

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS  
Seventy-ninth Session  
February 27, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:05 p.m. on Monday, February 27, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Scott Hammond, Senatorial District No. 18

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ben Graham, Administrative Office of the Court, Nevada Supreme Court  
Kim Kampling, Court Administrator, Division of Administration, Las Vegas  
Justice Court  
John T. Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association  
Andres Moses, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County  
Keith L. Lee, Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction  
Ronald P. Dreher, Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada  
Chuck Calloway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Jennifer Gaynor, Safe Nest  
Marissa Woodbeck, Director of Emergency Shelter Services, Safe Nest

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
February 27, 2017  
Page 2

Mark Rudy

David A. Dawley, Nevada Assessors' Association

Maurice Reid, Office of the Recorder, Clark County

John Fudenberg, Clark County

Barry Smith, Director, Nevada Press Association

Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division,  
Department of Motor Vehicles

Michael Nois

Jen Chapman, Recorder, Storey County Recorder's Office

John Bosta

Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Todd Ingalsbee, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada

Steve Schorr, Asian Cultural Alliance

Carl Magno, Asian Culture Television; Asian Cultural Alliance

Cavin Fung, Asian Cultural Alliance

M. Joseph Miller II, Compliance Officer, Chinese American Citizens Alliance,  
Las Vegas Lodge

Janeice Marshall, Asian Cultural Center

Oliver Lee, President, Korean Association of Las Vegas; Korean Chair, Asian  
Cultural Alliance

Diana Dikes

Billy Walker

Michael Susara

Tong Champ, Chair, Asian Cultural Alliance

Peter Tang, American Vietnamese Chamber of Commerce

Paul Magno, Asian Cultural Alliance

Wen Lee

Jaiming Zhang, Las Vegas Chinese Association, Nevada Chinese Association

Henry George, Pacific Islanders Chair, Asian Cultural Alliance

Pei Zhang, United States-Chinese Peoples Friendship Association

John Taylor

Rod Medallon

CHAIR PARKS:

I open the hearing today with three bills. I would like to go out of order and hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 79 followed by Senate Bill 6 and Senate Bill 175. I open the hearing on Senate Bill 79.

**SENATE BILL 79**: Revises provisions concerning the personal information of certain persons contained in certain records. (BDR 20-400)

BEN GRAHAM (Administrative Offices of the Court, Nevada Supreme Court):  
I appear on behalf of the Nevada Supreme Court and Administrative Offices of the Court. The Attorney General's Office is sponsoring S.B. 6. The intent is to harmonize S.B. 79 and S.B. 6. There have been incidents with public servants who have been attacked, their homes invaded, shots fired; they were stalked and threatened because their positions require they maintain the legal system.

**SENATE BILL 6**: Revises provisions relating to the confidentiality of personal information contained in records of county assessors. (BDR 20-376)

The intention of S.B. 79 and S.B. 6 is to widen and broaden the class of people with protection for their personal and confidential information. We narrowed a list of departments. The burden is placed upon local entities such as the assessor and the county recorder as well as Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Senate Bill 79 was broad, and we are asking to include job titles that are not in the written amendments. This law may help discourage a vendetta against a public servant. In Clark County, there are over 1,800 people with information blocks to access. There are only five or six information blocks in Carson City. A local judge's residence was invaded with gunshots. Confidential protection varies across the State.

KIM KAMPLING (Court Administrator, Deputy Clerk, Las Vegas Justice Court Administration):

California has a law that protects confidential information for judges and court administrators. I was assaulted by an employee who was aware of a pending termination. She researched my personal information through the Department of Motor Vehicles. After her termination, she came to my home with a knife and threatened me. Court employees have access to criminal records and DMV records, along with sensitive information. Nevada's protection law covers a judge in the assessor's office, but not the DMV, the Secretary of State's Office or the Clerk of the County Elections Office. It does not help if all of the public information is not made confidential.

A judge was attacked at a convenience store, and the perpetrator was released unbeknownst to the judge. The attack instilled fear that the perpetrator would search for the judge's residence because assessor's records are searchable

online. My name is on all the filings in court. Judges make decisions on people's lives. Court executive officers in district court sign death warrants. I get fan mail daily from jailed offenders, stating when they get out of jail they are going to find me at my house or their gang members will find me. The threat is either receipt of chocolate and flowers or they will kill me and my family. I would like my home address to be blocked and I support S.B. 79.

MR. GRAHAM:

The testimony is not of an isolated incident. Prior conversations with a Supreme Court Justice alarmed me that his assistant, whose name is on court documents, receives four or five letters a day from the prison.

JOHN T. JONES, JR. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):  
We support S.B. 79 with friendly amendments ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR RATTI:

Do public defenders need the same protections in some situations?

MR. JONES:

I do not represent the public defenders, but if they were on the bill and it does not cause a huge fiscal note, we would have no objection.

ANDRES MOSES (Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County):

This bill closes the gap by including other entities such as the Secretary of State, the Department of Motor Vehicles and the County Elections Department. We fully support S.B. 79.

KEITH L. LEE (Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction):

We support S.B. 79. It is important to extend these protections to justices of the peace, their families and spouses in appropriate circumstances and to broaden the scope of information that now can become confidential.

CHAIR PARKS:

At the justice court level do you hear domestic violence filings?

MR. LEE:

Yes. We hear initial arraignments and circumstances related to charges of domestic violence and misdemeanors.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
February 27, 2017  
Page 5

RONALD P. DREHER (Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada):  
We support S.B. 79 with the amendments Mr. Jones stated. Senator Ratti asked, why are the public defenders not listed? They too receive the same threats. The bill covers law enforcement and should cover the rest of the public employees who are subjected to threats.

SENATOR HARDY:  
Does this bill cover constables as well as potential constables?

MR. DREHER:  
I cannot answer that, but it should pertain to newly elected constables. We are talking about a bill that would make records confidential, but right now everyone is fair game. Persons in these public positions can have their information made confidential with this bill.

SENATOR HARDY:  
When running for office, it is required to provide an address. After the election, the person can request personal information to be redacted?

MR. DREHER:  
That is correct. Most people running for office are using post office boxes for their mailing addresses.

SENATOR HARDY:  
At voting you are not requested to provide your mailing address, you are asked where you live.

MR. DREHER:  
To address that issue would be however broad you want to make the bill.

CHAIR PARKS:  
When you file for office, there are certain documents that go public and certain documents that are not released as public documents.

CHUCK CALLOWAY ( Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):  
We support S.B. 79.

JENNIFER GAYNOR (Safe Nest):

Safe Nest is Nevada's largest nonprofit charity dedicated to assisting victims of domestic violence. We proposed an amendment to Senate Bill 6 but now understand Senate Bill 6 may be combined with Senate Bill 79. We want to support S.B. 79 and have Safe Nest included on the list of organizations which require the location be kept confidential to protect victims of domestic violence ([Exhibit D](#)).

MARISSA WOODBECK (Director of Emergency Shelter Services, Safe Nest):

We have taken every step to keep our area confidential and safe. The residents walk a half mile each way to a neutral meeting location to meet family and friends. Residents or employees are not permitted to disclose the address to keep the locations safe and confidential. The people we serve and protect have fled a residence of violence and danger. Residents were upset when they discovered our address listed on the Assessor's Website due to the public record information requirement. We have done all we can do, including hiring security officers to keep our area confidential and safe. We support the bill and are asking for your help to approve it. I provided a document on the history of Safe Nest ([Exhibit E](#)).

MARK RUDY:

It seems the people who are protected by this are testifying for it. The reason we do not have confidentiality protections for our public employees is because it is important for the public to know all. It is in the public's interest to know who the people are representing them. We have the lowest crime rates in the world, especially against elected officials, and this bill seems to be a measure that is going above and beyond to protect people in public positions. It is the risk you take when you enter into public employment to serve. I find it a more dangerous position if we do not know who our elected representatives are and what they stand for. It is important for people to know if their representative lives in their district, parish, county or state and to know who they are. There is already a disconnect between the elected representatives and people in this Country, and greater amounts of confidentiality to protect against a crime that is not coming is a bridge too far.

DAVID A. DAWLEY (Nevada Assessors' Association):

The assessors are concerned and oppose this bill. We understand public safety persons are faced with danger and understand the situation that public safety persons are in. We are opposed to this bill because we believe in transparency

and open government. We believe that whenever property tax or property information is removed from the tax roll, it opens the door to corruption. There have been other assessors in the United States that have accepted money in order to determine a value placed on a property.

We have an issue with section 4, subsections 3 and 4, where it states the photograph of the property is taken off the roll. I downloaded a picture and removed one property off the roll. It opens up the door to people interested in finding what is there. It attracts more people by taking the aerial photography off the roll and draws a huge attention to the property that is blacked out ([Exhibit F](#)).

In section 5, subsection 4, we are concerned with the statement "other employee of a court in this State." Does that include maintenance people and janitors? How far are we going to get into what are the actual "other employees of the court"? I do believe that possibly the court administrator and the prosecutors are entitled to protections.

I would like to clarify section 8. The assessor obtains ownership information, required by law, from the recorder's office. Section 8 states "by any governmental entity," but I want to clarify that does not limit the assessor to being able to get the information from the recorder's office so we cannot perform our jobs.

MAURICE REID (Office of the Recorder, Clark County):

We are neutral on this bill. We agree with the amendment to the bill that John Fudenberg is going to present regarding section 5. When we record a document, we identify the document by an instrument number.

JOHN FUDENBURG (Clark County):

We are neutral on this bill. I want to address the testimony from Maurice Reid from the Clark County Recorder's Office. We have been working with the courts and multiple recorders in the State and the Nevada District Attorneys Association by offering a friendly amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) to this bill. I would like to address Mr. Reid and Mr. Dawley's concerns. In agreement with Mr. Dawley, our amendment strikes section 4, subsections 3 and 4, stating that photos of the home would be removed. In section 5, subsection 1, we propose adding paragraph (c). Mr. Reid has concerns regarding the recording instrument number. Paragraph (c) in the amendment states that the affidavits contain an

“identifying recording instrument number” which is significant to the recorders throughout the State. The labor involved without that recording instrument number to remove and redact these records would be overwhelming. The Clark County Finance Department submitted a significant fiscal note. That fiscal note will be significantly reduced if the amendment is included.

CHAIR PARKS:

We have the amendment. Clark County did file a fiscal note. We will look more closely at the fiscal note for Clark County and the 16 counties that may face concerns.

BARRY SMITH (Director, Nevada Press Association):

I am neutral on this bill. I would like to be consistent with our testimony when the statute initially passed in the previous Session. It is very difficult to keep a handle on the growth of various classifications and people. This was our testimony when the statute was initially presented, the growth of titles of public employees wanting the protection. This is what we are seeing and hearing in testimony stating protection could be extended beyond the language as it is now.

CHAIR PARKS:

That certainly is something we will continue to consider.

JUDE HURIN (Management Services and Programs Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The Department of Motor Vehicles is neutral. We have submitted a fiscal note as a reflection of coming into compliance with the intent of the bill. We do have a great partnership with the courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Attorney General’s Office and are willing to partner with them for future amendments.

MICHAEL NOIS:

Those who have had the opportunity to expand on their outgoings of the pursuit of profit in the State and United States as well, unfortunately run into problems, not with the normal person, but maybe with a lawsuit or similar circumstance. My question, as a neutral person with a number of family members in law enforcement, once their military service is complete, is someone in a government office whose name has been removed should do something wrong, and we desire to search for more information to seek a remedy through a court



of law, how would we access this information if we do not have information to ensure we have just cause? The last thing I want to do is hunt for information so I do not try to follow a frivolous suit in due process. I believe we should protect those who uphold law and order. I am neutral and do hope those titles put aside are approved, but I hope the bill is not so blanket that anyone who has served in government service that you can never find out who they are. Transparency is what we are looking at, and there is a risk of rewards in a free society.

CHAIR PARKS:

I realize there is a level of information that is out there, not all of which is on the assessor's file, but we all know that we try to make access to that data for those who have the need to know easy. We will certainly take that into consideration.

JEN CHAPMAN (Recorder, Storey County Recorder's Office):

We are neutral on this bill. This is the world we live in. We have to protect those who protect us. We have concerns on how the bill is written. The Office of the Recorder manages the records and is frequently in these hearings working with the definition of personal information, which rules our lives. There are too many concerns as the bill is written now. A burden will be placed on a small county to implement the bill. We do not have a system like the larger counties have. Without a definition of home address, if someone is renting, or if someone retires, or a child becomes of age, there are questions about maintaining records forever. Without additional information as to how we can manage it, it is open-ended for the Recorder's Office. We support the idea and concept but have serious concern about the long-term records management. It adds new dimensions to the public information from *Nevada Revised Statutes* 239. Our NRS 247 points to NRS 239 and to NRS 603A.

There is confusion for a uniform application throughout the counties. The forms required to fulfill a request or for people who come in to view records, who creates the forms? What occurs if somebody requests a record that is protected? We do our due diligence and provide the form, but what happens if it is not legitimate? There is a penalty for that, but where is the oversight? You can get a court order for this not-so-pretty side of life, but maintaining records in the Recorder's Office becomes more difficult. We would appreciate being able to work with these finer details for the greater good and to manage these records over time.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In the rurals, we live in a different world. If you want someone's name and address in the rurals, you ask anyone on the street and they know where you live, how many children you have, etc. It is a different scenario in the large metropolitan areas than what we deal with in the rurals. I am sympathetic about having to redact actual public records and sympathetic on the other side in larger areas where people wouldn't have easy access. Where the judges live, where the sheriff lives are all available in the rurals.

Ms. CHAPMAN:

That is what makes it hard for us. We want to support the bill, but it is riding that fine line.

JOHN BOSTA:

What about the Freedom of Information Act? Is this taking away from that Act? I am not pro or con on this issue, I do know we have federal and State laws where there is a Freedom of Information Act. Would this be against that Act?

CHAIR PARKS:

As we proceed forward, we will make sure we double-check on such requirements. We have three amendments to consider.

MR. GRAHAM:

There are a lot of matters at play, and it is going to be difficult to proceed further until we mull things together and provide a mock-up of a bill. We will get the parties together and ensure fiscals are in order. We appreciate your help and concern.

CHAIR PARKS:

I close the hearing on Senate Bill 79 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 6.

**SENATE BILL 6**: Revises provisions relating to the confidentiality of personal information contained in records of county assessors. (BDR 20-376)

BRETT KANDT (Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):  
On behalf of Attorney General, Adam Laxalt, we thought Senate Bill 6 worthy of your consideration as to whether prosecutors could have the same protections as judges and law enforcement officers have under NRS 250.140. Prosecutors seek justice; it is their statutory and ethical responsibility. Like members of the

judiciary, law enforcement officers and their families and prosecutors seeking justice on behalf of victims and the community are often targeted and victimized by criminal defendants. If the Committee considers taking this proposal and amending it into S.B. 79, we are supportive of that ([Exhibit H](#)).

MR. JONES:

We thank the Attorney General's Office for sponsoring the bill on behalf of prosecutors across the State. I would like to adopt my remarks on S.B. 79 and place them in the record for S.B. 6. I have one addition I forgot to mention with S.B. 79. The Assessor's Website does include law enforcement. The District Attorney's Office has district attorney investigators who are sworn peace officers. We have a situation where the investigators of the District Attorney's Office can block their information from the Website, but prosecutors who actually appear in court with defendants cannot. I wanted to point that inequity out to the Committee.

SENATOR MANENDO:

What was your thinking on not including the public defenders while writing the bill?

MR. KANDT:

We were approached by the prosecutors with this policy proposal. I have not had a conversation with the public defenders about it. You may want to consider this policy issue as to whether these protections should be extended to other individuals or professions involved in the criminal justice system.

MS. GAYNOR:

The amendment we submitted was intended for Senate Bill 6. We want to reiterate our support for this bill and hope if the two bills are combined that our language is considered for the combined bill as well.

CHAIR PARKS:

Both of these bills, whether they are combined or proceed separately, will be handled together, so we will have you covered.

MR. DAWLEY:

I echo my comments for S.B. 79. There are options for people to take their names off the tax roll and for companies as well. You can do LLCs. You can put your property in the name of a trust. It does not have to be the "Smith Family"

revocable trust. Any unique name can be used. There are options to take names off the roll without taking your name off the roll, if that makes sense.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The issue I have is if I read someone's name in the newspaper, I can pull that person up on a Website and find out where and who he is. I am sympathetic to key people, but I do not know how far down the list we want to get because you can access the information.

MR. RUDY:

It seems like a lot of government people and government representatives are all voting on a special privilege for themselves. If that is not what is going on, please tell me differently. It seems like you are voting for a special privilege to take your name off the tax records or the county records so you can "protect yourselves" or whatever it may be. I am a publisher in town. Media people have been assaulted and killed before for releasing things in the media. Can I have my records deleted off the county records? There are people who own car lots. If I owned a car lot and somebody once killed somebody who sold them a bad car, does that mean they can take their name off the records because they are in a perceived threat? The reality is, there is very, very, very little violence against our public employees and against our public servants. This is a bridge too far. There is no reason for this, and it appears to be for government people to have a special privilege that no one else can enjoy. How can you vote for this for yourself and tell me I cannot have my records deleted?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This gentleman has the impression that we are extending this to all Legislators and elected officials. The bill lists protection for law enforcement, prosecutors and those involved on the prosecution side. I really do not care who has my name and address.

CHAIR PARKS:

You are correct. The bill is to protect a limited number of individuals.

SENATOR MANENDO:

The proposed amendment about the confidential location that provides shelter for victims of domestic violence is for a nonprofit and is not a government entity. We have been involved with Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, which has an independent living program. Some of those youths are on the run

because of sexual assault or sexual abuse at home. They come into our center and sometimes they get transitioned into this type of housing, and they are fearful about who may be looking for them. I understand the discussions and have heard them before.

I beg to differ about the lack of crime. There are hundreds of crimes every week just within two miles of my residence. I do not think I live in the most dangerous zip code, but I know the law enforcement officers in the southeast and northeast are extremely busy because of the criminal element out there. Relevant to the topic at hand, people are concerned about their own safety and the safety of their family.

It is a huge issue that I receive information on a daily basis. I think about our social workers, first responders and fire departments. Maybe there is someone in the audience who wants to come up and talk about what they do. I do not know if there are any social workers or first responders in the audience that maybe can share their concerns. Would that be okay, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR PARKS:

We are in the neutral position of the meeting, but if there are individuals who would like to share their concerns relative to what we are trying to achieve, yes.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Some people think public servants get phone calls and they come and put out a fire, then they go home and have a beer. That is not the case. Our first responders work extremely hard and can share some insight about this piece of legislation.

TODD INGALSBEE (Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada):

We are neutral on this bill. We think it is important for the district attorneys and jobs that put criminals away; however, we are usually the first ones to encounter those bad people and then are called to testify in those cases. We investigate arsons and convict those people as well. Our union hall has been vandalized and broken into and set on fire within the last couple weeks. Two months ago, the union hall was vandalized along with graffiti requiring painting. We are involved with the same bad people and we would definitely like to be considered on the bill.

CHAIR PARKS:

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 6. This would tend to be a situation where a subcommittee could be established, but I think the proponents are of uniform thinking that requires structure. We have four amendments and testimony to consider along with transparency and the public's right to know. The Committee will do follow up.

I would like to open the hearing on Senate Bill 175 designating November 12 as Asian Culture Day in Nevada.

**SENATE BILL 175**: Designates November 12 as Asian Culture Day in Nevada.  
(BDR 19-74)

SENATOR SCOTT HAMMOND (Senatorial District No. 18):

Existing law sets forth certain days of observance in this State to commemorate certain persons or occasions or to publicize information regarding certain important topics per NRS 236.018 through 236.085. This bill authorizes and requests the Governor to annually proclaim November 12 to be "Asian Culture Day" in Nevada. This day was chosen for a specific reason, but mostly, to pick a day for the Asian community to get together. On February 23, there was an error in drafting. The first Whereas clause should read "Whereas, November 12, 2016, was the sesquicentennial (150th) anniversary of the birth of Dr. Sun Yat-Sen ... ." It may require an amendment to correct.

HEIDI CHLARSON (COUNSEL):

The Legal Division did prepare what we refer to as an asterisk bill. The Committee members and public all have the updated version of the bill that has the change you reference. An amendment is not required for the correction. It has already been taken care of unless another amendment is proposed.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

There will be representatives from the different Asian communities to address the bill, and I have instructed testifiers that to say "ditto" is acceptable. According to the United States Census Bureau, the 2015 American Community Survey estimated the Asian population in Nevada to be about 214,846, approximately 7.7 percent of the total population of the State. To put it into perspective, my entire district is comprised of 135,000 people, so that is almost double the entire population I represent.

Despite the fact that a significant part of the State's population is Asian, there is no day of observance in our statutes relative to the Asian population. If you search online for Asian organizations throughout the State, you would turn up about 20 different organizations. I will not name all 20, but there is a significant contribution from the Asian communities. The trials and tribulations of the Asian Americans who first settled in Nevada are no less daunting than the stories of today's immigrants that fill our newspapers. Today, I ask you to celebrate their accomplishments and contributions to the State.

CHAIR PARKS:

Do you have specific individuals who wish to proceed next?

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I think they know the order in which they are going to testify from Las Vegas.

STEVE SCHORR (Asian Cultural Alliance):

I am honored today to speak for S.B. 175 on behalf of the Asian Cultural Alliance. The understanding of cultures of various people brings about a better understanding of the various heritages which can help build strong ties for all for the future ([Exhibit I](#)).

CARL MAGNO (Asian Culture Television; Asian Cultural Alliance):

I serve as the Filipino Chair and am honored to run the recently launched Asian Culture TV as the Chief Executive Officer. We at Asian Culture Television believe our primary role is to inform the viewers that there is a vibrant Asian community in the Las Vegas Valley. There are close to 3 million hardworking, multicultural people opening doors to over 42 million visitors ([Exhibit J](#)). I support S.B. 175.

CAVIN FUNG (Asian Cultural Alliance):

There will be an economic impact for Nevada with the passing of Senate Bill 175. Nevada would be the first State in the nation claiming Asian Culture Day and informing the world the State cherishes and appreciates all Asians. This would be our greatest niche.

M. JOSEPH MILLER II (Compliance Officer, Chinese American Citizens Alliance, Las Vegas Lodge):

With the recent conclusion of Black History month, I can appreciate the importance of a day to support and recognize all of Asian heritage. I support S.B. 175 for the benefit of all Asians for that day.

JANIECE MARSHALL (Asian Cultural Center):

I support Senate Bill 175 and per Senator Hammond's instructions, "ditto."

OLIVER LEE (President, Korean Association of Las Vegas; Korean Chair, Asian Cultural Alliance):

The theme of this day is to celebrate cultural racial diversity in Nevada. Language, religion, cuisine, social habits and arts are cultural diversities in every society. Presenting customs to people who surround us with music, dances, arts, crafts, food and clothing styles, to mention a few, are to be shared so that we live in peace and harmony ([Exhibit K](#)).

DIANA DIKES:

The purpose of Asian Culture Day will not only be designated for fun, it will provide education to all people within the community about the diversity of the Asian culture in Nevada.

BILLY WALKER:

Many people do not realize the many Asian cultural alliances will share a day to provide knowledge of the culture that could enhance relationships of all nationalities in the United States, which would be a social learning experience. I support S. B. 175 ([Exhibit L](#)).

MICHAEL SUSARA:

I support Senate Bill 175, "ditto."

TONG CHAMP (Chair, Asian Cultural Alliance):

Our children need to have knowledge of the Asian culture. I support Senate Bill 175.

PETER TANG (American Vietnamese Chamber of Commerce):

I support Senate Bill 175. Vietnamese culture as part of the Asian Culture Day would educate our youth.



PAUL MAGNO:

I support Senate Bill 175. Future generations will have knowledge and education of the Asian cultures and traditions if Asian Cultural Day is passed for November 12.

WEN LEE:

Education about the Asian culture for youth to understand different cultures and traditions will unite the community. I support Senate Bill 175.

JAIMING ZHANG: (Las Vegas Chinese Association; Nevada Chinese Association):

This bill will improve knowledge of the culture and traditions of the Asian communities in Las Vegas. I support Senate Bill 175.

HENRY GEORGE (Pacific Islanders Chair, Asian Cultural Alliance):

Culture is vital. I support Senate Bill 175. This bill will improve knowledge and educate our youth of the culture and traditions of the Asian communities in Las Vegas.

PEI ZHANG (United States-Chinese Peoples Friendship Association):

I am impressed with the work of Cavin Fung with the Las Vegas Asian community. I support Senate Bill 175.

JOHN TAYLOR:

I am part of the Asian Center and support Senate Bill 175. There are few people who understand all of what the Asian community, irrespective of what group it may be, Chinese, Japanese, or Korean, has accomplished to help and promote the United States going back to the 1800s.

RON MEDALLON:

I support Senate Bill 175. "A people without the knowledge of their past history or origin of culture is like a tree without roots," is a quote from Marcus Carvey. I believe the preservation of Asian culture and educating people about Asian culture is important for future generations to cherish their rich history.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

When I was approached by the community to sponsor this bill, I was told I was going to have a lot of support. As you can see, I received a substantial representation of the Asian community in the State. I appreciate that support and hope the bill processes quickly.

SENATOR MANENDO:

I know the date was an issue with some of the folks because there are so many groups that make up the Asian community. Some folks reached out to me regarding the date, which maybe gives more credence to one group over the other. They were looking for a neutral date. I do not know if you had discussions about the date? Where are we with reference to the date?

SENATOR HAMMOND:

There have been many discussions over the week with myself and the community members in Las Vegas. After reviewing the bill, the date is neutral. The bill establishes the date with a preamble explaining how it was arrived at. It is not just because of the date of the birth of Dr. Sun Yat-Sen. It was a combination of several things that happened, and the fact that the Cultural Alliance celebrated the first Asian Cultural Day already on November 12. I think the language is nuanced. It is not celebrating one group over another. This is how it happened, but I am more than open for further discussion going forward. There was a broad coalition of the Asian community, from China, Laos, Vietnam, Taiwan, and I probably omitted a few, but you saw many people testifying in support of it as written. However, but it is not to cut off any debate going forward. I want it to be a date to celebrate and to talk about it in this bill during this hearing, but I told others if they need to approach me I am still open.

SENATOR MANENDO:

It is long overdue to be recognizing our Asian culture and the communities that do wonderful work for us to make our community a better, safer place. There will also be an economic benefit that this is going to bring to our State. A lot of people will take part in the celebration. My appreciation to all persons who came out to participate in our process. We appreciate what you do to make our community a better place.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I look at what we have done in history, and you cannot go back and change history, but we can certainly go forward and make changes to celebrate the diversity of the world.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
February 27, 2017  
Page 19

CHAIR PARKS:

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 175 and adjourn the meeting at 3:49 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Debi Szaro,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	15		Attendance Roster
S.B. 79	C	13	John T. Jones, Jr. / Nevada District Attorney Association	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 6	D	1	Jennifer Gaynor / Safe Nest	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 6	E	3	Marissa Woodbeck / Safe Nest	History of Safe Nest
S.B. 79	F	1	David Dawley, / Nevada Assessors' Association	Residence blocked photo
S.B. 79	G	19	John Fudenberg / ClarkCounty	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 6	H	1	Brett Kandt / Attorney General's Office	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 175	I	3	Steve Schorr / Asian Cultural Alliance	Written testimony
S.B. 175	J	1	Carl Magno / Asian Cultural Alliance	Written testimony
S.B. 175	K	1	Oliver Lee / Asian Culture Television	Written testimony
S.B. 175	L	1	Billy Walker / Asian Cultural Alliance	Written testimony