

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

**Eightieth Session
May 9, 2019**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Vice Chair William McCurdy II at 8:47 a.m. on Thursday, May 9, 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:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair
Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Alex Assefa
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblywoman Connie Munk
Assemblyman Greg Smith

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Mark Peckham, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

John Fudenberg, Coroner, Government Affairs, Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner, Clark County
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and representing Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Shani Coleman, representing City of Las Vegas
Jeanette Belz, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson
Todd Ingalsbee, representing Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Jeff Buchanan, Deputy Fire Chief, Clark County Fire Department
Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County
Matt Robinson, representing Southern Nevada Health District
Brian McAnallen, representing City of North Las Vegas
Rhiann Jarvis Denman, Deputy City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas
Sean Hoeffgen, Judge, City of North Las Vegas Municipal Court
Delen Goldberg, Chief of Staff/Public Information Officer, City of North Las Vegas
Claudia Aguayo, Assistant City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas

Vice Chair McCurdy:

[Roll was called. Committee rules were explained] We will take the items on the agenda as they appear. Will all presenters come forward for Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to county officers.
(BDR 20-1153)

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

I have Dr. Laura Knight with me; she is going to be available to answer any questions as it relates to Washoe County. Doctor Knight is the chief medical examiner of the Washoe County Medical Examiner's Office.

Mr. Vice Chair, I will walk through each section of the bill, and my goal will be to describe the problem that we are trying to address, and then the verbiage that I believe addresses each of the sections.

If I could bring you to section 2, on page 2, lines 3 through 8. What we are addressing here is when somebody dies and the death falls under the jurisdiction of the coroner and an examination is conducted by the forensic pathologist, that forensic pathologist shall be the one to determine the cause of death. That happens probably 95 percent of the time throughout the state, and it certainly happens 100 percent of the time in Clark and Washoe Counties. It goes on to say that the certifier of the death shall record the death on the death certificate using the exact cause of death as determined by the forensic pathologist. To explain a little bit about why that section is necessary: In the 15 counties outside of Clark and Washoe Counties we conduct their forensic examinations. When we take jurisdiction and we conduct the examination, our forensic pathologist determines the cause of death and then we send that cause of death to the other 15 counties.

The sheriff is the ex officio coroner in the other 15 counties, so that sheriff then becomes the certifier of the death. What has happened in the past is that the sheriff will change the cause of death from what the forensic pathologist has determined. I want to make it clear that we are not talking about the sheriff changing something from a gunshot wound to a natural death. The more common issue is they may just change some of the verbiage, which becomes problematic. The example I have used is: We have a cocaine and heroin overdose; our forensic pathologist may write "acute cocaine and heroin toxicity" as cause of death and we send it to the sheriff who may change it to "drug overdose." That is problematic because the death certificate is primarily used for statistical purposes, and it is very important that we capture the particular drugs that people overdosed from on the death certificate—that is the problem that we are trying to address in section 2. We have received no opposition from the Nevada chiefs and sheriffs, who are the coroners in the other 15 counties.

Moving on to section 3, subsections 1 and 2, which begin on page 2, lines 9 through 15, and continues on page 3, lines 1 through 5: This section addresses when a police officer, fireman, emergency medical technician (EMT), or members of the coroner's staff are exposed to bodily fluids of a decedent. It would give the coroner's office authority to test the bodily fluid for communicable diseases and then report those results to the local health officer who has protocols to report it to the agency. Currently, what we have to do is get a court order. The problem with getting a court order is it becomes too late. There are two issues on this. One is that if we do not capture the fluids properly during the postmortem examination, we may not be able to test for the particular communicable disease. The other issue is if we do not get those results to the person affected, they may not be able to get the medication in time to take care of whatever disease they may have been exposed to.

Senator Parks asked me to create an amendment. I will work on verbiage and I will have that to you, Mr. Vice Chair, by early next week. He would like to add "Good Samaritan" to this section. That would read something to the effect of: When a police officer, EMT, fireman, members of the coroner's staff, or a Good Samaritan The example he used is when somebody drives up on a car accident and performs cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) on somebody who ultimately dies, we would like that same law to apply to that Good Samaritan so that the decedent can be tested and to protect the Good Samaritan under those circumstances. We will work on that language and we can get that to you early next week.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Are there any questions from the Committee at this time?

Assemblyman Smith:

On page 3, section 4, subsection 2—does that exist anywhere else? I am curious about that as a program that provides bereavement services to members of the public within the county. Is there nobody out there that does that now?

[Assemblyman Flores assumed the Chair.]

John Fudenberg:

There is not. I am going to go over that section in detail as well. I may answer some of the questions. I took a breath, but I am probably only a quarter of the way through the presentation so hopefully, Assemblyman Smith, I will be able to answer those questions for you and explain that section.

Section 4, page 3, lines 6 through 11, this allows the coroner to establish a program to promote the mental health of the coroner's staff and other persons impacted as a result of an incident involving mass casualties.

We have a friendly amendment to section 4, subsection 1 that has been submitted to the Committee by the City of Las Vegas ([Exhibit C](#)). We have worked directly with them on this verbiage. I will go through that amendment; again, it is a friendly amendment. The intent of that amendment is to clarify a few things. In the current bill, it says "any other person." The idea there is, I was asked, What is "any other person?" The intent was to have the public agencies and other private agencies that are impacted by a mass casualty incident receive these services. The City of Las Vegas proposed language which says, "or any other person employed by an agency or organization which, in their professional capacity, is impacted as a result of the incident involving mass casualties within the county." We believe that narrows it down a bit and clarifies who can receive those services once we establish the program at the Clark County coroner's or the Washoe County medical examiner's or any of the sheriff's departments throughout the state.

Section 4, subsection 2 goes on to allow us to create a bereavement program for members of the public. The concept here is that in Clark County we notify families of sudden, unexplained deaths five or six thousand times a year, and one Tuesday a month we may have a professional psychologist or somebody with similar qualifications provide a bereavement group debriefing for these families. There are other ways we may provide bereavement services. Washoe County wanted this bereavement program verbiage in the bill, and we think it is very good idea to be able to refer the members of the public who are affected by sudden undetermined deaths to a bereavement program.

The reason we have put the establishment of a bereavement program and a mental health program in statute is—if I could bring your attention to page 6, line 39, you will see that we are proposing raising the fee for a death certificate from \$1 to \$4. Using that current funding

of \$1, in Clark and Washoe Counties—I know not all the 15 counties outside of Clark and Washoe do, but I believe several of them do—we are able to fund four different things, which are listed on page 3, beginning on line 39. We can use that funding for a youth program; training for members of our staff; training for members of the ex officio coroner and his or her deputy; and on the top of page 4, for the purchase of specialized equipment for the office of the county coroner. We established that fund during the 2005 Session. We have never used that fund for the purchase of specialized equipment, but have used it for funding the youth program and training for us and ex officio coroners throughout the state.

What this bill would do is allow us to add the mental health and bereavement programs to the list of items we would be able to fund with this fee increase. This is in direct response to the 1 October incident that we had in Clark County. Reno had the Reno Air Races crash where they lost 11 lives. It became abundantly clear that we do not have a mental health infrastructure to support the first responder agencies that deal with these horrific incidents. That is what we are trying to accomplish here. Assemblyman Smith, to answer your question, Do other people provide those services? I would have thought they did and, certainly, there are plenty of them that will claim they do. But the problem is that once we had the incident, it was very difficult to find anybody who could provide those services. The idea here is to be able to establish programs and continue to fund them on a regular basis so that if we do have more mass casualty incidents, we would have these programs established where we are providing mental health services to our offices and the first responder agencies throughout our county.

Mr. Chair, I will take a breath and am prepared to answer any questions on what we have covered so far, and if there are none I will continue to go through the bill.

Assemblyman Smith:

Just for clarification, on the program that provides bereavement services, it sounds to me like you are opening it up to the general public rather than just the first responders, is that the intent?

John Fudenberg:

That is the intent. The mental health program is specific to the first responder agencies or, as it reads, persons that have responded to or been impacted by a mass casualty incident through their work, but the bereavement service program is intended to be open to members of the public, specifically the members whom we notify of sudden unexplained deaths who are grieving. I will give you another example of how we may do that: We impound property at the scene of a death. When the families come in over the next 24 to 48 hours to retrieve that property, they are often going through serious grief processes. We may have a mental health professional there to assist them. Right now we have one volunteer chaplain in our office who will occasionally help families whom we identify may need some support in that process. But we have a revolving door in our office of people that have just been notified of a sudden unexplained death and we feel it would be a good benefit to the public to have somebody to refer them to. So that is correct, it is the members of the general public.

The next change is in section 6, subsection 3, on page 5, lines 4 through 9. What this section states is the reason we were given the bill originally which came from the Attorney General's task force on the opioid epidemic. It states that if a coroner suspects that a death is caused by drug use or poisoning, the coroner shall cause a postmortem examination to be performed by a forensic pathologist. The reason why this is important to us is that right now—I will give you an example of when this may happen. Hopefully it does not happen anymore. We know it has happened in the past; we know it does not happen in Clark and Washoe Counties but in the other 15 counties. If they find the decedent dead with a needle in his arm and heroin is present at the scene, they may not send that decedent in for a postmortem examination. They may go ahead and draw the fluids from the decedent, have that sent to a forensic toxicology lab, and then the sheriff or his or her assigned detectives may interpret the forensic toxicology results. The problem with that is it goes against every standard that we have in the coroner/medical examiner world. That decedent needs to be brought in to a medical examiner's office, which only exist in Clark and Washoe Counties, have a postmortem examination conducted and, most importantly, have the results of the forensics toxicology testing be interpreted by a forensic pathologist. Forensic pathologists also go as far as consulting with forensic toxicologists to interpret those results and it is not something that should be done by a police officer—it should be done by a board-certified forensic pathologist. That is the issue that we are trying to take care of there.

We have received no opposition from the Nevada police chiefs and sheriffs on this section. Frankly, I think they understand why this is so important. We put "postmortem examination" versus autopsy because they do not have to do a full autopsy, which is a standard in our profession. We are not requiring them by law to do a full autopsy because a full autopsy is about five times more expensive than just an external examination, so the fiscal impact to the counties outside of Clark and Washoe will be minimal in this section.

The last change is on page 5, section 6, subsection 4, lines 10 through 12. This section gives the authority to the coroner to issue subpoenas. The subpoenas are specifically targeting medical records. When we do a medical legal investigation we need medical records from the physician who cared for the decedent during life and, generally, I would say the overwhelming majority of the hospitals and doctor's offices will turn those over to us, but some of them want a subpoena. We used to issue them in the past until we were notified we were not legally entitled to issue subpoenas, so we stopped that immediately. This will give us the authority to issue subpoenas to get medical records and any other document, record, or material that is believed to contain evidence related to an investigation. Some of the other material that we may go after is—for example, we have a case right now where we are trying to get surveillance video from one of the hotels because the decedent fell off of a ledge and we need to see that video to determine whether or not he jumped, was pushed, or fell accidentally. These types of things are very important to us. We do not have resistance in getting them, meaning they do not mind turning them over, but they generally want a subpoena to support their turning that evidence over to us.

Right now what we are doing is asking the police to issue those subpoenas, but the police are not always involved in these cases. A lot of our investigations are not criminal in nature so the police are not involved, and they do not necessarily want to get involved with issuing a subpoena if they are not the ones conducting the investigation. That is what that section takes care of.

Mr. Chair, that is all of the bill. Doctor Knight and I are available to answer all the questions you have. We also have some people in the south who are available to testify as well.

Assemblyman Smith:

Back to page 5, line 8: What situation would that be, ". . . following a hospitalization stay of 24 hours or more"? How would that come into play?

John Fudenberg:

The reason that we put the exception of "unless the death occurred following a hospitalization stay of 24 hours or more" is, if a decedent overdoses at his home, is transported to the hospital, and dies after 24 hours, the toxicology results from his blood are irrelevant to us. Because the decedent has been in the hospital for 24 hours, he has more than likely been given medication by the hospital, staff, and the drugs he has taken will have metabolized out, or certainly the results will be different. We do not rely on those particular forensic toxicology results. Hopefully, the majority of the time the hospital will draw blood. We call that admission blood. We will do forensic toxicology testing on that blood so we do not necessarily need the body of the decedent; we need the blood of the decedent. That is why that section is there.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I went through the bill, I have spent some time with you on this, and I think it is a good bill. I think the subpoena powers help where sometimes you need to get something right away and you cannot get hold of a judge. I think this is going to help shorten that process to move cases forward. The question I have is related to the \$4 fee. I can understand that it is important to get future equipment, but the one thing I was thinking about is the youth program—can you explain what that encompasses.

John Fudenberg:

Right now we have an established youth program in Clark County. It is called the Coroner Visitation Program. There is statute that outlines the program, but I do not know the section off the top of my head. That program is currently an offender program. We have offenders who go through the juvenile court system or other municipal court systems, and the judge will use this program as a sentencing tool. It is a three-hour program—it is not a scared straight program; we are not parading them through our morgue and showing them decedents; and we do not show them bodies. It is more of an educational program where we walk through several cases with the youth and demonstrate the impact that the deaths had on decedents' friends, families, the community, and their schoolmates—it is a very impactful program. That is an example of a program that we would expand and that we have used

funding for. When the youth are sentenced by the court, they are sentenced to pay \$45 for the program, but a lot of them cannot afford the \$45 so we will cover that with this funding. We never turn the kids away if they cannot afford the program.

Assemblyman Ellison:

So most of these kids who go through this do so because of a juvenile court order?

John Fudenberg:

That is correct.

Chair Flores:

We do not have any additional questions for now. I would like to invite those wishing to speak in support to come forward.

Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and representing Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:

We are in full support of this bill.

Shani Coleman, representing City of Las Vegas:

We want to thank Mr. Fudenberg from the Office of the Coroner for working with the City of Las Vegas. He walked through the proposed amendment we had ([Exhibit C](#)), which clarified language about who would be eligible for those mental health services in section 4, so I will not go over that. The City of Las Vegas supports this bill with the proposed amendment.

Jeanette Belz, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association:

We are in full support of section 4 of the bill. There have been horrible tragedies all over this country. Although some might feel that folks in the coroner's office might already be prepared for them—in a sense because that is what they do—I think the level of what has been happening in our country has increased so much, and the depth and breadth of these tragedies have become so great, that even they are not exempt from the post-traumatic stress disorder and other long term implications. We strongly support that section.

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of this piece of legislation. I want to start by saying that Mr. Fudenberg and his outstanding team in the Clark County Coroner's Office do an exceptional job, often under very challenging circumstances, in serving the people of Nevada's largest county. The City of Henderson is in support of this bill's language giving the ability to test decedents for communicable diseases as a means to better protect our first responders from potential exposure pathways to what could be life-threatening diseases.

Also, in the aftermath of the 1 October tragedy, I think our community has spent a lot of time assessing the types of services that are available, in incidents like mass casualty events, to our police and firefighters and our other emergency response personnel alike. We have looked at the issue and, as Mr. Fudenberg said, there may not be enough agencies out there that are providing these services. So I think it would be highly beneficial to allow funds from

this bill to cover that need. Same thing with the bereavement services; when a family is faced with a loss, that is a very valuable tool we can provide to them, to be able to have some counseling and help them through that challenging time.

Todd Ingalsbee, representing Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

We support this bill. We want to thank Mr. Fudenberg and the sponsor for bringing this bill. It not only protects our members, it serves a great purpose for our community and our citizens.

[Assemblyman McCurdy assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair McCurdy:

We will now go to testimony from Las Vegas.

Jeff Buchanan, Deputy Fire Chief, Clark County Fire Department:

First and foremost, I just want to say thank you to Coroner John Fudenberg for his tremendous efforts regarding this bill. We wholeheartedly support Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint). Unfortunately, in 2017 police officers and firefighters committed suicide at a greater rate than if they died in the line of duty. We know that behavioral and mental health is of critical importance, and we think getting this training in partnership with the coroner's office and other public agencies that respond to these horrific events is vitally important for our employees' behavioral and mental health.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Thank you for your testimony, and thank you for your service.

Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County:

I am testifying this morning in support of S. B. 463 (R1), specifically section 4. Today there is no place else I have to be, and nothing else I have to do than in this very moment. That is a meditation that I learned from a grant program that the Clark County coroner allowed me to use within my division at the district attorney's office. My team consists of 68 county employees that include 30 deputy district attorneys and support staff.

We handle 100 percent of parent-, step-parent-, and guardian-on-child sexual abuse and 100 percent of juvenile-on-juvenile sexual abuse. We handle cases of child fatality and near-fatalities, child torture, and child neglect. Then we are expected to go home to our families, or home alone, and carry the weight of those 100-plus children a week. It is a big responsibility, and we are all really tough and strong, but we still need to be reminded to take care of ourselves. Think about your lives and the times you go home to your families at night or on the weekends and the responsibility that you carry for the state of Nevada. How many times—when you are supposed to be with your family, and your mind wanders to work, and you are not in that moment with them. Think about when your mind wanders

to work—if that meant dealing with images of dead children or dead citizens and loved ones. Imagine the scenes that you can still see with your eyes open, and try to be in that moment with your family.

First responders for our community take on a lot of responsibility to carry that weight, and we proudly do it, and we are really tough and strong. But after October 1, with the coroner's assistance, I was able to bring in a grant program for my staff, for one hour on a Friday, so that they could prepare to go home to be in the moment with their families and then come back ready to go on Monday to serve the public again. Taking care of yourself is very important and, as people in very powerful positions, we often forget to do that as we take care of others. I appreciate your support of section 4 of S. B. 463 (R1). I know it has changed a lot since it was originally in the Senate, but even this step to deal with mass casualties is an important step for first responders.

[Assemblyman Flores reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Flores:

I would like to invite those forward those who seek to speak in opposition to S.B. 463 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to speak in the neutral position?

Matt Robinson, representing Southern Nevada Health District:

The Southern Nevada Health District provides death certificates for Clark County deaths from 1988 to the present. Currently the Health District transfers \$1 from its death certificate fee to the account for the support of the Office of the County Coroner. The funds are transferred from the fee that is currently collected. Since this bill increases the amount that would be transferred from the current fee, fees for death certificates will have to be raised to ensure that death certificate program funding is not adversely impacted by the transfer.

Chair Flores:

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in the neutral position regarding S.B. 463 (R1)? [There was no one.] The sponsor may come back up to offer any closing remarks.

John Fudenberg:

I do not have any further remarks, Mr. Chair. Thank you for allowing us to go through the bill this morning.

Chair Flores:

We are going to close the hearing on S.B. 463 (R1). Next, I would like to open the hearing on Senate Bill 464.

Senate Bill 464: Revises the Charter of the City of North Las Vegas. (BDR S-1154)

Brian McAnallen, representing City of North Las Vegas:

With me at the table today are Rhiann Jarvis Denman, who is deputy city attorney as well as Delen Goldberg, our chief of staff for the City of North Las Vegas. I am going to ask

Rhiann Jarvis Denman to present the bill section by section for you so we can make sure you are clear on what is in the bill and why we are seeking those changes.

If I may, before we do that, it is a little hard to bring this bill forward after the one we just heard, so on my behalf I would like to extend a note of gratitude to all of our first responders, understanding the challenges they go through. We deeply appreciate all that they bring to the table. I think the coroner has done a fantastic job, given the challenges that he had to deal with after 1 October, as well as our other first responders. Of course, the City of North Las Vegas also has a significant number of first responders so I would just like to take a moment to make sure it is clear how much we appreciate them.

Senate Bill 464 is brought to you today by the Senate Government Affairs Committee. I would like to extend my gratitude to Senator David R. Parks for introducing the bill and bringing it forward. With that, I will turn this over to Rhiann Jarvis Denman. We are here to answer questions that you have.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman, Deputy City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas:

The main purpose of this bill is to modernize and clarify many of the provisions of the North Las Vegas City Charter. This is the first time that we have proposed substantive changes to the charter in a number of years. Some of these changes are very small, but they have a big effect on the city to improve city processes and help us do things more efficiently. I will just go through the more substantive sections of the bill, but if there are any questions please feel free to interrupt.

For section 1, the changes proposed in this section are to the duties of the mayor in section 2.015 of the City Charter. The Charter currently says that the mayor shall have no administrative duties, which is inaccurate. The mayor does have administrative duties for signing contracts, resolutions, and ordinances. This is the practice across the state's local governments. Once the city council has heard something and approves that matter, the mayor has authority to sign on that matter. This was just to clarify that the mayor does have a duty to sign all contracts, resolutions, and ordinances that have been approved by council.

Section 2 of the bill is cleaning up and modernizing language. Section 3 of the bill is more clarifying language, changing the word "papers" to "documents and information" to make this broader and more modern.

Section 4 of the bill makes a small but very important change. Currently, the City of North Las Vegas has a very limited scope for special meetings. This is not consistent with the rest of the jurisdictions in the southern area of Nevada. We looked at several of the charters from the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, and the City of Mesquite. For the City of North Las Vegas, currently, we cannot conduct any additional business at a special meeting unless it is for emergency purchases. In other areas of the state, the cities can hear contracts and other types of purchases as long as those are noticed in accordance with open meeting laws. We just added in the language "unless notice of the special meeting called to consider such action is given pursuant to NRS 241.020." This is just to allow the council to hear other

matters at special meetings that may be important to hear at that time and allow business to be conducted at that special meeting as long as it has been noticed in accordance with the open meeting law.

Section 5 of the bill changes the language regarding the enactment of ordinances. This is just to clarify how ordinances are enacted by our city council. There was a little bit of disagreement in interpretation so we wanted to add in more clarifying language. We wanted to make it clear that when an ordinance is introduced at the council, that is the first time it is read to council. At the second meeting where the ordinance is introduced, the council can amend the ordinance at that time, or vote on the ordinance, or vote on the ordinance with amendments, or they can postpone the action to another meeting. There was a little bit of disagreement as to whether, at that postponement time, the ordinance would then have to be reintroduced, which did not seem to make sense considering that would be the third time the ordinance would be brought to the council. This is to clarify that if action on that ordinance is postponed, the council can, at the third reading of the ordinance, vote or pass amendments for that ordinance.

Section 6 is just cleanup language, as are sections 7 and 8. These are just modernizing and cleaning up the language of those sections. Section 9 is also cleanup. Section 10 just adds in "efficient and proper" administration to ensure that the city manager duties include that the administration is efficient and proper for the city.

Section 11 amends the city manager portion of the charter. Currently, under the City Charter, there are two positions that are appointed directly by the council; this is the city manager and the city attorney. Both of those employees have employment agreements with the city. Those employment agreements are entered into by those employees; they have the opportunity to review those contracts. The contracts are brought to the council at a public meeting so that the council has an opportunity to review and ensure that the provisions in those agreements meet the constitutional due process requirements for termination and suspension, and that the employee has understood and agreed to those provisions. The reason for removing the city manager suspension and removal portions proposed in S.B. 464 was to ensure there would be clarity in how a suspension and removal procedure would take place with the city manager. The termination and suspension procedure is addressed in the employee's employment agreement for the city manager and for the city attorney. That was the reason for taking out the language in that portion.

Section 12: This section deals with the city clerk. The city clerk is under the city manager in our charter, and the city clerk has specific duties for recordkeeping, working at council meetings, and keeping the minutes of the meetings. A lot of the language establishing the city clerk's duties was repetitive, and it did not make sense. It was not completely modernized. We spoke to the city clerk and went through these provisions to determine what would more accurately reflect the duties that she has. Most of the changes that were made here were to modernize and clarify exactly what the city clerk's duties are and how she administers those duties.

Section 13 changes the language in the city attorney section of the charter to correlate with the city manager provision, in that the suspension or termination of the city attorney should also be done in accordance with the city attorney's employment agreement. In both this and the city manager provisions, this was not new language that we just made up; we did look at other city charters throughout Nevada. The City of Henderson and the City of Mesquite also have this language included for these employees—that their termination and suspension should be done in terms of the employment agreement that has been negotiated and entered into publicly.

Section 14 of the bill is also clarifying language. It does include that the city manager and city attorney may, by proper legal action, collect all monies—that is in addition to the city council. That is something that goes on in the city currently, because if there is a lawsuit the city attorney has the duty to respond to that lawsuit. A lot of times there is not enough time to take things to the city council in order to have them responded to in a quick manner; for example, when lawsuits need to be answered, or creditor's claims need to be filed to collect monies for the city. We wanted to clarify that the city manager and the city attorney do need to have the ability to do that.

Section 15 of the bill is regarding hearing commissioners. We modeled this language after the City of Las Vegas charter. The City of Las Vegas has hearing commissioners and traffic commissioners, which we felt would be very helpful for our city. We have our municipal court judge, Judge Hoeffgen, who is in Las Vegas. He will be able to testify further on section 15.

Sean Hoeffgen, Judge, City of North Las Vegas Municipal Court:

I am here in support of the bill. Specifically, I am here to make a few comments regarding section 15 and to answer any questions from the Committee. Since fiscal year 2017, we have had an increase in traffic cases or citations filed in the North Las Vegas Municipal Court. In fact, we have experienced about a 15 percent annual increase in traffic cases being filed. Currently, individuals who are appearing for their traffic citations are waiting approximately three months before they have the opportunity to appear before a judge in the court. With this increase in cases, we feel the need for the position of a hearing commissioner to assist the court in handling these matters. Finally, since fiscal year 2017, the City of North Las Vegas has hired approximately 60 new police officers. These officers are responsible for the issuing of traffic citations to individuals for various traffic violations. I will be happy to answer any questions from the Committee.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The remaining sections of the bill, sections 16 through 20, are also just modernizing language. With that, we can close our presentation.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It looks like this is a pretty good update. Looking at section 11, at line 15 on page 10, "The city council shall adopt" This is the language you took out. It does not leave any control with the mayor, is that correct?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Those provisions were taken out because the city council has the authority to enter into the agreement with the city manager and will have already negotiated the terms of suspension and removal of the city manager should that come in front of the council. The reason for taking out that portion, "The city council shall adopt by affirmative vote . . ." was because that would require that matter to go to the city council, and getting a matter before the council may take as many as 30 days. If an issue has come up with the city manager where the city manager needs to be suspended immediately, the employment agreement would speak to what procedures have to be followed for that suspension to occur immediately, and then the matter would ultimately go to the council—but the employment agreement would allow that to be heard more quickly.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It just seems like the mayor would be involved in that negotiation or termination between the city attorney and whomever, prior to it going to the full city council. I feel like that is leaving a part of that process out, because he is the one that is going to have to address the public at the end. Is that not true?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

There are three people in the current city manager employment agreement that would have a say in whether the city manager is suspended. That would just be for the suspension. It is just to ensure that a suspension could occur more quickly than it would if we had to wait for a city council meeting because of things that may be going on with the city manager. So the council would ultimately have the decision authority whether that becomes effective, but to ensure that immediate suspension occurs we figured it would be better to go with the employment agreement. This is similar to the charters of the City of Henderson and the City of Mesquite and keeping consistent with our neighboring jurisdictions. It is just to ensure that the process can be handled more smoothly.

Delen Goldberg, Chief of Staff/Public Information Officer, City of North Las Vegas:

I just want to clarify that in both the existing charter and our proposed changes the mayor is one vote on the city council. He has no more or no less power than the other four members of the city council. That would be a joint decision, just as any other contract or matter of city business where they need a majority of three. The employment contract that was negotiated most recently for our city manager actually strengthens the power of the city against a city manager if there is reason, either for cause or at will. It is just a change of direction for the city in the sense that three votes of the council are not needed to suspend the city manager; it is two votes of the council and the city attorney.

Assemblyman Smith:

If I can beg the indulgence of the Committee, I have several questions, but I do not want to hog the time to myself. You just referenced the fact that you have a contract in place already with the city manager, even though this language is still holding. Which one would prevail if this does not pass?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

That is the reason for these changes. The employment agreement is something that is negotiated because the council has the ability to appoint a city manager and a city attorney, and those employees are hired with employment agreements in place that speak to termination, necessarily because they are employment agreements. Having these provisions in the current charter creates a conflict and an ambiguity in how these matters should be handled. If the employee has already agreed to termination and suspension provisions in their employment agreement and then there are provisions under the city charter, those two sometimes do conflict with each other and create an ambiguity in how the situation should be handled. The employee may receive the best of both worlds, which takes up additional time, additional resources, and, ultimately creates more administrative processes for the city, rather than smoothing out the employment issues pursuant to the employee agreement that has been publicly negotiated previously.

Assemblyman Smith:

You have mentioned several times that you are trying to follow other charters throughout the state. I did not see in here where you have a charter committee. Is that in the works?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

That is correct; we do not have a charter committee in this charter. That was not a provision that has been in the charter at all. The way that we brought forward these amendments was discussing issues that had come up with the city, speaking with staff, and presenting these proposed revisions to the council at two public hearings to allow the community to provide comment if they chose to. This was presented in October and again in December to our city council. At neither of those meetings did any public comment take place; however, there was the opportunity for the public to comment on these matters. Additionally, we did not add those provisions in, because the charter is almost like a constitution. It is not something that needs to be amended substantively on an ongoing basis. It is more something that is supposed to be broad enough to govern the city and not have to be frequently amended. The substantive amendments have not taken place frequently because the charter is such a strong governing document that allows for the provisions to help control the city; so that was the reason not to include a charter committee provision.

Assemblyman Smith:

Yes, I personally have an issue with that. I know other cities that have similar situations that have charter committees specifically for that, and I am surprised it was not in here. I personally am not happy with that.

If we could move on to page 13 regarding your hearing commissioners. Who does that now? You are adding this as new language, so obviously there is a need for it, but who is currently taking care of this problem?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Currently we have one municipal judge, Judge Hoeffgen, who is present. Judge Hoeffgen hears everything. The matters he is not able to hear are handled by judges pro tem who come forward to hear those matters currently. I can turn it over to him because he may be able to explain this better.

Judge Hoeffgen:

Ms. Denman's statements are correct. I am the only municipal court judge currently in North Las Vegas. What we do to assist with the issue is that we utilize pro tem judges on a weekly basis to hear those traffic sessions that are calendared. Twice a week we have a pro tem judge come in, one full day and one half day, to hear traffic matters. That is what we are currently doing to deal with the number of cases. As I indicated, currently when an individual gets a citation the officer will print on the citation the appearance date when the individual will have to make an appearance at the front counter with the court clerk. At that time, the individual will request to have a session with the judge. Currently, no sessions are available until mid- to late-July because of the number of cases that are coming to the court. If you have any other questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Assemblyman Smith:

How much is this going to cost?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

That would depend on how the council determines to pay this individual. In crunching the numbers, for a person who would be paid as an independent contractor, this would actually save the city roughly \$100,000, compared to creating a second municipal judge position, because the person would be operating as a contractor without the same benefits as a municipal judge. It would be a savings to taxpayers to allow a hearing commissioner to hear these lower level misdemeanors such as traffic misdemeanors, similar to what is currently happening in the City of Las Vegas.

Assemblyman Smith:

I assume his office would be under the City Attorney's Office. Is that where it would reside?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The municipal court is separate from the Office of the City Attorney, so that the hearing commissioner would be in the municipal court.

Assemblyman Smith:

I am going to have to jump back; I missed a page here. On page 11, at the top of the page, you have deleted "3. Supervise and coordinate administrative and responsible clerical work relating to the functions of the city council," and "4. Attend all meetings" I am curious as to why you have eliminated those duties of the clerk. I do not understand that.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Some of these duties were duplicative throughout this provision. For the "Attend all meetings of the city council," the city clerk can designate someone from her office to go in her stead; there are deputy clerks. So we eliminated that provision for that reason. The "Supervise and coordinate administrative and responsible clerical work" were duties already listed in other areas. That portion encompassed most of the duties of what the city clerk does, as well as the supervising of the operation and maintenance system, printing of ballots, and certifying the tally of election results. We were not taking away duties. We were just clarifying what the duties were and making it a tighter provision after discussing with our city clerk what exactly she does and what accurately reflects her position, so that in the future, when a city clerk is hired, it is clear exactly what the city clerk does now.

Assemblyman Smith:

I am going to move down a little bit. I am still under the clerk's duties [section 12]. I guess I have never seen this before as it did jump out at me—8. Supervise the recruitment of all election workers. Who will do that if the city clerk is not doing it?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Currently the city has a contract with the Clark County Elections Department because the Clark County Elections Department actually puts on the elections for us. That is under the duties of the Clark County Elections Department pursuant to our agreement with them.

Assemblyman Smith:

I have noticed you are following the charters of other charters around the state—or trying to—and I appreciate that. You did call out the city attorney, the clerk, the manager, but you did not talk about the assessor at all. Did you not want the assessor included in your charter as an ex officio? I see it in other charters, but I do not see it here.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The city does not have an assessor. That may be included in other charters, but that is not currently in our charter, so we did not add any provisions regarding an assessor.

Assemblyman Smith:

On page 5, you added language under 2(c) to postpone a meeting. What would happen that you would postpone it and not just take a vote on it? I have never seen that.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I do not think that this happens very often. If there has been an amendment made at a second reading of an ordinance, it may be postponed at that time for the council to further discuss the amendment with staff or to have staff brief them on that amendment and the effects of that amendment at that time. That may be the reason for postponement, in addition to any other reason that the council has.

Assemblyman Smith:

So technically, that would be at the first reading of that amendment. Am I wrong?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

You are correct. If the amendment is proposed at that second meeting, that would be the first time that the amendment has been read. If the council postpones action with that amendment on the ordinance to a second meeting, that will be the second time that that amendment has come up. At that time we felt that it would be a more efficient process for it to be voted upon rather than reintroduced, because an ordinance only needs to be introduced once before it is voted upon at the second meeting.

Assemblyman Smith:

Even though you are set up to have one or two meetings, possibly a third meeting is the one you are trying to eliminate from being heard again, right? Any other item would be heard or read on the first meeting and even the second meeting if it were postponed from the first to the second. By the time it gets to the third, you do not hear it again and I get that. But I am concerned that it is only heard once and the general public may not get a chance to hear or see that meeting. Then the third meeting comes along and—bang—it is voted on. And they say, What just happened? I would have a little concern about that.

Delen Goldberg:

To answer your previous question, it is actually a benefit to the public. Sometimes it is postponed because interested parties or members of the public are not able to attend or are not aware of a meeting. So upon the first reading, if, for instance, the city council gets input from the public that they have a concern—say on the Tuesday before the Wednesday meeting—and there is enough of a groundswell, the council may choose to postpone that action to enable conversations with the public or for people to come and testify for or against, or represent their opinions on the bill. That would cause them to postpone it. Again, there was just confusion. Do we start the process over again? Do we continue where it picked off? It is actually embracing public comment as well.

Assemblywoman Munk:

I have some real concerns about striking out some of the items for the city manager. I do not feel it is very transparent. It is almost as though he has a job in perpetuity. I feel like you are protecting the city manager. If we are going to go that far to strike out all of the information on how to get rid of him, it does not feel very transparent. What are the city manager's qualifications? If you are going to take out all of this, then we probably should know how you are going to be able to terminate him.

Delen Goldberg:

I am happy to submit our current city manager's contract as an exhibit ([Exhibit D](#)). That is all we can speak to, because it is the current manager. In fact, it was publicly posted. It is available as part of an agenda item. I think you will see and be satisfied that it is a very strong contract in favor of the city—in protection of the taxpayers and the people. It has at-will or for-cause at any time termination. If there is some wrongdoing on the city manager's part, he or she may be terminated. If the council simply feels, You are not serving our needs; our city is going in a different direction; times have changed; situations have changed; you have done a great job; or you have not done a great job; but we need new

vision and new leadership—at that time they can change the city manager as well. As said previously, for a termination, any three votes—just like any other matter—with a majority vote of the council, the city manager is terminated immediately. For suspension it is an even lower threshold; it is only two members of the council and the city attorney. There have to be some checks and balances so there is no potential abuse of power. It is a very strong contract, stronger than we have had in the past and stronger in favor of the city in protections of the people. It was recently negotiated to be more beneficial to the city and its interests. I am happy to get that information to you after the meeting.

Assemblywoman Munk:

I know we would all appreciate seeing that contract, since we are striking out so much of the duties of the city manager. You have mentioned that there were other cities, specifically the City of Henderson—how many city manager agreements agree from one to another? You had compared Henderson and I believe one other.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Yes. We were comparing this with the charters of the City of Henderson and City of Mesquite—the language of their charters that points to the employment agreement. I am unaware of how those employment agreements look, but we can certainly get that answer to you—those employment agreements for the city manager in Henderson and in Mesquite should be public—for us to see whether our agreement is on par with their agreements.

Delen Goldberg:

As Rhiann Jarvis Denman said, they are publicly available. We are happy to provide you public information. I think you will be confident to see that our city manager's contract is in line with national standards and southern Nevada standards. It does not deviate in any substantive way from any other contract that I am familiar with. Our city attorney's office and counsel were very deliberate in protecting the city through the city manager's contract—this was an item that came up recently, publicly, at a city council meeting—so they did their homework; they did their due diligence to make sure that our contract was in line with others. In fact, I might go even so far as to say there are fewer provisions for, if you will, perks and benefits in our contract than you might find elsewhere.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

What are the qualifications for a city manager? What kind of experience or education might one have?

Delen Goldberg:

I cannot speak to the exact job description but generally they need leadership, vision, education, and public policy experience. Our current city manager has a doctorate in law; he has numerous years of experience in public policy; he worked as an assistant city manager for several years and rose up the ranks. Typically, city managers come from different walks of life. Our former city manager was a public works director. She had not been an assistant city manager for more than a short interim when she became the city manager. Our current city manager has a government affairs and law background. They differ. If you look

valley-wide, you see a wide variety. They all share the same vision and capability. The proof is in the pudding. With any hire, you take a bit of a risk; you read résumés; you get references; you try and choose the best candidate. It is not until they actually are performing that you can truly judge what you have. The actions of the past year and a half speak for our city manager: The city is growing; we are bouncing up in credit rating to unprecedented rates from the recession; we are hiring; we have started a new division; we are hiring police officers; and we are opening libraries and parks longer and adding services for the residents. If you want to judge a city manager, the actions are the best way to do so. The actions speak for themselves—I would hope people see that.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

In the past, what issues led up to the removal of the city manager?

Delen Goldberg:

I am going to invite Claudia Aguayo, our assistant city attorney, to answer that.

Claudia Aguayo, Assistant City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas:

The question was regarding the facts that led up to the dismissal of our previous city manager. We are somewhat limited in what we can discuss about that since we do have a pending legal matter pertaining to that issue. Since we had a public hearing on it that involved a just-cause termination and malfeasance and misconduct, we can speak to what occurred at the public hearing. For those who were not there, it involved misappropriation of city funds. Specifically, it involved the former city manager—I will call it a snatch and grab on the way out—attempted to give herself a year's retroactive pay increase to help supplement her retirement benefit toward the end. That was investigated by a third-party law firm, and the investigation revealed that there was evidence to support those acts of misconduct.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

If you were able to remove her in the past, why do you want to change the process now?

Claudia Aguayo:

Generally speaking, I have been with the city for 15 years. As assistant city attorney, I primarily handle labor and employment matters. The process that is in the books currently is approximately 50 years old. I do not think it has been used very often. We are one of the few who have used this process. Unfortunately, we had to use the process and it was extremely challenging, cumbersome, impractical, inefficient, and very restrictive in the time frames. The time frames are arbitrary. Because it is so outdated, it does not conform with modern employment principles. What I mean by that is that it does not provide any mechanism for alternative dispute resolution or arbitration, for example. I want to make it clear that the final decision still goes before the city council. Even in the employment agreement, that final decision—whether to remove without cause or to remove for cause—does still go before the council. That does not change under the employment agreements and under the current language of the charter. The only changes are to the procedure, and in the employment world—think about collective bargaining—all of those

procedures are in those employment agreements. They are set forth in detail there. And those kinds of agreements, in their due process component, can reflect the needs of the employee and the needs of the employer.

Assemblywoman Duran:

When you want to suspend, is it a suspension pending investigation, or is it a suspension leading to a termination to go through that process?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The suspension is pending an investigation. That is in the terms of the agreement currently.

Assemblywoman Duran:

So if, in doing your investigation, there is found to be no just cause, is he or she reimbursed for the time of suspension, and will documents about the disciplinary action be taken off his or her record?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The contract discusses how compensation would occur under that situation. That definitely would be a procedure that the council would be involved in and the employee as well. That would be an equitable arrangement, yes. Claudia Aguayo may be able to answer your question more fully.

Claudia Aguayo:

There are several purposes to temporary suspension or administrative leave, as now most of us know it. One of them is to keep the employee gainfully employed so the terms and conditions of their employment, meaning their financial condition, do not change unless there is a very serious allegation involving criminal acts and things like that, where it is highly unlikely that the individual would come back. Ninety-nine percent of the time, it is a compensated with pay temporary removal. The other functions of that are to (1) preserve evidence—remove the employee so that an investigation can take place without interference, and (2) to maintain the efficiency of the workplace without disruption from an employee who may have issues and who is permitted to remain. Those are the primary functions of a temporary removal. That can all be addressed in the employment agreement. One additional thing I want to point out. If you compare our city attorney provisions to our city manager provisions, our city manager provisions do not prescribe the procedure that is currently prescribed for the city manager. That procedure has always had to be handled by the employment agreement. We are just actually trying to make those two provisions consistent, where final removal is done by council vote regardless of being on the basis of an agreement or not. It is only these due process procedures, which are extremely detailed—these involve procedural due process constitutional issues—so that no matter what we prescribe, it has to be within those constitutional boundaries. I do not think a charter is a good place to prescribe that type of detail. You can see from our agreements that we have painstakingly gone through a constitutional and efficient process that favors the city and the taxpayers and the employee as well.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

We talked about the ongoing litigation of the city manager who was removed. You also have removed other managers in the past. Can you elaborate on why they were terminated?

Claudia Aguayo:

We cannot speak to specific employment matters. We are limited in, (1) our knowledge, and (2) in what we are permitted to say, because of the attorney-client privilege and things of that nature. In my experience, most people left voluntarily or there had been some type of separation provisions in the existing agreement that have been triggered. So it has not had to go through the process prescribed for termination.

Assemblyman Hafen:

There has been a lot of conversation about city managers and employment. I am looking at other city charters throughout the state, and it looks like this language is almost identical to Henderson and a lot of the other city charters, where there is an employment agreement that is entered into, and that the terms of the employment agreement dictate how all of this conversation goes, rather than the NRS. Am I missing something? It looks like you are only trying to be consistent with a lot of the other city charters throughout the state.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Thank you for that question. Yes, that is correct. We are just trying to maintain consistency. We did look at several city charters and those provisions. Specifically, Henderson and Mesquite are very current. Henderson's was amended in 2015, I believe, and the city charter of Mesquite was formed in 2017. We wanted to make sure that this language would be modern, be consistent, and provide the city with a clear procedure and process for how these matters are handled, rather than the ambiguity that is currently created by these provisions.

Assemblyman Hafen:

Looking online, it was 2013, not 2015. I just want to get it on the record.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I apologize for that slip-up. So 2013 for the Henderson city charter. Thank you.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional questions?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Regarding the current contract of the city manager, it provides for the removal by council at any time. They are eliminating any requirement that future contracts contain that, by eliminating the charter provisions that require it. Can you talk about that?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Assemblyman, I apologize. I am not sure that I fully understand your question.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

If the current contract for the city manager provides for the removal by the council at any time by eliminating the charter provisions that provide for his or her removal by the council, they are pretty much eliminating any requirement that future contracts contain that, correct?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

By eliminating that language and pointing to the employment agreement, that is correct. It is not prescribing specific provisions that would have to be contained in an employment agreement. However, the employment agreement generally always will speak to termination and removal, because those are negotiated terms by those employees. Just as Ms. Aguayo has mentioned, with collective bargaining agreements and any type of employment agreement, those terms are spoken for in those agreements to make sure that in the instance of those situations occurring, there is a procedure in place. And it has been vetted by the employee and the employer.

Delen Goldberg:

You will be confident, were you to review city manager contracts across the country. This is not exactly the same because every city has specific needs, but substantively this falls in line with colleagues across southern Nevada, Nevada, and nationally. I do not know the proper name, but there is a city manager professional organization that offers template contracts. I know the City Attorney's Office consulted that template while drafting. I did not work on this contract but this falls in line with that, in an effort to be as protective of taxpayers in light of issues that we have had where the contract was not very strong for the taxpayers—it was much stronger for the city manager. We swung the pendulum to the other side with this contract. I will be sure to get you a copy of this contract. You will see that it is in no way an outlier to any other city manager's contract.

To answer your question, Mr. Carrillo, going forward it would be our hope and intention that any city attorney in the future would have the wherewithal to draft a competent contract that would include those provisions.

Brian McAnallen:

Ms. Goldberg was referring to ICMA, the International City/County Management Association.

Assemblywoman Munk:

On page 2, line 9, at 1(b), you have struck out "Have no administrative duties." With that struck out, it is going to change the charter. Does that give the mayor more executive authority over city government?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

This would not be giving any additional duties to the mayor. This only clarifies that the mayor needs to sign all contracts, resolutions, and ordinances as long as those have been approved by the city council. That language clarifies that the council must approve them before the mayor signs those documents. The mayor is the signatory authority because of being the mayor—other provisions throughout the charter reference that the mayor must sign resolutions and those sorts of documents. We wanted to make sure that in the future, when new mayors are elected, they understand that it is not necessarily "no administrative duties," rather there are duties to sign on behalf of council actions.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional questions? We do not have any more questions for now. Please step back as I invite forward those wishing to speak in support of Senate Bill 464. I see no one to speak in support. Is there anybody wishing to speak in opposition to Senate Bill 464? Seeing no one, is there anybody wishing to speak in the neutral position to Senate Bill 464? Seeing no one, please come back with any closing remarks you may have.

Delen Goldberg:

Members of the Committee, Chair Flores, Vice Chair McCurdy, we thank you sincerely for your time in hearing this bill. Our intentions really are efficiency and a new sense of clarity for this modern day, where things are electronic and paper books of record, and learning from our mistakes—the missteps that have happened in the past that have cost taxpayers monies and slowed down the process of business. This really is what we see as a clarifying bill to better do business in the city and to do business more efficiently so we can continue the growth and positive trajectory of the City of North Las Vegas. We thank you for your questions. We appreciate your thorough review of this, and we hope that you will support our intention to make things better in the City of North Las Vegas for its residents and the people.

Chair Flores:

I appreciate Senator Parks working with you on this bill, and I appreciate your lobbying team; they have been doing all they can. Specifically you [Mr. McAnallen], sir. I do not believe there is a lot of comfort about this bill in this Committee as of yet; I think you have a lot of work to do. We are going to close the hearing on Senate Bill 464.

Assemblyman Smith:

In light of the fact that our session is winding down and time is of the essence for all of us on this Committee, I am concerned that there are issues with this bill and we are not going to have the time to solve them. I would like to indefinitely postpone this bill at this time, if that is acceptable.

Chair Flores:

I will take a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH MADE THE MOTION TO POSTPONE
SENATE BILL 464.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HAFEN, HARDY, AND
LEAVITT VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEN BILBRAY-AXELROD
AND ELLISON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Now, I would like to open it up for public comment. Seeing no one for public comment, this meeting is adjourned [at 10:20 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mark Peckham
Recording Secretary

Geigy Stringer
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint), submitted by Shani Coleman, representing City of Las Vegas.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "First Amended and Restated City Manager Employment Agreement," dated May 9, 2019, submitted by Delen Goldberg, Chief of Staff/Public Information Officer, City of North Las Vegas, regarding Senate Bill 464.