

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eightieth Session
March 6, 2019**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Ellen B. Spiegel at 1:31 p.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5
Assemblyman Alex Assefa, Assembly District No. 42

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst
Wil Keane, Committee Counsel

Minutes ID: 422



Katelyn Malone, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

Andy Peterson, Vice President, Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada

Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Jamie Rodriguez, Government Affairs Manager, Office of the County Manager,
Washoe County

Matthew Walker, representing The Howard Hughes Corporation

Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety
Officers

Robert Ostrovsky, representing Nevada Resort Association

Dennis Erickson, Nevada State Director, Security Officer's Brotherhood

Jonathan Alvarez, Chief Executive Officer/Co-Founder, Protective Force
International, Las Vegas, Nevada

Ted Farace, Owner, Elite Security Specialists, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada

Lorenzo Sandoval, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Larry Kelley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

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

Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's
Office

Amy Coffee, Past President, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice

Kevin L. Ingram, Executive Director, Private Investigator's Licensing Board

Rachel Anderson, General Counsel, Office of the Attorney General

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber
of Commerce

Mendy Elliott, representing Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association

Andy Donahue, Market Representative, Southern Nevada Laborers-Employers
Cooperation and Education Trust

Alexis Motarex, representing the Nevada Chapter of the Associated General
Contractors of America, Inc.

Rose Jaime, Social Work Intern, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State
Education Association

Elisa Cafferata, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada; and Time to Care
Nevada Coalition

Yitbarek Heilu, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Mequanent Alemu, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Abiy T. Beshah, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Dereje Wolle, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Melkamu Zemeda, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of
Henderson

Chair Spiegel:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 184.

Assembly Bill 184: Revises provisions relating to security guards. (BDR 54-929)

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5:

Assembly Bill 184 relates to professionals we encounter every day: security guards. These professionals maintain a safe and secure environment for customers, employees, students, and the public overall. Most often we associate them with guarding banks or shopping malls, patrolling neighborhoods, or securing a public event like a concert or festival. However, they may also work as bodyguards, school security officers, and private investigators. Security guards have an important role to guard and protect, which enhances public safety and security. Over the years, the demand for and on security guards to deal with volatile situations has increased. We cannot forget the other scenarios that security guards may be confronted with, such as active shooters or acts of terrorism, such as on the night of October 1 [October 1, 2017, Las Vegas shooting].

In Nevada, there are two types of security guards, armed and unarmed, who may be employees of a company licensed under the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) [Chapter 648]. Currently, unarmed security guards are required to apply for a work card and pass a 30-question examination—which is posted online along with the study guide—with a score of 100 percent. There is no formal training required for an unarmed security guard. On the other hand, an armed security guard must attend a firearm safety course administered by a firearms instructor who is certified by the Private Investigator's Licensing Board (PILB). The course consists of eight hours of training and instruction on carrying, handling, and using a firearm safely, and it includes a comprehensive written exam that the student must pass with a minimum score of 75 percent. Additionally, the applicant must complete a minimum of five hours of instruction and training at the firing range. Once the course is completed, applicants will receive a permanent work card stating that they are authorized to use a firearm as a security guard. They must requalify every six months in order to maintain the certification.

Many states have legislation that requires a minimum of 40 hours of training for armed guards, and continual training. I have provided a handout that compares training standards for security guards in a few other states ([Exhibit C](#)), which has also been uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. Oklahoma requires security guards to have the most training, with 72 hours required for armed security guards and 40 hours required for unarmed security guards. Increasing the training requirements in Nevada can enhance the guards' level of skill and professionalism. While the distinction between

security professionals and peace officers will remain intact, we can acknowledge that the higher demands that are placed on this profession require a higher level of training.

Currently, the PILB is authorized to require a licensee or employee of a licensee to complete firearm safety training before being allowed to carry a firearm in the course of his or her duties. Section 1 of A.B. 184 requires that unarmed security guards receive at least eight hours of comprehensive training on their roles and responsibilities. It also requires a security guard to complete 40 hours of comprehensive training that is developed and approved by the PILB, in order to carry a firearm in their duties. This training, in addition to the firearm training, may include training on de-escalation, their roles and responsibilities, laws and regulations, ethics, first response, communications, and cultural sensitivity. The bill also requires training on the safe use of additional tools that may be used for disabling another person, such as pepper spray, Tasers, or handcuffs. The bill would require a psychological evaluation to determine that the individual can exercise good judgment in rapidly developing situations, require a screening for controlled substances excluding marijuana, and require continuing education. The PILB is required to adopt the regulations necessary to ensure compliance with these provisions and prescribe appropriate disciplinary action for a private patrol officer, or his or her employee, who fails to comply with these provisions.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill propose enhanced penalties for assault or battery which are applicable to uniformed security guards who are performing their duties. Uniformed security guards would be included in the existing statutory definition of civilian employees, as defined in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (c), subparagraph (9). This protects taxicab drivers, transit operators, and sports officials, making the offense a category B felony if a deadly weapon is used, or a misdemeanor if no weapon is used and there is no significant bodily harm.

Chair Spiegel:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Yeager:

On page 5 of the bill, line 10 states, "'Security guard' has the meaning ascribed to it in NRS 648.016." Does this definition include someone who is uniformed, or is that mentioned elsewhere in the bill?

Assemblywoman Miller:

I do not recall if the definition in statute includes the phrase "uniformed," although it does outline a comprehensive list of people who are included in the definition. I referenced a uniformed security guard to clarify that he or she was identifiable. We can refer to legal counsel for the statutory definition.

Wil Keane, Committee Counsel:

"Security guard" is defined in NRS 648.016 as "a person employed as a watchman, guard, security consultant, patrol officer or in any other similar position." They are not required to be uniformed, according to the statute.

Assemblyman Kramer:

Are you suggesting that additional penalties be imposed on security guards who are involved in an assault, because they have had the additional training and are being held to a higher standard?

Assemblywoman Miller:

The additional training has the potential to reduce the number of these interactions. I understand that the public is often volatile, and patrol officers and security guards will come across people who are intoxicated, dealing with other issues, or simply will not discontinue their bad behavior. While these professionals are on the job, there will inevitably be people who assault or attack them. Since they are protecting us and our property, they need the added protection.

Assemblyman Kramer:

Thank you for clarifying because I misunderstood what you said previously. I thought the additional penalties would be imposed on the security guard. If someone assaults a security guard, the security guard deserves more protection.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Is there anything occurring in the industry that would cause you to standardize and increase the training requirements? Are there more incidents occurring between security guards and the public, or that involve lawsuits?

Assemblywoman Miller:

This bill was brought to me by a constituent who owns a security guard company, and the request for increased training requirements came from them. There are security guards who will testify from Las Vegas today who can better share their experiences and what has been occurring in the industry.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Will the security guard or the employer be responsible for paying the fees for the training courses?

Assemblywoman Miller:

The way the bill is currently written, the security guard is responsible for paying.

Assemblywoman Neal:

How much will the training cost?

Assemblywoman Miller:

The training courses still need to be developed. Currently, the average cost of a training course is \$125.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, as referenced in section 1, subsection 5, paragraph (c)?

Assemblywoman Miller:

It is a standard psychological exam that has been used in many different industries.

Assemblyman Daly:

The bill seeks to increase the number of training hours required for security guards, but what training requirements do security guards have now to be allowed to carry a firearm?

Assemblywoman Miller:

The bill would increase the number of training hours that are required. The PILB would need to develop what the training consists of, but it would increase the number of hours required now.

Assemblyman Daly:

What training is required of them now?

Assemblywoman Miller:

I will defer that question to a member of the PILB or a security guard.

Assemblyman Daly:

De-escalation and similar trainings are what you are proposing to be additional trainings to what is required now. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman Miller:

Correct, that training would be an addition.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Section 1, subsection 7 states that officers who are not allowed to carry a firearm must complete eight hours of comprehensive training. How did you arrive at the decision to require them to have eight hours of training?

Assemblywoman Miller:

This decision was based on suggestions from those in the industry. We know that there are more laws and regulations that apply to someone using a firearm, so we want to ensure that the individual fully understands these laws in order to protect themselves and the public. However, an unarmed security guard's training can contain other pertinent subject matter—communications, report writing, and the roles and responsibilities of an unarmed security guard.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is being discussed with the PILB in regard to the scale of the fees for an 8-hour class versus a 40-hour class?

Assemblywoman Miller:

I will defer to what the PILB is currently using as an estimate for the fees. There is one school in the industry that currently offers an eight-hour training for \$125.

Assemblywoman Neal:

If the 8-hour class is \$125, would the fee potentially triple for a 40-hour class?

Assemblywoman Miller:

Yes, that is a possibility. We should keep in mind that, in any profession, there is often a requirement to invest financially and with our time.

Assemblyman Kramer:

Would an individual who completed this training program receive a certificate that would be recognized in the industry, allowing them to prove their qualifications to another employer? Or would different employers require different training programs?

Assemblywoman Miller:

Because this training program would be regulated by the PILB, the certification should be the same for anyone working within the field. A security guard could move from one company to another with the same training.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Are there security guards that currently do not need to be licensed by the Private Investigator's Licensing Board? Are all security guards required to be licensed or registered?

Assemblywoman Miller:

It is my understanding that a security guard who works for a private company is employed by them directly.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Do those individuals have to be licensed by the PILB?

Assemblywoman Miller:

No, I do not believe so.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Currently, there is a group that does not have to be licensed. Does this bill create a new licensure scheme for a new category of security guards under the PILB?

Assemblywoman Miller:

If it is required, I would assume that the answer is yes. However, I will defer the question to legal counsel.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Is it your intention to grandfather in the security guards who are already working? There are many security guards who may not be able to comply with the new rules within a certain amount of time. What would be the lead time for these employees to comply so that they do not lose their jobs?

Assemblywoman Miller:

I understand that we are working with an industry that has thousands of employees. I want the lead time to work well for the industry, and am more than willing to work with the PILB and other stakeholders on this.

Wil Keane:

Security guards currently do not have to be licensed, and this bill would not require them to be. However, if a security guard works for a private patrol officer, he would need to be a registered employee. Some security guards have to be registered under NRS Chapter 648, while others do not. This bill would not create a new licensing scheme for any of these people.

Assembly Bill 184 provides that private patrol officers who are required to be licensed, and their employees who are required to be registered, would have to complete the extended training program to carry a firearm. No security guard is required to be licensed or registered if they are not already required to be licensed or registered. A private patrol officer is someone who is in the business of employing watchmen, guards, and others. If you run a business that hires security guards and provides their services to others, you must be licensed as a private patrol officer. You and your employees would have to comply with the regulations that this bill would put in place if you want to carry a firearm. Some security guards do not have to be licensed or registered if they do not work for a licensee.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

The NRS definition of a security guard is "a person employed as a watchman, guard, security consultant, patrol officer or in any other similar position." My confusion comes from the terminology that we are using because I do not think it accurately describes the person we are truly talking about. We need to determine who will ultimately be impacted by this legislation.

Chair Spiegel:

Section 1, subsection 5, paragraph (d) of the bill discusses the screening test for the presence of controlled substances. Law enforcement officers, especially those who carry a firearm, are not allowed to have any controlled substances in their system, including marijuana. What is your thought process in allowing security guards who carry firearms not to be held to the same standard?

Assemblywoman Miller:

Marijuana is legal in the state of Nevada, and I think we need to stay consistent with the current laws. Security guards are not police officers and are more limited in scope than police officers as well.

Chair Spiegel:

We will now hear testimony in support of Assembly Bill 184.

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

I am in support of this bill, primarily because of the enhanced training component of it. I think it is a great idea to provide additional training to our security personnel, especially those who are armed, because it creates a safer environment for our citizens and communities. A few weeks ago, I testified in the neutral position on a similar bill. It did not include a training component, but did include enhanced penalties for battery. I have spoken with Assemblywoman Miller, and I believe that her intent differs from that of the other bill's sponsor. "Security guard" has been used very broadly here, encompassing everyone from loss prevention associates to security guards in the hotel and gaming industries. Perhaps the definition can be revised to be more specific, however it is deemed appropriate, to limit the scope of the enhancement. Lastly, I would like to comment on some of the language on page 2 of the bill, as someone who has worked in law enforcement for more than 30 years. On line 31 the bill states "tool that may be used for attacking or disabling another person." Perhaps using a more common term to the security and law enforcement fields, such as "less than lethal tools used for gaining compliance" would be more appropriate because security guards typically are not attacking and disabling people.

Andy Peterson, Vice President, Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada:

I agree with what Mr. Callaway said, and we support this bill. Additionally, the International Council of Shopping Centers passes along their support for the bill. Increased training is valuable in any instance in which a security guard carries a gun.

Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We support A.B. 184. We appreciate the added training component in this bill, these professionals, and the recognition in NRS Chapter 200.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Do you support section 1, subsection 5, paragraph (d) specifically?

Eric Spratley:

Yes, I am supportive.

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

We support this bill. Washoe County hires both armed and unarmed security guards to manage and assist at our county complexes. We require a level of training for our guards and

are supportive of the increased training as we feel it creates a consistent mandate across the board.

Matthew Walker, representing The Howard Hughes Corporation:

I would like to thank the sponsor for bringing this bill, especially section 2, forward. The city of Summerlin has over 22,500 acres, including more than 150 parks, senior communities, and large shopping districts. We ask our security guards to protect the businesses and residents of Summerlin from the individuals who may commit crimes in our city. They are essential to the quality of life that our residents and businesses have become accustomed to. We are thankful for the additional protection to place them in the same category as teachers, medical personnel, and other first responders.

Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:

We support A.B. 184 for one simple reason: you cannot have enough training. I understand the concerns that some of the Committee members have raised in regard to language changes and corrections, and I think the stakeholders would be interested in making those revisions. I echo Mr. Callaway's comments, as well as the comments from the others in law enforcement. We certainly support the training component of the bill, and ask that you do the same.

Robert Ostrovsky, representing Nevada Resort Association:

We hire, screen, train, and accept liability for security guards who work on our properties. We also frequently hire third-party security for larger events. We rely on the PILB to ensure that the security guards we hire are properly trained and screened, and this bill helps ensure that. I know there have been a lot of questions posed today, and perhaps there is some language that needs to be cleaned up, but it is important that the security companies we hire employ guards who are properly trained. This is just as important to a homeowner. If a private patrol officer is responding to a call, a homeowner needs to know that the officer is trained properly before he arrives on the property, and we rely on the licensing board to provide that training.

Dennis Erickson, Nevada State Director, Security Officer's Brotherhood:

I am a private patrolman for Citywide Security Services; I am also the state director for Security Officer's Brotherhood. I have worked in this profession for 22 years. Security officers are at higher risk for assault in their line of work. Security officers are often the first response in an incident or an issue on a property. Private security guards are tasked with maintaining the peace in apartment complexes and housing communities, and in doing their jobs, these officers are put at risk. We had an officer assaulted on Sunday for asking an individual to stop spilling beer on the floor, but there are no penalty enhancements for slapping a security guard. I am sure that there are thousands more of these stories, which is why we wholeheartedly support this bill. My company, and the Security Officer's Brotherhood, support this bill.

**Jonathan Alvarez, Chief Executive Officer/Co-Founder, Protective Force International,
Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a private patrolman; I own Protective Force International. I am also an Army veteran still serving our military and a former law enforcement officer. I have worked in security since 2013, and I have experienced all aspects of the industry—training, investigations, and response. I am in support of this bill, my organization is in support of this bill, and the training school for military law enforcement and security, of which I am vice president, is in support of this bill. I have been a victim of assault while working as a security guard on the Las Vegas Strip, inside a hotel and gaming establishment. I know firsthand that enhanced penalties for assault and battery would help prevent suspects from attacking a uniformed or ununiformed officer while on the job.

Ted Farace, Owner, Elite Security Specialists, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I was a law enforcement officer for the New York Police Department for 24 years, and the global corporate security director for J.P. Morgan for 15 years. I retired in Las Vegas, Nevada. I founded Elite Security Specialists with the intent of having qualified, trained individuals work for me. I used to only recruit former law enforcement officers. Primarily, we provide security services at Wynn Las Vegas and Encore hotel properties for their clients, visitors, guests, and occasionally executives. Ninety-nine percent of the services we provide are unarmed. I would like to thank Assemblywoman Miller and her colleagues for introducing this bill and giving us the opportunity to provide input on the training requirements.

When I moved here in 2001, I found that there were no training requirements outlined for security guards. I felt comfortable hiring former law enforcement officers because I knew they had years of experience and training. Many other states mandate 40 hours of training for unarmed security. This bill gives us the opportunity to expand our training requirements. After many years in business, I realized that my law enforcement colleagues were getting older and were unable to perform the duties that I hired them to do. I had to look outside the industry to recruit others beside law enforcement officers. This was a dilemma because I required them to have training. I established a training academy, the first licensed post-secondary security guard academy in the state of Nevada, and began training my own employees. Every employee at Elite Security Specialists has gone through the eight-hour training program.

Armed security guards must complete the eight hours of training for unarmed guards, obtain their license, and apply to upgrade their license for armed security. The initial eight hours of training provides an armed security guard with the knowledge of his roles and responsibilities as an unarmed guard before he receives additional training as an armed guard. At our school, we teach courses on the role and responsibility of a security guard, use of force, report writing, active shooters, civil and criminal laws, arrest and detention, emergency evacuation, and protecting property and assets. We teach our classes at a high academic level.

Currently there are three entities that govern security guards in Nevada. I hope that this legislation can enhance the level of security across the board. I support this bill.

Lorenzo Sandoval, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here today with Citywide Security Services. I am also a martial artist and owner of Ageless Martial Arts in Las Vegas, Nevada. I think it is very important to increase the amount of training that unarmed security guards receive. Security officers are constantly faced with bad situations, and fights can break out within seconds. From my experience, and based on what I have been taught, it is important to develop training programs that empower security guards in these situations—to teach them how to maneuver and react correctly.

This bill is important because a security guard can never have too much training for these situations. I always tell my students that they have to be able to react quickly. If their reflexes are not quick enough, or they do not understand what is going on, they will not be able to address and de-escalate a situation. By increasing the amount of unarmed training that security guards receive, we can give them the necessary tools to empower themselves and feel confident on the job so that they can properly address a bad situation when they are faced with one.

Larry Kelley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am currently employed as a security guard at Citywide Security Services, and I am here in support of the bill.

Chair Spiegel:

We will now hear testimony in opposition.

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

First, we would like to thank Assemblywoman Miller for discussing this bill with us. We support the portion of the bill that seeks to increase the training requirements for security guards. In conversation, it was discussed that taxicab drivers, referees, and law enforcement volunteers are protected under this statute, and security officers should be protected too. However, it is much more likely that a security guard will behave aggressively than a taxicab driver, referee, or law enforcement volunteer. We believe that de-escalation training should be a large component of their training.

There are already penalties in place for assaulting a security guard. If someone is found guilty of hitting a security guard, they are charged with battery which is a misdemeanor. The officer can arrest them or issue a citation. The misdemeanor is punishable by up to six months in jail. If there is substantial bodily harm to the security officer, a category C felony is punishable by 1 to 5 years in prison. The Supreme Court has determined that even a bruise could be considered to be substantial bodily harm. If a deadly weapon of any form is used, the assault is considered a category B felony, punishable by 2 to 10 years in prison, or 2 to 15 years in prison, depending on the level of harm.

We have concern with raising criminal penalties when no research has been conducted to show that it would deter crime. An Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice report states that increasing the lengths of prison stays has been a steady driver of Nevada's growing prison population, but recidivism rates have not declined. Despite longer periods of incarceration, recidivism remains a challenge in Nevada. There has been no research to prove that increased criminal penalties would prevent the assaults from occurring in the future. If there had been some research conducted on the subject, we would not be opposing this bill today.

Lastly, we echo the sentiments of Mr. Callaway. If the Committee votes in favor of this bill, security guards should be more clearly defined in statute to clarify when an assault is subject to enhanced penalties. For example, it should be defined that the security guard must be in uniform, performing the scope of his or her duties, and wearing identification.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Are you suggesting that the penalty be a gross misdemeanor and not rise to the level of a felony? I understand that no one has the right to slap security guards or throw a drink in someone's face without penalty, but what do you feel is the proper penalty?

John Piro:

We believe that the penalties, as they are currently, are satisfactory. We support the training portion of the bill, but do not support the addition of enhanced criminal penalties. If the Committee is inclined to enhance penalties in support of this bill, then a gross misdemeanor is preferable to a felony so it can be tried in front of a jury.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Can you remind me what a category B felony is? I understand that it is a serious felony that would likely prohibit a person from being able to work in most of the popular industries in southern Nevada.

John Piro:

There are approximately 212 crimes that are considered category B felonies in the state of Nevada. It is an issue that the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice has brought up because there are so many crimes that seem to be lumped together as category B felonies in Nevada. In this case, the bill states that the assault would be considered a category B felony punishable by 1 to 6 years in prison.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

What other crimes can we equate this to?

John Piro:

Assault with a deadly weapon is a category B felony punishable by 1 to 6 years in prison. The punishment as laid out in this bill is greater than a battery with substantial bodily harm as that stands on its own, which is a category C felony punishable by 1 to 5 years in prison.

Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

We also oppose this bill. In response to the question posed regarding category B felonies, it should be understood that if a person is sent to prison for a category B felony, he or she will not receive any time off for good behavior. If the court determines that they will serve 4 to 6 years in the Nevada Department of Corrections, they will serve that time in its entirety. In the case of category E, D, and C felonies, they could receive time off for good behavior.

In regards to our opposition of the bill, I concur with the statements made by Mr. Piro. Our main concern is in regard to the enhanced penalty. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (c), subparagraph (7) outlines the requirements that a civilian employee must meet to be protected—wearing a uniform, interacting with the public, and performing tasks related to law enforcement. I believe that it is necessary to clarify these requirements for security guards as well. It is very important for the public to understand, and I do not see it written anywhere else in the bill.

I have noted that the more substantial portion of the outlined training applies to those who will carry a firearm, but I believe it would also be important to include those using a Taser and other various weapons of that nature. Even more importantly, I think the training is important for those who will not carry a firearm as well. As we, and other security officers, have stated, these individuals are interacting with the public and sometimes become engaged in significant altercations. We want to ensure that these individuals are trained properly, especially in de-escalation training, so they can successfully diffuse situations so no one is injured.

Although we are opposed to this bill, we want to make it clear that we appreciate the intent of the bill, and we appreciate the job that security officers do. We do not want to imply that they are not deserving of an enhancement, but the enhancement should be used as an exception, not as a rule. And as Mr. Piro stated, we already have criminal penalties in place to prevent this conduct.

Amy Coffee, Past President, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

Although we cannot speak to the training outlined in the bill as good or bad, as we are not experts on the subject matter, we support more training for security guards. However, as Mr. Callaway mentioned earlier, we do not believe that the phrase "attacking or disabling" in section 1, subsection 5, paragraph (b) is appropriate, because no one, security guard or law enforcement, will be attacking or disabling anyone. These individuals are in the business of preventing crime, not being on the offensive.

As for the penalty enhancements, I agree with my colleagues. Taxicab drivers, transit operators, firefighters, and others are clearly defined in statute. A security guard, as defined in this context, is "anyone employed as a watchman, guard, security consultant, patrol officer or in any other similar position." A person who is guarding their brother's store could fall under this definition, and anyone in any type of security role is at risk. Since the definition is so vague, the enhancement becomes problematic. The way the bill is written, it would be

difficult to know to whom this enhancement applies to. For example, a security guard licensed under NRS Chapter 648 who has their license revoked by the Private Investigator's Licensing Board, can find another job and still be defined as a security guard as it is written here. The definition should be specific enough to dictate that the guard must be in uniform, and either in full compliance with NRS Chapter 648, or if they are employed by a private employer, in full compliance with the rules and regulations of their employer. If an employee of a casino is misbehaving, they should not be protected under the statute, and I do not think it is anyone's intent to have them protected. I do not think that the enhancement is easy to work with, but if it is going to be included in the bill, then it should be better defined.

Chair Spiegel:

We will now hear testimony from those in the neutral position.

Kevin L. Ingram, Executive Director, Private Investigator's Licensing Board:

While we support many aspects of the bill, we cannot support the bill in its entirety. Additional training for security guards is never a bad thing, but there will be a significant impact on our agency. I submitted a fiscal note for this bill that shows the impact of recouping the costs of an enhancement to our current database to track the added firearms training, as well as the less than lethal weapons training that is established by the bill ([Exhibit D](#)). Those weapons would require additional individual training for each tool utilized. There are authorities who set the standards for training and issue certifications for each item—each with their own end-user certification and recertification periods. Each of these additional training classes would incur an additional cost as well. As previously stated, the 8-hour classes for unarmed security guards can cost anywhere from \$75 to \$125, and the 40-hour classes for armed security guards can cost upwards of \$300 or \$400. Additionally, each class for less than lethal tools can cost anywhere from \$50 to \$150. It is presumed that the applicant will bear all of those costs.

I have testified before the Legislative Commission's Sunset Subcommittee on a few occasions, and they feel that some of our licensing fees are too high. In this case, we would have to increase our registration fees to capture the costs of enhancing our database and increase our fees to cover the cost of an additional full-time employee. These costs are estimated to be about \$80,000, as stated in our fiscal note.

The bill will also require each licensee to complete a psychological exam, which currently costs about \$250 per person, but could cost as much as \$290 per person in the near future. This is another fee that would be passed on to the applicant. These individuals are applying for entry-level jobs in which they will earn minimum wage, or up to \$10 per hour. It may be a burden to pay \$400 or \$500 upfront before they have begun working. I think there would be support from some license holders to pay those fees, but I cannot guarantee that.

In response to the previous question regarding NRS Chapter 648: NRS 648.060 licenses individuals who engage in the business of providing security services, as well as private investigators, repossessioners, process servers, armored transport, and executive protection. These individuals obtain licensure, and any individual who works for a license holder must

be registered. If a security guard is employed by a proprietary security company—works for Target, Kmart, or similar companies—and are paid on a W-2, they are not under the jurisdiction of NRS Chapter 648. The Nevada Gaming Control Board regulates all individuals who work in gaming establishments, with the exception of the gaming establishments that hire third-party security to supplement their staff at large events.

Chair Spiegel:

Could you explain why the costs would have to be borne by the employees, not by the employers?

Kevin Ingram:

I am assuming that the costs would be borne by the employees. If an employer chooses to bear the costs, they can certainly do that, whether a small business or a large corporation.

Chair Spiegel:

These costs are not required to be borne by the employee, but are required to be incurred. Is that correct?

Kevin Ingram:

Based on the way the bill is written, I would say that is correct.

Chair Spiegel:

I referenced Salary.com to determine the differences in salary of unarmed security guards and armed security guards. In the Las Vegas area, the median salary for an unarmed security guard is \$33,032 and the median salary for an armed security guard is \$40,979. If an armed security guard will receive a 24 percent higher salary than their unarmed counterparts, would we not want to make an investment in that employee? An employer would make the investment to ensure they have skilled workers, and an employee would make the investment to advance their career and earn \$7,947 more per year.

Kevin Ingram:

I wholeheartedly agree with your statement.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

In your fiscal note, you stated that there will be approximately 41,800 records affected by A.B. 184. How did you determine this number?

Kevin Ingram:

There are 41,800 active work card holders in the state of Nevada. Approximately 13,000 of those work in an armed capacity. A registered work card allows an individual to work for any category of license holder, including private investigators, private security, repossessioners, process servers, canine handlers, polygraph examiners, or any subcategory of license holder, including armored transport, executive protection, and armed or unarmed guards. Many work card holders can work for more than one employer as well. For example, a work card holder may be hired by a repossessioner, but if they then work for a security company, they

would be required to complete 8 hours of additional training for unarmed guards, or 40 hours of additional training for armed guards.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

You have 41,800 licensees. Is that correct?

Kevin Ingram:

No, that is not correct. Our license holders are companies or individuals who meet the minimum qualifications to be licensed. The 41,800 employees with registered work cards are the staff that license holders may hire.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

This bill could potentially impact 41,800 registered work card employees. Is that correct?

Kevin Ingram:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

If data enhancement will cost \$39,375, and there are costs for additional staff, typical regulation development, and staff development, then the added cost will be approximately \$50,000 each fiscal year. With 41,800 employees, there is an average cost of about \$1 per person to implement the bill.

Kevin Ingram:

We would have to recoup the \$39,375 for the enhancements to the database, as well as the additional \$46,504 for an additional staff member. However, the \$39,375 would only have to be recouped once.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

The additional cost would be about \$89,000 in fiscal year 2019-2020, and about \$50,000 in fiscal year 2020-2021. Is that correct?

Kevin Ingram:

Correct. I would also like to propose a friendly amendment to the bill, which was provided to the Committee as well ([Exhibit E](#)). The Private Investigator's Licensing Board's fiscal and accounting departments are currently established in statute under the Office of the Attorney General. I have reached out to Assemblywoman Miller, and I spoke briefly with her about this. The language of the amendment would remove the Private Investigator's Licensing Board from under the Office of the Attorney General. Currently, we are the only board to be established in this way, which is likely due to the fact that the Attorney General was the chairman of the PILB in 1969. We bring this amendment forward because the current Attorney General would like us to function separately.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Have you discussed this amendment with the sponsor?

Kevin Ingram:

Yes, I have spoken briefly with Assemblywoman Miller.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Until the sponsor has confirmed that this is a friendly amendment, it is inappropriate to say that it is. I think you need to have a conversation with the sponsor before we discuss drastic changes such as these.

Assemblywoman Neal:

While I understand that your amendment affects the same chapter of the NRS as the bill, I do not understand how it is germane. I am also confused by your testimony. You seemed to imply that the \$400 or \$500 in application fees would deter people from entering the industry. You testified in opposition of the bill, but nothing you said even seemed to support Assemblywoman Miller's vision for the bill.

Kevin Ingram:

We are not opposed to additional training requirements; we support them. If the licensees were to bear the cost of the psychological exam, drug testing, and required training, there would be no burden on the applicants. However, the majority of security companies that I have spoken with think that the applicant will bear the cost, and we do not have jurisdiction to regulate who will pay the fees. I wanted to bring it to the Committee's attention because it will be quite a large cost for the applicant to bear. They already incur an \$85 application fee and a \$30 to \$35 fee to have their fingerprints taken. If there will be additional fees for a psychological exam, alcohol and drug testing, and training, we will need to decide who will bear that responsibility.

Chair Spiegel:

Can you share with us your recent experience with the Legislative Commission's Sunset Subcommittee? I will also ask our legal counsel to weigh in on whether or not the amendment is considered germane.

Wil Keane:

Amendments need to be germane to the bill as a whole. This is a determination made by the Legislative Counsel. This amendment may or may not be considered germane, but I will consult with the Legislative Counsel to determine that.

Kevin Ingram:

Last year, the PILB was reviewed by the Legislative Commission's Sunset Subcommittee. A portion of the review was focused on the fees that the PILB charges for licensure. At that time, a majority of the questions posed were regarding why our licensing fees were so high. We presented data that compared other states' fees with ours. It is my understanding that the Sunset Subcommittee will request additional testimony this year. They have also asked me to evaluate our staff's salaries, and I will provide them with that information later this year.

Rachel Anderson, General Counsel, Office of the Attorney General:

We are testifying in the neutral position, as long as the Committee considers the amendment proposed by the PILB. The Attorney General is in support of this amendment.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

It was stated earlier that the PILB no longer wants to use the Attorney General as legal counsel, but instead use their own legal counsel. Did I understand this correctly?

Rachel Anderson:

That is incorrect. The PILB is separating its financial and personnel operations from the Office of the Attorney General, but would continue to use deputy attorney generals in the manner in which they always have.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I do not see language when I read this amendment, so what exactly are you in support of?

Rachel Anderson:

I am in support of the language that indicates that the PILB will use its funds to manage the areas within its responsibility.

Assemblywoman Miller:

First, Mr. Ingram is correct in that he has addressed the amendment with me. I spoke to Attorney General Ford about the issue as well, and as long as the amendment is germane and legal, it will be considered friendly. Additionally, I agree with those who are concerned about using the word "attacking" in the bill. I will submit an amendment to revise this because I do not believe that the wording coincides with the nature of the bill.

I do not want to seem as though I am taking lightly the use of marijuana. Reporting to work under the influence of marijuana, just as under the influence of alcohol, is an issue that an employer has the right to deal with.

I have reached out to businesses in various industries to gauge the impact that this bill may have. Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce has given me permission to state that their members did not have any initial objections to the bill.

I also understand the concern regarding the financial burden that the bill places on either the employer or the employee. I understand the objections, as I had spoken with the public defenders offices previously, but I am willing to work with anyone on this bill. Ultimately, our goal is to encourage enhanced training programs and increased training for our security guards to ensure that we have the most prepared, qualified individuals working in the field.

Chair Spiegel:

Thank you all for your testimony. [([Exhibit F](#)), ([Exhibit G](#)), ([Exhibit H](#)), ([Exhibit I](#)), and ([Exhibit J](#))] were submitted but not discussed, and will become part of the record.] We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 184 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 181.

**Assembly Bill 181: Revises provisions governing employment attendance practices.
(BDR 53-833)**

Assemblyman Alex Assefa, Assembly District No. 42:

Assembly Bill 181 revises provisions governing employment attendance practices. The bill intends to increase the safety of employees and citizens in the state of Nevada. Requiring employees to report to work when they are sick places them, and the general public, in danger. With today's technology, there are many ways to communicate; however, there are still employers who require employees to appear in person at their workplace to demonstrate that they are sick.

I propose this bill in memory of Mr. Thomas Kebede, who died in a car accident after he was required to report to work to prove that he was in no condition to perform his job duties. After Mr. Kebede physically reported to work, he was granted the day off. On his way home, his medication took effect and he lost control of his vehicle. His vehicle swerved into oncoming traffic and crashed. He suffered critical injuries and was transported to University Medical Center of Southern Nevada in Las Vegas. The other drivers involved in the accident suffered serious injuries as well. The incident shocked the entire community and remains engraved in our memories. Mr. Kebede was in a state of coma for six months, eventually passing away at only 30 years old. He was survived by his family and newlywed wife.

I share with you Mr. Kebede's story, but it is important to remember that this is only one of many similar incidents that have occurred in our state. If a person reports being sick or injured, they should not be required to physically appear at their place of employment to demonstrate their illness. It is also important to remember that not all illnesses are visible to a manager or supervisor. Assembly Bill 181 specifically prohibits an employer from requiring an employee to be physically present at their place of work in order to notify their employer of their illness. The provisions of this bill allow the employer to require the employee to notify them of their illness and inability to report to work; however, the method of notification cannot include the physical appearance of the employee at their workplace. Any employer that violates the provisions of this bill may be found guilty of a misdemeanor. The Labor Commissioner may impose a fine of no more than \$5,000 and may recover any costs related to the proceedings of such violations, including investigative costs and attorney's fees.

I urge your support on this important legislation.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Section 1, subsection 2 of the bill states that the violator is "guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000." A misdemeanor is often punishable by up to six months in jail. Is it your intent that jail time be a potential punishment as well, or would the fine be the sole punishment?

Assemblyman Assefa:

I have submitted a conceptual amendment to the bill ([Exhibit K](#)) which states in section 1, subsection 2 that "Any employer, or agent or representative thereof, violating any provision of this section maybe guilty of a misdemeanor." To answer your question, both the fine and the jail time could be potential punishments.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Section 1, subsection 1 of your conceptual amendment revises the bill to state "that he or she is sick or has sustained non-work related injury and cannot work," which seems to differentiate this legislation from workers' compensation statutes already in place. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Assefa:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Daly:

The bill states that the employee can be asked to notify an employer of their illness. All other provisions for sick leave policies are not affected, and the policies that a company has in place would still be valid. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Assefa:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Where does the money that is collected by the Labor Commissioner, as per section 1, subsection 3, get deposited?

Assemblyman Assefa:

Section 1, subsection 3 has also been revised with the conceptual amendment. It is my understanding that the money is collected by the Labor Commissioner and deposited in the State General Fund.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is your reasoning behind choosing a \$5,000 fine? Is there a reason you did not choose a lower threshold?

Assemblyman Assefa:

The spirit of the legislation is to ensure that employers do not practice these types of attendance policies. If we impose a fee that is too low, it may not impact the business financially and may be ignored. On the other hand, I do not want to impose a fee that is too high, so as not to impact small businesses.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The language in section 1, subsection 2 states, "Any employer, or agent or representative thereof." Would an employee left in charge in the absence of a manager be in violation of the law, even if they were following the direction of someone else?

Assemblyman Assefa:

The intent is that employers, managers, and supervisors who make phone calls to employees—who ask them to report to work to prove their illness—are in violation of the law.

Assemblywoman Neal:

To clarify, if a supervisor asks his or her secretary to make a call to an employee asking him or her to report to work to prove he or she is sick, both the supervisor and the secretary are liable.

Assemblyman Assefa:

The individual who tells the employee that he or she must appear in person would be held liable.

Chair Spiegel:

The person who makes the call is liable, not the person who tells them to make the call. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Assefa:

The person who initiates the direction of the call will be held liable. For example, the secretary who places the call is not in violation of the law, but the manager who initiates the action is.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

To clear up any confusion, a human resources supervisor would be held liable for directing a subordinate to require an employee to appear in person to provide proof of their illness.

Assemblyman Assefa:

That is correct.

Chair Spiegel:

We will now hear testimony in support of Assembly Bill 181.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce:

We would like to thank Assemblyman Assefa for reaching out and working with the business community on this bill. We appreciate his engagement, and we appreciate his addressing our feedback. We support the bill and the conceptual amendment that has been presented. We believe the bill addresses employee safety while preserving the accountability measures that employers need for their sick leave policies.

Mendy Elliott, representing Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce:

We would also like to thank Assemblyman Assefa for working with the business community. We support the bill and its conceptual amendment.

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

I agree with what the speakers before me have said. I would also like to thank Assemblyman Assefa for working with us on the conceptual amendment. He is a tremendous individual, and this is a good piece of legislation.

Andy Donahue, Market Representative, Southern Nevada Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust:

This legislation aligns with how we currently operate, and it works quite well for us. I greatly appreciate this legislation being brought to my attention.

Alexis Motarex, representing the Nevada Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.:

I agree with what the speakers before me have said.

Rose Jaime, Social Work Intern, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

I am here today in support of Assembly Bill 181.

Robert Ostrovsky, representing Nevada Resort Association:

We also support this legislation. To clarify, I believe the Labor Commissioner has broad authority to impose fines up to \$5,000 for labor law violations, although I have not had the opportunity to look it up. Perhaps this bill could default to the existing language in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

Andy Peterson, Vice President, Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada:

I agree with the previous speaker in that the bill ought to default to the current law. We support this bill as written, as we think it makes reasonable sense, is straightforward, and protects public health.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association:

We are in support of A.B. 181. We would like to thank Assemblyman Assefa for bringing this bill forward. It is common sense that employees should stay at home when they are sick. They do not need to report to work when they are sick, and we appreciate that this is a pro-worker piece of legislation.

Elisa Cafferata, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada; and Time to Care Nevada Coalition:

We support this legislation. We think it has many benefits for public health and it will be good for our state.

Chair Spiegel:

Before we hear testimony from those in support in Las Vegas, can the audience members in Las Vegas that are in support please stand? [Many people stood in support.] Thank you—that makes a statement. The Committee would like to thank you for taking time out of your day to be here in support and participating in the legislative process.

Yitbarek Heilu, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here in support of A.B. 181, which prohibits employers from forcing employees to report to their place of work when they are sick in order to obtain a day off. We are human beings, and sometimes we get sick or have other issues that prevent us from working. We should not be forced to go to work. We have the right to call in sick to our company without blame or unfair treatment.

I would like to share an experience of mine that relates to this issue. About five or six years ago, I was faced with family problems, was unable to acquire any sleep as a result, and came down with the flu. I reached out to my supervisor to explain the situation, hoping he would understand. He told me to come to work regardless, so I did—with hopes of convincing him in person. He did not understand and denied my request again. Instead of working, I drove my taxicab home, slept for four hours, and returned the cab back at work when my shift ended. The next morning, I received a call from my supervisor. I tried to explain the situation again, but the company was not happy with me. If I had driven in my condition, instead of getting the sleep I needed, I do not believe that I, or any passengers, would have been safe. This experience is why I believe that it is important to pass this bill.

Mequannent Alemu, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I knew Thomas Kebede, and I support this bill.

Abiy T. Beshah, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Thomas Kebede was a very close friend of mine. I am here today in support of Assembly Bill 181. I believe that this bill will eliminate the poor policies that companies have been implementing in the state of Nevada. I believe that this bill will save lives, like Thomas Kebede's and the others that were involved in the accident. Thomas was a hardworking man and a good husband to his newlywed wife. His wife had only been living in the United States for 21 days before her husband's car accident. You can only imagine how she suffered in that time. I believe it is not too late to save lives and change our policies, which is why I urge you to support this bill.

Dereje Wolle, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I have been a taxicab driver since 2011 and I knew Thomas personally. He was a very hardworking man. Thomas was sick; he had a condition that we were all aware of. He called out of work, but was forced to appear in person to prove that he was sick. After he presented himself, our supervisor sent him home, and that is when the accident occurred. Thomas died in vain, and no one was held accountable for his death. I am still a taxicab driver and do not want this to happen to anyone else. We should not be forced to go to work to prove that we

are sick. I am in support of this bill and hope you will consider it—to bring about change for the safety of taxicab drivers and the public.

Melkamu Zemeda, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here in support of Assembly Bill 181. On behalf of all taxicab drivers in Las Vegas, and hotel and casino employees, I would like to thank Assemblyman Assefa for presenting this bill and bringing this issue forward. This is a great accomplishment.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there anyone who wishes to testify in opposition?

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:

First of all, it has been a pleasure to work with Assemblyman Assefa. We have met with him three times in the last two days, and he has listened to our concerns. We do not have concerns with the policy that this legislation seeks to implement, since our organization has policies in place for calling out sick. We have an issue with the language that makes a violation of the policy a criminal offense. As the bill is written, it is unclear who will investigate the crime, prosecute, and which court would hear the case. It is our belief that these responsibilities will fall on the City of Henderson Police Department, the City of Henderson City Attorney's Office, and the City of Henderson Municipal Court, respectively. We are concerned because we hear misdemeanors in our courts. There is existing language in NRS Chapter 613.500 that grants the Labor Commissioner some administrative penalty power, which is currently utilized when an employer violates a labor law. We believe the existing statutes are better suited for use in the violation of this bill. However, we have only recently begun speaking with Assemblyman Assefa about these concerns.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Are you aware of the conceptual amendment?

Mike Cathcart:

Yes, Assemblyman Assefa has shared the conceptual amendment with us. However, the amendment still contains the word "misdemeanor."

Assemblywoman Carlton:

It is my understanding that the bill revises NRS Chapter 613, so these violations would be handled in the same way as any other wage and hour labor violations in the state. I do not believe that these cases would reach the Henderson Police Department, because they will be handled by the Labor Commissioner. Are you concerned with the lack of clarity in the bill?

Mike Cathcart:

Yes, I believe that is the case. There is not enough clarity in the bill to ensure that the violations are handled by the Labor Commissioner. It is likely that we will support the bill if that is the case. However, our courts may still hear the cases, because we are a court of jurisdiction for misdemeanors.

Chair Spiegel:

I encourage you to continue working with Assemblyman Assefa. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in neutral? [There was no one.]

Assemblyman Assefa:

This bill is common sense, and it is shameful that this still happens in the workplace. When I began conceptualizing this bill, I honestly did not know how to handle the issue. I was unaware that we needed to legislate such a thing in order to stop these practices from occurring. Nonetheless, it has come to my attention, and I hope you will support this bill.

Chair Spiegel:

We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 181. Is there anyone who wishes to provide public comment, either in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was no one.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 3:24 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Katelyn Malone
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a table titled "Comparison Chart: Examples of Training Standards in Different States for Unarmed and Armed Security Guards," dated March 6, 2019, presented by Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony presented by Kevin L. Ingram, Executive Director, Private Investigator's Licensing Board, regarding [Assembly Bill 184](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 184](#) presented by Kevin L. Ingram, Executive Director, Private Investigator's Licensing Board.

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter, authored by Austin Crowley, Officer, Thornton Police Department, Thornton, Colorado, in support of [Assembly Bill 184](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a document titled "Officer Austin Crowley: Curriculum Vitae," submitted by Austin Crowley, Officer, Thornton Police Department, Thornton, Colorado.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated March 5, 2019, authored by Greg Manukian, Director of Operations, Citywide Security Services LLC, Boulder City, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 184](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter, authored by Paul Cunningham, Law Enforcement Liaison, Security Officer's Brotherhood, in support of [Assembly Bill 184](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter dated March 5, 2019, to the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor, authored by Jim Hoffman, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice Legislative Committee, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice, in opposition of [Assembly Bill 184](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 181](#) presented by Assemblyman Alex Assefa, Assembly District No. 42.