

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
May 27, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Ben Kieckhefer at 8:05 a.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Chair
Senator Michael Roberson, Vice Chair
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Mark A. Lipparelli
Senator David R. Parks
Senator Joyce Woodhouse

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Debbie Smith (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Kelvin D. Atkinson, Senatorial District No. 4
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senatorial District No. 11
Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1
Assemblyman James Oscarson, Assembly District No. 12

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Lona Domenici, Committee Manager
Emily Cervi, Committee Assistant
Cynthia Clampitt, Committee Secretary
Trish O'Flinn, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Vanessa Spinazola, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Lieutenant Eric Spratley, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Mike Cathcart, City of Henderson
Bob Roshak, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Captain Natasha Koch, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Jeff Fontaine, Nevada Association of Counties
Mary Walker, Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County and Storey County
Wes Anderson, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families
Ron Dreher, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada
Constance Brooks, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Shannon Chambers, Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner,
Department of Business and Industry
Gustavo Nuñez, P.E., Administrator, State Public Works Division, Department of
Administration
Louis Louprias, Coordinator, Southern Nevada Operating Engineers
Trish Geran, F Street Coalition
Randy Soltero, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Jack Mallory, Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council
Archie Walden, Southern Nevada Laborers Training Trust
Tiffany Tyler, Ph.D., Nevada Partners, Inc.
Brian Reeder, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors
Sean Stewart, Nevada Contractors Association; Associated General
Contractors, Las Vegas 31A
Pat Sanderson, Laborers International Union Local 872

Chair Kieckhefer:

We will start with Senate Bill (S.B.) 111.

SENATE BILL 111 (1st Reprint): Provides for the use of portable event recording devices by peace officers. (BDR 23-618)

Senator Aaron D. Ford (Senatorial District No. 11):

Earlier this year, a Salt Lake City police officer investigating a suspicious vehicle at a convenience store shot a man. Both officers originally on the scene were wearing body cameras which recorded the entire interaction between police and the man ultimately shot. Having the benefit of the video from the body cameras, the Salt Lake City District Attorney was able to determine the shooting was justifiable. In New Mexico, by contrast, a state District Attorney announced in January that two Albuquerque police officers will face murder charges for the 2014 killing of a 38-year-old homeless man known to be mentally ill. The man was illegally camping in the foothills outside of Albuquerque when the police approached him. Video footage, captured by the police body cameras, showed that the culmination of the hours-long standoff between police and the man ended in a murder. In Salt Lake City, body camera videos absolved police of wrongdoing. In Albuquerque, it resulted in the prosecution of the police officers. When there is an interaction between police and the public, sometimes altercations occur. The use of body cameras by the police can aid in determining what happened in the interactions.

Shootings are not the only incidents of interest captured by body cameras. The capturing of evidence is only one beneficial output of body cameras. In December 2014, researchers from the University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology published results from a study they conducted in Rialto, California on policing with body cameras. The experiment showed that the technology itself may be the most important factor in preventing escalation during public interactions with the police. Whether a potential escalation is abusive behavior toward police or unnecessary use of force by police, the knowledge that events are being recorded creates self-awareness in all participants. The study found that the use of force by police using body cameras decreased.

I will refer to the document titled "Mock-up Proposed Amendment 7275 to Senate Bill No. 111 First Reprint" ([Exhibit C](#)) while explaining the proposed amendment. Section 1 of S.B. 111 requires the adoption of policies and procedures governing the use of portable event recording devices. Once the required policies are adopted, section 1 provides that each of these agencies must require its officers to wear a body camera while on duty. Most of the remaining sections of the bill provide exceptions for police body cameras from various provisions of existing law. For example, chapter 179 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* imposes limitations on the interception of certain communications, including oral communications, through an electronic,

mechanical or other device. Section 2, subsection 3 of S.B. 111 excludes police wearing body cameras from the definition of electronic, mechanical or other devices, making these provisions inapplicable to the use of body cameras. Other provisions of existing law make it a misdemeanor to engage in surreptitious electronic surveillance on State property, at a public school or on a campus of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) without the knowledge of the person being observed. Sections 3, 4 and 5 of S.B. 111 provide an exception to these provisions for the use of body cameras by peace officers in accordance with section 1.

Sections 7 through 10 are definitional sections that incorporate the necessary definitions from existing law relating to local sales and use tax. Section 7 authorizes the board of county commissioners of any county, by 2/3 majority vote, to enact an ordinance imposing a local sales and use tax of 1/8 of \$0.01 to provide money to law enforcement agencies in the county for the purchase and maintenance of body cameras and the storage of the records made. The board of county commissioners is required to hold a public hearing before enacting the ordinance. If the board enacts the ordinance and imposes the tax, the proceeds from the tax must be allocated among the law enforcement agencies in the county in proportion to the percentage of the population of the county served by such agencies.

Section 13 requires law enforcement agencies in the county to use the proceeds of the tax only to carry out the purposes of S.B. 111 and not for any other purpose. A board of county commissioners may enact the local ordinance authorized by section 7 on or after January 1, 2017, but must do so before December 31, 2017. The tax may not be collected after June 30, 2022, unless the Legislature authorizes continuation of the tax.

Section 15 requires a board of county commissioners that has enacted the ordinance and imposed the tax to provide quarterly and annual reports to the Department of Taxation concerning total proceeds of the tax received by the law enforcement agencies in the county. The report must contain a detailed description of the use of proceeds, including the total expenditures made by each law enforcement agency and a detailed analysis of the manner in which the expenditure complies with requirements of S.B. 111. The Department of Taxation is required to provide copies of the annual reports to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Legislature or the Legislative Commission.

Sections 16 and 17 are administrative provisions specifying how the Department of Taxation is required to handle the proceeds of any fees, interests and penalties received from the taxes imposed under section 11. Section 18 requires the county treasurer to distribute the proceeds received from the Department of Taxation to the appropriate accounts of the law enforcement agencies of the county. Section 19 sets forth requirements for the deposit of the money received by any city treasurer from the county treasurer. Proposed Amendment 7275 would become effective upon passage and approval for administrative purposes, including for the purpose of adopting the ordinance authorized by section 11, and on July 1, 2017, for all other purposes. The proposed amendment would sunset on June 30, 2022, unless the Legislature authorizes its continuation.

The amendment was brought in response to legitimate concerns raised about the cost of body cameras. At the Senate Committee on Government Affairs hearing, there was very little opposition to the bill. Most police agencies understand the need for and the benefit of body cameras for their officers. There appears to be more opposition today. However, body cameras work: they save lives and they save jobs. This is an important issue facing our Nation. Proposed Amendment 7275 authorizes a method through which body cameras can be paid for.

Senator Roberson:

Does this amendment change the amounts on the fiscal notes?

Senator Ford:

I do not think so. I asked for the fiscal notes to address the costs.

Senator Roberson:

What is the total amount of the fiscal notes?

Senator Ford:

The total, exclusive of the Department of Public Safety (DPS) amount, is approximately \$9 million. All but three counties could raise the sales tax and cover the associated expenses.

Senator Roberson:

Is this enabling legislation for the local municipalities?

Senator Ford:

Yes, that is correct. I have spoken with Clark County Commissioners who have indicated they will be supportive of this particular tax.

Senator Roberson:

I find that interesting given that they were provided the ability to hire more police officers last Session and were unable to get enough votes to do so.

Senator Ford:

The distinction they made is that body cameras are not more police.

Senator Roberson:

I have constituents who would like more police officers.

Chair Kieckhefer:

How can the total fiscal impact be \$9 million when the fiscal note submitted by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) is \$9.1 million the first year?

Senator Ford:

I believe the fiscal note you are referring to is on the first version of the bill. They submitted a second fiscal note after the amendment was submitted.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Both the original and the first reprint require all officers to wear a body camera. How is the fiscal note reduced?

Senator Ford:

The original version of S.B. 111 did not make the distinction that officers who interact with the public are required to wear body cameras as opposed to those who do not have routine interactions with the public.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I understand you have received information from Clark County indicating that their Board is willing to pass a sales tax increase, but I do not believe that the Washoe County Commission would agree. If the Board of County Commissioners refuses to enact the sales tax increase, are they still required to fund the body cameras?

Senator Ford:

Yes, it is a mandatory program.

Chair Kieckhefer:

How will that work in a city without the ability to raise a tax?

Senator Ford:

I do not know. This amendment provides an opportunity to create a method for payment, which was the primary concern raised by law enforcement agencies when S.B. 111 was first presented. I have worked with various law enforcement agencies, the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities and the Nevada Association of Counties trying to determine a funding source. This is the only option we have been able to find outside of the State funding it outright. That does not undermine the necessity for the program.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is any recording made by the cameras a public record?

Senator Ford:

There are exceptions to the utilizations of the recordings, but, yes, they are public records.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Will there be an exception if it is part of a police investigation as most other evidence is?

Senator Ford:

That is accurate. The law enforcement agencies will be required to create policies. The utility and usage of public records would be confined to how they are required to operate within the bill.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Does this apply to kindergarten through Grade 12 (K-12) police departments?

Senator Ford:

Yes.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I do not see K-12 police listed under law enforcement agencies.

Senator Ford:

The definition of department requires it.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I see NSHE, but I do not see K-12.

Senator Ford:

It was the intent to include K-12.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any testimony in support of S.B. 111?

Vanessa Spinazola (American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

Senate Bill 111 represents a balance between protecting individuals and privacy as well as holding police accountable. Body cameras can serve to exonerate police and save millions of dollars in a lawsuit. My understanding is the vast majority of the cost comes from storage. I encourage a fiscal breakdown between the cost of the system and the cost of storage. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) would advocate for less storage of the information because we do not want it available and held by the government for an excessive period of time. The ACLU is in support of the bill.

Chair Kieckhefer:

It is a public record that is subject to retention requirements.

Ms. Spinazola:

The bill states the recordings must be maintained for a minimum of 15 days. The policies the ACLU hopes will be enacted would indicate how long law enforcement agencies would be keeping the videos. Unless there was a specific incident of consequence, there would be no reason to maintain the video for an excessive period of time. I do not think the period for retaining these types of items is more than 30 days.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any additional testimony in support of S.B. 111? Is there any testimony in opposition to S.B. 111?

Chuck Callaway (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I testified in support of the policy in the Government Affairs Committee, but I am opposed to the bill as an unfunded mandate on the LVMPD. We support the use of body cameras and have been working towards implementing them since 2011. We currently have 200 officers wearing body cameras involved in a pilot program and have budgeted for almost 500 cameras for the next fiscal year at a cost of approximately \$800,000. It is not merely purchasing the camera, but there is docking equipment, data storage, contracts and licensing fees. There are also public information requests for video footage which require resources for response and redaction. The LVMPD recently established a video and project management bureau in our agency whose sole focus is the body cameras and storage.

Under the current “more cops” tax approved by voters in 2004, body cameras can be purchased as part of equipment for officers. Rather than relying on the Las Vegas County Commission, which has refused to implement the second half of the sales tax to hire more police, this Body should implement it.

Lieutenant Eric Spratley (Washoe County Sheriff’s Office):

We should identify the real problem and spend money on that issue by adequately funding Police Officers Standards and Training so we maintain the culture of police who interact appropriately with the citizens they serve. Poor officer behavior is a training issue. The greatest cuts in the Great Recession were to training budgets in police agencies. It appears the effects of poor training might be evidenced nationally, but is it occurring in Nevada? Mandating body cameras is like trying to put a Band-Aid on cancer; it is a systemic problem that should be addressed on the inside through training.

To the extent allowed by law, forfeiture funds or any other funds are better spent on training officers and addressing problems on the inside before they grow and become external issues. We have never been directed to use forfeiture funds or general funds to cover costs associated with mandates such as this for equipment. This would not work for small organizations, since funds are not guaranteed. The Washoe County Sheriff’s Office (WCSO) is not in favor of using forfeiture or our general funds to pay for body cameras. It is a technology that is too new. We support the idea of body cameras. We have been creating a team with other regional law enforcement agencies to make sure we choose the appropriate system for the region. Mandating the purchase of body cameras is

putting the cart before the horse and looking for a solution when we have not identified a problem.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Does the WCSO currently have any body cameras deployed?

Lieutenant Spratley:

We do not. The providers cannot get them to us to test.

Mike Cathcart (City of Henderson):

The City of Henderson proposed an amendment moving the date of implementation to July 1, 2017. That was included in Proposed Amendment 7275. That is important to the City of Henderson because we spent over \$1 million in federal funds to implement dashboard cameras to all vehicles on patrol. The company we are working with does not have a suitable body camera that will work with their dashboard cameras. We do not need two systems. The City of Henderson also has concerns about a funding mechanism we cannot participate in.

Bob Roshak (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

The rural counties have concerns about the ability to pay for this. The Pershing County Sheriff's Office indicated they would have to lay off two officers if they had to implement this now. Some of the agencies have dashboard cameras, but they do not have the technology to link these to the body cameras. Initial discussions about using forfeiture funds as a payment source were not satisfactory. Eureka County indicated they receive approximately \$500 annually from this source. We support the concept. We just do not have enough information or funding to implement it at this time.

Captain Natasha Koch (Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety):

The Nevada Highway Patrol has dashboard cameras in all of our patrol vehicles. We are concerned that we will lose the in-car video if the body cameras are mandated because we cannot afford both. We are working with the company that provided the dashboard cameras, but they do not have body cameras at this time. We do not need two systems.

Jeff Fontaine (Nevada Association of Counties):

We support the use of body cameras, but this is an unfunded mandate that would cost \$6.5 million to start up and \$3 million each biennium thereafter.

Enabling counties to raise sales taxes is still an unfunded mandate. The equipment is expensive and there are fixed costs that would have a disproportionate impact on many of the smaller counties.

Mary Walker (Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County and Storey County):

We support the policy. We do not support the costs. The cost to implement body cameras in Carson City and Douglas and Lyon Counties is \$500,000 over the biennium, per county. The Lyon County Sheriff's Office will have to lay off staff if this is mandated. Additionally, it is not typically rural communities where these altercations occur.

Wes Anderson (Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

We support the policy, but not the cost.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any further testimony in opposition to S.B. 111? Is there any neutral testimony on S.B. 111?

Janine Hansen (Nevada Families):

I testified in favor of S.B. 111 in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. In Rialto, California, a year-long study found that the use of body cameras reduced citizen complaints by 80 percent. However, I am concerned about the funding mechanism. It is important to find ways to improve relationships between law enforcement and citizens. In 2004, I was arrested while gathering signatures on a petition at the Reno bus station. I spent 7 hours in jail. I was exonerated both at the municipal court level and at the Supreme Court. The system worked for me. I recently was stopped for speeding in Lyon County and when I asked to read the back of the ticket before signing it, I was threatened with arrest. I signed the ticket, but subsequently filed a complaint. However, there are many people whose relationships with the police may be improved if the officers are wearing body cameras. The LVMPD found that citizen complaints were reduced when they used body cameras. This policy is important. But, I am concerned about the funding mechanism, especially unfunded mandates.

Ron Dreher (Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada):

We are in support of the policy, but we are concerned about the unfunded mandate. Police officers are under attack everywhere; body cameras will help. The WCSO does not have body cameras, but they do have dashboard cameras

and microphones that record encounters when emergency lights are turned on. The technology to blend the dashboard cameras and the body cameras is still being developed. The due process issues in S.B. 111 will generate fiscal impacts because of public information requests and storage requirements. There are also concerns about protecting investigatory processes and the protection of witnesses.

Constance Brooks, Ph.D. (Vice Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education):

We testified neutral on this measure in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs hearing. We support the policy, but we are concerned about the funding mechanism. The University of Nevada, Reno campus police use body cameras, but NSHE is struggling to fund further implementation at its other campuses.

Craig Stevens (Clark County School District):

The Clark County School District employs over 150 police officers. We are neutral with respect to S.B. 111.

Lindsay Anderson (Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District has 38 police officers. We are using federal grant funds for a pilot program with body cameras. There are privacy issues regarding filming interactions with minors. We support the police, but also have concerns about funding.

Senator Roberson:

I thought that S.B. 111 was enabling legislation, but I hear concerns that funding may be inadequate or nonexistent. I understand the policy rationale. Absent a 2/3 vote of a particular county board for a sales tax increase, there is no funding mechanism for the purchase of body cameras. Would the municipalities still be required to fund it?

Senator Ford:

Yes.

Senator Roberson:

My fear is that this legislation would result in fewer police in many locations.

Senator Ford:

This is the only funding mechanism we have been able to identify short of the State funding it completely. However, we know there are improper interactions

between police and citizens. Originally, the bill was only for Washoe County and Clark County. The rural counties were included because the use of body cameras can have a mitigating effect on the severity of altercations wherever they are used.

This bill is focused on body cameras. It is not focused on how many police officers are employed in a particular location. I have attempted to include all stakeholders in the discussions about S.B. 111 and its funding. No other funding mechanisms were suggested.

Senator Roberson:

I do not quarrel with the policy. I am concerned the counties will not approve the sales tax. If police departments are required to implement this without funding, the net effect will be fewer police officers on the streets.

Senator Ford:

You might be right. The State should fund it, but, there is no money to do so.

Senator Goicoechea:

How will DPS obtain funding for this program? Is there a mechanism that allows the State to receive a portion of the sales tax if it is imposed in a county?

Senator Ford:

There is a separate discussion regarding the funding mechanism for DPS.

Senator Goicoechea:

Will the school districts and NSHE have access to a portion of the sales tax?

Senator Ford:

Using Clark County as an example, if they were to enact the sales tax, every law enforcement agency within their jurisdiction would receive an allocation based on the percentage of the County's population it served.

Senator Goicoechea:

Great Basin Community College extends across five jurisdictions. How would that be allocated?

Senator Ford:

That would be on a proportionate basis per jurisdiction.

Senator Goicoechea:

I support the concept. I hope the technology catches up. I do not support unfunded mandates.

Chair Kieckhefer:

The DPS portion would be a Highway Fund appropriation. We will close the hearing on S.B. 111. We will open the hearing on S.B. 371.

SENATE BILL 371 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the use of apprentices on public works. (BDR 53-671)

Kelvin D. Atkinson (Senatorial District No. 4):

Construction jobs are rebounding, but many of the older workers in the industry are nearing retirement and it is important to train new workers to replace them. Apprenticeship is one of the oldest methods of training workers. Individuals earn while they learn to become highly skilled workers. Apprenticeships are a combination of on-the-job training and related classroom instruction in which workers learn the practical and theoretical aspects of a highly skilled occupation. If we do not have a trained workforce, we may not be able to fill future vacancies.

Senate Bill 371, as amended, requires apprentices to perform 10 percent of all labor hours worked on public works projects worth over \$1 million and State transportation projects worth over \$2 million. The fiscal issues raised by the Department of Administration's State Public Works Division relating to full-time equivalent (FTE) positions are not completely resolved. The Division states two FTEs would be necessary to oversee the program, while I think one FTE would be sufficient.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there currently a minimum requirement for the use of apprentice hours?

Senator Atkinson:

No.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I would like to hear from the agencies that submitted fiscal notes.

Shannon Chambers (Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry):

The amended bill increases from 30 to 90 days the time the State Apprenticeship Council has to act on the request for labor. Therefore, we can withdraw our fiscal note.

Gustavo Nuñez, P.E. (Administrator, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration):

The Division has reduced its fiscal note to include one FTE rather than two after discussions with Senator Atkinson. We currently have one person on staff tasked with contract compliance including monitoring prevailing wage compliance, hearings and appeals as well as bonding and insurance requirements and the bidders' prequalification process. This individual cannot be tasked with more duties. The new FTE will initially be responsible for filing waivers for projects. People have not been entering the apprenticeship programs because of the lack of work through the Great Recession. Initially, we will be asking for waivers. Relationships with the apprenticeship programs will have to be built. At least 120 days before projects can be bid, a report must be completed and filed with the Business and Industry's Office of the Labor Commissioner requesting the waivers.

There are currently three construction management at-risk (CMAR) projects that may be affected. Contracts for preconstruction services have been signed. The contracts including the guaranteed maximum price for these CMARs will be executed after S.B. 371 takes effect. Most likely, the additional administration required to implement this will require additional funds. We did not submit a fiscal note for this because we anticipate the construction contingency carried on all projects will cover it.

I do not want to appear negative. Apprenticeship programs are very important. There will be an increased need for trained labor.

Chair Kieckhefer:

What classification of employee is included in your fiscal note?

Mr. Nuñez:

This would be a program officer I.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there anyone here to testify in support of S.B. 371?

Louis Loupias (Coordinator, Southern Nevada Operating Engineers):

Currently, there are apprentices who have been on waiting lists up to 2 years without the opportunity to get into the field and work. This bill will allow a tremendous amount of movement for those already waiting and strengthen the existing apprenticeship programs. In addition, it costs less to hire an apprentice than a journey worker. Nevada will begin to have skilled workers.

Trish Geran (F Street Coalition):

I have seen construction workers who have been on apprenticeship lists and never called. This bill gives workers the opportunity to learn a skilled trade and improve their lives.

Randy Soltero (Nevada State AFL-CIO):

We support S.B. 371. Construction is coming back. There are a lot of people in Nevada who will need and utilize the apprenticeship program. Although there is a fiscal impact and the need for a staff person to monitor compliance, the AFL-CIO believes the benefits to the State and workers is great.

Jack Mallory (Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council):

There may be a number of waivers submitted in the early months of implementation, but it is good policy. In 1981, awarding bodies were charged with creating their own compliance programs for prevailing wage jobs. This involves verifying payroll reports and that the contractors do not exceed the allowable ratio of apprentices to journey workers, which is 3:1. If there are more than three apprentices to each journey worker, the contractor can be cited by the Labor Commissioner's Office. This work is already being done. If a company requests a waiver of the 10 percent requirement, the burden of proof is theirs. The waiver request is routed through the State Apprenticeship Council.

Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman (Senatorial District No. 1):

I support S.B. 371. Over the last 18 months, I chaired the Council of State Governments' Subcommittee on Military and Veterans' Concerns. One of the issues studied was how the men and women of our military could use the skill sets acquired in service once they returned home. This bill provides opportunities for Nevada veterans.

Archie Walden (Southern Nevada Laborers Training Trust):

I disagree with the need for a ramp-up time for this program. There are apprentices on waiting lists ready to go to work. There are also many who are waiting to be admitted to the next program at any moment. I have 70 apprentices on a list now. This bill will increase the trained workforce and decrease the injuries suffered on the job.

Tiffany Tyler, Ph.D. (Nevada Partners, Inc.):

We support S.B. 371. Considering the fiscal note, one FTE is not that much compared to the return on earned wages that results from these types of training opportunities. At the height of our economy, we were able to support a broad range of populations including veterans, former offenders and at-risk young adults. Creating programs that direct people to work rather than to dependence on welfare or crime is worth the cost of a staff person to monitor the program.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any testimony in opposition to S.B. 371?

Brian Reeder (Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors):

We see some challenges. The industry is still in recovery mode. This is a craft-by-craft issue; there are not apprentice programs in each part of the State in each craft. It is also a big versus small issue. The impact could be especially hard on small contractors with very few employees.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Did you provide opposition testimony in the policy hearing as well?

Mr. Reeder:

No, we did not.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any further opposition testimony? Is there any neutral testimony regarding S.B. 371?

Sean Stewart (Nevada Contractors Association; Associated General Contractors, Las Vegas 31A):

We support apprenticeship programs. We are an aging industry in need of workers. Apprenticeship programs are a great asset. Our concern regarding

S.B. 371 is the percentage amount. The 10 percent threshold will be difficult to achieve immediately. Currently, our contractors who are actively employing apprentices are at about the 5 percent level. The timing is also problematic: the 90-day approval for waivers may delay projects already in process.

Pat Sanderson (Laborers International Union Local 872):

During the Great Recession, many journeymen left the State because they could not find work. There are two ways to learn a job: on-the-job and as an apprentice. I hope a compromise can be worked out. There is a great need for new workers.

Senator Atkinson:

The bill is needed. I am surprised to hear the opposition, considering everyone in the industry knows the workforce is diminishing due to the age of the workers. There are a number of construction and highway projects that will be started as a result of legislation this Session. Supporting the apprenticeship programs in the State will be beneficial to the workers and the economy of Nevada.

Chair Kieckhefer:

This is an issue that is critical to the future of the State. We will close the hearing on S.B. 371.

We will recess the hearing at 9:32 a.m. until the call of the Chair.

The Senate Committee on Finance will come back to order at 3:41 p.m. I will entertain a motion regarding S.B. 321.

SENATE BILL 321 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning real property.
(BDR 9-728)

SENATOR ROBERSON MOVED TO REREFER S.B. 321 TO THE FLOOR WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

SENATOR LIPPARELLI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2015
Page 19

Chair Kieckhefer:

As there is no further business to come before this Committee, we will adjourn at 3:42 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Trish O'Flinn,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
S.B. 111	C	11	Senator Aaron D. Ford	Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7275 to Senate Bill 111 First Reprint