

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

**Seventy-Third Session  
March 9, 2005**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order at 8:07 a.m., on Wednesday, March 9, 2005. Chairman David Parks presided in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, and, via simultaneous videoconference, in Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Parks, Chairman  
Ms. Peggy Pierce, Vice Chairwoman  
Mr. Kelvin Atkinson  
Mr. Chad Christensen  
Mr. Jerry D. Claborn  
Mr. Pete Goicoechea  
Mr. Tom Grady  
Mr. Joe Hardy  
Mrs. Marilyn Kirkpatrick  
Mr. Bob McCleary  
Mr. Harvey J. Munford  
Ms. Bonnie Parnell  
Mr. Scott Sibley

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst

Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel  
Michael Shafer, Committee Attaché

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ted J. Olivas, Director of Community and Government Affairs, City of Las Vegas, Nevada  
Dr. Barbara Jackson, Director, Department of Leisure Services, City of Las Vegas, Nevada  
Billie Bastian, CPRP, Deputy Director, Department of Leisure Services, City of Las Vegas, Nevada  
Santana Garcia, Legislative Advocate, City of Henderson, Nevada  
Kimberly McDonald, M.P.A., Special Projects Analyst & Lead Lobbyist, City Manager's Office, City of North Las Vegas, Nevada  
Scott Morgan, Director, Community Services/Parks & Recreation Department, Douglas County, Nevada  
Elizabeth Lopez, Business Development Manager, G.C. Wallace Companies, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Scott Turner, Mapping Specialist and Corporate Challenge Coordinator, G.C. Wallace Companies, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Pamela Balconi, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Melvin Henkin, Member, Las Vegas Senior Citizens Advisory Board, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Lance Moran, Member, Las Vegas Senior Citizens Advisory Board, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Keith M. Lyons, Jr., Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association  
Bill Eddens, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Special Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
John Van Gorder, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities  
Kent Lauer, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association, Inc.  
Sean Gamble, Director of Government Relations, Incline Village General Improvement District, Incline Village, Nevada  
David F. Kallas, Executive Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association, Metro, Inc.  
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada  
Gary Wolff, Business Agent, Teamsters Local No. 14, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Douglas W. Sonneman, County Assessor, Douglas County Assessor's Office, Minden, Nevada  
David A. Dawley, C.N.A., City Assessor, Carson City, Nevada

Mark Schofield, County Assessor, Clark County Assessor's Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

Martha Barnes, Administrator Central Services and Records Division, Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles

Michael Schaefer, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Kareen Masters, Personnel Officer III, Nevada Department of Human Resources

**Chairman Parks:**

[Meeting called to order and roll called.] Today, we have two bills on the agenda and some other minor things to cover. Before we go into these bills, I'd like to provide an opening remark. It is the people's right to know the process of government decision-making and to review the documents and statistics leading to determinations as basic to our society. In general, access to such information should not be shrouded by a cloak of secrecy or confidentiality. This Legislature has consistently declared that government is the public's business, and the public, individually and collectively and represented by a free press, should have access to the records of government. This Legislature acknowledges that a free society is maintained when government is responsive and responsible to the public, and when the public is aware of government actions. The more open a government is with its citizens, the greater the understanding and participation of the public in the government process.

There are many complex issues regarding how state agencies and local government records are maintained, among which are the impact of data automation leading to significant increases in accessibility in today's world, and what protections we will build to prevent inadvertent release of both personal and confidential information. This morning, we will be hearing two bills that deal with personal safety and the right of the public to that information. It's also my understanding that these bills may be substantially amended, and we'll look at that from that perspective.

With that, I'd like to go ahead and start off by hearing Assembly Bill 31.

**Assembly Bill 31: Makes confidential certain records of local governmental entities relating to use of recreational facilities and participation in certain instructional and recreational activities and events. (BDR 19-602)**

**Ted Olivas, Director, Community and Government Affairs, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I'm joined today on my immediate right by Dr. Barbara Jackson, who's the Director of our Leisure Services Department, and Billie Bastian to my far right, who is the Deputy Director of the same department. I'd like to provide a brief overview of the bill and then turn it over to Dr. Jackson for some additional comments. We have some handouts this morning ([Exhibit B](#)), which include some of our written testimony and letters of support from various jurisdictions, as well as from some citizens from southern Nevada.

This bill would add a new section to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 239, which would allow governments to keep confidential the personal identifying information that we receive from the participants of our recreation programs. It's very narrowly defined to include only personal identifying information that we receive from people who register to use our recreation facilities or register or enroll in one of our recreation programs. Subsection 2 defines when we would be able to disclose the information, which would be in response to a court order, if the disclosure of the record is necessary to protect the public safety or to prosecute a crime.

The City of Henderson has proposed a friendly amendment, which is included in your handouts ([Exhibit B](#)). We are in support of this amendment, and it basically expands the criteria as to when we will be required to disclose this information. I'd like to note that for the Legislative Counsel's Digest, which is in the front of the bill, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) did a great job in summarizing what the existing law is relating to public documents. It references a 1990 Nevada Supreme Court case, *Donrey v. Bradshaw* [106 Nevada, 630 P. 2d 144(1990)], which allows local governments to perform a balancing test to determine whether records should be released or withheld. If a particular record is not expressly declared open by statute, a balancing test must be applied to determine whether a record must be disclosed. This test begins with the presumption that the record is public and should be disclosed. The test weighs the public interest in the document versus any privacy or confidentiality interest asserted by the keeper of the record.

I would submit to this Committee that it would be impossible to train staff at our 40 senior and family facilities and 63 Safe Key locations on how to perform this balancing test. While the City of Las Vegas is a proponent of open and inclusive government, we also have a responsibility and obligation to ensure that the participants of our recreation programs, particularly seniors and youth, can do so without the concern that their personal information may be made public.

[Ted Olivas, continued.] I'd like to close by saying that on February 9, the *Reno Gazette-Journal* had an article about the introduction of this bill. On the same day, there was another article in the same newspaper that said Las Vegas was one of the top U.S. locations for identity theft and consumer fraud, only behind Washington, D.C., and San Jose, California. I did not include copies of those two articles, but they are available. This bill not only reduces the probability of these crimes, but it addresses the safety and security of our recreation participants.

**Dr. Barbara Jackson, Director, Department of Leisure Services, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am accompanied today by my deputy director, Billie Bastian. Today, I'd like to speak to you about A.B. 31 and our support for the bill. [Read from [Exhibit B.](#)]

As part of our registration process, our department requests personal and, oftentimes, sensitive information from all customers who participate in our programs. We have a large database of customer information—close to 155,000 records, according to our latest count. Our customers provide this information to us when they register for swimming lessons, summer camps, Safe Key programs, youth sports leagues, theater, music, dance, martial arts, and gymnastics classes, as well as any excursions and other specialty and education classes.

We program and operate a total of 40 facilities. Seven of those facilities are designed specifically for seniors to spend their time involved in social and recreational activities. We conduct Safe Key, which is a before and after school program at 63 elementary schools, with approximately 10,000 enrollees. Our department leads the metropolitan area in providing comprehensive recreational services for individuals with varying abilities. Although we collect information on almost every customer, I mention these three categories because they represent the largest groups we serve. They are our most vulnerable customers: youth, seniors, and individuals with disabilities.

In order to provide our services, we collect the names, addresses, birthdates, parents' work schedules, private and work telephone numbers, as well as gender, age, and other specialized information from our customers. Specialized information may include such items as food allergies, alternate contact names, and other types of special accommodative information. We also maintain records that identify a specific type of program a customer is enrolled in and

where and when they plan to attend. We have legitimate business reasons for collecting this information. For example, we need parent work schedules and contact information in case of an emergency involving a child that has been left in our care. We collect names and addresses so that we can contact customers in case of a cancellation and in order to complete refunds. We want to keep the information that we collect on our customer private, as it is our belief that the customers intended it to be so.

We believe that A.B. 31 will safeguard the information we collect from our customers, and I am here to urge its passage. It is not my intent or the intent of the City of Las Vegas to hide our general business information. Rather, we are here to protect the privacy of the individuals who have enrolled in our programs.

[Barbara Jackson, continued.] The senior citizen who signs up for a day excursion certainly never intended that the information for his or her address, or the fact that he or she will be gone for the day, to be public knowledge. Families in the midst of custodial disputes over children expect their information to remain confidential. Medications and medical conditions reported for the safety of the participants in any of our programs should never be made public. Fortunately, that information is protected by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

The parent who leaves his child at summer day camp or at one of our 63 Safe Key sites and provides us with a home address, various phone numbers, and alternate contacts to be used in the case of an emergency, anticipates that this information will remain confidential. Marketers representing a variety of commodities should not be able to obtain our customers information and target our patrons, including youth and seniors, with their sales material or other propaganda. The juvenile girl who signs up for cheerleading class and gives us her address, phone, and school site should be protected from anyone obtaining and exploiting that information. We believe our customers should be protected. Currently, anyone, without explanation of who they are and for what purpose the information will be used, may request and receive access to all information we have on our customers. Assembly Bill 31 would change the classification of personal information on the individual that we collect from a public record or public book to protected, private information. We believe that this change is in the best interest of the citizens.

We have received support letters and/or emails for A.B. 31 from Churchill County Parks and Recreation, City of Boulder City Parks and Recreation, City of North Las Vegas Parks and Recreation, Douglas County

Community Services Parks and Recreation, Mesquite Recreation Division, and State of Nevada Division of State Parks.

[Barbara Jackson, continued.] I thank you, Mr. Parks and members of the Committee, for this opportunity to publicly support passage of A.B. 31. I will answer any questions that you may have.

**Assemblyman Atkinson:**

When individuals sign up for classes or seniors have certain classes, are they given a form or notified that their information could be released?

**Billie Bastian, CPRP, Deputy Director, Department of Leisure Services, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

At this time, we do not have that part of our registration package or practices.

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

On the current application to register for any of these, do they currently have to give their Social Security number?

**Barbara Jackson:**

We currently do not ask for Social Security information. We have one unit in our department, and that is the Senior Law Project Division, that does legal work. They are protected by legal confidentiality there. In the other cases, we are not asking on our application for Social Security numbers.

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

So, in this new language, we don't have to consider that Social Security numbers are being given out. Is that the intent of the bill?

**Barbara Jackson:**

Yes, that is correct.

**Assemblyman Grady:**

Dr. Jackson, I agree with the intent of this bill, but just to make sure it won't go too far—I think a sports program or a sports activity that may put out a program and lists the individual, their school, their age. Would this be prohibited under this legislation, or would it be open enough with that type of information would still be allowed?

**Barbara Jackson:**

I'm not sure I understand. If you're saying, "Do we have a list of our participants?" Would we publish that?

**Assemblyman Grady:**

Not necessarily publish it. Let's just say you have a football program or a school has a football program and they put the information on the individuals. The quarterback is Jimmy Jones, and it he goes to such and such school. I just want to make sure it doesn't go that far to prohibit things of that nature.

**Barbara Jackson:**

We are strictly talking about those cases where an individual comes in and wants personal information on a participant in one of our programs. I think it's pretty much common knowledge, when a reporter or parents or whoever come out to see a game, they would see that individual and know who they are. Sometimes they ask that question of the individuals themselves, but in this case, they would be coming themselves to ask for specific addresses so they could be contacted. That is what we are concerned about in this bill.

**Assemblyman Christensen:**

Mr. Olivas, this question I'll direct to you. As far as the information that people put on a form, and I may have missed this, do we have a copy of the forms that they fill out? Are they all similar across the board? The City of Las Vegas for its leisure services—whether it's kids in sports or seniors—are they similar forms, or are they the same form where they disclose all their information?

**Ted Olivas:**

I believe that the form is consistent throughout our Leisure Services Department for the participants that are signing up. That being said, we'd be glad to provide the Committee a copy of what we use and the information that we ask for on that form.

**Assemblyman Christensen:**

If you could. My interest in that would be to look over and see if it specifies what the information will be used for. I have four little boys. I'm putting them in city sports. I certainly want to make sure that the information is getting out to other people who may not be with the city organization or the organization that I'm giving that to. In this day and age, if they get into the wrong hands, really bad things can happen. That's the last thing that I want to see happen to me and my family, or to anybody else. If you could get me a copy of that, that would certainly help. If I'm going down to the City of Las Vegas enrolling in programs, certainly my understanding would be that people who administer the program would be using that information and not anybody else. If you could get that to me, that would really help. I appreciate that.



**Ted Olivas:**

That's exactly what we're trying to do here. With that being said, as Dr. Jackson mentioned, we only ask for the information that we absolutely need. As Assemblywoman Parnell mentioned, one of the things in this bill is a Social Security number. The only reason that's in there is because that's considered personal identifying information. We only try to ask for that information that's pertinent to protect the participant of the recreation program. If we need to know about their allergies, or if we need to know their work phone numbers, we'll ask for things like that. It differs, depending on who the customer is, as to what we ask for. We would be glad to get a copy of that for you.

**Assemblyman Christensen:**

The Social Security number that you ask for, what if I didn't want to provide that? I don't give that number to the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) because on the back of my card, it says, "For tax purposes only." I'm a strong believer in doing that on my voter record. That's a sacred code. What if people didn't want to give that out? Is there some other reference number or code that the city could generate to keep track of them, their allergies, or their contact info?

**Ted Olivas:**

We do not ask for Social Security numbers. It was in the bill only because it's a personal identifying piece of information, so it was included in there. We absolutely do not request that information from any of our participants. If they chose not to give us information on their allergies, we wouldn't force them to do so, but we want to ask the question on medications and things like that if it's appropriate for the individual program that we're offering.

**Santana Garcia, Legislative Advocate, City of Henderson, Nevada:**

I have a minor amendment, and as Ted has said, we are in support of this bill. We have this minor, friendly amendment. Under subsection 2, it only allows for the disclosure of such information on a court order. Several times a month, our attorneys receive subpoena requests from parents engaged in divorce or custody battles. They are asking for children's attendance at recreational activities, including Safe Key. We think these are legitimate requests. We want to ensure that a parent doesn't have to get a court order in order to get such information. Under paragraph 2, we are adding a paragraph b, just after the requirement that a court order be in response to an issue ordered by a court, upon finding that such records as necessary to protect the public safety or to prosecute a crime. We are adding a paragraph b, or in response to a subpoena. That is it.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

If the city rents out a recreational facility to a group—say, a trade organization—would they be able to use that name to advertise the fact that they hosted such-and-such a group at a party at one of their recreational facilities?

**Santana Garcia:**

I'm not certain of that answer. I'd be happy to get that information back to the Committee.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

It's just as far as if to say the Legislature rented a room there to host a party. The city will sometimes use in marketing material who has rented rooms and used the facilities for certain things. You'll see on the list for potential advertising pieces and so forth. I just want know, if you wanted to find out who rented a room in terms of a group, that's going to be covered under this?

**Santana Garcia:**

I'm not certain if that is going to be covered under this bill.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

This is just individuals?

**Santana Garcia:**

I think Dr. Jackson may better be able to answer that question, but I'm certain we would not disclose that information without their permission if that was allowed.

**Barbara Jackson:**

It has been our experience that we have had marketers who have asked for patrons of our facilities, mostly our parks. So, I would only assume that the possibility exists that they could ask who uses rentals. I've not experienced that to date. We have experienced those asking for people and addresses of those who have rented our parks to sell them commodities.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

I think Ted knows the answer. I'm just wondering if this just pertains to individuals or organizations?

**Ted Olivas:**

You are correct. This is very narrowly written to say "a person." If a group comes in, we could say the National Association of Realtors rented a room. This is personal information on people.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

That answers my question, thank you.

**Chairman Parks:**

Mr. Olivas, I think we need a little clarification on the definition of "person." Perhaps Ms. O'Grady can just comment on that for the record.

**Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

In the preliminary chapter in NRS, "person" is defined pretty broadly, to include any kind of entity, natural person, entity, et cetera, other than a government entity. So, it would cover, I believe, a group that wanted to reserve a room.

**Kimberly McDonald, M.P.A., Special Projects Analyst & Lead Lobbyist, City Manager's Office, City of North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Our Parks and Recreation Director was unable to be here today, but he would like me to go on record as supporting this measure.

**Scott Moran, Community Services Director, Douglas County, Nevada:**

I would like to go on record in support of this bill. We believe that the information we collect is certainly vulnerable. I did one to add one point of clarification: Anybody who is a volunteer within our organization, such as a youth sports coach, is required to provide us very sensitive data—Social Security number, driver's license—in order for us to obtain a background check. We're concerned that that information is vulnerable, as well as that information of that background check. We'd like to see that protected.

**Elizabeth Lopez, Business Development Manager, G.C. Wallace Companies, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

G.C. Wallace has a reputation as a good corporate citizen. It is committed to making fundamental contributions to the prosperity of our communities. One way they do that is by getting involved as a company in the various programs offered by the city, as well as encouraging and supporting their employees to participate. I have taken advantage of that. As often as I can, I volunteer. I compete, or train to compete, at the many recreational events the city coordinates. I firmly believe that the Las Vegas residents should get out and take part in local events, meet their fellow neighbors, and live more active lives.

I'm testifying today as a concerned and involved citizen of this community. I thought it was important to voice my concerns through Leisure Services to safeguard the individuals who participate in recreational programs and by taking measures to protect our private information. I personally have been involved in several Leisure Services programs. I play softball in their Friday night leagues. I've played softball in the City of Las Vegas Corporate Challenge ever since

I moved here in 2000. I compete in many events, as well as volunteer. I was named Volunteer of the Year in the 2003 games. Even as a volunteer, I must sign a waiver that includes my address, phone number, place of business, date of birth, et cetera. I am uneasy disclosing so much data because I have already been a victim of identity theft. Aside from that, I am already a prime target for marketers in both English and Spanish. I'd rather not have them armed with my personal information. I ask that you please consider making private information confidential.

**Scott Turner, Mapping Specialist and Corporate Challenge Coordinator,  
G.C. Wallace Companies, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I've been involved in the City of Las Vegas Corporate Challenge since 1997. I've also enjoyed my relationship with Leisure Services Department. I feel fortunate that G.C. Wallace encourages all employees to participate in community recreations. As A.B. 31 was brought to my attention, I was quite concerned. I have shared this information with my coworkers. All were amazed that all the information on public waivers are public record. The waivers are signed by members and participating volunteers, including information such as personal address, phone numbers, place of business, and date of birth. I feel this is an unsafe and has the opportunity for possible neglect. The risk of identity theft, as you know, is very high at this time. I am here as a concerned citizen for myself and my family, as well as my coworkers. My interest is to testify here today in support of the Department of Leisure Services and the effort to create a safeguard with all recreational programs as well.

In simply having the name "Scott Turner," I've received mail and have received calls from different Scott Turners, including job opportunities. Thank you for the opportunity for public support for the passage of A.B. 31.

**Pamela Balconi, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I also happen to be a parent who has had children enrolled in classes at the Mirabelli Community Center since 1996, and I am a longtime member of Mirabelli's morning aerobics class. I am testifying today in support of A.B. 31, because I strongly oppose my family's personal information being publicly accessible. I believe that the personal information that I have supplied the center is necessary, such as emergency contacts, work phone numbers, my address, home phone numbers, my birthdate, and those of my children. I believe these facts are necessary to serve for enrollment purposes, center coordination, and to best serve and protect the children in the event of an illness or accident. That could range from something that happens to the child during a class, or events which prevent a parent from picking up their child on time.

[Pamela Balconi, continued.] I believe it is important to understand that the information that I have supplied to the center could also be used by a predator to very easily establish the schedule and rhythm of my family's life. Most of the people who visit the center, as other families like mine, simply wish to enrich their lives via the activities available there. In addition to the fine staff, there are often many youth helpers, event volunteers, and, from time to time, people from various corrections programs who are doing public service as a part of their sentence. While I have the utmost respect and heartfelt gratitude for the center's level of excellence and their service, I have learned that their commitment to safety is compromised, because they are under the authority of a law that does not recognize the potential for harm due to personal record being public domain. It is my impression that the law was written in good faith to keep municipalities accountable and on the up and up. I believe this is a good system. However, I strongly believe that the checks and balances will not be compromised by making such specific patron data confidential.

I believe that the law should serve to protect people and their families. I do represent the consensus from mothers who have children enrolled in Leisure Services. Upon your request, I can provide you with signatures from other mothers who feel equally about this bill, but could not be here today. It is my earnest hope that this important, proactive update can be made into law.

**Melvin Henkin, Member, Senior Citizens Advisory Board, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

The Senior Citizens Advisory Board is very concerned that private information collected by this Leisure Services Department being made available to the public. Many seniors participate in activities sponsored by the Department of Leisure Services. In talking to many of them about this issue, our board finds that they are concerned about providing this confidential information to the public. They believe it would increase the chances of identity theft and increase the opportunity for burglary by allowing them to know when folks are not at home. Assembly Bill 31 would change the public record or public book to protected private information. We believe that that change is in the best interest of senior citizens. Our board believes that A.B. 31 will safeguard the information that is being collected, and I am here to urge its passage.

**Lance Moran, Member, Senior Citizens Advisory Board, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I would like to acknowledge to the Committee this morning the presence of a group of seniors, about 20, who fall under the label of "roundtable." They meet every week here in Las Vegas and discuss matters of community interest. They have all signed in this morning and all favor the passage of A.B. 31. The

Senior Citizens Advisory Board, as has been said before, is concerned with public information being collected by the Leisure Services Department and that information being made available to the public. As Dr. Jackson mentioned in her testimony, hundreds of seniors attend social and recreational activities at 8 different city sites. Providing this information to the public would increase the changes of identity theft, would allow strangers to know when seniors are out of the house, and would therefore increase the opportunity for burglary and would provide pieces of information that complete the puzzle for identity theft. As has been mentioned before, A.B. 31 would change the classification of personal information that is collected from a public record or a public book to protected private information. That change is in the best interest of senior citizens. Our board believes that A.B. 31 will safeguard the information that is collected, and I am here to urge its passage.

**Keith M. Lyons, Jr., Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association:**

We have reviewed the bill, and while we laud its goals, we have a couple of concerns about the bill. We believe one problem with the bill is it may limit the justice for individuals. This bill, as set forth in Section 2, only allows the necessary safety to prosecute a crime. The problem with that is there are many kinds of information necessary for litigation for the purposes to determine whether litigation is necessary on behalf of individuals who may have individually been harmed. It's not of such a nature that it would impact the public safety as a whole, but it could impact an individual. Without the information, without the ability to obtain that information, access to justice for those individuals will be denied.

I don't believe simply issuing a subpoena to obtain the information for public records is sufficient to allow access to those records when it's necessary. There has to be some process set up to identify who can obtain those records or how those records can be obtained when necessary, just to conduct an investigation as an attorney. You can't simply file a lawsuit on speculation. There are attorneys who do that. If the information is protected so we don't know who are possible witnesses or who was present when something occurred because that information is confidential, you will have an increase in litigation where people just have to file lawsuits in order to get the information in order to determine whether there's a valid claim.

That doesn't promote justice. That doesn't protect individuals involved. It actually does a disservice to those who have been harmed. Nevertheless, the goals are laudable, but we do believe it needs to be significantly amended to protect all people, so that if someone is harmed and that information is reasonable and necessary, it can be easily obtained, and not just for the purpose

of public safety or to prosecute a crime. Furthermore, just in listening to the testimony today, one of the things that I thought was interesting was that not all counties in the State of Nevada use the same forms. This doesn't just protect people in Las Vegas, it protects people statewide. In that there's no uniformity in the forms that are used, there's a possibility that some local and state agencies will say, "This information is on the form," rather than simply redacting it. All other information that is public will not be disclosed. I believe that, with amendments, this bill may be possible to protect seniors, the children, the individuals in youth, and public services, but we do believe it needs to be amended to allow access to the information for those who have a genuine need to hear it.

**Bill Eddins, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Special Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

I have participated in numerous educational activities offered through the City of Las Vegas Adaptive Recreation Division for approximately 10 years as a resident of Las Vegas, and for over 20 years as a competitor who uses a wheelchair. I'm speaking today because of my genuine support for A.B. 31. Many times, I must provide private information, including medical data, about my disability. Those are, in my opinion, to remain confidential. When any individual who requests them can obtain pertinent information about myself or any other activity participant, a very significant problem develops for me. In this day and age, identity theft is very real and highly probable.

The individuals with Disabilities Education Act [of 1997], makes all private information relative to a student confidential. Why is this data so easily attainable in the leisure service industry? Many dollars are spent to respect the privateness of an individual's demographics afforded any business, solicitor, or another individual. This information is a contradiction to the numerous no-call, telemarketing-type movements across the country. Recently, I requested some information via email, and now I receive over ten emails a day from Internet-based businesses, and it is rather annoying. Frivolous mail makes it to my mail every day, and I truly wish it could stop. The sharing of private information about individuals who participate in the City of Las Vegas recreational programs cannot be a permissible action, and I urge you to support and pass A.B. 31 and keep my private information private.

**John Van Gorder, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a participant in several programs: golf, kickball, water skiing. My concern is that people know my address, they know where I am, what I'm involved in. While we don't like to think so, being part of the physically challenged community, same as children, same as the elderly, we are a very vulnerable part of society. It's just a concern of mine, along with Billy Eddens, email address

information, marketing material, but mainly safety of my family, and safety of my property. I urge you to pass A.B. 31.

**J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:**

The perks of this bill have been very thoroughly covered, and it's not my intention to be redundant. I do, however, want to have the record reflect that the League of Cities supports A.B. 31. While reaffirming the League's commitment to open government, we feel that the League is in harmony with the intent of the public record statute and, furthermore, is also consistent with government's mission to protect public safety. For these reasons, we wish to voice our support for A.B. 31.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

Dr. Jackson, why do you collect date of birth for swimming lessons?

**Barbara Jackson:**

That has to do with the age category that the person needs to be in. We need to have verification of their age group; for instance, for participation in our leagues. If you are of a certain age group, only that age group can participate. We do collect the data to know what age group they are in.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

But you don't verify this in any way, correct? You just take their word for it.

**Barbara Jackson:**

I'm not certain if, in this Safe Key program, we may not have some verification, maybe, but I do know we have to verify their age group whenever they're doing league participation. I think my deputy can give you more specifics.

**Billie Bastian:**

In response to your question, generally speaking, we receive registration from our participants. Those are from participant children. We take their word from the parent that we fully identify the age of the child. We identify that a child is not achieving the standard for the course that is offered to them, whether it's a swimming lesson, a Safe Key, or a summer camp. Then we will oftentimes go back to the parent and ask for birth certificates. Same thing—we have a minimum age enrollment where someone must be five years of age or older in order to have the maturation to participate in the program, and if we have a child seems not of that age due to the behaviors that they're displaying in the program, then we will go to the parent and ask for birth certificate verification.



**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

But, couldn't that be accomplished just by asking for an age? Then, if you have to go back and ask for a birth certificate, at that point you get a date of birth?

**Billie Bastian:**

That was the intent of my comment. Yes, in fact.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

But originally instead of asking for a date of birth, this could be accomplished simply by asking someone's age. Date of birth is pretty identifying, but just asking for someone's age...

**Billie Bastian:**

I understand your comment, and we do ask for both birthdate and age. Oftentimes, that is just to get the two data pieces together. Sometimes the child may be five years of age within a period of time, but we may have a date that is time-sensitive before they can participate in the program.

**Assemblyman Atkinson:**

I know Nevada Trial Lawyers just spoke about their concerns, and I originally met with some of the folks from Las Vegas about this bill, and I have had the opportunity to read it myself. I thought it was a great bill, still do think that. I also understand the Trial Lawyers' concerns as well.

**Barbara Jackson:**

Certainly, we would not thwart any effort for any legal means. If someone needed the information for a court case and is able to show that it is a legal proceeding, certainly we would not thwart those efforts. We're just very concerned about those who are not able to demonstrate cause such as that for our information.

**Assemblyman Atkinson:**

I only asked that because I don't know if that definition is going to be defined, not going to be defined, or it's going to be made a little bit clearer, but I do know the [*Las Vegas*] *Review-Journal* and some of the other newspapers can get subpoenas for information as well. If they go out and get a subpoena, are they entitled to that same information, or are we talking—I just don't know the legal part that well—will they be able to get the same information that you could get for a child? If a child drowns in a pool, then the courts may want to get information from every child that was in that pool to verify that there were certain things, et cetera.

**Barbara Jackson:**

We would not have an issue with that, sir.

**Ted Olivas:**

I just wanted to say for the record, I was notified by a representative from the Trial Lawyers a few minutes before the hearing, and we said that we absolutely will work with them. We want to make sure that appropriate information is provided as needed. Additionally, as Ms. O'Grady mentioned earlier, if the definition or the term "person" is not more narrowly defined, then it needs to be, because the intent is not to withhold information on a group that wants to rent one of our rooms. It's really information that relates specifically to individual people that are requesting information. We'd like to explore that as well, to more narrowly define that.

There was a comment about a uniformity of forms among the jurisdictions in the State of Nevada, and I would say that in any of the local government jurisdictions, as well as the State, there probably is not one form that is the same throughout the jurisdictions. They need different information for different needs. That could never be accomplished. It's just not appropriate, so it just needs to be clarified that there is no uniformity in anything that we do, in terms of the forms that we use.

**Chairman Parks:**

Thank you for sharing that information. I do note for the record that there were quite a number of names of individuals who indicated support for the bill. At this point, we'll go ahead and take testimony from those individuals who are in opposition to Assembly Bill 31.

**Kent Lauer, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association, Inc.:**

When it comes to this privacy issue, I'm not questioning the intent of this bill. Obviously, I'm not advocating for the misuse of personal information collected by government, but I do want to raise several questions regarding this bill. The first question I'd like to raise is, how will the city monitor use of this information if it becomes secret? Who at the city will have access to the information and for what purpose? If this information is secret, how can the city be held accountable if questions are raised about these recreational programs?

For instance, the child who drowns in the pool. How can you monitor these programs if you can't contact the people who participate in them? What about rosters for team sports? Under this bill, those rosters could not be distributed. Or will the city make an exception for coaches or parents? Under the bill, a parent who wants to organize a season-ending party for a youth sports team could not get a list of players to contact. We just had such a party for my son

at the end of the basketball season. One of the parents contacted all of the other parents to say, "We're having a party at Pizza Hut. Here's the time and date." That parent wouldn't be able to get that list under the language of this bill.

[Kent Lauer, continued.] What about a parent who wants to know beforehand if his or her child will be in class with a youngster who doesn't get along with his or her child? The parent wants to find out if that bully will be in the same class as his or her child. That parent would have to get a court order under this bill to get that information. Will teachers of recreational classes be able to exchange information about students? I don't think so, not under this bill. The names of the students would be confidential. There might be a teacher who has his student in a recreational class who thinks that student may benefit by taking another teacher's class. I don't think that teacher could release that student's name to the other teacher. This bill raises several questions, and I would urge the Committee to consider those questions when it processes this bill.

**Sean Gamble, Director of Government Relations, Incline Village General Improvement District, Incline Village, Nevada:**

When I walked in the room this morning, I had no intention of being opposed to the bill, and I think my concerns have been addressed after the definition of "person," and Ted Olivas came up and said that he was willing to work on that and change it. Incline Village owns a chateau and golf club. With that, they like to solicit groups to come and stay, such as Nevada Mining Association. They're having their event there this September. They want to tell other groups, as a selling tool, who has stayed there before. They are in direct competition with casinos for space and for groups, and this would put them at a disadvantage if they could not advertise or say what groups have been there before as a marketing tool.

**Chairman Parks:**

I remember you sending me an email and asking me about that. This is a public facility?

**Sean Gamble:**

Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is a public facility owned by Incline Village General Improvement District.

**Chairman Parks:**

As I remember, the question that was presented by Mr. Lauer was, "How will the city monitor the use of its information, and if it's maintained as a secret, then who will have access to it?" Any closing comments on that?

**Barbara Jackson:**

What we have desired is an opportunity to be able to put in place a policy that tells us what to do. We are looking for the discretion to be able to say what cases are or are not. It's not difficult for us to establish a process by which we would do that. That is what we want you to form in our department, for us to say to our staff at the lowest levels, "This is what you can and cannot do and this is how we would handle it." We don't have a process for that in place without that direction, but we do need that direction from all of you.

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

I just need to clarify a couple of things, because I'm uncomfortable with the way some of the conversation has gone. First, clarify that we are not talking about Social Security numbers. Second, you have the right and the authority to not release information. Is that correct?

**Ted Olivas:**

To answer to your first question, we do not collect Social Security numbers for recreation programs. It is included in the bill as just another personal identifying piece of information. Your second question was?

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

Whether you currently have the authority to deny information being released. In the initial presentation, you talked about that it's just a matter of difficulty of instructing all of the people who may be requested of information that couldn't currently. If one of those people came into your latchkey program and said, "We would like information on John Smith," if that individual wasn't sure how to handle it, they do have the potential of calling a supervisor or getting some direction on how to handle that currently. I just want to make the point that there is a way right now, without the passage of this bill, to deny the release of information.

**Ted Olivas:**

The answer to your question is, there is a court case that exists from 1990 that says we can perform a balancing test. That being said, I don't believe that the staff that's on the front line level has the ability, when they get a request from someone in the community, to perform this balancing test. It's a gray area. This would eliminate the need to try to make that call.

Let me digress a little bit. We talked about how the city would monitor the use of this information. We use this information to send out information to the participants. We know these people participate in our program. We have a database. We know who the seniors are. We know who the teams are. We

know who the kids are, and we use that to distribute information from our Leisure Services Department. That's all we use it for.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

If you're using it for that information, would that allay the fear of the Incline Village GID [General Improvement District] cooperative, so that they could do the same type of thing in a marketing sense?

**Ted Olivas:**

I believe that the further refinement of the definition of "person," which we would like to do, would resolve that issue. I believe that it resolves their problem. What they want to do is they want to be able to promote the folks that are using their recreation facilities, I assume. If it's an organization, they can certainly use that. If we redefine this term "person," this resolves their issue.

**Chairman Parks:**

I have one final question myself. You indicated or referenced to setting up a policy. Since this is a really sensitive area, would this be a policy that would be approved by city council? Who would approve that policy?

**Barbara Jackson:**

Certainly, any policy of our department goes through a series of chains. We first start internally and then send it to our human resource staff. At some point in time, with a policy this severe, yes, I would anticipate city council would be looking at it as well.

**Chairman Parks:**

It would be reviewed by your Senior Citizens' Advisory Committee, as far as it would apply to them.

**Barbara Jackson:**

We do get input from as many potential sources as possible to make our call.

**Chairman Parks:**

If there are no further questions and no individuals to testify on Assembly Bill 31, we will go ahead and close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing for Assembly Bill 142.

**Assembly Bill 142: Authorizes certain persons to have personal information contained in certain public records kept confidential in certain circumstances. (BDR 20-952)**

**Chairman Parks:**

As a way of discussion on this bill, this was a requested bill put forward before the Committee. It was also a bill that had been requested in the previous session of the Legislature. I think certainly a lot of things have happened over recent years that give reason to support looking at such potential legislation. It's probably going to require an extensive amendment. A paper trail we use is called a "legi-matic," where we take a whole new look at it. There are also some other aspects that, as we look around the country, we have seen some other states have addressed theirs. We refer to it as a kind of freedom of information statute. An overview on that, and I hope that maybe we can come forward with something: I remember back in the 1997 Session when we went through a very, very extensive effort to try to update the State's open records law. I thought we had come a long way in developing a document, a bill that wasn't perfect by any chance, but it certainly was a great improvement. Needless to say, it did not get passed, and other legislation in recent years has not, either.

**David F. Kallas, Executive Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association, Metro, Inc., Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I'm here today representing the Nevada Council of Police and Sheriffs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association, Las Vegas Police Association of Civilian Employees, North Las Vegas and Henderson Police Officers Association, and the Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association, groups who have in excess of 5,000 law enforcement employees. The purpose of this bill is not to create a special of privileged class. The purpose of this bill is to provide some additional staying security to those of us who have chosen to dedicate our lives to public safety and who, by the very nature of our jobs, come into contact with individuals who, by the nature of our decisions, may seek retaliation against us. Unlike some of the criticism that it has received, that we are trying to address a problem that does not exist, those of us in law enforcement know the best way to solve a crime is to try to do something proactive, to try to prohibit it or prevent it before it happens. This bill seeks to do that.

We realize that with the extensive nature of the language contained in this bill, certain amendments certainly are more than likely to occur, and we are more than open to allow those to happen. I've had conversations with members of the press, members of the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association, and members and representatives from the Department of Motor Vehicles, all of whom express certain concerns about language contained in the bill. From our position in law enforcement, we are more than open to discuss making changes to the bill as it exists. As was quoted in one of the local newspapers, we were questioned as to why this bill did not include victims and witnesses of crimes. I can tell you

that the position of our organization is that we would like to include victims and witnesses of crimes in this language so they can receive some protection from retaliation against the people whom they've chosen to seek prosecution against who have witnessed other crimes.

[David Kallas, continued.] As I said earlier, one of the criticisms that was received was that we are trying to create a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. I'm going to go ahead and give you a couple of examples of incidents in law enforcement in which officers, by the very nature of their jobs, have been the subjects of retaliatory action against those individuals whom they sought to bring to justice. One of the examples that I discussed yesterday with a member of the press was a gang officer who had spent almost four years investigating the leader of one of the most violent gangs in Las Vegas. Yesterday, when I spoke with that press representative, I told that press representative the name of the gang was the Rolling 60s. The Rolling 60s is a violent gang in Las Vegas, but the actual gang name of the one that the gang officer was investigating was the Donna Street Crips. It's a gang that is centrally located in North Las Vegas, but certainly impacts all of Clark County.

For four years, the officer spent his time and other members of the gang unit's time investigating the individual leader, and the leader was eventually arrested and was placed in a holding cell in one of our local facilities. One night, an officer received a phone call from a Parole and Probation officer who said that during the course of an interview with one of his parolees, he was told that that parolee had just left a meeting in which that officer's name was discussed, and he had actually seen information exchanged with a couple other people present about the officer's home address and other personal information.

Immediately, the officer notified his supervisors, who in turn determined that, based on the violent nature of this gang, they were going to have to go through this officer's home, remove him, his child, and his wife, and place them in a safe location until such time they could apprehend these suspects. Eventually, the suspects were located, and the information that was discussed by a confidential informant was found on that person. This was assessor's office information indicating the officer's name and his home address. Also, on handwritten notes was other personal information, including his date of birth, his Social Security number, and other personal information that was relevant to what they determined to be an operation carried out at the direction of this jailed gang member.

That's just one incident. There are many other incidents. In this day and age, the job of law enforcement is to do proactive work to protect people. This bill aims to protect people who otherwise would be put in a position to potentially

receive retaliatory action against them just by the very nature of their job. We're trying to do this because in this day and age, sometimes information is too accessible. Nobody in this country ever believed we could be the victims of domestic terrorism, but you don't have to look any further than what occurred in Oklahoma City [on April 19, 1995], in the [Alfred P. Murrah] Federal Building, to realize that it has come to our doorstep. You have to look no further than what occurred on September 11, 2001, to realize that we to could be the subject of violence. I'm sure if Judge Joan Lefkowitz could be here today—the judge whose family was a victim of violence in Chicago last week—she, too, would tell you that we allow personal information about people who put themselves in the public eye to be accessible to others who have less than legitimate reasons for accessing that information.

We're here today to implore this Committee and this Body to provide these individuals with some protections, not what they do in their professional jobs, because we're now more accessible than we've ever been. Every single legislator sitting in this room, sitting in this building, their information is on a website, someplace. You have a phone number, you have a fax number, you have an email address, and you have a work address. Same thing with me. If anyone wants to find me, all they have to do is type <www.lbppa.com> into a computer, and they'll find out my business address, my cell phone, my business phone, my fax number, and my email address. If I need to be more accessible than that, I'm not sure why.

I don't understand why the legislators, attorneys general, judges, jurists, anyone involved in law enforcement, or any other person that is named in that document needs to have their private information about where they live accessible to individuals who have other than legitimate intentions for it. I appreciate the Committee's time, and I am certainly open to any questions.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

First of all, I have a disclosure that one of my companies sells homeowners lists. We compile it from the county recorder's office. We buy the film on a daily basis and compile it into databases and maintain this information. Title companies have it. There are a lot of companies that have websites, such as MetroScan. My question is, what is the county going to do to notify us if someone has filed this form to be exempt from the list, that we're not supposed to be reselling the information that we have on our website, or we have on a list that we're selling? Is the county going to do something to notify us? Because, according to this law, it says it would be illegal for us to continue to sell it.



**David Kallas:**

Not speaking on behalf of the county, I would presume that if this bill was to be enacted—and it's our hope that it would be—that it wouldn't be retroactive. Any information that any organization currently has or contains in their files would not be subject to the provisions of this law.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

It's not so much the retroactive. It's if you purchase a house today—on the microfilm, the deeds that get recorded—we pick that information up on a daily basis and continue to compile it. If you purchase a house today, there's no way to not have your name on the deed that's part of the record at the recorder's office. How are we going to know down the road that this is now an exempted record and we can't resell it?

**David Kallas:**

At this point, this particular bill does not address access to the recorder's office for particular deeds. I believe there are some procedures in place to access that type of information much more so than it is for the assessor's office. All you have to do is go to any computer, type in the assessor's office website, hit the button to record search, put in a name, and within an instant, you'll find out what that party's address is and how much they paid for that home. That's what the concern is—not so much what occurs with the deeds, because it's a little bit more work to be done. In the case that you're speaking, there certainly is some accountability in the accessibility of that information by your group and other groups.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

That was my concern, that the title companies maintain a database similar to the county's that anyone can call a title company and get a free report from them, and they'll just shoot it out, and how are we all going to be affected by this change. Thank you.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

Just to share with you, I'm a former public employee also, as a schoolteacher. I can see some merit in this bill, in the sense that students or young people have a tendency to be retaliatory. I know if we did give them a negative grade and not pass the class, there's many instances where, if they can get confidential information on us, I wouldn't be surprised to see them take steps for retribution. I can see this bill has some merit to it.

**Chairman Parks:**

I think it's also apparent that at least in Clark County today, not only can you find records of somebody's home, but you can also download and print out an aerial photo of the home as well.

**Ronald Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:**

I recently ran for office in the city of Reno, and the disclosures that you make and we all make are public. If any of you go to a website, as you well know, and you enter your name, you'll find out everything there is to know about you. The purpose of this bill, though, is a little bit different. It provides accountability in a sense of releasing any information that needs to be done. Over the years and prior to the 2003 Session, we had an extensive meeting with the Washoe County Assessor's Office regarding the accessibility of information on the Web, which not only provided aerial photographs of your home, but also provided diagrams of those homes. In the past year, for example, I know that Attorney General [Brian] Sandoval's family was on the Web, and the disclosure of that was readily available to anybody who wanted to go on the Web and find it. There has been also a website that disclosed law enforcement persons, their officers, their families, and their children. This has all been attempted, and we've attempted to stop that. However, in this day and age, there are no secrets, as you all know.

In my other life, after I retired from the Reno Police Department, I became a private investigator in the state of Nevada. It's a very regulated industry. I subscribe to a database that gives me access to 80,000 databases nationwide. I can run any of you at any time and find out anything there is to know about all of you. The purpose of this bill is prospective. It can't go backwards. The cat's out of the bag, and it's been out of the bag for years. What we're trying to do now is provide some security—which is the purpose of this bill—to stop access to having information released where there's no accountability. Anybody can walk into an assessor's office right now and get a list of whatever they want, and there is no accountability. This provides that. This gives us some reasonable background, and it keeps our record confidential to a degree. We're never going to stop it completely. We aren't.

I also want to point out that a couple years ago, one of things I was directly involved, having been threatened myself, and I'm sure anyone in law enforcement has. Maybe some of you have or have not. One of the important things about it is we had a highway patrolman named Ken Gager, who sat in front of this Committee several years ago, who received a package in the mail from a man named Robert Collins, who is now doing life in prison. I believe he's up in Ely still. We don't know where he got those records, but we do know that

he sent Mr. Gager a package bomb, and Mr. Gager suffered extremely. He's going to be disabled for the rest of his life. He was blown apart. This is what this bill prevents.

[Ron Dreher, continued.] We have had a number of law enforcement people killed in the line of duty in the state of Nevada. I also want to show you a picture of what's happened. On January 9 and 10 of this year, two California officers—one was ambushed ([Exhibit C](#)). He was a sergeant. He left behind his family and three children. Another one was stabbed to death in a correctional institution. If you don't believe me, you can check yourself. Our inmates in our correctional institutions do have access to websites. They do find out where we live. They do have friends on the outside. They do have the ability to locate where we are, who we are, what we are, our families, and the like.

Respectfully, I urge you to support A.B. 142 based on those reasons. It's a start. We are not averse to open records. None of us are. We all want to have open access, but this is about security. It's about protection. It's about safeguarding those people who put their lives on the line day in and day out. It's just not police; it's also you, the elected officials, that are listed in this bill. It's also about the victims of crimes. It's about all of us that go out there and do something and are victimized by people who have no conscience. Everyone in this room probably does. But I will assure you, having spent 26-plus years at the Reno Police Department, the last 11 in homicide, there are a lot of people out there that don't have a conscience. They don't have a problem with running our names on a website and taking us out.

Again, prospective only, this bill would take effect July 1, 2005, and from that point on, the onus would be on us to provide a list to provide our requirements to the assessor to say, "Please don't release that." There's already language in NRS 481, and most of it is mirrored in this bill that says basically the same thing this bill says. NRS 481 deals with Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) records. You can't access those unless you have certain criteria. The criteria that is stressed in NRS 250, the one that this bill refers to, is going to almost mirror the language that's in NRS 481 and put it back in NRS 250. There are some changes, and there are some things that need to be pointed out, because I also have had some contact with some people. The trial attorneys feel that this bill would not have an impact or prevent us from obtaining records or getting information in preparation of litigation. I think, if you'll look at Section 8, subsection 1, paragraph b, it specifically states that in preparation of investigations, these things are allowed. So, we're not cutting off access.

Dealing with NRS 481 and journalistic endeavors and their reasons to have access to this confidential information, even in the Nevada Department of Motor

Vehicles records today, this would provide accountability. It just asks who's asking for it and to please keep it confidential and keep a record of it; if you go to disseminate it, you'll have to keep a record of it for 5 years. That's what we're looking for. We want to know if something does happen to my family, to Dave's family, or to our highway patrolmen, our officers, our protectors, you all, that we can track back and find out who hurt you or who hurt your families. That's the other part of this bill. So, it encompasses a number of things that we're trying to do.

[Ron Dreher, continued.] Again, we started this several years ago, and it's very controversial any time you deal with open records, but I have to go back and reinforce this statement: We are for open records. This is security. This is accountability. That's what this bill's about, and obviously, there probably are a number of amendments or things that we can look at that can help us get this bill going. It's time in this day and age, as Dave said, of 9/11 [September 11, 2001], of Oklahoma, of the websites that are out there, of the public information that's out there right now. It's time that we start providing security for all of us. I urge you to support this bill.

**Gary Wolff, Business Agent, Teamsters Local No. 14, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have a personal interest in this bill. I have two children in the Nevada Highway Patrol. One is a sergeant here in Carson City, one is a trooper in Las Vegas. Both of them have families and children. You get back to the Ken Gager incident—the bomb, when it went off, not only destroyed Ken Gager's life, it darn near killed his wife. If she had not been standing behind a refrigerator door, she may not be here today. I'm asking you to look at this thing realistically. Dave has already said that there are amendments that would have to be made, but again, it is a security issue, and I think all of you have an obligation to protect your law enforcement officers. They have a difficult job. I did it for 31 years. It's not the most popular job in the world. We do save lives, but we usually get the brunt of the bad stuff.

I would really encourage you to help Dave and all of us in our efforts to get some type of passage of this bill to create at least some security not only for the officers, but for their families. Also, I'm a grandfather who has grandchildren that live in those houses. I submit to any of you: if you had to do this job, how would you like to get a phone call one day and know that some maniac got there who doesn't care a hoot about who they kill, who they hurt? Men, women, children—they don't care, and we haven't done at least something to help secure these officers. With that, I'll be quiet. Everything else has been said. I really want you to support this bill, I really do.

**Douglas Sonneman, County Assessor, Douglas County Assessor's Office, Nevada:**

I've spoken with our Douglas County Sheriff and many deputies on how best to handle the situation. We want to be as supportive as we can of their needs, this one in particular. Based on those discussions, we received a list of about 40 properties requesting their picture be removed from the Internet, which was immediately done in respect to their needs. We have requests from some of the deputies to remove their names. We've tried to be as accommodating as we possibly can. The problem for us, depending on how the bill is enacted, would be leaving gaps in our database. If the names are deleted, what would we put in their place? Our data is highly sequential, so gaps would be fairly obvious and problematic. If someone had a question and called and asked on a particular parcel, do we tell them, "I can't tell you, because if I go on to explain the reason, it may defeat the purpose of what these folks are trying to accomplish? My preference would be to allow something like an alias to be put on there, some other name that would take people off the track to be substituted. Then there would be no gaps in information, and it would significantly reduce the disclosure problem. Another avenue would be the utilization by these folks of trust agreements, which would put it into a different name than their personal altogether.

As far as who requests the information, I would ask that title companies also be added to that list. They have a very legitimate need. When they're issuing title policies, they need all the information to match, and they would get fairly concerned if, for instance, I put in a different name or I put in no name, that they could verify the name they have on their title policy is correct, and they would feel comfortable with issuing that type of policy.

**Chairman Parks:**

I know there is already in statute the ability for a registered voter to make his data confidential, and I was wondering if, at least in Clark County, there are quite a number of individuals who have the only thing on file being their name as being a registered voter. As far as the rest of the data fields, they're all blank. I don't know if that would offer some possible solution. It needs to say we do have already in record for individuals to have a record made confidential.

**David Dawley, C.N.A., City Assessor, City of Carson City, Nevada:**

I'm here representing many of the assessors in the state of Nevada. I'm here to oppose the bill. Although we understand the situation that has brought the bill about, we believe the records themselves should be open to the public. If at any point you close the record at that time, you create compromising situations where a person believes he may be taxed differently than someone down the street who doesn't have their information on the Internet. At that point, they

have no way of checking that information out. I agree with Doug in that our information is required to be published once a year in a local paper. Those lists are very long, and if you leave out one name, it's going to absolutely create a hole to where the people wouldn't be identified, but the properties would be identified. At that point, someone could easily target that person—no matter who they are—whether they are a judge, an elected official, or so forth. Something would need to be implemented or put in place so that it wouldn't create an obvious void. Mr. Sibley was absolutely correct. If we were to make our information confidential, the only thing that that person would have to do is go down to the recorder's office, sit down at the computer, and type in a name, same thing that you do at the assessor's office. They can get almost the exact same information from them that they do from us.

[David Dawley, continued.] I do have one statement that I would like to read from the Carson City Treasurer, Al Kramer:

The essence of the fair tax system is that anyone taxed there can openly see that he is being taxed at the same rate as his neighbor, that his house of such and such value is taxed as the same as his neighbor's house of the same value. The taxpaying public needs to be assured that the politically connected pay no less than the average Joe. Once we start hiding names and making some of the information off the record, a place for doubt is introduced. I believe in more information, not less. If the person wants to shield any real estate they own from prying eyes, they should put their property in a trust, the title of which can be in any name. We have one actually in Carson City. It's called "Gassy Lassie." I have no idea who the actual owners are, but that's the trust.

**Assemblyman McCleary:**

In your opinion, if we start making an exception now for certain groups, do you think that will open the door for other groups to come to this Body and ask for exemptions?

**David Dawley:**

I believe that's exactly the case. This particular bill lists 20 categories of people. If you do start limiting it to one person or one set of people, one group, then they will be coming back asking for more. I believe that this would just be the start of it. There are alternative avenues that can be worked on to achieve the same thing, other than to make that information confidential.

**Assemblyman McCleary:**

So, you think that other groups may be able to come here and justify why they should be taken off the list too, then?

**David Dawley:**

Yes, sir.

**Mark Schofield, County Assessor, Clark County Assessor's Office, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Rather than make a comment, I will just echo the remarks my two colleagues previously gave to you, but I'm also willing to address any questions the Committee may have. I think an important point that was brought up earlier by one of your members, Mr. Chairman, was it doesn't matter at this point what you do, relative to embargoing any classification of individuals or access to their information, because that information is readily available in the Clark County Recorder's Office.

The other concern—and believe me, I certainly appreciate and empathize with the safety concerns of the groups that previously testified—I've had several people come into the office and indicate to me that they're very concerned about their safety. At one point, I even met with the special agent in charge of homeland security the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation]; the previous district attorney, now a district court judge, Stewart Bell; and a member of the [Las Vegas] Metropolitan Police Department. The final analysis was that probably the best way to approach this issue is to do what Mr. Dawley suggested previously, and that is to put your home in a blind trust or a family trust with a fictitious name.

The other concern that I have, relative to the proposed language, is the aerial photographs. My concern would be that several people on a daily basis are in the recorder's office reviewing all documents that were recorded the previous day. You could feasibly, unless you also restrict access to the recorder's information, have a company come in specifically to locate, using whatever naming condition we use, such as "unknown owner"—if that's how we're going to classify it to keep it confidential—to gather this information, and I can assure you that it will be sold. That would be one of my concerns. The other concern is the aerial photographs. It would stick out like a sore thumb if you pulled up a parcel map, and you had two individuals that elected to avail themselves of this legislation, and all of a sudden, one of the parcels showed up blank. That's a trigger that something is wrong, and I'm afraid that someone with nefarious motives may want to do further research on that. Of course, they would go to the recorder's office.

[Mark Schofield, continued.] With that said, I certainly appreciate the concerns. I think the solution to it is what Mr. Dawley indicated. I'm neither opposed nor in favor of this legislation. I'm neutral on it. I think it requires some work. If you choose to entertain pursuing it further, one of the concerns I have is if you have a situation here where you allowed for retired peace officers to keep this information confidential after three years. How do we know that they retire, number one? Number two, how are we to track whether or not elected officials are no longer elected? Are we supposed to monitor that? As far as moving, would there be a reapplication process when the individual moved from their home if they avail themselves of this? Those are just a few of the questions that I have, and I certainly will be willing to work on that. I'd be happy to entertain any questions.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

Understanding the recorder's function in this, if anyone has a mortgage or you have a UCC [Uniform Commercial Code] file, how are we going to avoid that? That information is readily available and has to be to the public.

**Mark Schofield:**

I don't know how you would do that. I really don't. I think that poses a real, legitimate problem if you choose to pursue this legislation. Mr. Sonneman from Douglas County addressed it. This causes a real, legitimate problem for the title companies as far as doing research, et cetera. In order for this to work to accomplish the goal that you're trying to achieve, you would have to replicate this same language through the various recorders throughout the state. If you don't, it's very easy to track. In addition to that, I know in California there are companies that buy this information and sell it to various individuals for marketing purposes, and they're able to get information that's confidential. Many of you I'm sure are aware of the LexisNexis website that is a paid service. You can get any information you wish to, including a person's Social Security number off of that site. I don't know what you can do to keep private information about yourself out of the public domain. I don't know how that's possible. That was a long answer to your question, but unless you embargo the same information on the recorder's side, this will not accomplish the goal that you are trying to achieve.

**Assemblyman Sibley:**

Mr. Schofield's right, in that the information will be available. We purchase from the county the real estate deed transfers. We buy the whole roll of film. It's all the recorded documents from the day before. I have 15 years worth of these rolls of film, and we can always go back and access it. There are companies—MetroScan, Experian—that sell, county by county, the property records. My concern is Section 14 of the bill. It says if a person discloses confidential



information about a person that's listed, it can be that they're held for a Category D felony. My concern is that the county is like any other organization, including mine, in that we make mistakes. If a form is submitted, and we fail to omit this information, now there is the potential that Mr. Schofield or someone in his office is subject to a Category D felony. That concerns me and the liability, from the county's position.

**Mark Schofield:**

If I may just leave you with one more comment. I believe this could create a very serious public relations problem for the assessors, for the reasons articulated earlier by one of my colleagues, in that I can envision the moment something like this passes, unless it's all-inclusive of all citizens in the state of Nevada to have the ability to do what you mentioned earlier with the voter registration, to have their information embargoed not only off the website, but the internal mainframe. I can envision thousands of calls coming forward saying, "Why can't we also apply to have our names removed from your records?" I can assure you that will happen. If you choose to pursue this legislation, unless you include them, they surely will be back the next session asking for you to provide them the same ability and benefit.

**Chairman Parks:**

You are correct. That has been some of the discussion that has already taken place regarding this bill.

**Martha Barnes, Administrator Central Services and Records Division, Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles:**

We have no position on this bill, but we would like to bring something to the Committee's attention. Because of the size of our database, in Chapter 18, where it refers to the DMV in NRS 481, where we would need to flag the number of people listed in Section 6 of the bill, we would like to request that we get an extension on the implementation date. Because of the size of our database, it would take us a little time to get the programming done. We would certainly work with the requestors and the members of the Committee to establish this.

**Chairman Parks:**

I do have an email I received yesterday that I'd like to read into the record. It is from Richard Tiran, the President of the Nevada Parole and Probation Association, and he has been observing our hearing this morning via the Internet.

[Chairman Parks read from [Exhibit D.](#)]

Honorable Members of the Assembly Government Affairs:

In recent years, the availability of information that can be obtained from city, county, and State offices, and online is beyond comprehension. As legislators, the safety of our first line of defense, our law enforcement officer, is and should be paramount. Legislators need to recognize the dangers that the defenders of our local communities can face.

The brutal murder of the husband and mother of a U.S. District Court judge this past week has, in addition to shocking the nation and galvanizing law enforcement, become a horrific reminder of the dangers that many in the legal community face simply by virtue of who they are and what they do.

Some question whether available information on the Internet or through city, county or state offices about law enforcement officers, where at times can include pictures, addresses, phone numbers, and other assorted information, can inspire those who feel they have been wronged to take the law into their own hands and hurt those who protect our communities.

We need to be intelligent and look at what we can do to protect the privacy of our legal community, its officers, and families. Personal information of these public servants must be protected by any and all means. We urge you to take the first step: support [A.B. 142](#).

I'll hold that one. I have also gotten a number of other emails from persons in the public safety arena strongly supporting this.

**Michael Schaefer, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words. Back about 1996 or 1997, Judge Jack Leyman ordered that there be a confidentiality treatment for any registered voter as to their home address appearing on the records of Clark County. A few weeks after that law went into effect, I called and asked the registrar how many people had taken advantage of it. I was told there were about five: you, me, and three other people. A couple years went by, and it was several hundred people. I talked to them this morning, and it's about 0.5 percent of the registered voters of Clark County. Somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,250 registered voters have opted to have their address

retracted from public access through the Department of Elections. I think that's a very positive thing.

[Michael Schaefer, continued.] Taking a look at the assessor's records is a good next step. We have had police officers who, rather than give their home address on their driver's license as the statute requires them to do, will give the office address of where they work. Maybe in the assessor's office, they will have all the mail sent to their office instead of their home because of the exposure that they suffered. I would speak in favor of the bill. I think that any protection that you give to anybody who is a target is a very positive thing. There are other groups that are not included, and maybe they will come back in times to come, such as judgment creditors. I have a fellow that owes me a couple of hundred dollars on a fraud judgment out of Texas, and he's called me and threatened my life to the extent that I moved my residence to some other place for a few months until the thing blew over. I had no idea how to get a hold of him.

I would say, ultimately, anybody who is a target and can make a reasonable request should have protection from their address being available. It's easy to do it now through the elections department, and I think that should be statewide. I don't think there are any privacy concerns in Clark County that are that different from other parts of Nevada, and I favor your legislation that adds further protection to the records of our Assembly. I love our assessor's office.

**Keith Lyons, Legislative Advocate, representing Nevada Trial Lawyers Association:**

We're taking a neutral position on the bill. We recognize its laudable public goals. We do believe, though, that there are problems with the bill. We share some of the concerns that were testified to by the various county assessors. We also recognize, as a county assessor said, there is a current way to do that under current Nevada law, which is to set forth either a family trust or a blind trust, which would serve the same purpose. However, we have other problems with the bill which simply need to be addressed.

If it is passed, and if you look at Section 8 of the bill, it says that a county assessor may provide confidential information for use. It's not mandatory language, so it's discretionary with the county assessor whether they provide the information. There is no mechanism set up in Section 8 to obtain the information, so you could easily end up where one county assessor has one set of requirements to obtain the information and another county assessor has another requirement on how to obtain the information. You may have a county assessor that just says, "Tough. It's discretionary; I'm not going to provide it."

[Keith Lyons, continued.] The other issue is with when you look at Section 10. It says, "A county assessor may establish," and again, it's discretionary, "a program whereby a person may request a complete list of the assessor's rolls. There is no ability there to obtain one particular piece of information. In other words, what the assessor is going to provide us, then, is the entire list of the roll, and based on a conversation off the record with Mark, there are approximately 600,000 entries in Clark County's database. I was asking him how many pages, if that was to be printed off into a book, that it would take, and being rather naïve, I said 21 to 22. That's when he informed me: 600,000 entries at 26 lines per page—you can imagine the number of pages that is going to be provided. To get to one name, you're going to have to review all of those names to get to that particular thing. It would be a burdensome cost, I believe, for the county to provide that information. I believe he also informed me that it costs several hundred thousand dollars just to print that list once a year. They have to keep that list, provide us, and it has to be updated on a monthly basis or even a weekly basis. I can imagine the cost to the various counties.

Having said those concerns, the real concerns with NTLA that we have are the issues of the discretionary language. There is no standard set forth to require the county assessor to provide the information, if it's necessary to any party entitled to the information. We believe those revisions need to be done to the bill.

**Kent Lauer, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association, Inc.:**

I'll be brief, because I think you've heard several of the problems with this bill that I was going to mention. A couple of things: The Oklahoma City bombing, 9/11, the slaying of the judge's husband in Illinois, have nothing to do with this bill. Don't let that get you off track. The proponents of this bill haven't cited one instance in which public employees have been harmed because of access to assessor records. By passing this bill, you would indeed be creating a protected, privileged class of employees. To me, that's anti-democratic. It makes no sense at all to single out this information when the information is readily available elsewhere. There's always a remote chance that public information will be misused. If someone is determined to break the law, they're going to do it. That should not be the standard for closing off access to records that have been public for years.

**Kareen Masters, Personnel Officer III, Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada:**

I just want to take a moment and express the Department's concerns on a section of the bill.

[Kareen Masters read from [Exhibit E.](#)]

Section 6 of the bill designates the person who may request the personal information contained in the records of the county assessor be kept confidential. While a number of positions within our Department are included in the list, there are many others with similar duties and responsibilities that are excluded. For example, social worker investigators who perform child protective service work are included on the list. However, social worker elder rights advocates who are involved with cases dealing with elder abuse and neglect are not included on the list. Similarly, psychiatric social workers employed by the state are included on the list, while mental health counselors, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, and psychiatrists are excluded.

To address these concerns, I would like to propose an amendment to subsection 17c of Section 6 to specify any employee of the Department of Human Resources may request the information may be kept confidential. Currently, that section just specifies employees of the Division of Child and Family Services of our Department. I appreciate the Committee's consideration of our request.

**Ron Dreher:**

I'd just like to add a couple of points in rebuttal to some of the questions that were brought up. The first dealt with Assemblyman Sibley's comment on Section 14 regarding it being a Category D felony and the like. In order for that to occur, you have to know and reasonably know ahead of time that the person whom you're providing the information to is going to go out and harm somebody. That was the purpose of that, just to clarify it. It wasn't just if you release the information. You have to know if you're going to give it somebody else that it would be going to the purposes of hurting or providing substantial bodily harm.

The second dealt with a recorder of information, and that would be great if we could go and find a way to do that. If the trust is the way, then obviously that is a great mechanism of providing some confidentiality to that. Third, regarding the statements from some of the assessors that dealt with the information that is published once a year, I believe, by all the assessors of the state, because it's required by law. If you look at that, you'll find it only includes the name of the individual and the assessor's parcel number. Even in the bill they have in front of you, that would be the only thing releasable, and that's okay. That's the point of this. It would provide the confidentiality we're seeking right now.

[Ron Dreher, continued.] Fourth, dealing with the issues of going and getting, and changing the word "may" to "must." Obviously, that's okay. You don't want have someone go in there and say, "I'd just like one record," and the county assessor saying, "Well, you don't qualify under this. Therefore, we can't give you this, but we can give you this whole entire list." That's not right. I don't think that was the purpose of this, but those are some of the areas of concern that I had.

As far as DMV, as far as this being noninclusive, a simple solution—and I believe other states like California do have legislation that do provide the confidentiality sections—is that if you allow the individual to make that concern or make that commitment to the assessor and say, "I do not want my information published," just like we do with voter information. That is included in the bill as well. With that, thank you very much.

**David Kallas:**

I just wanted to address a couple of the issues that were raised by some of the speakers about the existing language of the bill. It certainly was discussed when we began this discussion on Assembly Bill 142. We know that there are some inherent problems with the language, just because of the voluminous nature of the language itself. Certainly, we are amenable to meeting with the Trial Lawyers Association and addressing their concerns regarding the permissive nature of some of the language, because we certainly don't want to inhibit their ability to garner information that's going to assist them during the investigation proceedings involving some sort of litigation. We do understand some of the concerns that the assessors stated to, even though one of them to me isn't really what this bill is about, and we realize that this bill is all-encompassing. We're not going to keep people from getting personal information from the county recorder, with regard to deeds of trust and the closing of information from title companies that they may need.

We certainly don't want to prohibit them from receiving that information in order to conduct their business, but this bill is a start. A lot has been said about the protection of the public employees involved in law enforcement, but as most people can see from the language in this bill, this is more than just about people involved in law enforcement. This is about anybody who we believe, at this point in time, has the potential to have some sort of retaliation act taken against them just because of the nature of their job and the type of individuals they have to deal with. So I don't want anybody to just focus on this bill and say, "This is just the benefit of a special privilege class of law enforcers." It's not, and that's why the language is as inclusive as possible. If this Committee deemed necessary, I would love to see this open to every single citizen of this community. I think we took a vote of the citizens of this state, a lot of them

might read your articles and say, "Yes, why do I want my information to be accessible for the public? What public good does it serve?" But this bill is a start. It doesn't answer all the questions. It certainly doesn't provide all the protections for every single resident and taxpayer of this state, but it's a start, and that's what we're asking this Committee and this legislative Body to do, to start someplace.

[David Kallas, continued.] I know one of the other individuals from the press association said there was nothing ever mentioned about a single law enforcement officer that had potentially received some abuse or retaliation because of access to the public information in the assessor's file. He must not have been present when I mentioned the gang officer, and I'll mention him by name: Officer Ken Wellington, who has since retired. His family had to be removed from their home because they had received information that there were two gang members en route to kill him and his family at the direction of another gang member whom he had placed in jail. With that, I'll finish my comments, and thank you, Mr. Chairman and the Committee, for hearing it.

**Chairman Parks:**

You wouldn't be opposed to reporters and television personalities being included in that group?

**David Kallas:**

Absolutely not. Even though I hate to mimic the California law, they currently have one that includes celebrities who can apply for exemptions, to have some of their information kept from the public rolls.

**Mark Schofield:**

Just another technical issue that I need to point out to you: Because this bill does not provide for the embargo of a person's name, the name will still show up in the publication of the roll, which was indicated earlier. I just needed to point something out to you. This does not provide for exclusion of the parcel number. So, technically speaking, if an individual's address is not arrayed, either on the website or on the internal computer systems within the 17 county assessors, it would be very easy to determine what the address is by backing into the parcel number. In other words, what you could do is you could go to the very next parcel, because the numbering configuration is sequential, and you can basically determine what the address was by that method. So, that's something you need to consider while you are considering all the technical changes to this piece of legislation, if you so choose to pursue it. By leaving the parcel there, it does not provide the necessary protection that the bill was intended to provide. I just needed to point that out to you.

**Chairman Parks:**

I think most of us are aware that the parcels are sequentially numbered. Some of them crisscross back across the street, but it's very important. I'd like to go ahead and close the hearing on Assembly Bill 142, and thank everybody for their testimony this morning. We will take this possible legislation under advisement.

I do have a couple other brief things to bring before us. We have three bill drafts that have been prepared for us. The first one is requested on behalf of the Nevada Equal Rights Commission. This is kind of updating things, bringing it more in place with federal statute.

- BDR 406—Revises provisions relating to Nevada Equal Rights Commission. (Assembly Bill 189)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR 18-406. (ASSEMBLY BILL 189)

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

The second one is BDR 22-591. It was requested by the Nevada Association of Counties.

- BDR 22-591—Authorizes governing body of local government to revise procedure for adopting certain minor amendments to master plan. (Assembly Bill 187)

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOEHEA MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR 591. (ASSEMBLY BILL 187)

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

The third one is BDR 19-595. This also was a bill draft request by the Nevada Association of Counties.



- BDR 19-595—Provides that certain electronic mail addresses are confidential and not public records open for public inspection. (Assembly Bill 188)

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR 19-595. (ASSEMBLY BILL 188)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

I do not have anything further this morning. Thank you, everyone. We are adjourned [at 10:24 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Michael Shafer  
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman David Parks, Chairman

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

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Government Affairs

**Date:** March 9, 2005      **Time of Meeting:** 8:07 a.m.

<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Exhibit ID</b>	<b>Witness</b>	<b>Dept.</b>	<b>Description</b>
N/A	A	Government Affairs Committee	N/A	Agenda
AB 31	B	Dr. Barbara Jackson, Director, Department of Leisure Services	City of Las Vegas, Nevada	Written Testimony, Information Package, and Proposed Amendment
AB 142	C	Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director	Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada	Two articles on police being attacked.
AB 142	D	Richard Tiran, President	Nevada Parole and Probation Association	Email to Chairman Parks Regarding Protection of Confidential Records
AB 142	E	Kareen Masters, Personnel Officer III	Nevada Department of Human Resources	Written Testimony and Proposed Amendment