

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

**Seventy-Third Session
March 7, 2005**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order at 9:07 a.m., on Monday, March 7, 2005. Chairman David Parks presided in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada, and, via simultaneous videoconference, in Room 4412 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

Nancy Haywood, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and
Municipalities, Carson City, Nevada
Don Stoker, City Council Member, City of Winnemucca, Nevada
Bob Erickson, Legislative Advocate, Representing the City of Fallon,
Nevada
Bjorn Selinder, Legislative Advocate, Representing Churchill County,
Nevada
Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association
Michael Tanchek, State Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor
Commissioner, Nevada Department of Business and Industry
Lori Ashton, Representative, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters,
Las Vegas, Nevada
Richard Daly, Business Manager, Laborers' International Union of North
America Local 169, Reno, Nevada
Paul McKenzie, Organizer, Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3, Reno,
Nevada
Jack Jeffrey, Legislative Advocate, Representing the Southern Nevada
Building and Construction Trades Council
Dan Musgrove, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the
County Manager, Clark County, Nevada
John Slaughter, Legislative Advocate, Representing Washoe County,
Nevada

Chairman Parks:

[Meeting called to order and roll was called.] We will open the hearing on
A.B. 148, which was requested on behalf of the Nevada League of Cities and
Municipalities.

**Assembly Bill 148: Expands exemption from requirements concerning payment
of prevailing wage for certain contracts for public works. (BDR 28-506)**

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

You have had distributed to you three items. The first one is on the Nevada
League of Cities letterhead ([Exhibit B](#)), entitled "Information Sheet regarding
A.B. 148." You also have a letter ([Exhibit C](#)) from Elko City Manager Curtis
Calder. Elko was not able to present today but asked that this letter be

distributed to the Committee. Finally, you have a small information packet ([Exhibit D](#)) from the City of Winnemucca that should have been distributed to you as well.

[J. David Fraser, continued.] Assembly Bill 148 is one of the League-sponsored bills, which was approved in our legislative package by a majority of the membership of the Nevada League of Cities Conference in October 2004 in Boulder City. Assembly Bill 148, as proposed, would raise the threshold above which prevailing wages are required to be paid on public works from \$100,000 to \$300,000. This bill has been presented in various similar forms multiple times. It was presented most recently in the 72nd Legislative Session, where it was introduced as a Senate bill and passed in the Senate, but it was not passed in the Assembly.

There are several reasons why we believe that this legislation should be passed. Most of them revolve around efficient use of taxpayer dollars, but we also believe that passage of this bill would have a positive economic impact on rural economies in Nevada, which, in turn, would have a positive effect on urban economies in a way that I will explain shortly. The current threshold was set in 1985, twenty years ago. Despite the inflationary adjustments, twenty years later that threshold is the same. What the prevailing wage rates of a project were in 1985 would still be the same today.

Prevailing wage rates are set by the Nevada Labor Commission. I see that the Labor Commissioner is here with us today. Prevailing wage rates are set by means of a survey, generally with classifications that are not necessarily reflective of rural labor markets. Therefore, the classifications tend to have wages set at rates that reflect the bottom line of the project costs, between 20 and 25 percent more than it would be if it were bid at the market rates in our rural communities.

I will specify, just one more time, that this would raise the threshold only in rural areas of the state. Assembly Bill 148, as drafted, would raise that threshold in counties with a population under 100,000. We don't have any argument with those wage rates in the urban areas. We feel that those prevailing wage rates are more reflective of the urban markets but are less reflective of the rural markets, because those project costs can be increased. Because of the need for prevailing wages to be applied in the rural areas today, we believe that puts local contractors at a disadvantage in the bidding process. We think that it is important that local contractors in the rural areas be given an opportunity to obtain these bids.

[J. David Fraser, continued.] As we know, many of our rural areas are hurting, and the local contractors tend to spend their money locally. An urban contractor and his employees securing one of those bids would tend to spend their money more back at home where they live. That is where they would buy their vehicles, where their families are, where they would spend their dollars, back in the urban areas. We feel that, by increasing this threshold, there would be an improved effect on the rural economies, and that is important even to the urban economies.

Some of the tax dollars—"C" [consolidated] tax dollars, most specifically—are distributed based on need. If the rural economies were to be bolstered, anything that the Legislature does—not just this—to bolster those rural economies will have a positive effect on the urban areas. The rural areas would not need to have as many of those dollars from the urban areas distributed to the rural areas. By that logic, the urban areas would benefit from anything—including this—that was done that strengthened the rural economies.

There is a process for amending prevailing wage rates with the Labor Commissioner that has been tried unsuccessfully, most recently in 2004. The majority of our membership has asked that we bring this measure forward to you. We feel that it will have a very positive effect on rural Nevada, in the savings of taxpayer dollars, as well as in the bolstering of rural economies. Again, we feel that it has further-reaching effects than just in rural economies, and it will help with the urban economies in the manner that I have just indicated.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Is the League membership fully in support of this?

J. David Fraser:

As I indicated earlier, the League passed this by majority vote at its October conference. It was not a unanimous vote, Mr. Atkinson. Two of our member cities, Reno and Sparks, did not vote in favor of this proposal.

Don Stoker, City Council Member, City of Winnemucca, Nevada:

I have been on the City Council for 17 years, and before that, I was on the school board for 16 years. I am really aware of what prevailing wage rates do and do not do. I am aware of what prevailing wage rates do to small counties and cities in this state, especially what it does to their budgets and the costs to the taxpayer. I am here today in complete support of raising the threshold of exemption from \$100,000 to \$300,000 for populations of counties under 100,000.

[Don Stoker, continued.] This is about the fifth time that we have been before the Legislature, either before the Senate or the Assembly, to testify against the prevailing wage rate threshold as written. Again, we are here not to change the prevailing wage law itself, just to change the exemption from \$100,000 to \$300,000, which has not been changed since 1985 and possibly even before that. We have been asked when the \$100,000 was put in there, and we cannot find a record of that particular date. It has not even been looked at, except for our presentations in the last four or five sessions at the Legislature in an effort to raise that threshold from \$100,000 to \$300,000.

We are pleading with you to take a look at this particular concern and pass A.B. 148. I would like to read a statement that we have written. It is called the "Prevailing Wage Presentation." [Read from [Exhibit D.](#)]

The City of Winnemucca supports paying fair and equitable labor rates on its public works projects.

The prevailing wage rates law, however, currently inflates local government's public works project costs by 15 to 25 percent, depending on how labor-intensive the project is. We have documented that the wage rates established by the Labor Commissioner for certain categories of workers are substantially higher than what is normally paid in Humboldt County. For example, the average wage rate paid by our local contractors for a laborer's work is presently \$9.48 per hour. The prevailing wage rate has currently been set at \$23.30 per hour. Plumbers are presently averaging \$14.50 per hour, while the prevailing wage rate in the urban areas has been set at \$22.50 per hour. Equipment operators are presently averaging \$14.37 per hour, while the prevailing wage rate in the urban areas has been set at \$34.33 per hour. Attached is the information that the City of Winnemucca presented to the State Labor Commissioner in December 2004, as part of our objection to the Humboldt County wage rates established for 2005 ([Exhibit E](#)). The Labor Commissioner indicated that most of the information provided could not be considered in the determination of the prevailing wage rates and offered to hold a public hearing for just the cement mason's average hourly rate of pay.

It is important to point out that prevailing wage rates in rural counties are self-perpetuating, because most of the larger construction jobs are completed by government entities that are forced to pay the prevailing wage rates as established by the

annual surveys. These higher rates are then used by the Labor Commissioner to establish the prevailing wage rates for the following year.

[Don Stoker, continued.] We have proven the magnitude of this problem not only by performing contractor salary surveys as summarized above, but also by requesting two bid figures on some of our public works projects, with and without prevailing wages. The prevailing wage bids were 15 to 25 percent higher than if the contractor were allowed to utilize their rural "normal" wage rates. Our local contractors have indicated in writing ([Exhibit F](#)) that the prevailing wage rates are roughly double their standard rates, which results in a 20 percent to 25 percent increase in their public works projects' bid totals. The contractors also point out that they have incurred a substantial loss in production on prevailing wage jobs, due to the workers' desire to continue to make the higher wages.

We have received documentation from other communities across the state that have also experienced substantially inflated costs on their prevailing wage rates projects.

The *Nevada Business* magazine has published several articles ([Exhibit G](#)) in the past that addressed the higher wages paid on public works projects due to the prevailing wage rates law. In the December 2002 issue, for example, one contractor indicated that it costs about 25 percent more to build a project using prevailing wage rates. Another contractor indicated that on prevailing wage rates jobs, they get poor productivity because people are going half speed trying to make the job last.

In the January 2000 issue, a brief by the Nevada Policy Research Institute ([Exhibit H](#)) concluded:

The existing \$100,000 prevailing wage rate threshold was established prior to 1985. If the \$100,000 threshold had simply been increased by the annual inflation percentage—for example, by the CPI [Consumer Price Index]—since 1985, the threshold would now be well over \$200,000 just to maintain the original intent of the law.

The City of Winnemucca is requesting that the 73rd Legislature approve A.B. 148 as a first step towards correcting the prevailing

wage rate problem that is undoubtedly costing Nevada taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

[Don Stoker, continued.] The City of Winnemucca put a pamphlet together. When we first came before the Legislature about six years ago, it was always that we didn't have enough documentation, we didn't have enough comparisons, and we didn't have enough actualities. The City of Winnemucca went as far as getting information from other cities ([Exhibit I](#)). The contractors of Winnemucca also have a letter of reference regarding the prevailing wage rate. There is some very good information from the *Nevada Magazine* about the prevailing wage rate laws boosting construction costs and so forth. The Nevada Policy Research Institute has also had an article on prevailing wage rates. Hopefully, everyone will take this and read it because it has some great information in it, and we put in a lot of work to put this documentation together.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I assume that the Construction Wage Survey ([Exhibit I](#)), which you people have put together in the City of Winnemucca, was done to try and respond to the Labor Commissioner, Mike Tanchek. If so, how many of these wages were actually adjusted, and how many prevailing wage rates were actually adjusted?

Don Stoker:

As far as we know right now, there have been none. The only one that is being looked at to be adjusted is the concrete person. Otherwise, there are no other adjustments.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

The most glaring one that I see in this is the prevailing wage rate for laborers, as well as equipment operators, in the City of Winnemucca and the northern rural counties. Being from the rural areas, I know most of the contractors that have completed this survey. When it is over double the prevailing wage rate in one community versus what the prevailing wage rate is that is being set by the state, I would have thought that those rates would have been addressed. So far, you are saying that the only one is the cement masons?

Don Stoker:

When the survey comes out, residential projects are taken out, most private commercial projects are not looked at, and the survey is skewed towards prevailing wage rates in the urban areas. Other laborers' jobs in Winnemucca are not looked at. The only things that are looked at are the prevailing wage rate jobs or unionized jobs that are at the mine. All of that is skewed towards prevailing wage rates.

[Don Stoker, continued.] They don't take that into consideration and do not come back and take an average. For example, for a laborer earning \$30 an hour here and \$10 for a laborer somewhere else, we are now going to come to an average of \$15 per hour or \$18 per hour. The wages are set at the \$30 per hour rate, and that is what you end up paying, because everything is skewed towards prevailing wage rates.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I assume that the Labor Commissioner is signed up to testify?

Chairman Parks:

He has signed in but has indicated his neutrality on the bill. He has indicated that he will speak. We will get the proponents and then later take the opponents.

Assemblyman Hardy:

The bill, A.B. 148, really doesn't propose to do away with prevailing wage. It looks at an exemption of \$300,000. I don't see any proposed amendments to do away with prevailing wage. I know where your interest is, but I think I need to just stick with the bill. When you had the Nevada League of Cities and you had the discussion of rurals being exempted with the \$300,000, I think that, as I recall, in 2003, we looked at a bill from the Senate that had a \$1,000,000 exemption. This is a far cry from that when we are looking at the inflationary cost.

I think that we are looking at a different animal than we were two years ago. We are certainly not looking to repeal the prevailing wage. I want to make sure that the angst over that particular conversation does not tarnish this bill. I think this bill is a more reasonable rendition of what we are trying to do to protect the rurals and get the economy and the rurals built up. Unless I am mistaken, that would be my observation of the bill, and I would probably object to anyone who wants to say that we are after anything else.

J. David Fraser:

You are absolutely correct. This attempts to do nothing more than to raise that threshold. We are not proposing to change the prevailing wage per se. You are also correct on the bill that passed out of the Senate in the last session. It was at \$1,000,000. That is higher than we think we need. So, yes, what we are proposing is just to raise that threshold to \$300,000 this time.

Assemblyman Claborn:

All that you are really doing with the prevailing rate is taking wages out of the worker's pockets. That is all you are doing here. You are trying to build

something with the wages of a worker. I don't see any bills in here to cut your pay 10 or 20 percent, either. I just want to let it be known that that is what happens here when you address the prevailing wage rate. It takes the money out of the worker's pocket. That is why it is established here. That is why I think that it is a great piece of legislation.

Bob Erickson, Legislative Advocate, Representing the City of Fallon, Nevada:

I would like to compliment Mr. Fraser and Mr. Stoker on their testimony. It pretty well summarizes the details of the existing situation of the prevailing wage. I have been involved in local government in rural areas since 1983. In 1983, the cap was \$100,000. You could then repave an entire street for that. Today, in the City of Fallon, we have difficulty issuing a seal coat contract to preserve the life of our streets for \$100,000. Most of our projects are far in excess of \$300,000 or \$500,000.

When we have to issue a project to do a street ([Exhibit J](#)), part of that contract is to redo the water lines, redo the sewer lines, and make electrical adjustments to the electric lines and other utilities. Basically, what we are talking about with the \$300,000 limit is regular maintenance types of projects ([Exhibit K](#)), such as seal coat projects, pothole filling projects, and very small public works projects. The rest of the projects are, of course, above \$100,000, and if this bill goes through, any project over \$300,000 will continue to come under the prevailing wage law.

Most of these projects, the maintenance-type projects, are done by small contractors. The contractor has an established wage scale that he pays his workmen. When we issue a contract over the prevailing wage rate threshold and we experience a 20 to 25 percent additional cost to the taxpayer, the people that work for the contractor are receiving a bonus. It is over and above their normal wage scale and over and above the normal wage scale for that type of work within their rural communities. This past year, we had just one project out of many that was over the \$125,000 limit but under the \$300,000 limit. This project was the creation of Millennium Park in downtown Fallon, which was designed to remove blight in the center of our city.

The project was started five years ago and, while a portion of the money and the contract was issued under the City of Fallon and subject to the prevailing wage, one-third of the money came from donations from citizens who wanted to support this project to create a park in downtown Fallon, as well as removing the blight that existed in the center of our city. This included a closed, abandoned service station that had been in need of some environmental remediation.

[Bob Erickson, continued.] In summary, raising the limit to \$300,000 would probably give us a little bit more flexibility in doing standard maintenance to our street infrastructure, which would extend the life of that infrastructure from 10 years to 15 years. I think that that is an important point. The rural economies are not as robust as the economies in Clark County and Washoe County. We have limited financial resources, and our property tax base is either flat or declining in most of the rural economies. Therefore, the tax dollars available for these types of public works projects are declining, not expanding. This bill would help us to stretch that dollar and maintain our infrastructure by extending their lives.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

On the first presentation, it says increasing the threshold for prevailing wages would allow more local contractors to secure bids on local public works projects. So, for these little maintenance contracts, you are not getting local contractors?

Bob Erickson:

In the City of Fallon, we do normally get local contractors for the smaller, maintenance-type jobs.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

These wages being paid are not leaving the local economy; they are being spent in the local economy?

Bob Erickson:

For the smaller projects, normally they are. Yes.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

It has always been my understanding that when, for instance, a mine closes in a rural community, there is obviously a huge loss in wages and buying power among the local people, and that increases the use of social services. It increases the number of people using emergency rooms for medical care. If you drop the wages in a community through this bill, why would that not have the same effect?

Bob Erickson:

I would like to defer to Mr. Stoker. We are not a mining-based economy, so I am not able to answer that.

Don Stoker:

I don't think that it would have an effect. Would you repeat the question?

Assemblywoman Pierce:

When a mine closes, the amount of wages in a community goes down precipitously. There is then an increase in the number of people who need social services, such as Medicaid and going to the emergency room, and not being able to pay those bills. Those bills are paid by the taxpayers. Why would this bill not have the same effect?

Don Stoker:

This bill would not have the same effect as that. It is only a threshold move. It is not the idea of prevailing wages that is changing. As Mr. Hardy was trying to state, all this bill is doing is changing the threshold from \$100,000 to \$300,000, to give rural Nevada taxpayers a little bit of a break as far as the small prevailing wage jobs are concerned. I don't think that it is going to have an effect. It is only the threshold that is changing; prevailing wage rates are not changing. The survey is not changing. Nothing is changed by this bill except the threshold, and that is from the \$100,000 projects to the \$300,000 projects. I think that that is an important aspect for the community to really look at.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

I think that it is important for all communities to understand that there is a connection between how much people get paid and whether or not they need social services, and that, when wages go down for any reason, there is an increased burden on taxpayers to provide social services. This bill will, in fact, increase the burden on taxpayers.

Assemblyman McCleary:

I have heard a lot of testimony about the struggles in the rurals. Does the State of Nevada subsidize those rural counties that are having trouble maintaining their governments?

David Fraser:

The State does not subsidize them per se. The point I was making is that the way the consolidated tax distribution works, there are donor counties and recipient counties. So, the better the rural counties do, the less those recipient counties will have needs. It is not necessarily a direct subsidy from the state, per se, but there is some subsidizing of rural economies by the urban economies. I think there is a general interest in all areas of the state to see those rural economies do better.

Assemblyman McCleary:

I would agree with that, too. I don't remember the dollar figure, but it is kind of substantial, the money that actually goes from the two biggest counties into the rurals to help subsidize them and keep them afloat. Correct me if I am wrong,

but the prevailing wage rate was set up to give people a living wage plus make sure that enough money would be provided for health care. Is that correct?

J. David Fraser:

I do not know if I am the right person to answer that question.

Assemblyman McCleary:

That is okay. Maybe I will have the Labor Commissioner explain that. My understanding is that it is to make sure that there is a basic bottom line for workers, to be able to compensate for living wages and to have health care. My concern here is that I hear you saying that you need help with the rurals, but I think that we are giving the rurals help now. I just don't know if I am comfortable changing the standards for you guys when we are, in fact, helping you financially on the other end. I don't know if it is necessary, but I will ask some questions of the Labor Commissioner when he comes up.

Chairman Parks:

Mr. Fraser, you attached some testimony to your sheet ([Exhibit B](#)), and I wonder if you might make a couple of comments relative to that sheet for our understanding.

J. David Fraser:

Yes. Attached to the Nevada League of Cities letterhead is a chart which lists some public works. Most of this information is found in the City of Winnemucca's packet as well, but we just tried to highlight those and feature that information a little bit. The top half of that indicates specific projects and their locations and what the prevailing wage rate bid on those was as compared to the non-prevailing wage. Mr. Stoker indicated that they had actually bid some jobs both ways in order to get a direct comparison. That is what those represented.

As you can see in the left hand column, the prevailing wage rate column, each of those projects are more expensive, including Carson Tahoe Hospital ([Exhibit L](#)), which is based on a court case, assuming that that is going to cost an extra \$1,000,000 because of prevailing wage. Down at the bottom is just a list of some crafts based on the Nevada Labor Survey, and what the prevailing rate is on that as compared to the non-prevailing rate found in the Humboldt County Survey ([Exhibit I](#)). I don't know if you want me to get into more specifics than that, but those numbers are important. That is really the basis of what we are indicating.

There are two things that are going on. One is that the more that the rural economies can be bolstered, the better off the urban economies will be. There is

also the matter of taxpayer fairness in terms of the taxpayers paying what is required by the local labor market. As Mr. Stoker indicates, each of these contractors have rates that they pay their employees, and we believe, if projects were more affordable for the local communities, there may, in fact, be more projects or, at least, that the scope of those projects may be increased to the point where there would actually be more opportunities to work.

[J. David Fraser, continued.] Each of our communities clearly has responsibilities to the constituents, not only to be careful with their tax dollars, but to provide economic impacts that will help people to find work and to have more of it.

Assemblyman Hardy:

As I look at the chart, two of these projects, over some period of time, would have been affected by this change in the statute that you are proposing: the skate park in Winnemucca and the sewer extension in Lovelock. Otherwise, they would not be affected by the increase from \$100,000 to \$300,000 that you are proposing?

J. David Fraser:

Yes. That is also the way I read it.

Chairman Parks:

I can understand the numbers and see that, by virtue of the fact that the size of the project would increase the cost because of prevailing wage. Does it have a negative effect on local contractors? Are they being precluded from offering or bidding on these projects because of the prevailing wage rate?

J. David Fraser:

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any cases in which they have actually been precluded. It's an open bid process. My feeling is that the local contractors would be able to be more competitive if they were able to bid the projects based on their own standard pay scales, as opposed to the prevailing wage pay scale.

Assemblyman Claborn:

I see the worker making a decent wage. That is what I see in your chart. A worker that is making a decent livable wage is what I see.

Don Stoker:

Looking at this particular exemption, I think that you have to look at the intent of the law. What was the intention when this was first put into place? Why was the \$100,000 exemption made law in the first place, so many years ago? I do not know when this law was exactly put in. We tried to find out and couldn't

find it. There was an intent, and you have to look at that intention. It is like anything else in this country; inflation has taken over. You used to be able to buy a gallon of gas twenty years ago for \$0.67 or \$0.80 per gallon. It now costs you \$2.50 a gallon.

[Don Stoker, continued.] It is the same thing as the intent of the law for the \$100,000 threshold. All it is doing is changing that factor, because of inflation, to bring it up to \$300,000. The threshold has not kept up with that inflation factor, but this will keep it up to give us the ability to be able to go out to bid with bids such as Mr. Erickson was talking about. You can't do anything anymore that is under \$100,000. This gives us the ability, without going out through the prevailing wage law, to be able to get a bid on it.

A real quick example is a skateboard park that was done in Winnemucca in 1999. We had two bids ([Exhibit K](#)). We had a Reno contractor do the bid. We had estimated a cost of \$90,000. We had a local contractor bid without using the prevailing wage rate. The Reno contractor bid it with the prevailing wage rate, because as he saw it, it was over \$100,000. His bid was \$119,000; the local contractor, using the same kinds of labor in Winnemucca, bid it for \$87,000. Again, I don't think that the City of Winnemucca is looking to make it unfair for people to make a living. We are not. We are also looking out for the taxpayers in Humboldt County and, hopefully, in the entire state.

If those bids had both been about \$119,000 for that skateboard park, it might not have been put in, because we didn't have the money to put it in. Luckily, we have a local contractor in the city of Winnemucca that put that skateboard park in at \$87,000, which met our budget.

I think that you really have to look at the intent of the law and what that was first intended to do. It hasn't been changed for 25, 30, or 40 years. All we are asking is to move up from \$100,000 to \$300,000. That is it.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

In my mind, if the prevailing wage rate that was established for Humboldt County were closer to the true wage of that county, there wouldn't be any reason to have a threshold anywhere from \$100,000 or \$300,000. Dave, would you care to comment on that?

J. David Fraser:

Yes, I think that is correct. It would be less of an issue to us if the prevailing wage rate scale were more reflective of the local labor market.

Don Stoker:

I have to agree with that. If you took the prevailing wage on one side, what Humboldt County is paying on the other, and take an average of that, we have no problem with that. If you just go from this spectrum to that side, that is the problem that we are having for the taxpayers and our budgets in small counties.

Bjorn Selinder, Legislative Advocate, Representing Churchill County, Nevada:

I am here to indicate support for A.B. 148. From Churchill County's perspective, we feel it is important for rural communities and economies. I am somewhat surprised that this particular number has not been adjusted to reflect inflation. When you think about it in terms of the Local Government Purchasing Act, the threshold for bidding, for instance, has gone up over the years. It used to be a rather nominal amount and has grown over the years as inflation has increased the dollar amount of what you can purchase.

I just wanted to add one thing for the record. I believe that there was a comment made that rural counties, for the most part, are being subsidized. I would say that I would respectfully disagree with that to a certain extent, especially since Churchill County happens to be an exporting county. We have provided CTX [consolidated tax] revenues to other communities over the years. Also, I would suggest that in good times, the net proceeds of the mines are a significant amount of money that the state shares—in the amount over the \$3.64 per \$100 assessed valuation limit. That goes for, I believe, support of schools and the General Fund.

Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers' Association:

We are in support of the bill. We have seen the impacts of prevailing wage on the local governments. I have been involved when previous bills have come up in some workshops. One of the biggest problems was identified just recently in response to Mr. Goicoechea's question. It is a question of having the labor rates reflect what actually occurs in that area. It doesn't, for the most part. It reflects the urban areas. Arguments that have been made are that you will not pay a living wage, but you are. The contractors that are local, who are bidding on these jobs, meet all of the other requirements. When they work for the private sector, they are paying wages that are definitely acceptable, and they are getting employees. What you are doing is getting an inflated wage for a public works project.

The issue that we have seen—and for those of you that have been dealing with the property tax issue—is that we have some areas that are extremely depressed, that have no leeway whatsoever in their tax rate. Instead of having some flexibility for maintenance projects, because you are not talking about building a building going to \$300,000, you are talking about keeping up

infrastructure. You don't have the ability to do that, because you can't even do your short-term or medium-term financing.

[Carole Vilardo, continued.] I think the other issue that you have when you are looking at this, is the fact that you not only want those projects kept up, but there probably should be an inflation factor to this. I can remember when it was changed, because it was in 1985. When it came out of the Assembly, it came out with an increase to \$200,000. It was knocked down by amendment in the Senate to \$100,000. The conversation and the discussion duplicates what is going on here today. It is time that we are able to provide some relief.

The other problem that you have is that, because you cannot get the additional financing in those entities that are at the cap, these projects, when they are able to be done, are being pulled in-house. By pulling them in-house, what you are further doing is restricting the tax base and the economic viability of the for-profit companies that you have out there. Somewhere, there has to be a happy medium. I can tell you that, I believe, it was Michigan—and I have put out an email to get this report; it was Michigan or Minnesota—is a very unionized state, has prevailing wage, and used to have prevailing wage on exemption for all school construction. About six years ago, when this report was done, schools were put under prevailing wage. In a highly unionized state, the analysis that was done said that it increased school construction costs by 10 percent.

You have had the same issue occur in California. This is not to remove prevailing wage; it is not even setting a threshold to build buildings. It is just allowing these entities to do some maintenance, to help maintain a viable economy. The workers are not going to be unskilled because they are the same contract workers that are working in those areas on non-prevailing wage jobs. I urge you to please consider this. I would be so bold, given some of the comments that are made, that if you consider this, please index it for inflation. With that, obviously we support the bill.

**Michael Tanchek, State Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner,
Nevada Department of Business and Industry:**

If possible, I would like to go last and do the cleanup on this.

Chairman Parks:

That is fine. We will move to those indicating opposition to the bill.

Lori Ashton, Representative, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I did fax you my standard opposition to this, and I will read it for the record.
[Read from [Exhibit M.](#)]

We are writing in opposition of A.B. 148. On a biennial basis, the prevailing wage laws of our state come under attack. When material and land costs rise, no one tries to negotiate down those prices. Knowing that they can't lower those costs, the public bodies believe the only way to save money is by raising the monetary threshold of the projects that would require the implementation of the prevailing wage. By doing this, the only cost savings would be off the backs of the workforce.

Prevailing wage not only establishes the amount of the fair hourly wage paid to workers in their area, but also ensures that those wages are monitored for any violations of state or federal laws. It will allow the unscrupulous contractors a way back into the smaller public work projects without this monitoring being in place.

Prior to the legislation that implemented the prequalification of contractors and the hands-on monitoring by the public bodies, the exploitation of workers existed at all levels of public work projects. If there are no parameters established for wages, it will be a race to the bottom dollar in bidding or negotiating, and the only ones who will lose will be the workforce. We strongly urge the Committee not to pass this piece of legislation, on behalf of the Nevada workforce and the Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters.

After listening to the testimony of Mr. Fraser, Mr. Stoker, and Mr. Erickson, I do have some observations. First of all—and Mr. Tanchek can comment later if I am incorrect—on the prevailing wage, for prevailing wage surveys, all commercial projects over \$100,000—not just prevailing wage projects, but all projects over \$100,000 in any area—are counted in that wage survey. Residential projects are the only projects, and those under the \$100,000 threshold, that are excluded from that survey.

The second comment that I continually hear is that all we want to do is regular maintenance. According to NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 338.011(1), "awarded in compliance with Chapter 332 or 333 of NRS, which is directly related to the normal operation of the public body or the normal maintenance of its property." That is an exemption to applying prevailing wage. The second part

of that statute also addresses emergency situations. If their concern is to keep up with and regularly maintain their infrastructure, that is already exempt from applying the prevailing wage in that area.

[Lori Ashton, continued.] If I were to use the scenario presented by Mr. Fraser, Mr. Stoker, or Mr. Erickson, where they talk it about it costing 25 percent more when applying the prevailing wage rate, then I guess I should make the same analogy that these rural counties should approach the suppliers and the land owners and ask for that same discount.

Richard Daly, Business Manager, Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 169, Reno, Nevada:

We are officially opposed to this bill. Many of the arguments and the various things that were brought up, I would like to comment on. Mr. Hardy's comment was that they were not trying to get rid of prevailing wage, but when the gentleman from Winnemucca was testifying, he ended his comments that they just support A.B. 148, but they left out "as a first step towards correcting the prevailing wage problem," a provision that we have probably talked about. I would say that they are not just here to raise the threshold. They are attacking the prevailing wage.

I think that it is a rather insidious attack. No one has gone and asked the contractors to put a limit on their profits on any of these jobs. They just want to save money on the backs of workers. One of the things that the testimony from the gentlemen from the League of the Cities said: "I think our contractors will be better able to compete," meaning the local contractors. How are they going to be able to compete? They will be able to compete by lowering the wages of the workers and paying people less on these projects. They are directly taking it out of the pockets of the workers, which I don't think is fair to anyone. The government agencies here are saying that this is such a good deal, but I don't see any contractors here saying prevailing wage is a bad thing. I think contractors like it. I think contractors think this is a good thing. I think paying a prevailing wage on projects is what is best, and it was intended to help the workers of this state. I am appalled that government agencies are attacking their own citizens and workers in their counties.

Areas such as Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, and Fallon have a lot of work that goes on. I am speaking for Northern Nevada and the Laborers' Union. I have 150 to 200 people that live in Carson City that are members of the union that like the wage rates that they get, and they get them on public and private jobs. We have 60 or 70 guys that live in Fallon. I have 30 or 40 guys and girls that live in Lyon County. We even have one in Eureka County. This is not just a Washoe County and Clark County issue. There are workers

spread throughout northern Nevada that I represent that would be damaged by this type of action.

Paul McKenzie, Organizer, Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3, Reno, Nevada:

I am here in opposition of A.B. 148. We don't feel that raising the threshold of prevailing wage jobs in rural communities is going to help our members or the other workers in those communities. We don't think it is going to help the rural communities that much. Some of the facts that were brought I would like to address, to clarify them or bring up for your thought.

One of the reasons that the sponsors of this bill feel that it is important is that they feel that it makes a positive impact to the economies in those communities. Trickle-down economics says that you give the money back to make a positive impact. That would say that if you pay the prevailing wage to the workers, the money trickles down to where it is going to be spent. You are not saving or helping the economy by holding money back out of the economy. You are actually hurting the economy.

The second thing that they say is that the surveys don't reflect the true wages in rural communities. There is a survey process. That survey process affects all of us. A few years ago, in Lander County, that survey process affected the operating engineers' wage badly. We ended up with a \$12 prevailing wage in Lander County. As a result of that, there were several jobs bid in Lander County, and there wasn't a big rush to get jobs done when the wages were so low. They bid some jobs, and one of the jobs was a \$500,000 job that a nonunion and union contractor bid. The union contractor was using the union wage, which is the allegedly inflated \$44 an hour wage, against the \$12 an hour wage; the difference in the bids was \$30,000 on a \$500,000 job.

Wages are not the big part of these bids. Another example of the discrepancy in the wage arguments is that they say there is a 30 percent difference in prevailing wage jobs to non-prevailing wage. Carson Tahoe Hospital was estimated at \$95,000,000. They are saying that, by applying prevailing wage to that job, it is going to raise the cost of it by \$1,000,000. That is 30 percent?

Another point that was brought up by the sponsor of the bill is that local contractors are at a disadvantage when you bid prevailing wage. Nobody is at a disadvantage when you bid prevailing wage. No one is. That is the reason you have prevailing wage. You level the playing field. I have to be a better businessman to beat the other guy at a bid, rather than using my workers' livelihood to underbid my opponent. If the local contractor cannot win the bid

with the fact that a guy from out of town has to mobilize and bring his equipment to town, then he is definitely not a better businessman.

[Paul McKenzie, continued.] That is probably why those prevailing wage projects are taking more time when the local contractor is doing it. He has to bid an area in there for more time, because he is dealing with the workforce that is not performing the job as quickly. The guy that has the higher paid workers is coming in, doing the job faster, can pay that mobilization cost, and still bid lower than a guy that is right there and has his equipment right there to do the work.

One other point that was brought up was that prevailing wage threshold has not been increased since 1985. I am not exactly sure what the operating engineer wage has increased to since 1985, but I know that, in 1980, I worked in Winnemucca as a laborer and I made \$7.50 an hour. I was working the type of jobs that the sponsors of this bill say a laborer today is making \$9.00 an hour. It is evident that the wages for the workers in Winnemucca have not gone up 30 percent in the last twenty years, so why do they want to raise the threshold to affect those same workers by 30 percent?

As I said when I started my testimony, I am very much opposed to this bill, and I would hope that the Committee would vote against and leave the threshold where it is.

Jack Jeffrey, Legislative Advocate, Representing the Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council:

Today I am also speaking for Danny Thompson, Secretary-Treasurer of the Nevada State AFL-CIO [American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations]. He could not be here this morning. He had to go to Washington. I am here in opposition of this bill. I can give you a little history, since the other side has opened this whole thing up. Not much of their testimony has much to do with what this bill says. It is mostly about prevailing wage in general.

Prevailing wage was first established by two Republican United States Congressmen, James Davis and Robert Bacon, and they call it the Davis-Bacon Act [of 1931] federally to this day. Many people refer to the Nevada prevailing wage laws as the "Little Davis-Bacon Act." It was first put into place because, during the Depression, when money was spent in local communities on construction projects, it was pretty typical for an out-of-state or out-of-area contractor to come in, bring their workforce with them, and pay them under the wages that the local workers were getting.

[Jack Jeffrey, continued.] When the job was finished, the contractor would leave, take the profit, and leave the workers in the communities, much like Assemblywoman Pierce was talking about with the mines. The workers were left in the community. The community did not have many social services, but they had a lot of people with no money in their communities, which caused a real problem. The problem was ironic, because the money was raised to build these projects, and it didn't help the local community at all. All the money went out of state.

That was the reason that the Davis-Bacon Act was first instituted. It was in the 1930s. I cannot tell you exactly when, but I can tell you when the threshold was raised. It was in 1985. I was a part of that. I was in the Assembly at the time. It was a compromise. The Democrats were in the minority in those days. The majority party was pushing the bill, at least in the beginning, to repeal prevailing wage altogether. There were hearings held in Las Vegas, Reno, and Winnemucca on that bill. I am not exaggerating. There were thousands of people at each of those locations, including Winnemucca, in opposition to the bill.

In Las Vegas, the hearings were held at City Hall. Not only was City Hall full, but the whole block was full of people. It was pretty much the same in Reno. In Winnemucca, they packed the convention center. At that time it was decided that they did not want to pass that bill, but a compromise was worked out that did several things. It started the survey process. Up until 1985, there were two prevailing rates, one for northern Nevada and one for southern Nevada. Generally, it was the rate that was negotiated with the building trades in those two areas.

The survey, since 1985, has been county by county. The threshold was set at \$100,000, which incidentally, if my math is correct, was 5,000 percent over what it had been. In fact, the federal rate today is \$2,000. The federal threshold today is \$42,000. We went to \$100,000 because we were told that the feds were about to raise theirs, and ours would have been in keeping with that. For whatever reason, and I do not have that reason, the feds did not raise that rate.

This bill would raise the rate 300 percent. Again, if there is any federal money in a project, the rate is \$2,000. I do not believe that local contractors are at a disadvantage, and I would like to reiterate what the previous speaker said. The local contractor has an advantage because he is established in the community. If he has a local workforce and has a local business, he does not have to bring people in, mobilize them, and pay room and board for them. If he is an efficient businessman, he should be in the driver's seat in that bidding process.

[Jack Jeffrey, continued.] If the threshold is increased 300 percent to \$300,000, there will be that many more jobs that will not be counted in the prevailing wage, because the law excludes those from the prevailing wage. The biggest problem that we've had in southern Nevada, and I think that is the same throughout the state, is establishing a meaningful prevailing wage in the small counties. It is hard to establish a construction rate in a small county that has no construction. We end up, at times, with what I would consider a handyman's rate—somebody that is in the community that does a little work—and that establishes a rate for the future.

The problem that causes is when a project of any size is built—say that Churchill County decides to build a school—their wage rate is established on a small number of hours by somebody who is making \$10 an hour. The contractors in northern and southern Nevada—in Reno and Las Vegas specifically—have to bid that project with wage rates that they are going to have to pay. They can't get people on the job for \$10 an hour or for whatever that lower rate is. What happens, then, is workers come in from other areas. The best example: Utah, where the wage rates are lower. Everybody really loses in that scenario. The former president of the Building and Trades Council said that these guys were leaving every Friday night with a suitcase full of dirty clothes and a paycheck. None of it was spent locally.

I know that a 300 percent increase to \$300,000 does not sound like a lot, but I think it has some unintended consequences that we all need to be aware of and be concerned about. In the long run, it will hurt Nevada workers throughout the state.

Assemblyman McCleary:

Given what Lori Ashton said about the maintenance provisions and emergency provisions concerning prevailing wage, do we even need this minimum threshold?

Jack Jeffrey:

I really cannot answer that. I do believe that maintenance done in-house is, of course, exempt. General maintenance is not meant to be covered by prevailing wage. It is a construction proposition. New construction, renovation, and remodeling are in that neighborhood. It's not general maintenance.

Assemblyman McCleary:

If this Committee decided, policy-wise, that we do not even need the threshold at all, is that going to cause any heartburn for you?

Chairman Parks:

I was trying to read in the small print of the statute. The applicability deals with normal operation, normal maintenance, and is related to emergencies.

Chairman Parks:

Is there any one else that would like to speak in opposition to the bill?

Michael Tanchek:

I did not have prepared testimony. I am looking primarily to answer questions. One thing that I did want to bring out, though, is that I went back and looked at our projects over the last couple of years. In 2003, out of the 109 rural projects that were reported, 46 of them would have been affected by this provision. Last year, out of the 127 projects reported, 49 of them would have been affected by this provision. This year, I do not have all my numbers in yet, but the trend looks to be pretty much the same, in terms of the number of projects that we are actually talking about.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

Could you give me those numbers again?

Michael Tanchek:

In 2003, we had 109 projects reported in the rural counties, the counties other than Clark and Washoe. Of those, 46 were under \$300,000. In 2004, we had 127 projects reported. Of those, 49 were under \$300,000.

Chairman Parks:

Were those 46 and 49 projects in excess of \$100,000 but under \$300,000?

Michael Tanchek:

Those went over the jurisdictional minimum of \$100,000.

Chairman Parks:

Applicable to this bill?

Michael Tanchek:

Yes. There were other projects that were reported to us that ended up being under \$100,000, so prevailing wage did not apply to those projects.

Chairman Parks:

I would like, since this a Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities bill, to ask if there are any final comments that Mr. Fraser would like to make.

J. David Fraser:

I would just like to ask the Committee to take this matter very seriously. We feel that it would be a positive step for the taxpayers in rural Nevada, as well as for those economies. I would just volunteer to the Chairman that one of the things that was mentioned is the need for contractors to ring in on this. In your packet from the City of Winnemucca, there are three letters from local contractors. I would just volunteer that if the bill were referred to subcommittee or brought back to work session, we would be happy to contact some of those contractors and see if they would be willing to come and visit with the Committee on that. Of course, I could not speak with them today, but again, we would be willing to see if they would come and do that for us.

Chairman Parks:

I know that there is quite a bit of data in this handout you gave us. We will look at that and probably have further questions. The hearing on A.B. 148 is now closed, and we will open the hearing on A.B. 149.

Assembly Bill 149: Makes various changes concerning redistricting of county commissioner election districts in larger counties. (BDR 20-334)

Dan Musgrove, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the County Manager, Clark County, Nevada:

Assembly Bill 149 is a bill that was submitted on behalf of Clark County. Between 1990 and 2000, according to United States Census figures, Clark County experienced an 86 percent increase in population, growing from 741,000 to over 1.3 million. Prior to the redistricting that occurred in 2001, the approximate population variance between our seven commission districts was 14 percent, with the largest district at 23 percent and the smallest at 9 percent, based on the 2000 Census.

When the county redrew its district boundaries in July of 2001, using those 2000 figures, we were able to bring those districts into relative parity. Following that redistricting, the population only varied from 14.6 percent to 13.7, and the ideal number for a seven district is 14.3 percent. As you can see, we had less than 1 percent variance.

The trouble is that we have already had a disproportionate amount of growth since that 2000 Census already. We have a large district already. I have provided a handout for you (Exhibit N) that gives the population estimates for July 2000, the revised population figures using the April 2000 U.S. Census figures for July 2001, and the population estimates for July 2004. As you can

see, we have Commissioner [Bruce] Woodbury's District A at 304,000, going down to Commissioner Myrna Williams' District E at 211,000, and Commissioner [Yvonne Atkinson] Gates' District D being at 207,000.

[Dan Musgrove, continued.] We are again getting that disparity between the districts. We truly feel that such a disparity among the districts actually violates the one-person, one-vote mandate that is part of the *Constitution*. Assembly Bill 149 would require that we do it once during the decennial, which would give us that vital capability of bringing the districts back into parity. It would ensure the residents equal representation by revising it, one time only, during that ten-year time period. That would be redistricting one extra time, versus when you normally would do it after the census numbers come in.

I think it is important to note that this bill request was submitted in our package and received a unanimous vote by all of our seven commissioners. All of them support it; all of them believe that there is a need to bring those districts back into parity. As you can tell, it is tough for some of our commissioners to be able to handle the size of their districts when you have essentially 300,000 to 400,000 people in a district. If you look at the land mass of Commissioner Woodbury's district, you can see that it's tough. This bill and this ability to redistrict would give us the opportunity to bring those districts into parity.

I want to note that the Attorney General has opined that we do have the ability to do it outside of the census time period, but the Legislative Counsel Bureau does not feel that we have the ability to do it outside of the decennial time period. That actually relates to the fact that Dillon's Rule plays in. Because we don't have the express approval to do it, the Legislative Counsel Bureau feels that we do not have that ability. We thought that it would be important to bring this bill before your Committee, before the Legislature, to give the Clark County Commission that ability to go ahead and redistrict outside of the census time period in 2001.

We are offering an amendment to our own bill ([Exhibit O](#)). What normal city charters have is the 5 percent language; we just ask that the 5 percent be removed. We have no other criteria other than the fact that we want to make those districts as equal in population as practical. That would be the amendment that we would offer.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Mr. Musgrove, I am just not familiar with Clark County. Are commissioners only elected in each district? Are the people in that district the only ones that vote for him? In some counties, they are elected countywide, but they have to run from a district.

Dan Musgrove:

Yes, that is correct. They represent the district and are voted only by those living in the district.

Chairman Parks:

When did the Clark County Commission move to recommend this bill draft?

Dan Musgrove:

It would have been in August of 2004.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Will this allow them to redraw lines at any time, or are we just asking for this one time? I know that population is going to continue to grow.

Dan Musgrove:

This would be only one extra time during the 10-year period. We would do it, as in the Legislature, when they redistrict. This would just give us one additional time period to do it. We would look to do it midway in that 10-year period.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

So, in a sense, it is 10 years now? It will be going to 5 years, and it will continue every 5 years.

Dan Musgrove:

This would give the option to the Commission to do it one extra time if they felt it necessary, based on the population growth. At some point in time, perhaps the population would level out in Clark County, and we would not have that disparity. At least this gives them the option to do it one additional time to keep those districts in equal balance between the populations in each district. As you can see already, in just the three years, it has gotten quite out of balance. We are just looking at one additional time period as an option.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

It could happen that, if there is huge population boom in 3 years, it could happen then. It doesn't necessarily have to be 5 years?

Dan Musgrove:

That is correct. They could do it prior to an election period if they thought it was important enough to give those folks the ability to try to get to one-person, one-vote. We would not be able to do it again until the actual census would come out, and that would be in the next decade.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Who participates in drawing the lines? I only ask that question because Mr. Goicoechea brought this up, and we do know that, in Clark County and a couple of others, because they run in their boards, politics comes into play when they draw the lines. When asking who participates in drawing those lines, I want to make sure that we don't get down the line and have commissioners and other people fighting over drawing the lines in three years so they can try to create more Republican seats or Democratic seats. I want to make sure that does not come into play years down the line, and they start wanting to redraw the lines based on that. I would say the same thing if the board was controlled by Democrats, and they were doing the same thing. I am worried that we don't get into that later on.

Dan Musgrove:

Absolutely. This is a political game, no doubt about it. The importance was that this was a 7 to 0 vote, and we have a 4 to 3 split on the Commission. I think that all of them saw this as something that was important to do for their constituents and not cross party lines. As you can imagine, there will be politics involved as to people looking to give themselves the best districts that they can. I think that you have enough folks involved in the process that it has to be fair and equal.

John Slaughter, Legislative Advocate, Representing Washoe County, Nevada:

I signed in as neutral on the bill. As it is written, the bill does not affect Washoe County. Just as information, in Washoe County we are currently in a position where it would not be necessary for us. The largest variation we have in our districts is about 3.5 percent at the moment.

Chairman Parks:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 149. As there are no other items or issues to come before us this morning, we will adjourn [at 10:42 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Haywood
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman David Parks, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Government Affairs

Date: March 7, 2005 **Time of Meeting:** 8:00

Bill #	Exhibit ID	Witness	Dept.	Description
	A			Agenda
	B	J. David Fraser, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities		Information Sheet, 3 pages
	C	J. David Fraser, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities		Letter from Curtis Calder, City of Elko, 2 pages
	D	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Prevailing Wage Presentation, City of Winnemucca, 5 pages
	E	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Letter to Mike Tanchek, City of Winnemucca, 2 pages
	F	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Memorandum of Support, 4 pages
	G	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Nevada Business magazine, 5 pages
	H	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Nevada Policy Research Institute, 3 pages
	I	Don Stoker, City Council member, City of Winnemucca		Construction Wage Survey, 2 pages
	J	Bob Erickson, Legislative Advocate, Churchill County		Schedule of prices, 1 page
	K	Bob Erickson, Legislative Advocate, Churchill County		City of Winnemucca Public Works Projects, 1 page

	L	J. David Fraser, Executive Director, League of Cities and Municipalities		Reno Gazette Journal article on Carson Tahoe Hospital, 1 page
	M	Lori Ashton, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters		Opposition to <u>A.B. 148</u> , 1 page
	N	Dan Musgrove, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the County Manager, Clark County		Commission District Population Deviation, 1 page
	O	Dan Musgrove, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the County Manager, Clark County		Amendment to <u>A.B. 149</u> , 1 page