

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Seventy-Fourth Session  
March 30, 2007**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair John Oceguera at 12:11 p.m., on Friday, March 30, 2007, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman John Oceguera, Chair  
Assemblywoman Francis Allen  
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson  
Assemblyman Morse Arberry, Jr.  
Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley  
Assemblyman Chad Christensen  
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert  
Assemblyman William Horne  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick  
Assemblyman Garn Mabey  
Assemblyman Mark Manendo  
Assemblyman David R. Parks  
Assemblyman James Settelmeyer

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Vice Chair (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Clark County Senatorial District No. 11

Minutes ID: 712



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Brenda Erdoes, Committee Counsel  
Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst  
Earlene Miller, Committee Secretary  
Gillis Colgan, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Terry Graves, representing American Chemistry Council  
Mark Rossolo, Outreach Director, Green Building Initiative  
Renny Ashleman, representing Southern Nevada Home Builders Association  
Irene Porter, Executive Director, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association  
Jim Sala, Senior Representative, Political Director, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters  
Ken Dunham, Executive Director, Lumber Association of California and Nevada  
Caroline Lowman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Robert Tretiak, President, International Energy Conservation, Las Vegas  
John C. Sagebiel, Environmental Affairs Manager, University of Nevada, Reno  
Terry P. Clodt, Board member, Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators  
Mary Wilkinson, Vice Chair, Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators  
Ryan Flood, Certified Voice Stress Analyst, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Patrick Flood, Private Citizen, Cathedral City, California  
Peter Maheu, President, Nevada Society of Private Investigators  
Ronald Sailon, Assistant City Attorney, Henderson, Nevada  
Mike Kirkman, Owner, Las Vegas Detectives  
R. L. "Dick" Putnam, Polygraphic Examiner and Consultant, Reno, Nevada  
Robert Roshak, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Ronald P. Dreher, Advocacy Investigation Services, Reno, Nevada  
Dr. Jason Geddes, Nevada System of Higher Education  
Colleen Janes, Purchasing Officer II, Nevada State Purchasing Division  
Jay Johnson, representing Northeast Energy Services Company, Inc. (NORESCO)  
Michael Hackett, representing Pinnacle West Capital Corporation and Arizona Public Services Energy Services  
Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League  
Kevin Dick, Director, Nevada Small Business Development Center

Su Lee, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General  
Paul Smith, Intern to Assemblyman David R. Parks, Assembly  
District No. 41

Gail J. Anderson, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of  
Business and Industry

Teresa McKee, In-house General Counsel, Nevada Association of Realtors

[The roll was called and a quorum was present.]

**Chair Ocegüera:**

We will open the hearing with Assembly Bill 295.

**Assembly Bill 295: Makes various changes regarding the Green Building Rating System of the Director of the Office of Energy. (BDR 58-945)**

**Senator Michael A. Schneider, Clark County Senatorial District No. 11:**

This bill seeks to ensure that the spirit of the legislation passed in 2005, Assembly Bill No. 3 of the 22nd Special Session, is embodied in regulation. It established a "green" building program, which deals with energy and environmental design, for the State of Nevada. A key aspect was to provide for choices in green building rating systems. However, in promulgation of regulations by the Department of Energy (DOE), only one rating system was implemented. That was the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system. This was due to limited time and resources the Department had available to implement the regulation and a lack of awareness of alternative rating systems. Assembly Bill 295 requires the Department of Energy to recognize a second standard. That standard is Green Globes. Like LEED, Green Globes offers a system that will place low demands on the DOE in that it is a self-administering system similar to LEED. This bill does not call for the replacement of LEED, nor does it preclude the adoption of other green building rating systems. In fact, it allows for the DOE to create their own Nevada custom green building rating system if it desires to do so. Green building is a budding industry which requires competition to fully develop in a way that maximizes the objective of creating highly energy-efficient buildings. Recognizing only one standard will stymie and retard the evolutionary development of the standard and the implementation of the technologies that create energy savings. It is important that the State of Nevada provide for the competitive environment as it moves to stimulate energy conservation in building design. Last fall, the Council of State Governments passed a resolution on energy-efficient measures in buildings. That resolution implored that both LEED and Green Globes should be recognized as building standards in

legislation. There may be a question whether Green Globes and LEED are compatible.

We are offering an amendment to take care of bill drafting technical issues. In Section 1, subsection 1(b), the reference to "v.1" is to be removed. The amendment adds the language in Section 2 specifying "Two Green Globes" as the equivalent to "LEED silver level." In Section 1, subsection 4, we suggest to remove "nationally." This might be interpreted to mean the State could not develop its own standard.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions for Senator Schneider?

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

I am supportive of this bill and what you are trying to accomplish here. I think we as a Legislature need to make sure we are doing a good job analyzing the fiscal impact of all these bills. We need to make sure the benefits we are passing on are appropriate to the benefits and the energy the State will receive and to make sure there are no unintended consequences to school districts or state budgets. This is trying to clarify the existing standard. What was the previous fiscal note in terms of the cost of abatements with this particular change?

**Senator Schneider:**

I do not have that. Those are important questions. I will work with you to answer them.

**Terry Graves, representing American Chemistry Council:**

We offered the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) as explained by Senator Schneider. The only controversial part of the amendment is elimination of the word "nationally" in Section 1, subsection 4. It indicates that it takes some choice away from the Department of Energy if they chose to develop a custom standard. The other amendment was to remove the version 1, which is obsolete, from Green Globes. In Section 2, it clarifies making the two systems equivalent.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Graves? [There were none.]

**Mark Rossolo, Outreach Director, Green Building Initiative:**

[Submitted written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

The goal of the Green Building Initiative, a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization, is to make green building practices a mainstream practice. We market and oversee the Green Globes rating tool for commercial buildings. It originated in

the United Kingdom from a system where LEED also originated. Green Globes was adopted by the Canadian National Government and is widely used in Canada by the government and the Building Owners and Managers Association of Canada. We brought it to the United States in 2005 and it has been formally recognized by six states. The American Institute of Architects, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies have recognized Green Globes. The system is an online interactive tool that is a very cost-effective way to build green. It acts as a green building consultant to the builders. You do not have to have a sustainability expert on staff in order to use the Green Globes tool. It will walk you through the process. We have about ten buildings nationwide that have been dually certified by LEED and Green Globes and they have all fallen within the exact same area of percentages within the two systems. Green Globes is based on a four-tier system similar to LEED. The Clinton Presidential Library in Little Rock, Arkansas, was dually certified and was a LEED Gold level and rated three Green Globes. A summary from the University of Minnesota found that 80 to 85 percent of the assessment tools are identical. The major difference is that Green Globes puts more focus on energy efficiency and energy usage. LEED puts more focus on material usage.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

**Terry Graves:**

The packet I handed out ([Exhibit E](#)) includes letters from several reputable sources and some studies which say that Green Globes and LEED are comparable standards and stress that it is necessary to have competition in this market. We spoke with the Director of Energy, Dr. Getchell, about the fiscal note and there would probably be some cost involved with doing the hearings to make a regulation based on this statute.

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**

What is the rationale behind taking out the word "nationally" in your amendment? Are we going to set standards in our energy office or what standards will we be following?

**Terry Graves:**

It may imply that the Department of Energy could not do their own custom program. They may want to comment on that. If it is not a problem, we do not have a problem leaving it in.

**Assemblywoman Gansert:**

Are you getting the same end product as LEED and is it less expensive to use with the same outcome?

**Mark Rossolo:**

The difference in cost is going to be associated with the need to have consultants online. With the Green Globes tool there is a \$500 registration fee. Should you choose to go through the third-party verification, there is also a fee associated with that. The Green Globes tool is an interactive tool with immediate feedback on what you are doing well, things that you can improve, and supplementary information on where you can find out more on a particular section. For example, if you are working on water usage and you want to know how to decrease water usage, it will give you ideas about new features you might use. The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design system is a paper-based format and there is a time savings benefit with Green Globes.

**Chair Ocegueda:**

Are there further questions? [There were none.] Are there others who wish to support the bill?

**Renny Ashleman, representing Southern Nevada Home Builders Association:**

We support the bill with the amendments. We have offered a friendly amendment to add the Southern Nevada Green Building Partnership method of rating and certification to the approved list. I will get that to the Committee. Its ratings on energy savings are equal to or better than LEED. It is superior in water conservation and is less expensive because it concentrates on energy and water savings. It does not go into some of the other aspects that LEED does.

**Chair Ocegueda:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Ashleman? [There were none.]

**Irene Porter, Executive Director, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association:**

We made a commitment in the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee during the last legislative session to develop a green building program for residential construction in southern Nevada. The National Association of Homebuilders had an agreement with the Green Building Initiative. Our program is based on the Green Building Initiative for residential construction. In January 2007, the National Association of Homebuilders, the Green Building Initiative, and the International Code Council signed an agreement to develop the model energy standards for all of the international building codes. We put the program together in southern Nevada with a great cross section including utilities, builders, subcontractors, engineers, and architects. We developed the standards and the green building program in conjunction with Green Globes and the Green Building Initiative. It is a voluntary program and we have some builders who are willing to do pilot projects and offer this to homeowners. Our water conservation element includes the entire Southern Nevada Water Authority and the Water Smart Builder Program. Therefore, there is a

comprehensive water conservation element with a great savings to homeowners. We hope the Committee passes this legislation and is in favor of our amendment of including the residential elements so this is available economically to our homeowners.

**Renny Ashleman:**

The cost of these programs matters greatly. We do not have legislation which says reimbursement through these abatement mechanisms shall be commensurate with the amounts spent on them. I anticipate that will happen. It is important to gather the data on the three systems because there are advantages to analyzing what it will cost the State and its' subdivisions. Abatement is very important, but some of the statutes could give abatements in excess of the cost and some of the reimbursements are extremely expensive in relation to what they achieve in the way of savings.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there further questions for the home builders? [There were none.]

**Jim Sala, Senior Representative, Political Director, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters:**

We represent about 12,000 members and work with about 480 contractors in the State. We are in support of A.B. 295. This is a national issue for us. As a member of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee we have been discussing this issue in regard to long-range planning and have been considering Green Globes as an alternative for the county's green building program. Our members work with a lot of the issues in this bill, especially timber issues. Protecting the environment, reforestation, and other issues are very important to us. It is the livelihood of many of our members and we are very interested in this bill and its adoption. We have done a study that compares Green Globes to LEED and submitted a brief comparison ([Exhibit F](#)). A 62-page study is available by email. The carpenters have been able to verify that the Green Globes program is user-friendly, more cost-effective, and affordable than LEED, especially in regard to the interactive web-based system. We support this bill and urge your support.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Ken Dunham, Executive Director, Lumber Association of California and Nevada:**

We are a 500-plus members trade association with members being independent lumber dealers, lumber yards, and building material firms. Our members employ more than 55,000 people in these two states. We are in strong support of this

legislation because it expands the options for public buildings and structures by using more than one of the green rating systems. Many states and local governments across the country accept only the LEED system. There are other systems which are equally valid. Assembly Bill 295 adds Green Globes and the language allows for other systems to be added. We have identified as many as 10 to 15 different rating systems around the country. We are here to encourage the State to expand the options for those who want to construct environmentally sound buildings throughout the country. We as a lumber association respectfully urge you to adopt this legislation to expand the abilities of the builders and contractors to utilize a wide range of green building practices. We agree with the amendments offered by Senator Schneider. [Mr. Dunham submitted a copy of his prepared testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Chair Oceguera:**

Are there questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

**Caroline Lowman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

[Submitted written statement ([Exhibit H](#)).]

[PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit I](#)).]

**Chair Oceguera:**

Thank you for testifying. Are there any questions? [There were none.] Are there others in support?

**Robert Tretiak, President, International Energy Conservation, Las Vegas:**

We in the energy conservation industry welcomed Assembly Bill No. 3 of the 22nd Special Session. It added a major driver for people to do energy conservation measures. We support this bill because it expands the choices available to those entities wishing to improve the environment and reduce their waste of utilities. We commend Irene Porter for developing the southern Nevada standard which includes water.

**Chair Oceguera:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Are there others wishing to testify in favor of A. B. 295? Are there any opposed to A. B. 295?

**John Sagebiel, Environmental Affairs Manager, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR):**

I am a LEED-accredited professional. I have worked in green building and am formerly the director of the UNR renewable energy center project. I designed, built, and live in my own sustainable, zero net energy home in Reno, Nevada.

In principle, I support the idea of multiple green building standards. One that has not been discussed here is the Cascadia Design Standards, which is a living building standard and a very aggressive green building standard. I am concerned about legislating into the *Nevada Revised Statutes* specific references to specific green building standards. I feel those should be reviewed by technical people at the Department of Energy or other appropriate places. I have given you a summary of some of the issues I find with Green Globes in comparison to LEED ([Exhibit J](#)). In their current version, LEED has complete online submittals of all their information. The system requires a rigorous verification of everything a person has done in their process of getting their building certified as a green building. It is truly a rigorous audit of what is done. The Green Globes program allows the user to choose a third-party verification system. To me, it is a disincentive for the person to take a rigorous approach while the LEED system rewards and recognizes exemplary performance. You, through the laws that you have passed, are also rewarding exemplary performance by significant tax breaks. I think the State and the taxpayers deserve something significant in exchange for the significant tax break given. The LEED system and some other green building standards recognize exemplary performance and reward it. The cost of the two programs are similar, with the exception that the United States Green Building Council offered this past fall to refund all the registration and certification fees of anybody who certifies a platinum level building, which is the highest level. They are rewarding very exceptional performance.

It is my understanding that the very first scoring item in LEED for homes is solar orientation. I have a concern over declaring in legislation that Two Green Globes is equal to Silver LEED. It is my understanding that there are no peer review findings that verify it. Although it was stated earlier that Green Globes has more focus on energy, the exact focus has never been clearly defined to me. The category of energy in Green Globes is 36 percent of the points. The category of energy and atmospheres in LEED is 24 percent of the points. If you look at energy consumption, the Green Globes program is 11 percent and LEED is 14.5 percent. In the energy component of Green Globes, they include alternative transportation, which is included in a different area of LEED. It is very difficult to make the comparisons. I am very concerned about the livelihood of the carpentry trade and feel it is very important that as we look to the future, we have true sustainable forests. The LEED system recognizes a very rigorous standard for sustainable forestry and Green Globes recognizes a whole series of what are called sustainable forestry management practices, some of which in well-documented literature have been shown to be not sustainable. My last point is that simply facing a house south does not help. If you over-glaze a building you end up with as many problems as you would if

you under-glaze for solar heat. The correct amount of glass, the correct orientation, and the correct shading are needed.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

In our efforts to encourage energy conservation and the correct building standards in regard to this important resource, we need to be sure that benefits the State gives are commensurate with the gain. We must balance our needs. If we abate real property taxes, it affects how much money our schools get. Do you have any thoughts on how to evaluate a good incentive and make sure it is properly balanced with other state needs?

**John C. Sagebiel:**

The State, through the real property tax abatements, is giving away a significant amount of resources. I feel it is critical that the State receives a benefit commensurate with that. The only way to make sure the State is receiving that benefit is to have a very rigorous third-party verified program. A person who has built a green building which reduces the impact on Nevada's energy infrastructure and the secondary impacts of energy production needs to have the project verified to receive the property tax abatements.

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

Please let us know if you have any further thoughts on how a state can evaluate the right balance as we look at our State's goals. I think it is something we need to address with the energy-related bills we are processing this session.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there further questions? [There were none.] Are there others wishing to testify against A. B. 295? We will close the hearing on A.B. 295.

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 53.

**Assembly Bill 53:** Makes various changes regarding licenses for and disciplinary action against administrators of facilities for long-term care. (BDR 54-570)

**Terry Clodt, Board member, Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators (BELTCA):**

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**

I thank you for bringing this to light because I believe there is a real problem. In Section 2, subsection f, will this give you the power to address the issue?

**Terry Clodt:**

We can only suspend or revoke a license and the Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators (BELTCA) is seeking the authority to place conditions on an individual license, as well as place the person on probation. All incidents do not require a harsh punishment such as suspension or revocation. We want to make sure the individual engages in the profession and cares for the elderly.

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**

I am a supporter. If we enact this portion of the bill, is it going to give you the hammer that you need to secure the safety of our seniors who live in these homes?

**Terry Clodt:**

Yes.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

In Section 1, page 2 of the bill, does it give the expiration of the license to be up to four years?

**Mary Wilkinson, Vice Chair, BELTCA:**

Subsection (b) contains the other part of this requirement. The individual would pay twice the fees to cover a four-year period. By qualifying under the *Nevada Revised Statutes* 654.150 and 654.155, there are rigorous regulations that state qualifications for any kind of licensure. Basically, they are starting over and have to meet the requirements, including completing continuing education units. It is not just paying the fee.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

Why make such a long period of time and why not make the deadline for reinstatement within one year after the license expiration to keep them on track?

**Mary Wilkinson:**

There is another portion of the requested legislation that allows the Board to expire the license. We currently do not have that authority. The provision you are referencing was the second part of the issue. If the legislation is passed, the Board will have the choice to expire or allow for another alternative for the applicant to come forward and renew their license. If they waited, the measure would become more extreme.

[Chair Oceguela left the meeting.]

**Acting Vice Chair Buckley:**

Are there any other questions of the witnesses? Is there anything the witnesses would like to add?

**Terry Clodt:**

[Continues prepared testimony.]

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

We will probably not be able to change the definitions of any of these categories because we will not be able to give adequate notice to anyone that we were considering them; and they are also duplicated in another bill, being sponsored by Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, that is pending in the Government Affairs Committee. We can look at the material on page 7 with regard to the Board activity and consider that, but not the other on pages 7 and 8. We will ask our legal counsel about the subpoena powers to make sure they are consistent with the other Boards.

Does anyone have further questions on the bill? [There were none.] Is there anyone else to provide testimony on A.B. 53? [There was none.] Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition? [There was none.]

We will close the public hearing on A.B. 53.

[Chair Oceguela returned to the meeting.]

**Chair Oceguela:**

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 223.

**Assembly Bill 223: Requires the licensing of voice stress examiners and interns. (BDR 54-900)**

**Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1:**

Mr. Ryan Flood lives in my district and asked me to look into this issue. Times are changing, technology is moving, and I believe in letting the legislative process work.

**Ryan Flood, Certified Voice Stress Analyst:**

Voice Stress Analysis (VSA) utilizes a combination of technology and knowledge developed over the last forty years within the truth verification

profession. The result is a new, computerized, portable system that delivers the desired results when used by competent, well-trained analysts.

[Submitted study of the Utility and Validity of Voice Stress Analysis ([Exhibit L](#)).]  
[Presented PowerPoint program ([Exhibit M](#)).]

There is an Assembly bill that is requesting the Attorney General be removed from the licensing board for Voice Stress Analysts. It was requested that a voice stress analyst be placed on that board. The Attorney General is going to request that a member of the general public take her place. I would suggest that a voice stress analyst be included instead. A demonstration of voice stress analyzing is available for anyone who is interested.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

When a person is under physical stress, does that affect voice stress analysis?

**Ryan Flood:**

The answer is yes. The point of the voice stress analysis is to give the burden of proof to the innocence of the person. The goal of everything in the technique of the voice stress analyst is to reduce all stress possible. I would have a pre-interview with the person to establish if there is anything they are concerned or worried about or if they are feeling well. You take care of all those needs before the examination.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

If they were stressed about the privacy of another individual and they did not disclose it, would that have an effect?

**Ryan Flood:**

Yes, it has the potential if they are not willing to provide a full disclosure. It would be exactly the same for a polygraph.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there further questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

Are there others wishing to support the bill?

**Patrick Flood, Private Citizen, Cathedral City, California:**

My background includes 27 years in law enforcement. I was trained in the use of polygraph, used polygraph, and taught polygraph at one of the renowned

international schools in San Diego, California. I was trained in voice stress analysis and within a year I was teaching voice stress analysis internationally. I am well aware of the differences between the Voice Stress Analysis and the polygraph. They are both good tools. There is nothing wrong with either of them, but they are used differently. Unfortunately, over a period of time voice stress has been besmirched by some of the polygraph associations in America. I believe this is because they are concerned about lost revenue in their businesses unless they cross-train. The main study done by the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute proved that voice stress worked effectively and determined stress. Unfortunately, they did not use the terminology nor the techniques required in the voice stress, but used polygraph techniques and questions. There have been other studies done on the polygraph because that is the standard for lie detection. In a study in Michigan, I found research errors when I was halfway through it. There is nothing wrong with polygraph and there is nothing wrong with VSA. They are two separate instruments that are good tools to find the truth. There is no such thing as a lie detector. The polygraph measures what the body does and so does VSA. With training and experience, a good examiner uses the instrument to come up with the truth. There is no reason for the State of Nevada not to have the opportunity to have Voice Stress Analysis as a licensed tool for the use of the consumers.

**Chair Ocegueda:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Are there others to support the bill? [There were none.] We will go to opposition.

**Peter Maheu, President, Nevada Society of Private Investigators:**

It is our opinion that VSA is an unproven science and to create a private licensing board position that condones this activity is a waste of taxpayer money and validates what has been proven to be a questionable form of ascertaining the truth. Our group vehemently opposes this bill and creating another board position on the Private Investigators Licensing Board for a discipline that is practiced by very few people in this State while there are over 300 private investigators and only one board position for them. The private patrol personnel in the State also have only one board position. We feel we do not have proper representation on the Board and appointing a Voice Stress Analyst to the Board will not help us.

**Ronald Sallon, Assistant City Attorney, Henderson, Nevada:**

I argued a significant case before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and will summarize the case facts. One of our officers was investigating a rape case. He interviewed the rape suspect using Computer Voice Stress Analysis (CVSA). The results of the CVSA indicated that the suspect was lying to the officer. The officer included the results of the CVSA in his affidavit for arrest. Ultimately,

the suspect was acquitted of the rape charge. He sued the officer, the City of Henderson, and the manufacturer of the CVSA. This case is old and I have submitted a copy of the appellate brief ([Exhibit N](#)). He contended that CVSA is "junk science" and that it was improper to use it to establish probable cause to make the arrest. I represented the City of Henderson and the officer in the litigation. As it progressed, the CVSA manufacturer turned against us and said the officer was wrong to use the CVSA and that the officer had been trained by the manufacturer not to use the results in an affidavit for arrest. This took us completely off-guard. It is an elementary principle of law enforcement that an officer doing an investigation has to include all of the pertinent information summarizing the investigation. The judge decides whether there is probable cause to make the arrest. To say that a person should use this tool as part of his investigation, but not tell the judge about it in the affidavit of arrest, was hardly a position we expected. Ultimately, the City of Henderson and the Police Officer prevailed.

We had a very bitter experience with the CVSA. As the result of this lawsuit, we made the decision never to use it again and have not. If you are going to use the tool, you are going to have to account for it. It is a little disingenuous to have the manufacturer of the CVSA tell us this is a wonderful product and is on par with polygraphs, but do not tell the judge that you used it when you submit an affidavit for arrest.

**Assemblyman Horne:**

This seems to have been a procedural dispute you had with the manufacturer of the CVSA. We had these types of problems when polygraphs first came on the scene. Do you think in future use of this tool, the problems will be solved? Do we completely abandon this technique?

**Ronald Sallon:**

I think there is more than a procedural issue at stake here. The manufacturer of the CVSA filed an affidavit in court and stated they told the officer not to use the CVSA results in an affidavit and he did it anyway. Why would the manufacturer who would vouch for the validity of his product tell us not to use it? From the legal perspective at the time of this case, it was well established that polygraphs were legitimate law enforcement tools and could be used to establish probable cause. There is no comparable case law with the CVSA, but the manufacturer is telling us not use it to establish probable cause.

**Assemblyman Horne:**

Is there something in this bill that would mandate you to use this tool? Until the manufacturer tells you that you can use this in your affidavit to establish probable cause, you can have the tool and choose not to use it.

**Ronald Sailon:**

That is correct. My advice to the City of Henderson will be to never use this because it is nothing but trouble. If another agency decides to use it, that is their choice. They should look at the background before they take that leap.

**Mike Kirkman, Owner, Las Vegas Detectives:**

I was trained as a polygraph examiner in 1978, practiced it until 1995, and have kept current with what goes on in the field. Voice Stress Analysis has not been proven to be more than 50 percent accurate. To license someone to practice that in the State of Nevada and have an accuracy rate of no better than the flip of a coin is an error in judgment and will cause us problems. I urge you not to pass this bill.

**Chair Oceguera:**

Is there anyone in Carson City who wants to testify against the bill?

**R. L. "Dick" Putnam, Polygraphic Examiner and Consultant, Reno, Nevada:**

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit O](#)).]

**Chair Oceguera:**

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

**Robert Roshak, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We want to go on record indicating that we are against A.B. 223.

**Ronald P. Dreher, Advocacy Investigation Services, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a former Reno Police homicide detective, a private investigator, and a licensed process server. I ask that you oppose A.B. 223 with all due respect to the sponsor and the co-sponsors of the bill. I used the VSA in a major homicide investigation in Reno involving a murder and child abduction of two children in 1989. At that time, you received four hours of training to become a licensed VSA person. We had a major investigation in Plumas County and were introduced to the VSA tool. After 15 minutes, the Voice Stress Analyst concluded that the person we were interviewing, and who was a lead in our murder investigation, was lying to us and was probably the suspect in our case. We had been dealing with polygraphers and used them as a tool sparingly. There is a lot that goes into a polygraph. A detective does an interview, a polygrapher does a pre-interview, they do a polygraph, and a post-interview. Then the detectives interview the person again. There are many ways to determine deception and non-deception. The gentleman who testified in favor of this bill told you that in 15 minutes, he could tell you whether or not you are telling the truth. He said there are no inconclusive results here. In my opinion

and in my investigative experience, the VSA is hocus-pocus. I do not want to put the wrong person in prison. It is not my intent to put someone on death row who is not responsible for the crime or to arrest someone when I do not have probable cause. We take our investigative tools in law enforcement very seriously. I ask this Committee to oppose A.B. 223.

**R. L. Putnam:**

Officers from the Washoe County Sheriff's Department told me they have the VSA and have used it only once in the last year.

**Chair Ocegura:**

Are there others wishing to testify in opposition? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify from a neutral position? [There was none.] I am going to close the hearing on A.B. 223.

[Ronald D. Slay did not appear and submitted written testimony on A.B. 223 ([Exhibit P](#))]

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 341.

**Assembly Bill 341: Makes various changes relating to energy conservation.**  
**(BDR 58-389)**

**Assemblywoman Heidi Gansert, Assembly District No. 25:**

I want to compare the components of Assembly Bill 341 and Assembly Bill 184 for the Committee.

There are some amendments and the Distribution and Use of Universal Energy Charge chart ([Exhibit Q](#)).

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit R](#)).]

**Dr. Jason Geddes, Nevada System of Higher Education:**

The reason net metering is showing up in all these bills is that it is the number one issue identified by the Renewable Energy Efficiency Task Force as something that we need to pass forward. I included a grid in my informational packet ([Exhibit S](#)). It shows the bills that have been before you and what is moving forward. On net metering, the reason we have the 250 kilowatts on the lower limit and the megawatt on the upper limit is because we look at the provisions of schools. The Union of Concerned Scientists identified that our current range of 30 to 150 kilowatts is difficult to use. If we wanted to put up solar panels of the 100-kilowatt size in Clark County on 18 schools, we would have to get 18 different pricing options through the utility and then take that to

the School Board for approval. It becomes a very difficult process. The idea is to get the limits high enough so we can get these systems on the schools. The schools are in the 500 kilowatt to megawatt range. We are trying to make sure the net metering goes up so that we can accommodate those systems.

On page 3 of the handout, there is a chart of updated energy statistics. We spend \$6 billion to \$8 billion to purchase energy annually in Nevada. Natural gas and transportation fuels are the dominant components of the amount of money we spend. It is appropriate to add people to the Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Task Force who have expertise in renewable fuels, fuel conservation, and natural gas issues. The Universal Energy Charge fund is an option. I have included a picture of a solar house and I have a panel from a solar thermal system for you to see. It is an option for the Housing Division to use.

**Assemblywoman Gansert:**

I provided a table which indicates the Housing Division's portion of the Universal Energy Charge is about \$3 million per year. They keep about \$1.5 million in reserves, but there is money available every year and they are spending that on conservation weatherization.

**Jason Geddes:**

The last section is the Nevada Integrated Design Laboratory. There is a proposed amendment to take the funding out and allow them to receive grants and contracts. We are pursuing federal and state grants as well as private donations. The Builders Association of Northern Nevada is interested in putting in some green features and looking at how they can get technical expertise to design standards similar to what they have in southern Nevada. They see the design lab as an option and are considering putting funding into these design labs to help them. We would like to create the lab and then find the money to fund it. In a design lab, you can simulate what a building will look like and how it will perform with energy features. You can see how lighting works on your building. We were able to use a lab when we designed the student union at the University of Nevada, Reno, and we were able to change the design before construction to optimize the energy efficiency of the building. The main stairway in the building, which is four-stories, will be flooded with natural light. We would never have noticed it if we had not put the model through the system.

We have been working with Assemblyman Bobzien and the Public Utilities Commission to make the net metering the same and I think we are close to getting consistent language.

**Chair Ocegura:**

Are there any questions for Dr. Geddes?

**Colleen Janes, Purchasing Officer II, Nevada State Purchasing Division:**

The Purchasing Division supports A.B. 341 and we are here to propose a friendly amendment ([Exhibit T](#)). The language we are proposing would create a third-party consultant fund which would be managed by the Nevada State Office of Energy. They are aware of and in support of this. As the statute is now, state agencies must set aside funds for third-party consultants. Many agencies do not have those funds and it is beginning to delay projects. Normally, they set aside the funds and are reimbursed when the loan is secured. Creating this fund would allow these performance-based energy retrofit projects to proceed even if the agencies do not have the money to pay for the third-party consultants. If the third-party consultant advises the State to not award a contract, the fund would cover fees for work accomplished.

**Chair Ocegura:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**

Did you bring this before us on a different bill?

**Colleen Janes:**

It was on the same bill, but I think we did that prematurely.

**Jay Johnson, representing Northeast Energy Services Corporation, Inc. (NORESCO):**

I am an employee of NORESKO, an energy service company that does energy service performance contracting per *Nevada Revised Statutes* 332 and 333. [Provided supportive information ([Exhibit U](#))]. I agree with Jason Geddes' and am in support of the bill. I support the changes in Sections 7 and 8. The additional term will allow for more renewable energy projects. By extending to a 20-year term, we will be less reliant on bond or grant funds to get these projects to pay back in a timely manner. It will allow the agencies to purchase more energy-efficient equipment and maintenance items. We will do this when the life of the systems exceeds the term of the financing. It would be reviewed by the third-party consultant. The Bond Council and the State Treasurer have also been reviewing the system life. This will allow for more renewable energy solutions than we have been able to do in the past. These projects are sold with a guaranteed maximum price, performance, savings, and completion date. There have been about \$13 million worth of these projects completed in the last couple of years including Western Nevada Community College, the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, Phase I of the Pershing County School District,

White Pine County School District, and Lincoln County School District. This is a great program for agencies that do not have money in capital budgets and are spending excess money for energy. It is a great way to shift wasted energy dollars into cash flow and funding solutions. In White Pine County, the program saved over \$400,000, which equates to four teachers that they have been able to retain. There are many other projects in various stages of development.

The funds for the projects could come from the interested energy service companies up to a cap of \$10,000. The intent would be to create a funding source to cover the cost of a third-party consultant. We will explore getting rebate dollars from the energy companies. Many of the third-party consultants have agreed to defer their billing until a project has been awarded, which is usually in 60-90 days. The typical consultant fees are \$4,000-\$20,000. Once the job has been awarded, has gone to the Board of Examiners, and implementation began, it could cost another \$10,000-\$20,000 or more. Once it is funded, the cost of the third-party consultant is put into the program cost and included in the financing. If the project did not proceed, the funding for the third-party consultant could come from the energy service companies that contributed money or through the utilities.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Michael Hackett, representing Pinnacle West Capital Corporation and Arizona Public Services Energy Services:**

We support this bill with the amendments that have been offered for the same reasons as Mr. Johnson has indicated. We have used performance contracts to do these energy retrofits and energy conservation projects. We are very interested in the part of the bill which will extend the performance contract to 20 years.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there others in support of the bill?

**Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League:**

We are in support of the expansion of renewable energy and feel this bill does that. We are in support of the bill.

**Kevin Dick, Director, Nevada Small Business Development Center:**

We work with businesses and government operations on environmental performance and compliance in energy efficiency. I am here to explain the Integrated Design Lab. [Provided written testimony ([Exhibit V](#)).] It is important

for Nevada to address residential and commercial construction. The impacts of new buildings will be with us for the next 30-50 years. We are looking at the cumulative impact of those buildings over their life span. One of the benefits of high-performance buildings is workplace productivity. The Carnegie Mellon Foundation did a study of commercial office buildings in the United States and found, on average, the cost of energy per square foot was \$2.35. The cost of labor in those buildings is \$318 per square foot. The labor cost savings from improved workplace productivity can dwarf the energy efficiency savings. In new Leadership in Energy and Environmental Designs (LEED) commercial office buildings the workplace productivity savings are typically 10-17 percent. The indoor air environment is much better in high-performance green buildings. Today, we spend about 90 percent of our time indoors, which is often the most polluted air we encounter. The public health benefits of green building are significant.

The Nevada Integrated Design Lab is a vehicle for providing outreach, education, training, assistance, and promotion of new production residential and commercial construction. The goal of the lab is to provide the education and training to minimize the cost of transferring this information to the new market for green building. The education would include training on the new International Energy Conservation Code (IECC), which is used in southern Nevada and will be in northern Nevada next year. We have started working with the builders associations in northern and western Nevada to assist them in developing green building guidelines for use in this region. Implementation of those guidelines will require education and promotion. There is a need for training in commercial construction on how to design a LEED building and the certification process so we correctly construct the high-performance buildings and minimize the cost associated with the transition. There is an opportunity through the Integrated Design Lab to provide internship opportunities for architectural students. The concept came from the Pacific Northwest and there are a number of design labs that are in operation. The design lab in Boise is being used to provide architectural students experience in urban design that they would not get at the state university. The Nevada lab will give students experience to work in our two different climate zones. We have worked to develop some partnerships with different organizations and have submitted several grant proposals to try to find funding for this project. We have submitted proposals to the United States Environmental Protection Agency and another to the United States Department of Energy. Partners in these proposals included the Builders Association of Northern Nevada, the Builders' Association of Western Nevada, the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, Sierra Pacific, Nevada Power, and others. There is recognition of the need for this type of an education and training program and it will help advance green

building in the State. Unfortunately, the Department of Energy declined our funding request because it was not new or innovative enough for them.

**Chair Oceguera:**

Are there questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone to speak in opposition?

**Robert Tretiak, President, International Energy Conservation, Las Vegas:**

I generally support this bill in its entirety and the amendment. I object to the change in Section 10, from 10 to 20 years, because it is important for the citizens of the State to save as many tax dollars as they can in energy-efficient buildings.

**Chair Oceguera:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify against the bill? [There was none.] Is there anyone to speak from a neutral position? [There was none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 341.

[Judy Stokey, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Power/Sierra Pacific Power Company, submitted a letter of support for A.B. 341 ([Exhibit W](#)).]

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 531.

**Assembly Bill 531: Makes certain changes to provisions concerning the Private Investigator's Licensing Board. (BDR 54-513)**

**Su Lee, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General:**

Assembly Bill 531 was introduced by our office to eliminate an inherent conflict within the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). As currently written in NRS 648.020, the statutes require the Attorney General or her designee to act as the chairperson of the Private Investigator's Licensing Board. At the same time the Attorney General is charged under NRS 228 as acting as legal counsel for all licensing boards, including this Board. In the case of the Private Investigator's Licensing Board, this has resulted in the situation that the Attorney General sits as the Board Chair and also acts as their legal counsel. The intent of this is to eliminate that conflict of interest by taking the Attorney General off the Board and having the Attorney General's Office remain as their legal counsel. It would change the way the Board is funded. Currently, any money the Board takes in goes to the Attorney General's Special Fund and the Board's administrative costs are paid by that fund. Section 2 of the bill would create a separate fund for the Board much like most other boards have for operations. We do not object to the proposed amendment.

**Peter Maheu, President, Nevada Society of Private Investigators:**

Our Society has always felt there has been a conflict in the Private Investigator's Licensing Board because the chair of the Board and the legal counsel were members of the Attorney General's staff. This bill remedies that and we are in favor of A.B. 531.

**Assemblyman David R. Parks, Assembly District No. 41:**

My intern will present the amendment and there is a handout showing the existing current statute ([Exhibit X](#)), as well as the proposed conceptual language.

**Paul Smith, Intern to Assemblyman David R. Parks, Assembly District No. 41:**

I am here to propose a friendly conceptual amendment to A.B. 531. The purpose of the amendment is simple. Currently, the executive director of the Private Investigator's Licensing Board is in the unclassified service of the State. In contrast, the executive directors of virtually all other boards and commissions in the State of Nevada are compensated at a rate set by the individual boards and not the State. This amendment seeks to remove the executive director from the unclassified service of the State and allows the compensation to be set by the Board. This will bring them in line with the other boards and commissions in the State and allow the Board to dictate the compensation of its own employee. We support the balance of the bill.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there questions on the amendment?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

Does changing the position from unclassified to having compensation set by the Board have any effect on the person's retirement rights?

**Assemblyman Parks:**

It is my understanding that all executive directors of the boards and commissions participate in the Public Employees' Retirement System.

**Chair Ocegüera:**

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Are there others to testify on the bill? Are there any who want to oppose the bill? Are there any who wish to speak neutrally on the bill?

We will close the hearing on A.B. 531.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 531 WITH THE AMENDMENT SUBMITTED BY  
ASSEMBLYMAN PARKS.

MOTION SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE.

Is there discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Parks will be assigned this bill on the Floor. We will open the hearing on  
Assembly Bill 562.

**Assembly Bill 562: Revises provisions governing persons regulated by the Real  
Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 54-  
584)**

**Gail J. Anderson, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business  
and Industry:**

Assembly Bill 562 is the Real Estate Division agency bill. The majority of the sections of the bill deal with two proposed legislative changes which encompass several chapters of licensing law under the Real Estate Division's jurisdiction. One is an addition to the law to require a licensee, certificate holder, permit holder, or a registrant to notify the Division within ten days after a conviction or a plea of nolo contendere to a felony relating to the practice of the licensee or any crime involving fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or moral turpitude. It is a proactive requirement of the licensee to notify the regulating body of a conviction or plea. They are also required by law to disclose that on their application for renewal at their next licensing period and to supply documentation. That encompasses Sections 1, 9, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 25 of A.B. 562.

The other part is to allow the Real Estate Division to disclose investigative documentation to another licensing board, agency, or governmental agency, including law enforcement, that is investigating a person who holds a license under one of these chapters of law. Any investigation in the Real Estate Division is confidential and the documentation that is acquired or subpoenaed during that investigation is confidential. The Real Estate Division has been precluded from fraud task force work. In a fraud investigation task force on real estate practices, the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police, the Financial Institutions Division, and the Mortgage Lending Division participated, but we were not able

to other than in theory. There are times another governmental agency is investigating one of our licensees whom we may also be investigating. We are requesting to share that information in very limited circumstances with an appropriate authority.

Section 2 amends *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 645 which is the real estate licensing law. It makes a change in the license denial appeal procedure which would allow the Commission to hear the appeal at the next meeting. It now states within 90 days and sometimes it causes us to call a special meeting. Sections 3 and 4 are "housekeeping." The Real Estate Commission has adopted the regulations that are referenced in statute. They were moved to regulation and we need to remove them from statute. Sections 6 and 12 are at the request of the Real Estate Commission and the Commission of Appraisers of Real Estate, respectively. The Real Estate Division has three commissions that work within our licensing jurisdiction. The request is to increase the maximum allowable fine to \$10,000 for each violation found by the respective commission. Violations are found as the result of administrative hearings with witnesses, testimony, documentation, evidence, and the finding of factual allegations. The commission determines appropriate discipline. Each commission has the full latitude to apply penalties they deem appropriate within the authority that is bestowed on them by law after a hearing and a finding of violations. These fines have not been changed in the years since the laws were created and the commission has requested the latitude. Section 7 requests a change in real estate law in the time, from three to five years, that a proceeding to suspend or revoke may be commenced. This comports with the required retention of work files and records that must be kept for a transaction. There are also times when there are alleged violations that occur in subsequent transactions. Section 8 allows the pre-permitting education for a business broker permit to be offered through distance education. The law originally referenced classroom. Distance education is an option in many of our programs, and particularly in this program, where there are not a large number of potential permit holders and the education is not offered often enough when someone needs it. It is a pre-licensing program which would be offered through a pre-licensing school. Section 11 refers to registered interns under NR 645(c), which is our appraisal chapter and relates to an intern terminating his relationship with a supervising or mentoring appraiser. It changes the time from 30 days to 60 days that the intern has to acquire a new supervising appraiser. It removes the word "licensed," which is inappropriate. It requires a certified residential appraiser or a certified general appraiser to supervise an intern.

**Chair Ocegueda:**

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

On the provision with regard to notification when someone is convicted of a felony, especially in the part related to the practice of the licensee, a fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation, it seems that after someone is convicted, it is too late. Would it make more sense to do it upon arrest? They are still entitled to a presumption of innocence so they would not lose their license. If they are arrested for embezzling from the property they manage or from the company, you may want to check early.

**Gail J. Anderson:**

If the Division was notified, there is a complaint process. We can investigate that and take action as fast as possible to complete the investigation. Once a license is granted, it takes an action of the Real Estate Commission to revoke or suspend the license. We have to have proof of a conviction or some basis in order to take action on a license that has already been granted. It is different than the screening process we do for issuing a license where we consider any convictions before we grant a license.

**Assemblywoman Buckley:**

Would you not want to know if someone got arrested?

**Brenda Erdoes, Committee Counsel:**

Most of the licensing boards are currently not set up that way and are set up to consider convictions only. I am not sure if that is a response to the current or past case law. I believe you can consider these things if the arrest is for a crime related to the license itself. It may be somewhere you want to go in the future.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

In Section 3, what is the advantage to the license holder and the public to remove the educational time from the statute?

**Gail J. Anderson:**

Previously, the Real Estate Commission was allowed by statute to adopt the regulations for continuing education. It allowed the Commission to adapt to changing needs. The protection of the public is of the utmost concern to the Commission and the Real Estate Division. They have adopted educational changes and this is a housekeeping issue to keep them in regulation only.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**

I understood that the statute gave the base minimum standard and allowed you the opportunity to set higher standards.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there further questions?

I am concerned about Section 5, the disclosure of information to other agencies.

**Gail J. Anderson:**

This is limited to another regulatory or governmental agency that is conducting an investigation. The only time we can share information now is after a public hearing.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there other questions? [There were none.]

Is there anyone wishing to testify?

**Teresa McKee, In-house General Counsel, Nevada Association of Realtors:**

We support A.B. 562 as written.

**Chair Oceguela:**

Are there any other questions?

**Assemblyman Parks:**

I need to disclose that I am a real estate licensee in the State of Nevada. I do not believe this bill will affect me more than anybody else.

**Assemblyman Horne:**

Are you changing who can supervise an intern?

**Gail J. Anderson:**

The lowest level licensee is not allowed to supervise an appraisal intern. It is a technical correction.

**Chair Oceguela:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 562.

The meeting is adjourned [at 3:09 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Earlene Miller  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman John Oceguela, Chair

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

## EXHIBITS

**Committee Name:** Committee on Commerce and Labor

**Date:** March 30, 2007

**Time of Meeting:** 12:00 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
AB 295	C	Terry Graves, American Chemistry Counsel	Proposed Amendment
AB 295	D	Mark Rossolo, The Green Building Initiative	Written Testimony
AB 295	E	Terry Graves, American Chemistry Counsel	Information Packet
AB 295	F	Jim Sala, Nevada Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters	Informational Packet
AB 295	G	Ken Dunham, Lumber Association of California and Nevada	Written Statement
AB 295	H	Caroline Lowman, Private Citizen	Written Statement
AB 295	I	Caroline Lowman, Private Citizen	PowerPoint Presentation
AB 295	J	John Sagebiel, University of Nevada, Reno	Written Testimony
AB 53	K	Terry Clodt, Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators	Prepared Testimony
AB 223	L	Ryan Flood, Certified Voice Stress Analyst	Study
AB 223	M	Ryan Flood	PowerPoint Presentation
AB 223	N	Ronald Sailon, City of Henderson	Appellate Brief
AB 223	O	R. L. Putnam, Polygraph Examiner	Written Testimony
AB 223	P	Ronald D. Slay	Written Testimony
AB 341	Q	Assemblywoman Gansert	Proposed Amendments
AB 341	R	Assemblywoman Gansert	Written Statement
AB 341	S	Jason Geddes, Nevada	Grid

		System of Higher Education	
AB 341	T	Colleen Janes, Purchasing Division	Proposed Amendment
AB 341	U	Jay Johnson, Northeast Energy Services Corporation, Inc.	Supportive Information
AB 341	V	Kevin Dick, Nevada Small Business Development Center	Written Testimony
AB 341	W	Judy Stokey, Nevada Power/Sierra Pacific Power	Letter of Support
AB 531	X	Assemblyman Parks	Proposed Amendment