

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 11, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Warren B. Hardy II at 1:48 p.m. on Wednesday, April 11, 2007, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Chair
Senator Bob Beers, Vice Chair
Senator William J. Raggio
Senator Randolph J. Townsend
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Terry Care
Senator John J. Lee

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Bernice Mathews, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 1

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel
Michael J. Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst
Olivia Lodato, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lora E. Myles
Shawn M. Elicegui, Utilities, Incorporated of Central Nevada
Jennifer Lazovich, Focus Property Group
Laura Billman, Nye County
Pat Hines

Frederick Schlottman, Administrator, Offender Management Division,
Carson City, Department of Corrections
Dave McTeer, Division Chief, Information Technology Division, Department of
Administration
Crystal Jackson, Commission Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Lisa Gianoli, Washoe County
Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County
Al Bellister, Nevada State Education Association
Lonnie Shields, Clark County Association of School Administrators and
Professional Technical Employees
David F. Kallas, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees,
Incorporated; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs

Chair Hardy said the work session documents would be discussed first. He said Senate Bill (S.B.) 325, S.B. 369 and S.B. 516 would be heard at the next meeting.

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 157.

SENATE BILL 157: Revises provisions governing the appointment of a public guardian and the management of the office and cases of a public guardian. (BDR 20-272)

Lora E. Myles said she represented public guardians on the bill. She said the bill was drafted by public guardians in the state. She said amendments were added to the bill, especially in section 11 ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chair Hardy asked Ms. Myles to discuss the new language in the bill. She said the new language was primarily on page 6, section 10 of the mock-up of Proposed Amendment 3583 to S.B. 157, [Exhibit C](#). She said section 10 made it a requirement a public guardian appointed a deputy in their absence.

Chair Hardy asked Ms. Myles if the bill made a population exemption in section 9, subsection 2, paragraph (c) of the mock-up. She said there were four ways to appoint a public guardian. She said several parties requested an exception to appointing a private professional guardian to act as public guardian in counties with populations less than 100,000. She said Washoe and Clark Counties had well-established public guardian programs. She said six of

the rural counties had no programs. Chair Hardy asked if the remaining counties must establish a public guardian program. She replied he was correct.

Ms. Myles said section 11 of the bill stated a public guardian could be appointed as a temporary guardian in order to determine if guardianship was necessary and if the ward was a resident of another state or county. Subsection 2 of the bill said the ward must be a resident of the county where the public guardian operated. She said the language on residency requirements was changed to expand the definition.

Chair Hardy asked if the language requiring the ward lack "sufficient assets" was removed. Ms. Myles replied it was removed. She said if there was no other appropriate family member, the public guardian could be appointed regardless of the number of assets owned by the individual.

Ms. Myles said the public guardian must sign a clause stating they had received a copy of the petition for appointment of the public guardian. She said it provided notice to the public guardian that someone was petitioning for the appointment of a public guardian.

Ms. Myles said section 12 of S.B. 157 allowed a public guardian to hire an attorney who was not an employee of the county to assist in guardianship issues. Section 14 changed the language in regard to fee payments. The language was changed to say fees were paid upon approval by the court.

Senator Bernice Mathews, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 1, thanked the Committee for the hearing.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 157.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the hearing on S.B. 123.

SENATE BILL 123: Makes various changes to provisions relating to public records. (BDR 19-462)

Chair Hardy said there was a separate mock-up of proposed amendments on S.B. 123 ([Exhibit D](#)).

Senator Care said the Subcommittee members, Senators Townsend, Beers and himself, met twice to take additional testimony and hear concerns raised on the initial hearing of the bill. He said the second hearing produced the Proposed Amendment 3229 to Senate Bill 123, [Exhibit D](#). Senator Care stated section 3 went to nongovernmental entities. He said the language had been amended for private companies fulfilling a public purpose. He said the companies were concerned about personnel records and data becoming public. The amendment stated the documents were directly related to the administration, management or regulation of an activity. He said the amendment stated it did not apply to financial or other proprietary records.

Chair Hardy asked about bid documents. He asked if the documents were proprietary except in cases where there was a dispute.

Senator Care said the bill did not make any document public today that was not currently public. He said if the bid documents were not public, the bill would not make them public.

Chair Hardy said it was important to establish for the legislative record that bid documents were not public record.

Senator Care said section 4 clarified the language concerning the production of records. He said the amendment said the fifth business day after the date a written request was received. He said it required a response by the fifth day, not necessarily producing the actual documents. He said the intent was to ensure a response occurred within a certain amount of time. He said there was no time constraint in the amendment due to the complexity of the possible requests for information. Senator Care said language was added in lines 42 and 43 saying a government entity had to cite specific statute or legal authority when refusing to release requested material. Senator Care said lines 29 and 30 were added to ensure an oral request was not prohibited.

Senator Care said language was changed in section 6 to enable a confidential book or record to become public after 30 years. He said the party holding the document could go to court and demonstrate the document was still or should be nonpublic. He said section 7 remained unchanged, section 8 went to redaction and section 9 was deleted completely. He said that summed up the changes in the bill.

Chair Hardy said he wanted to be certain the language in the bill said anything not a public record should not be made a public record by the act. He closed the hearing on S.B. 123.

Chair Hardy opened the hearing on S.B. 200.

SENATE BILL 200: Extends the duration of certain redevelopment plans.
(BDR 22-358)

Senator Raggio asked for clarification on the extent of the redevelopment areas. He said he wanted assurance the extension of a redevelopment district to a 45-year limitation only applied to the redevelopment plan of the City of North Las Vegas ([Exhibit E](#)). He said the present law retained the 30-year period for the other applicable redevelopment areas. He said he was reluctant to extend the life of redevelopment districts beyond the existing 30 years. He said he supported this measure because of the case made on behalf of the City of North Las Vegas.

Chair Hardy said the legislative intent was to assure such extensions were brought to the Legislature on an individual basis for consideration.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 200.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the hearing on S.B. 201.

SENATE BILL 201: Revises provisions governing public works. (BDR 28-526)

Chair Hardy said extending the concept behind construction manager at risk was an important tool to have available for the government. He said a number of outstanding issues on the bill needed more time. He said there was an amendment in the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)). It was difficult to accurately estimate job costs primarily due to the fluctuation in material costs. Before a final bid document was approved, construction manager at risk allowed an ability to secure material. He said the concern was the extent construction manager at risk potentially eliminated the bid process when considering subcontractors. Chair Hardy said the purpose of the amendment was to protect the bid process. He said the first part of the amendment kept the language relative to construction manager at risk except it included the requirement to deal with the lowest-bidding subcontractor. The amendment to section 3 was withdrawn. He said an amendment, not included in the packet, from the professional engineers and architects requested the ability to do constructability reviews. Chair Hardy said he included the request in section 14 of the bill. He preferred the Committee process the bill with the amendment on page 2, section 2 of the work session document, [Exhibit F](#). He also included the request from the engineers and architects.

Senator Lee requested he be included on the conference committee to further study the bill.

Chair Hardy said he would include Senator Lee in future meetings. He added he would bring the full negotiated resolution for the Committee's consideration.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 201.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 222. He asked the proponents of the amendment to testify. He added there was a mock-up of the amendment ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATE BILL 222: Creates the Nye County Water Authority. (BDR S-317)

Chair Hardy requested a member representing Nye County explain the proposed amendments to the Committee. He said amendments were received from Utilities, Inc. of Central Nevada, Nye County and Focus Property Group [Exhibit G](#). Chair Hardy asked Mr. Elicegui to explain his amendment to the Committee.

Shawn M. Elicegui, Utilities, Incorporated of Central Nevada, said the purpose of the amendment was to make the intent of the legislation clear. He said the goal establishing the legislation did not set a preference for governmental ownership of wastewater and water facilities when the facilities were owned by a regulated utility.

Chair Hardy asked Ms. O'Grady, Committee Counsel, to further research the language in the amendment proposed by Mr. Elicegui. He said the term "authority" was changed to the term "district." He said it created a more traditional district which mirrored language used in other water districts. He said there appeared to be a conflict between Ms. Lazovich's and Mr. Elicegui's amendments. Chair Hardy outlined the locations where members of the Board resided, [Exhibit G](#).

Jennifer Lazovich, Focus Property Group, said the language proposed by her group stated if a person was a resident of Pahrump Valley and on the District Board, that person could not be affiliated with a privately owned utility.

Laura Billman, Nye County, said she agreed with Ms. Lazovich's amendment if the other seats remained as proposed and the two members from Pahrump Valley were included.

Chair Hardy asked if there was a preference for two members from Pahrump Valley or three members, as proposed by Mr. Elicegui's amendment. Ms. Billman said she had no preference.

Senator Care was concerned with the wording on page 4, subsection 4, of the proposed amendment. He said it needed to say a recall may occur by a simple majority vote of all the members of the commission. He said with five commission members in Nye County, a four-to-one vote could result in the removal of a Board member with one commissioner's vote.

Chair Hardy asked Ms. O'Grady to note the change in wording for the amendment.

Senator Titus asked what made up a supermajority.

Mr. Elicegui said the definition of a supermajority for the purpose of this bill was a vote of five members of the District.

Ms. Billman said in S.B. 222, a supermajority meant an affirmative vote of not less than five of seven members of the Board.

Mr. Elicegui said the second point of his amendment was to distinguish the service territory from the service area, which is a defined term of the District, as opposed to the service territory of a regulated utility. He said the first revision was designed to reflect the three utilities in Pahrump provide water and wastewater service.

Chair Hardy said it was important to establish the bill spoke to both water and wastewater.

He said Nye County and Mr. Elicegui proposed a dual amendment beginning on page 6, line 35 of the mock-up, [Exhibit G](#).

Mr. Elicegui said the purpose was to require a supermajority vote when water was exported from a hydrographic basin within Nye County.

Mr. Elicegui said page 8, lines 31 through 36 of [Exhibit G](#) was an attempt to avoid a situation where the five-vote supermajority could be circumvented. He said if the District decided not to exercise its power of eminent domain, a person could not be found aggrieved.

Chair Hardy said he preferred water policies in Nevada be conducted through Districts.

Senator Lee said it was rewarding to see the formation of a water district in Nye County. He said the Southern Nevada Water Authority could now work with a group of organized people.

Chair Hardy said everyone needed to understand the membership of the District. He said the membership included one member from Beatty or the Amargosa area, one member from Tonopah, three members from Pahrump Valley who are not affiliated with a privately owned utility company, one member in Nye County from the Currant Creek or Smoky Valley area and one from Nye County other than the Pahrump Valley.

Chair Hardy asked if only the three members from Pahrump Valley could not be members of a privately owned utility company. He asked if the other members on the Board could be affiliated with privately owned utility companies.

Ms. Lazovich said she was not concerned with whether anybody was affiliated with private utility companies, but in Pahrump, there were three such companies.

Chair Hardy asked if the sponsors of the bill had objections if the Committee made the prohibition against being affiliated with private utility companies apply to all members of the Board.

Ms. Billman said it would be good to make the prohibition cover all members of the Board. She said Nye County had many small municipal utility companies.

Chair Hardy said the prohibition would apply to all the members.

Senator Raggio said the Board needed to have seven members. He asked if three members were residents of Pahrump, why was a member of the Commission required.

Ms. Billman said the member of the Commission came from the desire to have an odd number of members on the Board.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 222.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Hardy asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 11, 2007
Page 10

Senator Care asked if someone was not affiliated with a privately owned utility company, would it also include the spouse or some degree of consanguinity

Ms. Lazovich said the intent was to exclude anyone associated with a privately owned utility company from serving on the Board.

Senator Care said the wording entered into the issue of conflicts. He said legislative history was clear the Committee was trying to ensure no conflicts.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 307.

[SENATE BILL 307](#): Revises certain provisions relating to state and local governmental purchasing. (BDR 27-782)

Chair Hardy said an amendment had been proposed by Greg Smith, State Purchasing Division.

Senator Titus said S.B. 307 was written to impose standards on purchasing at the state level comparable to 30 other states and the federal government. She said the bill originally applied to the Purchasing Division of the Department of Administration. She said the Purchasing Division suggested the bill cover all agencies that do purchasing. She said the amendment extended the bill to cover Nevada Department of Transportation, the Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry and Nevada System of Higher Education ([Exhibit H](#)).

SENATOR TOWNSEND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B 307.

SENATOR LEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy said S.B. 325, S.B. 369 and S.B.387 would be heard on Friday. He opened the discussion on S.B. 496.

SENATE BILL 496: Makes various changes to provisions governing the State Board of Pardons Commissioners and the State Board of Parole Commissioners. (BDR 19-1435)

Chair Hardy said S.B. 496 exempted the State Board of Pardons Commissioners and the State Board of Parole Commissioners from the requirements of the Open Meeting Law under certain circumstances. He said no amendments had been proposed.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 496.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Hardy asked if there was any discussion concerning S.B 496.

Pat Hines asked for an amendment to the bill. She wanted the State Board of Pardons Commissioners and the State Board of Parole Commissioners to not be excluded from the Open Meeting law.

Chair Hardy asked if she was advocating the indefinite postponement of S.B. 496.

Ms. Hines wanted to express her opposition to the bill.

Senator Titus asked who was allowed to attend parole and pardons meetings.

Frederick Schlottman, Administrator, Offender Management Division, Carson City, Department of Corrections, said members of the press, victims, family members of both victims and inmates could attend parole board hearings. Senator Titus asked if those people were notified of hearings and Mr. Schlottman replied they were.

Senator Care asked if the bill were passed, who would be allowed into the meetings.

Mr. Schlottman said the same people allowed now would still be allowed to attend.

Senator Care asked if members of the press currently attend parole hearings. Mr. Schlottman replied they were allowed to attend.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 497.

SENATE BILL 497: Revises provisions relating to certain public facilities.
(BDR 22-1352)

Chair Hardy said there were several amendments proposed. Senator Lee requested the deletion of section 1 in its entirety. The second amendment provided the authority to the county to sell naming rights be applicable only to shooting ranges in Clark County. The final amendment was from the City of Las Vegas requesting it be allowed to grant naming rights ([Exhibit I](#)).

Chair Hardy said selling naming rights had to be approached with a great deal of caution. He said every time someone wanted to sell a naming right, he wanted them to appear before the Legislature. He said he would accept a motion to amend and do pass with Senator Lee's amendment removing section 1 and Senator Titus's amendment granting naming authority only to shooting ranges located in Clark County.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 497.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Hardy asked if there was further discussion on the motion.

Senator Care asked how the County determined who could buy the naming rights. He asked if it was the highest bidder.

Senator Lee said there was contractual law in purchasing over which the County had purview. He said the Clark County Board of Commissioners would notify and solicit bids.

Chair Hardy said before the bill was processed, he would ask Clark County to provide the Committee with the contractual laws.

Senator Titus said the bill provided for the Commissioners to adopt by ordinance procedures for the naming process.

Chair Hardy reiterated the motion was to adopt Amendments 1 and 2 and not Amendment 3, [Exhibit I](#).

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 508.

SENATE BILL 508: Creates the Office of Information Security within the Department of Information Technology. (BDR 19-575)

Chair Hardy said S.B. 508 created a third component within the Department of Information Technology. He said there were no amendments and no testimony in opposition to the bill ([Exhibit J](#)).

Senator Raggio said there might be a budget issue pertaining to the bill, but he had no objection to the passage of the measure.

SENATOR TITUS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 508.

SENATOR RAGGIO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 517.

SENATE BILL 517: Requires that certain payments to the State of Nevada be made electronically. (BDR 31-633)

Chair Hardy said the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada proposed three amendments. The first amendment required electronic transfer of money could be made by any method allowed by the agency. The second amendment clarified the transfer of funds must occur by the due date. The final proposed amendment deleted the requirement for a Social Security number and substituted an appropriate identification number ([Exhibit K](#)).

Senator Lee asked what qualified as an identification number.

Dave McTeer, Division Chief, Information Technology Division, Department of Administration, said all the agencies involved were concerned with the use of Social Security numbers. He said the agencies agreed to the requirement for an identification number.

Senator Lee asked what was required to receive an identification number.

Crystal Jackson, Commission Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada, said the state issued identification numbers through the Department of Personnel for all state employees. She said the identification number was used in lieu of Social Security numbers.

SENATOR BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 517.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Hardy opened the discussion on S.B. 369.

SENATE BILL 369: Revises provisions concerning the recording of declarations of homestead. (BDR 20-58)

Chair Hardy said a question had arisen concerning the fiscal note attached to S.B. 369 ([Exhibit L](#)).

Lisa Gianoli, Washoe County, said the fiscal note from Washoe County represented a one-year period of nonstandard declarations of homestead files. She said 430 files were nonstandard and resulted in \$10,750, and the remainder of the money came from a \$5,000 computer upgrade required to segregate a nonstandard document and some additional staff time because of time required for dealing with nonstandard documents.

Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County, said the fiscal note submitted by Clark County showed a positive impact of \$30,000. She said it was an error, it was a negative \$30,000 impact. The number came from the nonconforming homestead files.

Senator Raggio said if the bill passed, it was an unfunded mandate to the counties.

Senator Townsend said an unfunded mandate was not the intention of the bill. He said a problem occurred in Washoe County when homestead forms were deemed unacceptable because they were one-eighth of an inch too big and a \$25 fee was added to file the form. He said a reasonable and user-friendly approach was needed to make the system work for the taxpayer. He said he had discussed the problem with the recorder in Washoe County. He added Carson City did not create a problem with a nonconforming form.

Chair Hardy suggested a letter be drafted and sent to each of the counties indicating the Legislature was concerned about the problem and wanted the counties to resolve the issue.

Senator Townsend said if counties choose to say they do not want any liability by giving out a form, then the results will be nonconforming forms from various sources. He said the form he sent was created by a glitch in the printing department. It was one-eighth of an inch too small on the margin. He said the information he used had come from the county. When the form was transposed to the printer it was too small and hundreds of people called him about the \$25 extra charge to file. He said the letter needed to explain everyone was working for the public.

Chair Hardy recommended staff draft a letter for approval by Senator Townsend for distribution to the counties.

Senator Beers asked if the bill still had a fiscal note if the counties responded to the letter and stopped charging the \$25 fee for nonconformance.

Senator Townsend said he re-mailed the homestead form to thousands of Washoe County citizens because of the one-eighth inch error in the margin. He said the way people were treated at the recorder's office was unacceptable.

Senator Raggio asked if a quick response was possible from the counties in regard to the proposed letter.

Ms. Gianoli said she would try to get the problem resolved immediately and respond to the Committee.

Senator Raggio said imposing a fiscal burden on either of the major counties was not acceptable. He said a positive response could solve the problem.

Senator Townsend asked why all local government did not post a homestead form on the computer.

Ms. Gianoli said the form was relatively simple, and she would check with the legal department concerning liability for distributing such a form.

Senator Townsend said the recorder's office did not need to hand out the documents but have them available on the Internet for interested persons to print and bring into the recorder's office.

Senator Raggio requested Ms. Gianoli ask the District Attorney if there were problems with the suggestions from the Senators.

Chair Hardy closed the work session. He opened the hearing on S.B. 429.

SENATE BILL 429: Enacts provisions relating to labor organizations that represent public employees and members thereof. (BDR 23-1325)

Senator Beers said a federal law required transparency in union finances. Senate Bill 429 provided similar laws for state union members much like the

transparency requirements in campaign reporting. He said the law attempted to extend common-sense rules to local and state government unions.

Senator Care asked what problem the bill was trying to solve.

Senator Beers said on page 9, lines 12 through 17, S.B. 429 exempted anyone covered by federal law that required transparency. He said the bill was about transparency and openness in government. He said the modern worker was more educated and better able to ask questions. He said the bill was designed to let people know how their money was spent. Senator Beers said it was a complex bill with all new language.

Chair Hardy asked for testimony in favor or opposition to S.B. 429.

Al Bellister, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), said his organization was opposed to the bill. He said NSEA was extremely transparent in their business transactions. He said S.B. 429 was modeled after the federal legislation. He said the federal legislation was passed to cover private sector unions. He said this bill expands the coverage to public sector unions. He said there were significant differences in the federal bill and S.B. 429. He said the federal bill was passed in 1959 when there were numerous investigations regarding alleged corruption in the labor movement. He said it was a different era from today. He said S.B. 429 was not needed in Nevada. He said strikes were prohibited in Nevada under *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 288. He said section 18 of the bill appeared to ask unions to provide their procedures for authorizing strikes, despite the fact strikes are illegal. He said Nevada was a right-to-work state and nobody was forced to join a union. He said the NSEA was a democratically run organization. Mr. Bellister said the organization openly adopted constitutions and bylaws. They had reporting requirements under the NRS 288. He said section 10 of S.B. 429 was a free speech concept. He said the bill appeared to prohibit a union's ability to discipline its members except for failure to pay dues. He said the bill unduly interfered with the union's ability to police its internal affairs. He said section 18 of S.B. 429 seemed to impose the requirement of dealing with the issuance of work permits. He said it was not appropriate for a bill to impose upon labor unions to determine immigration status of employees. He reiterated his organization was opposed to S.B. 429.

Lonnie Shields, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional Technical Employees, said he agreed with Mr. Bellister and his organization opposed S.B. 429.

David F. Kallas, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees, Incorporated; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs, said he understood the concerns about transparency and education. He said it also involved accountability. He said the union organizations were accountable to their members. He said individuals chose to participate in an organization and pay dues. The same people have the opportunity to vote on and agree to the collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Kallas added they had the opportunity to vote on and approve the bylaws that govern the organization. He said they also had the opportunity to elect officials to oversee the operation of the organization. He asked the Legislature to not micromanage how the organizations were operated.

Ms. Smith-Newby said Clark County's attorney had read the bill and was neutral on it. She said Clark County was concerned about section 12, subsection 3, concerning a governmental employer appearing or petitioning a member of an employee organization. She said if Clark County offered an amendment, it would be to eliminate that section of the bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 11, 2007
Page 19

Chair Hardy closed the hearing on S.B. 429. He asked if there was any further business. As there was none, he adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Olivia Lodato,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Chair

DATE: _____