

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 11, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 8:36 a.m. on Thursday, May 11, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Chris Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblyman Jim Marchant
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11
Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel
Isabel Youngs, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeffrey Schub, Executive Director, Coalition for Green Capital, New York City, New York
Jennifer Taylor, Executive Director, Clean Energy Project
Rusty McAllister, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Leonard B. Jackson, Associate Minister, First African Methodist Episcopal Church of Las Vegas; and Director, Faith Organizing Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada
Naomi Lewis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Rodrigo Gonzalez, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada, League of Conservation Voters
Maria-Teresa Liebermann, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress
Jerry Holliday, President, The Uplift Foundation of Nevada
Kathy Lauckner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jennifer J. Gaynor, representing Nevada Credit Union League
Phyllis Gurgevich, President, Nevada Bankers Association
Javier Trujillo, Director of Public Affairs, City of Henderson
Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Intergovernmental Services, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Warren B. Hardy II, representing City of Mesquite; and Mesquite Police Department
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Patrick Moers, Police Chief, City of Henderson Police Department
William McDonald, Chief, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue
Matthew Morris, Fire Chief, Henderson Fire Department, City of Henderson
Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County
Pat Whitten, County Manager, Storey County
Lisa Foster, representing Boulder City
Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Scott F. Gilles, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno; and representing Reno Police Department

Michael Sean Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association; and representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Law Enforcement Coalition; and Las Vegas Police Protective Association
James Halsey, Captain, Douglas 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
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Brooke Maylath, President and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group; and representing Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Terri Laird, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada

Chairman Flores:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were explained.] I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint): Creates the Nevada Clean Energy Fund. (BDR 58-1133)

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1:

It is my pleasure to present Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint), which creates the Nevada Clean Energy Fund, also known as a "green bank program," and creates the Board of Directors of the Fund to administer it. There is also a small amendment I am requesting to the bill (Exhibit C).

Energy is an extremely hot topic. The reasons for this range from environmental to political to financial. Despite differing reasons, the solution involves transitioning from traditional energy sources to renewable energy sources, thereby helping the environment and ending our dependence on foreign oil. Worldwide, there is a shift toward a low-carbon energy industry. According to an analysis by *Bloomberg New Energy Finance* in New York, a milestone occurred in 2013 when the world added 143 gigawatts of renewable electricity capacity, compared with 141 gigawatts of new plants that burn fossil fuels. By 2030, new capacity added from renewables will be more than four times that of fossil fuels.

Despite the addition of capacity from renewables passing fossil-based energy, changing the energy system is not simple. Nevada needs to continue deploying technology that can compete with the benefits offered by fossil fuels, which is generally regarded as steady, reliable, and affordable. In response to my constituents and the citizens of Nevada, we need to look forward as we refine the state's energy policy, not backwards. We are in a competitive economic environment. If we want energy investments in our state to result in growth and jobs, we need to indicate through our actions the direction in which we are going.

I believe the key energy principle remains the same—less expensive, cleaner, and sustainable energy sources for our communities and customers. This includes equitable rates, equal opportunity for energy savings, lower fuel costs, and scaling clean energy resources at the lowest cost to ratepayers through optimal use of grants and financing.

Therefore, I sponsored Senate Bill 360 of the 78th Session, which directed the Legislative Committee on Energy to complete a study of the viability of establishing a green bank to help finance the use and harnessing of clean energy projects in Nevada. During the interim, the Coalition for Green Capital (CGC), in cooperation with the Office of Energy in the Office of the Governor, executed the study [*Nevada Green Bank Study*] ([Exhibit D](#)). Over the course of eight months, the CGC met in person and by telephone with policymakers, clean energy advocates, regulatory agencies, and others to understand the clean energy landscape in Nevada. The CGC produced a report and specific recommendations on how Nevada could establish and fund a green bank to catalyze greater clean energy deployment, which are contained in S.B. 407 (R1).

I would like to cite some statistics contained in the *Nevada Green Bank Study*. Often I see that people who are low- to moderate-income cannot participate in solar and green energy projects. One of the things the green bank or the Nevada Clean Energy Fund will do is open up options and opportunities for those who cannot afford to get into the green economy. The *Nevada Green Bank Study* report says on page 28:

Taken together, the entire clean energy market SAM [serviceable addressable market] could be as high as half a trillion dollars, driven by enormous utility scale solar potential. Distributed solutions are a smaller share of overall SAM, but still far greater than current investment capacity. The market size of distributed solar for residential and commercial is estimated to be \$1 billion. The building energy efficiency opportunity is estimated to be over \$2 billion of cost-effective investment opportunities.

If a Nevada Green Bank were to focus on the serviceable addressable market, serving economically, feasibly, and using existing technologies, the investment opportunity would be approximately \$3.5 billion of investment. For wind, it is between \$2.6 and \$10.8 billion of capital investments. To date, only \$290 million of investment has occurred to construct the Spring Valley Wind Project. For energy efficiency, the numbers are staggering: \$2.25 billion of investment opportunity is identified in Nevada's energy efficiency market; for solar, \$8.2 billion to \$511 billion; and for geothermal, representing between \$3.5 billion and \$10.6 billion of investment opportunities.

Green banks eliminate the upfront cost by offering 100 percent financing in partnership with private lenders. Green banks can eliminate the greatest barrier to consumers and businesses that want to adopt clean energy technologies. Green banks allow consumers to adopt clean energy and lower their energy costs. By improving the terms of financing, green banks can lower the price of solar electricity. Total energy demand is reduced through efficiency. The result is a lower total energy cost with upfront payment.

We are always talking about jobs. There are several bills being presented this session that deal with jobs and job creation. This investment also helps to create jobs and apprenticeships. Connecticut Green Bank has now created more than 10,000 jobs. This provides a template for Nevada to use in terms of the potential economic impact.

Jeffrey Schub, Executive Director, Coalition for Green Capital, New York City, New York:

As Senator Spearman described, CGC worked with the Office of Energy in the Office of the Governor last summer to complete the legislatively directed study on the green bank opportunity in Nevada. The work we performed under that project was funded by the Energy Foundation, a large organization focused on clean energy policy innovation in the United States. Senator Spearman just described the results of that study, which found enormous potential for clean energy investment and identified market gaps and barriers preventing certain forms of investment and prohibiting the flow of private capital to take advantage of this potential.

The bill in front of you is based on the recommendations of that study. The bill contains a number of key provisions. The first is that it calls upon the Governor's Office of Energy to form a nonprofit corporation called the Nevada Clean Energy Fund. The bill also calls for the creation of a Board of Directors of the Fund. There will be nine members on the board. The makeup of the board is a mix of government officials, ex officio positions, and Governor appointees. Those appointees will be based on nominations from several industry groups. The Nevada Clean Energy Fund will be empowered to provide financing with a range of tools using multiple forms of loans, credit enhancements, warehousing, and securitization to drive in its own and private capital into the market gaps that Senator Spearman identified to make capital more readily available and accessible to a range of stakeholders that are not able to adopt clean energy technologies that would lower their energy costs because of the inability to access capital.

For instance, a homeowner wants to perform a multimeasure, deep energy-efficiency retrofit on their home, which may allow them to lower their energy costs by as much as 20 percent, 30 percent, or even 40 percent. Those projects can typically cost up to and above \$10,000. It is very hard to find financing solutions that are tailored for those types of projects, meaning that the financing comes with the technical assistance, projections, and handholding that is often required to actually get a customer to understand and move forward with a project. The Nevada Clean Energy Fund could pair that market development technical assistance with financing that is specifically suited to address these needs. This is modeled after green banks that have been deployed in multiple other states around the U.S. and world.

The Nevada Clean Energy Fund, as a nonprofit, could accept money from both public and private sources. It could accept state or federal funding, and it could accept private sources of capital specifically with the intention of targeting philanthropic and mission-driven capital. The goal is for the Nevada Clean Energy Fund to be capitalized with sources of funds that have a low cost of capital and are mission-driven, effectively satisfying a public purpose by bringing in capital that is willing to bear risks that private lenders may not be willing to and credit enhance private capital to get those private lenders more comfortable and familiar with lending into the space.

For instance, there are many customers who would not qualify for traditional lending today because of income requirements, debt-to-income ratio thresholds, or even Fair Isaac Corporation (FICO) scores. There is ample evidence and many studies that have shown FICO scores have very little correlation to whether or not someone pays their energy bill, which is effectively what we are talking about here. Other green banks around the country are developing and deploying green energy finance solutions targeting low-income homeowners so that they can adopt certain technologies like solar and energy efficiency. Default rates on those loans are incredibly low because this is effectively substituting for an energy bill. The standard metric that has traditionally been applied for evaluating borrower eligibility is not suitable for this kind of lending in many cases.

The Nevada Clean Energy Fund would seek out its own capital from the kinds of sources I mentioned previously. It would seek to pair that and partner with the private sector to drive private investment into the gaps identified before. The intention here is to leverage as much private investment into clean energy markets as possible so that, ultimately, private capital can serve this sector entirely on its own. Realizing the full potential that was described requires private investment predominately, so the goal of the Nevada Clean Energy Fund is to drive that private investment and bring it in at scale in a way that it is not today.

There are a few other provisions in the bill that I want to note. The bill does call for the creation of very specific consumer protection standards to ensure consumers and borrowers understand exactly what they are signing up for, there is total transparency, and there are strong requirements on borrower eligibility. The board also must produce annual plans and reports on the progress made by the Nevada Clean Energy Fund.

Senator Spearman:

I want to elaborate a bit on what Mr. Schub just said with respect to financing for low- to moderate-income people. I have heard from some colleagues that they do not see a need for green banks or the Nevada Clean Energy Fund because banks can make the loans. With the recent downturn in the financial and housing markets, many of my constituents in Senate District No. 1 were hit hardest with foreclosures. Many of them do not have the FICO score. Some of them have a FICO score as low as 300. I do not know of a traditional financial institution that is going to loan \$10,000 to someone with a FICO score of 300. One of the greatest benefits of this is to ensure those people who are of modest means have an opportunity to participate in energy efficiency, rooftop solar, geothermal, wind, et cetera.

There was a bill sponsored by Assemblyman McCurdy with respect to energy efficiency [Assembly Bill 223]. One of the reasons that bill is so important is because the proportional deficit for those who are low-income compared to those in the higher income ranges in terms of what they pay on their utility bills is outlandish. Here is another way to partner with that legislation for people who want to lower their energy bills. People who want the energy efficiency envelope around their house—the double-paned windows, more insulation, different doors, et cetera—can do this. Right now, if that financing was available, people would be taking advantage of it. It is not available.

What the Nevada Clean Energy Fund does is level the playing field. For me, it answers the question of how to help low-income families. How do we help them participate in this green economy? This is one of the ways we can do that.

Assemblyman Brooks:

There are so many Nevadans that do not get the opportunity to take advantage of this clean energy economy that is upon us. We always talk about this "new Nevada" when, in fact, there are two Nevadas. This helps bridge that gap. I understand this bill creates a clearinghouse and is set up to get gifts, arrange financing, et cetera. Do you see the state putting its bonding capacity into this bank or incurring liability for debt?

Senator Spearman:

Within the bill there is not a risk for the state. Remember, this 501(c)(3) can accept grants and federal dollars as well as private dollars. One of the most difficult tasks in trying to get this started is trying to get people to move beyond what the paradigm is. The green bank solution, using public funds and marrying them with private investments, is where the money and funding comes from. It is not based on FICO scores. Someone who can pay their energy bill may have a low FICO score.

Jeff Schub:

The Nevada Clean Energy Fund is not designed or intended to use the bonding capacity of the state and apply state backing, full faith, or anything like that. It is not written in the legislation. I would also say it is not prohibited. Down the line, when the Nevada Clean Energy Fund has its legs under it and has staff, familiarity, and comfort in this activity, it is conceivable that it could reach out to its state agency to explore the possibility of using private activity bonds or infrastructure bonds to raise funds for a specific kind of project or investment. Even in that case, the bonds would be fully secured by the underlying investment. They would not be backed by the state government. That is down the road, though.

Assemblyman Daly:

It seems to me this is a lot like the bill to create the Nevada State Infrastructure Bank [Assembly Bill 399]. It also reminds me of the weatherization initiative that came with the Obama Administration. I know Senator Horsford brought something similar forward in 2011 [Assembly Bill 416 of the 76th Session]. We are trying to help people weatherize their homes for energy efficiency. This is similar except we are taking it a step further and getting people into renewable energy. In that situation, there were grants and various things that were available. I do not think we set up a board like this, but it was similar. There was a nonprofit that they would subgrant to. They would go out and try to help constituents that qualified for the weatherization programs.

Along those lines, I know the legislation back in 2011 recognized we are trying to create jobs, but we are also trying to ensure we are creating good jobs. I know there was not a prevailing wage attachment, but there was a wage attachment in there. I think the workers would get at least the state average wage. We had to make the same argument during the hearing on the bill to create the Nevada State Infrastructure Bank. We pointed out that this is state money. In the weatherization with the federal government and the grants, wages have to be considered in my view. All too often, it seems to be an afterthought. I do not see it in this particular legislation. I hear arguments that if you offer wage protection, people will not hire those professionals. I say, if you are going to have the state involved by incentivizing an extra mechanism, we should have consistent policies.

This agency will be a state agency. I assume a state account will be opened. There will be a state board. It does not say in the bill, but I assume it will be subject to the Open Meeting Law. The only thing is that it may not be financing public works, but there needs to be some wage protection in there. If we are going to have state partners and bring that in, we should establish wage protection. If the private sector could do it themselves, they do not need those strings. But if they need the state and they want us to help them, I think the state owes it to the workers in Nevada to put some protections in.

Why are we not putting in protections for people doing these projects the same as we have when we did other mechanisms? The amendment on the Nevada State Infrastructure Bank established that these are public dollars and these will be public works jobs. The prevailing wage applies to it. This is a bit different. These will be small-dollar jobs. It is also not a public project. But there is state financing and partnerships. There has always been wage protection when we create these kinds of bills.

Senator Spearman:

Within the legislation, it does not prohibit any type of agreements in terms of wages. Nevada will not be the first one to establish a green bank. With respect to the small-dollar jobs, when you look at incomes in the renewable energy industry, most of those jobs start north of what we are trying to get as the minimum wage. One home may appear to be a small-dollar job, but to that homeowner it is a big deal; especially if that homeowner is one of our seasoned citizens. I want Jeff to answer the other piece in terms of why we set it up like this, because the rationale for this bill is contained in the *Nevada Green Bank Study*.

Jeff Schub:

I think there is a valid concern around prevailing wages. I think it comes down to interpretation and structure of the organization. As currently written, the bill effectively calls for the creation of a private nonprofit. This is an independent private nonprofit corporation that happens to have board members who are appointed by the Governor and ex officio. I think the way I would characterize it is as a private corporation that is governed by members of government. It also does not have public money. It is not being funded or seeded with public funds. The projects would not be public. I think we have tried to draft this in a way that enables the entity to be in the market as a private actor with a purpose and attachment to state policy. Why create a private nonprofit? I think the reason is that it is important for the state to ensure this activity and entity is connected to the state's clean energy policy more broadly. Not only does it position the Nevada Clean Energy Fund to have the standing and gravitas and legitimacy of an organization that is aligned with the state's policies, but it also ensures it is acting in deference of citizens and taxpayers. There is a state link, but in terms of the prevailing wage, I think because this is drafted to be a private, independent corporation, I think it would not be a requirement.

Assemblyman Daly:

You are right. It probably would not be a requirement. However, I would point out that in section 16, subsection 2, it does state that, "In addition to any money available through gifts, grants, donations or legislative appropriation to carry out the purposes of this chapter" When we did weatherization, we recognized we had to have wage protection. I know Senator Spearman mentioned that these jobs may make north of minimum wage. Minimum wage is \$8.25 if you do not have health insurance.

Senator Spearman:

No, I was referencing \$15.

Assemblyman Daly:

Even so, that is substantially lower than the state average wage, which is somewhere around \$30. It is substantially lower than what a normal construction worker would make in an industry's prevailing wage. I do not know that you have to go all the way to prevailing wage. These are smaller projects. But there should be some wage protections. On the weatherization, there were grants that came in and were given to whatever agency got it within the state. The state had a subgrantee, which was a nonprofit that coordinated the projects. We had wage protection in that in 2011. This is very similar. It seems all too often that these issues are an afterthought. I do not think it is intentional. It is one of the factors I always look at. We should not be using the state's power to create jobs with the state's backing.

I heard that there is no state risk, but Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce always said that if the state was not on the hook for something, you would not need to be in the building with the bill. If we are going to facilitate this partnership, there should be protections.

Senator Spearman:

Let me clarify. When I said north of \$15, I was not talking about \$16 an hour. Many of the jobs in the renewable energy industry are around the average wage. It does not prohibit prevailing wage from being one of the requirements to secure a job. The board of directors of the fund will set up the infrastructure. They will see what needs to happen. If that is something that needs to take place, I would think we would ensure people on the board are sensitive to the fact that although the state is not putting in public money, one of the concerns is prevailing wage.

Assemblyman Daly:

If they are paying more than that already, we should set that in as the state minimum wage. Prevailing wage is not what I was shooting for. I would be happy with it, but the state average wage or some percentage of that, like 100 percent or 110 percent, would seem to be appropriate. If people are already making that in the industry, sure. Set that as a minimum. I know their employers have paid less than that. It should be in the legislation.

Senator Spearman:

These are designed for low- to moderate-income people. We are not talking about a whole construction crew. We are talking about someone who has a home and says their energy bill is \$150 a month. If they could weatherize the home or put the energy efficiency envelope around their home, then the energy bills would be lowered. That homeowner goes to the Nevada Clean Energy Fund and requests money to do that. This is not like a school or city hall.

One of the things I did not say that is a constant for me is that I view energy through the lens of national security. Something we do not talk a lot about here in Nevada is that with the closure of the coal-fired plants, we have one baseload—natural gas. Prices are low now. If they begin to fluctuate, what do we do? The suite of bills that are coming through the Legislature this session are designed to help get Nevada on the track so that we will not be beholden to one baseload. That is all we have. If something happens to the pipeline, if prices spike, et cetera, what do we do? I think that it is incumbent upon us as legislators to look at the broad picture. Just like a puzzle, there are several pieces that go into that to ensure Nevadans are secure with our energy supply. This legislation is designed for the person who lives on West Carey Avenue and Revere Street in North Las Vegas, or someone who lives near Lake Mead. These are family homes. They do not want to sell it. They want to live there. Right now, because it is not energy efficient and does not have the same securities with respect to windows that they might have in Summerlin, that person is condemned to always pay higher energy prices.

Please hear me well. If the current financial instruments were able to do the job, they would be doing the job. Since they are not doing the job, I believe it is incumbent upon us to fill that gap. We are talking about grants, but a lot of it is private investment. We have a tendency to think about investment portfolios like the standards we see on Wall Street, but

more and more there are people who are committed to the environment and getting off fossil fuels. They are investing in what are called "green portfolios." Those portfolios are billions of dollars. The people do that because they want to help us move toward energy efficiency and protect the environment.

I am not sure what else I can say. Wages can be accounted for with the board of directors. If it is a homeowner, and that is typically who we are talking about, the bidding that will be done will be done at their kitchen table.

Assemblyman Kramer:

At one point, you referred to public funds. My understanding is that we were establishing a separate, private corporation which has directors appointed by the Governor based on certain rules. The funds initially would not be state appropriations. Are we talking about public funds?

Senator Spearman:

The public funds I am referring to are the grants that we will get. I think you heard Mr. Schub say that down the road, the state may want to invest some money to leverage their money with other private investments. We are not asking for an appropriation right now from the Legislature. It is a matter of securing grant money and leveraging that with private investment.

Jeff Schub:

To clarify, there is not an appropriation or transfer of public funds into this nonprofit corporation. It is not publicly funded. The initial corpus of dollars that the Nevada Clean Energy Fund will seek to raise will come from nonstate sources, which could include philanthropies. "Grants" can apply to state and philanthropic grants. That is the intention here. Philanthropies could make grants or program-related investments. Our organization works with states across the country looking to establish similar kinds of organizations. We have relationships with foundations that are broadly interested in supporting this. They specifically said they want to employ their own endowment funds into dedicated green vehicles. That was the point Senator Spearman was making before about investors that only want to invest in green portfolios. They have identified institutions like the Nevada Clean Energy Fund as an ideal vehicle for that because there is no uncertainty about whether those dollars would be going into green projects. The intention would be to seek out capital sources like those, including other mission and impact investors that are looking to specifically deploy their capital into solely clean energy projects.

Down the road, should the state find itself with funds to invest in clean energy projects and be looking for a vehicle to do so, it very well could decide that it would tap the Nevada Clean Energy Fund to be that deployment vehicle, but it is not designed to be initially or primarily funded by state funds.

Assemblyman Kramer:

I noticed that so far, green banks in New York and Connecticut have been established. Were they funded to the point of being able to do any good? I realize their populations are greater. Would we expect investment in a green bank in Nevada that would get things started? You cannot read the future, but it would be neat to know if this really has a chance for success. Could we have some homes for lower-income people that make a difference?

Senator Spearman:

Yes.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In section 13.2 of the bill, would it be accurate to describe these technologies as being potentially eligible for financing through a green bank?

Senator Spearman:

Yes. The eligible technologies include not only what is available now, but we want to ensure the language is broad enough so that innovations that are currently in the incubation stage can be accessed after they have been deployed.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I was reading about how New York and Connecticut structured their financing. The Coalition for Green Capital was saying that sometimes when technology is new or risky, the green bank may need to underwrite 100 percent of the financing because of the type of technology it is. When I was looking at "tidal currents" in section 13.2, subsection 7, I immediately assumed that was a new technology. What are the situations we could get into if the green bank has to underwrite 100 percent and there is no private partner?

Jeff Schub:

That is a very good question and an important point. There is definitely an inflection point in the energy technology development cycle where technology becomes commercially viable and capable of sustaining commercially orientated finance. There is a point where this is a risky technology that is still in the development stage. The role of green banks and the Nevada Clean Energy Fund should not go beyond that inflection point and get into the business of financing technologies that are not commercially viable, but I would argue there is value in having the entity be comfortable going to that inflection point—finding technologies that have been proven in other markets but maybe never deployed in Nevada or the United States. Connecticut has deployed some hydrotechnologies that have not been proven in U.S. markets yet.

The goal here is to bring technologies to market that are capable of reaching scale on commercial finance terms. There is definitely an important inflection point. Green banks around the world typically focus on mature, commercially developed technologies, especially for the first few years of operation. It is only later, when they have a more robust balance sheet and are more comfortable operating in the market, that they start edging slightly earlier in the development cycle where they get involved with technologies that might be slightly

less commercially deploying. It is important that they are mindful of technology risk. The purpose of this entity is not really to take on technology risk. It is to fill gaps in perceived risk in addressing this market.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I am glad you said it is like a phase-in approach. You take what is commonly known to be a technology and then as you grow and become stronger as a bank you assess the risk for the newer technologies. I was noticing that Connecticut streamlined themselves to at least four product offerings. They tried to keep themselves within a particular framework.

In section 16, subsection 1, paragraph (c), they break it out. In Connecticut they had a tax equity-based lease fund. I wondered if that was also envisioned. You have language that says, ". . . and other financial products and structures." "Structures" are the creation such as a tax equity based lease fund. You have the expertise on the board, but I was wondering about that. Can you break that down?

Jeff Schub:

Before I answer that specific question, I believe Senator Spearman has a small amendment for a technical change in the language in that exact paragraph removing the terms "senior loans" and "subordinate loans" to avoid any confusion about liens [page 5, ([Exhibit C](#))]. One of the first products they did create was a tax equity lease fund to provide solar rooftop leases to homeowners that were unable to adopt solar without paying cash. That was a product developed specifically to support local in-state installers that did not have access to their own lease products like some of the larger national installers do. It was a boon to the market and local installers because all of a sudden they had a product to offer. It was a structure where Connecticut Green Bank provided subordinated capital and equity to own the fund, but there was senior debt from private investors. The tax equity also came through a private investor. It was a fairly complicated fund structure, but one that followed standard industry practices for that kind of product. It is conceivable that a similar product could be offered in Nevada. I believe that product was created in 2012 or 2013, but it was a very long time ago in terms of industry maturity of solar finance. It is not necessarily creating a product that would be required. That gap has been largely filled in many respects. It is an example of a structure. The Nevada Clean Energy Fund might create something like that.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I have a question about section 16, subsection 1, paragraph (a). I was thinking about how you laid out this work program that you develop annually. We had a conversation about creating pathways for our communities to participate in this emerging market and ensuring we have jobs and training and the ability to participate at all levels of energy market growth.

When I read this section, I kept thinking, we have not had a lot of conversation about what those pathways are to ensure all communities are integrated, and they can find a job and wealth creation through participating in this new market, which is developing in amazing ways in several categories nationally. We are at a point where we are ready to bust it wide open in regard to all the technology. We are getting ready to change the game in storage and other things. Has any conversation happened around creating these pathways and the workforce development here for energy?

Senator Spearman:

The whole purpose of the Nevada Clean Energy Fund is to support projects that lead us towards energy independence. Although it is not explicitly stated, here is a scenario: Let us say one of the companies that is a member of the Urban Chamber of Commerce in Las Vegas says that they have the wherewithal to install weatherization, windows, insulation, et cetera.

They do not have the money to do it. If there is a viable renewable energy project, which I believe that would be one, this is one of the places they could go to seek financing. The bill itself does not create the jobs or the apprenticeships, but it lays out an infrastructure whereby that can happen.

Assemblywoman Neal:

My last question is about section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (e) of the bill. It says, "Enter into agreements or cooperate with third parties" Who would be the additional third parties? We know you will do grants with the federal government, but the other third parties speak to someone other than what we have already discussed, which are the private investors. Maybe there are more people we are thinking about.

Jeff Schub:

This section broadly refers to the groups of coinvestors and private investors that would not be investing directly into the fund but would be cofinancing products. Part of the value and intention of the Nevada Clean Energy Fund is to not only bring in certain kinds of private capital directly into the fund but also to coinvest and leverage private investments into projects themselves. You might have a project where half of the debt would come from the Nevada Clean Energy Fund and the other half would come from a local credit union or a local bank. We want to encourage private lenders to become familiar and comfortable with lending into these types of spaces so that they can do it themselves at scale.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in favor of the bill?

Jennifer Taylor, Executive Director, Clean Energy Project:

I represent the Clean Energy Project, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that educates civic, community, and business leaders on forward-looking energy policies that will strengthen our state's economy and protect its environment. The Clean Energy Project is the business voice of the clean energy economy in Nevada and represents 500 Nevada businesses that support these policies to help grow our renewable energy resources and strengthen energy efficiency programs. I am here to testify in support of S.B. 407 (R1) to create the Nevada Clean Energy Fund.

What I had to comment on has been commented on by Senator Spearman and Jeff Schub. They did a great job presenting how this will create opportunities across our economy. Energy efficiency, which will make up many of these projects, covers a broad array of industries and stakeholder sectors. Thank you for considering this bill and considering opportunities for people to obtain clean energy outside traditional financing.

Rusty McAllister, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO:

We also stand in support of this bill. We think it is a great idea and encourages the development of new technology and new jobs. The only thing we would ask for is that there are protections in the bill to ensure workers are taken care of. We want these to be good paying jobs with benefits. We certainly support this concept.

Leonard B. Jackson, Associate Minister, First African Methodist Episcopal Church of Las Vegas; and Director, Faith Organizing Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada:

We stand in full support of S.B. 407 (R1) and the Nevada Clean Energy Fund. We also stand ready to continue to educate our community so when the door opens, we will be prepared to direct them in the proper direction for job training for solar energy. This is definitely needed. We look forward to your support and implementation of S.B. 407 (R1).

Naomi Lewis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a senior studying environmental studies at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am here to testify in favor of S.B. 407 (R1). This bill is important because for a long time, clean energy choices have only been an option for upper- and middle-class people. It is a great investment, but the payback time is simply too long for those who are low-income. With green banks, we can ensure solar is a viable choice for all homeowners, and not just a lucky few. Loaning options have historically been racist against the African-American and Latino communities in particular. As we stand right now, the solar business is not that much different. Making clean energy choices too expensive for low-income people is an inherently racist act because people of color are the most affected by wealth inequality. Low-income people are the most impacted by the environmental costs of our state being so reliant on dirty energy. At the same time, they cannot afford to invest in clean energy options like solar. It is almost like they are stuck in a Catch-22. They cannot afford to invest in clean energy options, but cannot afford the negative health impacts of not doing so.

We can use other states as examples. States like California, Connecticut, and Washington have invested in clean energy funds, and they have been nothing but successful. In California, they were able to bring new and innovative companies to their state, and in turn, more jobs came because of the endless opportunities the clean energy fund gave them. I think we can do better in Nevada.

Rodrigo Gonzalez, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada, League of Conservation Voters:

[Testimony translated from Spanish to English by Corina Hernandez]

Good morning. My name is Rodrigo Gonzalez. I am sorry I am going to speak in Spanish, but the president of the Committee, Edgar Flores, does understand. I am from Chispa Nevada, and I am here to support S.B. 407 because I believe it would be a great support for our communities of color and would facilitate credits for small businesses to create green projects and, at the same time, would create jobs. On the other hand, these would help homeowners to have the credits they require to improve their homes or make certain adaptations to be energy efficient. This is why I am supporting S.B. 407.

Committee Chairman Assemblyman Edgar Flores-

Many thanks.

[Translation submitted as ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chairman Flores:

I will do a quick interpretation of that. He is saying he is 100 percent in support. It will help small businesses and homeowners and create employment. He says that green energy is the way to go. That is a very quick summary of that. *Gracias por tu testimonio*. [Thank you for your testimony.]

Maria-Teresa Liebermann, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress:

I am here to support S.B. 407 (R1) because it will help make Nevada's clean energy economy accessible to all Nevadans. I, like many Nevadans, want access to clean energy products, but I am not able to have the resources to access these products. I was one of those people that a few years ago wanted to harness the power of the sun at home, but was not able to afford it. Our Latino community is desperate to give our children a better life and better health with clean energy, but cannot afford and access it. We need to find ways to give low-income families and communities access to renewable energy; green banks do just that. I urge you to support S.B. 407 (R1) and help hardworking, low-income Nevadans be part of making Nevada a clean energy leader.

Jerry Holliday, President, The Uplift Foundation of Nevada:

I am here to express support for S.B. 407 (R1) because it will affect many areas of Nevada in a positive way. Providing funding for promising clean energy projects both small and large will generate jobs in the growing clean energy industry. It will encourage additional private investment and spur growth. We have a great natural advantage in renewable and clean energies. Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint) will provide important needed financing to utilize the natural resources that are abundantly available in our state. I want to thank all of you for your stellar work in following the wishes of our citizens who are overwhelmingly in favor of the state's use and development of clean energy.

Kathy Lauckner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

I wanted to say that having been involved in these weatherization projects for the past 25 years, our granting sources have been predominately federal dollars that have come to the states and then been dispersed to the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, the City of Henderson, et cetera. The City of Henderson just finished on a multimillion dollar grant project helping 90 homeowners weatherize their homes. If we had this initiative, we could bring more grant dollars to our city to help people living in low-income housing. Sometimes we want private partnerships to happen, but the way the granting system was set up through the university or through the states and counties, they were unable to accept the dollars. Having this initiative will allow us to accept more grants into the state and help more people.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position?

Jennifer J. Gaynor, representing Nevada Credit Union League:

We do support green energy and the goals of S.B. 407 (R1). We do appreciate the removal by the sponsor of the "senior loan" language from section 16, subsection 1, paragraph (c) in the amendment (Exhibit C). That language could have opened the door to harmful, unintended consequences. It could make it more difficult for low-income Nevadans to refinance mortgages, sell their homes, or get home loans. Thank you for that technical cleanup.

Phyllis Gurgevich, President, Nevada Bankers Association:

We stand in support of energy efficiency initiatives. We echo the appreciativeness for the proposed amendment and Mr. Schub's statement that clarifies this is not an exercise in shifting priorities on any existing loans. Our members are still digesting the language. What is giving us pause and putting us in a neutral category is that we believe this could benefit from more specific language on consumer protections. We appreciate there is a goal of serving low-income families. We feel the board of directors may benefit from including someone that represents the low- or moderate-income communities or a consumer advocacy group. We support energy efficiency initiatives, and we appreciate the amendment.

Senator Spearman:

To the question raised by Assemblyman Daly, if you will meet me in my office, I will try to address that. I think you are talking about wage protections. That is easy to do. If there is more we need to do with the Nevada Bankers Association, I am available. I would like to get this done as expeditiously as possible, so if you will all meet with me today, I would greatly appreciate it.

Chairman Flores:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 407 (R1). I see Senator Ford is here, so I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 176 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 176 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 23-666)

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11:

I am here to present Senate Bill 176 (1st Reprint) today. Last year we attempted to require officers who come into contact with the public on a regular basis to wear body cameras [Senate Bill 111 of the 78th Session]. We could not get it done because we could not find a funding source to make it happen. We compromised, and we were able to allocate money to the Department of Public Safety. Effective this summer, all peace officers who interact with the public will be wearing body cameras.

In S.B. 176 (R1) we are looking to require every officer throughout our state to wear a body camera if they interact with the public. This will not apply to detectives or people working undercover. This bill provides a mechanism whereby the county commissions are enabled—not required—to increase the 911 surcharge on cell phones. Right now, some counties are authorized to charge up to 25 cents and maybe more. This allows every cell phone to be charged up to an extra \$1 a month to fund 911 services that are obviously so integrated within the safety of our citizens and officers. In fact, you will hear from the City of Henderson about technology that exists today. A body camera can be turned on and interact directly with dispatch when 911 is called. There is a direct nexus between using 911 funds and the body cameras. It is enabling. It allows the counties to decide, on a county-by-county basis, if they want to institute this surcharge per phone up to \$1 a month. They may decide not to do anything, or they may decide to charge 10 cents extra a month. That will be sufficient to pay for the body cameras.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Did you ever consider requiring school police to wear body cameras? I do not recall that being contemplated in past discussions. I am curious as to why we would not want school district police officers to be equipped with body cameras as well.

Senator Ford:

Yes, we did consider school districts. In fact, Clark County School District asked to be put into the bill. We ran into hiccups relative to the distribution of the 911 funds. That is why they are not in the bill at this juncture. We will continue to look for efforts to allow school districts and the Nevada System of Higher Education to get involved.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

In your testimony you mentioned a surcharge. Obviously, that money will continue to come into play. I am not sure how often body cameras need to be changed out. Through normal duties they may get smashed. Will the charge be continuous to allow for replacement, or will the charge only be implemented for a short period of time? Maybe after a certain amount of time there could be a once yearly charge.

Senator Ford:

The county will be able to ascertain how much of a surcharge, if any, they want to impose on cell phone bills for 911 funding. That can be used for hardware, like the camera itself; software, like backup data; personnel associated with instituting all of this into policies; et cetera. There will not be restrictions that prohibit them from replacing body cameras. One thing I did fail to recognize is that the initial purpose of the 911 surcharge is obviously for 911 services. In addition to body cameras, this will allow 911 services to be issued with these funds as well. They are also looking to upgrade to Next Generation 911 technology with these funds as well. This bill just provides an option in that regard. Moving forward, they will be able to operate under whatever terms the county provides.

Assemblyman Marchant:

Is there a possibility that the federal government could withhold funding for Next Generation 911 technology if we use the funds for something other than 911 services?

Senator Ford:

Several jurisdictions use 911 fees for general fund purposes, which is a lot broader than what we are looking to do here. To be sure, the telecommunications industry has voiced a concern about that. One of the Federal Communications Commission members has voiced his concerns about that, but as far as I understand it, there have been no funding threats to implementing this. Many places use this money for much broader purposes. There are technologies out there right now that connect the body camera to a 911 phone call.

Assemblyman Ellison:

A lot of the smaller areas in the state do not have 911. They are trying to get their services through another city. How might this hurt the smaller counties? The 911 services are spread out. They have to go to another dispatch center in another area. The dispatchers might be outside of the city. They do not collect in that township.

Senator Ford:

It is news to me that some of our counties do not have access to 911. The 911 surcharge is already being collected, period. This does not change the current collection process. It just allows for an additional surcharge if the county commission desires that they pursue that particular option. It is on a per-phone basis. If the phone bill is at an address in Nevada, but they use 911 services elsewhere, it is the address in Nevada that the surcharge would apply to.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It would go by area code, basically. Is that how it works?

Senator Ford:

I do not think I can speak specifically to how they do it from the district perspective in terms of area code or something else. But if your address is in Nevada, you are being charged a surcharge on your phone bills already for 911 services. That process will continue moving forward.

Assemblywoman Neal:

We just came out of the special session. I thought some of the funding for police that we passed in Assembly Bill 1 of the 30th Special Session was also going to pay for body cameras on the new officers.

Senator Ford:

That is accurate. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department already has a collective bargaining agreement whereby all officers who come into general contact with the public are required to wear body cameras, but this is not just for Clark County. This is for counties throughout the state. It is also for the City of Henderson and the City of North Las Vegas.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Since Clark County has a different funding source, would the 911 money be dispersed into other counties?

Senator Ford:

Currently there is a committee that discusses the distribution of 911 fees in their current form [Nevada Public Safety Communications Committee]. This bill creates a new advisory committee that would ensure there is a fair distribution among all the jurisdictions in a particular county on a prorated basis. The short answer is yes, the other jurisdictions within Clark County will be receiving funds, but Clark County will as well according to how the advisory committee makes a determination.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

When unions come, will this be an aspect of collective bargaining?

Senator Ford:

The wearing of body cameras will be mandated. However, the policy for how it is implemented will be left up to each jurisdiction. There are rules that we laid out for the Department of Public Safety on what some of those policies need to look like, but the specifics of each jurisdiction's policies will be left up to those jurisdictions. For example, discipline will be a part of the negotiated process, but the body cameras themselves would be mandatory.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

Is public records access addressed within the bill?

Senator Ford:

Senate Bill 111 of the 78th Session passed and required peace officers to wear body cameras. We borrowed that language for this bill. It was a compromise between the Nevada Press Association, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the peace officers, and other interested parties on how the public would get access. There are provisions that deal with it. I cannot say exactly what those are, but there are provisions for public access. The Nevada Press Association would not have accepted it otherwise. The ACLU was there to temper and protect the individuals in the videos.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in favor of the bill?

Javier Trujillo, Director of Public Affairs, City of Henderson:

We come in strong support for this bill. We appreciate working with the majority leader, and we appreciate his putting in place the enabling authority for the counties to look at funding not only for 911 infrastructure, but also to replace, maintain, and upgrade body and vehicle camera systems. The 25-cent user charge that is allowed in statute is already being utilized by the vast majority of counties in the state. In Clark County, we do not have that authority. This would extend that user charge authority to Clark County, and the Clark County Commission would choose whether to impose that charge. It is also important to note that the bill as presented is a mandate, which means that by July 1, 2018, all agencies in southern Nevada would be required to implement the body camera policy. Our police chief is in Las Vegas, and he is available to answer any questions. We can submit his comments for the record ([Exhibit F](#)). He can speak in more detail about how police agencies can utilize this new authority.

Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada:

The Libertarian Party of Nevada thanks Senator Ford for bringing this bill and supports it wholeheartedly. We believe it would be an important protection for both officers and citizens.

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

We are here in support of S.B. 176 (R1) and thank all of the bill sponsors, joint sponsors, and especially Senator Ford for bringing it forward this session. While we could not get into a position of support on the bill last session, we did work hard with him over the interim. With the provision of S.B. 176 (R1) which enables a funding mechanism for the technology, this places us in a position of support for the bill as introduced and as revised.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing City of Mesquite; and Mesquite Police Department:

I want to apologize on behalf of Chief Tanner for not being here today. He wanted to be here today, but he is unable to. Mesquite Police Department was one of the first police departments in the state to implement this as a matter of policy. All of our officers currently have body cameras, including our detention officers. We found this to be an exceptionally valuable tool in terms of protecting not only the public but also the police officers. Complaints have gone down significantly since video evidence has been available. We find it to be a money-saving tool.

The portion regarding the 911 surcharge is extremely important to the City of Mesquite in terms of upgrading the 911 service. We are in very strong support of that. We have looked at the option internally to change the legislation to allow us to do it as an entity, but that is not logistically possible. I will use this opportunity to publicly plea on behalf of the City of Mesquite for the Clark County Commission to implement this on behalf of the city so we can make the many necessary upgrades to our 911 system. We are in full support of this legislation.

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

We are in support of the bill, and we appreciate Senator Ford working with us. Last session we supported the policy of the bill, but at that time we did not have all our officers equipped with cameras, so funding was an issue. Now we do have our officers in the field equipped with these body cameras. The question came up about the sheriff. He wears a uniform and interacts with the public in town hall meetings. My recollection of the conversation was that the intention of the bill was that the body cameras would be worn by the patrol and traffic officers. This bill is for the officer handling calls for service, not necessarily the sheriff, even though he could technically fit into the bill's definition.

As you know, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department was one of the first police departments in the country to establish a body-worn camera program. Through budgeting, more funding, and a pilot study grant, we have equipped our officers with cameras. Today, I have Officer Sam Diaz with me. This is his first trip to the Nevada Legislature. He will be with us for the next few days. He wears a body camera day to day in the field. He is a field training officer. If you have technical questions about how the camera functions, how it is worn, how the data is downloaded, et cetera, he is the man to answer those questions.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Michael Bagley of Verizon sent in a letter about the 911 fee ([Exhibit G](#)). I do not know if you are familiar with it, but will there be a situation where we may be ineligible for Next Generation 911 federal funding?

Chuck Callaway:

I have heard that. When I spoke with our Chief Financial Officer, Rich Hoggan, he told me he is not aware of current federal funding that we get in regard to 911 services. We have a property tax for 911 services that was established several years back. I believe that tax is supposed to sunset in the future. This funding source could help with future 911 upgrades and expansion. I am not aware of any federal funding we could lose. I think there can be a nexus drawn with future technology and how that interacts with an officer's ability to coordinate camera footage with dispatch in the field. I think that technology is just around the corner if it is not already here.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The largest concern would be to ensure the tax we have set aside does not sunset so that the funding is still in play.

Chuck Callaway:

Yes. I think that would be a component. From our point of view, we already have cameras on our officers. We are neutral on funding being used for body cameras. We can certainly benefit from this bill for our Enhanced 911 (E911) expansion.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Last session you had a lot of younger officers who were wearing the body cameras and the older ones were not. Have you seen them use this evidence in court?

Chuck Callaway:

Absolutely. We have seen over 100 cases where officers have been exonerated because people made false complaints. We have had cases where citizens say they want to file a complaint because of something an officer did. The investigator tells them to come down to the station to file a statement and also mentions there is body camera footage. Once the complainant finds out there is body camera footage, they do not file the statement. Many times we look at the footage and find that the allegations are false.

On the other hand, through body camera footage, we have had a few cases where we found officers have been involved in misconduct. They have been disciplined accordingly. It is a win-win. It protects the officer and the public.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It is not the body camera that is expensive, it is the storage. How long do you have to keep that on record?

Chuck Callaway:

There are two parts to that question. The first part is if the body camera footage is evidence—if an officer turns on the camera and it catches the offender committing a crime, the officer engaging in use of force, or an officer-involved shooting. If there is an officer-involved shooting, we will keep that footage forever. If it is a case where criminal conduct is caught on the video, once that case is adjudicated and the retention period has expired, we will purge it. In many cases it will be kept forever. For routine stuff like the officer pulls someone over on a traffic stop and nothing happens, our policy is that we retain it for 30 days. If the citizen does not file a complaint in 30 days, that camera footage is purged. We found that the storage has been cheaper than we initially expected it to be.

Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.:

We support this bill wholeheartedly. Regarding Assemblyman Ellison's question about the older officers not wanting to wear it, currently every uniformed officer is wearing that. We were able to make that a subject of mandatory bargaining. Therefore, everyone has to wear it.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod asked a question about collective bargaining, and I would like to follow-up. How would that be a part of the collective bargaining?

Mike Ramirez:

It is subject to bargaining because it is equipment. This is a new tool, so it made it a subject of collective bargaining.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Is that like uniforms?

Mike Ramirez:

Correct.

Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

We encourage your support for this important legislation. This is quintessential compromise legislation. We talked a lot about how we access these records as an organization. We do that through a public records request. That is how both the press and we as an organization can access that data. I want to echo what Chuck Callaway said. It has led to win-win outcomes—outcomes that are both positive for the police and positive for the people involved in those incidents. It is a way we can keep a check and balance on police conduct.

I also want to state that last year Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's use of force and body camera policies were named as model policies to follow throughout the United States by ACLU national. This is not something we acknowledge lightly as an organization. We think this bill is the first step to bringing that statewide and making the state of Nevada a national model.

Patrick Moers, Police Chief, City of Henderson Police Department:

I am here in support of S.B. 176 (R1). My comments will be submitted ([Exhibit F](#)). I testified in support for this bill before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs as well. Importantly, I think we focused on the 911 piece. Just to give some brief background, the 911 system is a landline-based system. Our E911 system allows cell phones to be triangulated now. The system is pretty much all that we are currently using. There are still some jurisdictions on the antiquated landline system in Nevada. Next Generation 911 is our newest system that builds on previous generations and allows greater speed, accuracy, and ability to be more efficient in handling incoming and outgoing multimedia communication. This means we can take photos and stream videos in Next Generation 911. That is where the body camera aspect may work in conjunction.

In 2009, the City of Henderson had in-car videocameras with body microphones. That system was about \$1.5 million. The continued upkeep has been substantial. We think body cameras are a very good enhancement of what we have been doing already. It has increased transparency and accountability within our community. It has been very good. More importantly, as things have changed, it is an all-encompassing system. What used to be a radio dispatch from a dispatcher to an officer in the field on his vehicle radio has led to the integration of laptops and mapping systems. Body cameras will now also be integrated in that. I have seen vendors who can have the 911 dispatcher draw a geofence around a call for service in an emergency and activate a body camera. That is a nexus to it.

The new Clark County safety initiative does allow that funding to be used for body cameras. For Henderson, that only encompasses about 25 or 26 officers through a department of about 360 officers. All that money cannot be used for all of those officers. We do not get any federal funding for that. That is based usually on states that have 911 coordinators. Nevada does not have a 911 coordinator, so we are not eligible for federal grants.

William McDonald, Chief, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue:

We operate a regional communication center serving the fire departments in Clark County, North Las Vegas, and Las Vegas Fire and Rescue. We are in total support of S.B. 176 (R1).

Matthew Morris, Fire Chief, Henderson Fire Department, City of Henderson:

The City of Henderson's fire department is in full support of the bill.

Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties:

We are in support of S.B. 176 (R1). As of today, over half of Nevada's 17 counties have already implemented body cameras. We have heard from our members that they also support the policy of employing body-worn cameras on their law enforcement officers. We appreciate the sponsor working with us and the counties in regard to adding a funding mechanism for the mandate in the bill.

Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:

We are here in full support of the bill. We already do have a surcharge for 911 services. With the fee increasing, we believe there should be enough funds to cover the additional costs of the body cameras.

Pat Whitten, County Manager, Storey County:
Ditto.

Lisa Foster, representing Boulder City:

Boulder City is in full support of this bill. They do not have body cameras yet. They wanted to take the opportunity to encourage the Clark County Board of Commissioners to take advantage of this funding mechanism.

Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

We, too, support this bill. We think it is good public policy. I do have to put on the record that the funding mechanism is at the county commission level. We will work with our county commissions and hope they enact the additional fee. If not, we will be back here next session looking for some funding.

Scott F. Gilles, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno; and representing Reno Police Department:

We support the bill, and we think this is a good policy. We have expressed some hesitancy going forward just because we do not have the full authority to pull the trigger on the surcharge the way that the county does. Hearing the county's testimony and in conversations with them, we are confident the county will work with all the local law enforcement agencies to ensure the body camera program is fully funded as well as take advantage of the funding mechanism in the bill to improve our 911 telephone services.

Michael Sean Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association; and representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Law Enforcement Coalition:

We would like to thank Senator Ford for all his hard work on this bill and working with us. We wholeheartedly support it.

James Halsey, Captain, Douglas County Sheriff's Office:

We are in full support of this bill. It goes without saying that the cameras themselves will be a boon for law enforcement. The transparency it provides between law enforcement and the community they police cannot be overstated. It is the future. What has been difficult is how to purchase these. We did a feasibility study at the Douglas County Sheriff's Office last year, and one of the hurdles we had was how to fund this. This bill provides a potential mechanism for that. We want to institute the program, it is just a matter of how to do that. Ultimately, how it is funded would come from the county commissioners. This bill would provide a potential source for that funding. Whether the county commissioners decide to fund it fully or partially with this, that is up to them, but we are in full support of this bill.

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

We are greatly appreciative of the funding mechanism to pay for the equipment and the personnel to help maintain it. We hope the counties will assist in the funding for this.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:

We echo the previous comments from law enforcement. I can talk briefly about the collective bargaining aspect of this. It was an addition to the safety requirements in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 288.150. It is also the disciplinary procedures. Senator Ford put that on the record for us in the Senate hearing and in this hearing. We appreciate that. Those are the aspects that we will be talking about during collective bargaining.

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We are in full support. I think this provides a great measure of transparency.

Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I echo the sentiments of my colleague, Mr. Piro. The Washoe County Public Defender's Office is in full support of this measure.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral to the bill? [There was no one.] Senator Ford, would you like to make closing comments?

Senator Ford:

The fact that we got so many people in support shows all the hard work we have been putting in on this bill. We have been working on this since February 2015. This is a quintessential example of compromise legislation. It is a good bill. It will protect the public. It will protect our cops from frivolous complaints. I appreciate that. I mentioned that Illinois is an example of a state that uses their 911 money for more than just 911 services. Illinois, Iowa, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Washington, West Virginia, and Puerto Rico all use 911 fees on other things. Some of them deposit it directly to their general funds and spend it on whatever they want to. There is less concern since we are still using these funds for public safety. That is actually in a federal report that came out talking about the use of 911 funds. The Chief of the Henderson Police Department indicated that because we do not have a 911 state coordinator, we are not eligible for 911 federal funds in that regard. That is not something that is at jeopardy until we go that route.

When I presented S.B. 111 of the 78th Session, my son, who was then 14, testified. His testimony was simple. It was on the backside of a lot of bad interactions between cops and citizens—African-American citizens in particular. My son said, I should not have to feel unsafe walking in my own community when I see a cop. These body cameras can help

everyone. He said, If you are talking about how much it costs, then I know that you do not value my life. This is a good opportunity for us to continue to create good relationships within our communities. It cuts down on frivolous complaints, and it ensures that we catch the one rogue cop out there.

Chairman Flores:

I will close the bill hearing on S.B. 176 (R1). Next on the agenda is Senate Bill 188.

**Senate Bill 188: Revises provisions prohibiting certain discriminatory acts.
(BDR 18-106)**

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7:

I am here today to present Senate Bill 188, which revises language throughout the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) in regard to discrimination. Over the past few sessions, the Legislature has passed a number of bills addressing both sexual orientation and gender identity. Senate Bill 188 resulted from a conversation I had with Clark County Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani, who informed me the term "gender identity or expression" was not included in statutes dealing with Nevada System of Higher Education. From there, I asked our legislative staff to review other possible oversights in the NRS consistent with the legislation we have passed over the last decade. I introduced Senate Bill 164 of the 78th Session to make corrections to NRS consistent with various bills passed over the last decade. Senate Bill 164 of the 78th Session was then voted out of the Senate 21-0 before dying in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs after getting a favorable hearing.

Senate Bill 188 is a slimmed down version of S.B. 164 of the 78th Session, with only 31 pages instead of 37, so hopefully this streamlined version will make it across the finish line this session. Senate Bill 188 brings statutes in line and up to date with recently passed legislation. It is really a cleanup bill making technical corrections to previously overlooked statutes.

First, in sections 4 and 5 the bill defines the terms "gender identity or expression" and "sexual orientation," and provides in section 3 that these definitions be included in the preliminary chapter of NRS as a reference point. Section 4 states, ". . . 'gender identity or expression' and any variation of that term means a gender-related identity, appearance, expression or behavior of a person, regardless of the person's assigned sex at birth." Section 5 states, ". . . 'sexual orientation' and any variation of that term means having or being perceived as having an orientation for heterosexuality, homosexuality or bisexuality."

I also want to note that in section 9, "gender identity or expression" is added to the list of attributes that may be considered as aggravating factors in a first-degree murder case. Otherwise, for a representative sample of how the statutes are updated generally throughout the bill, we can look to sections 1 and 2, which revise provisions concerning the membership and activities of the Nevada Equal Rights Commission within the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. The new language in section 1 requires that

"... the Commission must be representative of all groups, including, without limitation, those based on religion, disability, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender identity or expression, and representative of both sexes in the State." This description replaces the previous language, which required instead that the Commission be representative of "religious, disabled, racial and ethnic" groups.

Other sections of the bill similarly update language concerning, among other groups, state and local employees, children, inmates, persons involved in real estate transactions, charitable corporations, school employees and students, the National Guard, and gaming licensees and patrons.

Even the Charter of the City of Sparks is updated in section 34 of the bill to add a person's gender identity or expression to the circumstances under which a person shall not be appointed or removed from, or favored or discriminated against a city position or appointive administrative office.

In short, S.B. 188 brings our statutes up to date with regard to discriminatory practices by deleting archaic and overly narrow language and replacing it with broader, more culturally appropriate language that has entered into common usage. While there are many fiscal notes attached, only one shows a fiscal impact—the one from White Pine County School District for \$1,500 per year for training ([Exhibit H](#)).

Chairman Flores:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in favor of the bill?

Brooke Maylath, President and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group; and representing Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

We are in full support of this bill. We need these types of protections in the face of many other jurisdictions in the country trying to erase us and make us disappear.

Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO:

We are in full support of this bill.

Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

Section 22 of the bill applies specifically to the students of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). Our nondiscrimination policy for NSHE from the Board of Regents says that NSHE is committed to providing a place of work and learning free of discrimination on the basis of a person's age, disability, gender, military status or obligations, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, genetic information, national origin, race, or religion. No employee or student in the workplace or in the academic environment should be subject to discrimination. We certainly agree with that and agree with having it in statute also.

Michael Sean Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association; and representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Law Enforcement Coalition; and Las Vegas Police Protective Association:

We support this bill.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing for S.B. 188. We will move on to the work session.

Assembly Bill 280: Revises provisions relating to preferences in bidding for certain contracts for businesses based in this State. (BDR 27-1060)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 280 creates a preference for a bid or proposal for a state purchasing contract that is submitted by a "Nevada-based business." This bill was sponsored by Assemblyman Frierson, Assemblyman Carrillo, Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno, Assemblyman Sprinkle, and others. It was heard in this Committee on April 5, 2017. The measure imposes certain penalties and restrictions upon a business that makes a material misrepresentation or commits a fraudulent act in applying for a preference or fails to comply with the requirements for a preference. Further, the bill provides that any person who willfully makes a material misrepresentation or commits a fraudulent act in applying for a preference or willfully fails to comply with the requirements for a preference is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000.

The bidding preference that a contractor, an applicant to serve as a construction manager at risk, or a design-build team that meets certain requirements receives for certain public works contracts under existing law is increased from 5 percent to 10 percent. The measure makes a willful failure to comply with the requirements to receive a bidding preference for a public work a misdemeanor and creates a separate violation for each worker, vehicle, or design professional by which the contractor, applicant, or design-build team falls below the requirements ([Exhibit I](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 280.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 280.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman McCurdy will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 53 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the installation, operation and maintenance of telecommunications facilities. (BDR 18-234)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 53 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to the installation, operation, and maintenance of telecommunications facilities. It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Transportation on behalf of the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology in the Office of the Governor. It was heard in this Committee on April 28, 2017. Among other things, the bill authorizes the Department of Transportation to grant longitudinal access and wireless access to certain rights-of-way owned by the Department to telecommunications providers to construct and install telecommunications facilities. The measure also provides for monetary and in-kind compensation to the Department for longitudinal access and wireless access to certain rights-of-way. Finally, S.B. 53 (R1) creates the Telecommunications Advisory Council to assist the Department in administering access to rights-of-way to telecommunications providers and to provide other assistance as requested by the Department ([Exhibit J](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 53 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 53 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Marchant will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 384 (1st Reprint): Provides for the confidentiality of certain information in the records and files of public employee retirement systems. (BDR 19-506)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 384 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Ratti and heard in this Committee on May 3, 2017. The bill provides that certain information contained in the Public Employees' Retirement System, Judicial Retirement System, and Legislators' Retirement System is a public record—namely the identifying number, last public employer, years of service, retirement date, amount of annual pension, and benefit type—of a member, retired employee, retired justice or judge or retired Legislator. All other information regarding a retired employee, retired justice or judge, retired legislator, or beneficiary that is contained in a record or file in the possession of a public employee retirement system is confidential, regardless of the form, location, and manner of creation or storage of the record or file

containing the information. The measure also clarifies that a person who possesses, controls, or has custody of any information that is confidential pursuant to this bill may not disclose the information or be required to disclose the information and may not produce or be required to produce the record for inspection ([Exhibit K](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 384 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 384 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, KRAMER,
MARCHANT, AND McARTHUR VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN
WOODBURY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 399: Provides for the acceptance of a tribal identification card in certain circumstances. (BDR 18-78)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 399 is also a duplicate of Assembly Bill 415, which went through this Committee earlier this session. This bill authorizes state and local governmental entities to accept a tribal identification card that is issued by a tribal government for the purpose of identifying a person if the tribal identification card meets certain requirements. Further, a business that accepts a driver's license or identification card issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles for the purpose of identifying a person is required to accept a tribal identification card for the same purpose.

There is one amendment that was proposed by Lorne Malkiewich on behalf of the Nevada Resort Association. The amendment allows certain types of businesses to decline the identification if a business reasonably determines that a federal statute or regulation requires a different form of identification ([Exhibit L](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 399.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 399.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman McArthur will take the floor statement.

**Senate Bill 422: Revises provisions governing regional planning coalitions in certain
counties. (BDR 22-919)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 422 was sponsored by Senator Manendo and heard in this Committee on May 4, 2017. The bill provides that a regional planning coalition may designate the regional transportation commission to administer the comprehensive regional policy plan. The bill also repeals the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Act developed by the Coalition ([Exhibit M](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 422.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 422.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Carrillo will take the floor statement.

**Senate Bill 460: Revises provisions governing the membership of the Local
Government Employee-Management Relations Board. (BDR 23-556)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 460 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission. It was heard in this Committee on April 24, 2017. The bill revises the membership of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board by increasing the membership of the Board from three to five members; increasing the number of members of the Board who may belong to the same political party from two to three members; and requiring that at least three members of the Board reside in southern Nevada.

As discussed in the hearing, the attached mock-up allows a quorum of three members of the Board to hold hearings and requires whenever three or four members of the Board meet, not more than two of the members may be members of the same political party. Finally, a majority vote of the entire membership is required to take certain actions, as listed in subsection 2 of Section 2 ([Exhibit N](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 460.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 460.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Daly will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 493: Revises provisions concerning the participation of certain school administrators in collective bargaining. (BDR 23-1081)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 493 eliminates the use of salary to determine which school administrators are to be excluded from membership in a bargaining unit and instead excludes from such membership any school district administrator above the rank of principal, regardless of salary ([Exhibit O](#)).

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 493.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 493.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I will vote this out of Committee, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Ditto.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN MARCHANT AND
McARTHUR VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman Brooks will take the floor statement. I will close the work session. Is there any public comment?

Terri Laird, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada:

I want to say thank you on behalf of our retired state employees for your support of Senate Bill 384 (1st Reprint). We want to thank Senator Ratti for bringing that bill forward.

Chairman Flores:

This meeting is adjourned [at 10:53 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Isabel Youngs
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint) presented by Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1.

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Findings & Report on Nevada Green Bank Study," dated June 2016, submitted by Jeffrey Schub, Executive Director, Coalition for Green Capital, New York City, New York, regarding Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit E](#) is a copy of a translation of testimony by Rodrigo Gonzalez, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada, League of Conservation Voters, translated by Corina Hernandez, in support of Senate Bill 407 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony submitted by Patrick Moers, Police Chief, City of Henderson Police Department, dated May 11, 2017, regarding Senate Bill 176 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated May 9, 2016, in opposition to Senate Bill 176 (1st Reprint) to Chairman Flores and members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, authored by Michael Bagley, Director, Government Affairs, Verizon, referenced by Assemblywoman Neal.

[Exhibit H](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7, dated May 11, 2017, regarding Senate Bill 188.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 280, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 53 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 384 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 399, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 422, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 460, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 493, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.