

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

**Eighty-first Session  
April 9, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:18 p.m. on Friday, April 9, 2021, Online. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair  
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair  
Senator Dina Neal  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Ira Hansen

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Senatorial District No. 16  
Senator James A. Settlemeyer, Senatorial District No. 17  
Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst  
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel  
Janae Johnson, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Tick Segerblom, Commissioner, Clark County  
Joanna Jacob, Clark County  
Mayli Alarcon, Mechanical Contractors' Association of Las Vegas; Sheet Metal  
and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern  
Nevada  
Arielle Edwards, City of North Las Vegas  
Jennifer Lazovich  
Nicholas Vassiliadis, Carpenters Local 1977  
Brian Reeder, Nevada Contractors Association

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 2

Randy Robison, City of Las Vegas  
Andy Donahue, Southern Nevada Labor-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust  
Skip Daly, Laborers Union Local 169  
Alexis Motarex, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors  
Rob Benner, Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada  
Rick McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition  
Mike Snyder, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees  
Carrol Albertson, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees  
Lisa Randle  
Jim Dunlap, President, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition  
Daniel Jackson  
Matt Richardson  
Adam Teti, President, State Law Enforcement Officers Association  
Carter Bundy, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees  
Liz Sorenson, Director, Communications Workers of America District 9  
Cameron Hopkins, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees  
Stephanie Dube, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041  
Sonja Whitten, Vice President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041  
Peggy Bohn, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041  
Bruce Snyder, Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Department of Business and Industry  
Lynn O'Mara, Director of Communications, Northern Nevada Development Authority  
Justin Lichter, Industrial Realty Group, LLC  
Kris Sanchez, Deputy Director, Governor's Office of Economic Development  
Derick Hembd, President, Sixco Nevada Inc.  
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada  
Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce  
Aaron West, CEO, Nevada Builders Alliance  
Nick Vander Poel, Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce  
Patrick Donnelly, Director, Center for Biological Diversity  
Jake Tibbitts, Manager, Eureka County

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 67.

**SENATE BILL 67**: Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-400)

TICK SEGERBLOM (Commissioner, Clark County):

My office is on the sixth floor overlooking the west of the Las Vegas Valley. The windows were dirty, and I asked how long has it been since the windows were cleaned? I was told it had been ten years, and I proposed getting the windows cleaned. It took two years to get the windows cleaned. Anything that is over \$100,000 has to be put out to bid as it is a huge complicated process.

There are other projects like getting streets repaved, which costs over \$100,000. I suggested just paving sections. I was told this is a violation of the rules and we would be trying to get around the rules. The truth is we just need an expedited process to get contracts and workers going that do not work for us. This is the goal of S.B. 67. This bill is a dream come true for the Commissioners.

JOANNA JACOB (Clark County):

Clark County has submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit B](#)) for S.B. 67. The original bill was Statewide and proposed a threshold change for local governments from \$100,000 to \$250,000. These sections have been deleted in the amendment. A couple of critical things the bill has changed from discussions with stakeholders is a pilot program in section 2 of the amendment. We are proposing to try a pilot program and see if we can get these jobs out to work.

The Clark County Commissioners are asking for jobs with S.B. 67. We want to make sure that we get work out. This is especially for the construction sector which is important for the economy. We want to keep it strong as we recover from the economic impacts of the pandemic. The bill is proposing a delivery method known as job order contracting. Our goal at Clark County is to hire multiple contractors and spread the work out to the fullest extent as possible.

We will start working with the labor and industry community. It will be a four-year pilot for Clark County. The Clark County Recreation District and the three large cities in southern Nevada population are over 100,000 population which are Las Vegas, Henderson and North Las Vegas. It is limited at the request of stakeholders and is a new process. We want to take the time to see

how it works for the larger agencies and then bring back to the Legislature in four years. We are hoping to have data that will be generated with reporting through the amendment.

The goal of job order contracting under the pilot program is to get exactly the kind the work that Commissioner Segerblom noted. It is for maintenance, repair, demolition, renovation and remediation for minor construction, which are small jobs. This is not for new construction for buildings or a new building because this is an alternative to low bid construction. Job order contracting is at its heart on call contracting. The intent is to hire multiple general contractors through a competitive solicitation. The awarded contractors will be on call to do work that comes up during the course of the fixed contract period. The work, as it comes up, will go out through a job order. The price is negotiated up front; materials and labor are determined by a concept known as unit pricing. The specific prices per unit are set up for the agency and contractor.

This will help because we will not have to put out smaller jobs one by one through procurement. Commissioner Segerblom talked about the delay and how Clark County jobs are based on the volume that has to be maintained. Job order contracting has been successfully used for many years and started with the Army Corps of Engineers. It is used by public agencies, local governments, housing authorities, states and municipalities around the Nation. We can learn from best practices and research for S.B. 67. It is best used when limited and not to replace low-bid contracting. Public agencies under the pilot program can only put out \$25 million per year under this method.

The intent is to keep jobs small with multiple job contracts and multiple jobs going out. A list of sample projects ([Exhibit C](#)) is the type of maintenance and repair projects proposed for Clark County Real Property Management departments. Clark County is responsible for 500 public buildings covering over 6 million square feet of space and 120 parks at 5,200 acres. The \$25 million is a fraction of the average of around \$51 million in total project for the Real Property Management per year. These are some of our most critical repair jobs. In the list, [Exhibit C](#), there is one mistake: the Clark County Detention Center South Tower is not a job that will be considered for a job order contract. The rest of the jobs on the list will cost \$1 million and under. This is recurring work that has to be done and the problem that we are trying to solve.

The amendment section 2, subsection 1, identifies the projects' limits and provides that the pilot project can only be used for certain agencies. Public agencies will be tasked to ensure compliance with the apprentice standards that apply to other public work in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 338.01165. Section 3, subsections 2 and 3 of the proposed amendment provide for the \$25 million threshold.

There is a two-year contract period under section 8. The original bill had proposed three optional one-year extensions to the two-year period. We narrowed this down in response to stakeholder concerns to a single one-year extension. We want to ensure this system works and offers opportunities to access these contracts. We may be delayed in getting this going since it is a new process. We worked with stakeholders on the language on the two-year period to use any unused funds not used in the first year in the second-year period. There was some concern about this section, and this does not mean the agencies will be able to sit on the money then put out one big job. This section is for repetitive jobs, and the goal is to get out small, repetitive work.

Sections 4 and 5 of the amendment state the requirements for procurement including the requirement for public agencies to advertise the public bid. Specific requirements for solicitation include qualifications that will be sought from the contractor by the agency which will put out the details about the method of pricing on the job. This is to make the process clear so the contractors are able to bid. Section 7 added the application to the existing local bidder's preference to the bidding processes because we want the jobs generated under this bill to go to the fullest extent they can to the local contractors. Section 8 provides the general contractor is responsible to contract as needed. Because this is in indefinite quantities, we cannot identify what will come up at the beginning of the contract. General contractors can engage subcontractors, suppliers or professionals needed to complete the job order.

Section 9 provides that a job order contract is the work that goes out under the umbrella contract. When the job order contract is issued, the agency will describe the scope of the job with the contractor. They will work out the schedule and the scope to determine what is needed for the job. We are requiring contractors to name the subcontractors that will be used on the job and also notify us of any substitution of a subcontractor. This changes the

timeline from months to weeks instead of going through the whole solicitation process at the County level.

Section 10 provides for the reporting to stakeholders and labor community so that the new process is transparent. We want to generate the data to see how it is working once it gets off the ground. We have agreed to quarterly reporting to the governing bodies for Clark County or for any of the cities that use this method. Quarterly reports for each contract will go to the governing boards. These will be publicly available for all job orders under these contracts indicating the cost for subcontractors used. We put in language to empower local governing boards to dictate what they want in the report. The amendment provides the Legislature will get copies of these reports annually.

Sections 12 through 13 of the original bill is the self-performance change and has been deleted. There were some concerns for impacts on small businesses. We looked into those concerns and have agreed to delete these sections from the bill. Section 14 is new and provides for the sunset provisions as was requested from the labor partners. This will provide a way to come back to the Legislature if there are changes and fixes needed within four years of the effective date. We are committed to coming back in four years to work on this as needed.

In late January, Governor Steve Sisolak asked governments to get work out that is sitting on our shelves. We had prefiled this bill since it is priority for Clark County, but this would help the local governments who are identified in this bill to do just that. The bill will get work out for parks, parking lots and bathrooms in the public parks. The splash pads at the public parks need maintenance or repair. This is an important bill for Clark County because it will benefit our community. We have projects planned in every commission district in southern Nevada.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

As I look at this, you are going to do a job order. Will this be defined on what jobs will be entailed? It sounds like an ongoing list.

MS. JACOB:

The importance of the job description in the front of the solicitation cannot be overstated. We looked at a project from the City of Austin, Texas. When they went out for the request for proposal on the project description, it said

everything that could come in real property management, from electric vehicle charging stations to electric and roof repair. The public agency needs to define it up front since the contractors need to know how to bid the job. The general contractors are taking on this risk at the beginning of the year.

The goal would be to look at what the needs are as referenced on the project list, [Exhibit C](#), as it covers a lot of territory. We want to make sure it encompasses the type of work and to give certainty to the contractor. It could mean anything that comes up in our parks, such as a job order to resurface a tennis court. It would be in the scope of work. A prebid meeting with the contracting community would go over the details. I have seen other agencies do this, giving details on what type of work that will be expected. It is important to invest the time for this process.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The job order itself will determine what the job will be? You could issue a job order every month? Say one could be for parks and one for a sidewalk or something like that?

MS. JACOB:

Exactly, we would have to look at a job subject to the threshold and how the program will be structured. We could put out one job order a month. We talked to the City of Long Beach, California, since it uses this program and hires multiple people to be on call. They rotate sending out contractor A to do this job, then the next job goes to contractor B. It depends on frequency and availability to determine how many contractors are hired or how quickly the job can get out if it is a priority. We are not sure if it will be one per month, and this is why we have a two-year contract period to get it out, subject to the annual threshold.

The parcel list is only a fraction of the global list of projects. Under the 2-year period, there are 49 projects that could get out on the street. It will depend on some factors as to how many general contractors are hired and the availability of subcontractors and suppliers. There is the question of job order contract versus job order. The contract umbrella is the goal, and then job orders would be issued. The savings would come in as the jobs are not being put out to bid, instead they would put under the scope of the contract.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This is the sense of the pilot program—to get it fine-tuned, then turn it loose to the rest of the world.

SENATOR HANSEN:

The original bill had brought up some concerns for qualifications for contractors that would exclude small contractors. I am small contractor and have done a fair amount of work for the cities. My concern is raising the bar to qualify as contractor may be involved in the bidding. It eliminates a lot of the smaller contractors under the current language.

MS. JACOB:

The amendment for northern Nevada was to write them out and pilot in the south. There is language that mandates that 50 percent of the work needs to be subcontracted out because of those concerns. We want to be sure to spread the work out to put multiple people to work.

SENATOR NEAL:

One quick question on the adjustment factor that is applied to unit prices. How does this work? I did see the 50 percent, but you do have some general contractors that will be allowed to do some of the work. How does this adjustment factor work for the pricing?

MS. JACOB:

Adjustment factor is how the contractor will bid profit and overhead. If we have unit price, that is going to be for material and labor. How it works is the line item pricing has a unit with the quantity. The pricing will be done as coefficient to the 100 percent of the price book or 97 percent of the price book. We received feedback from public agencies using this, as we have to be wary of people coming back low on the price book. It needs to be profitable for the contractors and needs to pencil out. That is how it works. You have your unit price and everything gets adjusted by that multiplier which is applied to the unit price for the quantity. A multiplier on each job order is how the adjustment factor works. I have a job sample order and I can file this with the Committee.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

A quick clarification, this bill will allow more work to be done by subcontractors instead of the city and county workers who are doing some of this work.



MS. JACOB:

We do not have in-house crews to do a lot of the work that is being proposed. These are the smaller jobs that line up. There is a list of jobs on the shelf that will be put out to general contractors. The general contractor will do the work and in turn put it out to subcontractors. The southern Nevada labor market has the type of work that will exceed the 50 percent threshold on these jobs because of the specialty work and with the subcontractor market in southern Nevada. It may have been work that traditionally had gone out for low bid. The point is the work is not going out and is sitting on the shelf. We are getting jobs out and prioritizing the small dollars' work that is important to the community. It is the maintenance work that needs to be done to maintain the public buildings and grounds.

MAYLI ALARCON (Mechanical Contractors' Association of Las Vegas; Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern Nevada):

We support S.B. 67. Both associations believe it will help local entities escalate some much-needed improvements while simultaneously providing work opportunities for the construction industry.

ARIELLE EDWARDS (City of North Las Vegas):

The City of North Las Vegas supports S.B. 67 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

JENNIFER LAZOVICH:

This is great bill, and I support S.B. 67.

NICHOLAS VASSILIADIS (Carpenters Local 1977):

The Carpenters Local 1977 supports S.B. 67. This bill will bring much-needed jobs.

BRIAN REEDER (Nevada Contractors Association):

The Nevada Contractors Association is made up of general, subcontractors and affiliated businesses throughout southern Nevada. We support S.B. 67.

RANDY ROBISON (City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas supports S.B. 67.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 10

ANDY DONAHUE (Southern Nevada Labor-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust):

This is an innovative concept, and we support S.B. 67.

SKIP DALY (Laborers Union Local 169):

We need a pilot program in southern Nevada. We asked to have something that would not allow third-party administrators so you could not have someone who operates as a group and bid up the work. I do not see this in the bill or the amendment. Window cleaning is not a public works job and is a purchasing issue. Another issue is where it says you can substitute subcontractors and is not allowed under regular construction.

The reason you do not want to substitute contractors is a prime contractor or higher-tier contractor selects subcontractors and builds their jobs to put in their bid based on that contractor's pricing. If contractors are able to substitute, it creates a potential third-party issue. There would not be savings passed on to the subcontractors as bid shopping is a big issue. There is no number of people on the selection committee, and it could be one person. The list of proposed projects, if they are priority, need to go out for bidding. We are not sure why people are letting the grass grow. We are opposed to S.B. 67 because if this is a pilot program, it should be Statewide.

ALEXIS MOTAREX (Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors):

Representing the commercial construction industry in northern Nevada, we are neutral to S.B. 67. Senate Bill 67 is limited to Clark County. We have concerns with a third-party administering these contracts. Language needs to be added to the bill prohibiting third-party administration and requiring these contractors be directly managed by the local government. Oftentimes, third-party administrators with this type of work charge more than 10 percent of the budget for services. The contractors can write off tax dollars over projects and not pay a third party to manage those contracts.

ROB BENNER (Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada):

We do have concerns with the bill as stated by previous speakers. Since it is not affecting northern Nevada, we are neutral to S.B. 67.

MS. JACOBS:

I did meet with the stakeholders on this bill. Clark County has projects on the shelf, and it comes down to volume of what projects can be completed. We

agreed to take out northern Nevada since this is a pilot program. As for the third-party administration for contracts, we do hire people in Clark County to administer the contracts. The best practices are because this delivery method has been in place and has been used around the Nation for 35 years. Best practices that evolved have been studied and includes close administration of this program. Under the pilot program, there will be some data to bring back and show what it looks like in Nevada in four years. I am committed to working with anyone on this bill to move it forward.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 67 and open the hearing on S.B. 286.

**SENATE BILL 286**: Revises provisions relating to public employees.  
(BDR 23-1012)

RICK MCCANN (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition):

Section 1 of S.B. 286 deals with the definition of supervisory employee for purposes of describing who can or cannot be in a collective bargaining agreement. Prior to the 2019 Session, if an employee met any of the descriptions that are set forth in NRS 288.138, for example, the authority to hire, fire, suspend and assign, the employee could not be in the same bargaining unit as those he or she supervised. In 2019, S.B. No. 135 of 80th Session sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris exempted law enforcement and firefighters from such a broad definition since they work under a paramilitary command structure. Law enforcement and fire agencies ranking officers frequently undertake supervisor roles as temporary supervisors while the regular supervisor is out on sick leave, vacation, training or observing extended leave. Such a temporary assignment could require the new temporary supervisor to step out of his or her bargaining unit in theory for that temporary period of time. We believe this is an unworkable process.

Senate Bill No. 135 of the 80th Session resolved this issue. It also included certain categories of peace officers to which the exemption applied, including the categories in the original bill. In the proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)), section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (3) removed this portion. The only part left in subsection 1, paragraph (a), subsection (4) adds a category to the exclusions going directly to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Protective Association for Civilian Employees (PPACE). The Association provides civil

support services to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) under paramilitary command structure. Without the proposed amendment to include these folks, certain unions are seeking to raid PPACE of its members under NRS 288.138, which is form of union-busting. By adding these civil law enforcement support services people to this statute, they are exempted under their own paramilitary command structure. They will stay in their own bargaining unit without fear of being pulled out in a union busting campaign. This part of the bill prevents raiding of union members.

When the original collective bargaining bill was signed in 2019, it included only those four persons defined as State employees. They were essentially classified employees of the State and some employees under the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). However, the new collective bargaining bill also signed into law described a specific bargaining unit that included all category II peace officers. The problem is the Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers represents State gaming control officers, and there are about 95 in the State. They are unclassified employees and do not qualify for collective bargaining under NRS 288.425. However, there are category II peace officers who are theoretically under their own bargaining unit set forth in the statute. They are category II peace officers placed in a specific bargaining unit and by law, they are defined as employees but not classified. There is inconsistency with this, and it is unfair to the gaming control agents, who deserve to be in collective bargaining.

We recently bargained the first contract in the State's history on behalf of category II officers, and the gaming control agents watched while receiving no benefit of the contract due to this dilemma. In order to remedy this isolated situation for those officers, we are seeking to amend the law in section 2. It would add a third category of employee to the definition of who is entitled to collective bargaining, category II gaming control peace officers who would be added to the classified or unclassified service of the State. The amendment does not open collective bargaining for everyone. The amendment is showing good faith to other stakeholders by restricting section 2 to only include category II gaming control peace officers.

We are striking out the changes in section 3 of the proposed amendment. After reviewing the possible complications that could be caused by opening up the number of bargaining units set forth in the 2019 law, we decided to remove this amended language. In section 4 of the amendment, the last sentence was

added in error and is an incorrect statement. It would be inconsistent with NRS 288.550, which is in the original law. The last sentence in section 4 is removed. Essentially 50 percent of the bill has been eliminated because of conversations with stakeholders.

I want to address the opposition to this bill. There may be two unions that oppose as it seems to raid union members. There is no raiding element in the bill. Senate Bill 286 will keep certain unions from raiding those folks. Like others from unions who will oppose this bill, those people do not act upon logic or true belief only that the bill is bad because they are ordered to say so by their national offices. National offices are not in touch with what we are dealing with in Nevada. Any national office that opposes protecting members from being raided or tries to prevent members from being included in collective bargaining is taking a position completely to the contrary. It is antithetical to the best interests of these workers.

MIKE SNYDER (Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):

I worked with PPACE for 16 years while I was the director of LVMPD. It is an honorable organization with good people who represent the civilian employees of the LVMPD and the support staff for LVMPD. As a civilian association, we represent over 83 different classifications from custodians to forensic scientists. We represent 1,500 employees of which 1,200 are active association members giving us an 80 percent membership rate. We have 20 supervisor classifications with 90 employees in those classifications, which is a 77 percent membership rate. In addition, we have 18 classifications that could at any time step into the role of acting supervisor with respect to stepping outside of a bargaining unit. We want to be included in the statute so assigned temporary supervisors would not be forced to leave PPACE simply because they met 1 of 12 indicators in the statute.

We at PPACE would not want our supervisors or those employees acting in a supervisor capacity for a day, a week or longer to be forced out, especially as it would leave them with no option of representation. Being in a paramilitary structure as civilian employees they meet even less than the criteria listed in NRS 288.138. When an employee is less than a sergeant, the acting supervisor would be the rank and file police officer stepping into a supervisory capacity. Specifically being a paramilitary organization, our supervisors have several levels of oversight and ultimately do not have final approval in at least 10 out of 12 of the indicators listed in NRS 288.1381, subsection 1, paragraph (b).

Other groups have attempted to split PPACE into two groups to bust the union and limit representation for employees in this group. We wish only to maintain the status quo and are not looking to create any new bargaining units. It is important to note from my perspective of looking at this experience on both sides of the table there is no negative impact to this change with respect of how it would impact PPACE. It would not have a negative impact on LVMPD and would be a positive impact for employees in that civilian association. It would limit potential litigation with future supervisory status which is cost-effective for PPACE, LVMPD and other employers.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

The original bill has been deleted. Mr. McCann, I assume you are good with the bill and would like to move it forward?

MR. MCCANN:

Yes, we would like to move it forward. This bill will help keep PPACE from being raided.

CARROL ALBERTSON (Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):  
I support S.B. 286, especially the first section that pertains to civilian employees.

LISA RANDLE:

I support S.B. 286 and section 1 that pertains to civilian employees.

JIM DUNLAP (President, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition):

I support S.B. 286 with the amendments as written. There has been a lot of discussion back forth with Mr. McCann and the stakeholders for getting the bill amended. I do not see any reason why we should be holding out gaming control officers from having the ability to collective bargain as category II peace officers in the State. As it pertains to PPACE, clearly this bill would protect them and we should be protecting our workers. I am 26-year law enforcement veteran and currently active in Nevada.

DANIEL JACKSON:

I support S.B. 286, especially section 1 that pertains to civilian employees.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 15

MATT RICHARDSON:  
I support S.B. 286.

ADAM TETI (President, State Law Enforcement Officers Association):  
I support S.B. 286, especially the collective bargaining for gaming control agents.

CARTER BUNDY (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees):  
A couple of things have come up with S.B. 286. First, we in no way oppose anything related to local government, and there is one small piece in the bill that relates to local government. We agree with the sponsor that raiding is inappropriate; we have no opposition to this section. With respect to section 3, it has been stricken, and this is good because it was an unconscionable way of assessing a union. Section 3 would have split this union in half, and we are glad it is gone. Section 1 would have siphoned off workers in the supervisory unit, State employees who went to other units. We are glad to see these sections gone from the bill as they were straight-up raids.

We are against raiding and the original bill did that. With respect to section 2 however, including the gaming control agents breaks an agreement between the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and Communications Workers of America (CWA) about the important parameters of bargaining units for State employees. There can be all kinds of unintended consequences and a certain paramount of importance to both AFSCME and CWA that union agreements should adhere to. While we respect the sponsor and certainly the workers involved, we cannot support legislation that abridges union mutual agreements over bargaining units without reaching an agreement first. We ask that you oppose S.B. 286.

LIZ SORENSON (Director, Communications Workers of America District 9):  
The CWA District 9 is opposed to S.B. 286. This is new law and simple legislative changes can have unintended consequences. Before bringing these matters to this Body, CWA District 9 believes we should have exhausted all administrative remedies. We may be back in front of you in the future, but this legislation should not be moved now because of those possible unintended consequences. More importantly, some labor members are not united on this matter. Before we cause more divisions, CWA District 9 believes we should continue discussions and exhaust all remedies among our union brothers and sisters.

CAMERON HOPKINS (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees):

We are not here union-busting, and this is not what we do. We are a union for State employees. The changes in sections 1 and 4 are great. But splitting up category II peace officers breaks an agreement between AFSCME and CWA. We cannot stand behind the bargaining unit parameters that have been set up between the unions to split. The changes made so far have been phenomenal, but I am hoping the Committee finishes the process of removing the last remaining changes. This bill is going to open up an agreement between two unions right when we have bargaining units certifying. I am opposed to S.B. 286. I do not want this bill to be used against any of the three unions speaking today.

STEPHANIE DUBE (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041):

I am opposed to S.B. 286. We are actively organizing and building our own union. Ditto to the previous speakers.

SONJA WHITTEN (Vice President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041):

I am opposed to S.B. 286. I support all the speakers who are opposed to this bill. I feel very strongly that this bill should not be moving forward. I want to prevent workers from having the ability to organize and have collective bargaining rights. I just feel this is not the correct bill to do that.

PEGGY BOHN (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 4041):

I agree with the speakers before me in opposition to S.B. 286.

BRUCE SNYDER (Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Department of Business and Industry):

I am neutral to S.B. 286. Section 2 would allow unclassified category II peace officers and the gaming control agents to have collective bargaining along with the classified category II peace officers, who have had collective bargaining since 2019. In 2019, the Employee-Management Relations Board (EMRB) received a motion requesting the unclassified category II peace officers be added by board action. The Board denied the motion noting that the bill was clear and only giving collective bargaining rights to classified employees. The Board's order stated at the end of the section order, "If the Legislature wanted



to include certain exceptions for individuals, they would have done so. As such, it is up to the Legislature to change the statute."

With respect to section 3 which is being amended out, the same thing happened in 2019. A request was sent to the Board to split the supervisory unit into two subunits, one for peace officers and one for all other supervisors. The Board denied the motion again pointing to the same language in statute. The Board's order stated, "It is the Legislature's duties and will to change or amend language of the statute and not this Board." In summary, I speak today to affirm the Board's deference to the Legislature as the duly elected Body to make such policy decisions. The EMRB takes pride in administering the law as written and will continue to do so faithfully with respect to any changes that may be made by this Body in regard to this bill or any other bill affecting our statutes.

MR. McCANN:

The exhaustion of remedies heard from the EMRB was made a year and half ago. This is in section 3, subsection 2 where gaming control opens up bargaining units. I have to remind everyone that they are already category II peace officers and part of the group.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 286 and open the hearing on S.B. 298.

**SENATE BILL 298**: Revises provisions relating to inland ports. (BDR 22-536)

SENATOR BEN KIECKHEFER (Senatorial District No. 16):

I am here to present S.B. 298 and propose a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) that is available online. The amendment was drafted for concerns with the bill and purposes of clarity for the Committee. Senate Bill 298 updates the inland port laws. Nevada's history is full of the importance of freight and railroads. The founding of Las Vegas was the need for a way station for a new railroad going through. It is a critical part of northern Nevada's economic development history and infrastructure. The general consensus is that freight and rail will be a critical part of our future as well. This bill will primarily update the inland port laws that were put into statute in 2011. Since that time, there have been no inland ports created. More work needs to be done in this space to make sure the statute is meeting the needs of the reality on the ground. The bill will update inland ports from NRS 277B.

Section 2 creates additional powers for the Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED). This provides regulatory power to create, operate and maintain an inland port and authority. All the various factors are included in section 3, subsections 1 and 2.

Section 6 has two of the main changes in the amendment. We are going to take out the requirement that an inland port be a contiguous area. You can create an inland port that is noncontiguous for the purpose of potentially creating a multiregional inland port diameter. In section 6 is a strike-through in subsection 1, paragraph (b) which says it cannot include any residential property. There are some areas in the northern part of the State that an inland port may capture some residential property and that would be disallowed by current statute. It makes sense to allow the will of the property owners. In the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit F](#), for section 6, the first change is to retain the language that is being struck out of subsection 3, paragraphs (a) and (b). This is a response from municipal airports to ensure that they remain part of the process if their land is being incorporated into the boundaries of an inland port.

Section 7 continues to incorporate the authority of the Executive Director of GOED and makes some of those powers more explicit rather than the office generally. Section 8 is another area in the amendment which retains the strikeout portion on lines 35 through 41 of S.B. 298. This was a suggestion from GOED. If an inland port ordinance is created, it should include descriptions of the boundaries of the inland port; the location of the principal office of the authority; the name of the port and authority; and the number of directors who will serve. The change in section 9 of the amendment was suggested by the GOED to ensure when local governments participate in the creation of inland ports they retain the appointing authority to the board of directors. This will retain all the language from lines 11 through 45 of the bill.

On page 6 of the bill in section 9, subsection 4, there was insertion of language that would have exempted inland ports from the Open Meeting Law. Subsection 4 has been struck out entirely in the conceptual amendment. This would ensure inland ports continue to comply with the Open Meeting Law and are required under current statute. There are some conforming changes to ensure that this happens. The amendment strikes out section 15 for retaining the repealing sections.

Another request from GOED is important to update a study on inland ports in Nevada. It specifically addresses the three megapolitan regions as delineated in *Nevada's Plan for Recovery and Resilience*. The economic development plan has outlined a lot of possibilities, and this bill is designed to update statutes. It will ensure if people create an inland port, it is a component of rail development and economic development in the State and ensures that they are able to do so. A new section will be added.

LYNN O'MARA (Director of Communications, Northern Nevada Development Authority):

I am here to present information on S.B. 298 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

JUSTIN LICHTER (Industrial Realty Group, LLC):

Industrial Realty Group is in support of S.B. 298 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit H](#)). We have taken in several work projects. This bill can take a lot of traffic off the road.

SENATOR NEAL:

I understand inland ports. You are now including the residential parts as part of the inland port zone. I have a huge problem with that. You are no longer confining it to be inside of a county, which means it could be anywhere. The private ability to create the inland port where the scope of power is and the expansion of the power is problematic for me. Creating an inland port is a government function and not a private company function. These are my concerns with this bill.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

There are incredible number of types of ports throughout the Country. I cannot speak to their government structure. We are creating something entirely new or something that works for Nevada.

KRIS SANCHEZ (Deputy Director, Governor's Office of Economic Development):

One of the ports to look at is the Kansas City's KC SmartPort. The state has a structure that is a public-private partnership, where private industry is represented as well as government entities. The port operations meet the demand of industry and the concerns of local government with the jurisdictions that are included as represented by the port authority. The residential component is one of the things S.B. 298 does and allows for the noncontiguous

nature of the port. That is important. Think of southern Nevada with the inclusion of Apex and the south valley, the end result could be included in one inland port authority.

As we move forward with infrastructure development in Nevada, we are focused on ecosystem and networks. Those networks extend beyond State borders. We are trying to align with research that has been done. The recommendations said to take a broader look at a place in those networks and ecosystems in the megapolitan regions. If there is a desire of the Committee to allow for noncontiguous port authorities by the way those boundaries would be delineated out, then residential areas would be included. For example, if we included Apex and the south valley with development, this would be the case. The facilities included in the port which are moving freight around would be under the jurisdiction of the board. The board would have representatives of the localities and jurisdictions represented there.

SENATOR NEAL:

A residential process has been excluded since 2011, and we did not have to deal with it. What are the appeal rights or objections of residents? Where are they being included in this inland port? We are talking rail and moving freight or the expansion of it. Residential was not part of it, and I did not see the provisions in this version that allowed an appeal or objection process, right? I do not see the pathway. Do you know what this pathway will be?

MR. SANCHEZ:

We can work with you and the Committee on making sure those interests are represented and have no negative impact on our residents. One of the things that is important is how freight flows through the communities and ensuring the freight flows are efficient. This will ensure we are not the weak link in the chain. We are looking into how freight flows through the State, where are the bottlenecks, where to improve and enhance infrastructure to ensure the freight flows are seamless. We would not want incidents of impacting a residence or industry negatively. Moving forward, we are happy to work with you on getting these concerns addressed.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am glad to see the amendment from Senator Kieckhefer as anytime it is noncontiguous, we have rail and airports with inland ports. I think there needs to be some sideboards to this bill. As for noncontiguous, do we get the rail in

Fernley and the airport in Reno? I am concerned about only two of the three. We have Interstate 80 that can head east out of a rail junction in Fernley, was this the thought?

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I think that is right, Senator Goicoechea. The original statute only required two out of the three. All three would be burdensome and Senator Neal is right about having protections for residential communities. It is not the intent to override residents.

SENATOR HANSEN:

The requirements that Senator Neal has asked for will be taken care of. On the floor, if Senator Neal says no, then I will say no.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

There were concerns about transparency on the original bill and the Open Meeting Law. I will follow Senator Neal's lead; if she is happy with it, then I will be happy with the bill.

MR. LICHTER:

Residential concerns are related to how things could lay out. In typical local zoning codes, there would be a clause about residential adjacency to an industrial property. In most areas, the industrial use of the inland port would not be allowed specifically within a residential area. There would be some sort of limitation and setbacks in the zoning code.

DERICK HEMBD (President, Sixco Nevada Inc.):  
We support S.B. 298.

BRYAN WACHTER (Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada):  
We are in strong support of S.B. 298. We believe it will help diversify our economy and provide us new tools going forward.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce):  
The Las Vegas Chamber supports S.B. 298. This bill will provide another tool for the State in efforts for economic diversification and job creation as we work to recover from the economic impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 22

AARON WEST (CEO, Nevada Builders Alliance):  
The Nevada Builders Alliance supports S.B. 298. I will say ditto to the previous statements before me.

NICK VANDER POEL (Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce):  
Senate Bill 298 is a good bill in terms of economic development, commerce, diversity, jobs and economic diversification. We encourage your support.

PATRICK DONNELLY (Director, Center for Biological Diversity):  
I am opposed to S.B. 298 as referenced from my letter of opposition ([Exhibit I](#)).

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:  
I will close the hearing on S.B. 298 and open the work session.

ALYSA KELLER (Policy Analyst):  
Senate Bill 4 was heard on March 3, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).

**SENATE BILL 4**: Revises provisions relating to the imposition of certain penalties by ordinance for certain violations relating to fireworks. (BDR 20-402)

SENATOR NEAL:  
I support the changes in the amendment. I want to make sure the exemption for the persons under 18 also applies to the criminal charge?

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):  
The language proposed by Clark County as it relates to persons under the age of 18 only exempts from the civil penalty. Clark County can provide clarification as to whether the intent was to exclude from civil or if the intent is to exclude from criminal penalties as well.

MS. JACOB:  
We can agree to that change. When we looked back it is very rare that we penalize minors on this. We can make that clear in the amendment.

SENATOR NEAL:  
I do not want to see anyone under the age of 18 go to jail for storage of fireworks.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

A quick clarification, we have a \$10,000 maximum penalty, but by ordinance the county board of commissioners will establish parameters of those civil and criminal penalties if it is only a box of firecrackers versus a truckload, and if you have box of firecrackers, you will not get hit with a \$10,000 fine?

MS. JACOB:

That is the intent of this language. It is similar to the language in NRS 477 allowing the Fire Marshal to tier at the regulatory level. The Fire Marshal can make those distinctions, and this is the intent of the language. We could take testimony on the local level and determine the tiers. We can consider the factors and severity of the violation. In addition, it will depend on the number of violations the person has had before.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I just want to make sure it is the ordinance that would impose it and not the Fire Marshal.

MS. JACOB:

Yes. That is correct. We are talking about the board of county commissioners shall have power and jurisdiction to pass ordinances. This is the existing law, so the ordinance would set forth the tiers.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

I will be supporting the bill and the amendment. I asked for some information regarding wildland fires in Nevada that were caused by fireworks. From 2015 to 2019, there were 397 wildfires started by fireworks. Additionally, the Bureau of Land Management in Winnemucca and Battle Mountain Districts between 2016 and 2021 had 8 fireworks-related fires, and those fires consumed 439,238 acres. The related fire suppression costs reached \$11,328,000. I think more needs to be done for this issue. This is good start until we get a source of the dangerous fireworks. We are still going to have a problem. I do support the bill.

SENATOR HANSEN:

While it is true the fireworks started the fire, real reason the fire burned a half million acres is they had not grazed it properly for years.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 24

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 4.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:  
We will jump to S.B. 297 in the work session.

**SENATE BILL 297**: Revises provisions relating to agriculture. (BDR 22-480)

MS. KELLER:

Senate Bill 297 was heard on April 7, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)). A conceptual amendment ([Exhibit L](#)) was submitted by the Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In the conceptual amendment, is the plan that a private water company would have to provide water at a wholesale rate? Do they have to provide the infrastructure to get it there? That one amendment really concerns me.

SENATOR PAT SPEARMAN (Senatorial District No. 1):

Both amendments have been read and gone to Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and the land manager. I do not know if the language really conveys what we are trying to do. If you have issue with that, I can have the Legal Division take a look and tighten up the language.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

We are mandating. The other question is would they have to provide the infrastructure? The amendment says all private entities with which the State and county has an agreement regarding the planning, development or distribution of water resources. I am concerned for the private sector having to provide water at a reduced rate or the infrastructure to deliver the water.



Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 25

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

The intent is not to be reaching into private lands. We were looking at when the city or county sets the ordinance, they set everything else that follows. If that portion is an issue, I can have the Legal Division and NACO tighten up the language.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That is fine as long as it still has to be approved through the county ordinance.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I cannot remember where it is, but it is above everything you just mentioned. The city did not want to be under what the county would do. The county wanted the ability to determine how or if it was going to do something like this. Everything else falls under as it is determined by the governmental entity that prescribes the ordinance.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 297.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR NEAL:

It is both amendments that were submitted?

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Yes, it is both amendments.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will move back to S.B. 57 in the work session.

**SENATE BILL 57**: Revises provisions governing the imposition of certain special assessments by a board of county commissioners. (BDR 20-403)

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 26

MS. KELLER:

Senate Bill 57 was heard on March 3, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit M](#)).

SENATOR HANSEN:

Is this the bill dealing with the Air Bed and Breakfasts (Airbnb) issue, when people were using them for party houses?

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

That is correct.

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

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HANSEN:

One thing that Clark County needs to realize is Airbnbs are popular and getting more popular. It reminds me of the debate we were having between the Nevada Taxicab Authority, Uber and Lyft. The County needs a plan to tax the Airbnbs. I will be opposing this bill.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I cannot support this bill.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA AND HANSEN  
VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will move to S.B. 77 in work session.

**SENATE BILL 77**: Revises provisions relating to public bodies. (BDR 19-466)

MS. KELLER:

Senate Bill 77 was heard on February 10, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit N](#)).

SENATOR NEAL:

Regarding the deletion in section 2, it was my understanding that it is offering the exception if they close by a court order then go in and try to request the information that was exchanged. Now this is deleted, and it means that there is no access to get the information?

JAKE TIBBETTS (Manager, Eureka County):

The intent in section 2 would withhold any information exchanged in nonpublic meetings, from the Public Records Act. The intent is striking section 2 which was based on testimony from folks including those in the Open Government Coalition. There were follow-up conversations with folks based on caselaw in Nevada related to records that are withheld because of being predecisional and deliberative. We felt it was best to just allow it on a case-by-case basis, based on the public records request. There is already a standard on when those would be released; this does not effect it whatsoever. It will be on a case-by-case basis that those records would still be allowed and subject to release through Public Records Law. We are not effecting it whatsoever with the intent of striking section 2.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

From the hearing, I had some concerns brought up by the Open Government Coalition. I appreciate the amendment, and it has addressed some of my concerns. I will vote to support it out of Committee and reserve my right to change my vote.

SENATOR HANSEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 77.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

The next bill in work session is S.B. 253.

**SENATE BILL 253:** Revises provisions related to alarm systems. (BDR 20-968)

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 28

MS. KELLER:

Senate Bill 253 was heard on March 29, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit O](#)).

SENATOR NEAL:

I have problems with the bill and understand the advertising piece. The issue is section 3 where the false alarm could be attributed to a regular citizen. The concern is if a minor or someone who has Alzheimer's triggers the alarm, is the family going to get that fee for accidental false alarms? This part I do not support.

SENATOR JAMES A. SETTELMAYER (Senatorial District No. 17):

The issue is some municipalities are fining the company who has nothing to do with this. I am not familiar with the counties or municipalities that are fining the individual, so it does not impact them in any way shape or form. Municipalities are trying to fine the manufacturer, and that does not do anything to reduce the problem nor does it make any sense. This does not impact it and the counties are only going after the manufacturer. It would be the situation if the counties chose to do that. Hopefully, citizens will come forward to tell the counties they do not agree with that. The bill does not affect individuals.

SENATOR NEAL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 253.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will move to S.B. 368 in work session.

**SENATE BILL 368**: Requires the issuance of bonds for environmental improvement projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR S-366)

MS. KELLER:

Senate Bill 368 was heard on April 7, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit P](#)).

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 29

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 368.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:  
Next bill in work session is S.B. 373.

**SENATE BILL 373**: Provides for collective bargaining by certain state employees.  
(BDR 23-675)

MS. KELLER:  
Senate Bill 373 was heard on April 7, as referenced from the work session document ([Exhibit Q](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:  
I know that NSHE is completely different than what we have under collective bargaining for State employees. I will support the bill out of the Committee, but I reserve my right to change the vote on the floor.

SENATOR HANSEN:  
I will be no on this bill, and NSHE needs a major overhaul. I realize this bill is for collective bargaining, but financially, it is out of control.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 373.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HANSEN VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:  
We will vote on bills we heard today starting with S.B. 67.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 30

Ms. KELLER:

Senate Bill 67 was heard on April 9 and has a proposed amendment.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I will be a no on this bill. I am concerned for the nonunion contractors and the provision changes to the requirements for smaller contractors.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I will support S.B. 67 since this is a pilot program in southern Nevada.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS  
AMENDED S.B. 67.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HANSEN VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

The next bill is S.B. 286.

Ms. KELLER:

Senate Bill 286 was heard on April 9 and has a proposed amendment.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

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

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS  
AMENDED S.B. 286.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I will be a no as I was confused with the bill. I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 31

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am also concerned with the bill; I will vote it out of Committee. I do reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

SENATOR NEAL:

I ditto with Senator Goicoechea on this bill.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HANSEN VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

The last bill is S.B. 298.

Ms. KELLER:

Senate Bill 298 was heard on April 9 and has a proposed amendment.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I just want to make sure the bill sponsor works with Senator Neal, as she raised some legitimate points. I will support it out of Committee, and I will follow her lead on the floor.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

I have the same concerns as Senator Neal. I will support it to get out to the floor, but I reserve my right to change my vote.

SENATOR NEAL:

Senator Kieckhefer said he would work with me, but for now I am no on the bill. I do reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 298.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NEAL VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 9, 2021  
Page 32

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Seeing no further business, I adjourn this meeting at 6:12 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Janae Johnson,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Begins on Page</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 67	B	1	Joanna Jacob / Clark County	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 67	C	1	Joanna Jacob / Clark County	Clark County Sample Potential Projects
S.B. 67	D	1	Arielle Edwards / City of North Las Vegas	Letter of Support
S.B. 286	E	1	Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 298	F	1	Senator Ben Kieckhefer	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 298	G	1	Lynn O'Mara / Northern Nevada Development Authority	Testimony
S.B. 298	H	1	Justin Lichter / Industrial Realty Group, LLC	Letter of Support
S.B. 298	I	1	Patrick Donnelly / Center for Biological Diversity	Letter of Opposition
S.B. 4	J	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 297	K	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 297	L	1	Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 57	M	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 77	N	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 253	O	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 368	P	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 373	Q	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document