

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

**Seventy-ninth Session
April 5, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 11:56 a.m. on Wednesday, April 5, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Jan Brase, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tina Leiss, Public Employees' Retirement System
Ron Dreher, Police Officers Research Association of Nevada; Peace Officers Law Enforcement Coalition
Mike Ramirez, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs
Jason Guinasso
Richard P. McCann, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers
Joe Deese

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 2

Marlene Lockard, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees
Michael Sean Giurlani, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association
Scott Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers Association; President, Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs
Michelle Jotz, Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Eric Spratley, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Mike Cathcart, City of Henderson
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District
Robert Roshak, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Terry Reynolds, Deputy Director, Office of Business and Planning, Department of Business and Industry
Steve Aichroth, Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry
C.J. Manthe, Administrator, Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry
Tyson Falk, Nevada Housing Alliance
Jodi Stephens, Manufactured Home Community Owners
Bob Varallo, Nevada Association of Manufactured Home Owners
Helen Foley, Nevada Assisted Living Association
Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas
Bum Hess, Storey County
Carolyn Campbell, Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Civil Division, Clark County
James Gerren, Department of Building and Fire Prevention, Clark County
Fulton Cochran, Assistant Fire Chief, Department of Building and Fire Prevention, Clark County
Lee Plemel, Community Development Department, Carson City
William Brewer, Deputy Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority
Amy Jones, Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Reno
Mishon Hurst, Deputy Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Reno

CHAIR PARKS:

I will open the work session on Senate Bill (S.B.) 39.

SENATE BILL 39: Revises provisions relating to state purchasing. (BDR 27-122)

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 3

JENNIFER RUEDY (Policy Analyst):
I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 39.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:
I will close the hearing on S.B. 39 and open S.B. 57.

SENATE BILL 57: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Commission for the Reconstruction of the V & T Railway. (BDR S-414)

Ms. RUEDY:
I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 57.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:
I will close the hearing on S.B. 57 and open S.B. 88.

SENATE BILL 88: Revises provisions relating to the Contingency Account in the State General Fund. (BDR 23-105)

Ms. RUEDY:
I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR MANENDO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 88.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 88 and open S.B. 314.

SENATE BILL 314: Revises provisions related to the installation of certain systems for obtaining wind energy. (BDR 22-482)

MS. RUEDY:

I will read the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)). An amendment has been proposed by Clark County.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am in discussion with Clark County regarding the amendment, but we have not come to an agreement.

SENATOR HARDY:

Could you agree with specifying the amount of acreage allowed? Would you agree to 20 acres?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Yes.

SENATOR HARDY:

Would Clark County be amenable?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Clark County officials indicated they would not be concerned about parcels above five acres. They are concerned about smaller parcels. I can confirm with Clark County and bring S.B. 314 back to the Committee for consideration. As written, the amendment would nullify the bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 5

CHAIR PARKS:

We will hear S.B. 314 during our next work session. I will close the hearing on S.B. 314 and open S.B. 384.

SENATE BILL 384: Provides for the confidentiality of certain information in the records and files of public employers and public employee retirement systems. (BDR 19-506)

MS. RUEDY:

I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATOR RATTI:

I have submitted an amendment with minor changes to section 1 of S.B. 384 ([Exhibit H](#)). The language should read "and amount of annual pension, benefit type of a member" The comma has been added.

The reason for making these records public is to identify abuse and fraud. We want to balance the need for transparency with personal privacy. An identifying number will be assigned to each public employee's records. Should a third party or the media identify abuse or fraud, the Public Employees' Retirement System can connect the data with the employee and conduct an investigation.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Can you clarify the language "benefit type?"

TINA LEISS (Public Employees' Retirement System):

The comma following "pension" and the phrase "benefit type" is interpreted to mean either a disability benefit or a service retirement benefit. If the comma followed "benefit," it would be interpreted as type of member, which would be regular member or police/fire member.

The intent of the legislation is to designate "benefit type."

CHAIR PARKS:

Will the process of designating identifying numbers incur costs and require a fiscal note?

Ms. LEISS:

I do not expect any additional costs. We should be able to complete the process by the effective date of July 1.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 384.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 384 and close the work session. I will open the hearing on S.B. 282.

SENATE BILL 282: Revises provisions relating to peace officers. (BDR 23-539)

SENATOR TICK SEGERBLOM (Senatorial District No. 3):

Senate Bill 282, as amended ([Exhibit I](#)), proposes amendments to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 289 relating to the police officers' bill of rights.

RON DREHER (Police Officers Research Association of Nevada; Police Officers Law Enforcement Coalition):

The sponsor of S.B. 282 has agreed to an amendment, [Exhibit I](#). Senate Bill 282 as amended will provide additional due process to peace officers when ordered to provide compelled statements; will provide hearing officers appointed in State internal investigations with the authority to exclude evidence of willful and knowing violations of the peace officers' bill of rights; will require internal affairs investigations to be completed prior to placing a peace officer on administrative leave without pay in certain circumstances; and will provide sanctions against local and state law enforcement representatives who knowingly and willfully violate the peace officers' bill of rights. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

We must emphasize that these willful and knowing violations of the peace officers' bill of rights are brought to the attention of the law enforcement agency by the representatives of the subject officers at the time the violations

occur. We will have testimony today from individuals or their representatives who were denied their rights at various times in the process. One officer, before making his initial statement, asked for an attorney and was denied. This was a willful and knowing violation of the officer's rights. In criminal law, this is known as the fruits-of-the-poisonous-tree. We are asking that the same concept apply in this process.

In another case, in an internal affairs hearing, the supervisor asked questions of an officer that were outside the notice of administrative violation. The notice has several elements: date of occurrence, time of occurrence and allegation of wrongdoing. Supervisors cannot ask about the officer's bank account or unrelated personnel issues. Our complaint is with officials who do not care when they are told we recognize a willful violation of the peace officers' bill of rights. They demand answers under threat of insubordination.

In one of the rural areas, an officer was called in to provide a statement in an internal affairs investigation. He was properly noticed regarding off-duty conduct. However, it immediately became a criminal investigation. There is a difference between a criminal and an administrative investigation. This agency used the administrative investigation as a ruse to begin a criminal investigation. I advised the officer to invoke his Fifth Amendment rights and refuse to incriminate himself. He was ordered, under threat of insubordination, to answer their questions. This is a clear example of a willful violation of the officer's rights. Any information obtained under these circumstances should be inadmissible.

Once the fruits-of-the-poisonous-tree doctrine has occurred, the investigation should be terminated. However, if there is corroborating evidence, nothing prevents the department or agency from taking a course of action.

On the whole, the internal affairs process is properly administered. We are addressing the few investigators who willfully and knowingly violate officers' rights. Once violations are brought to the attention of law enforcement agencies by the subjects' representatives and the recommended disciplines are appealed, it may take months or years to reach arbitrators, hearing officers or the courts. In administrative hearings, officers and their representatives have the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence of violations.

Without a penalty, nothing prevents willful and intentional violations of NRS 289.085. This section of NRS was meant to provide arbitrators or judges with the power to exclude evidence in those hearings where violations occurred. In cases over the past several years, this has not been the case. Complaints of willful and intentional violations of officers' due process rights have fallen on deaf ears.

For years, we have requested monetary penalties for violations. In California, there is a \$25,000 penalty. Those who oppose monetary penalties have suggested letting NRS 289 work to protect officers' rights. We have seen that it does not work. With S.B. 282, we are asking that once willful and intentional violations have been established with an arbitrator, hearing officer or court, officers' legal costs be reimbursed by the agency allowing the violations.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

The peace officers' bill of rights are statutory rights. Most of these officers are covered by union contracts, and they do not need to negotiate these rights. They are fundamental and guaranteed rights.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

At what point are due process rights violated? Who employs the hearing officers?

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

In Nevada, State agencies have hearing officers. Most of the unions have arbitration processes. Each organization has a different independent process for evaluating evidence. They work for the organization but are meant to be independent. Nevada employs a panel of private attorneys.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Hearing officers and arbitrators are pulled from a panel. Who makes the selection?

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

It depends on the agency. In general, agency employees select hearing officers. In regard to the question of when due process rights are violated, there is a potential violation of rights when testimony is compelled under threat of termination.

SENATOR HARDY:

Under S.B. 282, as a guilty officer under investigation, I could ask investigators "are you ordering me to answer?" If the response is yes, nothing I said or did after that point would incriminate me. Is that correct?

MR. DREHER:

Correct. Once a supervisor orders an officer to give a statement under threat of insubordination, that officer is protected from incriminating himself. Statements that are compelled cannot be used in subsequent criminal investigations. However, the statements can be used to discipline the officer through the administrative violation process.

SENATOR HARDY:

If an officer committed homicide and is compelled to give testimony, that testimony and anything coming from that portion of the investigation cannot be used against him. Is that correct?

MR. DREHER:

In a criminal investigation, the officer would be advised to remain silent and to ask for counsel. It would not preclude gathering evidence in a criminal investigation or his being charged with criminal violations. These are the Fifth Amendment rights afforded to all of us.

SENATOR HARDY:

Would S.B. 282 result in added costs? How many of these cases could result in cost to the State?

MR. DREHER:

It may be \$10,000 to \$15,000 per case. In the past ten years, I have seen less than ten cases that would have required reimbursements to officers.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

If an officer is compelled to make a statement in a criminal case, the officer's personal testimony cannot be used. All other evidence in the case could be used and the case prosecuted.

MIKE RAMIREZ (Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs):

We support S.B. 282. I have been a representative during internal affairs investigations for the past three years. I have reminded detectives when they are outside the scope of the notice. When they say, "duly noted, now answer the question," it is a willful and intentional violation of officers' rights. These are the cases we address in the bill.

In the two cases referenced earlier, both officers were denied representation, even after requesting assistance. They were told to give an interview or be terminated. We were able to resolve the matter through conversations with senior officials. Without a penalty, the lengthy and costly cases end with a simple apology.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Will this legislation keep bad apples in their jobs?

MR. RAMIREZ:

No. It is to protect officers' due process rights.

JASON GUINASSO:

My law firm is proud to represent law enforcement officers. I was involved in a case involving an officer who had served a Nevada police department for ten years. Officer Dan Woyciehowsky had received several awards, commendations and specialized training. He had never received a poor performance review and had never been subject to discipline for misconduct. Without exception, his performance reviews had met or exceeded the standards of his department. On Saturday, September 21, 2013, at 8:00 p.m., Officer Woyciehowsky reported for his regularly scheduled shift. He was suffering from flu-like symptoms including a stuffy and runny nose. He had a cough, body aches, chills and lethargy. Nevertheless, he reported for his shift. He did not want to call in sick because the office was short-staffed.

At approximately 9:15 p.m., Officer Woyciehowsky was called into the station by his sergeant who did not give a reason for the call. Officer Woyciehowsky was escorted to the sergeant's office where a lieutenant was waiting. The door was closed and locked, and the officer was interrogated regarding an anonymous complaint. The sergeant and lieutenant believed the officer was under the influence of drugs. They observed he had bloodshot eyes, a pale face

and was a little slow. Neither had observed that he was inhibited in any way with respect to his job performance. Neither had observed Officer Woyciehowsky performing his job duties before calling him into the station.

When asked about his condition, Officer Woyciehowsky explained he was suffering from the flu and was not feeling well. In violation of the city's drug and alcohol policy, the officer was asked inappropriate questions. They asked what medications he was taking and asked him to write them down. They asked if he was addicted to certain medications. The sergeant violated the city's administrative rules by telling the lieutenant he suspected the officer had been using alcohol or drugs.

Officer Woyciehowsky during this process repeatedly requested legal counsel in accordance with his rights under NRS 289.080. No one from the city disputed that the officer had made these requests. However, the sergeant and lieutenant ignored or refused his requests. They continued the interrogation. Under the threat of insubordination, Officer Woyciehowsky fully cooperated with the investigation. He was instructed to go home and wait for a telephone call. Within an hour he was called back to the police station and ordered to bring his service weapons and police identification.

When Officer Woyciehowsky returned to the station, he was greeted by the deputy chief and the sergeant who informed him he was facing charges of insubordination. He was required to provide a urine sample for a drug test. Despite his denied request for legal counsel and a union representative, the officer was also forced to take a breathalyzer test. Both tests were negative for drugs or alcohol. He was placed on administrative leave and later terminated. The case was not resolved for two years. The officer could not afford to pay legal fees.

Two statutes are relevant to this case. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 289.080, subsection 1 states, a peace officer who is the subject of an investigation may upon request have two representatives of the peace officer's choosing present with the peace officer during any phase of an interrogation or hearing relating to the investigation, including, without limitation, a lawyer, representative of a labor union or another peace officer. Officer Woyciehowsky was not provided this right. The sergeant and lieutenant were both aware of this provision.

Nevada Revised Statutes 289.085 clearly protects officers from self-incrimination for statements made without counsel or representation. The statute states,

If an arbitrator or court determines that evidence was obtained during an investigation of a peace officer concerning conduct that could result in punitive action in a manner which violates any provision of NRS 289.010 to NRS 289.120, inclusive, and that such evidence may be prejudicial to the peace officer, such evidence is inadmissible and the arbitrator or court shall exclude such evidence during any administrative proceeding commenced or civil action filed against the peace officer.

During our presentation in arbitration, I highlighted the word "shall," and I fully expected all the evidence induced during this inappropriate interrogation would be inadmissible. Despite the clear language of the statute, it did not happen.

Section 2, subsection 2 of S.B. 282 will ensure this will not happen again by accomplishing two goals. It will clarify the circumstances when this exclusionary rule must be applied and make the intent of the Legislature clear. It will act as a deterrent to individuals who may disregard the rights of peace officers during the interrogation process.

RICHARD P. MCCANN (Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers):

We support S.B. 282. Many of these issues can be resolved without arbitration. This is not a solution looking for a problem. There are some problems to deal with. An officer may be charged with misconduct and the charges are sustained. In a predisciplinary hearing, a chief of police lists offenses outside the scope of the notice. This is a violation of the peace officers' bill of rights. This situation did occur and seemed to be willful and intentional.

Another agency noticed one of our members, who was informed the internal investigation would include an examination of the member's performance. Another notice addressed misconduct. These issues are not in conformity with NRS 289 which requires notice of the nature of the investigation and specifics relating to the alleged misconduct.

Another officer received a notice of a formal investigation of the officer's demeanor, performance, knowledge and adherence to policy and procedure. The officer was accused of abusing the rights and authority of the position of police officer and violating the philosophies of the police department. No specifics were offered.

In some cases, these violations cannot be resolved through discussion. Senate Bill 282 is needed as a guidance and statutory responsibility. Officers who violate policy will be held responsible as will the agencies. When the system is violated intentionally and willfully, there have to be consequences.

JOE DEESE:

I am a peace officer whose rights were violated. Senate Bill 282 addresses situations like mine. I was noticed regarding a search I conducted for weapons. During the search, I found drugs. It was deemed an illegal search and the department decided to discipline me. At a hearing for this offense, I was informed of four additional charges. The investigating officer did not respond to my representative's numerous requests to restrict the proceedings to the noticed offense. The investigating officer demanded I answer questions. On the advice of my representative, I complied. Eighteen months later it was resolved and I was vindicated. It was a long, difficult process.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):
We also fall under NRS 289 and are in support of S.B. 282.

MICHAEL SEAN GIURLANI (President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association):

I am a 25-year veteran of Nevada Highway Patrol. We support S.B. 282. These violations do not happen often, but when they do, they have long lasting and severe effects on our employees.

CHAIR PARKS:

A violation of an officer's rights affects the officer. What is the impact on the police department?

MR. GIURLANI:

It tends to be a drain on morale. If an officer is singled out for misconduct in an incident involving many officers, group morale suffers and respect for the

investigator is diminished. If the process is drawn out, the stress on the individual can be damaging.

SCOTT EDWARDS (President, Las Vegas Peace Officers Association; President, Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs):

We support S.B. 282. I am working on three cases of members who were charged with one offense and are now being investigated for others. They were not noticed on the new charges or given the opportunity to answer questions. Our objections have been ignored. We work for a productive environment with our management teams. Senate Bill 282 will help with the process.

MICHELLE JOTZ (Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association):

We support S.B. 282. Section 1 removes reference to collective bargaining agreement and will aid in encouraging agencies to conduct a timely investigation. Some collective bargaining agreements allow an agency to suspend an employee without pay pending the outcome of an investigation. Some investigations are not completed for more than a year. If the agency is not obligated to pay an employee's salary, there is no incentive to be expedient. Section 2 of S.B. 282 adds enforcement provisions to NRS 289 and provides incentive for agencies' guarantees of officers' due process rights.

We are asking that agencies be held accountable. Senate Bill 282 provides that accountability.

CHUCK CALLAWAY (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

We oppose S.B. 282. Departments have to balance the need for transparency and public safety with the rights of our officers. Senate Bill 282 inserts principles of the Fourth Amendment exclusionary rule, a constitutional provision, into personnel management and discipline of employees.

The bill is more restrictive than the exclusionary rule. Under the exclusionary rule as it applies to evidence collected in a criminal case, evidence illegally obtained by a police officer is inadmissible. However, corroborating evidence or witness testimony is admissible.

Senate Bill 282 would exclude any evidence in certain cases. As an example, if an officer's wife calls his supervisor and claims he is using illegal drugs, the sergeant would call the officer into the station for questioning. The officer refuses to answer without the presence of a representative but is compelled to

testify. This is a violation of his rights under NRS 289. If sometime later a second investigating officer legally follows the process, under S.B. 282 the investigation must be terminated because of the earlier violation. The officer cannot be disciplined even if there is corroborating evidence, such as a positive drug test or body camera footage.

Senate Bill 282 hinders public trust and accountability. Police officers' actions are scrutinized by the public. We are unclear about the reason for the unions' suggestion in section 1 removing collective bargaining language.

Agencies should have the right to suspend officers without pay during a criminal investigation. The language of S.B. 282 in section 1 should be clarified to indicate internal investigations only.

Finally, S.B. 282 provides that if a department has violated an officer's rights, all attorney's fees and costs must be paid by the department. Officers' unions have resources to defend officers. It might be argued that officers who are found guilty should pay fees and costs incurred by the departments.

Violations of peace officers' bill of rights are rare. There is a grievance process in place. If S.B. 282 is enacted as written, it will create an environment where any officer accused of misconduct would begin with the claim of a violation of rights. There would be no incentive to cooperate.

SENATOR RATTI:

Can you outline an effective process?

MR. CALLAWAY:

The process varies according to the seriousness of the allegation. All of our internal affairs investigators have been trained on the requirements of NRS 289. We make every effort to protect our officers' rights, as well as the rights of citizens.

ERIC SPRATLEY (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):

We oppose S.B. 282. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 289 adequately covers issues addressed in the bill. Section 1, subsection 2 addresses collective bargaining agreements. Associations can change these requirements during the next negotiation sessions. In Washoe County, an appointing authority can immediately suspend without pay an employee pending discharge for gross

misconduct or conduct which gives rise to a clear and present danger to public health and safety. The change proposed in S.B. 282 would strike out our ability to suspend officers without pay, regardless of the seriousness of the charges. Under S.B. 282, officers who are charged with gross misconduct and are a danger to public health and safety would continue to receive a paycheck for the duration of the investigation.

The provisions of section 2 of S.B. 282 are addressed in NRS 289. Evidence wrongfully obtained is inadmissible and the arbitrator or court shall exclude such evidence during any administrative proceeding or civil action filed against police officers. Senate Bill 282 would expand the excluded evidence to include anything collected beyond that which has been wrongfully obtained. The entire investigation would be void and abated. A single violation at the beginning of an investigation would invalidate the entire process. The bill is far-reaching.

A solution is to continue improving training of investigating officers. In Washoe County, we often call on other jurisdictions for investigations of our officers or employees.

When employees are not disciplined for infractions, morale in the department suffers.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Your department is continually training internal affairs officers on NRS 289. Is that correct?

MR. SPRATLEY:

Yes. Our Office of Professional Integrity is the unit conducting internal affairs investigations. They are continually trained in peace officers' bill of rights issues.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Why do we have conflicts?

MR. SPRATLEY:

I am not aware of situations like those described today. We respect the rights of our officers and work to protect them.

SENATOR MANENDO:

If the language is changed to reflect internal rather than criminal investigations and departments are not held responsible for legal and court costs, would you be satisfied with S.B. 282?

MR. SPRATLEY:

I do not agree with any part of S.B. 282. I agree with the amendment, [Exhibit I](#), which changes NRS 289.020, subsection 3 to read if a peace officer refuses to comply with "an order" rather than "a request." The principles of S.B. 282 are covered in NRS 289. The difference is that this is an attempt to take all of the evidence in an investigation, find one error and invalidate the entire process.

SENATOR RATTI:

The intent is to apply consequences for violations of peace officers' rights. What other solutions are available?

MR. CALLAWAY:

If officers believe their rights have been violated, they can file a civil lawsuit against their departments.

SENATOR RATTI:

Lawsuits are expensive for everyone. I would prefer a management tool or consequence that would change behavior long before a lawsuit was necessary. Lawsuits may be an effective remedy, but they are not an efficient remedy.

MR. SPRATLEY:

Local governments and police departments can work together to avoid these situations. I would want to know if police officers' rights are violated in our agency.

MR. CALLAWAY:

Sponsors of S.B. 282 have said they want to address "malicious and willful" violations of peace officers' rights, but this language is not in the bill. There is a difference between an unintentional violation and one that is malicious and willful.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 18

MIKE CATHCART (City of Henderson):

We oppose S.B. 282. We are especially concerned about the section 2 provision requiring that all evidence obtained during an investigation be deemed inadmissible in the event of a violation of a peace officer's rights.

CRAIG STEVENS (Clark County School District):

We oppose S.B. 282. We are also concerned about section 2.

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Washoe County School District):

We oppose S.B. 282.

ROBERT ROSHAK (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We oppose S.B. 282.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The opposition centers on the language in section 2, subsection 1. Is there concern about section 2, subsection 2 paragraph (d) of S.B. 282 providing for the hearing officer or the arbitrator awarding to the peace officer all attorney's fees and court costs? This could be very expensive and a burden on the small rural communities I represent.

MR. ROSHAK:

Some agencies are concerned. There is an appeal process.

MR. DREHER:

Collective bargaining agreement language was added to NRS 289 in 2011.

CHAIR PARKS:

We close the hearing on S.B. 282 and open S.B. 501.

SENATE BILL 501: Extends the prospective expiration of the Consumer Affairs Unit of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 18-908)

TERRY REYNOLDS (Deputy Director, Office of Business and Planning, Department of Business and Industry):

Senate Bill 501 extends the expiration of the Consumer Affairs Unit from June 30 to June 30, 2019. We have been working with the Governor's Office of Finance and funding has been identified. The technical details are forthcoming.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 19

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
Are we waiting for a budget amendment?

MR. REYNOLDS:
We are waiting for a funding amendment. The Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Governor's Office of Finance are working on the details.

CHAIR PARKS:
The fiscal note reports the funding is contained in the *Executive Budget* within budget account 4681. If our Committee takes favorable action on S.B. 501, the bill will be rereferred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

MR. REYNOLDS:
There will be a fiscal amendment.

CHAIR PARKS:
We will close S.B. 501 and open S.B. 500.

SENATE BILL 500: Revises provisions relating to the Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 18-909)

STEVE AICHROTH (Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):
Senate Bill 500 consolidates the Manufactured Housing Division and the Housing Division. The combined resources of both divisions will provide better service to all Nevadans including those residing in manufactured home communities, those living in multifamily apartments and those hoping to become homeowners.

The lack of affordable housing opportunities in Nevada is the most serious problem in housing. Manufactured housing provides alternatives within the affordable housing spectrum.

Lining up both divisions under the leadership of one administrator will provide for consistent and reliable policy direction, a more stable and efficient level of service, and greater public awareness of programs available to those in need of affordable housing. In the past, merger attempts have been made with the intention of reducing costs to the State. This attempt will not duplicate those efforts. We constantly monitor our costs; however, we see this merger as an

opportunity to provide a much greater level of service to our residents. One of the ways this manifests itself is through the potential to develop or preserve manufactured housing through the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program, which allows for the development of manufactured housing. Our combined personnel will be able to view proposals, provide commentary, and oversee the installation and annual inspection process of manufactured structure developments.

The Housing Division operates the Weatherization Assistance Program, which provides energy-efficient testing and improvements to reduce utility costs at no cost to homeowners. Approximately one-third of homeowners receiving assistance reside in manufactured home communities. The combined division will be able to use our resources to eliminate the duplication of effort in the process.

Industry will also reap the benefits of the combined division. Inspections of commercial structures, particularly those at special events, need to be completed in a short period of time. The combined division will have cross-trained field personnel who will be able to inspect temporary structures in a short time frame resulting in less down time for the infrastructure of the event.

Senate Bill 500 creates a new budget account 3045 in section 24. Three of the four current Manufactured Housing Division budget accounts will become part of the new Housing Inspection and Compliance budget account (B/A). This budget account will encompass all of the regulatory functions currently performed by both the Manufactured Housing Division and the Housing Division. This will include the complaint investigation process and the inspection process for manufactured housing as well as the compliance and audit functions in regard to housing weatherization and tax credit programs.

The fourth budget area funds the Lot Rent Subsidy (LRS) Program and will be placed in the Housing Division's Low-Income Housing Trust Fund account B/A 3838. This will be a separate category within the account for complete transparency regarding revenues and expenditures of the program.

In sections 17 through 20 of S.B. 500, the Lot Rent Subsidy fee and the parks fee, which support the investigative component of the Division, along with the qualification language for the LRS program have been removed from

statute. The intent is to move the conforming language into regulation. We fully intend to apply the same language that is being removed from statute into regulation with no change to the fee structure or qualifications for recipients of the LRS Program. Moving these items into regulation will provide the Division the ability to make changes as necessary to the program and the program qualifiers based on changes which may occur during the Interim.

Section 28 of S.B. 500 commits the Housing Division to contributing up to \$75,000 from the Account for Low-Income Housing which is in addition to the Lot Rent Subsidy fee collected to assist with the monthly rent of an eligible family on a manufactured home lot. This will provide funding to assure the continuation of this program. A friendly amendment ([Exhibit K](#)) aligns the bill language with the Governor's recommended budget . This replacement language is a clarification for the flow of funds between funding sources.

Section 25 of S.B. 500 creates the position of Housing Advocate. This position will provide dedicated assistance to our most vulnerable residents, including senior citizens, veterans, disabled individuals and those with extremely low incomes. The advocate will have the ability to guide citizens to affordable housing opportunities and services to improve the quality of their lives. The advocate will develop relationships with fair housing service providers, Housing and the U.S. Department of Urban Development (HUD), property managers, affordable housing developers, manufactured housing communities, resident councils and nonprofit legal assistance agencies. The advocate will have an understanding of all the programs of the combined division including all tenant assistance programs.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Senate Bill 500 will provide that the Lot Rent Subsidy Program would be transparent. Is it not transparent now?

MR. AICHROTH:

It is transparent. It is in a separate budget account, B/A 3842. It will move into the 3838 budget category. It will be more obvious as a category.

SENATOR MANENDO:

What will be the cost of the advocate position?

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 22

C.J. MANTHE (Administrator, Department of Housing Division, Business and Industry):

The salary will be in the upper \$60,000 range plus benefits.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Have you considered placing the advocate position in Manufactured Housing Division now? We have been asking for this position for a long time.

MS. MANTHE:

An affordable housing advocate will meet the needs of all Nevada citizens. The Housing Division touches the lives of one in four Nevadans. Combined, having one advocate would represent effective and efficient government.

CHAIR PARKS:

Would the advocate handle complaints relative to tenants in apartment dwellings?

MS. MANTHE:

Yes. The advocate would work to resolve disputes.

TYSON FALK, (Nevada Housing Alliance):

The Nevada Housing Alliance supports S.B. 500. Combining the divisions will mean eligibility for federal funding opportunities.

JODI STEPHENS (Manufactured Home Community Owners):

The Manufactured Home Community Owners (MHCO) opposes S.B. 500 because of concerns with section 17 and section 18, which move annual fees out of statute and into regulation. Section 19 removes the Lot Rent Subsidy. Since 1991, this Nevada association has contributed \$8 million into the fund. We want to be sure the funds go to the intended recipients. We would request an administrative cap on the fees.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Does the Manufactured Housing Division work well for the MHCO?

MS. STEPHENS:

Yes, sometimes. Distribution of the Lot Rent Subsidy is a concern.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Manufactured home owners in Nevada have had a good working relationship with the Manufactured Housing Division. I do not know how the merging of the divisions will impact them. Some of their homes cost more than \$100,000. Will their service change with a new departmental organization?

Ms. STEPHENS:

We are not aware of any concerns.

SENATOR MANENDO:

I am not certain about the reason for merging the divisions. They need more staff.

SENATOR HARDY:

Do you have a suggestion for a dollar amount on the cap on fees?

Ms. STEPHENS:

We are working with the Manufactured Housing Division on the details and language.

BOB VARALLO (Nevada Association of Manufactured Home Owners):

We oppose S.B. 500. Our Association is well served by the Manufactured Housing Division, and we have a good working relationship. We have had limited contact with the Housing Division. We do not see a benefit in merging the divisions, especially for those who live on leased property. Homeowners and renters are treated differently by statute. An advocate might be helpful.

Ms. MANTHE:

Senate Bill 500 represents good government by pooling resources such as information technology, inspection compliance staff and economists. The Housing Advocate will be based in Las Vegas where the majority of constituents experience housing issues.

The Housing Division has 33 full-time employees. The Manufactured Housing Division has 14 full-time employees. The combined division will have fewer than 50 employees.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Will the 14 Manufactured Housing Division employees transfer to the Housing Division and all be working on manufactured housing issues?

MS. MANTHE:

All employees are located in the same building. No employees will change offices, but we will cross-train for more efficiency.

SENATOR MANENDO:

It may mean reducing the number of employees who work with people who live in manufactured homes.

MS. MANTHE:

There are many areas of overlap. The Housing Division administers a weatherization program. One-third of the families in this program reside in manufactured homes. The Housing Division helps constituents with homeownership, including purchases of manufactured homes. We will continue to serve the needs of the manufactured home community and all affordable housing needs of Nevada's citizens.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Would funds from the LRS Program continue to benefit those who live in manufactured homes or would the funds be absorbed into the division?

MS. MANTHE:

The funds will be accounted for in a separate budget category. All the expenses can be tracked separately and accounted for. With the combination of the divisions, up to \$75,000 will be dedicated to the LRS Program funds. This would delay or avoid the need for fee increases. We want to be certain the Program continues without service disruptions.

SENATOR RATTI:

Merging the divisions and ensuring service to the manufactured housing community is a management and leadership issue. What are management and leadership strategies?

MR. AICHROTH:

In Las Vegas at the Nevada State Business Center, there is a common waiting room for the Housing and Manufactured Housing Divisions. There will be no

change. There will continue to be dedicated staff and resources in Las Vegas. The combined division will have the ability to cross-train employees across offices.

In Carson City, both divisions are in the same building. All employees will be in a position to assist anyone who comes to the office.

SENATOR RATTI:

You have described a narrow resource issue. Can you outline strategy and budgeting? As one division, how do you make sure the minority group is served at existing levels?

MS. MANTHE:

Our combined philosophy is one of open communication. We value partnerships. Both divisions have prioritized outreach and relationship building. As a combined division, we would continue to reach out to residence councils, manufactured housing communities and legal aid organizations. We will continue to conduct workshops to understand the needs of the stakeholders.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Have you had conversations with stakeholders regarding S.B. 500 and the plan to merge divisions? If so, what has been the reaction? Has there been consensus?

MR. AICHROTH:

Yes. I have been in touch with homeowners' organizations, though we have not reached consensus. The process will continue, and I will spend more time with stakeholders.

SENATOR HARDY:

With the adoption of S.B. 500, the division will get more money from the federal government, service levels for manufactured homeowners will not change or will increase, and complaints will be adjudicated more efficiently. Is that correct?

MR. AICHROTH:

We will continue to communicate and work to resolve problems.

MS. MANTHE:

The Housing Division receives funding from multiple sources for preserving affordable housing, expanding affordable housing and improving the quality of life for those who live in affordable housing. More federal funding has been awarded and obligated for affordable housing needs, subject to federal appropriations. Senate Bill 500 would allow for wider dissemination of the funds.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are the funds contingent upon program design?

MS. MANTHE:

Some of the funding is earmarked for lower-income, vulnerable families. We also have funding for disabled individuals and families. If Nevada does not use the funds, they will revert to the federal government.

SENATOR HARDY:

Senate Bill 500 will help the disabled and the poor?

MS. MANTHE:

Yes.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Are you prevented from helping the disabled and the poor now?

MS. MANTHE:

In 2015, there was a shortfall in the LRS Program. We provided a grant to the program of \$100,000. This is an example of the overlap in our divisions.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Are you prevented from adding staff if you have resources and funding? Manufactured Housing Division has only 14 staff members.

MS. MANTHE:

There is a process to request more staff.

MR. REYNOLDS:

We have flexibility to hire staff. However, manufactured housing as a fee-funded agency is restrained by a reduced budget. Senate Bill 500 would allow for more resources and opportunities.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close S.B. 500 and open the hearing on S.B. 477.

SENATE BILL 477: Enacts provisions relating to residential establishments for persons with disabilities. (BDR 22-146)

SENATOR JOSEPH P. HARDY (Senatorial District No. 12):

I am chairman of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs which met four times during the 2015-2016 Interim. I have submitted a summary of recommendations relating to S.B. 477 and other legislation ([Exhibit L](#)). We heard testimony related to residential care homes (RCH) for people with disabilities and/or those who need to live in a safe family-type atmosphere. Of the 350 RCHs in Nevada, only 10 percent utilize Medicaid as a funding source. The vast majority of RCH residents are elderly who utilize their own resources together with family support to maintain a comfortable environment that is reminiscent of a private home.

In 2013, changes to NRS resulted in several unintended consequences relating to RCHs. Notably, some RCHs are now recognized as commercial establishments requiring commercial sprinkler systems. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit M](#)).

HELEN FOLEY (Nevada Assisted Living Association):

Senate Bill 477 defines the term "single-family residence" to include a residential facility for groups in which ten or fewer persons with disabilities reside and a home of individual residential care. A single-family residence is distinguished from residential establishments which require commercial grade sprinkler systems. Single-family residences are located in residential neighborhoods. Conditions do not exist to support commercial grade sprinkler systems in residential neighborhoods.

We are proud that the regulations and codes for residential facilities in Nevada are some of the most rigorous in the Nation. Section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of S.B. 477 defines a single-family residence as a residential

facility for groups in which ten or fewer unrelated persons with disabilities reside. We may need to make changes to “unrelated” as some residents may not be related to the homeowner. Facilities with two residents are not required to have commercial grade sprinklers. We may need to change the language to read a facility with three to ten residents.

Section 8 of S.B. 477 requires rezoning, zone variance or special use permits. However, residences classified as single-family residences do not, by definition, need these variances and special permits. Section 8 implies that they do.

Section 16 addresses required fire sprinkler equipment. Some amendments to the language may be necessary. The section identifies facilities with two or more residents. We request changing the language to read three or more residents because that is the standard for residential facilities for groups.

BRIAN MCANALLEN (City of Las Vegas):

We oppose S.B. 477. We are always concerned about overprescribing building and fire codes in statute. We will work with the sponsors of S.B. 477 for solutions.

BUM HESS (Storey County):

We oppose some of the language in S.B. 477. These houses are more suited to multifamily zoning areas. Storey County officials would like to have more control over zoning, especially in our historic communities.

SENATOR RATTI:

Zoning decisions made by local governments must comply with federal housing laws.

MR. HESS:

In our County, we have experience with residential facilities which are meant to be for one population but are changed to accommodate another. We do not intend to violate federal housing laws.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):

The Legislative Counsel Bureau has not received amendments. Once we have reviewed suggested language, we can provide guidance for compliance with federal housing laws.

MR. HESS:

We will work with all interested parties on an amendment.

CAROLYN CAMPBELL (Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Civil Division, Clark County):

We are concerned about S.B. 477 as written. Section 3 defines "halfway house for recovering alcohol and drug abusers." It refers to the definition in NRS 449.008. We request the definition be similar to the definition of a residential facility for groups in that it would put a limitation of ten or fewer residents.

Section 7, subsection 3 reads "the governing body ... shall not refuse to issue a special use permit to a residential establishment that meets local public health and safety standards." We request adding "or that achieves the goal of community integration." We want to be certain residents can be integrated into communities.

A lawsuit was settled between Clark County and the Nevada Fair Housing Center some years ago. Senate Bill 477 would negate the settlement agreement and may expose the County to litigation.

The bill prohibits the denial of a use permit application except where the applicant fails to meet the local public health and safety standards. The definition is unclear, but we would request including "achieves the goal of community integration." In addition to any fiscal impact assumptions, the County has an ordinance in place that arose out of the settlement agreement with the Nevada Fair Housing Center. Senate Bill 477 would supersede that ordinance. When residential facilities are clustered, they lose the advantage of integrating into residential neighborhoods.

JAMES GERREN (Department of Building and Fire Prevention, Clark County):

We have concerns about S.B. 477 as written. The proposed changes to NRS 278 create a challenge for us in terms of issuing appropriate building permits. Specifically, these changes would create direct conflicts between NRS 278 and the International Building Code which is the adopted building code for Nevada, the State Fire Marshal and Clark County. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit N](#)).

FULTON COCHRAN (Assistant Fire Chief, Department of Building and Fire Prevention, Clark County):

The hierarchy of buildings, the classification of hazards and the appropriate safeguards are carefully thought out at the national level. The National Fire Protection Association has three sprinkler standards, 13D for dwelling, 13R for residential and 13. All three types are used in homes we are discussing today. There has been confusion over the classification system and the required sprinkler systems.

We support the referral in *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 449 going back to the State Fire Marshal regulations, so we do not start mixing inside other state regulations the minimum safety standards set by the State. An example, in NAC 449.211, the language refers to sprinkler systems, and it directs the reader to look at NRS 477, the State Fire Marshal regulations, and any local ordinances. That language should be inserted in section 16, subsection 1. The sentence would read a "residential facility for groups must be equipped with the fire sprinkler system that complies with the provisions of NRS 477 and any local ordinances."

Regarding the definition of "capable of self-preservation," [Exhibit N](#), section 16, subsection 1 says a residential facility must be equipped with a fire sprinkler system if the facility has two or more residents who would have difficulty perceiving danger or moving to safety in the event of a fire. I do not know who on staff in the Building and Fire Prevention office is qualified to make those determinations. We are not health professionals. This is a qualifier that does not fit within the national language. This section of [S.B. 477](#) is unenforceable.

CHAIR PARKS:

It appears amendments may be necessary to [S.B. 477](#).

LEE PLEMEL (Community Development Department, Carson City):

We are neutral to [S.B. 477](#). The concept of allowing these facilities integrating into residential neighborhoods is good. The definition of single-family residence varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Generally, four to six unrelated persons are allowed to live in one household as a single-family unit.

In Carson City, up to four unrelated persons are allowed in one household. We cannot require a group home for four people to apply for a special use permit if we allow four otherwise unrelated persons to live there. This is equal treatment

under federal law. Federal law does not determine the number of people allowed. The law is concerned with equal treatment.

Our recommendation for changes to section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (a) is to limit the number to six unrelated persons. With as many as ten people living in one residence, there are parking and traffic issues.

We agree with Clark County's recommendation of limiting the number of people living in a halfway house. Our recommendation would be a limit of six. The number should be consistent with that allowed in group homes. If fewer people are allowed in residential facilities, it may address some of the concerns about historic neighborhoods. These limitations would not prevent a local jurisdiction from allowing facilities for more than ten persons while requiring special use permits.

SENATOR HARDY:

The intent of S.B. 477 is to require rational sprinkler systems for residential facilities. These are generally single-story buildings and do not require commercial grade systems. It is important to work with those who have concerns. The objections are not insurmountable.

MS. FOLEY:

We have asked for limits of between three and ten for all facilities. *Nevada Administrative Code* contains square footage requirements.

We will work with those who have concerns about S.B. 477. In regard to the concerns about the term "capable of self-preservation," our residents are categorized by two codes. Residents who are considered Code 2 have a difficult time ambulating. Facilities with Code 2 residents need upgraded fire sprinklers. Many supportive living arrangements and community-based living arrangements with mentally ill residents are not required to provide upgraded fire sprinklers. They are able to move out of a building without assistance.

We are asking to be considered single-family residences because that is what we are.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 477. We will defer discussion on S.B. 417 until our next meeting.

SENATE BILL 417: Provides for the establishment of programs to encourage tenants of housing projects to save money for certain purposes. (BDR 25-836)

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 183.

SENATE BILL 183: Makes the provisions of the Local Government Budget and Finance Act applicable to housing authorities. (BDR 31-616)

SENATOR DAVID R. PARKS (Senatorial District No. 7):

Senate Bill 183 makes provisions of the Local Government Budget and Finance Act applicable to housing authorities. These are authorities established by local governmental entities. The Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority is a consolidation of the Las Vegas Housing Authority and the Clark County Housing Authority.

Senate Bill 183 proposes to include housing authorities and local governments under the same budgetary and financial reporting requirements. Under the legislation, housing authorities must prepare and submit a budget with the Department of Taxation. There is a division within the Department that reviews the budgets and provides guidance to local governments.

In my experience with the Las Vegas Housing Authority, the local government did not provide any oversight. Budgetary oversight is imperative. There is no fiscal impact to S.B. 183. The Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority has a \$150 million budget. Some level of oversight needs to be provided by an independent agency.

WILLIAM BREWER (Deputy Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority):

We oppose S.B. 183. The bill would affect all housing authorities in Nevada. The Nevada Rural Housing Authority (NRHA) is not considered a local government for the purposes of NRS 354. Housing authorities do not levy taxes or use local or state funds for their activities. Funds utilized by the housing authority are those provided through federal programs or which are generated by other activities such as multifamily housing developments.

There is no fiscal note on S.B. 183 because there is no fiscal impact on the State. Compliance costs would create a financial burden on the housing authority. The oversight requirements of NRS 354 are met under our current structure. Our board of directors is appointed by the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities. The NRHA and its activities are reviewed by our board, NACO and the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities. We are audited by a third-party independent auditor each year, and the audits are publicly available on our Website.

Senate Bill 183 and the requirements under NRS 354 raise several questions. As a rural housing authority, we would be required to submit 17 different copies of our budget, each needing a separate approval. Annual reports would need to be submitted separately. These reviews are also required by HUD. This would be an additional layer of review.

AMY JONES (Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Reno):
We oppose S.B. 183. The legislation would have an undue burden on the housing authority. We are overseen by a board of directors which is appointed by the City of Reno. We have the same reporting requirements as the NRHA. The budget is approved by our board. Our capital fund program provides funds for capital improvements. The reports of the disposition of those funds are open to public review and hearings and subject to board of directors and HUD approval.

We are required to complete multiple annual audits for HUD. Our financial department is staffed by four employees. Our development department has a staff of five. Additional audits and deadlines would be a burden on this staff.

Oversight is important. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provides that oversight.

MISHON HURST (Deputy Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Reno):

Our primary funding is from HUD. The HUD office provides oversight. We are subject to many regulations. Senate Bill 183 would add to those responsibilities.

SENATOR PARKS:

There may be HUD reporting and auditing, but housing authorities collect other revenues. Housing authorities created and established by local governments

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 34

work with budgets that are not reported as an agency of the city. Senate Bill 183 is meant to require a report of their financial activities. I will work with NRHA for agreement. I can amend section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) to exclude NRHA.

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 183.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 5, 2017
Page 35

CHAIR PARKS:
The hearing is adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jan Brase,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	8		Attendance Roster
S.B. 39	C	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 57	D	7	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 88	E	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 314	F	3	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 384	G	2	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 384	H	1	Senator Julia Ratti	Revised Amendment
S.B. 282	I	4	Senator Tick Segerblom	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 282	J	4	Ron Dreher / Police Officers Research Association of Nevada	Written Testimony
S.B. 500	K	4	Steve Aichroth / Department of Business and Industry	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 477	L	6	Senator Joseph P. Hardy	Summary of Recommendations
S.B. 477	M	5	Senator Joseph P. Hardy	Written Testimony
S.B. 477	N	5	James Gerren	Written Testimony