

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
March 31, 2015**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman John Ellison at 8:09 a.m. on Tuesday, March 31, 2015, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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: www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John Ellison, Chairman
Assemblyman John Moore, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblywoman Shelly M. Shelton
Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblyman Glenn E. Trowbridge
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

William B. Scott, Author, Scott Systems LLC
Tony Shelton, Policy Director, District 10
Steve Sanson, President, Veterans in Politics, International Inc.
Rondha Gibson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Janine Hansen, President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Vanessa Spinazola, Legislative & Advocacy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Legislative Services, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada, and representing Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Nevada, Washoe School Principals' Association, and Washoe County Public Attorneys' Association
Stan Olsen, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers
Michael Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association
Warren B. Hardy II, representing City of Mesquite
Natasha Koch, Captain, Executive Officer, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
John Fudenberg, Assistant Coroner, Government Affairs, Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner, Clark County
Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Tom Grady, representing City of Fallon
Tim Ross, President, Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association, and representing Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada

Tom Ely, Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, and representing Taxicab Authority, Department of Business and Industry

Rusty McAllister, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada

Ryan Beaman, President, Union Local 1908, Clark County Firefighters

Priscilla Maloney, representing Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

Tina Leiss, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System

Chairman Ellison:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We are going to go out of order because Assemblywoman Diaz is testifying in another committee this morning. The first bill will be Assembly Bill 403 and will be presented by Assemblywoman Shelton.

Assembly Bill 403: Revises provisions concerning peace officers. (BDR 23-813)

Assemblywoman Shelly M. Shelton, Assembly District No. 10:

Before we get started, I would like to mention I am working on an amendment, which I hope to have to this Committee by the end of the day or tomorrow at the latest. I have had several agencies approach me with various suggestions for the bill, so we are still tweaking it a bit.

Chairman Ellison:

After I read this bill, I realized it is similar to Assemblyman Munford's bill, Assembly Bill 162. However, you have a different funding mechanism in your bill. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

That is correct.

Chairman Ellison:

Will you address the funding during your presentation?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

Yes, I will. Thank you for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 403. For a number of years now, Nevadans have been losing trust in law enforcement. The days of the local beat cop walking the streets and getting to know the residents have gone the way of the horse and buggy. [Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Also here to testify on this bill is Bill Scott, whose son, Erik, might still be alive had proper de-escalation training and body cameras been utilized. In Las Vegas,

we have Rondha Gibson, the widow of Stanley Gibson, and Steve Sanson, who will also be testifying.

I would like the Committee to hear Mr. Scott's testimony at this point.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Mr. Scott, you may begin your testimony.

William B. Scott, Author, Scott Systems LLC:

My eldest son, Erik Scott, might be alive today if Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department officers had been required to wear body cameras in the summer of 2010. Why? Because body cameras are a powerful deterrent to the use of deadly force. They are literally unimpeachable witnesses.

Officer William Mosher, who panicked and shot my son, Erik, as he and his girlfriend walked out of Costco, had already killed one man and shot a second in his first five years with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Those shootings were ruled as justified. With no video evidence or civilian witnesses, inquest jurors had no alternative but to accept the accounts of on-scene police officers, even though they were highly suspect. [Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Neal:

In the bill on page 3, section 2, subsection 1(a), what do you envision as being the disciplinary rules that would be enforced if an officer fails to operate the recording device, manipulates the recording, or prematurely erases the recording?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

I would like to refer that question to Tony Shelton, my policy director. We have done a lot of research as far as what other agencies are doing. We have also looked at the U.S. Department of Justice reports. Mr. Shelton has the information on that issue.

Tony Shelton, Policy Director, District 10:

Are you talking about the length of time that the data is stored?

Assemblywoman Neal:

The first part of the question is what discipline do you envision would be appropriate if the officer failed to operate the device?

Tony Shelton:

In all honesty, this bill came from the Legislative Counsel Bureau ten minutes before the deadline. We were unable to get some of the things in there that we wanted to. There are going to be some amendments. I do not know if we can exactly spell that out in the law. We are going to figure out what we can do with reference to the guidelines. In all honesty, there has to be some teeth in the bill. If there are no teeth, it will not work. We are expecting amendments and looking for suggestions regarding things like that.

Chairman Ellison:

Before the end of your presentation of the bill, could you touch on the fiscal note so we know where we are going to be sending the bill?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

Chairman Ellison, you had mentioned to me changing some of the language to "enabling," so we are looking into that as far as the amendments. If I understood you correctly, if we make the language "enabling," it takes away the fiscal note.

Chairman Ellison:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I support body cameras 100 percent. Where I start to have questions is in section 4, where we are requiring someone with some or all of the powers of a peace officer to have insurance. What level of insurance do you have in mind, and who will be paying for it? I see this as almost equal to that of a doctor who is required to have malpractice insurance.

Assemblywoman Shelton:

It is along the same line, but what brought this to our attention were the federal agents. At the federal level, agents have to carry their own liability insurance. Mr. Shelton has some data on the insurance cost. I would have thought the cost would be a burden for an officer. However, just the liability insurance is not a big-ticket item, especially if it is never used.

Tony Shelton:

What we found was the federal government currently pays up to half of that insurance with a maximum of \$150. On some of the officer forums, we are

finding people who are reporting they only pay \$7 per month and are getting up to \$1 million in liability coverage. This only works for officers who do not have constant claims and payouts. The whole reason behind this is once an officer starts getting claims and payouts, it is just like a driver. A driver cannot drive on the road if he cannot be insured. This is a way to filter out the problem officers who are costing taxpayers money.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I would assume in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (6), if an officer is subject to disciplinary action, the officer is responsible for the financial expenses incurred by the department. Would that go back to the insurance?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

We were trying to think of some kind of deterrent for the officer. That is another part of the bill we are looking to amend after talking to different agencies and the way they are set up to run.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Mr. Scott, thank you for coming today and telling us your story. My condolences go out to you and your family. I know this has to be very difficult for you. Assemblywoman Shelton, thank you for bringing this bill forward. I am also supportive of body cameras. However, I do have a question regarding section 4. Are there any other public employees in Nevada who are required to pay for their own liability insurance versus having their employer pay for it?

Assemblywoman Shelton:

We tried to research every aspect, but I did not research other public employees or government entities. I will check into that and let you know.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Your bill is similar to Assemblyman Munford's bill, A.B. 162. I received a question from a constituent after the hearing on A.B. 162, so I will ask you the question. Is the cost of the camera going to be built into the cost of the officer's uniforms so they are then able to offset some of that cost on their income taxes? They felt it would be a burden if the officer had to pay for it up front and then be reimbursed by the department later.

Tony Shelton:

There have been many discussions regarding how to finance this. We have not had any discussion about having the officer pay for the camera. We have been looking through the budget to determine where this can be done. We did find

there is \$17 million in the self-insurance fund for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Las Vegas Metro). The \$17 million sitting in that fund is for no other purpose than to pay out claims. In order to fully implement the camera program, it would cost \$1.1 million, according to Sheriff Joseph Lombardo, who was interviewed by Jon Ralston last week. He also said it would be approximately \$250,000 every year after that for the storage.

To give you an idea of where Las Vegas Metro's budget is, last year, the Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team spent \$162,000 on ammunition. The fuel bill for SWAT was \$251,000. It is all a matter of priorities. When we are hearing about not having enough money to do this or that, it is not that they do not have enough money, they are using the money in places where they have put their priorities higher than being accountable to the public. These cameras have come down in cost. We are not talking about millions and millions of dollars to do this anymore.

The Los Angeles Police Department put out a call to businesses and private individuals to put cameras on their police officers. They received \$1.3 million in five months. That was enough to take care of much of their police department. A small town like Greensboro, Arkansas, raised \$130,000 just by getting businesses and private individuals to donate. They raised more than \$1,000 per officer from private donations.

In this state, we have a lot of businesses. They are not too big on paying taxes for things they have no say so whatsoever in how the money is spent. Businesses in Nevada are very generous to give when someone needs something. Las Vegas Metro needs these cameras, they need the accountability, and they need the transparency. I believe our businesses will step up to help and take some of the burden off the taxpayers.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I am not sure how far I should go with this. I am curious, have you talked to any private businesses to see if they are interested?

Tony Shelton:

Assemblywoman Shelton and I own a small business. We will start with \$2,000. I think other businesses will step up.

Assemblywoman Dooling:

I believe this current cycle is happening because we have officers being shot deliberately for no apparent reason. We then have officers reacting quickly. Do you have any thoughts on some type of resolution for that issue? This question goes to anyone who may be testifying today.

Assemblywoman Shelton:

I would like to defer that question to Mr. Scott. He has already done research in this area.

William Scott:

The common narrative is exactly as you said, meaning the bad guys are more "gunned up," and it is more dangerous out there. Historically, the facts do not support that. *The Atlantic* magazine ran an outstanding story last December addressing that type of issue, asking what is going on. Their conclusion was it had a lot to do with training. Some of the facts and figures they mentioned were astounding. Police officers were told they have one of the most dangerous jobs out there. They have to act very quickly and make decisions in a fraction of a second. If you look at the facts, there are 63 million interactions between police officers and civilians in a year. If you track through the number of fatalities of officers, it eventually comes down to 15 officer fatalities per year by felonious assaults, which are intentional attacks on officers. Most officers are killed in traffic accidents. An officer's probability of being killed on the job intentionally by these bad guys comes out to be 0.00008 of 1 percent. The officer has a pretty good chance of going home at night.

I can relate this to flight testing. I spent 12 years flight testing airplanes, and 35 years ago this Friday, I had to jump out of an airplane that crashed. While I was in the parachute, I saw a pilot fall to his death. We had very little time to act. We were out of altitude and ideas. I jumped out at 1,000 feet. There is always time, believe it or not, even in a police officer incident, to stop and think. A lot of thinking can happen in one second to decide whether to shoot or not to shoot. Is there a real danger there? Is there another option? It comes back to training.

Unfortunately, academies are now training cadets to be afraid. These cadets hit the streets, and they are scared stiff. Talk to the older officers who are out there, even at Las Vegas Metro. They say they are more afraid of the young guys than they are of the bad guys.

There is one other factor that there is not a lot of data to support, but I see it anecdotally over and over. We now have a generation of officers, the newer officers, who are called the "thirteeners." The "thirteeners" are the 13th generation of Americans, and they are a totally different breed. They are the first generation raised on video games. Many of these officers, in a virtual sense, have been shooting and killing everything from aliens and bad guys since they were six years old. According to psychological researchers, they have literally wired their brains to shoot first. That is why we see them go to the lethal end of the spectrum so quickly.

Assemblywoman Shelton:

Chairman Ellison, if I could, I have Rondha Gibson and Steve Sanson in Las Vegas, who are part of my presentation also.

Chairman Ellison:

We want to make sure if they have written testimony they give it to the Committee Secretary in Las Vegas. We are not going to limit them as much, but if they could keep it to about five minutes.

Steve Sanson, President, Veterans in Politics, International Inc.:

Before I begin my testimony, I would like to thank Assemblywoman Shelton for bringing this bill forward. My organization endorses candidates to elected seats, exposes corruption, and champions veterans' rights. We are here today to express deep concerns for veterans returning from combat with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and civilians with mental illness.

We need mandatory laws in dealing with de-escalation. We need officers on the streets who can recognize mental illness and who are able to use voice commands to take charge of the situation without the cost of life. We need cameras so there can be clear and direct footage of a situation. These cameras will protect the public from an entitled officer, and the officer from an uncontrollable assailant.

The life of Erik Scott could have been saved if the officers knew they were being filmed. The life of Trevon Cole could have been saved for the same reason. The life of Stanley Gibson could have been saved if the officer on site was equipped with de-escalation training. Former officer Jesus Arevalo, the killer of Stanley Gibson, had several complaints in his record. One of those complaints was about his negative action against a lesbian. Bryan Yant, the killer of Trevon Cole, had two shootings prior to the shooting of Mr. Cole. One of the shootings prior to Mr. Cole ended in a death. That assailant was unarmed. It was proven in a coroner's inquest that Mr. Yant lied on the stand. If the cameras were available, there would not have been a question as to what happened. Mr. Yant cost taxpayers \$1.7 million in civil penalties, not to mention the countless amount of money for the coroner's inquest, investigations, attorney fees, and other costs.

The amount of money we, the taxpayers, pay out in legal fees, police investigations, and civil penalties would be reduced substantially if we implement this bill, not to mention the cost of life, the families left behind, and the outrage of a community.

We speak about where the money is coming from, but officers have no problems paying their union dues. Apparently, the taxpayers do not have a problem paying eight Las Vegas Metro police officers to be on the Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees Executive Board to the tune of \$1.4 million per year in salary alone. These officers do not do any police work. In some states, it was ruled unconstitutional to have taxpayer money fund a private entity.

Again, the passing of this bill would save countless lives and would reduce "runaway cops" on our police forces.

Chairman Ellison:

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

Rondha Gibson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in favor of this bill. This needs to be done. If there were body cameras when my husband was killed, everything would have been okay. You just do not understand what kind of stuff I have been living through; what we all live through every day. It is not easy. The cover-up. Everyone has lied to me. There is no truth to anything. To this day, I do not know the truth of what happened to my husband. If the body cameras were on, I would have known something by now. Unfortunately, we will never know the full truth. This bill needs to pass. It is very important. As you said before, the money you paid me, you could have used to buy body cameras for everyone. I do not see why they have to lie.

Chairman Ellison:

I am sorry, and I know this is emotional. Did you say the officer was wearing a body camera?

Rondha Gibson:

No, I said if he would have been wearing one. It would have made a huge difference, but he did not have one on.

Chairman Ellison:

Any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in favor of this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in favor of the bill?

Janine Hansen, President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

We support having body cameras for police. There are many specific issues, and I have discussed these with Vanessa Spinazola of the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada (ACLU). I have another meeting I need

to go to, so I will let her refer to those. I would like to testify to things that have happened to me where I think body cameras would have improved behavior.

The Rialto, California, police experiment study with cameras has shown that they greatly reduce problems between the police and citizens. This is an important goal. We want to get along with police. I certainly enjoy all the police who work in this building, and we have a good relationship. I admire them. However, when I was driving here from Elko on Monday morning, going through Fernley, I was distracted and running late, so I must have been going too fast in a 25 mile per hour zone. I was stopped by a police officer, whose badge number is 7871. I apologized and told him I did not realize I was speeding. We went through the usual procedure, but when he handed me the ticket, I asked him four times if I could please read the back of the ticket. I read the front of the ticket, but I wanted to read the back of the ticket. He would not allow me to do so. I tried to lift the ticket up to read the back, but he said no, he would give it to me when he was done. I asked him if it was not my constitutional right to be able to read what I was signing? He threatened me at that point and said if I did not sign it, he was going to arrest me.

I have been arrested before, but I did not have time that day to be arrested because I had to be here. I did sign the ticket, but I failed to write "signed under protest." I wanted to read the rest of the ticket and felt it was my right to read it before I signed it. I think his behavior would have been improved, and he would not have threatened me with arrest if he had been wearing a body camera.

In 2004, I was petitioning at the bus depot in Reno for signatures on a petition that was approved by the state of Nevada. I had gone through the process that was required by state law. In fact, I had helped get the law changed in Nevada allowing people to petition on state or government property. I had called in advance and told them I was coming. Within five minutes of arriving to gather signatures, my son and I were both arrested, handcuffed, put in a paddy wagon, and hauled off to the jail on Parr Boulevard. We were exonerated and, in fact, the ACLU defended me in the court case. We were exonerated in municipal court and then, because of other issues, this went clear to the Supreme Court of Nevada and I was exonerated again. In fact, Lynn Chapman, the Vice President of Nevada Families for Freedom, documented it and took pictures of what happened. She used a regular camera because we did not have a video camera.

I do think there are instances where this would improve the behavior by those whose behavior may be out of bounds. I appreciate this bill coming forward

because I think it is important in our communities for citizens to have confidence in the police. I have interacted with the sheriff in Elko County and it has been very positive. We want that to always be the case. We want to have confidence in those who put their lives on the line and who are there to help and defend us. We appreciate all of their work. However, there are times when some officers threaten to arrest you when you want to read your ticket. I think this is a good idea.

There are many things in this bill which I think are an improvement; for instance, section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraphs (3) and (4). Ms. Spinazola will address this further, but we should not be filming randomly; for instance, at First Amendment rallies. We do not want to intimidate people as they exercise their First Amendment right to petition.

Chairman Ellison:

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

Vanessa Spinazola, Legislative & Advocacy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

We are here in support of the bill. I would like to explain a couple of amendments we will be bringing forth and answer a couple of questions that have come up. Our main concern is we do not want body cameras used as a tool of government surveillance. They are important to engage with citizens and record interactions that are inappropriate, but if the data is kept too long or used in other ways, it can basically become a way to conduct Fourth Amendment searches without warrants and conduct other government surveillance on citizens.

The first thing Ms. Hansen mentioned on page 3 in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (3), currently states, "Prohibiting the recording of general activity." In my discussions with law enforcement, they have stated that is somewhat unclear. What we mean by that is a generalized activity using the First Amendment rights.

There is currently a law proceeding through the Tennessee Legislature, and they have language that states body cameras shall not be used to surreptitiously gather intelligence information based on First Amendment protected speech, associations, religion, or to record generalized activity. We will be bringing an amendment regarding this issue to basically prevent law enforcement from standing outside a worship service or a protest and merely having their cameras on constantly to surveil those people and keep that data for later use. That is the type of use of the body cameras we would like to prevent.

Regarding the disciplinary rules, we believe most of that should be done through police department policy. Some of the examples that could be used to ensure disciplinary action is direct disciplinary action against the individual officer, adopting rebuttal evidentiary presumptions in favor of the criminal and defendants when the camera footage has somehow gone missing, and adopting rebuttal evidentiary presumptions in civil plaintiffs when they are suing the government and law enforcement for the civil activities that come out of perhaps being a victim of law enforcement abuse. I wanted to put that on the record.

I appreciate the new language in section 6, subsection 4, paragraph (c) on page 5. There is a citizen review board in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), and the Las Vegas Metro citizen review board has been very active. This bill provides that the policies we are delegating would be open for the public to weigh in. I think that is a very important component that has been added to A.B. 403.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraphs (3) and (4), it says, "(3) Prohibiting the recording of general activity; (4) Protecting the privacy of persons: (I) In a private residence." What does that mean? If someone were to come to my house and cause a situation and an officer comes to the door, does he have to turn off the camera?

Vanessa Spinazola:

What we envisioned by this is a scenario that happens quite often when officers serve a warrant, which is the unexpected arrival of an officer at someone's home. It may be your home and your warrant, but you have people in your home that may not have any legitimate law enforcement reason to be taped. This would be put into the policies and not in NRS. We are envisioning a scenario where the policy would say something regarding an interaction where there are private citizens present and they ask the officer with a camera to stop taping. They may not want to be on the camera footage that will be taken back to the precinct where the data will be uploaded and retained, and that the public can look at. There should be an option for a citizen to say they do not want to be on camera and to have the officer turn off the camera while they are exiting the room. That would be up to the local policies.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I would like to make this real. I have been doing youth justice workshops for children for four years on how to interact with the police. First, there needs to be respect on both sides. How would this scenario work? The officer comes to the door and has the camera on. My 15-year-old answers the door. I tell the

officer to turn the camera off because I do not want my child on video. What do you think is really going to happen in that circumstance? I can tell you, it will probably not go well. Something will probably happen that is not necessarily favorable for either party. When an officer enters a house, they do not know the circumstances or what could happen. There is a natural defensiveness that kicks in when a residence is involved. Officers do not know what is happening in that house. I would like you to tell me how that is going to work in real life. To me, that promotes a problem. There needs to be respect on both sides.

Vanessa Spinazola:

It is a complicated issue, and I do not think this is something we can put in NRS. We are talking about having policies where citizens can request videos be removed. We are talking about data retention periods. We talked about having a minimum data retention of 15 days in Senate Bill 111. If nothing results from the incident, that would be video footage that could be erased and not available to the public. If police officers enter that type of situation and they feel they should keep their cameras on, that is their responsibility as law enforcement. That is why the de-escalation training portion is extremely important as well, and it is a new portion of this bill. When they see there is nothing happening in the house, they do not need to bring the SWAT team to serve the search warrant. They do not have to face every scenario expecting the worst. As you said, it is also citizens being respectful of how they request the cameras to be turned off.

I think the reason we want this in the bill is because we want those policies considered. We should not be permitting government surveillance of private residences when not everyone in that private residence is under any sort of suspicion.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I have one more scenario with an officer serving a warrant. I could be in the apartment of a friend. The officer is coming for my friend. The officer has a right to be there, but is limited to a certain degree. I am an invited guest, they are coming for my friend, I am sitting on the couch, the officer has the warrant, and enters the private residence. What happens then? I understand what you are saying about de-escalation policies, which is important. It does not take into consideration other criminal law rules and practices that are technically legal. You are with the ACLU, so I need you to talk about the real-life situations. At the end of the day, the person is going to accuse the police of something, and we need to figure out what their rights are in this scenario. Just because it is statutorily there does not mean it does not conflict with another criminal law procedure or rule.

Vanessa Spinazola:

That is a scenario that happens every day. It could go fine; the door is answered, the warrant is served, and that is the end of the story. Maybe much more happens. Again, I am going to rely on the police officers in that scenario. They will have their body camera turned on and will have to deal with the issue if other people are asking them to turn off the camera. Perhaps the officer comes in and only has a conversation, while the friend is off to the side. The difference is, when the camera is on, it is recorded permanently.

We have had other bills preceding this in the Legislature about facial recognition software, iris and retina determination, and voice print technology, all of which are very invasive and can pick up a lot of personal information. If a person is captured on that camera and it is retained, but it is later scanned for facial recognition, that person has become a suspect, or a part of the surveillance tool of government just by virtue of being in that apartment. Having the camera on brings it up a notch, and it is something we do have to consider. I am not saying it is not complicated and that it is not going to take training. I am saying we want this one line in the bill so that the policies that are enacted and brought to the citizen review board panel can be considered and the public can participate. I think it is important to many citizens. I think many citizens and constituents are not going to want the police walking into their homes, where their friends may be present, with cameras recording video that is kept by law enforcement. I think it is very important to consider those policies.

Chairman Ellison:

I think there are situations where the officers need those cameras on. When an officer goes into a residence and there is a heated discussion, they should not have to pick and choose whether the camera should be off or on. They are going in to do their job, which is important. Domestic violence may be one of the worst situations when an officer goes into a residence. I think those are issues that will come up, and we will have to address them.

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? I would like everyone to keep their testimony to three minutes or less. I would like one of the officers to comment on the ticket that Ms. Hansen received Monday. If there is an officer pulling someone over and not letting that person read the ticket, that is an issue.

**Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We support the philosophy behind the bill, and we appreciate what Assemblywoman Shelton is trying to do. As I stated in my previous testimony on A.B. 162, law enforcement embraces this technology.

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Las Vegas Metro) is moving forward with cameras, and by the end of next year, we will have approximately 700 cameras to equip our officers.

As this bill is written, we have to oppose it. We have some concerns, the first being the unfunded mandate. I appreciate the comments made by Mr. Shelton, and I will be sure to provide him with contact information for Las Vegas Metro so he can make his \$2,000 donation to get the ball rolling toward funding cameras.

In theory, it is a great idea to reach out to private industry to get donations to pay for cameras. However, that is not a reliable funding source. We already reach out to private industry, especially on the Las Vegas Strip, to assist with hiring police officers to work overtime and cover our resource shortfall. You can only go to the well so many times. I am not saying there are not more individuals out there who might be willing to contribute, and we would certainly support that. I am saying, at this point, it is not a reliable funding source.

I will not talk a lot about the cameras because I have already testified before this Committee on A.B. 162, and also on S.B. 111 in the Senate. I will briefly say there are difficulties with cameras that need to be worked through. Some of those were briefly addressed with Assemblywoman Neal's questions. In those cases as described by the ACLU, if a law enforcement officer arrives to serve a search warrant and the citizen asks for the camera to be turned off and something were to happen, that citizen is then in a situation where there would have been video of that incident had the camera been left on.

We need to be very careful about when we start telling the officer when and when not to have the camera on. Not to mention the fact that the officer in the field has to make split-second decisions and should not be thinking about the camera. If the officer is on routine patrol because of an increase in burglaries in a specific area, can the officer have the camera on or does it have to be off? Is that general activity? It is more complicated than it sounds.

In addition, there are some things in this bill that I think are problematic, aside from the cameras. It was stated that the liability insurance would be about \$300 per year per officer. On the federal side, half of that cost is paid for by the federal government. We have over 3,000 commissioned officers, plus we are now in charge of constables and we have correctional officers in our jails. This bill does not specify, but if it were expected that law enforcement pay half of the liability insurance, that would be a significant fiscal impact which would override any savings we would see to put toward cameras.

I do not necessarily think liability insurance for police officers has much benefit. The department is still responsible for the officer's actions, even if the officer acts inappropriately. To use an analogy, if a clerk in a grocery store had liability insurance and left a bag of dog food on the ground where someone falls over it, the grocery store will still be sued. The clerk may also be sued, but the grocery store is not off the hook just because the clerk has liability insurance. The same thing would apply to a police officer. Just because the police officer has liability insurance, the department would still be responsible in a civil action.

Regarding the theory behind the officer paying for a complaint against him if it is sustained, our officers respond to about 1 million calls for service each year. Last year, we had roughly 714 complaints filed against police officers for various reasons, from discourtesy to use of force. Of those 714 complaints, the average time to complete an investigation ranged from 60 to 70 days. The officers in internal affairs who investigate these complaints do not just investigate one case at a time. They may have a caseload of 15 different cases and may work on different cases throughout the day. They may interview on one case and then interview on another case in the same day.

How do you break down the cost that was associated with one investigation to put that cost on the officer? If a case did arise to the level where the officer was terminated, the financial department could theoretically try to come up with a figure of what the officer owed for the investigation. That could then be taken from the officer's last paycheck. Understand, there are grievance processes with all of these investigations, and officers have the ability to grieve the discipline that was brought against them. Hypothetically, a year down the road the officer appeals, hires an attorney, and the discipline against him is overthrown. Does the officer then get the money back? Is the department responsible for interest and other things associated with that? It opens a can of worms when talking about these issues.

I would like to touch on some of the information given to you. Last year, 47 police officers died from gunfire in the United States. This information is available on the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) website. There were also two officers who were assaulted and died as a result of their injuries, and ten officers who were the victims of vehicle assault by being run over by a vehicle. In 2013, 31 officers were killed by gunfire. The information given to you that 15 officers die in the line of duty on average per year is not true. I encourage you to look at the FBI website. I would also encourage this Committee to do a ride-along with our officers. Go out in a patrol car and see firsthand what these officers are going through.

We have a robust system put in place for de-escalation training in our agency. I would be happy to introduce you to the people who do that training and let you see firsthand some of these reality-based scenarios the officers go through.

Finally, I certainly have sympathy and feel for the families who have lost loved ones. I would like to note, however, that in the Stanley Gibson incident, although the officer was not wearing a body camera, that incident was captured on video by a citizen who lived in the apartment complex. That video played on the news nightly for quite some time.

Chairman Ellison:

Can you address the incident that Ms. Hansen testified to earlier about not being allowed to read a ticket before she signed it?

Chuck Callaway:

Citizens have every right to read a ticket or a document a police officer hands them before they sign it. I believe the incident occurred in Lyon County. I would encourage Ms. Hansen to reach out to that agency, talk to a supervisor, and file a complaint if she believes the officer denied her the ability to read that ticket.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I would like to commend the ride-along program at Las Vegas Metro. I had the opportunity to participate, and I would recommend it to anyone in the Legislature. It will give you a completely different perspective as to what law enforcement has to go through. We were fortunate enough not to experience any situations that would have put us in danger, but the high-speed chase down Nellis Boulevard was a white-knuckle ride.

Chairman Ellison:

I encourage that also. I have been on many ride-alongs through the years. It does give you a different outlook as to what police officers go through while they are on patrol.

Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Legislative Services, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

I am here in opposition to A.B. 403. The Washoe County Sheriff's Office, overall, is very supportive of the use of body cameras. We are partnering with other local law enforcement jurisdictions in Washoe County to explore the best use of this technology. We are trying to get the best technology for our money. We sincerely believe recordings will exonerate more officers than they will impeach.

You heard testimony earlier that Los Angeles received \$1.3 million to help many officers with cameras. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) has 9,843 officers. The Rialto Police Department has 103 officers and serves 28 square miles, which is a very small department. There will be large statistical numbers when data analysis is done on a small department. When you look at Los Angeles with 9,843 officers, that \$1.3 million may have covered some officers. The big issue is the storage of the video data, which is extremely problematic for law enforcement agencies. Having to hold on to that video evidence is a mechanical nightmare. I will not even speak to the fiscal aspect, but the storage alone is a big problem.

In Washoe County, we would certainly accept any financial donations. We would partner with agencies to buy cameras or storage. The cameras are the least expensive part of the whole process. It is the maintenance, storage systems, and personnel to provide public records requests.

This bill requires every uniformed officer who deals with the public, which is everyone in our agency, to wear body cameras. There are approximately 800 employees at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. It would be just over \$1 million to implement this technology. Las Vegas Metro is much larger than we are. I can guarantee the LAPD spent a lot more than \$1.3 million to implement body-worn technology in their jurisdiction.

Last week we met with many people regarding S.B. 111, including the cities, other law enforcement agencies, school districts, higher education, the news media, and the ACLU, to see if we could get legislation passed that would work for law enforcement, the ACLU, and the media so we could all have body cameras mandated by the state. It only raised more questions. The more we dug around in that sandbox, the more issues came up that were problematic.

In the spirit of transparency and openness, I need to make it known that we feel this legislation is a huge burden to the law enforcement jurisdictions. Legislating policy and procedure should be left to the chiefs and sheriffs at the agencies, not through state mandated laws.

When was the last time you logged into a MySpace account, purchased a tape recorder, or used a compact disc? This is similar. We are talking about a piece of technology that might not even be here in three years. By that time, there may be a better way of doing business, yet you are mandating a state law that officers wear body cameras. We ask you to take a step back and evaluate this bill for what it is, and allow the agencies to develop the policy. We support

your decision to have us use this technology, but leave the policy to our chiefs and sheriffs.

Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

I will not take up a lot of time because my counterparts have explained many of the issues that all of Nevada deals with. This is not just a Las Vegas Metro issue, this impacts all the counties.

I hate to keep talking about finances, but Pershing County does not even have a 911 system. They would love to have cameras.

Chairman Ellison:

There are many counties that do not have an enhanced 911 system.

Robert Roshak:

That is correct. With regard to the insurance, it would be an unfunded mandate on the employees. What type of insurance are they going to buy? Who is going to be the provider? It does not seem to make any sense other than one more attempt to penalize police. We are being painted with a broad brush when it is not everyone. Departments have policies and procedures. If there is an issue with a particular agency or officer, it needs to be addressed at that level.

I would like to read something that was published in the *Scientific American*, Volume 311, Issue 6, in an article relating to body cameras worn by officers. It states, "Blindly adopting the technology without a carefully thought out policy and without training on how and when cameras should be used could make matters worse."

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada, and representing Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Nevada:

We stand in opposition to A.B. 403 for a number of reasons. We have said we would support the body cameras all along. Our position has been that it is an evolutionary process, but it will happen. It is going to take some time to make it happen. This bill, like the others, addresses that, and it is the good part of the bill.

After listening to approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes of law enforcement bashing, I have to tell you it is an insult to those in law enforcement. It was difficult for me not to speak out. I am a 26-year veteran law enforcement officer who worked homicide, working some of the most horrific murders you could imagine, and working the streets. For the last 15 years since I retired,

I have been representing law enforcement officers. I am also an honorably retired veteran of the United States Army. I served my country there as well.

This body has done wonders in supporting veterans, but I have to tell you, it has not done wonders in supporting law enforcement. This bill goes against the grain of supporting law enforcement.

Speaking to the bill, in section 2, subsection 1, it states a police officer shall be required to wear a body camera, and that the body camera will be activated when there is an initiation of any law enforcement or investigative encounter with citizens. In patrol, everything we do in those eight to ten hours, absent going to lunch and coffee breaks, is law enforcement related. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (3), prohibits the recording of general activity. An officer has to have the camera on when he goes into a scene; he has to turn it off during other conditions. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (4), prohibits the recording if the officer goes into a private residence. Do you know how many houses I have gone into for domestic violence cases? The officer is damned if he does and damned if he does not. This bill will cause more internal investigations than you could believe.

On top of that, officers have to maintain liability insurance when our employers currently do that. I have been sued a couple of times. I know the system works because if I act in the scope of my employment, I am covered. If I do not act in the scope of my employment, I am not covered. This bill creates policies and procedures to tell an officer when he can or cannot turn on a camera, when he can or cannot do his job.

I heard the testimony about the individuals killed by officers. I have compassion for those who testified. There is more to the story as well, which is online. Officer Mike Ramirez from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department is here today, and I asked him if it would be okay if I shared his story. It is not easy to turn on and off what we do in the escalation of force because it happens too quickly. Officer Ramirez was sitting in Wal-Mart when the two people he was interviewing pulled out guns and started shooting him. He has recovered, but that is the other side of the story. I know most of you know that. I want you to do ride-alongs to see what we do. We are not the bad people that have been portrayed here. That is an insult to all of us who wear the badge.

Last Friday, within 24 hours, six officers were killed in the line of duty in the United States. Two of those were by gunfire. That destroys what was testified to earlier. I am sick of it because I have buried my fellow officers. Their names are on the Nevada Law Enforcement Officers Memorial outside this building. They call us villains of the world. There were officers in Las Vegas murdered

last year sitting in a restaurant. We have to get over the cop bashing and get down to the business of the part of the bill that makes sense; the body cameras.

Assemblyman Munford's bill is about body cameras. Senator Ford's bill is about body cameras. That is what this is about. I encourage them, I have worked with them, and I have seen them in action. I spent two hours representing a Washoe County deputy who had audio and video cameras in the car, but not on the body. After seeing the video, what a revelation that was.

Senator Ford, in his presentation, presented two videos of two different instances where the body camera did, in fact, save the officer. He also presented one video that convicted the officer. Body cameras have a good purpose, but regarding the rest of the bill, it is not appropriate to do that to us. It will cause more harm than it is worth. You would have to write a book of rules in order to cover every instance where this bill would be a factor. It would be impossible to cover every situation an officer may go through. The U.S. Supreme Court has stated in situations where officers' lives are in danger, they have to have the ability and discretion to save themselves. I want my officers to go home at night. They are not paid to die. Their survivors deserve the rights we give them.

Chairman Ellison:

These camera issues are not anti-police. They are simply a tool to get at the truth to protect both sides. Assemblyman Munford's bill has been amended, and I am sure there will be amendments to this bill as well. I understand your pain and your concerns. I also have friends whose names are on that memorial outside. It needs to be fair.

Are there any questions from the Committee members?

Assemblywoman Woodbury:

I do relate to quite a bit of what you were saying. My husband is in law enforcement. For the last three years he has worked in drug enforcement where he has to deal with some of the most violent criminals. There is a chance he may not come home, and we deal with that every day. I know my husband would be glad to wear a body camera. We know officers who were glad they were wearing the body cameras because it proved they were justified in their split-second reaction. I want to let you know, I understand your concerns, and officers do face danger every day.

Ronald Dreher:

We are not bashing body cameras. We want them and we encourage them, but there is a huge cost as to their use, as you have heard from law enforcement throughout the state. The concern I raise is the fact that an officer has to be able to react in an instant. We have Simunition training. For those of you who do not know what that is, officers go through deadly force situations, peaceful situations, and de-escalation training. The training portion is immense. Some of the dollars we have talked about come from the result of the training we have to go through. We do not put an officer on the street immediately; it takes a couple of years to do that. They also have continual training. Especially today, with the attacks on law enforcement, Simunition training is designed to teach officers how to react when an individual puts a hand into his waistband, or what to do when an individual pulls out something believed to be a weapon. We have to train in those situations. We want the officers to go home. We want them to know they must react in an instant, because if they do not react in an instant, they may not go home.

In rare situations, a person may pull out a cell phone. However, it does not always happen like that. Most of the time, when an officer is involved in a situation and the individual is walking away, the officer is yelling "Police. Halt." The officer does not want to shoot that individual. I know one officer who shot a child, and he quit his job the next day. It was a deadly force situation, and he had to take the life of a juvenile. It affected him so badly, his career was ended. The rest of us move on, we cope, and we stress. We have all types of evaluations to be able to cope with what we go through and the things we see in this profession. The body cameras see some of what goes on. Hopefully, Senator Ford's bill will be presented in this Committee and you will be able to see the videos. A problem with the body cameras is they move with the body. If you are wearing it in the center of your chest and bend down, unfortunately it does not always pick up what is happening. You cannot always trust the videos, which is another problem. All of us in law enforcement have no problem wearing these cameras.

Chairman Ellison:

I have been through the Firearms Training System (FATS) about ten times. It was a great process to go through. Is there any further testimony in opposition to the bill?

Stan Olsen, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:

I am representing the Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers (NAPSO) with 1,400 members throughout the state. We are opposed to this bill as written. We support the idea of cameras and have supported every one of the camera bills. One concern we have is the time limits because of the finances

involved. There are problems with the bill, many of which cannot be fixed. I do applaud Assemblywoman Shelton's effort.

These officers are not going out every day with the intent of shooting anyone. There are always two sides to the story. Granted, cameras can sometimes address those issues. I have been involved in three shootouts in my 36 years in law enforcement. With the exception of one, I was shot at first. In that situation, I was standing about three feet from the suspect, he pulled a gun, I pulled a gun, and I just happened to fire first. It was a split-second situation. The cameras may have picked up something on that incident, but the other two, they would not have.

Cameras are beneficial. They do clear more officers than they convict, which is a good thing. We support the idea of cameras, but we do not support the rest of this bill. Making the language enabling is a good way to go forward so we can be financially sound.

Michael Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association:

I was a state trooper with the Nevada Highway Patrol for 25 years. I am now retired. The Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association opposes this bill with regard to the issues of the liability insurance and the de-escalation training, only because of the huge financial impact. I am supportive of the body cameras. When a complaint is filed against an officer and the video can be seen, it is of great benefit.

As far as the training, I am for training all of our officers in these situations. However, dealing with emotionally disturbed people is a completely unpredictable science. The cost of that avenue is going to be astronomical. It is easy to say we need to learn to deal with and speak to folks better. I am a firm believer that you treat people how you would want to be treated if you were in their shoes. I follow that practice. However, like Mr. Olsen, I was also involved in three officer-involved shootings. Two of those incidents we were shot at first and we returned fire. Those are scary situations. When you have someone 15 feet away and someone else 7 feet away over the hood of a car trying to kill you, there are a lot of things that go through your mind in a short period of time. You think about your family, your friends, your life, why you are doing this, what you are doing, how you are going to get out of the situation, et cetera.

We are tasked to make these decisions in a split-second. It is tough to train people to make those kinds of decisions. It requires ongoing training. The Chairman mentioned the FATS program, which is a very valuable tool.

We do not use it all the time because it costs money. Simunition training is also a very valuable tool, but we do not use it all the time because it also costs money. The departments have implemented force-on-force training recently, which is amazing training for officers. When I look at where I was 25 years ago to where I ended up, training has come a long way. However, we have to look at what we are dealing with in society.

In Miami a couple of years ago, when the bath salts issue came up, a surveillance camera captured a man who was attacking another man on the causeway. He was literally consuming that other human being. An officer had to intervene. Those are the kinds of people we see. Are we trained to deal with people who are committing these types of horrific crimes? No, we are not. The financial impact on these agencies is going to be astronomical. Do we support the training? Absolutely. Do we support the body cameras? Absolutely. Regarding the liability insurance issue, I will echo what everyone else has said.

Chairman Ellison:

I believe we can address many of these issues with the amendments that will be proposed.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing City of Mesquite:

In the interest of brevity, we would like to associate ourselves with the testimony that has already been provided, particularly that of Mr. Callaway. I would like to remind the Committee, as I try to do on these sorts of bills, oftentimes the focus is the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, but these things do impact the smaller police departments in our state, as well.

Body cameras have been a priority for the City of Mesquite in their police department for some time. Roughly, 80 percent of our officers wear them, and 100 percent of our patrol officers wear them. We do believe it is a fantastic policy. The challenge is sometimes in the details.

As I sat listening to the testimony, it occurred to me that this might be an ideal scenario for an interim study to look at all of the surrounding issues. It is going to be very important to get the policy right for a lot of different reasons. Our concerns have been well articulated in the previous testimony, and we will associate ourselves with those.

Natasha Koch, Captain, Executive Officer, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:

We oppose the bill as written. As many of my counterparts have said, the Nevada Highway Patrol currently has in-car videos in all cars for lieutenant and

below. We understand the importance of video. The biggest concern for us, as Lieutenant Spratley said, is the storage. The storage for a body camera is much more than the storage for an in-car video, the reason being the new generation of body cameras are all high definition, which means the storage capacity required is much larger than for the in-car videos. It will be a huge fiscal impact for the state.

Chairman Ellison:

I know that will be the biggest concern, especially in the smaller counties. The presenter of this bill has addressed much of that. We are hoping to get into the details. We will try to work through this. I think the study was a good idea, and perhaps we can put that in the bill to address some of the issues in the future, as well. Any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.]

John Fudenberg, Assistant Coroner, Government Affairs, Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner, Clark County:

Clark County does support the concept of body cameras. However, there are portions of this bill we oppose. The first is the negative fiscal impact of approximately \$6.8 million for the first year. That \$6.8 million was calculated based on the initial purchase, information technology infrastructure, and the data storage, as mentioned in earlier testimony.

To explain how we arrived at that \$6.8 million, Clark County is responsible for 63 percent of Las Vegas Metro's budget. In addition to that, they are responsible for 100 percent of the budget for the detention facility. That \$6.8 million includes the 63 percent of Las Vegas Metro's budget and 100 percent of Las Vegas Metro's detention officers.

As Mr. Callaway indicated in his testimony in reference to section 4 and the liability insurance, I am not aware of any lawsuits that have come about where the agency was not also named. Clark County and Las Vegas Metro would still have to maintain liability insurance, even if the officers were mandated to obtain their own. This would not result in a cost savings when it comes to the liability insurance expenses.

The \$17 million liability fund mentioned by Mr. Shelton could not be used for the purchase of body cameras. That fund has a specific purpose, and we cannot use it to purchase equipment.

Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties:

We would like to echo the comments of law enforcement, as well as my colleague from Clark County, specifically in regard to the fiscal impact, as well as the provision for the requirement of the liability insurance.

If this bill includes a mandate, especially to implement immediately, there will be a significant fiscal impact to counties. In terms of prioritization of dollars for law enforcement, especially in the rural counties, there are counties who do not have a 911 system. As written, the bill's effective date is January 1, 2016. Counties are currently going through their budget process for 2015 and 2016. That process will be completed by the end of session. If this bill were enacted as written, counties would not have the opportunity to budget for this expense.

Tom Grady, representing City of Fallon:

I believe everyone agrees that body cameras would be beneficial in a perfect world. You have heard testimony from Clark County, and since 11 of the Committee members are from Clark County, keep in mind there are 16 other counties and 18 cities. If you read section 12 of this bill, it tells you this is not an unfunded mandate and the state is not responsible for it. I think you have heard almost every person testify that it is an unfunded mandate.

As Ms. Stapleton just mentioned, the starting date is January 2016. If we had the money and ordered the cameras today, they would probably not even be received by then because we are not the only state looking at this. There will be a large demand for the body cameras.

I hope you will look at what this is going to do as a mandate on the local governments and let us work into it as we go along. Do not place a date in the bill we know we cannot meet.

Tim Ross, President, Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association, and representing Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:

I would like to echo the sentiments of all who have spoken so far. I would like to briefly point out a couple of things. As seemingly normal people, we do not understand how some people can act the way they act sometimes. When I worked overtime in the jail, it was hard for me to believe that someone would dig in the toilet and eat their own poop. Unfortunately, these are the kinds of people we deal with. No, it is not all the time. Most citizens are wonderful people, and they are great to deal with. You never know what is going on in someone's head. Being normal people, as we all are, it is very difficult to see that. We understand the effect of simple drugs, such as Ambien and Xanax that are prescribed every day. We never know who we are talking to.

At the sheriff's office, we have crisis intervention training. One of the things I learned there was when I am talking to people, I do not know if I am the only voice they hear. It hit home with me on that point. Very shortly after I attended that training, I was in a situation where I was having a conversation with someone, but he was having three other conversations. You never know how that person is going to react.

With the current trend we are dealing with nationwide, the counties have been forced to institute ambush training. That is a sad state of affairs for law enforcement in general. These are concerns we have. It is difficult to understand why someone would want to cause you harm or even kill you just because of what you do for a living. Having laws like this and changing the way we view police officers is going to make it difficult for anyone to want to do the job. It will make it difficult administratively to hire, recruit, retain, and, quite frankly, get the best people we possibly can for the job.

I think the whole thing about liability insurance could not be more off base. The point that was made about timing and that we always have time to stop and think could not be more untrue. I do not know what is going to happen every time I get out of that vehicle or every time I approach someone.

I would also like to touch on the de-escalation training. If someone comes to me and asks me to turn my camera off, that immediately tells me it would be a good time to keep that camera on. We do have dashboard cameras in Washoe County, and I also carry an audio recorder. I have been asked by individuals if I am recording them. If the answer is yes, that is an immediate de-escalator, and we cannot forget the value of that.

As we have all said before, we are in favor of body cameras, but done with clear legislation.

Chairman Ellison:

We have one more testimony in Las Vegas from the Taxicab Authority of the Department of Business and Industry.

Tom Ely, Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, and representing Taxicab Authority, Department of Business and Industry:

We would not be immediately impacted by this bill as it does not require us to wear body cameras, but our agency has been seriously looking at wearing cameras. We believe it is a great idea. We are in support, just like the others, of having body cameras and car cameras at all times. However, this bill would impact us fiscally, which has been stated by the other testifiers.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There was none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] I will ask Assemblywoman Shelton to come back to the dais.

You have heard the issues that have been brought up. The effective date will be a problem. The fiscal note is also a problem. I would ask that you get that worked out and back to us so we can address it. If we can find a way to get a study in this bill to address future issues, I think that would be a good idea.

Assemblywoman Shelton:

I had forgotten to mention, there are two written testimonies that have been submitted to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). The first is from Lisa Mayo-DeRiso ([Exhibit E](#)) and the second is from Charles Schaer ([Exhibit F](#)).

We did a lot of research on this issue, so I do have Las Vegas Metro's Use of Force Policy if anyone is interested. They do have a little bit about de-escalation training in this policy, but it is only a small section. That is why we added the de-escalation training in the bill.

I think everyone who testified today agrees we need body cameras, and I think they agreed with the de-escalation training. I think the cost is the major point being opposed. I believe the money is there; we just need to be wise and find it for them.

I also want to point out there are currently three bills at the Legislature for body cameras: mine, Assemblyman Munford's, and Senator Ford's. Whichever one goes forward is going to be good for the community.

Chairman Ellison:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 403. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 363 and invite Assemblywoman Diaz to present the bill.

Assembly Bill 363: Provides an optional benefit to the surviving spouse of a deceased police officer or firefighter. (BDR 23-1056)

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11:

I put before you today for your consideration Assembly Bill 363. I would like you to take a moment and think about why we are all here. We do not usually give too much thought to it, especially in the day-to-day business we carry out for our state. We would all not be here if we did not have the support systems of our families. Our parents, our spouses, and our children are the motor

that keep us going. Thinking about family is the genesis of why A.B. 363 came about.

You may recall when two police officers recently lost their lives while in the line of duty. Those two police officers were in very different circumstances, and they both had families they were caring for and providing for. In these unusual and rare cases where a life is unfortunately lost while performing a service to our state, this bill gives the survivors a choice, especially if that public employee who died is not fully vested in the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS).

With me today, I have Rusty McAllister. He will walk you through this bill and expand on why we think it is important to give a spouse or survivor beneficiary a choice when the public employee has lost his life while rendering a service to our state, whether he is a schoolteacher, a firefighter, or a police officer.

Rusty McAllister, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

For purposes of disclosure, I am a board member for the Public Employees' Retirement Board, although I am not speaking on their behalf today.

As Assemblywoman Diaz said, currently PERS has a benefit, and has had for many years, that offers a surviving spouse of a public employee who was killed in the line of duty a portion of their retirement. The current formula used to calculate this benefit is difficult to understand and has some inherent problems. It does not provide the surviving spouse a livable amount of money. Under the current system, it is possible for the surviving spouse to be paid as little as \$450 per month.

This came to our attention from some members of the board and some members of leadership of some of our employee organizations after the assassination in 2014 of the two Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department officers while they were eating lunch.

If I could, I would like to give you two examples that will show you how the benefit would be paid to the surviving spouse of a public employee killed in the line of duty. These examples do not reflect any real-life event, but are merely to give you an idea. Under the current law, if a public employee is killed in the line of duty with less than ten years of service and was earning a monthly average compensation of \$6,900 per month, the surviving spouse would only receive \$450 per month. Under A.B. 363, assuming the same monthly compensation, the surviving spouse would receive approximately \$3,450, or half of the deceased employee's monthly compensation, because it would be more than the earned service credit in PERS.

The second example I would like to give you is a public employee killed in the line of duty with 13 years of service with an average monthly compensation of \$8,900 per month. Under current law, the surviving spouse would receive a benefit of approximately \$1,400 per month. Under A.B. 363, again assuming the same monthly compensation, the surviving spouse would receive approximately \$4,450, or half of the deceased employee's monthly compensation because it would be more than the earned service credit in PERS.

While doing research for this bill, we thought of the tragic event in Sparks during the fall of 2013. You may remember the brave and heroic schoolteacher who was shot and killed while saving the lives of countless others. This incident is another example of a Nevada public employee who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving the public. The life of a schoolteacher or snowplow driver is no less important than the life of a police officer or firefighter. We believe any public employee or member of PERS should have the same benefit.

We are thankful that Assemblywoman Diaz added language in the amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) for a survivor beneficiary. The way the bill was originally drafted, it would have only been for a spouse. Many of our employees are not married. Therefore, their children would only receive \$400 per month and would receive no other benefit to help take care of them if the member of the system were killed in the line of duty. The amendment clarifies that issue.

No amount of money could ever make up for the loss of a loved one, especially a child growing up without a mother or father, but the least we could do is make sure the family can continue with as normal a life as possible. The family of a public employee killed in the line of duty will face many obstacles to overcome as they pick up the pieces of their lives. This bill will help with the financial piece. For that reason, we ask the Committee and all members of the Nevada Legislature to support A.B. 363.

If you will indulge me for a few minutes, I will walk through the proposed mock-up amendment ([Exhibit G](#)).

Section 1, subsection 1, adds "or survivor beneficiary." The beneficiary named with PERS would be entitled to either 50 percent of the employee's salary or their earned benefit in PERS, whichever is greater. For those who have worked for an extended period of time with a longer benefit in PERS, their benefit would be greater than 50 percent of their salary. Essentially that is the crux of the bill; to improve the benefit for the survivors of a public employee killed in the line of duty.

Section 1, subsection 4, of the bill provides for the PERS Board to define by regulation "killed in the line of duty." This is so it can be limited to whatever the Board decides is an appropriate fashion, so as not to create too great of an impact to the system, but yet still provide a benefit for the employee's family. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Ellison:

In existing law, do the children not have a package?

Rusty McAllister:

Yes. Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 286.673, the child would receive \$400 per month.

Chairman Ellison:

Is that per child?

Rusty McAllister:

Yes, until the age of 23.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

For a person who retires normally and dies, does the spouse draw survivor benefits until his or her demise or until he or she remarries?

Rusty McAllister:

The spouse would receive a benefit until he or she is deceased. I do not believe there is any provision that removes the benefit if the spouse remarries.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

Thank you for correcting me. I was under the impression that under the normal system if a spouse remarries, he or she is no longer the spouse and, therefore, lost the benefit.

Rusty McAllister:

There were some workers' compensation laws in the past that dealt specifically with that issue. If a surviving spouse received a benefit due to a workers' compensation injury, the benefit is retained until he or she remarries. That was changed in statute in a previous session for police and fire, and more recently for regular employees. That only dealt with workers' compensation and not with PERS.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

Is this going to be amended to apply to all full-time public employees who are killed in the line of duty?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

That is correct. Our intention is to extend it to all Nevada public employees who are killed in the line of duty and are in PERS.

Rusty McAllister:

This bill would be prospective only, not retroactive.

Chairman Ellison:

Would this bill require a two-thirds vote on the floor? If you are changing it to anyone who was a state employee, would this not have a large fiscal note?

Rusty McAllister:

I will let PERS speak specifically to the cost. Their fiscal note was as the bill was originally drafted, which came back as minimal. In conversations with the Director of PERS, if we expanded it, it would cost even less because it expands the pool. Also, the risk factor decreases when it is not only police and fire and goes to all public employees. They can give you a better idea of what that would entail, but that is my understanding based on my conversations with PERS.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Do you have a ballpark figure as to how many people this may include each year?

Rusty McAllister:

There have been no firefighter fatalities in the last ten years that would qualify for this benefit. I was told there were approximately seven police officers who were killed in the line of duty in the last ten years. I am not positive about that number, but I will get the accurate information to you. I do not have the numbers if we were to expand it to all public employees. However, the number is very small.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I remember in 2006 a judge was shot while in his office in Reno. Fortunately, he was not killed, but it does speak to the fact that all public employees need this type of protection. With the amendment, does it cover all branches of government?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

It would.

Assemblywoman Neal:

My question is in regard to the amendment, section 2, subsection 4, and the strikeout language. The word "line" was struck out and replaced with "performance of his or her duty." In the PERS fiscal note, they indicated they would need to define when this language would apply. Have they explained to you what that process would be? I am assuming there is a trigger mechanism of when it would apply. In the PERS fiscal note on page 2, it states, "...the bill would require that the System Board define when the term 'killed in the line of duty' would apply." Yes, it is minimal because it is rare, but is the rarity still going to exist once this definition comes out?

Rusty McAllister:

I am trying to separate two hats with regard to my position on the PERS Board. In the past, when regulations were needed to be worked on for PERS, typically, the chairman of the Board would appoint a subcommittee to work with PERS staff to come up with language. They would research other states' policies that may already be in place for definitions; for example, "killed in the performance of duty." We would work with a subcommittee of three and PERS staff, and then come back with a recommendation for the full Board with a final definition of what that would be. It would then be put in PERS regulations.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I believe the reason for that language is to make sure the scope remains narrow. We do not want to open it up to everyone saying their spouse died while performing his job in order to be entitled to this benefit. It is supposed to be for those tragedies that may occur, whether the individual is a Department of Transportation employee picking up cones in the street and being run over or a police officer shot in the line of duty. God forbid we see any more casualties in the classroom. It is really meant to keep the scope limited versus someone just passing away while doing his job. We need to be careful in the language, otherwise it will have a tremendous fiscal impact, which is not the intent. It is truly to cover those who gave their lives in the performance of their duties, and whose families will live without them for the rest of their lives.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Has the language "performance of his or her duty" been used before, or has it always been "killed in the line of duty?"

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I believe we changed from "line of duty" to "performance of duty" because it no longer applies to only police officers and firefighters. We are expanding it to all public employees. A classroom teacher is really not in the line of duty when something tragic happens. There are so many jobs in the state that perhaps

"performance" would capture their role with the state. We could have PERS or legal counsel weigh in on that.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I can talk to you about this offline. I did sign on to this bill, but it was not until just this moment that I realized the different language. You said it is limited, but it seems if I was a teacher performing my duties and I was shot in the classroom, it would be in the line of duty. We hope that never happens, but it seems this encompasses many people.

In section 2, subsection 2, "dependent parent" was existing law. Does the dependent parent's benefit remain the same even though the child could potentially see an increase?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

Could you clarify that question?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Section 2, subsection 2, states, "'Dependent parent' means the surviving parent of a deceased member who was dependent upon the deceased member for at least 50 percent of the surviving parent's support for at least 6 months immediately preceding the death of the deceased member." Is what the dependent parent receives going to increase or stay the same? Is the child's benefit going to increase?

Rusty McAllister:

Perhaps PERS can give a better clarification than I can, but under the current statute, if a member of the system dies in the line of duty, a dependent parent does not receive a benefit unless they were named as a beneficiary with PERS. A dependent parent does not receive either the \$450 or the \$400. Does that answer your question?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Yes. I wanted to make sure it did not apply and we were not capturing multiple people. They have to be named as a beneficiary, so that does limit it even more.

Assemblyman Moore:

Instead of "line of duty," the amendment is "performance of duty." Based on that language, would a water meter reader or a teacher who happens to have a heart attack while working, be covered?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

It is not my intent to cover an instance where a public employee has a heart attack and dies while on the job. It has to be a situation where something out of the norm happens. For example, the shooting in the Sparks school that took the life of a teacher, the two police officers who were shot while having lunch, or a firefighter who may go into a burning building to rescue people and does not make it out. Those are the situations we are trying to capture in this bill—when a public employee acts as a hero in these types of circumstances and unfortunately loses his life while performing his job.

If the language does not sit well with the Committee and we need to give more clarity to this section, I am open to recommendations.

[Assemblyman Moore assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chairman Moore:

Are there any further questions? [There were none.] Is there any testimony in support of the bill?

Stan Olsen, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:

We stand in support of the bill. This actually started with Mrs. Beck, who spoke to me and to Sheriff Gillespie after her husband, Alyn Beck, was killed in a pizza parlor. Her concern was not only for herself, but also Mrs. Soldo, Igor Soldo's wife, who had an infant child and is only getting \$450 per month. It was a terrible event enacted by a couple of radicals. There was no way to prevent it and it was sad. This is a great bill.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada, and representing Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Nevada, Washoe School Principals' Association, and Washoe County Public Attorney's Association:

We stand in support of the amended portion of the bill for the reasons stated by Assemblywoman Diaz and Mr. McAllister. We believe it is time it was separated because of the issues you have already heard and the unfortunate events that took place.

In response to some of the questions on the performance of duty, it was obviously not in the line of duty for the Sparks school teacher to go to the rescue of that child, but he did. That is what we would consider performance of duty. Another example would be a flagman holding a flag on the highway and getting run over while performing his duty. We have heard the heart attack

issue come up before. I believe the performance of duties will be addressed by PERS when they make the regulations.

**Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department**

We are here in support of A.B. 363. To answer the question that was asked of Mr. McAllister earlier, we have had eight police officers killed in the line of duty since 2006.

Ryan Beaman, President, Union Local 1908, Clark County Firefighters:

We rise in support of A.B. 363. To answer Assemblyman Stewart's question, this would apply to one of our members who had 10 years of service and who left a wife and five children. Over 12 years, we have had only one member who would qualify.

**Michael Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers
Association:**

We support the amended portion of A.B. 363.

Vice Chairman Moore:

Is there any further testimony in support? [There was none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill?

**Priscilla Maloney, representing Local 4041, American Federation of State,
County and Municipal Employees:**

If this is even possible, we are in opposition with an explanation. We signed in in opposition to this bill before we had a chance to look at this amendment. I know you are pressed for time, but I would like to walk you through how American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) retirees come to their conclusions on a bill.

We have board meetings, we go through the bills carefully, the board votes on the positions, and then we post the positions on our website as public. We met on March 20, 2015. At that time, we had six PERS bills already in play, three of which affected benefits. You heard our testimony on what we considered a very destructive bill, Assembly Bill 190. Three of the bills were more administrative, the others were housekeeping bills, and Senate Bill 69, which was heard this morning.

One of the things our board does is we consider very strongly the Public Employees' Retirement Board's position on a bill. The PERS Board met on March 18, 2015, and has not yet had the opportunity to vote on the bills that were dropped that week. Therefore, we do not have a position on this bill, nor on the other bills dropped in the week of March 16, 2015.

We are trying to be consistent with our policies and procedures within our board's assessment of these bills. I have discussed this with the sponsor of the bill. I certainly appreciate that the amendment extends this bill beyond police and fire. To be consistent and have some integrity in our internal process when we analyze a bill, whether a benefit goes up or down, we have to have a thorough discussion and a vote. We are not meeting again until April 10, 2015. That may seem like we are trying to dodge, but we are also trying to fight for integrity, transparency, and consistency.

I certainly appreciate the policy arguments, and no one would be against something that might enhance the lives of the survivors of these tragedies. Currently, our public position is opposed. However, I will take this amendment back to the board. I did speak to our executive director yesterday, and my suggestion was supported that we be transparent with this Committee about what our process is, but we have to take it to a full board vote.

For the record, I said the same thing on S.B. 69 this morning. That committee has a benefit that this Committee does not have. That bill is exempt, so it is meaningful if we get a position and give it to that committee. Unfortunately, things are just moving that way this session, where we now have a total of 12 PERS bills, 6 of which all have to do with benefits. Tomorrow we will hear Senator Roberson's bill, Senate Bill 406, which has some of this bill's language in it.

I will certainly entertain any questions, or grilling if it is appropriate, on the position we are taking this morning. Again, it is not about the underlying policy of this bill, it is trying to put this all together in a coherent legislative program for this particular session.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

A number of agencies or groups have testified as neutral to bills if their board has not met and they do not have an official position.

Priscilla Maloney:

Because of the number of PERS bills and the repetition with which they were presented in the last seven weeks, we literally laid them all on the table and discussed the interplay between the different sections of each bill. I have to double check my numbers, but at rough count, we have something close to 30 proposed statutory changes between all of these bills. Each statute needs to be analyzed by our board. The public perception that came up in yesterday's hearings is part of our guiding force. We have not had an actuarial assessment on this bill, which was part of the consideration with all 12 bills.

[Assemblyman Ellison reassumed the Chair.]

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I am not sure if this question should be for you, but I am wondering about these particular benefits, which are well deserved. How do they interact with the existing workers' compensation laws? Secondly, my concern is we are changing killed in the line of duty to something less traumatic. In my 35 years working in government services, which involved a considerable amount of time with police and fire, I was only involved in one on-the-job death case. It involved a gardener who was bitten by a brown recluse spider. It took him 1 1/2 years to die, but he absolutely died from that bite on the job. I would want people in that type of situation to have the benefit of this provision. Maybe some tweaking of the language about eligibility would be required.

Priscilla Maloney:

My first three years in Nevada were spent at the Office of the Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers, Department of Business and Industry, as a legal researcher. That did come to mind when I was looking at the original bill and the amendment. Even with that background, I do not think I am the person to answer that question. It may be that PERS could address that. Traditionally, the legal standard was something along the lines of a death arising in the course and scope of employment.

Chairman Ellison:

Any further testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral to the bill?

Tina Leiss, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System:

The Public Employees' Retirement Board has not had an opportunity to review this bill and take a position. At this point, we are testifying in the neutral position. I will tell you, however, that the Board does have, as part of its funding policy, a position that it will not consider benefit improvements unless and until the system is 85 percent funded. We are not 85 percent funded at this time. There is an exception to that policy, if there is careful and thoughtful analysis as to how the benefit improvement would be paid for.

Chairman Ellison:

How long do you think it will be before the system is 85 percent funded?

Tina Leiss:

Many factors go into the calculation of when we would be 85 percent funded. This bill, as written, only applied to police and fire, which is slightly better

funded than the regular fund. On a market value basis, we are approximately 76 percent funded. It would be a few years down the road before we would be 85 percent funded. Part of why we are in good shape and marching deliberately and purposefully toward the funding goal is because we adhere to a very sound funding policy. With that being said, the policy does allow the Board to not actively oppose a benefit improvement if the costs are accounted for.

Generally, the Board would oppose benefit improvements until we are at least 85 percent funded. With that being said, when we valued the cost of this bill, we made a couple of assumptions. First of all, this was valued when it only applied to the police and fire fund. We received statistics that I think are better kept with police and fire than what we would have on the regular employees. We valued it based on an average of one killed in the line of duty death per year. That has been the average over the last ten years. Clearly, last year you would have seen more than one killed in the line of duty. We do not have accurate statistics for regular employees killed in the line of duty, and we have not valued what that would cost at this point. However, in the regular fund portion, you are spreading the cost over about 90,000 people versus police and fire, where it is spread over about 11,000 people. We have not had a chance to value the amendment. However, I do believe the actuary would value those as a low cost. Currently, the cost is valued for police and fire as 0.02 percent of payroll, which equates to about \$170,000 per year. The way our contribution rate mechanism works, 0.02 percent of payroll would not trigger a contribution rate increase. Therefore, if this were enacted as drafted, it would not trigger a contribution rate increase in the coming biennium. However, I cannot tell you that PERS paying out more money to certain people would not cost anything, because it clearly would. We value it as a percentage of payroll, and at this point, the percentage of payroll is minimal compared to the size of the system as a whole.

This cost was valued based on a pretty restrictive definition of killed in the line of duty. I believe the statistics we were given would apply to those who were perhaps shot and died the same day, not as Assemblyman Trowbridge talked about. I do not believe we would have considered being bit by a spider and dying a year-and-a-half later. That is a much different conversation, so the cost would be dependent upon how many people to whom this would apply.

Currently, our survivor benefits are an earned benefit because this is a retirement system. The survivor benefits in place are based on what the member has actually earned in service. I think that also goes to a question that was asked earlier, again by Assemblyman Trowbridge. I think a policy question for this Committee is if this is an appropriate benefit to be paid, is it appropriate

to be paid through the retirement system or through some other form of workers' compensation benefit?

Those are a couple of the issues we have identified, and I bring those forward for your consideration.

I would like to mention that as drafted, we would apply this only for those deaths that happened on or after the date of this legislation. Therefore, we would not increase benefits for those who are currently receiving benefits based on members who were killed prior to the effective date of this benefit. That would also increase the cost more than we have valued in our fiscal note. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Ellison:

When does the Board meet next?

Tina Leiss:

The Board's next meeting would be the third Wednesday in April. By policy, I do have some authority as the Executive Officer to appear before you and testify as to what I believe the probable position would be. We also have the option of scheduling, with a three-day notice under the Open Meeting Law, a telephone meeting of the Board if we feel we need to consider and take positions sooner than late April.

Chairman Ellison:

The reason I ask is because we have had two or three bills where PERS chose to testify in neutral. It would have been nice if we had known where PERS stood on those bills. Our deadline is April 10, 2015.

Tina Leiss:

I can confer with the chair of the Board and we could attempt a telephone meeting with adequate Open Meeting Law notice to take a position.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there any further testimony as neutral to the bill? [There was none.]

Assemblywoman Diaz, do you have any closing comments?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I hope we can earn your support making A.B. 363 a reality. I would love to see us at least take care of the spouses and families of those who pay the ultimate price for the good of our state.

Chairman Ellison:

I have been approached about another amendment, and once I have that information, I will let you know. We can address that right away and get the bill moving.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

I would appreciate you keeping me informed.

Chairman Ellison:

Is there any further discussion? [There was none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 363. Is there anyone here for public comment? [There was no one.] The meeting is adjourned [at 10:56 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lori McCleary
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman John Ellison, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: March 31, 2015

Time of Meeting: 8:09 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 403	C	Assemblywoman Shelton	Written testimony
A.B. 403	D	William B. Scott, Scott Systems LLC	Written testimony
A.B. 403	E	Lisa Mayo-DeRiso, Private Citizen	Written testimony
A.B. 403	F	Charles Schaer, Private Citizen	Written testimony
A.B.363	G	Assemblywoman Diaz	Mock-up Proposed Amendment