

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-ninth Session  
March 10, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:03 p.m. on Friday, March 10, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator David R. Parks, Chair  
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair  
Senator Julia Ratti  
Senator Joseph P. Hardy  
Senator Pete Goicoechea

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senatorial District No. 6  
Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst  
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel  
Debi Szaro, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Adam Mayberry, Community Relations Manager, City of Sparks  
Shirle T. Eiting, Senior Assistant City Attorney, Sparks City Attorney's Office  
Robert O. LaRiviere, Chairperson, Sparks Charter Committee  
Holly Welborn, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Tess Opferman  
Caleb Harris, United Veterans Legislative Council  
Fred E. Wagar, Disabled American Veterans

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 10, 2017  
Page 2

Richard Carreon, Nevada Veterans Association  
Caesar O. Melgarejo, Veterans Policy Analyst, Office of the Governor  
Sean McDonald, Administrator, Division of Central Services and Records,  
Department of Motor Vehicles

CHAIR PARKS:

I open the hearing today with two bills and a work session. I will start the meeting on Senate Bill 202.

**SENATE BILL 202**: Revises various provisions of the Charter of the City of Sparks. (BDR S-503)

SENATOR JULIA RATTI (Senatorial District No. 13):

The City of Sparks Charter does set out the manner in which elections are to be held for local officials. The City Attorney, the Mayor and the Municipal Court Judges are elected by citywide elections at both the primary and general elections. These officials are required to live within the City boundaries. The City Council members must reside in the ward for which they are elected to represent. In the primary election only residents of that ward may vote for them, but in the general election, the top two Council candidates go forward and are elected on a citywide basis.

It is a concern that this voting system may create an inequitable result. A Council member of a district may win the general citywide election although the registered voters in the district the Council member represents may have voted for another candidate. The ward's choice may not necessarily be successful in a citywide election. This charter bill seeks to change that so we go to what is known as ward-only voting where the City Council members would be elected by ward-only in the primary and a ward-only in the general election. The Sparks Municipal Court Judge is not required to be an attorney who is admitted to the Nevada State Bar, and we would like to change that.

The municipal courts have evolved significantly as well as the legal issues they face since the Charter was first conceived. They must make judgments on setting bail, deciding evidentiary issues, granting protection orders and overseeing specialty courts. The City of Sparks is one of the few cities our size that allows nonattorneys to preside as court judges. Those are the two significant changes in this bill to the City of Sparks Charter.

ADAM MAYBERRY (City of Sparks):

I want to give an overview of how we got to the issue with the hybrid election system. There were two reasons for bringing forward a charter bill amendment addressing the City of Spark's hybrid election system. One reason is the case of *Public Integrity Alliance, Inc. v. City of Tucson*, 805 F.3d 876 (9th Cir. 2015). The Ninth Circuit ruled that the Tucson hybrid system of voting was unconstitutional. In 2016, the full Ninth Circuit ruled that the hybrid system did not violate the U.S. Constitution. The matter is set for a conference before the U.S. Supreme Court for later next week to determine whether the Court will hear the case.

The Sparks Charter Committee was briefed on the issues the hybrid system creates under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The voting system that utilizes a citywide voting structure may violate section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. A citywide election for council members is one method used in other jurisdictions to dilute a minority vote. The inequity created by the system may result in a council member of a district winning the general election citywide, although the voters in the district itself voted for a different candidate.

It is the desire of the Sparks Charter Committee to seek amendments to the City Charter to mandate ward-only voting for Council member candidates in Sparks. Senate Bill 202 is straight forward. Under Section 1, charter section 1.060, subsection 5 seeks to require each Municipal Judge in the city to be a licensed member of the State Bar of Nevada. Section 2, charter section 5.010, subsection 5, eliminates the hybrid voting system so City Council members must be voted upon in the general election only by registered voters of the ward that the candidates seek to represent. Currently, each Council member is voted for by all registered voters of the City in the general election, and candidates are currently only voted for by registered voters of the ward they seek to represent in the primary election. Section 3, charter section 5.020, subsection 3 provides clarity stating that if one candidate receives the majority of the vote in the primary, he or she is declared the winner. This is consistent with other city charters throughout the State.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The City Council seats will only run in the primary? The language states if you get the majority of the votes in the primary, then you are deemed elected.

SENATOR RATTI:

In many elections that are nonpartisan, you run in one district both in the primary and in the general elections. If you achieve 50 percent of the vote in the primary, you win. We have not been able to do that because of the bifurcated system. The current system allows you to run in the ward for the primary and citywide in the general election. It would not make sense to follow that 50 percent rule. Now we will be aligning our system to the typical system of a representative ward system. It makes sense to apply the more common practice of a candidate getting 50 percent of the votes in the primary, the candidate wins the election because the dynamics of the election are not changing.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Do you mean 50 percent plus 1 percent?

SENATOR RATTI:

Yes, it is 50 percent plus 1 percent. I know this Committee has seen has seen ward-only bills in the past. There is a significant distinction in this situation because the Charter Committee is coming forward and asking for this change.

SENATOR HARDY:

If there are two people running in the primary, is one going to win outright?

SENATOR RATTI:

If only two people file, they just go to the general election in this new system; if three people file, you would have a runoff, and the top two would move to the general election.

SENATOR HARDY:

Unless there is a 50 percent winning.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Because of that response, at a primary election, regardless of the number of candidates, it does not state if there are more than two candidates.

SENATOR RATTI:

Yes. Regardless of the number of candidates, the odds of getting more than 50 percent of the votes change. I see what you are saying.

SHIRLE T. EITING (Senior Assistant City Attorney, Sparks City Attorney's Office):  
The current structure is if there are only two candidates, there is not a necessity to have a primary. Both candidates would go to the general election. That is in another section of the charter. When there are three and one obtains a majority, then that candidate is declared the winner. If there is not a majority winner, then the two top candidates would proceed to the general election.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Maybe if the bill read: if a primary is held, the only thing that mandates a primary being held is the fact that there would be over two candidates. Maybe that would be clearer.

HEIDI CHLARSON: (Counsel):

There is a section of law of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 293.180, which provides that in order for there to be a primary, there has to be more than two candidates. If there are only two candidates in the city election, both candidates would go on the general election ballot and there would be no primary. It is just not clear in this bill because it is another section of law not related to the city charter that determines that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am fine with that as long as it is on the record.

SENATOR HARDY:

A Charter Commission reviewed and approved it? Did it then go to the City Council for approval?

MS. EITING:

No. The Charter Committee is a separate committee. The City Council was notified of the Charter Committee's vote. The City Council does not take a position on the Charter bills.

SENATOR HARDY:

Did the City Council provide an opinion about it?

MS. EITING:

We do not ask the City Council because we view the Charter Committee and the City Council as two separate entities. The Charter Committee is the one that

asked Senator Ratti to sponsor the bill. The Council remains neutral on the Charter Committee's recommendations.

SENATOR RATTI:

I served eight years on the Sparks City Council, and I was affiliated with four charter bills. Regardless of the content of the charter bill request, we have a strong philosophy in the City of Sparks that it is the Charter Committee's job to make the Charter recommendations. Typically, the City Council does not take a position on any of them.

SENATOR HARDY:

The Ninth Circuit said it was okay, but we are waiting for the U.S. Supreme Court to say it is okay, the way it is now?

MS. EITING:

There is a conference set for March 17, which is when the U.S. Supreme Court will render the decision whether to grant the writ of certiorari and to accept the case, so the case is pending.

SENATOR RATTI:

I wanted to note because it will be coming forward, the City of Reno has a similar bill. It started on the Assembly side and just passed off the Floor. Reno is doing the same thing, so it will make our communities relatively consistent.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The Charter Committee's functions are actually defined by the Charter. Some of them do require ratification by the Council with a recommendation. I guess it depends on what the Charter says. I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. MAYBERRY:

Every charter in the State is different. The City of Sparks specifically states that the Charter Committee is separate and autonomous from the City Council. The Chairperson of the Charter Committee will testify.

CHAIR PARKS:

You have three candidates, one wins the majority and on page 5 in section 3, charter section 5.020, subsection 3, states, "Such candidate shall enter upon his or her respective duties at the first regular City Council meeting next succeeding the meeting at which the canvass of the returns ... ." I just noticed

this is for the general election. I was thinking how that would complicate things if it were a primary. I stand corrected, my apologies.

ROBERT O. LARIVIERE (Chairperson, Sparks Charter Committee):

We reviewed the Sparks Charter in March and April 2016 and discussed and debated the merits of eliminating the hybrid system of voting. We concluded it was the right thing to do to provide the true and fair representation of the voters' choice for their Council representatives in each respective ward. The Committee also feels the newly elected Municipal Judges should be licensed members of the State Bar.

CHAIR PARKS:

It appears the City of Sparks has a nonattorney as the Municipal Judge?

Ms. EITING:

Both Municipal Court Judges at this time are attorneys.

CHAIR PARKS:

I was reading the language in the bill as to the effective date.

Ms. EITING:

I apologize. Our Municipal Court Judges are elected. Out of an abundance of caution, we put language in the bill that it would not take effect until the current judges were up for election.

CHAIR PARKS:

The language gave me the presumption that maybe one of the judges was not an attorney.

HOLLY WELBORN (American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

We support S.B. 202. We are thrilled this bill is being put forward to avoid future confusion in the U.S. Supreme Court about the legalities and potential legal violations under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the "one person, one vote," a provision of the Constitution.

This is taking steps to put in the protections on the front end before the City of Sparks opens itself up to lawsuits. We are very pleased to see this bill, and we believe that unless this bill passes, the City of Sparks will remain open to potential lawsuits. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 prohibits voting

practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color or membership in one minority language group.

The hybrid system of voting as structured dilutes the vote and diminishes the voice of the voters in the ward which the Council person represents. This could not be more apparent than in the 2016 Sparks City Council Ward 1 race. Sparks City Council Ward 1 is majority-minority Ward. There were two Hispanic individuals who have run for the Ward 1 seat. The prevailing candidate in the 2016 primary was a Latina woman, Denise Lopez. Ms. Lopez won her ward in the primary by more than 50 percent of the vote and lost in the general election by less than 2 percent. During the general election, Ms. Lopez received the endorsements of several reputable organizations, including the *Reno Gazette Journal* and local labor unions. The consensus was that Ms. Lopez won both debates and was the best candidate for the position. When I looked at the results, Ms. Lopez also won her ward handily at 50 percent of the vote in the general election. Sometimes there are upsets in elections, but this result was due to the fact Ms. Lopez had to run at large in the general election. Whether section 2 is an issue or race is an issue, the system is fundamentally unfair. As a matter of policy, it should be changed. Without change, this circumstance is likely to happen again.

TESS OPFERMAN:

I support S.B. 202, specifically the removal of the hybrid voting system in the City of Sparks ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR PARKS:

I close the hearing on Senate Bill 202. I will open the hearing on S.B. 191.

**SENATE BILL 191**: Establishes a standard for evidence of eligibility for any benefit, program or assistance provided to a veteran with a military service-connected disability. (BDR 37-803)

SENATOR NICOLE J. CANNIZZARO (Senatorial District No. 6):

Senate Bill 191 establishes a standard of evidence of eligibility for any benefit program or assistance provided to a veteran with a military service-connected disability. Senate Bill 191 will provide consistency among various statutes related to veterans with a service-connected disability as determined at the federal level.



Section 1 of Senate Bill 191 adds a new section to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 417, Veterans' Services, and Honorary Recognition Related to Military Service. Section 1 of provides that for the purpose of eligibility for any benefit, program or assistance provided to a veteran with a service-connected disability:

1. The veteran shall be deemed to be a veteran with a service-connected disability to the extent determined by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs; and 2. A certificate from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs or any other military document which indicates that the veteran has incurred a service-connected disability and which indicates the percentage of that disability is sufficient evidence: (a) That the veteran has incurred a service-connected disability; and (b) Of the total percentage of the service-connected disability.

This bill is seeking to create a standardized definition that mirrors the definition of a service-connected disability at the federal level, so it will apply for local and State benefits as well.

Sections 2 through 8 of this bill make conforming changes throughout the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. Section 2 makes conforming changes to NRS 333 relevant to State purchasing by the Purchasing Division that provides a preference for a bid or proposal submitted by a local business owned and operated by a veteran with a service-connected disability. Section 3 makes conforming changes to NRS 338, relevant to preferences for awarding a contract for certain public works to a local business owned and operated by a veteran with a service-connected disability. Sections 4 through 7 make conforming changes to NRS 482 relevant to vehicle licensing and registration to all special license plates for which a veteran with a service-connected disability is eligible to be issued. Section 8 makes conforming changes to NRS 502 of licenses, tags and permits relevant to the issuance without charge of hunting and fishing licenses for certain veterans with a service-connected disability.

Section 9 includes the effective dates. Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 are effective upon passage and approval. Sections 4 and 6, relevant to special license plates for a veteran who survived Pearl Harbor or a veteran who was awarded the Purple Heart, respectively, has some flexibility in the effective date based upon the enactment of A.B. No. 250 of the 78th Session. Senate Bill 191 provides for those two sections to become effective on the earlier of either July 1, 2018,

or the date upon which the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles pursuant to section 7 of chapter NRS 62, *Statutes of Nevada 2015*, notifies the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau that sufficient resources are available to enable the Department to carry out the amendatory provisions.

This bill does change the definition as a whole for what qualifies as service-connected disability of disabled veterans. It would also affect NRS 361 and NRS 371, which deal with property tax exemptions for disabled veterans and also Governmental Services Tax. This would change the definition within the NRS so veterans with a service-connected disability rated at the federal level would also be eligible for State benefits.

There were fiscal notes submitted by four departments: the Department of Administration, the Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Veterans Services and the Department of Wildlife. There were no fiscal impacts.

I have had conversations with interested groups about this legislation who will be proposing a slight change to this bill in section 1, regarding "a business owned or operated by a veteran." In order to conform with the statutes, the statement would be "owned and operated by a veteran." Additionally, in section 1, subsection 2, "a certificate from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs ..." will be replaced with an amendment that would state, "A certificate or electronic verification based upon implementation of electronic databases" that may affect how this is applied going forward.

I urge your support for this legislation to establish a standard for evidence of eligibility that is consistent with that at the federal level to provide consistency for Nevada's veterans.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

I agree with where you are heading, but I have one concern where it states "a certificate from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs or any other military document ... ." A veteran in Elko is receiving his services for a disability and suddenly he relocates to Reno and the service providers do not accept the documents he has or an adjustment is made to the percentage of the service-connected disability. I would like to see this document being issued by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. This is your service disability and no questions asked rather than any other document because down the road, the

document may be rejected or the certificate may be required. What are your thoughts?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Specifically, the circumstance you are referring to is what we hope to alleviate with this legislation by enabling any document to satisfy that requirement because we had heard there were discrepancies when applying for different benefits if it were in a different county or city. Mr. Harris may be able to shed some additional light on that. The reason and intent of that language in this bill is to address that issue so whatever documentation a veteran has to show, his or her service-connected disability would be accepted when applying for benefits.

CALEB HARRIS (United Veterans Legislative Council):

The United Veterans Legislative Council represents a collaboration of Nevada veterans groups and advocates. Some of the groups involved with UVLC are the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, American Legion, Vietnam Veterans of America, Purple Heart Association, Marine Corps League and Women Veterans.

We unanimously support S.B. 191. The intent of the bill is to standardize the interpretation of veterans' disability ratings throughout the State by utilizing the existing system established by the governing body on such ratings, the U.S. Department of Veteran's Affairs (VA). There are several varying interpretations of the Individual Unemployability (IU) rating. This bill will correct inequities and ensure that misinterpretation of these standards in the future does not take place. Mr. Wagar will answer your question, Senator Goicoechea.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is it any other military document of the United States or does that only apply to NRS 417 with regard to the United States of America military documents?

MR. HARRIS:

The reason for the military documents is the point when there would be a gap in the process. A veteran may not have a rating from the VA; therefore, the military interpretation of the disability rating would be applicable in this case. If there was not a catchall in the bill and it was left for the VA to process, then there may be some veterans left out of the benefits processing because they had not yet received that rating from the VA.

SENATOR HARDY:

So it would be an official document; it would not just be a doctor's note from the clinic?

MR. HARRIS:

I would presume it needs to be an official document. I was not involved with that particular aspect of the bill, but I would presume it would absolutely have to be a United States official document. A document from the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) would be ideal.

SENATOR HARDY:

It would be great if we had a list of those kinds of documents that would be acceptable.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

To Senator Hardy's point, the intent of this bill is for the service-connected disability to be on a United States military document. I will be happy to follow up on language to make it easier for this bill to apply and potentially include a list of documents. The only potential concern is there may be some other document a veteran may have that is not on the list but may qualify as an official military document, and we would want veterans to be able to use a particular document.

CHAIR PARKS:

I know from my own experience. I received a letter from the former Veterans Administration. I would assume that after leaving the service and then pursuing a disability status, the VA would provide that documentation.

FRED E. WAGAR ( Disabled American Veterans):

At the last state convention, the Disabled American Veterans passed resolution 1001 to fully support all levels of government to recognize IU as 100 percent for all State purposes ([Exhibit D](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

We will have a certificate from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs and it will indicate the total percentage of the disability as sufficient evidence. I need clarification on the percentage. I am not aware of county assessors being able to devalue or discount the amount of service by deciding you qualify for a veterans disability exemption. I was not aware that the county

assessors state you are going to receive a 50 percent service because that is what your certificate shows. How do you deal with that? The bill says the total percentage of that disability, so then do they have to look at the certificate and provide only 50 percent of the value because that is what your disability is rated?

MR. HARRIS:

An example is an issue we are dealing with in Senate Bill 141 that Senator Hardy is sponsoring. Last Session, there was a bill for disabled veterans license plates. The language was that 100 percent disabled veterans would be eligible to qualify for the license plate. In our minds, the IU veterans would qualify because they are also rated at 100 percent by the federal definition. When it went through the DMV, they implemented that for veterans who did have the 100 percent rating. As Mr. Wager explained, the matrix as to how the IU eligibility rating is determined is intricate. The IU may not have that overall 100 percent rating, but we intended that the bill would apply for those individuals with IU; however, the bill was implemented in a different way by DMV and differently in each county. That is an example of the inequities taking place that we hope this bill will rectify.

**SENATE BILL 141:** Revises provisions relating to special license plates for veterans with a qualifying service-connected disability. (BDR 43-636)

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I come out of the rurals, and I think the assessors may not understand this matrix; it requires clarification.

MR. WAGAR:

If the language needs to be altered, we just want to ensure that those receiving IU through the federal government are recognized by the federal government as receiving 100 percent disability benefits, and that the same treatment is initiated through the State and its counties. We have counties doing different things.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am concerned about veterans who may have a percentage lower than 100 percent, say 60 percent or 70 percent. Who is going to make the determination that they only get 60 percent or 70 percent of the benefit? Your

testimony is that a veteran requires a rating of 100 percent disabled or 100 percent IU disabled.

RICHARD CARREON (Nevada Veterans Association):

In response to Senator Goicoechea's question regarding documentation, the Committee may not know that when you have a service-connected disability, a lot of the folks also go through the medical retirement board. It is not just a medical evaluation, it is a concurrent evaluation performed by the Department of Defense and VA simultaneously. This is a Medical Evaluation Board Narrative Summary (NARSUM) in addition to the orders that the DOD provides that can be used as official documentation to legitimize the veteran's service-connected disability. The preliminary NARSUM is a document certified by the DOD and is normally accepted at the point when the VA eligibility criteria has been established. There are already three documents, and a fourth document is Combat-Related Special Compensation (CRSC) which annotates the amount of service-connected disability of the veteran related to combat. The NARSUM created as a preliminary official document along with the CRSC and all points in between are documents accepted by the county assessors.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

My goal is to ensure that the person behind the counter at DMV or in the county assessor's office, to whom the veteran presents the DOD or VA document for verification, can easily interpret the document and determine the veteran qualifies to provide the service.

MR. HARRIS:

I will task myself to ensure I get a list of the specific documents that would pertain so the service provider can review and specifically determine the veteran's status by comparing the list with what the veteran is presenting for verification. Would that be acceptable?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I think it would be extremely helpful because we are saying these people do not want to help. Truly, they do not know what is acceptable. If it is in NRS 417, they will search and find what is an acceptable document.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The requests from Senator Goicoechea and Senator Hardy will help to alleviate some of the concerns. This concludes my testimony.

MR. CARREON:

I am in support of S.B. 191. This bill will alleviate the confusion about which documents are accepted. I have gone through the medical retirement process, and there is no stress-free part of the process. Post-service through the VA, you feel pried and prodded like a biological experiment. For veterans who have a service-connected disability, this bill will alleviate that additional stress by saying there is no other requirement needed, and the State will conform to DOD and VA guidelines.

I am an 80 percent service-connected disabled veteran. There are requirements from the State that some veterans, including myself, have to go through an additional medical examination by the State to determine eligibility for social security disability and other benefits. This bill would alleviate that compounded issue of having to visit multiple doctors, organizations and facilities, and would make the medical packet that the VA recognizes as part of the eligibility record for the State.

CAESAR O. MELGAREJO (Policy Analyst, Office of the Governor):

I am neutral on S. B. 191. Governor Brian Sandavol supports S. B. 191 which is consistent with the Governor's goal of making Nevada the most veteran- and military-friendly State in the Nation. Establishing what evidence is deemed sufficient proof will alleviate some of the frustrations our veterans have experienced in the past. The Governor's Office has received many complaints and concerns throughout the year regarding the one form from the military that states they are IU and are receiving veteran's compensation at the 100 percent rating. As stated earlier, the VA form states the veteran is certified at the 60 percent rate. There are inconsistencies with the process in the language in S.B. 191. The language amendments will help alleviate some of the frustrations for our veterans.

CHAIR PARKS:

I notice there is a representative from the Department of Motor Vehicles in the room. I realize that in the rural areas, the DMV relies upon elected officials to create some of the DMV duties.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 10, 2017  
Page 16

SEAN McDONALD (Administrator, Division of Central Services and Records,  
Department of Motor Vehicles):

We are neutral on S.B. 191. I appreciate the clarification comment from Senator Goicoechea. That would certainly help us as an enhancement in policy to attempt a better flow in processing.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

My wife spent 36 years as a field technician for the DMV and local assessor's office, so I have to be careful about what we load up.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I will work on amendments to clarify the language.

CHAIR PARKS:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 191. We will proceed to the work session which has three bills. We can proceed with Senate Bill 197.

**SENATE BILL 197**: Extends the deadline for issuing certain bonds for certain environmental improvement projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR S-493)

JENNIFER RUEDY (Policy Analyst):

I will explain the provisions of S.B. 197 as contained in the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 197.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is S.B. 198.

**SENATE BILL 198**: Extends the deadline for issuing certain bonds relating to the property and natural resources of Nevada approved by the voters in 2002. (BDR S-494)



Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 10, 2017  
Page 17

Ms. RUEDY:

I will go through the work session document on S.B. 198 ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 198.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR PARKS:

Our final bill on work session is Senate Bill 148.

**SENATE BILL 148**: Revises provisions relating to veterans. (BDR 37-57)

Ms. RUEDY:

Senate Bill 148 was heard on Wednesday, March 8. I will go through the work session document on S.B. 148 ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 148.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

SENATOR PAT SPEARMAN (Senatorial District No. 1):

On behalf of veterans or loved ones affected by this bill, I would like to thank all veterans for their service. This bill will go a long way in helping our veterans who are suffering in silence.

MR. CARREON:

The 14 years I was on active duty we had been under the policy "don't ask, don't tell." During that time frame, I had eight soldiers under my supervision who were identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer. Seven of the eight were midterm career soldiers with four or more years of service and in their second or third enlistment. Two of the eight were deployed once, and

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 10, 2017  
Page 18

three were sent overseas and assigned with other responsibilities. Because of the "don't ask, don't tell" process, they were involuntarily separated from the military, not seeing any benefits of their service. This bill would align Nevada with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense policies.

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

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 10, 2017  
Page 19

CHAIR PARKS:

The work session is now complete. I will adjourn this hearing at 2:11 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Debi Szaro,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
S.B. 202	C	2	Tess Opferman	Written Testimony
S.B. 191	D	3	Fred E. Wagar / Disabled American Veterans	Written Testimony
S.B. 197	E	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 198	F	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 148	G	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document