

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

**Eighty-third Session
March 31, 2025**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 3:36 p.m. on Monday, March 31, 2025, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 6 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John Ellison
Senator Lori Rogich

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Dina Neal (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Fabian Doñate, Senatorial District No. 10
Senator Edgar Flores, Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Jeff Stone, Senatorial District No. 20
Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel
Diane Rea, Committee Secretary

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 31, 2025
Page 2

OTHERS PRESENT:

Samantha Bivins
David Cherry, City of Henderson
Isaac Hardy, Humane World for Animals
Penny Lambright, Founder, Chairman and CEO, Patriots and Paws
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Jeff Rogan, Clark County
Kenny Taylor, Chief Constable, Henderson Township
Adrian Hunt, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Jason Walker, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Jordan Ross
Isaac Velasquez
Pio Rejas
Teissy Angel Ramirez
Ed Uehling
Jason Woodard, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Cyrus Hojjaty
Arturo Carmona
Mo Denis
Christine Johnson
Marco Rauda
Mario Delarosa
Arturo Castro
Rogelio Regalado
Brittany Walker

CHAIR FLORES:

I would like to open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 325.

SENATE BILL 325: Requires certain counties and cities and certain nonprofit organizations to establish a program relating to the adoption of certain animals. (BDR 20-1004)

SENATOR FABIAN DOÑATE (Senatorial District No. 10):

I come today to speak on S.B. 325, a bill that waives the adoption fee for pets for veterans, law enforcement officers and first responders. Today I am joined by Samantha Bivins. We will go over the bill language, background and the provisions of this bill.

Senate Bill 325 is an act relating to animals. [As shown in the] presentation ([Exhibit C](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.) it requires the governing body of a county or incorporated city and certain nonprofit organizations that operate an animal shelter to establish a program to waive the adoption fee of certain pets adopted by a person who is a veteran, law enforcement officer or first responder, and requires the Department of Veterans Services to submit a report to the Legislature concerning such programs.

In 2020, the Pets for Vets Act, S.B. 245, took effect in California allowing veterans with a valid veteran [-designated] driver's license to adopt any cat, dog or rabbit for free. The program received a surge of positive feedback, and veterans in Nevada are eager to hear about the possibility of the same bill being introduced in this State. Owning pets, especially dogs and cats, has been shown to improve veterans' mental health. Veterans report feeling calmer, less lonely and more secure when they have a dog by their side. The benefits are particularly strong for those with PTSD, leading to better self-care, increased completion of household tasks and meaningful reductions of PTSD symptoms with assistance dogs. At the same time, shelters are facing an overflow of pets in need of loving-caring owners; pairing veterans with these animals creates a mutually beneficial relationship, improving veterans' mental health while also giving pets a stable home. With that being said, S.B. 325 requires counties and cities with animal shelters to establish a program waiving adoption fees for veterans, law enforcement officers and first responders to the extent that funding allows, and nonprofit shelters that receive county or city funding must also implement a similar program. By connecting veterans, law enforcement officers and first responders with pets in need, we create a cycle of support that benefits both the individuals and our heroes.

Before Ms. Bivins mentions her remarks, I do want to reference that there is a proposed conceptual amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) to the bill. Instead of making it a "shall" establish a program, a county or city "may" establish a program that waives the adoption fees of an animal that is six months or older and has been at [the shelter for at] least seven consecutive days.

We took that recommendation based on our initial meetings from the Animal Foundation in Las Vegas, where it becomes more cost-prohibitive for the cities and counties as animals stay in the shelter longer. We saw this as not only a reduction in fees of getting pets out of our shelters but also providing support to

our veterans and our heroes. The rest of the provisions just deal with reporting, et cetera.

The last thing that I want to say is, I think before the Department of Veterans Affairs [Services] handling the reporting requirements to the Legislature, now we say that a county or city that chooses to enact such provisions for that program would be the ones that refer the data back to us in terms of how practical or how popular the bill has been upon being signed and implemented.

At this time, I would like to pass it over to Ms. Bivins to talk more about the background of the bill.

SAMANTHA BIVINS:

I am excited for the opportunity to copresent this important and impactful legislation with my close personal friend, Senator Fabian Doñate, and give my testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR FLORES:

To your family, we say thank you for their service and to your service.

DAVID CHERRY (City of Henderson):

As many of you know, the city operates its own animal shelter. One of the things we try to do is make sure that we are able to give as many pets as we can, who come into our shelter, an opportunity to have a loving home. I think I could not say it better than the presenters of the bill said today about the importance of finding those pets homes; even better with this bill, they would go to homes of veterans, first responders and our police officers. I think this is a win-win all around. We are proud to support this bill, and we hope that you will do the same as members of the committee.

ISAAC HARDY (Humane World for Animals):

Echo. This is a good bill. It is going to support our veterans and encourage pet adoption.

PENNY LAMBRIGHT (Founder, Chairman and CEO, Patriots and Paws):

I will read my letter of support ([Exhibit F](#)).

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):

Washoe County is neutral. I want to thank Senator Doñate for the amendment that he brought forward that makes this permissive for local governments. It gives the option to opt in. Some counties or cities may not have the fiscal ability to do this, so we appreciate it. And Senator, while I know that this is not a fiscal committee, I did want to note, perhaps to prevent the bill from going to the fiscal committee, that this amendment does remove the fiscal note that Washoe County had originally submitted.

JEFF ROGAN (Clark County):

I just want to ditto exactly what Ms. Matijevich said just a moment ago. This was very important to us that the amendment come through with the ability to opt in. And I want to thank Senator Doñate for bringing that forward and agreeing to that amendment.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 325. Next on the agenda, I will open the hearing on S.B. 210.

SENATE BILL 210: Revises provisions relating to fees collected by constables and sheriffs for certain services. (BDR 20-540)

SENATOR JEFF STONE (Senatorial District No. 20):

It is my pleasure to present S.B. 210, which revises provisions related to law enforcement for certain services. With me today from Las Vegas is Kenny Taylor, constable serving in Henderson. Senate Bill 210 aims to revise the fee structure for services provided by law enforcement agencies, sheriffs of each county in the State of Nevada and constables. The bill proposes increases in various fees associated with law enforcement services, such as serving summons, taking bonds and executing writs. The increased fees are outlined on pages 2 through 5 in the bill. These fees have not been increased in 20 years.

Section 1 [amends] NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 248.275, subsection 1 to indicate the fees that a sheriff of each county in the State may charge and collect.

Section 2 [amends] NRS 258.125 to indicate the fees that constables are entitled for their services. There is no fiscal impact on local government or the State. The intent is to update the fee structure to reflect current service costs

and ensure that law enforcement agencies are adequately compensated for their services. You will see an amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) that was submitted. We are asked to incorporate the fees from Senator Ohrenschall's bill, S.B. 381, which changes are reflected in the amendment ([Exhibit H](#)).

SENATE BILL 381: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 20-1076)

I will now turn it over to Constable Kenny Taylor appearing from Las Vegas.

KENNY TAYLOR (Chief Constable, Henderson Township):

As the Senator spoke, the fees have not gone up or had any change since 2002. Since that time, the cost of living and the economy has more than doubled as far as the inflation. In 2024, just our vehicle insurance alone had gone up 300 percent with no warning. With these outrageous fees and stuff, there's cost to operate the office, and to maintain the deputies to provide the services is just really in need of some additional funds. Just the cost of doing business, as far as being able to serve the public in a timely fashion, has gone up. As far as trying to maintain deputies in order to provide these services as well, the cost of fuel has gone up. I do not know if you caught it, but the cost of insurance just for our vehicles in 2024 had gone up 300 percent which was something that came upon us that was completely unexpected. I believe that it is time now for us to make these changes. Most of the fees—it does not cost the public. Most of the fees that we are associated with are by large companies, law firms and so on. Sometimes, we do have eviction fees and stuff that are from citizens. For the most part, it is large corporations and property owners.

SENATOR ELLISON:

Isn't this something that they could have done administratively in each county?

SENATOR STONE:

It did require state legislation in order to enact these new fee schedules.

SENATOR ELLISON:

They seem like that would be something small that actually goes to a private vendor or area that the fees could have been adjusted down there. And I just hope this is going to be enough to at least break even, this process.

MR. ROGAN:

This is an important bill for our counties. These fees, because they have not been raised in 20 years, we have to subsidize with taxpayer dollars. Our constable's office and I want to hit on something that Constable Taylor touched upon briefly. Generally speaking, constables and deputy sheriffs in some counties, their job is to enforce judgments that have been obtained in private civil actions. It is some private person suing another private person or private business obtaining a judgment that they then take to the constable to enforce, meaning to get the money that they are due from the judgment. These are costs that should be borne by those private parties. They should not be borne by the taxpayers. Just for context, last fiscal year, Clark County subsidized our constable's office to the tune of \$1.2 million. We do need these fee increases—although it is never very popular—in order to make sure that we are breaking even in our constable's office, and we ask for your support.

ADRIAN HUNT (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

We also echo the same sentiments of Clark County. We thank Senator Stone for bringing this forward, and we urge the committee to advance this bill.

JASON WALKER (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):

Thank you, Senator Stone, for the work you have done in getting this bill brought forward. The processes and civil service are increasingly on the rise in Washoe County, and I am sure that they will continue. Urging your support for S.B. 210.

JORDAN ROSS:

I am chair of the Southern Nevada Rural Constables Alliance, Nevada State Director for the National Constables and Marshals Association and Constable of the Laughlin Township. I want to particularly thank Senator Stone for having brought this forward, and I also appreciate Senator Ohrenschall's cosponsorship of the bill. As Constable Taylor pointed out, as well as Deputy District Attorney Rogan, we have seen significant increases in cost without seeing increase in revenue to support this.

Constable Taylor mentioned automobile insurance. The fact is that across the board on risk management, workers' compensation, liability insurance umbrella policies—these have all increased. Clearly, as he also pointed out, the cost of mileage needs to be increased because we have not seen this. In addition to which you know, the more complex cases take up more time, and we need to

be able to see more to at least try to achieve the goal of breaking even or as close to it as we can get. I would also point out that as Mr. Rogan pointed out, virtually all of the consumers of the services of both constables, as well as the civil divisions of sheriffs, are serving for the most part commercial clients, and that these are, as he said, private matters.

SENATOR STONE:

Thank you for your consideration of S.B. 210 that seeks to modernize the fee schedule for sheriffs and constables, ensuring that the fees charged are commensurate with the services provided. This bill is crucial for maintaining the financial sustainability of local law enforcement agencies in Nevada. I urge your support and thank you for your consideration.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close out the hearing on S.B. 210. The next two bills up on the agenda are mine, so I will hand over the gavel to our Vice Chair Ohrenschall. We will be doing S.B. 155 first.

SENATE BILL 155: Revises provisions governing peace officers. (BDR 23-326)

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I would like to open the hearing on S.B. 155.

SENATOR EDGAR FLORES (Senatorial District No. 2):

It is an honor to be on this side of the dais presenting S.B. 155. I am joined today by Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva who proudly represents Assembly District 28 which is my former district. I truly believe we have an incredible human in Assemblymember D'Silva; I left that seat, and I think we got an upgrade for sure in the Assembly. Also sitting in the room is former Senator Mo Dennis, and I have the tremendous honor of now being in his seat. It is just a special day for us to have the privilege of all three of us being in the same room.

I wanted to give everybody some general background on S.B. 155. I then would like to hand it over to Assemblymember D'Silva. Isaac Velasquez will then close out the presentation.

By way of context, this conversation started last session. The City of North Las Vegas is joining us in the room.

They [the Assembly] had A.B. No. 30 of the 82nd Session where they were trying to engage in a very similar conversation. We are going to be working off of the amendment ([Exhibit I](#)). I want to make sure that everybody is working off of this amendment and not the actual bill as that is changed.

The data, according to the military in the United States: Since 2001, we have had approximately over 150,000 non-U.S. citizens honorably serve in our military, engaged at times of war, [who] have served our country honorably. I make that point because what S.B. 155 looks to do is allow for non-U.S. citizens who have been honorably discharged from the U.S. military and are lawfully authorized to work in this country to apply to be members of law enforcement.

I want to make this point. I have had an opportunity to speak with every agency on this issue, or better said representative of law enforcement. Some agencies have indicated that with the amendment, they are now in neutral. Others have indicated that they still have some concerns, and we will allow for them to bring those up during the opposition. But I just wanted to make it abundantly clear that we have been working with them. We have notified them from the very beginning, including during the interim, that we were trying to do this bill and why we were trying to do it. Just by way of context, for those of you who are wondering, why are we hoping to expand the pool of candidates? What is the benefit and what is the current rule now?

I will reference the Immigration Nationality Act (INA), throughout this conversation today. There are really four key sections: 316, 319, 328 and 329. Those are the ones that really focus on naturalization, becoming a U.S. citizen. Just by way of a simple introduction to immigration law under INA 316 and 319, you will see that it usually takes five years from the moment you become a lawful permanent resident to apply for citizenship.

There are exceptions to those rules. Some of them are if you served in the military, sometimes you can expedite that. Those go into the 328 and 329 sections. At times, if you have served in the time of war, you can also expedite citizenship even if you are undocumented and you have served. There are a lot of cases of that wherein after specific wars, we utilize that statute to help those folk. And if you are married to a U.S. citizen, sometimes you can expedite it and become a naturalized citizen within three years.

What is really important though to understand is this: In order for you to be lawfully authorized to work in the United States and to obtain a benefit, become a lawful permanent resident or obtain some other immigration benefit, you must go through a U.S. Department of Homeland Security vetting and background check. It is much more intense than any background check that even law enforcement does. And the reason for that is they want to know if you have any other type of convictions or charges in different countries. They want to see if you have any pending charges here in the U.S. They want to do detailed biometrics. They cross-reference between almost every single database that the U.S. has, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. They do their whole other extensive background check, and they just cross-reference through all of those.

After you go through that very intensive background check and you apply for continuous work permits or you are applying for other benefits, you then again go through another background check each and every single time. In addition to that, in order for you to enlist in the U.S. military, you also go through a background check there. So now the individuals that we are talking about and we are capturing in this particular bill have gone through an intensive Department of Homeland Security background check. They've gone through the military background check and then when they apply, they'll go through the third background check with that specific agency; and even there, if there's any flags or concerns, they simply do not have to hire them. But that candidate, in my opinion, will have gone through more intense vetting than an individual who applies for law enforcement—and is not an individual who's gone through the Department of Homeland Security vetting or [that by the] U.S. military. So, as an employer, when you have one of these individuals try to apply, you know for certain that they've gotten at least through two very intensive background checks before you even put them through yours. I wanted to make that abundantly clear to address concerns of how do we know this individual has been vetted? I wanted to make that clear, that is how it would work.

The reason we have been so passionately advocating for this particular conversation is there are folk who have served our military, and it is a natural transition for those individuals to want to go into law enforcement. Granted, we previously alluded to that the process could take a few years. You can wait for five years, or whatever it may be and simply do it then. But I just think that it is a missed opportunity, and I have always been an advocate to utilize individuals and maximize their talent exactly when we have them available. So, if we have

individuals who are ready to apply to become members of law enforcement, but they just have not been able to become citizens for whatever reason, or they are not eligible yet, whatever it may be, I think we maximize the opportunity to have those candidates apply.

The other thing I wanted to make clear is that this individual will be held to a much higher standard because unlike a U.S. citizen, should they get in trouble or commit any errors that could potentially lead to a conviction, not only would they be looking at possible termination of their job, but they are also looking at termination and being disallowed from remaining in this country as it could be a removable [offense]. So, they have to adhere to a much higher standard because they can't get in trouble now because their immigration status could put them in a scenario where they get deported. I just want to make that clear because they are going to live to a much higher standard because they have to.

I would like to hand it over to Assemblymember D'Silva. I do not know that everybody knows his story. He has a purple heart. He has honorably served this country, but I do not think you know the full story and breadth of everything he has done for this country and, more importantly, about his immigration status while he was serving our country honorably and fighting overseas.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER REUBEN D'SILVA (Assembly District No. 28):

I was supporting this bill in its original language. I just was told earlier today that the bill had been amended to a more narrowly tailored format, and I am even more supportive of it now.

A little bit about my own background, my immigration story. Senator Flores has brought me here to expound upon my experiences in the armed services as an immigrant. I came to the U.S., and I was undocumented until I was 13 years old and did not have any papers. When I joined the service, I was a green cardholder. I was a legal permanent resident at that time. For the duration of my time in the U.S. military, in the U.S. Marine Corps, I was not a citizen. I was a permanent resident, a green cardholder. Up until the very last few months is when I finally received my citizenship. As many of you know, I was deployed and served in Iraq. I was not a citizen during my deployment, and I was injured in the war. I was shot through the arm by a sniper during a combat resupply mission in Fallujah. At that time too, shedding blood for this nation, my nation, I was not a citizen of that nation. I would not have been able to vote or

do any of those things; hold office, none of those sorts of a privileges that are held by American citizens.

While I was in Iraq, I was handling sensitive intelligence data. We would get intelligence briefings about troop movements, about where the enemy was positioned, where we believe the enemy was moving along our convoy routes. I was privy to sensitive communications data. I had on my radio the ability to contact the F-18s that were flying above head to call them airstrikes. I transported all kinds of sensitive material, including arms and munitions, throughout the area of operation in the Al Anbar province, I was in the Fallujah, Ramadi [Wadi] Hauran, Al Assad area in central and western Iraq, and I was not a citizen at the time. The work that I was doing—and many folks, who have been making opposition statements against this bill, have been saying should be only in the realm of a U.S. citizen. Only U.S. citizens should be allowed to do that type of work. I was doing that type of work at the very front lines of our security efforts for this nation in a war zone as a noncitizen.

After I was injured, I spent some time in the hospital. I was at Balboa Navy Hospital, and I had a caseworker assigned to me, and their job was to pretty much transition me out. I had a pretty significant injury. My arm was pretty much blown off. It had to be reconstructed, and they asked me, what can we do for you? What are some of the things that we can help you toward transition into the civilian world? I told them there are two things. I want to see my parents more if you can just get them here to San Diego. And number two, I want to become a U.S. citizen.

It took some time—but before I left the armed services, literally, about six months—before I was able to raise my right hand and take that oath and become a U.S. citizen. I was one of many who served in my platoon, not just the company but at the very basic level, who was a green cardholder at the time. I know that Senator Flores and I go a long way: he knows some of those individuals who served in that role. We were reservists who went to war from this community. Many of them wanted to come back and serve in law enforcement but just could not. Eventually, all of us became citizens, but we were not able to extend that service that we had already exhibited to this nation, to our own community. I wanted to look into law enforcement as a career, or firefighting, before I deployed to Iraq. That was one of my plans once I got up. But there was always that inhibitor here saying that I just would not be able to serve because I was not a citizen. That was my plan. My whole goal

was to get my citizenship and then go into law enforcement. Of course, that did not work out because I was injured. I am disabled. I can't use my left hand, and that really prohibited me from going into law enforcement.

I went to teaching as a way of also extending my service to this country, to this community. So I am of the strong sort of understanding and strong belief that this is one place where I think we could look at reevaluating our eligibility requirements for law enforcement for those who have been honorably discharged from the U.S. Armed Services who had the training, who had the extensive security background checks, who have the desire to serve and the sense of duty. This is a sort of a reform that we could make to current law to allow folks who have already given so much of this country to be able to then also give back to their communities as law enforcement officers.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Thank you, Chair Flores, thank you Assemblymember D'Silva for sharing your personal story, for your bravery and your courage fighting for our country and thank goodness you came back alive.

SENATOR DALY:

I know you spoke, Assemblymember, to some of the other people that came back that were also green cardholders. Were they honorably discharged when they got out?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER D'SILVA:

Yes, all of them were honorably discharged. It was just that during this time, we did have backlogs. You were trying to expedite citizenship requirements. I know that the Bush Administration had actually looked to also help expedite the citizenship applications of folks who were serving in the armed service. Especially when the war, you expanded the wars both in Afghanistan and Iraq, this became a priority. The process is a little bit more expedited today. But at that time, it did take years for folks who would come out of high school, join the armed services who go through a whole four- or even six-year enlistment and not be citizens. Eventually, the citizenship would come about, but they were all honorably discharged. But in that scenario, [they] would not be able to become law enforcement officers upon that discharge.

SENATOR DALY:

That was the other part of my question, I was looking at the existing language before any changes, and it says only citizens or wards of the U.S., and then it had or who have been honorably discharged from the military service of the U.S. may be employed as an officer. So, if citizen or not, existing law already said you could, but they still prohibited, they still said no?

SENATOR FLORES:

It was not my understanding that they would allow an individual who has been honorably discharged, presently, who is not a U.S. citizen to join law enforcement. And that is what has been conveyed to me by law enforcement.

SENATOR DALY:

It sounds like there is probably some confusion there. But the way I read it is if you were honorably discharged; because as you said, you do not have to be a citizen to serve. It takes time once you get out, as long as you were honorably discharged. I think this language would allow the honorably discharged person, but it would not allow anyone else that was legally employable in the U.S., which I think is a little bit of an expansion which is not bad. I am just saying that we are touching on two things here. I was just trying to make the point [that] is if there's somebody trying to say this is terrible, we should not do this, I said we have been doing it a long time already. At least in theory.

SENATOR ELLISON:

You would still have to go through POST and the training every officer has to go through. I think when you come out of POST, you are all ready to hit the street and ready to go, you are already a citizen. So not much more you can ask of you. I think the big thing is make sure that, you know, POST is available and some of the other things that Las Vegas will require. I guess that is where you are going to be an officer at. Right, or try.

SENATOR FLORES:

I just wanted to make it abundantly clear that any individual that is captured under this particular bill would have to undergo every other requirement that every other applicant would have to on the physical training requirement, the background check requirement, any type of examination or any requirement imposed on any other applicant; they would have to go through that. And to be abundantly clear, should this bill pass, there is nothing that disallows law enforcement from denying an applicant. They are not obligated to have to treat

them differently or give them a different point system. They are going to be treated exactly like every other individual. This only opens the door to allow them to apply, then law enforcement will decide whether or not that candidate is a good fit or not.

SENATOR ELLISON:

A lot of the people do not realize that World War I was getting into this, and World War II was massive. Anybody who came into the country could earn their citizenship by serving this country faithfully, and that is what you have done.

SENATOR ROGICH:

It is always nice to see you, Assemblymember. With regard to when they are honorably discharged, are they already in the process of seeking citizenship when they apply for the police department?

SENATOR FLORES:

Presently, not everybody is in line to become U.S. citizens either because they have not applied, they do not know that they can utilize the benefit that the military provides and/or, at times, there are scenarios where they do not want to be a citizen because they are working in special operations. A simple example would be they have a citizenship to a country that we are in conflict with, and they do not want to have the dual citizenship because the other country will make them lose their citizenship at that time. Strategically, they may not. The U.S. allows for dual citizenship, but other countries may not. So strategically, at times for purposes of operations and missions, they may choose not to become a U.S. citizen at that time and will have to wait for afterward, and sometimes it is just a strategic move. In most scenarios, when you do not have a citizen [it's] because they do not know they are eligible to take advantage of that benefit.

SENATOR ROGICH:

When an individual applies for the police force, will that be a requirement that they do become a citizen at some point?

SENATOR FLORES:

No. When they apply for the police force, they would just have to go through the regular kind of requirements that are imposed presently on every other individual. But there would not be an additional requirement for that individual.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER D'SILVA:

You know, that is a good question that you are asking, Senator. If you look at some other states, there are other states that allow green cardholders, regardless of veteran status, to serve in law enforcement. I think a good example is the NYPD [New York Police Department]. New York City now is a city that has a very strong immigrant character and has for a very long time. They allow noncitizens to become police officers. They prefer U.S. citizens, but they have opened the door for green cardholders to apply and become officers. They do mandate that you also have to begin a process to become a U.S. citizen while you are doing this, but it is dependent upon the different jurisdictions. I do not believe the way that the law is written here would be applicable in this scenario though.

ISSAC VELASQUEZ:

First and foremost, I would like to apologize. I am actually in Virginia at the moment attending BOLC [Basic Officer Leadership Course]. I think that one of the bigger issues that we come across is that we have a lot of people in the military, specifically like myself, where I was undocumented until I was about the age of 19. A lot of us are very patriotic toward this country since we were born and raised here. One of the biggest things that, as you are growing up, you tend to get pushed toward is that you want to be a police officer, a fireman or astronaut or something of that type of workforce. It has always been my dream to join the military. When I got my residency, I was finally able to do it. I would have wished to have the opportunity, and a lot of my friends have felt the same.

I have a couple of testimonies from other friends of mine that have been in the military and have not been in the military. But the residency part I feel is something that not only helps a lot because, when you look at a serviceman like Reuben D'Silva, for a while getting a residency or becoming a citizen from being in the military was not always a quick process. So in the meantime, it was something that we needed to make sure that we had before we applied. Given the circumstances today, fortunately, it might be a little bit quicker, but we never know in the future how that might be. We might get an administration that decides to hold a lot of citizenship pathways, and people could potentially still be in the military and be maintained as residents. So that is one of the concerns that I would have in this scenario and as to how we can expedite the process to have them serve their communities as police officers potentially in the future.

I also believe that this type of acceptance for residents can really help with enhancing community representation, specifically in communities where we have a lot of residents that maybe some citizens will always know what these residents are going through. But that is pretty much the gist of what I was thinking.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Thank you very much for your testimony. Thank you for your service to the nation and the military. I appreciate your being part of the presentation.

PIO REJAS:

I am here to express my strong support for A.B. 155 [S.B. 155] which expands the eligibility of peace officers to include individuals who are legally authorized to work in the U.S. under federal law. I was not aware of the amendment, so I will stick to the first one which I also support. This bill is deeply personal to me. My grandfather was a police officer, and his dedication to serving and protecting his community introduced me in a lifelong commitment to helping others and pushing for meaningful change. His ideas of service and justice live on in me. And I always wanted to follow in his footsteps to protect the peace just like my hero did. When I came to this country, I wanted to become a law officer to serve my community with honor and integrity. Unfortunately, because of, from my understanding, outdated restrictions that passed [it] was impossible for me. Instead, I chose to study political science. I feel that I have grown to love [this] because it allows me to advocate for the changes that truly matters. Changes like A.B. 155 [S.B. 155].

As a lawful permanent resident, I find it ridiculous to think that people like me who live here, contribute to our communities and follow the law would be denied the opportunity to protect and serve. Public safety is about dedication, integrity and the willingness to step up for our communities. It should not be restricted by outdated policies that exclude highly qualified individuals based on their immigration status. Protecting our community should be about one thing—ensuring that those who are ready and willing to serve can do so. I ask this committee to pass A.B.155 [S.B. 155] so that people like me and many others can have the opportunity to uphold peace and protect others.

TEISSY ANGEL RAMIREZ:

I am in full support of S.B. 155 due to the fact that Senator Flores mentioned we do have to follow a lot of procedures. I am not under the military, but I am

an undocumented individual but protected with DACA [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals]. We have to go through the background check. But not only that, individuals that have gone through the system should have that opportunity to also be able to contribute to society. It will also benefit Nevada and also their families. We do see a lot of individuals that are seeking for jobs in our community. I am fully advocating for those individuals that are out of the workforce, and it is a great opportunity for us to grow in Nevada.

ED UEHLING:

I think it is the function of a police force or anything local is a local matter. It is none of the government's business in Washington, D.C., what qualifications are required. So certainly, this should not only be permitted, but it should be expanded so other well-deserving immigrants and people that are not citizens yet can participate in the society. Unfortunately, it was chosen to use the example of Fallujah; however, as indicating service to the country. Fallujah was one of the biggest, most horrible massacres and just demolishing of another people's homes and their lives and everything. It is unfortunate to use that as an indication of service. Unfortunately, I know our country has killed about 22 million people since World War II. In all these battles, they've overthrown about 41 countries' governments and provoked wars all over the world. But Fallujah is the My Lai of the Iraq debacle that should have never ever happened in the first place. I think that is highly unfortunate, but I certainly support this law and expanding it to everything that we do locally.

JASON WOODARD (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

First, as a marine and a retired police officer I would like to thank Assemblymember D'Silva for sharing his story. I would also like to thank Senator Flores for the conversation and dialogue in regard to this bill. As it currently stands, the membership of the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association is in opposition of this bill.

One of the reasons why is NRS 289, rights of peace officers, also prescribes to law enforcement agencies the requirements involving backgrounds that must be met or the background investigations that must be done in order for agencies to lawfully hire and employ someone as a peace officer. One of those requirements is to establish that the individual is of good moral character. I am not asserting that any of these folks that we have talked about here today do not fall within that category of exceptional moral character; however, there is a challenge when trying to establish that history or that level of background when some

information is not available to background investigators. Primarily, some of the information not available to background investigators would be information that basically is a break in information accessible to that investigator because the individual took up residency in the U.S. midway or halfway through their life point. This can create challenges in order for us to complete a thorough background investigation and ultimately submit a background.

Again, I want to thank Senator Flores for being open to this conversation or to a dialogue. We look forward to further conversations on this point.

MR. WALKER:

Washoe County Sheriff's Office is in opposition to S.B. 155. I echo the comments of Lieutenant Woodard. Unfortunately, we are not able to get to a better position.

SENATOR DALY:

When I was reading the section of the language, that existing language that says if a person is honorably discharged, [a person] may or may not be a citizen. Are you guys denying those people if they apply because they are not citizens, even though they have been honorably discharged, and the law says that they can?

MR. WALKER:

I do not have the exact language in front of me, but when I managed our backgrounds investigation division, I believe that was one of the provisions that was set forth from Human Resources specific to U.S. citizen prior to application.

SENATOR DALY:

I will read it to you again. What it says right now in [NRS] 281.060, "only citizens or wards of the United States or persons who have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States."

There's no rule. If you guys have a rule that is doing that, you are in violation of this statute the way I read it. I was just curious if you know if you are or if you are not.

MR. WALKER:

Thank you for pointing that out. Senator Daly, I will follow up when I get back and bring that information forward.

SENATOR ELLISON:

I did not understand, but the U.S. did a background check prior to going into the military. Is that correct?

MR. WALKER:

Yes.

SENATOR ELLISON:

Secondly, the military does a background check when they get there. That's two. Then when they become a citizen, they have a background check. So, I am kind of confused that you guys will not allow somebody that now, as a citizen of the U.S. with three background checks, you will not even allow them to apply to have a background check.

MR. WALKER:

Thank you for bringing that to my attention, Senator Ellison. Just like I stated to Senator Daly, I will double-check on my end and bring that information forward, but I believe that is the way that we have it written.

SENATOR ELLISON:

Would you please get that back to us because I think that needs to go to the Governor.

I am not saying I am right or wrong. I am just saying that when somebody went through that much to become a citizen, they've done everything in the world, I think, right. Anyway, sir, if you do not mind, I would like to have that information brought back to me.

MR. WALKER:

I will follow up on that.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I appreciate that, and do you mind copying the chair and all the members of the committee too, if you are able to?

MR. WALKER:

No problem at all.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

I have heard a lot of great points from the testimony and support, and there's a lot of good intention behind it. We appreciate all the efforts and the service that was given by Reuben D'Silva and I believe the Senator, too. I am just uncertain about crime rates. I just need to know, has this been done before? And has this had an effect on crime rate? So as long as there has not been an increase in crime, I would not be in opposition. So I am just uncertain, and I am also curious about why has this not been also extended to firefighters? I mean, I think that is important too. I am just curious because I was in Altadena just now and oh, man, heartbreaking.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Letters of opposition have been received from Reva Crump ([Exhibit J](#)) and George and Darla Lee ([Exhibit K](#)). I will close the hearing on S.B. 155 and open the hearing on S.B. 367.

SENATE BILL 367: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 18-1085)

SENATOR EDGAR FLORES (Senatorial District No. 2):

I am here to present S.B. 367, alongside Arturo Carmona and former State Senator Mo Denis. I will provide everybody a little bit of a road map, a walk through a little bit of where the genesis of this concern comes from. Mr. Carmona then will walk through as an industry expert on how he believes that we can address the concerns that we have through this bill. Then he will hand it right back over to me so I can very quickly walk you through the sections of the bill so that everybody knows how we are exactly addressing that issue.

All of us had the pleasure of serving in this committee and or in this building during great times. We have all been here where we have been working through very great times of our history, and then a lot of us have served during COVID, which was very dark times of our history. Unfortunately, when we were going through the pandemic, one of the realities that became very clear was that not all communities were impacted of the same. There are disproportional impacts, particularly in our rural communities and traditionally disenfranchised communities in general communities of color, et cetera.

One of the reasons for that was because information did not travel the same and as quickly as we needed it. At times, we were in directive number five or six or seven, and some of the rural communities were just getting directive two. In such a fast-paced environment where there were so many things happening and we needed to get the information out, vulnerable communities were unfortunately left out, and we saw this with the rural communities. But in general, communities that speak different languages, the information was just unfortunately not getting there fast enough. As a state, we have a responsibility to ensure, particularly when we are all mandated, to follow certain rules or to comply or to ensure that we are doing things in unison. Unfortunately, that was not happening.

One of the reasons for that—how we were pushing out information—is key. How we move information from point A to point B is crucial, and at times just putting information out online is not sufficient because not everybody has access to the internet. The traditional approach of maybe putting everything in a newspaper does not work, or maybe the traditional approach of just putting everything in one specific language may not work. Perhaps we give a contract to a company based in Southern Nevada that does not have the relationship that they should in the rurals. Now they have a contract and they are supposed to be moving information to the rurals.

When we have a lot of companies or we have established, well-recognized entities, the rurals can be the ones to move the information out there. What we look to address here specifically is that, how information is moved in this State: and that we have the best partners and that we create a database of these best partners so that we can utilize them to move information in and out from different regions of the State, and that we utilize the best folk that we have in the rurals to do that. To approach the rural conversations, we utilize the best partners that we may have in other communities that speak Tagalog or Arabic or Spanish and we utilize them to move information.

That is ultimately the agenda. COVID really put that front and center and with that, I would like to hand it over to our industry expert, Arturo Carmona.

ARTURO CARMONA:

Thank you for your work on a bill that is very important to our communities. I am the president of the Latino Media Collaborative (LMC). As a leading advocate for sustainable journalism, LMC has formed powerful collaborations

with over 25 networks and media outlets representing over 100 TV, radio, digital and print platforms. The creation of a community media program within the Department of Administration would help Nevada maximize the use of these community and rural media as platforms for the state's outreach campaigns.

Unfortunately, many state employees who manage state advertising are not fully aware of the media outlets that could be effective partners in the advertising campaigns the state sponsors. Many of the media outlets that could be valuable partners with the State are not well-versed in how they can compete for contracts that place advertising in the media on behalf of state government, especially in rural and disadvantaged communities. The community media program would help remove these barriers by educating state agencies about the utility of advertising in community and rural media by informing these media outlets about the potential for them to publish advertising that will help their readers learn about topics that are important to their lives.

One of the major priorities is making sure that Nevadans in rural and urban communities get accurate and timely information about government policy and decisions that affect their lives from public health and emergency preparedness to access to benefits and services for themselves, their businesses and their families. As you know, governments at every level, but especially the State, use outreach and advertising to communicate with residents about the programs and services that affect them. For that communication to be effective, it is crucial that it take advantage of these resources and the community trust and understanding before these outlets.

Even as social media takes a larger role in the information economy, traditional media, including community newspapers, radio and TV, for many Nevadans is very important and critical, especially for seniors and those in rural communities. Senate Bill 367 would give Nevada a chance to address this issue in a way that is mindful of the state's unique demographics, especially its strongly rural nature and the importance of senior communities.

SENATOR FLORES:

I would like to walk through the bill very quickly. Do a section by section. I am not going to read at you, but I just wanted to give you highlights.

One of the larger sections is section 2. Section 2 creates the rural and community media program within the Department of Administration to assist

state departments and agencies in public outreach, public engagement, marketing, advertising in rural communities and historically underrepresented communities. It also lays out the responsibilities of the director who will develop and maintain a database of rural and community media outlets in the State. This goes back to the conversation that I brought up when we opened up the hearing and ensures that we have the right partners that are best situated to move information in Nevada that also provide training, education and outreach to the state departments and agencies about the importance of rural and community media.

It also creates an annual report requirement. The director must submit an annual report to the Legislature. This is to ensure that we are utilizing the best partners. It may come to our attention that we have a huge database of rural partners and when we are talking about moving information to the rurals, we are not utilizing any of them. That would be a scenario that we would probably want to push back and ask for some feedback. Why are we utilizing these folk versus the folks that are best situated to better serve the needs and/or move information in those areas?

In addition to that, it also details what the report must include, which is information on the utilization of rural community media outlets and any contracts or subcontracts within these outlets.

Section 3 specifies specific requirements for departments and agencies. Any state department or agency that spends money on public outreach, marketing or advertising should, to the greatest extent possible, direct these expenditures to rural community media outlets. The goal is to improve outreach and engagement with members of the community served by these media outlets. There's also the reporting requirement.

Section 4 just has definitions and applications that are already in existing law.

SENATOR ELLISON:

I am trying to get the fiscal note to come up on here and I can't get it to show up. Problem I got is some of the media outfits in rural Nevada have gone broke. You're putting another burden on top of them. Wells closed their unit. Wendover has 1 and 1.5. Eureka does not have anything. Elko has radio stations and one newspaper, which is back east now. Then Ely has two radio stations and one newspaper that is really small. You start going up the line and

there's zero, zero. When you are starting to do these reports and stuff on these, how are you going to do this? Number one, who pays for this? That's number two, and is the State? I can't see no fiscal note on here because there's nothing here. Maybe you could answer that for me.

SENATOR FLORES:

Absolutely. I appreciate your concern, but I think this cuts in the other direction. What I mean by that is we are not putting any type of requirement on the outlets themselves. The requirement is on the administrator, and what we are hoping to do is for example, you mentioned in Elko you have a radio station, and you have one print outlet. What they would do is voluntarily become part of this database with the administrator so that the administrator at some point, should they need information to be moving in rural Nevada, does marketing campaigns, does any type of outreach to the rurals that they [the State] instead of giving the contract to say company A in Southern Nevada—say, wait a minute, we have this radio station in Elko or we have this print outlet in Elko and we are trying to outreach in Elko. Let us utilize them. This is to help those companies and those entities that are already established and have a reputation within their own respective communities to give them an opportunity so that the State utilizes them. Because one of the things that we are concerned about that became very relevant during the pandemic is that we were spending money on marketing, we were spending money on different vendors, but we were not always utilizing the best ones that are best situated in the best location.

In this scenario that you mentioned, if they were a part of this database, the administrator would have outreached directly to them and said, “By the way, I see your radio station out in Elko, Nevada. We need to promote this campaign. We have this much funding, we'd like to hire you.” So this is to help them. There's no requirement on those outlets to do anything with reporting or any of that: that falls directly on the administrator.

MR. CARMONA:

As Senator Flores mentioned, the idea here is to distribute existing resources, existing money that the State is already spending on marketing and communications, not to create a fiscal note. And like was referenced, what we have seen is that far too many state resources are going to digital behemoths that are impacting the local journalism economy. We share the same concern that you articulated, and we want to turn that tide back. If the State is advertising on health or the Department of Motor Vehicles or you name it, we

want local rural and community outlets to get first in line of investment. I think we share the same concern as far as that particular question.

SENATOR ELLISON:

There are a couple, two to three stations out there, and usually each one of them has four stations on each radio. So that is not a problem. The [*Elko Daily Free Press*] is a little different. It used to be the *Elko Independent*, but it went broke too. Trying to sell advertising to some of these companies, if you are taking out advertisements, they will throw out the red carpet for you, but it is the other way around, it might be a little more difficult, so anything we can do to help, we will try. Wells had a great little newspaper, and they finally just threw up the towel. Wendover has two online newspapers. Nothing is in print; one prints a small one that I think it is once a week. But if you start getting farther, toward Pahrump, Hawthorne, Eureka all that way, then it starts narrowing down and you just can't put more burden on some of those people out there.

SENATOR FLORES:

I truly appreciate what you are mentioning because this is exactly why we are having this conversation. I would like to maybe invite, offline, for us to have a meeting with those particular media outlets because in my opinion, when they see the intent of the bill, they are going to realize that this is utilizing the money that is already being spent now and asking the question, are we utilizing the right folk? Because as you know, in Elko, a digital print ad might not be the best way to reach some of those folk. It might be a traditional newspaper. It may be radio, right? But the point is you got to speak to them, and I think those folk out there, those outlets that you are mentioning, are going to be the ones to come back and give real feedback. If you want to come and speak to the folk in Elko, we have the winning strategy for that, so it is really helping them. We'd love to have a meeting with them, all of us collectively, because I assure you that they are going to want to be a part of this.

MO DENIS:

One of the things that this really can do is to help those organizations in rural and other areas that perhaps are struggling now because they are not getting as much work. This would actually even the playing field a little bit and allow them to be able to stay in business. I would believe that in the future it would also help to maybe incentivize others to—if they see that there is going to be money spent in these areas—maybe start up some new media outlets in those areas.

We view this as a positive thing to get that information out to those areas with the people who best know those areas.

SENATOR DALY:

You have already said part of this is advertising dollars already being spent for a variety of different public service announcements when we had COVID, trying to get that information out there, a variety of things, of money that is already being spent. I think the intent on this is to try to get the best bang for your buck. Same as if this was private industry for profit, they would absolutely be going and looking for how can I reach my target audience?

A lot of times with state advertising, it is everybody in the State. Then are you going to enough of the diverse outlets or different outlets to hit all the targets? You can just go to one big one, the TV, and you are going to hit, but are you going to get down and drill down in the communities? I think that is where this database is trying to get to? Because if it was private and you are trying to make a profit, to drive business or customers to your business, you are definitely going to use the right outlet and try to find it. We're just trying to get the State to do that.

SENATOR FLORES:

One hundred percent. We specifically are addressing that concern. We have to be good stewards of the money we spend in this State. Presently, there are many marketing campaigns that are happening consistently and continuously throughout the year, every single year. Because we have an obligation as a State to move information to all regions of our State by creating this database that is voluntary, you as the private entity volunteered to participate in it. You're putting yourself out there, you are raising your hand. You're saying here is what I bring to the table. When you are trying to reach this demographic, here's how much I could charge. Here's how wide of a net I can cast. I think I would be the best person for that.

What we fear is happening presently, and it is not intentional; we are consistently working with the same groups when we are doing these marketing campaigns and missing the opportunity to do things better, more effectively, cheaper for the State. At the same time, [this would] maximize and help the outlets that, for example, Senator Ellison was mentioning that are out in Elko and would absolutely, probably, be the best folk to reach individuals out there.

MR. CARMONA:

The component of the training is absolutely critical because the spending is so disaggregated department by department, public information officer by public information officer. In each of the respective departments, we find that there could be very different perspectives on what efficiency means. What we are also saying is you should have a baseline training so that folks understand how to communicate with rural or urban centers or other areas so that you can increase the efficiency that Senator Flores talked about so that folks are advancing a communication strategy that is really informed by the best ways to communicate with our diverse community. Training is absolutely central to this policy.

SENATOR DALY:

I think along those same lines, the entity that is getting the business, they are going to give you back a report and say there are so many people and all that kind of stuff. They are not going to tell you if they are not doing a good job. Generally, they are getting the business, right. But I think—and not like every state agency is going to be running or hiring marketing developers or any of that kind of stuff—that is probably money not in their budget. But if they did reach out to some of these outlets, I think they would find out that and they can probably reach a particular demographic for less money more effectively, especially when they are supposed to be trying to get out across the State. If you are trying to communicate with people about emergency management or fire prevention, right, you gotta talk to the people that are in the wildfire interface areas and know how to get to them, and do not waste your money talking to people in the urban core.

SENATOR FLORES:

Absolutely. That's exactly what it is. We hope that a few years down the road after this bill passes, that Senator Ellison will come back and say, "Oh, you know, I have had conversations with these different outlets and, absolutely, they are doing a much better job moving some of this information." I keep picking on you, Senator Ellison, because you know your community in a way that I admire very much because you are out there. I call you the Governor of Elko. And I have upgraded you, but I think they respect the level of in-depth analysis that you bring to that community. You're really there, and you are listening to the beating heart of the community. That type of human is who should be leading the conversations in Elko. We are looking for outlets to do

that, and we want to do that in every beating heart of every community that serves as part of the bigger beating heart of what Nevada represents.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

One question I have, on S.B. 367, if this becomes law, do you think it might spur more community radio stations or public access television stations? We heard Senator Ellison talk about the dwindling number of radio stations and TV stations and newspapers. But I am wondering if something like this might try to spur maybe neighbors or communities to try to start a newspaper, start a radio station or a TV station?

MR. CARMONA:

That is the idea. The idea is to ensure that the resources that are being spent by the State really go to our local communities. I think a lot of that will also rest, I believe, in the way the program is administered by the Governor's Office and the program itself. But I think at the end of the day, that is the intent, that is the intent of the policy.

MS. RAMIREZ:

I am in full support because I am part of the outreach community, and I would love to see more language inclusivity. I will also love to see that my community also gets a piece of a pie, so I am in full support.

CHRISTINE JOHNSON:

I represent Caliente, the seat of Lincoln County. For those of you who may not be familiar, Caliente has a five-member city council led by Mayor Steve Rowe and Mayor Pro Tem Sean FitzSimons. The [city is] located approximately 150 miles north and a little bit east of Las Vegas.

The City of Caliente enthusiastically supports this bill. Efforts in this space have been promoted by the Lincoln County Authority of Tourism (LCAT), and they have been doing an incredible job. The increased partnership by the State will only amplify LCAT efforts. We appreciate the work of the sponsor to bring this bill forward, and we do hope that the committee will advance this important legislation.

MARCO RAUDA:

I want to thank the committee for listening to this bill, the sponsor for working on this bill with us and my partner Mo Denis for helping present the bill as well.

I think this is a great opportunity for us to just be able to get more information to more folks in kind of the pockets where the information does not get to. Looking forward to, hopefully, this committee passing the bill in the future.

MARIO DELAROSA:

I am here to support S.B. 367. I used to be a newspaper owner, but the pandemic forced us to close the doors. We could not print; also, we could not distribute the newspaper in case we printed it. It was very difficult, so we could not restart the newspaper, reopened because of the economics of that. It is very expensive to print a newspaper and to have reporters and everything that it involves having a newspaper. It is very important to bring this information to minorities and rural areas, information that might be in their own language. It is very important for the whole state to have people informed of benefits, opportunities and information.

ARTURO CASTRO:

I am the CEO of HCI Advertising of which the legal name is Hispania Comunicación Integral. We've been here in Las Vegas since 1998. We opened our Hispanic ad agency at that time, and we are a full-service advertising agency that offers services from A to Z, from strategy to content, creation production. And we have been impacted by this situation for 27 years. Every time we are closer to get a contract, something happens. Because we have been demonstrating that our company has brought amazing results, there is a lot of information that can show that. But every time that we are trying to get a new contract or something, we are impacted with this kind of situation. We are part of the media. It is important to say that media, it's the outlet, but we are the guys, not bad, but we also are the guys that create the strategies that create a communication, that create the content. And in today's days in the industry, they said that content is king. Media is queen. So we work together as one. So that is why I am here. That's why I support the bill.

ROGELIO REGALADO:

I am the owner of Fiesta 98.1 in Las Vegas, as a DJ as well. I fully support this bill because this will help the local media up in Elko or the local media that is focused on minorities. For example, my station, instead of going to a huge advertising agency that might use online sources that are not even in Nevada, this way you guys will support local media at my station or the local stations in the rural areas. That's why I fully support this bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 31, 2025
Page 31

BRITTANY WALKER:

On behalf of Boulder City, we are in support of this bill. We believe it will expand communication efforts to the rural areas.

SENATOR FLORES:

Thank you to all the different media outlets and small business owners that are here. This is a bill for them, and I appreciate them taking the time to meet with me, be here present and for the folk who joined us over the phone.

VICE CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We have a support letter ([Exhibit L](#)) from the Nevada Press Association. I would like to close the hearing on S.B. 367 and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank, signature page to follow

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 31, 2025
Page 32

CHAIR FLORES:

I would like to open it up for public comment. Having nothing further to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, we are adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 325	C	3	Senator Fabian Doñate	Presentation
S.B. 325	D	3	Senator Fabian Doñate	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 325	E	4	Samantha Bivins	Testimony
S.B. 325	F	4	Penny Lambright	Support Letter
S.B. 210	G	6	Senator Jeff Stone	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 210	H	6	Senator Jeff Stone	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 155	I	9	Senator Edgar Flores	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 155	J	21	Senator James Ohrenschall	Reva Crump Opposition Letter
S.B. 155	K	21	Senator James Ohrenschall	George and Darla Lee Opposition Letter
S.B. 367	L	31	Senator James Ohrenschall	Nevada Press Association Support Letter