

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session
April 21, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:06 a.m. on Friday, April 21, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Cecelia González (excused)
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Diane Abbott, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Melissa Friend, Manager, Emergency Management Programs, Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, Office of the Military
Jon Bakkedahl, Deputy Administrator, Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, Office of the Military
Andrew LePeilbet, Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Counsel
Brittany Benesi, Senior Legislative Director, Western Division, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Rebecca Goff, Nevada State Director, Humane Society of the United States
Bob Rilling-Smith, Legislative Analyst/Community Outreach Coordinator, American Kennel Club

Chair Torres:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] Welcome to the hardest-working Committee in the Nevada State Legislature, the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, meeting for the first time this week.

We have three bill presentations today. I do not expect them to be too long. We will take them in order. We will begin with Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint). Please begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to emergency management. (BDR 36-237)

Melissa Friend, Manager, Emergency Management Programs, Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, Office of the Military:

I am here to testify in support of Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint). The State Disaster Identification Coordination Committee (SDICC) was added to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 414 in 1997, revised after the tragedy of 1 October, and again in 2021 in the efforts to streamline the reunification and identification of victims during an emergency, disaster, public health emergency, or other health event. In the 2021 revision, some of the law was redacted through miscommunications in agency conversations with external partners. Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint) seeks to add some language that was removed in error as it pertains to the information sharing between agencies. Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint) also adds language protecting any member of the SDICC from civil action in the disclosure of information done in good faith. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Torres:

Committee members, do you have any questions? [There were none.]

I do have one quick question. I am looking at section 5 of the bill where it talks about the number of the medical record of the person treated. What is that number exactly? I am referring to section 5, subsection 2, paragraph (b), on page 7.

Melissa Friend:

The number of the medical record of the person treated would be in relation to a chart number.

Chair Torres:

Are all the records going to be consistent within all of the hospitals in the state of Nevada? I am wondering why that identifying information would be critical?

Jon Bakkedahl, Deputy Administrator, Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, Office of the Military:

It would be to use that as the individual patient identification number versus the patient's name when we are transferring records.

Chair Torres:

Then what would be the plan if there was a number that was repetitive? If I am at hospital A and then hospital B, are the numbers going to be aligned with one another? Will hospital A and hospital B never have the same chart number, and if they do, how would they be identified then?

Jon Bakkedahl:

It would be identified by the medical facility first and then the patient identification number.

Chair Torres:

I appreciate it. That clarifies it for me. Committee members, do you have any additional questions?

Assemblyman Nguyen:

In terms of the resource that you currently have, and I am looking at the early section of the bill, section 2, subsection 2, that talks about if the State Disaster Identification Coordination Committee shall prepare for and coordinate the sharing of information among state, local, and tribal governmental agencies regarding persons who appear to have been injured or killed. In terms of those situations that you are already dealing with, how are your language access services in terms of those situations? Do you have the ability to work with other agencies in terms of providing the language needed if you were to communicate to the community at large in terms of certain things that require a language translation? Is there a process or is it already in place?

Melissa Friend:

The Division was lucky in getting an access and functional needs coordinator. She is currently located in Las Vegas. We would work with her for translation in addition to American Sign Language.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Do you know how many languages you are covering currently with that coordinator? If you do not know the answer, you can get that to me later.

Melissa Friend:

I will follow up with you on that. I am not sure.

Assemblyman Carter:

Back to what the speaker asked about the data that is there on page 7, what kind of protections and procedures are there in the event of a data breach with all that personal medical and demographic data? Are there any plans, or what would happen?

Jon Bakkedahl:

Those policies and procedures would be developed by the SDICC themselves, which is the membership of the two medical examiners, the coroners, and it includes the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) Privacy Officer, to make sure that all those requirements are being met; but until this gets approval, that policy and procedure has not been created.

Assemblyman Carter:

I am a freshman this year, so bear with me. What you are telling me then is that those issues will be dealt with in the regulation process once they are in statute.

Jon Bakkedahl:

Yes, that is correct, sir.

Chair Torres:

Something that we could do is clarify that, too, in the bill by adding that the SDICC that you mentioned is required to create the regulations if a data breach were to occur.

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? [There were none.] We will invite anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 2 (R1).

Andrew LePeilbet, Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Counsel:

We support S.B. 2 (R1). It is cleaning up our regulations moving forward, and it is helpful. I like the questions about the security of the individual patients. We have 279,000 veterans in our state and when you count the active military and their families, it comes to half a million. That is 16 percent of our population. I know you have heard this from me before, but we are a significant element. This is for the security of all of us, and we support the bill.

Chair Torres:

At this time, is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of S.B. 2 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in support of S.B. 2 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 2 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 2 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify neutral to S.B. 2 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on phone line wishing to testify neutral to S.B. 2 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will invite the bill sponsor to give any closing remarks. [There were none.]

I will close the hearing on S.B. 2 (R1). We will go ahead and proceed, moving on to Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint): Revises the membership of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. (BDR 19-236)

Jon Bakkedahl, Deputy Administrator, Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, Office of the Military:

Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint) addresses the membership of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security, chaired by the Governor. The commission was created by the Nevada Legislature in the 2003 Session and established a group to provide advice and counsel to the Governor on homeland security to coordinate Nevada's homeland security concerns and recommend funding for the State Homeland Security Grant Program.

In the 81st Legislative Session, the Division of Emergency Management (DEM) was transferred from the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to the Office of the Military. When this happened, the seat on the commission that was designed for DPS/DEM was maintained by DEM as called out in the existing *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). Division of Emergency Management is requesting an additional position to be put in statute NRS 239C.120 to include the ability of the Governor to add an employee of the Department of Public Safety to the commission. Division of Emergency Management submitted an amendment for a change in verbiage after the Senate committee hearing. The language was discussed, agreed upon, and supported by DPS, and is reflected in the current action. I will take any questions that you have.

Chair Torres:

Committee members, do you have any questions?

Assemblyman Nguyen:

I was looking into the existing makeup of the commission. I am not sure if we are looking at the folks who are underrepresented in terms of the rural area, like communities which are under 100,000 in population. Where are their voices in terms of this commission?

Jon Bakkedahl:

The commission was designed and developed for the funding based upon the grant operations that we receive. The majority of that funding goes to the intelligence centers in the urban areas and then for programs primarily based in those urban areas as well. There is some representation. It is just a lot smaller than the two major urban environments in the state.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Can you point me to that—where those folks are represented, because right now I do not see them represented anywhere.

Jon Bakkedahl:

Could I send you the list of that information offline? I do not have the current membership list in front of me.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Great. I appreciate that.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

It looks like you are recommending an additional member with going from fifteen to sixteen. Typically, a committee or group will have an odd number for voting purposes. Have you given any consideration to the need for that?

John Bakkedahl:

There are additional members, ma'am, that the Governor has appointed to the committee. If I can send you the list as well, you will see all the current membership on there. There is a mandatory list of membership and then there are the other appointees by the Governor.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

This is not a comprehensive list then?

Jon Bakkedahl:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

You can send that to the to the Chair, and she will distribute that.

Chair Torres:

I am going to have the Legal Division clarify the makeup of the committee.

Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:

I was going to point out, especially for Assemblyman Nguyen's question, NRS 239C.120 requires there to be sixteen voting members in addition to the president or CEO or the designee of the Nevada Broadcasters Association as a voting member, but the people you see broken down in paragraphs (a) through (f) are not the entire composition of the committee. There are additional members that are left to the Governor's discretion to appoint within that number. I believe any representation from rural communities is not required by NRS, but the Governor has the authority to appoint those people for some of those other undesignated seats.

Chair Torres:

Committee members, do you have any additional questions? [There were none.] We will go ahead and invite anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 3 (R1).

Andrew LePeilbet, Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Counsel:

We are in support of S.B. 3 (R1) and the addition of the one member to the committee.

Chair Torres:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of S.B. 3 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in support of S.B. 3 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 3 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on phone line wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 3 (R1)? [There was no one.] I invite anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 3 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 3 (R1)? [There was no one.]

At this time, I will invite the bill sponsor for any closing words. [There were none.] We will go ahead and close the hearing on S.B. 3 (R1) and move on to Senate Bill 331.

Senate Bill 331: Revises provisions relating to state and local emergency management plans. (BDR 36-813)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

I am here to present Senate Bill 331 with Brittany Benesi from the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA). What S.B. 331 does essentially is it requires emergency management plans to include provisions for people's pets. We discovered over the interim that in emergency situations, especially where there are evacuations for wildfires or extreme weather like blizzards, in certain areas the guidance to people with animals has been inconsistent, both telling them never to leave their animals behind, but also telling them to ensure that they have a place for their animals to go. Many shelters do not allow animals, or many of the temporary sheltering areas set up in schools, churches, parking lots, and the like do not allow animals. What S.B. 331 does is it requires that a municipality or county or another jurisdiction that is creating an emergency management plan accounts for these considerations in their planning and provides some guidance for people who have pets and, where possible, even provides for a shelter that allows people to bring their pets with them.

My colleagues and my copresenter can speak a little bit more to this, but we do know that one of the main reasons that people ignore evacuation orders is because they are concerned about pets that they do not want to leave behind. It is also a common cause of people breaking evacuation orders and returning to homes, businesses, et cetera, to retrieve animals. We are hoping that by keeping animals and people together, we can keep both animals and people safe. I will turn it over to my colleague for some further comments.

Brittany Benesi, Senior Legislative Director, Western Division, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals:

This bill updates state statute to ensure that emergency operation plans address, to the extent possible, the evacuation, transport, and shelter needs of people with pets. It will also ensure that emergency plans designate at least one emergency shelter that is able to accommodate people with pets, policy that will improve public preparedness, increase evacuation compliance, and streamline emergency response for when the next disaster strikes.

As you may know, the ASPCA has a long history of supporting local governments and disaster response efforts. Our national field team deploys nationwide to assist in relocation, search and rescue, sheltering, and reunification efforts during disaster events. They have seen time and again the importance and benefits of planning for evacuation, transport, and particularly shelter needs of people and pets, and the risks associated to public safety when we fail to do so. As Senator Scheible noted, research has found that pet ownership is the highest factor for risk of evacuation noncompliance, risk that can be especially high in families without children. A failure to evacuate during an emergency endangers not only the residents, of course, but the first responders responsible for the evacuation area. Similarly, it estimates that 80 percent of people who prematurely reenter an evacuation site do so to retrieve a pet. Notably, abandonment or unintended separation from a pet during an emergency is heavily associated with post-traumatic stress and other psychopathologies, even more so than the loss of one's home during a disaster.

As you know, disaster risks are increasing across the state. We have seen growing severity of extreme heat events with eight of the ten warmest years since 1895 occurring between 2000 and 2020, and warmer temperatures are increasing wildfire risk. Between 2000 and 2018, the rate of wildfire more than doubled over the previous 20 years. Additionally, warmer atmospheres can carry more water, increasing the instances of atmospheric rivers like we have seen this past winter causing rapid runoff and potential for flooding. As extreme weather and resulting emergencies grow in size and intensity, the importance of comprehensive emergency planning and public preparedness is clear. Nevada's local governments recognize this growing need. Many have updated their emergency plans already, increased public outreach by adding pet preparedness checklists to their websites and collaborating with groups like the National Animal Rescue and Sheltering Coalition. However, gaps remain that S.B. 331 will fill.

When a local government emergency management website includes pet preparedness, as Senator Scheible noted, the message is often a variance of never leave your pet behind during evacuation but have a pet-friendly place ready to go. This typically is followed by a recommendation that residents have friends, families or pet-friendly hotels lined up. Obviously, these directives have the best of intentions, but are significantly prohibitive for families who either cannot afford this unforeseen expense or do not have a local network. Research identifies these gaps as clear areas of improvement. A national survey released in September 2021 found that while 90 percent of people with pets plan to bring their pets with them during a disaster, only 16 percent have an emergency shelter secured or know where they would go, and only 46 percent had an emergency preparedness plan in place at all. Senate Bill 331 will help ensure that residents can be confident that when an evacuation order comes down, they will be able to leave and stay with their pet.

A similar law was passed in Florida in 2020. House Bill 705 required that local governments that designate emergency shelters also designate shelters that can accommodate persons with pets. Our national field team saw the impact of this new law. Benefits included an effective centralized incident command during Hurricane Ian, improved resource sharing across

shelters and jurisdictions, and notably higher levels of preparedness and comfort across evacuees.

It is important to note the local jurisdictions in Nevada who are already meeting the parameters of S.B. 331. The City of Henderson, for instance, obtained a large animal trailer for sheltering so that any human shelter can become a colocated coshelter, and the Douglas County website shares that the most common evacuation shelter is the Douglas County Community and Senior Center, making a point to note that the center is pet-friendly.

I recognize this is a lot of information. To close, S.B. 331 is simply a vital step toward ensuring that Nevadans never be faced with the choice of seeking safety or staying with their beloved pet. I want to thank Senator Scheible for her leadership on this issue and thank the Committee for your time. I respectfully ask for your "Aye" vote.

Senator Scheible:

I would like to add one thing that came up in the Senate hearing which I feel is relevant. You know, I have been honored to work with the ASPCA on this issue, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), and RedRover. There are numerous national organizations that are committed to improving emergency response for pets. They have all committed to continue working with local jurisdictions that might be struggling to implement any of this; including with funding policy recommendations and on-the-ground support so that we are not putting the onus on governments without the follow-up to come behind and ensure that they are able to implement it.

Chair Torres:

Committee members, do you have any questions?

Assemblyman Koenig:

If you can indulge me a little bit, I have a little story. I grew up with pets. I love pets, but when my daughter was a three-year-old, I got her a little white kitten for her birthday. She named her Snowball. We knew my wife had some allergy issues, but we got a nice cat house, and we have a nice, enclosed yard, and it was going to be an outside cat. After a week or so my wife really could not breathe. I had to sit down with my three-year-old daughter and have the tough discussion of, do we want to keep Snowball, or do you want to keep Mommy? After a long discussion, we agreed to keep Mommy and we had to get rid of Snowball. My daughter said, I thought if you got a birthday present, you should be able to keep it forever.

My concern is especially in bigger cities where you have multiple locations for emergency shelters, you could designate one for pets, but I come from the rurals. I represent the rural-est of the rurals so there might only be one shelter available. Bringing pets into that one shelter could cause health concerns for some people. I want to make sure that if there is only one, and I do not want to sound insensitive, but we need to keep the health of people in the forefront along with the health of the pets. Is there anything that is going to force that one

shelter in that small area to accept the pets at the detriment of the health of some of the other public? That is my concern on that question, if you could.

Senator Scheible:

You are correct, this does not require that every shelter be pet-friendly or that in a case where there is only one shelter that it be pet-friendly. It requires to designate one shelter, but we could work on the language for one place to accommodate people and pets. What we have seen, and probably Ms. Benesi can speak to this better, but what we have seen in some areas is where they are not actually colocated, but the people are in one building or one room, and then there is a kennel situation. Those are some of the things that the ASPCA, HSUS, and other national organizations can help with too. They could fund buying ten large dog kennels and ten cat kennels. Then you have those located in a separate room, a shed, or another building so that when people do show up to the shelter, they have a place where they can safely secure their animal and then they can go to the human side of the shelter.

Brittany Benesi:

I, too, want to offer clarification that in our experience, the ASPCA absolutely considers the needs of the people and recognizes that allergies are a significant concern. In the situations where there is only one facility, a colocated option, whether that is a trailer where the animals are actually outside and residents are able to take care of them without having them cohabitate in the same facility, or in instances where some facility like a school or community center may be utilized, and there is explicit separation that addresses the allergy needs of people without pets. That is something that we would welcome the opportunity to provide training and resources to support.

Chair Torres:

I actually had the pleasure of touring the SafeNest domestic violence shelter before coming up for the legislative session. They do something very similar to what you are saying, and that definitely makes sense where they have the kennel separate. It is a side attachment like the garage or a building where they have the kennels, and that is where the animals stay. Then the owners can take the animals out for walks and such. They are separate from the habitation part and the living quarters of that shelter. I imagine that is what it seems to me you are describing.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

You mentioned that this question came up when you presented to the Senate. Is there a requirement that goes along with this for staff or supplies? You mentioned some kennels and so on. Is there anything like that which accompanies this, or is it only to have a space for the pets?

Brittany Benesi:

The language of the bill includes to the extent practicable, which is what resources are available to that local government. Our organizations as referenced, ASPCA, HSUS, RedRover, have grants available specifically for supplies, and in our experience supply needs are one of the most easily-met resource requirements because once they are established, they

are there for perpetuity. In terms of staffing, cosheltering actually frees up volunteer resources because the local governments, under current law, are still required to address the needs of people with pets, but those animals are taken to separate shelters which requires volunteering and staffing resources. By cosheltering, owners can care for their pets, which frees up the resources that would otherwise be dedicated to the animals.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I am reading the legislation. The actual mandate would be for every municipal government or a political subdivision to have at least one shelter that could accommodate pets. Correct? My second question is, what about some of our subdivisions that have populations of 100,000 or more that may, in all actuality, need more than one?

Brittany Benesi:

To the extent practicable, we want to recognize that some of our rural jurisdictions may have only one facility or may not even have a facility identified. Our hope is that the language addresses the concerns of underresourced communities. For larger populations, while the language requires at least one shelter, our hope is that by updating the law in emergency operation plans, they will consider what their population needs are. Yes, there will be the need to meet the statute, however, if they recognize that there is a population of 100,000 or more, that at least one-third of those are going to have pets and that they would address those needs because of the benefits associated.

Senator Scheible:

I can be a bit more frank than Ms. Benesi and say that our conversations with local governments have been great and they are planning to implement this. If there is a situation where a larger jurisdiction designates 25 shelters, and only one of them is able to accommodate 10 pets, we can come back and fix it, but we are not trying to solve problems that do not exist.

Chair Torres:

Thank you. I do not believe there are any other questions from members. At this time, is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 331?

Rebecca Goff, Nevada State Director, Humane Society of the United States:

On behalf of the HSUS and our Nevada supporters, I am here in strong support of S.B. 331. The rate and intensity of natural disasters and extreme weather events are rapidly increasing throughout the western region of the United States. We often hear many of today's disasters are historical, record-breaking events, leaving people and animals displaced for extended periods of time. These emergencies bring significant risk to public health and community safety. Sharing this risk, but often overlooked, are our residents' pets. The HSUS deploy staff and volunteers to assist with disaster and rescue relief. While our role is to help animals in need and keep families together after disaster strikes, our people have seen firsthand the devastation ill-preparedness brings.

In my own experience, having worked both the evacuation sites at the Caldor Fire and the Dixie Fire in the summer of 2021, I saw evacuees choosing to live in their car in the parking lots of these shelters despite the extreme heat and suffocating smoke rather than be separated from their pets. I distinctly remember a woman, her adult daughter, and her two large dogs sharing a small sedan with whatever belongings they could grab. The humans were taking turns getting relief from the elements in the shelter while the other human stayed in the car with the dogs. It was truly heartbreaking to see, and this is just one example.

Currently, too many emergency management plans neglect to consider pets. These traumatic events to our communities cause enough chaos and confusion without the added stress of a beloved companion being unable to shelter with you. We have seen the impact that ignoring this bond between people and pets brings, and it is an unnecessary hardship to families that have already lost so much. Senate Bill 331 will also help protect our residents and their pets and first responders as households are more likely to follow evacuation orders when they know they have a safe place to bring their pet to shelter with them.

We thank Senator Scheible for the leadership on this important issue, and we ask the Committee to vote "Yes" on S.B. 331.

Bob Rilling-Smith, Legislative Analyst/Community Outreach Coordinator, American Kennel Club:

We are here in strong support for S.B. 331. Simply put, people should not be put in danger because they do not have a place to take their pet during an emergency. As has been stated, a lack of pet accommodations is one of the biggest reasons for avoiding emergency shelters. We thank the Committee for your attention to both protecting pets and therefore people, and urge your strong support for S.B. 331.

Chair Torres:

Both of you have posted letters on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System too [[Exhibit C](#) and [Exhibit D](#)]. I want members of the Committee to know so they can check those out. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of S.B. 331 here in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in support of S.B. 331? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 331? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 331? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 331? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 331? [There was no one.]

All right, at this time, I will go ahead and invite the bill sponsor for any closing remarks. [There were none.] I hope you have a doggone good day. At this time, we will go ahead and close the hearing on S.B. 331.

Is there anyone wishing to testify in public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to testify in public comment? [There was no one.]

[Committee meeting reminders were given.]

We will adjourn [at 9:46 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Abbott
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter, dated April 20, 2023, submitted by Rebecca Goff, Nevada State Director, Humane Society of the United States, in support of Senate Bill 331.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter, dated April 19, 2023, submitted by Bob Rilling-Smith, Legislative Analyst/Community Outreach Coordinator, American Kennel Club, in support of Senate Bill 331.