

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

**Eighty-Third Session
March 27, 2025**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Venicia Considine at 8:02 a.m. on Thursday, March 27, 2025, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 1 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Chair
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva
Assemblymember Rebecca Edgeworth
Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Heather Goulding
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt
Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy, Assembly District No. 22



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Drozdoff, Committee Policy Analyst
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Karri Hurwitz, Committee Secretary
Mary Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Will Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation
Brian Mason, Tribal Chairman, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation
Andrea Martinez, Private Citizen, Walker River Paiute Tribe
Jeannene Jensen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Michael Alonso, representing Noah's Animal House Foundation
Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Chair Considine:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Today we will be hearing two bills. First, we will hear Assembly Bill 392, which revises provisions relating to interlocal agreements and contracts with tribal governments, followed by Assembly Bill 418, which revises provisions relating to animals. To ensure that we get through everybody in a timely manner, we will set a 20-minute time limit for each period of support, opposition, and neutral testimony with each speaker having up to 2 minutes. Let us get started. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 392. To present this measure we have Assemblymember Carter. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 392: Revises provisions relating to interlocal agreements and contracts with tribal governments. (BDR 22-1059)

Assemblymember Max E. Carter II, Assembly District No. 12:

I am going to ask my copresenters to introduce themselves, starting with Will Adler and working back towards me, if that is okay?

Will Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

Hello, I am Will Adler, principal of Silver State Government Relations and proud to be here.

Brian Mason, Tribal Chairman, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

I am Brian Mason. I am the Chairman of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

Andrea Martinez, Private Citizen, Walker River Paiute Tribe:

I am a former chairman of the Walker River Paiute Tribe and tribal citizen of the Walker River Paiute Tribe in Schurz, Nevada.

Assemblymember Carter:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 392, which revises provisions relating to interlocal agreements and contracts with tribal governments. A little bit of background: cooperative agreements are critical to the functioning of the state. We know that working to benefit Nevadans does not happen in a vacuum. However, we also know that not all parties are always considered equitably when making such agreements nor are agreements always beneficial for all involved. I am specifically referring to our tribal governments. According to the United States Attorney's Office, Nevada is home to 28 federally recognized tribes, bands, and communities and it is essential that we work to prioritize, strengthen, and protect relationships with all 28.

We know that relationships between governmental entities and tribal governments have been historically fraught, often characterized by extremely unequal power dynamics, secrecy, and deception, and an emphasis on assimilation and division. We are still working to correct these historical inequities and breaches of trust, which is why we must carefully craft and monitor future agreements with certain protections. This is what we are seeking to do with A.B. 392. I am going to turn this over to former chair Martinez to give us some background and explanation of why this is important.

Andrea Martinez:

I am here to express my strong support of A.B. 392, a bill that revises provisions related to interlocal agreements and contracts between tribal governments and public agencies. Through my tenure I have witnessed the profound impact that cooperative action between tribal governments and public agencies can have on our communities. These agreements are vital for ensuring the safety and well-being of our citizens, particularly in rural Nevada where resources can be limited. However, I have also seen instances of negligence and inaction that can undermine these important partnerships. Assembly Bill 392 is crucial for tribal governments seeking to establish and maintain effective agreements with surrounding agencies regardless of the leadership in place. This bill would enhance the ability of tribal governments to collaborate with county agencies, ensuring that cooperation and protection for all citizens of Nevada remains a priority no matter who holds the decision-making power.

Moreover, as a former law enforcement officer, I have observed firsthand how these agreements are essential for our law enforcement agencies both on and off the reservation. They help navigate complex jurisdictional issues and facilitate necessary assistance, ultimately fostering safer communities for everyone. I want to thank Assemblymember

Carter for carrying A.B. 392 and urge all members to support this important legislation. Together we can strengthen the relationships between tribal governments and public agencies and ensure a brighter future for all Nevadans.

Assemblymember Carter:

With the Chair's permission, I will turn it over to Will Adler to walk through the bill and Chairman Mason to give some comments and explanations of why we are here.

Will Adler:

I am with Silver State Government Relations, representing Duck Valley and Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribes in this scenario. I want to thank Assemblymember Max Carter for bringing this bill forward. I want to briefly go through the bill, which is essentially section 1. I want to point out a few things; this is not maybe a new concept or even a new ability in law, but we did want to encourage these programs to actually foster or be generated between county governments specifically and tribal governments. For the record, these do go on today and now and actually are pretty productive when it comes to interlocal agreements—when it comes to law enforcement, emergency medical services, or even shared law enforcement agreements like housing of detainees or prisoners of some kind. Tribal governments already have these arrangements in some scenarios, but not all. Then a lot of it is the lack of governmental heft when it comes to the tribal side of this to get these agreements done. There are a lot of misunderstandings and hardships when it comes to the information sharing, but to have this in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) we feel would support the concept of encouraging these and having these show up more frequently across Nevada.

The most important thing is going through the whole of the bill. If you look at section 1, the "shall" line I want to point out is, there is no mandate here, but it is: shall, on behalf of the county or agency thereof, engage in good faith discussions with the tribal government for the performance of such services. We only want the mandation of having that open door and having that first good conversation, because that really is the preventive barrier with a lot of these conversations—the understanding that this is possible or the understanding that tribal governments need support too, and it is not all on the federal government. It is usually some bout of interlocal because whether it is tribal or rural Nevada, we are all out there in the sticks and there is not a lot of support no matter who you are, be it police, fire, or medical services.

I want to thank Assemblymember Carter again for bringing this bill forward. As you see going through section 1, it lays out some general parameters that I think are similar to the ones that Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe has when it comes to the law enforcement agreement. I took that as the guidelines for this, but I did want to see this encouraged in NRS and shown that this is not a mandate, but this is a mandate of having that open hand and a good discussion. Thank you very much and thank you for bringing this bill. Chair Mason wanted to share some stories about what it is like having a lack of security and law enforcement and what it could be if something like this could be produced across tribal and county relations.

Brian Mason:

I am the chairman of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Shoshone-Paiute Duck Valley Indian Reservation. I know a lot of your faces from sitting in this chair testifying on different issues. It is almost like, buckle up, because you are about ready to be very embarrassed and very upset and I am going to walk through some things. It is very complicated because some of the tribes are self-governance tribes and some are not self-governance tribes. Self-governance tribes basically, in 1993 in the state of Nevada—and there is a bunch of them throughout the United States—I cannot remember how many in the state of Nevada are self-governance. What that did was these tribes took most of the responsibilities from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and contracted it and took care of it, of the things they wanted to.

Duck Valley is a self-governance tribe, but we did not contract law enforcement or road maintenance out. Those are the two things that the BIA provides for us; law enforcement and roads. Some of the tribes that are not self-governance may have their own law enforcement, such as—for a while the Te-Moak Tribe did. I am not sure of some of the situations of other tribes, but some of them have their own policing force, which is within their constitution. We left that in the BIA's hands. What that does is it kind of limits a tribe's ability to provide something as simple as public safety.

In northern Nevada, in northeastern Nevada, there are various—it was mentioned that there are 28 tribes in the state and all of them are different as far as needs, assets, what kind of things they can bring to the safety of their community. Ours is unique—and you are all aware of this as we have gone through different things, but the remoteness. Right? We are 97 miles north and through a windy canyon road for any kind of response. There is such a shortage in BIA policing, and that is where we get all of our law enforcement, which I have spoken with legislators on the federal level. Both of our state senators, the two state senators in the state of Idaho because our situation got to a point where we—and it is current right now, have two officers who cover from the Idaho border which is Duck Valley; all the way down to Elko and their four bands of the Te-Moak Tribe; all the way to the Goshute Tribe, which is partially in Utah; all the way to McDermitt. Two officers.

This has happened when we have had a shooting or a violent crime or something that is a severe public safety issue and we will just use the—we had a suicide-murder, and then three houses down we actually had a kidnapping at gunpoint. The officer—the response was in Elko so that is two hours right there just to get somebody to respond. School was letting out so we had a bunch of kids who were going to be getting off the bus in the neighborhood. We literally had to go as council members and firefighters to prevent—we did not respond with arms, but we did have to respond as some kind of deterrent to make sure that all the kids were turned around; they assembled in the school. They were taken care of until we could get an officer.

We had one officer arrive and this was not the act of the kidnapping incident. Well, the officer arrived but he could not do anything because he did not have any backup. We had to wait additional time for backup to get there before they can even attempt to make entry into the house. If we had some type of memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the

surrounding communities. In Idaho, we have an agreement; our BIA officers are deputized in the state of Idaho. We just do not have it on the Nevada side. We do not know where the response is going to come from, and for us, we do not really care. We just want the most timely response that we can absolutely get.

When you are in a community and law enforcement and safety is two hours away, that weighs on you as one of your most important things that you have to deal with as a tribal leader. There are not a lot of options. Part of the thing that I approached the senators on—and it was kind of an embarrassing topic because our BIA officers, our officers, our law enforcement are federal agents and there is just a limited amount of them. Law enforcement is not a career that a lot of people are pursuing and the BIA, just like any other municipality, we are so short on officers and we just cannot get any. They just will not—they are not there.

I approached the two senators—Senator Catherine Cortez Masto and Senator Jacky Rosen—and I am sure you are familiar with the term, but I was going to go to the United Nations (UN) and request Blue Helmets. Blue Helmets are peacekeeping forces that the UN provides because we cannot get any law enforcement, and we did not do it because Senator Cortez Masto has presented on the federal level the same issue that we are dealing with because everybody is dealing with it. The Montana senator, he is no longer the senator, but he had the same situation on all the large Montana tribes and they were going through the same thing. There is a federal bill that is trying to take care of some of this stuff. The main thing is there is definitely a need and it is an important bill. I think it is something that the state of Nevada, dealing with all 28 tribes, they are all going to have a unique problem, but they all lack adequate law enforcement.

Assemblymember Carter:

To sum up before we go into questions, this does not mandate agreements. What it does is, if an agreement is put in place, there are two big rubs here, and that is what we are trying to fix. It is a rub when we ask a tribal entity to surrender their sovereignty and two, the counties are worried and have experienced, not all the time, but built-up grievances and financial obligations. That is what this does. It makes both parties respect each other's tribal sovereignty first and then responsibility to live up to your commitments from both sides in these interlocal agreements. With that, we are open for questions, Chair.

Chair Considine:

Committee members, please let me know if you have questions. We will start with Assemblymember DeLong.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you for bringing this bill. I think it is a good bill, and Chairman Mason, it is good to see you. Congratulations on being elected Chairman. I really have two questions. The first one is, can you explain on page 2, line 38, last word going on to the next page, what is "organized segment of a tribe"? What is that getting at as far as a governmental body?

Will Adler:

There are tribal governments and then there are subdivided tribal governments that go over a larger geographic area. It is for the one in this town specifically; Washoe Band or Washoe Tribe actually has a Carson City colony, one down in Douglas County, two over on California's side of the map, and one on the north side of Lake Tahoe. It is five separated governmental entities all identified as the Washoe Tribe. That is the closest regional one. Similar things happen in Elko with subdivided territorial or geographic separations of the same peoples with the Te-Moak Tribe.

Assemblymember DeLong:

My second question has to do with the time frames. I want to understand why you picked 90 days. A quarter of the year seems like a pretty long time. If there is a contractual disagreement, 90 days seems like a very long time. Is there a specific reason you picked 90 days?

Assemblymember Carter:

It is because of the glacial pace that all too often local and county governments move. This is to where nothing is a knee-jerk reaction. It gives both sides time to straighten things out rather than: Yeah, we are mad, we are going to terminate the agreement—a bit of a cooling off period, but also an acknowledgement that things do not move very rapidly in state and local governments.

Will Adler:

I have another answer for that question too. Tribal governments often get a lot of their payments and repayments through the federal processes. Previously this has happened with the—I will not speak what tribal community, what county—but because the federal government had a delayed fight with final payments or getting the budget funded federally, some of the tribal payments were delayed for police services and things unbeknownst to the tribe and out of their control, but the local government actually extended their period. I think we got to 90 days at a county level for that reason. I think a good buffer period of good faith is needed sometimes.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

I believe Assemblymember DeLong kind of touched on my question and so did you, Mr. Adler, because I was wondering if 90 days really was long enough. It seems that if there is a situation going on and the tribal community is already strained, that may put undue hardship specifically regarding the outstanding payment for an outstanding debt. That was really the portion of it that concerned me. Since it is out there, if I may ask or tie an additional question to it. In terms of the 97 miles and the distance, how much would this shrink the time that you are waiting for a response? Just to get that on the record of what impact this could have for you?

Brian Mason:

It allows them to at least respond because right now we are just in such a unique situation because it is Bureau of Indian Affairs, law enforcement, federal officers. When something

happens in Owyhee, Nevada, which is quite the distance—when they call 911 it goes to Utah. It goes to Fort Duchesne, Utah, for dispatch and then they contact another agency and then the officers are dispatched. Even an MOU that ropes in the communication for the emergency service is desperately needed. I do not know all the ins and outs about BIA law enforcement. Our support comes out of the Phoenix office. But when Jane Doe who lives on X Lane calls and says, Someone is breaking into my house, it goes to Utah; we can do better.

Assemblymember Goulding:

When I read this in preparation for today's meeting, my question was really, why? Thank you for providing that good explanation of what is going on. Under current law, are you prohibited from entering into this kind of agreement? I am trying to wrap my mind around it; is this new enabling language?

Assemblymember Carter:

No, interlocal agreements are perfectly fine right now. A lot of the tribes have them. What this is addressing is the rubs on both sides. What the tribal entities do not like is when a government entity comes in and tells them, In order for us to have an agreement with you, you have to surrender part of your tribal sovereignty. In the local governments, whether it is justified or not, talk about delinquent pay and not living up to the contract on the other side. This just takes and sets those boundaries to take and protect both sides. That is what this is trying to do.

Brian Mason:

If I may add something also. Each of the tribes are going to be different because we are all sovereign tribes, right? One tribe may want to enter into an agreement one way and another tribe in another way, as long as they stay within the parameters of the actual bill. I said that we have an agreement with the state of Idaho and they are cross-deputized in the state of Idaho. Historically, and I wish—we have a senior statesman who is on council and has been on the council since the eighties. At a time, there was this in place with Elko County. We had an agreement with Elko County and, quite frankly, the Sheriff used to live in Mountain City, which is the town right outside the reservation line. These have been in place before. I just think there—it is bringing to the point where there is a need again for them. But I remember a time when there was an agreement with Elko County and the sheriff's department. I do not know if that was because he happened to live in Mountain City, but there was that. In general, tribes retain that right, that sovereignty, that treaty status, that federal agents are the law enforcement for an Indian reservation. Agreements with local enforcement is out of survival, necessity, and safety.

Assemblymember Goulding:

Thank you for that clarification.

Andrea Martinez:

I would like to add, leadership always changes on every level in public agencies, and tribal government, sometimes depending on who is in those positions, is dependent on what MOUs get acknowledged or not.

Assemblymember Kasama:

I have two questions if I might, hopefully quick. One, I am just wondering about the contract that you enter into. Each tribe will just negotiate their own rate with the local police force. Is that correct?

Assemblymember Carter:

Yes, that is exactly correct. It equates to the interlocal agreements that we are more familiar with; like between Clark County and Henderson, and North Las Vegas and Clark County. They are not the same; they are negotiated separately. And just like that, the tribal entities and the different local government entities may have different concerns. There is not a pattern; they are not all the same.

Assemblymember Kasama:

My other question is—let us use Elko as an example again. If an incident happens in Elko and the tribes there have entered into an agreement with the Elko Sheriff's Department, could you still have a choice if a Bureau of Indian Affairs federal officer happens to be in Elko, because you said there are only two and they are wandering all around? Could you have a choice which one you would ask to respond if one happened to be close? Would you have coverage from both? I guess maybe that is the right question.

Brian Mason:

I do not have that answer. I do not know what the answer is. There is obviously something in the agreement that dictates that. I am not even sure—so Elko is part of Te-Moak Tribe. I do not know what kind—I know some of them are tribal enforcement—law enforcement—and some of them are BIA. They are right in town; something similar to Reno-Sparks. I am sure they have some type of agreement, and I would defer to Elko folks who may have some familiarity with what kind of law enforcement agreement Elko colony has. All the colonies—the colonies that are within the city limits; Ely is one, Winnemucca, Battle Mountain. I think what I am saying is they are all unique. The bill gives the particular tribe the option or at least the leeway to do it—enter into an agreement for the safety of their people. But they are all going to be different animals, I think. Ours is going to be unique, just like Walker River's is going to be unique.

Assemblymember Carter:

Typically, they emphasize these agreements; emphasize the most rapid response when there is crisis—does not necessarily have to, but the main goal of this is getting a faster response to emergency situations.

Assemblymember Gurr:

I cannot really speak with firsthand knowledge but I know in town that it is a first responder, just like you said, Assemblymember Carter. It is going to be the first nearest person who can get there. I know the tribal police and the BIA both respond to incidents to help local police and the Nevada Highway Patrol, but I think they go by the Nevada State Police Highway Patrol now officially. I know that, like you stated, Chairman Mason, we had a deputy station in Mountain City for years, but then the population base in Mountain City is gone, the store

is gone, the bar is gone, and manpower along with everything else. I think the bill is good. I think we ought to do it and everybody is going to structure a local agreement. My question when I get to it instead of speechifying is, as with everything we do in this building, there are unintended consequences when we do this. Have you reviewed any unintended consequences to the tribes themselves? What could come out of this bill?

Assemblymember Carter:

I will tell you—the unintended consequences are mitigated first by us working hard on identifying the problem and we kept it focused on the problem. Also, the fact that it does not mandate, it gives freedom to not be in it also. We are not trying to create a mandate. That is where we are trying to mitigate the unintended consequences.

Assemblymember Gurr:

Thank you for that. I realized after you had gone through this, that you have done a lot of thought and a lot of participation. The whole idea behind this bill is more enforcement, quicker response, helping the public no matter whose public it is. I appreciate your interest.

Will Adler:

I do think this could help with tribal governments sustaining these agreements. If we do have them in NRS and cited and we do have the structure around them as spoken to briefly, these agreements could be ended on either side of the county or the tribal line. Frankly, in looking at the history of these, frequently it is the tribal government that does come in and say, Hey, why do we have this and/or we are no longer happy with it. But if we have more structure to them, I think the sustainability of these will be better. As you said, the first responders are first responders. We will take whoever is there for a crisis and thank you for seeing that.

Assemblymember D'Silva:

Thank you all for bringing this bill forward. Chairman Mason, it is always an honor to have you here in the Legislature. My question really is about the parameters of these interlocal compacts. The bill is saying that from this moment forward, this will be some of the new parameter structures that will be in place between these agreements. Are there any retroactive effects of this bill?

Assemblymember Carter:

No, this is proactive, not reactive.

Chair Considine:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? I have one on page 2 and you have already sort of talked about it under section 1; "shall . . . engage in discussions in good faith." It is not requiring or mandating anything except for engaging in good faith discussions. Because there is a "shall" there, what happens if they do not? Is there any penalty because we do have a shall? I just do not see anything in here. Is it just good faith that shall be sufficient?

Will Adler:

We do have a history of bills like this that do say, a county "shall" and whether it be a siren or other things, we did have to come back before. Speaking to representatives of county governments that we already have some of these agreements in place, I just want to make it clear that counties shall have a good faith discussion when approached by a tribal government because today a lot of tribes do not understand that is already in place. Counties want to be there to help the citizens of the county, be it county property or a tribe within that county. The holistic nature of county governance is to help all. I do think this is to say, if you are approached by tribal government, you shall have a good faith conversation with them. If they are not getting that, for the record, please call Will Adler and I will help you get a better conversation with any county government. I do think this should be sufficient to guide the path, but that mandate is to have a good conversation. But once you do so, here is what an agreement would look like, and that creates a lot of clarity where there are some ethereal misunderstandings today, I think. That is all.

Chair Considine:

Thank you very much for that answer and thank you for the presentation. We would like to now move on to testimony on the bill. I would like to begin testimony today here in Carson City in person. If you would like to testify in support of A.B. 392 in Carson City, please step forward. [There was no one.] We will go to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line in support of A.B. 392? [There was no one.]

We will move on to opposition. Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 392 in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone line? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 392? [There was no one.] Would the sponsors like to make any further comments? No, they will not. Thank you so much.

I will close the hearing on A.B. 392. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 418, which revises provisions relating to animals. To present this measure, we have Assemblymembers Hardy and Hibbetts. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 418: Revises provisions relating to animals. (BDR 20-849)

Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 418, which revises provisions relating to animals. Our work in this building is dedicated to the betterment of Nevada and its citizens. We work to prioritize their needs and address aspects of Nevada law that will have a positive impact on their lives. Importantly, though, we sometimes need to extend that work beyond just the people of Nevada to also focus on those who are not able to speak for themselves or on their own behalf. We must also direct our efforts to ensuring the well-being and safekeeping of the animals in this state, which is my intent with A.B. 418. Chair, with your permission I would like to turn it over to my copresenter to tell you how we got here.

Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy, Assembly District No. 22:

As my colleague mentioned, one of the things we like to do when we present a bill, if we can, is share the story of where the legislation came from. Last summer, I was contacted by a constituent. She shared with me a very heartbreaking story of what happened to her dog that was taken to a local groomer. The dog suffered some trauma, some mishandling when she was in distress there, and later the dog passed away. In Las Vegas, that constituent is there and if she could come up to the table, I would like her to share the story herself. We will give her a minute. But that is where this came from, a constituent's experience. I am sure that it has happened before. We felt the need to bring this legislation to protect those that do not have a voice that are living beings. I will turn it over now to Ms. Jensen in Las Vegas.

Jeannene Jensen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I guess I will just tell you what happened to my dog. Saturday, June 22, I dropped off three of my dogs for a ten o'clock appointment for grooming. Three hours later when I picked my dogs up, only Lucky and Chico were brought out to me. I saw someone open a door to their dryer room and bring out Daisy. She was coughing and having a hard time breathing. I asked, What happened to Daisy? Their reply was, Oh, she has been barking. When I got into the car, I put the seat belts on my dogs and I noticed that Daisy's tongue was turning dark purple. She was panting and moving all over the back seat. She was losing control of her bladder and her bowels; she was spitting up from her mouth. I immediately called you and I called the grooming and said that Daisy cannot breathe and I was taking her to the animal hospital. The only remark from them was telling me that they were sorry.

Green Valley Animal Hospital was waiting for me and they took Daisy back into the emergency room immediately. All the attempts were made to help her breathe in their oxygen tent. Her temperature was 108 degrees and it climbed to 109 degrees. The veterinarian told me that Daisy may have complications with her brain, her eyesight, not being able to control her bladder and bowels and be a normal dog from no oxygen that long. The next day, Sunday, we made arrangements to see our girl, Daisy. She was still struggling to breathe and coughing so the doctor put her back in the oxygen tent so there would be less stress. The veterinarian said her trachea was collapsed. Her lungs were filling with fluid. We were told the oxygen gave her a little relief. We made the final decision to put her to sleep, to cross over the Rainbow Bridge. This was the worst decision that we had to make because she was only five to six years old, happy, playful, and a healthy dog. She did not like cages very long so she would bark. If only they had used some common sense and taken her out of a cage, put her on a leash so she could watch the other dogs being groomed, or better yet, have called me to come pick her up.

She died with a collapsed trachea probably from a collar used too tight around her neck while grooming and heat exhaustion. She was a member of our family and she did not deserve this. I just feel that these groomers need some type of training. I understand that anyone can put a dog grooming sign up and have a business.

Assemblymember Hardy:

Thank you for being here today and sharing your story. I know how hard that was for you and Mark. We appreciate you being here.

Jeannene Jensen:

Thank you.

Assemblymember Hardy:

I will now turn it over to my colleague to go through the bill.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

Specifically, A.B. 418 requires each governing body of a county or incorporated city to adopt an ordinance requiring, with certain exceptions, the owner or operator of a kennel, an animal rescue organization, or a commercial establishment engaged in the business of handling animals to complete a training course on handling animals. This course will be prescribed by that governing body. The bill further requires the ordinance to prescribe the manner in which such entities complete the required training course and renews it biannually. That is the legalese way of saying we want people who engage in the custody of animals to have training in how to recognize medical distress and what to do about it when they see it.

In closing, our animals are family. We should endeavor to provide all animals across the state, whether in our homes or in kennels and rescue organizations, the love and care they deserve. I urge you to support this measure and I thank you for your consideration. We are now happy to stand for any questions.

Chair Considine:

Thank you for that presentation. Our Committee questions will begin with Assemblymember Goulding.

Assemblymember Goulding:

Thank you for your presentation. I am wondering why you decided to put it on the cities and the counties to establish the requirement instead of just baking it into the statute; this is the requirement. It seems like a burden on cities and counties to have to create the requirement, create the ordinance, when a statewide standard might be more effective and less burdensome on local municipalities.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

This bill was actually designed based on a Clark County ordinance that was recently passed and we did not want to be the big bad state coming down and saying, Here is what you are going to do. We wanted to leave it to the local municipalities because that is the lowest level of elected official so that they can be responsive to their particular constituents.

Assemblymember Hardy:

Just to add on to that, when we do legislation there is a balance of being too prescriptive. Not having things in statute if something changes—if we are to prescribe a certain course or

something like that—then we would have to come back later if that course was not available. We have been meeting with stakeholders and talking about addressing your specific question because what we want is—the training they are getting is basically cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), first aid-type of certification in handling animals. The goal is that people are not getting some random course or whatever, but they are getting a recognized certified course in first aid and animal handling. We are happy to work on this language to fine tune it so the intent we are seeking happens.

Assemblymember Goulding:

Can you build out on how you see enforcement would happen?

Assemblymember Hardy:

I know the Clark County ordinance does require that the training would be kept in the business so if someone wanted to see it, that it is there, that they did receive the training. This would be something in my mind that I would like to add to this. As far as the enforcement piece, again, I am happy to explore that more. We do not want to be too punishing on businesses, have too high of a fine or anything like that. But yes, absolutely. We would be open to talking about how that would be enforced.

Assemblymember D'Silva:

Thank you, Assemblymembers, for bringing this bill. I think it is a great bill that uplifts some of the least among us, our animal friends and family. My question really is the training. How do we go about ensuring that the training is solid and is coming from an established source? Will this be through nonprofits or through animal control or maybe other divisions within the local government? How does that play out?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

In researching this, I wanted to make sure, number one, that the training actually existed first, and it does. There are numerous nationally recognized agencies and organizations that offer this training. You can go to a community college and get this training, as they offer it as part of their vet tech certification; most of the community colleges offer it as a stand-alone course, if you want to go that route. There are online places; there are places you can go in person other than colleges. There are many places that offer this training for free simply because they want people to have it. Again, we want to leave it up to the municipalities for the flexibility of it. We are working with the different municipalities to try to get to that sweet spot, if you will, between prescribing what they have to do without being too onerous. We are currently working on that at the moment.

Assemblymember Hardy:

The intent is not to make this burdensome on any municipality. We do not expect them to create a course; that is not what we are saying. As Assemblymember Hibbetts mentioned, there are online certifications for this. I happened to look this morning and the Red Cross offers them. There is a course in Henderson next month that is in person where you can do this. The standard would be that it is a recognized, certified CPR first aid training for those who handle animals.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

Thank you for the presentation. I know that the loss of even one pet is devastating for someone because they are members of our families. But I am wondering, when you were putting this together, was there any statistical data showing how often this happens?

Assemblymember Hardy:

No, I did not specifically research any data. This incident and then I think two or three other people had reached out and mentioned to me that had happened to an animal of theirs or someone they knew while they were at the groomer. Again, those of us who have pets and love them and take them somewhere and place them in someone's care, you trust they know what they are doing and your pet is going to be safe there, and then when something like this happens, it is devastating. We just want to try to prevent that and do what we can at a minimum to give some reassurance and confidence to the public that their pets are going to be safe.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

In this space, is there anything you can share on where you see cost in terms of how the training is provided or if there are costs, who pays for it, what this type of cost looks like?

Assemblymember Hardy:

Again, as my colleague mentioned, I think there is the Red Cross course that was less than \$20. The course that was in person that I mentioned I think was \$70. Obviously, if you are going to go to a community college and get some type of vet assistant or tech program, that is going to be more. It varies and he did mention there were some that are free. I think it is a wide variety. Again, we do not want to require that you have to go get an associate's degree to work as a groomer, but you are just getting basic first aid CPR.

Assemblymember Gallant:

Thanks for bringing this bill forward. I probably utilize a groomer more so than anybody else in this building with four standard poodles. I do have a couple questions and I just want to make sure because it looks like maybe—I might be reading this wrong. In terms of this, would anybody who is handling animals for equine be exempt from this, but anybody who is handling nonequine animals would be included in this? I see veterinarian on that list. I guess I am a little confused. Are we going to be making veterinarians go through training? I think they have got plenty of education in terms of that. Correct?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

That is correct. It does not apply to a veterinarian and that is specifically for the reason you stated, because they are doctors.

Assemblymember Gallant:

Why would we make them do that? Then in terms of dog trainers, which is not listed on this, but it does say without limitation. It could be extended. In terms of dog trainers and groomers, there is no actual state licensing. Not that I am asking for it because I am, you know, barrier of entry. Maybe the municipalities—I know we have Ms. Jacob here about

how you would essentially enforce that within those types of business licenses and how that would work on a practical level. If you do not mind, can we phone a friend?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

It was her ordinance we based this on. I am going to make her answer this one.

**Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services,
Clark County:**

I had a feeling I was going to have to come up. We just passed our ordinance right as I was heading up here to the Legislature. It was the first board meeting in February. We are ready now to start implementing, but the intent is, as it has been discussed here, that it is going to be tied—the requirement for the training that we have in our ordinance is going to be tied to your business license, your local business license. Before you can renew or apply for your business license for this type of category of service, you would have to show evidence of completing the training.

Clark County—and I am not saying everybody needs to do this because there are options that have been discussed here—but because it is an important issue for our board, Clark County is developing a training that we are going to provide free of service for everybody who is doing this. It is going to take us a while to develop it. Our ordinances were passed in February, but the way it was structured is that within 18 months we are going to create the training, publicize the training, and make it available to the public. The language in here about the manner in which the board of county commissioners or the city council can prescribe how to do the training I think is good language. It gives everybody the flexibility to do that. That is where I said, Okay, we have already passed this ordinance so I was planning on coming up in neutral today because we have passed the ordinance and I think we can make our ordinance fit the language of this bill. Our intent is that we are going to create our own. It is tied to your business license, so it would be like the checklist of documents that you would have to provide when you apply for or renew your business license.

I cannot remember the—I was just looking at the ordinance and I have to probably follow up with you, Assemblymember Gallant, if that is okay. I think we tried to capture a broad category of businesses that were providing services to animals, especially in southern Nevada where the heat impacts are severe. Assemblymember Hibbetts just handed me something. I can certainly follow up with you afterwards or the Committee if you would like to see how we define it in the ordinance.

Assemblymember Hibbetts just pointed out—this is from my ordinance, which it says—I think it does apply to any establishment which sells, grooms, trains, and boards animals. Trainers are included. Thank you, Assemblymember Hibbetts.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

That is the Clark County ordinance, not the proposed NRS.

Assemblymember Karris:

Thank you for the presentation. I think everyone in the state is concerned about animal safety, especially with the things that have occurred in the past year, but these things happen all the time. I love that something like this is coming forward. My question was sort of touched on. I love the fact that some municipalities may provide this for free because I was concerned with the impact on these businesses for how much it is going to cost for training. I am not quite sure I get the leaning towards CPR end rather than the handling end because you would not have to revive some pet getting groomed if you had not already mistreated it. Maybe a little heavier on the training on handling.

My question is this though—and maybe since there is going to be free courses in the future, but maybe not everywhere in the state, my thought was rather than a handling/CPR training which could impact the employees and the business owners, has there been any thought to having cameras where you could watch? Because if the owner has training, but they are not always there because they are a business owner, they may have more businesses, they may be busy. Is there any thought at all to having cameras in these places so there is actual evidence of what is going on with your dog? I know that is a great inhibitor to bad behavior on a human's part.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

That issue did not come up during the discussions for this bill. I do know there are many places, specifically boarders—I do not know about groomers—that offer free livestreaming so you can watch your four-legged friend have a better time than you. That issue did not come up in our discussions.

Assemblymember Hunt:

Thank you for the presentation. My question is, have you thought about how long the required training course would be before they actually get their certification?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

Based on the way the current language is written, that would be left up to the municipality. Again, we do not want to be too onerous on the individual municipalities. We do not want to say, Well you have to have four hours—and I honestly have not looked at the course specifically—when two hours would work. It is currently left up to the municipality.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

Building on Assemblymember Karris' question and a point in the ordinance which states that the owner or operator of the business who handles the animals is the one to receive the training, to her point, they are not always there. Is there consideration of extending this to the people who actually handle the animals? I realize we are creating a point of accountability with this legislation, but we are not necessarily addressing the issue that causes the animals to have the problem, which is whoever in all of these businesses is actually providing the service to that animal on that day.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

That is a great point. If you look at this like other industries, the owner may own two, three, or four different grooming places. Obviously, they cannot be everywhere. I would look at it as a key employee for each individual location. There should be somebody on-site during operating hours who has this training, and that would be my intent.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

For the record, not everyone who works, but someone is trained as opposed to—if you work in a pet grooming-related business, you require this training to work in this business at this point.

Assemblymember Hardy:

I agree with what you are saying. Whoever is there, physically in charge of and supervising or handling the animals, should have some training. Again, we are open to fine tuning that on how we can address that because you are correct. When we owned our business, we were not always there. Those employees had to have food-certified training, health cards, and all that, we are definitely open to working that.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

In a perfect world, yes, I would like every single employee to absolutely have this training, but we also do not want to be too burdensome on the business itself. There is turnover. If every time you hire somebody you have to say, Well you have to go to your class, we do not want to put that much of a burden on the business. But again, we are also leaving it up to the municipality to say, Let us pick one. Sparks may say, If you are going to work here, you are going to have this training. Whereas Reno may say, We just want somebody on-site who has this training.

Chair Considine:

I do have a question and I may have missed it, but I keep looking at the language of the bill. We seem to be talking about household pets: dogs and cats. But I do not necessarily see that restriction in the bill, especially when it is animal rescue organizations. If it is exotic pets, if it is reptiles, if it is lion habitats. Does this cover everyone or is this supposed to be just household pets?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

Chair, if I understand your question correctly, you are looking at the section 1, subsection 3.

Chair Considine:

I was looking at section 1, subsection 1, line 5, requiring the "owner or operator of a kennel, an animal rescue organization, or a commercial establishment engaged in the business of handling animals, including, without limitation, a breeder, a cattery, a retailer, a pet groomer, or a dealer, to complete a training course." I just wanted to—since I did not see—let us say that I have exotic animals and I am bringing them in. Does it cover any type of animal? I guess I am just trying to figure out if this includes really exotic animals or if it is a rescue organization that rescues lions or llamas or any type of animal.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

For the record, llamas are cute. The intent is household pets and we are actually currently in discussions with one of the stakeholders for rescue organizations that specifically deal with providing shelter for the pets of domestic violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking; people who are trying to get out of those situations and need a place for their animals. That was never the intent to have people trying to help other people have to fall under onerous regulation. But no, the intent is household pets, not—I know down south we no longer have primates as pets. At least I do not think we do anymore. I think they have all been shipped out. But in that case, that is not what our intent is for this bill.

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thanks for bringing the bill and the presentation. I just want some clarification. There has been a lot of discussion about specifics on how long the training is, who gets trained, and how much training. Is the intent of the bill to have the counties or the cities address those kinds of details?

Assemblymember Hardy:

Yes, as it is written here, that is the intent. Again, we are not trying to make this burdensome on any county or municipality in any way. That is why it is not prescriptive. But yes, that is the intent.

Assemblymember Karris:

I am going to bring us back around because I need a little more clarification. I think I misinterpreted section 1, subsection 1. Is this bill only for the owners of a business of this type or is it also for the employees? I read it that the owner needs to have it. But then I went with "without limitation, a breeder, a cattery, a retailer," and I stuck on a pet groomer. If you had a pet grooming establishment, those people who handle pets all the time, daily, are they not receiving it because the owner would have it and you are establishing only one person per site would need to have the license?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

Actually, in my interpretation, and Legal may have a different interpretation of this because lawyers usually do, it says owner or operator. If I am an owner and I own four different groomers, I obviously cannot be at all four. But I am also not operating all four of them. Someone else is operating my business for me. Again, the intent is that someone, and at a bare minimum, someone on-site has this training. If Legal says I am completely wrong, we can have them redraft this.

Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel:

The way I am reading the bill is that the only people who are required to have the training are going to be the owner or operator of the business. The language that you were talking about specifically, Assemblymember Karris, which is saying an establishment engaged in the business of handling animals including, without limitation, a breeder, cattery, and so on, those are the types of businesses, at least the way I am reading it.

Chair Considine:

Thank you so much for that presentation. We would like to move to testimony now. We will begin with testimony in support here in Carson City. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in support of A.B. 418? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wishes to testify in support?

Jeannene Jensen:

I would like to testify.

Chair Considine:

Go ahead. You have up to two minutes.

Jeannene Jensen:

I am a nurse. I am retired and every year I had to take courses to qualify for my renewal of my license. I feel that anyone who can handle an animal in a grooming business should be certified, and if they quit that business and go to another business, they still are certified for a year. Animals should be treated almost like humans. They are special, special animals and this is what I feel. They need to be certified.

Chair Considine:

Seeing no one else in Las Vegas, we will go to the phones for testimony in support of A.B. 418. [There was none.] Do we have anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 418? Please go ahead when you are ready.

Michael Alonso, representing Noah's Animal House Foundation:

Noah's Animal House Foundation is in very reluctant opposition. Noah's Animal House Foundation is a 501(c)(3). As some of you probably know, it shelters the pets of domestic violence victims in Las Vegas and in Reno. The concerns we have are we are not opposed to the training. I spoke to the sponsors about this and appreciate them bringing the bill and the conversation that we had. It is just more along the lines of some of the questions I think from the members. We are in the City of Las Vegas and City of Reno. Licensing is different in the City of Las Vegas than it is in the City of Reno. Just really more the concern, kind of what we are thinking, is maybe it should be more prescriptive on what type of training it should be so there is not different training in Las Vegas and different training in Reno and how the enforcement works in Las Vegas and how the enforcement works in Reno. Are their fees charged? What are those fees? Sort of those things that just—Noah's House provides everything. It provides food and veterinary care. It does all of those things and provides a place for the victims to come, and training is occurring because it is a really important thing and it is a sensitive thing.

That was just a concern; is it best practices? Are they inconsistent? The training is between one jurisdiction and the other. We support the training, and if there is some way to work this to make it work or an exemption for—because Noah's Animal House does not fit into the exemptions that are in the bill currently. It is something we are talking to the sponsors about and happy to keep working with them on.

Chair Considine:

Is there anyone else here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 418? [There was no one.] Not seeing anyone else in Las Vegas approaching the table, is there anyone on the line in opposition to A.B. 418?

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I have a service dog and I do oppose this bill and I appreciate Assemblymember Karris for her concern. I wish that it would require to have a video because if my service dog goes to a grooming place and comes out and it is limping or something is happening with him, I cannot go anywhere because he is my eyes. I would really be looking forward to seeing if we could talk to the sponsor of the bill to make sure that the groomers, or what this bill is talking about, they are held accountable. If they do provide a video, not that I will see because I am blind, but Gemini will describe that for me nowadays. It will be an incentive for the business to do good by the pets and I would not mind paying an extra \$10-\$20 to have the videotape because my dog is important to me. He is my eyes.

Chair Considine:

We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone here in Carson City? If you would like to testify in neutral on this bill, please go ahead when you are ready.

Joanna Jacob:

We are neutral because we did the ordinance and we think that our ordinance does fit the parameters of this bill right now. Obviously, there have been amendments discussed. We will continue to work with the bill sponsors because they worked with us, and just to follow up on a few questions and on the subject, today, our ordinance does require the staff at every facility to also take the training. We think the language that says we can prescribe the form of the training would cover that so we would not have to change our ordinance. That is why we are neutral. I think this is one of the things that is giving the localities the flexibility, is probably the right way to go here. We will continue to work on this with the bill sponsors and we are neutral today.

Chair Considine:

Is there anyone else neutral on Assembly Bill 418 who wants to testify in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line? [There was no one.] Would the presenters like to make any final comments?

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

Just a quick thank you for allowing us to present this bill and thank you for your thoughtful questions. We do appreciate it because we do not think of everything, otherwise we would not have to have hearings. We are working with Mr. Alonso on his concerns. I do not want anybody to be surprised when you see an amendment for those concerns and we are open to working with any of the Committee members if you have concerns and would like to see amendments. We are happy to discuss it.

Assemblymember Hardy:

I, too, just want to thank you for hearing this bill and for your questions and suggestions. I think one thing we can all agree on is that we want our animals to be safe and to be cared for when they are out of our presence. There have been some great suggestions here and as Assemblymember Hibbetts said, we would work with anyone who would like to get this just right so the situation Ms. Jensen faced and went through can hopefully be prevented in the future and that their little dog Daisy, her passing will bring about legislation that protects other animals. We would like to call this Daisy's Law in remembrance of her. We look forward to working with all of you in hopes of passing this legislation.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:

I apologize. I just want to put on the record our appreciation for Ms. Jacob and Clark County and their assistance in coming up with this.

Chair Considine:

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 418 and we will move to public comment. [There was none.]

Our next meeting will be Friday, March 28, 2025, at 8 a.m. in Room 3143. That concludes our meeting today. The meeting is adjourned [at 9:23 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karri Hurwitz
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster