught up with this. I understand that is not the intent to catch those people, but I want to make sure we are very clear that is not the intent. All we are going to have in the future is people looking at the statute and not necessarily watching this hearing.

Senator Nguyen:

It is definitely something that I thought about. I think this is such a unique product that you are not going to have many people who have used catalytic converters in their collection. If it has been used and has been cut off, you cannot just put it on another vehicle. It is not a transferable type of item that can normally be swapped between vehicles. Furthermore, under those types of circumstances, I do trust our law enforcement partners to use proper discretion. I am not even sure what the scenario would be where the police would get called out and the person had more than one used catalytic converter with no proof. It is simply not a scenario you would see very often, but I understand your concerns with the potential overreach that our law enforcement agencies might use. They might be able to address some of the discretion and some of the circumstances they would use in their investigation in a scenario like that.

Chris Ries:

It would be the totality of the circumstances. In the scenario with your dad and his garage, I do not think that would meet the level of what this bill is trying to do. It is more so for the person who is driving a car and has 40 of them in their trunk. The other thing I would say is that if you take a catalytic converter off a car, you can etch the VIN number into it, and those would then have some sort of ownership and link to the registration of the vehicle. Your concern is extremely valid, and we do not want to capture those people; we want to capture the people that are stealing the catalytic converters. I think this bill, along with writing the VIN number on that catalytic converter that was taken off the vehicle, would address your concerns.

Assemblywoman Considine:

We have heard that once you have taken these catalytic converters off, they cannot be reused, and that they are being taken for the specific types of metals that are in them. What is the process and how difficult is it to take the catalytic converter and remove those metals? Can somebody do that easily or is this only being done by professional recyclers or processors? How does that work? I ask because we are hearing that people are cutting these things off and walking around with shopping carts full of them, so if you cannot get that metal out easily, I am wondering how organized this is. Therefore, is this more of a pyramid-type crime; or are there random people doing it because they can extract those precious metals, go anywhere, and then sell it?

Chris Ries:

It is easier to take the catalytic converter off than it would be to get the precious metals out of it. It can be done, but more often than not, they are taking these to a scrapyard or a secondhand dealer, and they would be the ones to remove those metals. We have seen people cut the catalytic converter open and scoop out those precious metals, so it is not impossible, but it just takes a little bit of time. In terms of it being a larger, pyramid-type operation, we do see quite a bit of coordination, oftentimes finding a large number of these catalytic converters at once. It is not usually a single person that goes out and steals one; typically, it is more than that. Therefore, with the graduated penalties in this bill, I think it makes sense that someone caught with two to nine would be a category D felony, and then someone with ten or more, which is quite a bit of catalytic converters, would be that class C felony.

Assemblywoman Considine:

For these metals, do we know who the buyers of the metals are and whether or not their purchases spike? Do we keep track of any of that?

Senator Nguyen:

We do not currently, and that is why that is included in this bill. You will hear from some of the scrap metal people that I have been working with on this piece of legislation that they simply will not buy it. I think we can trust and verify, and this allows us to verify to see who they are. In fact, it was brought to my attention that in Reno, outside of the Nevada Parole and Probation offices, there is one of these scrap metal recyclers with a giant vinyl sign which says, "We buy catalytic converters." Therefore, there are clearly people buying them, but we do not know how many they are buying, or what condition they are purchasing them in. This will allow us to follow that, find out how many there are, and how many people are still engaging in this because there will need to be a record of those types of transactions.

Chair Miller:

I have a few questions about this as well. First, can you describe how someone would go about legally purchasing a catalytic converter? Is there a reason outside of a mechanic obtaining one to fix a vehicle or for the creation of a car?

Senator Nguyen:

This bill is only for used catalytic converters. This is not for new catalytic converters. If you want to go on Amazon and buy a catalytic converter, you can do that. If you want to go through the manufacturer and buy a new catalytic converter, you can do that. If you want to buy 100 new catalytic converters, you can do that, and you can have them in your garage to tinker around with. If you want to replace your own catalytic converter, you can order it, and you can do it in your house. There are no issues with owning as many new catalytic converters as you want. This definition is limited to used catalytic converters.

Chair Miller:

To clarify, I can legally purchase catalytic converters, correct?

Senator Nguyen:

Yes, you can.

Chair Miller:

With that, how is it determined if it is used or not? Is it based on the VIN number or is there some type of way an expert can tell if one is used or not?

Senator Nguyen:

When it is used, they are taking a saw and sawing it off the vehicle. That is why it is not reusable.

Chair Miller:

It is not necessarily the condition; it is the appearance which would identify it as used?

Senator Nguyen:

I think we have some people in the industry here in the room who can answer that question. I see Andy MacKay is here, and he may be able to get that answer for us.

Chair Miller:

It seems like this criminalization would be based on possession, where if I have these items in my possession, that would be indicative of the fact that they were stolen. In Nevada state law, what other items do we consider to be stolen just by the possession of the item or the amount of the items in possession?

Senator Nguyen:

I think the perfect example is the possession of identifying information of another. If I am in possession of a shoebox of passports or more than two of them, there is a presumption that I have them for illegal uses, and the state no longer has to prove that intent. It is one of our unique, rebuttable presumption-type felonies that we have. If I have Ms. Louie's identification (ID) and Mr. Ries's ID and they have not given me permission to have those, I have to prove that I have permission from both of them to have those in my possession. Passports, driver's licenses, or even players cards from casinos are considered forms of ID; therefore, if I had ten players cards from multiple people, the prosecution would not have to prove that I had bad intent. Many of us do not like the idea of rebuttable presumptions where you have to prove your innocence because that is not typically what we do in this country. This does not even go that far, so the prosecutor would have to prove that intent. This does not have a rebuttable presumption; in fact, we took that language out. Therefore, they would have to prove that you did or did not have ownership of two or more catalytic converters. As I said, you can have one, but if you have two, that is where you run into problems.

Chair Miller:

Are there any other examples that require the physical removal of something? That example, ID crime, is a crime more so linked with effort; creating IDs or stealing information to create them. Is there anything else that is just good, old-fashioned burglary?

Senator Nguyen:

In the scenario I offered, they are not creating IDs for the possession of the actual identity of another. This is in the instance where you have stolen these IDs; for example, you have gone to a casino, taken multiple purses, and you have all these credit cards and IDs of other people with all the personal information of multiple people. That is a situation where you might not be able to prove the crime of theft, but now you are proving the crime of possession of that.

Assemblywoman Newby:

I just wanted to clarify, the catalytic converter is a piece of equipment related to internal combustion engines, correct? Therefore, as more electric cars come out, there will be fewer of these in existence. Am I understanding that correctly?

Cevan Louie:

Yes, they only relate to automobiles that have exhaust systems that are producing those emissions such as carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxide. Electric vehicles do not produce those emissions and therefore do not require this gas emission device. Yes, that is true.

Senator Nguyen:

To follow up on that, I think that touches on why this issue is important in the district that I represent and is probably true of many of my colleagues in the Assembly with their districts. This type of crime targets certain vehicles which tend to be older vehicles whose catalytic converters are easier to take off. If someone with a \$100,000 car has their catalytic converter taken off, they can probably have it replaced. That person can probably afford rideshare, have someone in their family drive them around, or they may have multiple vehicles to quickly switch to. Due to the older nature of some of these vehicles that are targeted in these catalytic converter thefts, it is further victimizing people who need that vehicle to get to work. Then, suddenly, they cannot get to work, and they might not be able to afford the insurance deductible to get a new catalytic converter. Furthermore, supply chain issues may cause this person to wait for months for a catalytic converter to be replaced to make their car operable again. Or they are driving around without a catalytic converter, causing increased wear and tear on their vehicle, and the car may not last as long as they anticipated it would. That was something that I was concerned about and was part of my motivation in bringing this bill.

Chair Miller:

With that, I do not see any additional questions, so I will open it up for testimony. Is there anyone that would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint)?

John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protection Association:

Before the role I am currently in, I was a street cop who pushed a black and white for 13 years. I have done hundreds of car stops, I have been in thousands of homes, I have been in thousands of garages, and I cannot think of a time where I have ever seen anyone with a catalytic converter. I say that now because, if I am out there still pushing a black and white and I see someone with the catalytic converter, they probably stole it, to be honest with you. They are very hard to steal unless you have the wireless tools to do it, and that is the reason

why this law was created, because it used to not be easy to steal catalytic converters. With the inventions of wireless tools and things like that, that is what made it easier. I have known people who have had catalytic converters stolen from their vehicles, and sometimes they must have their car towed as well as report it to their insurance company. It is just a very difficult crime to deal with, and I know that Senator Nguyen has worked hard on this bill and talked to the stakeholders. We appreciate her bringing this bill and I ditto everything that Mr. Ries said.

Alfredo Alonso, representing Alliance for Automotive Innovation:

Alliance for Automotive Innovation is made up of about 23 manufacturers worldwide. We thank Senator Nguyen for bringing this bill. I think it is the smartest bill we have seen so far dealing with this issue. Just so that everyone understands, there are about 258 different manufacturers of catalytic converters in the U.S. alone. Therefore, there is no way to identify them; they are made for certain brands, some are made for certain size engines, and it varies so much, especially in a post-COVID world where you are having trouble getting them in the first place. It is a very difficult situation in terms of attaining them, so many companies have come out and started manufacturing them, but no one can keep up because obviously they are being stolen at record numbers right now.

To give everyone an idea, there are two types of catalytic converters: there is a direct fit which is obviously made for a specific vehicle, and then there are some that do fit other vehicles. To the point that was made earlier, people just do not keep these in their garages. With older vehicles you might keep various parts for your engine, et cetera, and you might think, Well, I am going to keep all this stuff. I have known those people that will keep multiple parts, and catalytic converters are not one of them. They look like a flattened loaf of bread, and they weigh between 10 and 20 pounds. It is not something you are just putting under your arm and carrying around, and I have never seen someone with one in their possession. I have been involved in various instances where I know folks who own and work on vehicles, and I have never seen one, or for that matter multiple, kept around.

We thank Senator Nguyen. It is a good approach. It is a fair approach, and I think it may actually solve some of our problems.

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

I think the previous speakers have summarized this well. First off, I want to thank Senator Nguyen for introducing this piece of legislation. As Mr. Alonso said, it is the smartest bill, and I think this is probably the smartest bill in the entire union. This is going to be a bill that I think other states are going to ultimately model after. It is a priority, not only of ours, but of our national association in every state across the union. There are two measures that are going through Congress, and we know how functional Congress is, so yeah, they are going to actually fix it in time. Therefore, I applaud her for addressing this.

A couple of things to show you in terms of the impact, I pulled some information from our dealers, and this is just one dealership in Las Vegas. Last year alone, they had \$27,000 in catalytic converters stolen from vehicles that were on the lot of the dealer; furthermore,

\$20,000 in damages in terms of individuals cutting gates, cutting fences, to get in and access the lot to be able to steal these catalytic converters. However, I think most importantly is, who are the biggest victims, and those are your constituents. Last year this store had over \$40,000 in repairs just for the cost of the catalytic converters that were stolen. Remember, that is one store in Las Vegas. This is a chronic problem, and what Senator Nguyen is doing is going to address it from both sides. I think this is a smart piece of legislation. We sincerely encourage the Committee's consideration and support of it.

Terry K. Graves, representing Nevada Trucking Association; Nevada Manufacturers Association; Enginequest, North Las Vegas, Nevada; and Western Metals Recycling, Sparks, Nevada:

Legitimate scrap metal processors have long been involved in attempting to reduce metal theft in the days of copper theft and now are attempting to help with catalytic converter theft. We had concerns about the requirement of the issue of checks in this bill. I think that has been corrected. We can now use electronic transfers which my client, Enginequest, uses. They do not do checks anymore; they only do automated clearing house payments, so I believe that has been taken care of in this bill.

Furthermore, just to describe the process for a legitimate scrap metal processor, if a seller brings a catalytic converter to their store, they will pay \$300 to \$400 for that catalytic converter. This would be from a legitimate repair shop. Or they may get a scrap vehicle in that still has the catalytic converter on it. From there, he would sell that catalytic converter to a re-processor or refiner; that refiner will tear that catalytic converter apart, reclaim the rare earth minerals in it, and then return those rare earth minerals back to manufacturers that would install them in a new product. It is to be pointed out that federal law does not allow the reuse of a catalytic converter, and that has something to do with Environmental Protection Agency standards for emission controls. There is no way to recertify a used catalytic converter; that is, economically recertify. Therefore, for somebody to reuse a used catalytic converter is actually illegal.

Chair Miller:

Mr. Graves, do you support the bill as written in the reprint?

Terry Graves:

Absolutely, we do. We thank Senator Nguyen for that. One comment from our copper theft days: if you can catch a few of these thieves, you find out that it is a small population doing most of the thefts. This bill will hopefully allow us to catch a few of these folks and make a deep cut into the number of thefts that are occurring. I will wrap up with reminding you that today is Nevada Trucking Day at the Legislature.

Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties:

We are in support of this measure and this attempt to address this massive issue across our state. When reaching out to our members, this has also impacted county vehicles across the state as well. We thank Senator Nguyen for crafting this solution and engaging

stakeholders in the interim to develop this bill. Again, the Nevada Association of Counties is in support of S.B. 243 (R2).

Isaac Hardy, representing Nevada Pic-A-Part, Las Vegas, Nevada; SA Recycling, North Las Vegas, Nevada; and Urban Consortium:

The Urban Consortium is made up of Reno, Sparks, Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas. We are in full support of this bill. This has been an ongoing issue that local governments are trying hard to resolve. I believe North Las Vegas has already adopted an ordinance addressing this issue; however, we need a more universal solution. We need to protect the single mothers and single fathers that go out to their car at 6:30 in the morning, turn it on to go to work, and their catalytic converter is gone. Now they cannot use their car and they are out \$2,500 to \$6,000. We believe that this bill will protect people like that. We want to thank Senator Nguyen for putting in a lot of effort and making sure we get this thing right. We urge the Committee's support.

Jake Matthews, representing Copart, Reno, Nevada:

Copart specializes in the resale and remarketing of used, wholesale, and salvaged title vehicles for a variety of sellers, including insurance companies, rental car companies, and local municipalities. Copart is in full support of S.B. 243 (R2) and urges its passage.

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. 243 (R2) as it is a comprehensive cure for the problem it is seeking to solve, and we want to thank Senator Nguyen for bringing the bill.

Nick Schneider, Policy Analyst, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Vegas Chamber is in support of S.B. 243 (R2), and we would like to just echo the comments made by our colleagues before us. I would like to just add, not only does the catalytic converter theft result in about \$2,500 in repairs, but for a small business especially, this also adds a loss of revenue for the downtime of that vehicle as well as increased insurance premiums. For that reason, we are in support of S.B. 243 (R2).

Michael Alonso, representing American Telephone & Telegraph Company:

American Telephone & Telegraph Company (AT&T) is in support of S.B. 243 (R2). AT&T was a member of the coalition that worked to modify scrap metal laws during the 75th Legislative Session back in 2009, and we are here today to thank Senator Nguyen for bringing this bill forward. AT&T operates a fleet of nearly 375 motor vehicles in the state of Nevada, and we are not immune from catalytic converter thefts. In the past two years, approximately 20 catalytic converters have been stolen from vehicles in our gated and fenced yards. These specifically target our bucket trucks because they sit higher off the ground, providing easier access to the catalytic converter. These thefts occur because there is a robust resale market in stolen materials. The thefts impede our ability to provide reliable and consistent service to our customers. We appreciate Senator Nguyen working with all

interested parties to bring Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) forward and are pleased to add our support.

Chelsea Capurro, representing MGM Resorts International:

I want to echo everyone's comments in support and thank Senator Nguyen for bringing this bill.

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

Putting out the official, me too, in support of Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint).

Greg Herrera, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are in support of Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) and would like to thank Senator Nguyen for working with law enforcement and other stakeholders in bringing this bill forward. We believe this bill will assist law enforcement in tackling this significant problem that affects communities throughout the state.

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:

I want to thank Senator Nguyen and Detective Ries from Metro for all the work on this bill. This was one of the highest priorities of our police department coming into session, and we appreciate the bill.

[\[Exhibit C\]](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become a part of the record in support of S.B. 243 (R2).]

Chair Miller:

I will now open it up for testimony in opposition to S.B 243 (R2). [There was none.] Then I will open it up for testimony in neutral of Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint). [There was none.] With that, I will close testimony on Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint), and welcome Senator Nguyen back up for any final remarks. There are no final remarks, so with that, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint), but welcome Senator Nguyen back up as I open the hearing for Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint). Senator Nguyen, once you are ready, please proceed.

**Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to traffic offenses.
(BDR 43-309)**

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Senate District No. 3:

I am bringing Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint). It is a cleanup bill, and I am sure you have heard that multiple times this session. I can see there are so many new people on this Committee, so I will give you a little bit of background on what Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint) does. This is a cleanup bill of Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session and Senate Bill 219 of the 81st Session. Senate Bill 219 of the 81st Session authorizes the court to suspend the driver's license of the defendant in certain circumstances. The bill was sponsored by Senate

Majority Leader Nicole Cannizzaro and had extreme bipartisan support in both houses of the Legislature. In fact, Senate Bill 219 of the 81st Session passed out of the Assembly 34 to 8, and in the Senate, it passed 17 to 4. I had the privilege of carrying Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session, which decriminalized certain minor traffic offenses, and it also passed with bipartisan support. In fact, Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session passed 38 to 1 in the Assembly and 20 to 1 in the Senate.

This bill seeks to address some of the inconsistencies that inadvertently took place between S.B. 219 of the 81st Session and A.B. 116 of the 81st Session, particularly as they relate to the suspension of a person's driver's license. More importantly, what this Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint) does is, it cleans up a lot of the implementation language that we have come to learn has taken place in the implementation of Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session. I will tell you that with Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint), I was able to get that one vote that voted against Assembly Bill 116 in the 81st Session. Senator Hansen had voted no, and he proudly voted yes on this cleanup bill because I think he recognized that there was a lot of effort that went into this.

To give new members some background on Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session, when I brought it in that 81st Session, I was in fact the fifth person to bring it, and my predecessors before me paved the way to be able to pass that legislation in such an overwhelmingly bipartisan manner. I think the first bill was brought by Michele Fiore when she was in this body, then it was brought by Tick Segerblom, then again by Jason Frierson, and during the session prior, it was brought by your now Speaker, Assemblyman Steve Yeager. I felt as though they really paved that path, expressing how this was a nonpartisan issue and that this is something that everyone can get behind, which is why we had the votes come in as they did.

With that being said, this bill went into effect on January 1 of this year, 2023, and there are lots of cleanup measures that we are still presently in the process of trying to clean up and figure out how we can have that legislative intent be implemented appropriately. We have some jurisdictions that are having an easier time, some that are struggling to find a pathway forward, and this Wednesday, I have another working group on this. I always tease that I will probably be bringing a cleanup bill to A.B. 116 of the 81st Session every year that I am humbly elected to this body.

With that, many of the things we implemented in this bill were just cleanup-related. For example, we have a traffic ticket to require information about the issuing police officer, and then we learned that our Las Vegas Paiute Police Department use Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department tickets, therefore, it did not make sense for that to be included on there. It also added to confusion because when people received a ticket, it already says who the ticket was issued by, who the police officer was, and what their badge number is on that ticket. However, I think putting the name, telephone number, address, and website for the agency on there as well was probably confusing because they may not realize that they need to go to the court and not to the police station to handle their ticket.

We had some other issues when it came to protections for those jurisdictions that continued to want prosecutors prosecuting those civil infractions. This gave them some flexibility with some normal prosecutorial immunity that they would continue to have if they chose to be a part of the civil infraction process as well. Many of our courts are also moving towards electronic notifications, whether it is text messages or emails, to remind people of when their fines are due, when to pay their ticket, or similar things. Therefore, we added some language in there that allows the collection of that type of information if people want to participate in receiving text message or email notifications. We found that to be something that is quite effective in getting people to pay their tickets. Sometimes getting that text reminder from the court about a ticket that is due with a corresponding link to how you can pay for that ticket or a reminder for them to do their traffic school is probably a more modern approach to getting people to do what they are obligated to do under the law.

We also gave some flexibility to the courts, asking them to come up with a process for how they would set aside default judgments. What this did when we decriminalized some of these minor traffic infractions was instead of having police officers come into the court, taking them off of the street and away from doing their job, they can now submit an affidavit with the relevant information, and that can be presented to the court. Therefore, instead of beyond a reasonable doubt, which is a much higher standard, now we have a preponderance of the evidence, which is a much lower standard. We will see people being able to move through this process quicker, and we will keep our needed peace and public safety officers on the streets and out of the courtroom because they will be able to provide that information.

For those of you who were not here, we also gave some flexibility to the prosecutors; if something is charged as a criminal citation, and after the prosecutors do their full investigation they choose to amend it down to a civil infraction, they have the ability to do that. We also wanted to put some further clarity in the law. Again, it was always our intent that if you are pulled over for a broken taillight and the police officer, when he comes to give you your civil citation realizes you are under the influence or smells alcohol or sees other crimes, they can continue that investigation onto those criminal things. Therefore, that does not change their job in the field at all. Neither did A.B. 116 of the 81st Session, but this brings further clarification to make sure that we understand this is first and foremost about public safety.

There are a couple of sections that we are continually working on that have come to my attention, even since this passed out of the Senate with a vote of 21 to 0. We are learning that there are exorbitant requirements for people posting a bond if they do want to challenge their civil infraction. What happens is, if you get a ticket for a civil infraction that imposes a fine of \$250 and you want to challenge it, there are some courts—not all of them—that are requiring a \$250 bond to be posted before you can even challenge the ticket. Therefore, we are looking at some of those problems, as well as some implementation problems that are taking place in some of the courts on how they set aside default judgments. Some of them do not think they can set a default judgment. What that means is, if you get a ticket and you forget to pay it, it will then go into default and get sent to collections. Well, imagine the next day you realize that you want to pay it, you just missed it, you would have to deal with

the collections process. Therefore, we are ordering the courts to come up with a process so people can go ahead and pay that ticket if they want to, and they do not have to go through that process.

Those are some of the things that we are continually working on, and I would like to say that this bill, in this reprint, is the final thing, but if we were to get a work session on this bill, I anticipate there will be some additional changes as this bill was just implemented January 1, 2023, only five months ago. I imagine we will see this bill again and as I said, I imagine I will be back here session after session trying to further clean up any of the language that is included in here. With that, I am open to any questions you might have.

Chair Miller:

I would like to remind people that we are still working on the *Nevada Constitution* and even our *U.S. Constitution*. Therefore, session after session, we anticipate the work that needs to be done. With that, do we have any questions? I do not see any questions per se but there are members who are not here who are actively paying attention, so we will ghost a question in a moment. Members may not physically be sitting here, but that does not mean they are not engaged. We will go ahead and start with Assemblywoman Newby.

Assemblywoman Newby:

I was curious about section 2.8, subsection 2, where it goes over a traffic ordinance that would be enacted by the board of county commissioners. I am not familiar with traffic ordinances they would necessarily put into place. Do you have any examples of that, or can you give sort of the genesis of that particular change?

Senator Nguyen:

I do not know if I can come up with examples, but I can explain why they need that authority. Currently, we have certain traffic offenses that are contained in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). If you are pulled over for speeding, you are given a ticket under a specific NRS. Those also determine where the money goes from the fines issued, some of which even going to the State Permanent School Fund. That is where funds collected from tickets that are written off the NRS go. When there is a gap in any law and there is no NRS for it, a county or a city, most of their charters allow them to create ordinances or misdemeanors in those areas to fill those gaps. That might be something that is unique to that location or locality, and that gives some flexibility. Speeding is speeding across the state, but there may be some unique types of traffic citations or laws that are unique to say, Clark County but that Elko County would not require.

Therefore, this gives them the flexibility, and they can already do this when it comes to criminal charges and could do that when traffic violations were criminal. Therefore, they want to be able to say, we realize that this is a gap in the NRS, but we do not think it should be a criminal misdemeanor, and we want to have our own civil citation. This allows the county to be able to do that.

Chair Miller:

If someone wants to contest a ticket—and I am thinking in traditional terms of showing up to court to contest that ticket—how does legal counsel ask questions if the police officer can just submit an affidavit? I am taking this from the idea that the police officer is not present in court and they only presented a statement. Could you speak to that?

Senator Nguyen:

Well, that is the law. This bill does not do anything to change what we passed in A.B. 116 of the 81st Session, just to make that clear. However, I can answer that question because I think it puts a context in some of the problems that we are addressing which you will see an amendment on if this bill proceeds to a work session. Prior to this change, you could be arrested and get six months in jail for a speeding ticket, a broken taillight, or any one of those previously criminal infractions. When we converted over to civil infractions for those minor traffic matters, you can no longer be incarcerated for six months for that, and you can no longer be arrested if you fail to pay your warrant or you fail to pay your ticket. When you are charged with a crime, you have certain constitutional protections including you are innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. What happened in the past was people would go in and they would plead not guilty to the criminal charge of their traffic matter, and they would request a trial. They would then have a criminal trial where they would be allowed to cross-examine, and it would be up to the city, county, state, or whoever was prosecuting that ticket to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that they had committed that charge. Obviously, incarcerating people for traffic tickets was a drain on our resources, and we rightfully agreed that policy was not correct.

Then we moved into a civil infraction, and the standard is a lot less because the consequences are less severe. You are not going to jail if you are found guilty of speeding or other smaller traffic infractions; but we still wanted to make sure there were due process protections. I think that is where we are running into some difficulty because some of the courts are treating this exactly as they would any other civil case, and I do not think that was our policy intention here. We do not want to fine and fee people to death because they are challenging a charge and are requesting due process; that is built into the statute. Currently, you see people who do not have an attorney going in wanting to contest a ticket, and they have to put a bond down like you would if you were conducting a civil trial. Then you get your trial date where, on your own, you could potentially subpoena that officer if you were not okay with just the affidavit. I do not think that is what we intended, so that is some of the language that we are looking at right now.

In addition to that, there are also problems with people who want to resolve it and they do not know whether they are going to get a reduction in points or be ordered to traffic safety school, and so they are being asked to essentially plead guilty to the civil citation without knowing what the outcome is. Therefore, that is a new process we are hoping we can clear up in statute and clarify what our intent was. I think people want to know what it is they are facing if they want to resolve it; are they getting traffic school or something else? Furthermore, I think some of those things like points, traffic school, and that type of accountability is necessary for public safety, and that is not being implemented in some

of the jurisdictions around the state currently. Therefore, I anticipate some of those things being addressed in the future. I know that does not really answer the ghost question, but I think it puts context to some changes you might see coming forward if this was to make its way to a work session.

Chair Miller:

I am doing a state-by-state comparison in my head, and it is reminding me just how complicated some of these procedures are. Not seeing any additional questions, I will open it up for testimony in support of Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint).

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

We rise in support of this bill. We worked very closely with then-Assemblywoman Nguyen, now Senator Nguyen, on this bill and we support the changes that we are working to clean up, particularly the bond for contesting a ticket. We will be with you forever on this cleanup if you need us to be.

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

We would like to thank Senator Nguyen for continuing to work on this issue. Traffic tickets were something that kept people in a cycle of poverty. There were many people that could not afford to pay traffic tickets but were scared to go to jail, would eventually get a bench warrant, get arrested while driving, lose their car, lose their house, and take a long time to get back on their feet. Assembly Bill 116 of the 81st Session started to bring a stop to that, and this bill is further refining those procedures. We are more than willing to continue to work on this issue so that a traffic ticket is not something that ruins somebody's life.

Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I want to thank the bill sponsor for bringing this forward and her continued work over the years on this issue. I echo the sentiments of my colleagues.

Adam Cate, Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

We are in support of this bill, and in response to one of the questions, the Washoe County Code Chapter 70 has a long list of traffic infractions that mirrors the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. There is actually some very specific language in the ordinances about certain areas in Washoe County for instance, where parking is illegal. Therefore, there are local issues in the code that would benefit from a change as we did for the state level, making it a civil infraction as opposed to a misdemeanor. We are in support of the bill.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We support S.B. 104 (R1), and we want to thank Senator Nguyen for her allowing us to be part of these discussions.

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

We are testifying in support of Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint). Happy to have participated in these working group sessions. This is a good start at a cleanup for the often misunderstood traffic citation system.

John Abel, Director, Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protection Association:

We support the cleanup language for the bill.

Greg Herrera, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are also in support and would like to thank Senator Nguyen for including us in these discussions.

Chair Miller:

I will now open it up for testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint).

Tom Clark, representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction:

The judges are concerned and continue to be opposed to the elements of the bill that will not allow them to revoke a driver's license. We have respectfully agreed to disagree with the sponsor of the bill on that particular provision. We do know that there are some other provisions of this bill that need some cleanup work, and we are looking forward to our Wednesday meeting to have her and the other stakeholders who have been up in support working on those key elements.

Chair Miller:

With that, I will open it up for testimony in neutral of S.B. 104 (R1). [There was none.] I will go ahead and close the hearing on Senate Bill 104 (1st Reprint) because our presenter has left and there will be no final remarks on the bill.

Our last order of business today is public comment.

[There was no public comment.]

Assembly Committee on Judiciary

May 1, 2023

Page 23

With that, this concludes our business for the day. I will see everyone back at 8 a.m. tomorrow morning. This meeting is adjourned [at 10:32 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 letter dated May 1, 2023, submitted by Howard Handler, Senior Director, Strategy, Policy, and Government Affairs, National Insurance Crime Bureau, in support of Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint).