

THE FOURTH DAY

CARSON CITY (Thursday) October 13, 2016

Senate called to order at 2:06 p.m.

President Hutchison presiding.

Roll called.

All present.

Prayer by the Senator Denis.

Our Heavenly Father, we are indeed grateful, this afternoon, for the opportunity to gather together again. We are thankful for this great time of year that allows us to appreciate the great wonders that there are in this world. We are thankful for our families and the support that they give us and the opportunity we have to serve because of their dedication. We are thankful for all of our staff and the great work that they do to put this Special Session together.

We would ask that Thy Spirit will be here with us as we deliberate. That we can do so in a manner that is kind and deliberate, to be able to ask the questions that need to be asked and to be able to do the work that we need to do.

We thank Thee for all the blessings that we have in our lives. We truly are greatly blessed living in such a wonderful time in the history of the world. We ask Thee that Thou will help us and guide us as we make decisions through life. Father, we say this in the Name of Jesus Christ.

AMEN.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

By previous order of the Senate, the reading of the Journal is dispensed with, and the President and Secretary are authorized to make the necessary corrections and additions.

MESSAGES FROM THE ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, Carson City, October 13, 2016

To the Honorable the Senate:

I have the honor to inform your honorable body that the Assembly on this day passed, as amended, Assembly Bill No. 1.

SUSAN FURLONG

Chief Clerk of the Assembly

MOTIONS, RESOLUTIONS AND NOTICES

Senator Roberson moved that the following persons be accepted as accredited press representatives, and that they be assigned space at the press table and allowed use of appropriate media facilities: KPIX-5: Christin Ayers, Mackenzie Stock; KNPR PUBLIC RADIO, CDC GAMING REPORTS.com: John L. Smith; KSNV-TV: George Enrique Romero; KTNV-TV: Mayson Agnew; KTVN-TV: Brandon Fuhs; KVVU-TV: Kurt Rempe; LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL: Heidi Fang, Ed Graney, David Guzman, Richard N. Velotta, Matt Youmans; LAS VEGAS SUN: Jackie Valley; LOS ANGELES TIMES: David Montero.

Motion carried.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING AND REFERENCE

Assembly Bill No. 1.

Senator Kieckhefer moved that the bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Motion carried.

MOTIONS, RESOLUTIONS AND NOTICES

Senator Roberson moved that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Assembly Bill No. 1, with Senator Roberson as Chair and Senator Kieckhefer as Vice Chair.

Motion carried.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

At 2:14 p.m.

Senator Roberson presiding.

Assembly Bill No. 1 considered.

The Committee of the Whole was addressed by Senator Roberson; Jeremy Aguero, Principal Analyst, Applied Analysis; Joseph Lombardo, Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Bill McBeath, President, CEO, The Cosmopolitan, Las Vegas; Chair, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Fiscal Affairs Committee; Senator Ford; Senator Farley; Senator Denis; Senator Manendo; Senator Segerblom; Senator Gustavson; Senator Ratti; Senator Harris; Senator Spearman; Senator Haw; Patrick Moers, Chief of Police, City of Henderson; Michael Ramirez, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.; Chris Giunchigliani, Clark County Commissioner; Justin Roberts, Captain, Investigative Command, North Las Vegas Police Department; Ronald P. Dreher, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada; Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas; Warren Hardy, City of Mesquite.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

We will begin with public comment before hearing Assembly Bill No. 1. Hearing none, the Committee will proceed with Assembly Bill No. 1.

JEREMY AGUERO (Principal Analyst, Applied Analysis):

I served as staff to the Southern Nevada Tourism Infrastructure Committee (SNTIC). Over the past couple of days, Mr. Hill has presented to this Body an outline of the work of SNTIC, and the extension of that work is Assembly Bill No. 1. I am joined, today, by Sheriff Joseph Lombardo. He and I will provide an overview, in terms of the background, SNTIC considered in evaluating the proposal to increase police protection within the resort corridor and throughout southern Nevada. Sheriff Lombardo will talk about the background relative to the need we are seeing in southern Nevada and the reasons he came before SNTIC to ask for additional resources.

Please refer to the presentation entitled Recommendation Summary, Clark County Crime Prevention Act of 2016. Page 1 is the recommendation SNTIC made to increase the sales-tax rate by 0.1 percentage point. The first portion is allocated toward a defined resort corridor, and the balance of the money is allocated throughout southern Nevada. Some of this language has changed slightly. This is enabling legislation giving the Board of County Commissioners the ability to increase this tax and, ultimately, provide this level of funding.

Page 4 provides information regarding where the need is located. The historical Las Vegas police staffing ratios on the Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) have an established staffing ratio target of 2 officers per 1,000 residents. This information shows there was a period where

the number of officers per 1,000 residents did exceed that threshold; then, the recession hit, and revenues shrunk significantly as has the size of the force deployed by Metro. In the graphic on page 4, the populations do not adjust for the visitor populations. Visitors account for 17 to 18 percent of the full-time equivalence of the population in southern Nevada. If we look at national statistics and compare the number of police officers per 1,000 residents, we are, in reality, even lower than what we see here because we are not adjusting for that visitor full-time equivalency population.

Page 5 provides a bit of history as it relates to the More Cops Sales Tax, a precursor to this legislation. In November, 2004, Clark County voters approved increasing the sales tax an additional 0.5 percent to hire and equip additional police officers. While this was authorized, not all of that money was made available to actually equip and hire additional police officers. In 2005, the Legislature passed the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act also known as the More Cops Sales Tax which authorized an additional 0.25 percent increase in the sales tax for additional police officers. In 2005, the Clark County Commission enacted the entire amount. In the 2013 Special Session, the Legislature authorized an additional 0.15 percent in sales tax for additional police officers. In September, 2015, the Clark County Commission enacted the 0.05 percent increase in the sales tax that is in effect today. On July 1, 2016, the 0.1 percent increment that was available, and could have been enacted by the Clark County Commission, expired.

On page 7 the Incremental Police Funding Recommendation is discussed. This was for a 0.10 percent increase in sales tax that would apply countywide. Assembly Bill No. 1 and the sales tax increase were some of the options considered by SNTIC. They also looked at increasing the property tax, room tax, liquor tax, cigarette tax and an option for increasing things like Business License Fees within the resort corridor. When they evaluated the sales tax and decided to increase it within the resort corridor, they found this created problems. They did not recognize there were broader issues throughout the entire County, and it would run the risk of creating a bifurcated rate within the Clark County area. In trying to be progressive relative to the streamlined sales tax act, we would violate it by having separate rates within a single county. There could also be problems associated with things such as a mall located on one side of the border, as opposed to the other side of the border, creating a situation where someone could theoretically avoid a small portion of the tax by simply walking across the border. This is something we would like to avoid. After these discussions, SNTIC, again, recommended the 0.10 percent increase to hire and equip police officers.

On page 8 the police funding distribution plan is discussed. It is shown as being distributed in two ways. It is important, at least to the members of the Assembly, that it be clear that this distribution occurs simultaneously. The 0.10 percent will generate approximately \$39.2 million in new revenue that will go to staff and equip the police departments in southern Nevada. About 20 percent of this revenue, approximately \$8 million, will be used within the resort corridor to address a specific need which the Sheriff will address. The balance of those funds, about \$31.3 million, will be used for community policing throughout all of Clark County, including, but not limited to, the resort corridor. In drafting, it may appear to be a first and second distribution as part of the mathematical formula, but that was never intended by SNTIC to be any other way than simultaneous.

Page 10 presents the incremental resort corridor police funding plan and how the formula works in Assembly Bill No 1. We use the total population in southern Nevada, including the visitor population, the amount of the sales tax that is attributable to the tourist activity and the portion attributable to residents as an allocation formula to ensure some of this money is actually going to the resort corridor. In calculating the visitors' share of taxable retail sales, the daily visitor population share of about 17 percent of the overall population, is multiplied by a multiplier of 1.15. The reason for the 1.15 multiplier is that our sales tax structure is designed to get more out of expenditures from visitors than from residents. This is how we constructed it, and it is a virtue not a vice of our existing tax system. An example of this would be making food for consumption at home that is not subject to the sales tax but eating out is subject to the sales tax. A visitor is going to eat out much more than a resident. Those two numbers, multiplied together, equal about 20 percent of the visitor share of taxable sales. We next calculated the resort corridor police funding allocation by multiplying the generated tax revenue of

\$39.2 million by 20 percent, which equals the resort corridor funding of about \$8 million. The balance of the funding would be allocated to community policing throughout southern Nevada. The resort corridor police assignments for Assembly Bill No. 1 are defined in section 8 dealing with the long definition of the boundaries.

On page 11 resort corridor police assignments are described. The left hand graphic shows the Las Vegas Strip area. The Sheriff indicated to SNTIC the importance of having both front-door and back-door coverage for all the areas on the Strip including the Flamingo corridor which is adjacent to the Strip, where coverage would need to be similar. The right-hand side provides a graphic of the downtown Las Vegas area, a rectangle based on the way the roads are constructed. This is easier to understand than the language in section 8 of Assembly Bill No. 1.

Page 13 provides an overview of how money would be allocated to incremental community police funding. Some monies would be dedicated to the resort corridor for that specific need; other monies would be distributed not only within Metro but to all the police departments in southern Nevada. The allocation would be distributed based on the population of each one of those areas in much the same way as the More Cops dollars are distributed. One of the amendments that came out of discussions with the Assembly was the need to take into account call volume. Once money gets to a police department's jurisdiction, the call volume is to be considered in how money is allocated within the jurisdiction. When I go through the bill in terms of its individual sections, I will point that out.

Page 14 discusses the expected increase in new police officers. The expectation is for an additional 300 police officers, 66 in the resort corridor based on the allocation expected there and an additional 245 allocated throughout the community.

JOSEPH LOMBARDO (Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I will be separating my presentation into community-wide versus resort-corridor need. Cops make a difference, and in order to make that difference, we need the numbers to put toward the problems. Crimes in Clark County and Las Vegas are up 14 percent to date. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), in presenting their numbers per Uniform Code Reporting (UCR), showed crime is up 11 percent across the Nation. Violent crime is up 4 percent Clark County. Almost every jurisdiction has arbitrary ways of reporting but not with homicide. In 2015, we had a 4-percent increase in homicide numbers compared to the rest of the Nation that had a 10-percent increase. Year-to-date, the Las Vegas Metro Police Department has a 26-percent increase in homicides. How do we address that increase? We address it with a formula called "officers per 1,000 permanent residents." Currently, the ratio in Clark County is 1.7 officers per 1,000 residents; while nationwide, the ratio is 2.1 per 1,000 residents. This is how we measure how effective we are as police officers.

The bar graph on page 4 of the presentation, shows that between 2007-2011, we crested the 2 officers per 1,000 residents ratio. I could provide a bar graph that would show the crime rate numbers associated with those years. The increase of 2 officers per 1,000 residents decreased that crime rate. Starting in 2012, where the number dropped below the 2 officers per 1,000 residents ratio, it would show an increase in crime. The data is definitive. The data dictates the results of having more cops.

SNTIC brought me on board to present the public safety concerns associated with an increase in tourism due to the Convention Center expansion and the stadium. The 2 officers per 1,000 residents ratio would not include the 42 million visitors. Currently, 9 percent of all Metro calls for service are associated with the resort corridor maps, equating to about 54,000 calls per year, which is a heavy lift for my police officers. I have been asked "why now; why not push this to the regular Session?" The answer is because the need exists now. The regular Session is months away. It would conclude in another four months, then require the enacting of the software associated with the taxes and the hiring process. We could be looking at a three-year window. My need for police officers in the resort corridor started three years ago.

I am separating the resort corridor because we have a flawed program called Safe Strip. The Safe Strip program is where, as head of Metro, I inform the CEOs of each of the corporations and individual properties that I cannot provide a safe environment for the tourists, community and employees that work in the Strip corridor with our existing resources. I ask them for the additional funding to pay for police officers through the months of April-September at a price

tag of \$1.1million to \$1.4 million. This extra funding covers 45 to 60 additional officers to address the needs along Las Vegas Boulevard on Friday and Saturday nights, only, during these months. In the long term, it will be unsuccessful because, over the years, some participate and some chose not to participate because of their funding mechanisms. If those numbers were made permanent, I could provide police protection 24/7 along the resort corridor boundaries. Why 24/7 on the resort corridor boundaries? Because at any point in time that you are on Las Vegas Boulevard or Fremont Street, it is difficult for a police officer to move and fully function as a proactive, preventive police officer within that environment.

I need police officers with boots on the ground, 24/7 to provide that safe environment. We do not roll-up the sidewalks. We provide a full-level capacity associated with the Strip and Fremont Street. The staffing numbers on the graveyard shift equate to staffing numbers associated with the day shift, and that is different from any environment in the United States outside of Time Square. In comparison, New Orleans is about a 1-mile length of property. Las Vegas Boulevard is about 5 miles in length. New Orleans provides a staffing model of 100 police officers during peak times. My maximum number, at any point in time, is 80 police officers, but the majority of the time it is more like 40 police officers. Time Square is, approximately, 15 blocks and has 100 million visitors in a year with 100 police officers, 24/7. Both New Orleans and Time Square have demonstrated a successful model in the last two years.

We have been asked if there was another direction that could be taken because this is a regressive tax. It has been proven to be the most stable tax to determine staffing for my police department. Property tax is probably the best way to go, but the property-tax downfall in the last two years affected Metro to the tune of approximately \$60 million. This tax is not attached to food, medication or gasoline. Even after pursuing 14 different options, each time we came back to this option as the best.

Questions have been asked about the \$98-million to \$100-million balance associated with the original More Cops program. That amount used to be \$148 million. Each year, there is an \$11 million deficit associated with that fund balance. That means the fund balance will be void in the 2024/2025 fiscal year. At that point, we will need to determine an alternative funding mechanism for the 775 police officers currently hired or face layoffs. If you attach some of that money to the \$39 million presented today, we are looking at \$42 million. We are looking at an additional three to four years, and we would be faced with the same picture. The Board of County Commissioners asked whether we have done this before and where do we go now? Mr. Sisolak, Chair of the Board of County Commissioners, supports this proposal as did SNTIC by a unanimous vote. He assured me we will continue to have his support as we move forward.

Today's environment is completely different in regards to violent crime. This is no secret to the Department Homeland Security (DHS) with what has happened in the United States and around the world. Several worldwide events with mass casualties have occurred and downtown Las Vegas and the Strip have been mentioned in as top targets for future events. As matter of protocol, and because of secrecy and clearances, I assure you we are proactive in that aspect.

Questions have been asked about why the resort corridor maps are included and why those specific maps with their particular design? I based that discussion on our Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR). That is a program where we are ask individuals through the "If You See Something, Say Something, Say Something" campaign to bring forward any information they see or hear that sounds suspicious. The majority of the SARs are associated with the two resort corridor maps found on page 11. In the Assembly, language was addressed providing that after a three-year period, with reasonable accommodations, we can adjust these boundaries, as needed, associated with infrastructure increases. These would include things like another casino being built or intelligence that might lead us to look at other boundaries.

BILL MCBEATH (President, CEO, The Cosmopolitan, Las Vegas; Chair, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Fiscal Affairs Committee):

I serve as the Chair of the Metropolitan Police Department Fiscal Affairs Committee, where we provide the oversight for all fiscal affairs, including all budgeting and staffing. We are dealing with an important subject in this Special Session. Tourism is important to our State, specifically to Las Vegas. You have heard the statistics provided by Mr. Aguero and the Sheriff. The minimum standard for police protection in a big city is 2.12 officers per 1,000 population.

Mr. Aguero has taken the 44 million visitors who come into town on an annual basis and adjusted them for a full-time equivalency population. We are currently at 1.71 officers per 1,000 population. When you add the full-time equivalency population, this ratio drops below 1.5 officers per 1,000 population. These are anemic standards, especially when you understand there is a direct correlation between crime and dropping below the standards. We are responsible, from a public safety standpoint, for providing a safe environment not only for our employees but for the 44 million guests we bring into the Las Vegas corridor and downtown.

The financial impact of our State's success is predicated on the success of tourism. As we try to diversify our State and our State's economy to not be as one-dimensionally reliant on tourism, we need to ensure we provide the minimum public-safety standards that exist throughout the Nation's big cities. I do not like management by antidote, but when I walk through Times Square, New Orleans or San Antonio, I see officers everywhere I look. The visual impact of seeing 100 dedicated officers in Times Square is a deterrent for crime, and it works. I do not see this in Las Vegas. I have had the benefit of being the President of four other Strip properties, and I did not see enough visible officers. We were so concerned about this as an industry that we created the Safe Strip program with the Sheriff. The private sector is spending \$1.5 million a year to pay for additional protection on weekends between April and November. We have to provide an environment that keeps our tourists secure. I do not believe it is the private sector's responsibility to provide that public safety, and we are trying to address that here. The program is inefficient in that it pays officers overtime to work additional eight- to ten-hour shifts on the weekends who have already worked a full workweek.

We have demonstrated how important the securitization of the Strip corridor and downtown are for our tourism through our own actions as an industry. We have statistically addressed the metrics by which agencies around the Country are measured, and we have not been able to reach our goal. This is not a subjective task. We are looking at real numbers and real data. It is imperative and incumbent upon us to take the corrective action needed to get us back to where we were to help the Sheriff and this industry create the environment everyone expects when they come to town. It is a boots-on-the-ground program that works.

Las Vegas is a tourist destination. We do not only compete in the United States; we are an international destination. We have been successful and able to grow because we keep reinventing ourselves. We have had billions of dollars in new investment to create fresh and new attractions, and we have the greatest hotels, resorts and attractions in the world. But, what really distinguishes us is the critical mass. When you put this together with 150,000 rooms, the critical mass becomes important because of pedestrian access and flow—if our guests do not feel comfortable moving up and down the Strip corridor or downtown because we have lost our ability to manage and control that presence. Our advantage and our moniker as the number one tourist destination in the world will be gone at that point, and it will be self-evident what would happen to our economy.

SENATOR FORD:

I have three questions. First, could you expand on the sales tax, and why it is the appropriate approach to address this issue? Second, we have done this before. We passed More Cops before, and for some reason, the Commission allowed that passage to expire. I heard what you said regarding Commissioner Sisolak stating it would take place this time, but I need more assurance from you that this is actually going to be the case. Last Session, my son testified in support of body cameras for cops. My third question is whether this will affect the ability of Metro to provide all officers with body cameras, especially in a preventative approach.

MR. AGUERO:

I will answer the first question on the sales tax. Sheriff Lombardo will answer the two policy questions.

The simplest answer is that sales tax is the most stable, largest and most diverse base of taxes that we have today. We have had conversations before about tax policy and the diversity of tax policy. We wanted to be predictable, stable and equitable, both vertically and horizontally—all of those things we talk about in terms of overall tax policy. The other piece is this has to be robust enough to gain us sufficient revenue. It has to be a source that can generate almost \$40 million a year with a modest tax increase. During SNTIC's work, we evaluated 14 separate

alternatives. Some of them seemed good, but we could not get enough information to make them work. For example, we looked at one relating to business licenses and allocating some of the tax to the licenses. We tried to figure out how we would get to those 3,000 business licenses, and ultimately, realized that even if we could figure that out, the ability to apply it from the Department of Taxation to business licenses would be a nightmare. Ultimately, only a couple of options remained.

The State of Nevada has a relatively narrow set of revenues. The big revenues are gaming tax, sales tax and property tax. Gaming tax only applies to gaming properties. SNTIC thought that restaurants, movies theaters and night clubs should also contribute to this tax. Because of changes we have made, anything we do with property tax is difficult. This left us with sales tax, and we had a robust debate about the positives and negatives of this tax. There are some short comings to it, but that is how we got to where we are now.

SENATOR FORD:

Are you going to issue a sales tax in Clark County?

MR. AGUERO:

Yes.

SENATOR FORD:

The majority of the cops are going to be located in the perimeter of the corridor, not throughout all of Clark County, is that correct?

MR. AGUERO:

No.

SENATOR FORD:

That is good.

MR. AGUERO:

That is not the case. We are talking about generating about \$40 million. We are going to take a portion of those funds for the corridor that closely represents the amount contributed by visitors because there is an acute need in the resort area, as was pointed out by the Sheriff. The balance of the monies will then be distributed throughout the entire Clark County area for community policing. The money will be collected throughout Clark County, and it will be distributed throughout Clark County.

SENATOR FORD:

We are talking about utilizing the sales tax where everyone will pay but everyone will also get the benefit, is that correct? At a proportional level, the monies being contributed will go toward more police, is that correct?

MR. AGUERO:

You are absolutely right.

SENATOR FORD:

Thank you.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Before we leave that question, I would like to refer to Mr. Aguero's slide, on page 13 of the handout. The matrix at the bottom shows the distribution of funds perceived to be generated by this tax. In my jurisdiction, it would equate to 266 police officers; in Henderson Police Department, 26 officers; in North Las Vegas Police Department, 15 officers; in Mesquite Police Department, 2 officers, and in Boulder City Police Department, 1.5 officers. The Boulder City Police Department previously received 0.5 police officers so they will now have two police officers. This totals 311 officers from the predictions for the sales-tax revenue.

In reference to question 2, you are correct; we have done this before. Mr. Aguero alluded to the 0.15 percent tax that was previously approved by the Legislative Session. After the Board of County Commissioners approved the 0.05 percent, they believed it would get us to where we

needed to function appropriately to fight crime. The numbers have not supported that when looking at homicides. In 2014, there was a 10-percent increase, and in 2015, a 4-percent increase that put us in the 26 percentile year-to-date. The Board of County Commissioners agreed that the need and environment has changed related to crime and Homeland Security needs.

I know that body cameras have been one of your major concerns associated with policing. I support body-worn cameras, and we negotiated with our collective bargaining association for mandatory body-wear cameras. This includes cameras for all our officers with boots on the ground—those individuals who wear uniforms—the K-9 section, SWAT and traffic sections. A part of those negotiations related to the original legislation. There were concerns it may have been in conflict with the Police Officer's Bill of Rights because a camera is a piece of equipment worn on the body and it would be considered a negotiable item. In the agreement with the Association, my police force decided to move forward with the body-wear cameras.

SENATOR FORD:

Will this money pay for that?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes, it is included in the revenues from the sales tax intended for law enforcement and associated equipment.

SENATOR FARLEY:

My question is about white-collar crimes on businesses. It is not small petty crime; it is big crime. A business can, literally, turn over a written statement from someone who stole from a business yet cannot get a detective or a response from Metro. I understand you are out on calls about bigger things, but I would like to know if this funding will help relieve some of the pressure and issues so our businesses can get a response?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

We are not on bigger things. Those are the perceptions of the victim and whether or not something is important to them. You may be alluding to something being complicated as far as the type of crime. I believe in prevention versus response and investigation. You cannot achieve prevention or create an omnipresence with a lack of resources. In the Assembly, some of the complaints were about quality-of-life type of calls and the failure to send a police officer for these. These calls include loud music, individuals loitering, etc., and the lack of responses are directly related to a lack of resources. We triage our calls and prioritize them by level of importance and whether an individual has met with harm versus a property crime. Staffing associated with my area is a combination of multiple items such as size of the geography, types of calls generated, amount of calls generated and the standard amount of time an officer spends on a certain type of call. There are four parameters we equate to determine staffing levels. The funding in the original bill was strictly related to population. Some of the language in the amended bill addresses this as we included calls for service.

In regards to Senator Ford's statement, those 200 police officers, minus the resort corridor areas, can be distributed within my 8 area commands based on the totality of calls and population. It is not a finite number in the area commands, but with appropriate numbers, some of those additional police officers may move into the specialized detective units. The first priority will be for uniformed officers, then for the detective units so each one will be bolstered as we move forward.

SENATOR FARLEY:

It is frustrating to call now on an issue and, when you finally track someone down, get a response that they have bigger issues and cannot get out to you. It is not just me or other businesses calling about a couple hundred bucks. We have some big issues of theft that are occurring in the work place. This sends people the message that businesses have no ability to enforce or recover white-collar crimes using law enforcement. Our insurance companies are going after and recovering on our behalf. The best result most businesses can get from law enforcement is a case number to give to the insurance company to show a crime has been reported. I understand your answer, but I am bringing this up to you for the businesses. I know we have problems on the streets and I do feel safe in Las Vegas. I appreciate everybody's job

and how well they are doing it, but it is broader than what is going on in the streets, and I believe the businesses would support some response.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I absolutely agree with you. When I was elected, I moved the detectives from a siloed environment out to the area commands to address the issues you described. This was to provide more quality investigations, to know you as a name versus a number and provide more timely investigations. We have shown this has worked. If we were a private organization, we would probably be bankrupt because we formerly had a solvability factor of approximately 3 percent associated with the totality of crime. Now, with the redesign, we are around 11 percent. The increase of police officers will have a definitive and positive effect as we increase the pursuit.

SENATOR DENIS:

I have a question about one of the amendments made by the Assembly regarding the possible need for future changes to the maps. Language was inserted that allows the County to make these changes. There are two maps, one is for the Las Vegas Strip and the other is for the downtown area. How is the City of Las Vegas going to have input into their boundaries versus what is in the County if the County is the only one allowed to make changes? This is in section 9, subsection 7, on page 7.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

On page 7 of the bill, section 9, subsection 6, lines 33 and 34, state, "If the Board determines that there is a rational basis for modifying the amount or formulas for calculating the allocations of the proceeds of the tax, the Board may adopt an ordinance revising the formulas for calculating the allocations of the proceeds of the tax." A rational basis to move boundaries might be something like the building of a new mega resort in order to adjust the boundaries because of an issue with calls for service or a definitive increase in calls for service within one block in any direction of the new resort. That was the intent of that language. They have two representatives from the City and two from the County on the Board and meet on a monthly basis. It is my intention that those discussions be part of the meeting where the City has representation to make adjustments because they make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

SENATOR DENIS:

But, the Board of County Commissioners are going to make ordinances related to that. The City would need to make ordinances as well, would they not?

MR. AGUERO:

The idea is to make this as streamlined as possible. The Sheriff represents both the County and the City in his jurisdiction. Because the ordinance is created by the County, they will apply the sales-tax rate. The idea was to streamline it so as not to go through two processes. As the Sheriff said, there has to be a rational basis associated with it, meaning they are going to have to say where the calls for service are in order to make any adjustment.

SENATOR DENIS:

If the City builds something that is outside this big resort, or a hotel goes in, something like Cashman Field, would it happen in that committee so the City would have representation?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Absolutely. The authority was left to the Sheriff and Chief of Police depending on the jurisdiction. The language is referenced to my jurisdiction.

SENATOR DENIS:

Thank you. I want to make sure they have the ability to do that since the City has 40 percent of Metro's budget. I have one more question. If we were to build a stadium, I noticed it is not on any of these maps. Would you not also have to have a presence there?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

The stadium would be considered a private enterprise, and the bonding makes it questionable as to whether it is only a private enterprise. They are required by *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS)

to provide their own security. During events, per NRS, they have to provide police-officer coverage commensurate to one officer per 400 pedestrians, consumers or fans. The officer or officers would have to be paid on an overtime basis to supply security to the stadium. If the retail environment created the critical mass as we described associated with Las Vegas Boulevard, where there is a constant presence of pedestrians and tourists, we would adjust accordingly.

SENATOR DENIS:

If that develops in the future, would it be something that could go to that committee so it could make recommendations for those types of adjustments.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Senator Farley mentioned she felt safe, but there are folks who do not feel safe. It is not a matter of feeling safe; it is the matter of doing everything folks can individually do to protect themselves and their families. This is a big issue for me in my district. Every night, I get the crime mapping information that is two miles from my house. Last night, there were 24 crimes within 2 miles of my house. Sometimes it is 19, and there are other nights when there are 100 crimes. I commend what you and your officers do out there on the streets. We really appreciate it.

I do not know if there is money that is going to be, specifically, dedicated for crime prevention. Heidi Straif is our Crime Prevention Specialist in the Southeast Area Command. She is a dynamo, and I see her at all the events in my district. She is hands-on, and we appreciate that. I do not know if you have Crime Prevention Specialists for every command area. It is important to make sure we have the resources for them to do their jobs, including things like organizing Neighborhood Watch meetings and making sure we have the proper information to send out to folks. This is something that concerns me because I hear it every day either by email, at meetings or via social media. People ask about what else can we do or express that they do not have enough materials to hand out. We are trying to get more people involved, and it is tough to get people together. We cannot even give them a Neighborhood Watch sticker or paper to put names on to give that information to you.

Senator Ford mentioned the body-worn cameras. The major cost is associated after the purchase ensuring everything is updated. I want to make sure we do not run into a speed bump where we have allocated money for the body-worn cameras but not for the maintenance.

I also have concerns about the City of Las Vegas putting in 40 percent of the budget and its ability to determine boundaries.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

The City of Las Vegas does have input. It is a mandate because of the Fiscal Affairs Committee. With the operational meeting that I have with both the County Manager and the City Manager, I, as an elected official, do not have full autonomy. They control the purse strings. They have complete input and access to me to make their voices heard and to make adjustments accordingly because of that 40 percent. The 40 percent requires certain parameters be met yearly as far as production, staffing and all of the other associated things.

During the downfall of the economy, the civilian functions were not replaced as they were traded out because we were attempting to balance the budget as we moved forward. The civilian positions are funded through the General Fund, not through the More Cops fund. The Crime Prevention Specialist position you described is a civilian position. With the increase in the economy, and the increase we have in the General Fund, I have been able to fill all existing vacancies in the civilian ranks. Now, every area command has a Crime Prevention Specialist, and we have, again, put those prevention functions on the policing side into place.

The continuing cost of equipment and replacement of the cameras through attrition, wear and tear, or damages is built into the More Cops fund. That is similar to what we do with vehicles. Vehicles are included with police officers in the More Cops fund, and they wear out in a much shorter timeline than a camera. All of those continuing costs are built in.

SENATOR MANENDO:

I am not so much concerned about replacement, but about making sure you have the funds you need to have equipment operating, including everything that goes along with recording. The keeping of the data is expensive, at least from what I learned. It appears the majority of the money is spent on that end rather than on buying the body-worn cameras.

Our officers need to have their vests replaced at least every five years. I want to see that happen too. I am involved in my area command and know the officers. I appreciate what they do, and I am concerned for their safety.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I would like to clarify your statement that storage costs outweigh the cost of the cameras. It is actually the opposite. In the beginning of our evaluations associated with the cameras, we thought as you stated, but advances in camera technology have proven otherwise. We had allocated approximately \$280,000 to \$300,000 a year for video storage, and right now, we are operating at about \$28,000. Advances in technology and use of the Cloud, plus the durability of the equipment as new versions come out, have flipped the costs.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

Is there a correlation between the number of officers and the number of arrests made? Does this impact the consequence of numbered jailed days and prison days?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

There is not necessarily a correlation. You would think that, at face value, but as I described earlier, we are in the prevention model versus the response model. An environment of prevention creates an omnipresence which reduces crime. The response model is a failed model. It does not work. It is not like Hollywood where you see the officers arrive at in-progress crimes. It is rare for that to happen in a police officer's career. The investigation is important, but prevention is the greater, more beneficial, more appropriate model when we talk about policing. I was asked, "As you get more police officers, does it mean more arrests, more people needed in the District Attorney's Office and more need for increases in the State coffers for Statewide incarceration?" This does not equate like you would think it would. In actuality, prevention is a better model. In Clark County, we are at capacity day after day within our system and we have robust alternatives to incarceration that we are putting into place. The Department of Justice recommends an 11-percent vacancy factor in detention centers; we are operating around 4 percent. We are always looking for alternatives to incarceration to adjust for those numbers.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

If there is anything we can do, here, to enable you to do that—to let people out early or keep individuals out of the jail system—I would be happy to help. I am sure all of us would.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I have a couple of questions about the charts from the Nevada Police Research Institute (NPRI) regarding violent crime per 100,000 residents versus staffing levels from 2008 to 2011. The slide on page 4 of the handout, shows a ratio of above 2.0 officers per 1,000 residents for 2008 to 2011, and the NPRI figures show a ratio of 2.0 officers and above for 2010 and 2011. I was wondering if you have seen this information and are aware of the discrepancy?

The chart also showed that violent crime went up from 2007 to 2010 per 100,000 population. In 2008, there were 985 violent crimes with 1.9 officers. In the following year, there were 834 violent crimes with a ratio of 2.0 officers, and in 2010, 911 violent crimes with a ratio of 2.1 officers. Can you explain that discrepancy?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I am not aware of those numbers, and I have not seen that report. The only thing I am aware of in the report is the question I presented or the issue I presented referencing the fund balance and the existing More Cops. I would need to review the data they are drawing from. Does it quote the source data? How we record data internally is different than how we submit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). We record a number of different crime categories that we are not required to report to the FBI. An example of that being in the description of sexual

assault. If you look at the numbers provided by the FBI, they are completely different internally. I would need to look at that report to see the comparisons. I feel confident in my verbal presentation.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Thank you, Sheriff. I was curious. I like to look at numbers and statistics.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

One of the things I am aware of in the NPRI report is that the original intent of More Cops was to hire 1,200 police officers. There was a comment that we have not hired 1,200 police officers. We have not received the full 0.5 percent that was originally provided. Yes, 0.5 percent, half of a cent, would enable us to hire 1,200 police officers. We are at 0.3 percent.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I am sure you can use more officers. You mentioned that many of your officers are working overtime on the weekend after putting in a 40-hour week. If you were to cut the overtime, would that pay for any new officers?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I do not know the math off the top of my head, but I believe our budget for overtime last year was \$18 million. It would be hard to determine a number associated with the overtime because of the way it is handled. For example, homicide numbers vary at any point and time. Right now, the homicide unit could justify putting in ten more police officers. Six months from now, we may not be able to justify that number of officers, making it hard to determine the exact numbers. In the past, due to separations, we have had a consistent, 5-percent internal vacancy factor which requires officers to work more overtime. Now, we are at less than 1 percent through adjustments of our overtime numbers. More importantly, the majority of our overtime comes out of the detention center which is fully funded and does not include City funding. They have given me the ability and authority to hire, which I have not done in the last few years, so we are making a direct effect on that as we speak.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I thought Mr. Aguero might be able to figure that out quickly in his head.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

The number I use when I talk about staffing and the number of police officers associated with revenue is \$115,000 per officer. That includes salary, benefits and all associated equipment.

SENATOR RATTI:

I want to make sure I heard you correctly. It has been said you have money sitting in an account that could be spent on additional police officers. I think I heard you say that was your ending-fund balance?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Please repeat the last part.

SENATOR RATTI:

In your original testimony, was that number they are referring to your ending-fund balance?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

No, it is the reserve fund associated with the original More Cops legislation. The intent is to have an initial-hire amount. When the taxes are enacted, we can perceive the revenues that are generated and then hire the commensurate number of police officers, making adjustments in small percentages as the revenue becomes more accurate in the tax receipts. But, the remainder of the funds are intended to fund those police officers to their retirement. The balance associated with the original More Cops is intended to continue to pay for those police officers separate from the General Fund because we carry it as a separate budget line item. We are currently operating in a \$11-million deficit associated with that fund. The revenue we are generating is less than the cost for those officers in the More Cops fund, which is 775 police officers. If we leave that

balance alone, with the revenue that we receive each year, at an \$11 million deficit, in 10 years it will be down to zero.

SENATOR RATTI:

What was your overall budget's ending-fund balance at the end of 2015?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Less than 1 percent.

SENATOR RATTI:

Less than 1 percent?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

The General Fund has less than 1 percent.

SENATOR RATTI:

Your ending-fund balance?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes.

SENATOR RATTI:

How do you manage cash flow?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

The County has assured me they are my back stop.

SENATOR RATTI:

Thank you. Mr. Aguero, did you analyze what it would look like if you did not have the ten-year rolling average on the property tax cap?

MR. AGUERO:

No. To make sure that I am clear, are you talking about the secondary provision that essentially goes to inflation of the ten-year average and moves it out to get zero?

SENATOR RATTI:

Correct.

MR. AGUERO:

At this point, it would not have mattered because that number is negative and will likely remain negative for two to three years. We have rolled off the good years. Now, we have the bad years that are carrying that down. Because it is the greater of that, it is the inflation factor not the 10-year factor that is affecting that 0.2 percent we are seeing today. So, no, we did not do it for this, but had we eliminated that component part, it would have had no effect on what we are taking about today.

SENATOR RATTI:

Thank you.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Approximately 22 percent of my funding from the General Fund comes from property tax—\$121 million—which has a direct effect on my ability to move forward in General Fund hiring because of the negative number described by Mr. Aguero.

SENATOR RATTI:

Are you still standing by the ending-fund balance of all your funds in your General Fund of 1 percent?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes, in my General Fund.

SENATOR RATTI:

Are the More Cops funds kept in a separate account?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes.

SENATOR RATTI:

What was the ending-fund balance on that fund in 2015?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

It was between \$98 million and \$102 million.

SENATOR RATTI:

Do you know what it was as a percentage?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I do not know. If you look at my budget, it is around \$875 million. I do not know what that equals as a percentage.

SENATOR HARRIS:

The slide on page 8 indicates it is estimated that \$39.2 million in tax will be generated. You indicated that 80 percent of the funding will go to fund community police at about \$31.3 million. As different areas of our valley grow, it may take a while for the population in an area that is resource scarce to generate the requirements for a police substation or additional officers, as is happening in the southwest valley. The residents who live in the southwest valley are concerned about the safety of their neighborhoods because of the theft and crime. These residents would like to see an increase in patrol cars throughout the community because larger communities and Home Owner Associations have indicated that when there is a greater presence of patrol cars, crime tends to go down. I would like to know more about what you envision this bill doing for our communities to reassure our residents of your commitment to their safety and wellbeing.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

I have talked about violent crime, and I have provided the numbers for property crimes, where we have been flat for the last two and one-half years. We have been doing a good job associated with property crimes, and we are going to do a better job. We hired 133 police officers using the 0.05-percent money. The station in the area of Cimarron and Sahara was mothballed because of the recession and now serves as temporary housing for our motorcycle officers. As a result of hiring those 133 police officers, I was able to, once again, make it a full-fledged patrol station. The boundaries between Charleston and Flamingo are included in that new substation. The northern boundary went from Charleston all the way to Flamingo. This area is no longer the responsibility of the Southwest Area Command, and you will have better response within that jurisdiction. The same thing will happen, on a greater scale, with the ability to hire the 200 police officers outside of the resort corridor, with distribution based on population and calls for service. If the Enterprise Area Command you described dictates and supports the numbers, then, that number of officers will be provided.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Are you saying that in addition to a strong commitment to the safety of the tourists who visit Las Vegas, you are going to have an equally strong commitment to our residents? Are you going to ensure our residents are getting their share of resources that are important to them to feel safe?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes, absolutely.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

In our Country, we have recently seen a number of unfortunate events involving police-officer shootings of community members. When we met a couple of months ago with the Sheriff, we discussed how to get to accountability with respect to cultural competency with the bill that is before us. My concern is always about how much emphasis is put on law enforcement

versus public safety, because, in the community's mind, there is a sharp difference. Law enforcement is the assumption of guilty until proven innocent, and public safety is the assumption of innocent until proven guilty. Many times, that determines the difference in how officers interact within the communities they serve. Is that reflected in the bill? What are we doing to ensure that the officers currently employed, and those that will be hired will have the level of cultural competency needed to avoid some of the unfortunate events we have seen across the Country?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Our conversation was beneficial. Prior to my tenure as Sheriff, we had a problem in the police department. In 2012, we were audited by the Department of Justice (DOJ) associated with concerns about our use of deadly force. As a result, 73 recommendations came forward. We are now abiding by 71 of those recommendations. We have been supported by the cops office and are in full compliance with those recommendations. Those recommendations are directly related to what you are describing as cultural awareness and include awareness of internal biases and the annual training associated with the mandate through the DOJ. If you have grants provided by the DOJ, DHS or the federal government, there are mandates for that type of training. We went above and beyond those requirements and set up the Office of Community Engagement to address these issues. We provide additional training on our own on an annual basis to every police officer. We have doubled the numbers within the academy environment for the type of training directly related to cultural awareness.

You are correct; there is not language in this bill that addresses this issue because it has been addressed in previous language and associated mandates with what we do as an organization.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Is that enough, or is there something we need to do to make sure it is not implicit but explicit moving forward? Even though it has been addressed in other places, sometimes, there is a tendency to lapse because people do not see it in front of their face. Sometimes what is not inspected is often neglected.

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes, it is inspected. It was done previously but is not addressed in this bill. You are not seeing in Las Vegas what you see in other jurisdictions in the United States because we learned our lesson. The language you described is now encompassed within our culture as an identified policy known as "The Sanctity of Life." As a result, our reportable use of force is down 60 percent from 2010. This year, our deadly use of force is down over 30 percent. We are going in the right direction.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Nevada is a wonderful place to live, and I do not want to see us lapse into some of the things we see across the Country. My questions are preventative in nature. Are there things in place so there is an open-door policy so when officers see someone else doing something that could easily take us in that other direction, there is a mechanism to report the action and make sure that it is handled? As officers retire and we hire replacements, do we have something ongoing that says, "See Something, Say Something," for not only the community but also for officers to ensure we do not go down the road we have seen in some areas across the Country?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes, there is. As the result of the DOJ audit, there was a change in our policy and we added a duty to report process that is directly related to what you described. A officer has a duty to report and can be held accountable if he or she does not report an action, whether anonymously or not. In our "Use of Force" report, before we revamped it, we were lacking citizen participation. They now have a vote associated with officer accountability. With the new board in place, we have had a 30-percent increase in accountability, directly related to the Use of Force Review Board. The tactics used by an officer are reviewed, and the officer is accountable. We did not have that in place before.

SENATOR HAW:

Page 4 cites significant population growth as contributing to your disability to get from a ratio of 1.7 to 2.0. Are other structural issues, such as overtime pay or the Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) that keep going up, also impacting this? Is there something else that needs to be addressed to help you maintain your force and keep it at the level you need?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

Yes. Obviously, we have had an increase in population in the Las Vegas Valley. This is a finite number that is compensated for by the General Fund. In the past two years, I have had a commitment from the County Commission and the City Council for an increase within the General Fund to make adjustments, with the assurance to continue in that aspect. Since they took my end-fund balance away, it is difficult to work within this environment and make adjustments if you are not funded at the appropriate level. I no longer have the end-fund balance to work with. If it is not met commensurate to population and continuances of COLAs and benefits, I will be in a lay-off situation.

Collective bargaining may be what you are alluding to. We participate in collective bargaining and are a subject to approval by the Fiscal Affairs of the City and County. Adjustments have been made in collective bargaining over the years. This happens with every contract now and more often with a new hires versus existing employees. We adjust for cash-outs, longevity and those types of items to make adjustments for the future. No employees from 2013 receive longevity pay. The Assembly had concerns about the salaries and benefits provided by NPRI (Nevada Policy Research Institute) and the big monies that they reported. A lot of those were because of payments that occur when an individual separates from the police department and their sick and vacation leave is cashed-out causing a onetime inflated number. This looks disturbing at face value, but adjustments have made for that moving forward.

PATRICK MOERS (Chief of Police, City of Henderson):

I am here in support of Assembly Bill No. 1. The City's benefit will be, approximately, \$4.2 million. That equates to approximately 26 police officers including their salary, benefits and associated equipment. To clarify associated equipment, in 2009, the Henderson Police Department instituted mobile video cameras or a camera in every car which that money will continue to fund. As a police department, this is not the extent of where we want to go. We are still committed to expanding and enhancing our technology. In the future, we would like to have body cameras and recognize that it would be great for the City.

The current staffing levels for the City of Henderson is 352 officers. Those additional 26 officers will move us to, approximately, 378 officers. The current ratio for the City of Henderson is 1.2 police officers per thousand, and those 26 officers would move us to 1.29. Those officers could address a couple of the issues we are experiencing, today, related to response times that went up to, approximately, a minute more than we would like them to be—almost nine minutes. Those are priority one calls, the most serious calls, and those officers would help us improve on our response time. Calls for service have gone up over 13 percent from the year 2010.

Statistics support why this is important to do this today. In the City of Henderson, between January and June, robbery was up 25 percent, aggravated assaults were up 59 percent, larceny was up 6 percent and auto theft was up 18 percent. Obviously, those officers would truly make a difference in what we can address in our City. In 2015, we arrested approximately 11,000 people. Of those, 47 percent actually lived in Henderson and 53 percent did not. They come across the border from other states to commit their criminal acts, something the Sheriff and I have in common because there are no borders. We fight a regional battle to keep those folks out of each other's jurisdictions.

Another reason we support Assembly Bill No. 1 is our continuing effort toward our diversity efforts in policing. When I became the Chief four years ago, we began a great diversity program, and we continue that outreach. Our application rate for minorities has risen from 25 percent to almost 50 percent during that time. This is an increase for the minority races which we are glad to see occur in policing today. It is another opportunity for our organization to continue to work in the community and look like the community. I ask for your support on Assembly Bill No. 1.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ (Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.):

I would like to thank the Sheriff for bringing this bill forward. We need more officers on the street; they want more help. Senator Farley, I apologize for the service you did not receive. We are constantly sending out emails to our members reminding them you are the citizens, and it is you we are serving. Officers have many challenges. One of the last calls I went on related to a five-month-old baby who was left with a boyfriend while a woman went to work. Apparently, the baby cried too much so the boyfriend put the baby in oven. I will let you figure out what happened. After several hours on that call, I was immediately assigned to another domestic violence call. This one was about two roommates arguing because one of them ate the other's Oreos. You have to go from one call like that to another and to turn it off between calls. I apologize for your lack of service. I will address our members to make sure this does not happen again.

We support this bill. We want and need more officers. Anything we can do would be greatly appreciated. Assembly Bill No. 1 will help fill the gap because, as the Chief said, crime does not stop and crime knows no borders. When we get a domestic violence call, there are two officers. On a robbery call, there are three officers, one looking for the suspect and the other two working with the customers and the folks that have just been robbed. There are two other officers at jail, and sometimes, that leaves only one or two officers out there trying to protect the City. It is tiresome for our folks.

The department trains us in diversity yearly, with monthly updates. We take training so we do not have what has happened in other jurisdictions around the Country happen here at Metro. Passage of Assembly Bill No. 1 will support training and the addition of equipment, like cameras. We support Assembly Bill No. 1.

CHRISTINE GIUNCHIGLIANI (Clark County Commissioner):

I had to sign in as opposed to this bill although I am not opposed to the bill overall. I am in opposition to the sales-tax component, and I have been consistent on that. I would love to be able to vote for a tax increase for our Metropolitan Police Department, as they do a phenomenal job. There is much more community-oriented policing going on than there was previously. I appreciate that this is enabling legislation. I attended several Commission meetings, and I never saw the 14 potential models referred to by previous speakers regarding the types of taxes that could generate revenue. I would have liked the Commission to have been allowed to look at those modeling components and to have been able to decide if there was blending that might have worked better, such as implementing a Special Improvement District tied not only to property tax but to the room tax for the resort corridor if a stadium does come into that area.

The Minority Leader spoke earlier about the body cams. I am in agreement with his statements. I do not think we should have to wait until the waterfall component comes in to purchase the body cams or even the drones that may be needed for use in the wetlands or other locations where there is a large area to patrol. There has been little discussion with regard to fire safety, but we do have a shortage of fire personnel, and there will be fire safety issues if the stadium comes in. That is not addressed in either piece of legislation.

In the original More Cops tax of 2005, we added a caveat that 80 percent of the dollars had to be allocated towards the neighborhoods. I do not see that in here. I do not know if you had any discussions about this, but I hope you will ensure that while you take care of the tourists, our residents are also dealt with and community-oriented policing is still a component. I commend Sheriff Lombardo because he has been pushing for more of that and has added additional staff. I ask you to ensure we do not lose sight of our constituents while we are trying to deal with the issue of tourists.

JUSTIN ROBERTS (Captain, Investigative Command, North Las Vegas Police Department):

I want to thank Sheriff Lombardo and his team for their leadership in spearheading this bill. We are appreciative of the North Las Vegas Police Department for their partnership in this. We had 341 officers years ago and now are at 269. We are, absolutely, in support of Assembly Bill No. 1. It would mean an additional 15 officers for the North Las Vegas Police Department.

SENATOR FORD:

Please speak to the body-camera issue. We heard from Henderson, and I know they are working on a proposal that we can consider in 2017. What is North Las Vegas doing?

CAPTAIN ROBERTS:

We have been working on it for the last year, and the bottom line is, the funding for the infrastructure. We have looked at several body cameras and have different companies working with us. We are trying to get the funds for the infrastructure.

SENATOR FORD:

Are you contemplating that the funds from this bill would be used for body cameras?

CAPTAIN ROBERTS:

We are contemplating use of funds from everywhere we can get them. This is a component of that.

SENATOR FORD:

I understand this is enabling legislation. We are giving the County Commissioners authorization to increase the sales tax. Will this require a two-thirds vote by the County Commission, or is it a majority vote in Clark County?

SENATOR ROBERSON:

It is majority vote. It would only be a two-thirds vote if we required it in the legislation.

SENATOR FORD:

Is that what we did last Session in the More Cops bill? Did we require more than the majority?

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I do not recall. Sheriff Lombardo may recall. Are you talking about the Special Session in 2013, right after sine die?

SENATOR FORD:

Yes.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

That was a super majority. The requirement was put into the bill at that time.

SENATOR FORD:

Is the difference between that bill and this one that we are not requiring the super majority in this bill? This bill would generally authorize the County Commission on a four to three vote. Is that correct?

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Yes, that is my understanding. I see Sheriff Lombardo nodding in agreement.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I have a question for Sheriff Lombardo. Last Session, we passed a large educational package for hiring more teachers. One of the biggest problems I saw when passing the bill was there are no teachers to hire and we end up using substitute teachers. Are you and the other police departments having the same problem as far as the ability to hire people willing to be police officers during these terrible times?

SHERIFF LOMBARDO:

No, we have not experienced any of those issues. We hired 300 plus officers in this fiscal year, and we did not have any issues in reaching that number. Part of those 300 hired were due to attrition. With 133 we had from the 0.05 increase, we have added an additional 18 police officers this calendar year. We are keeping up with attrition, but we have lists in place that would adjust for any hiring practices.

RONALD P. DREHER (Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada):

I represent the Peace Officers Research Association in Nevada and all law enforcement coalitions consisting of the Nevada Association of Public Safety and the Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs. Together, we represent over 10,000 officers in the State of Nevada. I am asking your support for Assembly Bill No. 1. I have spent 42 years recruiting and retaining police officers in this State. I am a honorably retired Reno Police, Major Crimes Detective. It is hard to wait and get 300 police officers, train them on the street and get them ready. I have watched this Body kick the can down the road over the years when it comes to hiring more cops on behalf of our organizations and Clark County. You need these officers. It is not easy to get a trained officer on the street. It is not easy to ensure we do not lower our standards. Only 1 in 40 recruits to our profession make it, and that is the way we need to keep it. Your departments, your Sheriff of Clark County, your Chiefs of Police in Mesquite, Boulder and North Las Vegas have some of the best police officers in the State of Nevada. I ask this Body to support Assembly Bill No. 1.

BRIAN MCANALLEN (City of Las Vegas):

Public safety issues are major issues for the City of Las Vegas. Nearly 67 percent of our General Fund budget goes to fund public safety and 40 percent of Metro's budget is provided by the City as is our detention and enforcement jail. We are concerned about the cops issue, and we need to see as many officers on the street as possible.

We appreciate Assembly Bill No. 1 and its issue of defining a resort corridor where we can focus our emphasis. We have given our full support to the Sheriff and what he is doing regarding flexibility of responding to calls for service and making adjustments to the other boundaries to impact full public safety in both the unincorporated City and the County. We would like you to pass Assembly Bill No. 1.

There is a sense of urgency here and in the other Chamber. There was significant discussion about why we are doing this in a Special Session. We are four months away from the regular Session, which will last 4 months. We need time to have the ordinances drafted by the Board of County Commissioners and collect the taxes so we can build the academies and get those boots on the ground. With the increase in threats, there is a significant fear for our safety and the safety of the corridor. In recent years, Las Vegas has been called out in Al-Qaida publications as a targeted area. That concerns our Mayor and City Council. We need the protection that can be provided by the extra force, and we need it now.

There is also an increased demand on the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department every time a President or Presidential Candidate comes to town, as they have in the last few weeks. These events drives the force to cover that event and be on a higher alert. They make it difficult to respond to our neighborhoods when we have the calls for service. The extra help, the extra law enforcement is necessary, and the time is now. We urge you to vote in favor of this bill.

WARREN HARDY (City of Mesquite):

Chief Tanner asked me to express the support of the City of Mesquite for this bill. Even though it means only two officers, that is a big deal for the City of Mesquite. The Mesquite Police Department was the first to fully implement body cameras, and we did that over two years ago. We are in full support of this bill.

Senator Hardy moved to do pass Assembly Bill No. 1.

Senator Lipparelli seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

On the motion of Senator Settlemeyer, seconded by Senator Harris, the Committee did rise and report back to the Senate.

SENATE IN SESSION

At 4:29 p.m.

President Hutchison presiding.

Quorum present.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. President:

Your Committee of the Whole, to which was referred Assembly Bill No. 1, has had the same under consideration, and begs leave to report the same back with the recommendation: Do pass.

MICHAEL ROBERSON, *Chair*

GENERAL FILE AND THIRD READING

Assembly Bill No. 1.

Bill read third time.

Remarks by Senator Spearman.

I wanted to follow up on a question I asked previously. It is not my intent to impugn the integrity of any of the officers. I know that for every officer who does not follow procedures, it puts a target on the other good officers that are on the street. The second thing is, I did not get an opportunity to talk about the cultural and ethnic diversity of all of the departments, if they have any standards, and if those standards are not being met, what are the departments doing in terms of achieving diversity through recruitment or bringing officers up through the ranks in training?

Roll call on Assembly Bill No. 1:

YEAS—21.

NAYS—None.

Assembly Bill No. 1 having received a constitutional majority, Mr. President declared it passed.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Assembly.

Senator Roberson moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Motion carried.

Senate in recess at 4:32 p.m.

SENATE IN SESSION

At 12:02 a.m.

President pro Tempore Hardy presiding.

Quorum not present.

REMARKS FROM THE FLOOR

Senator Ford requested that the following remarks be entered into the Journal.

SENATOR FORD:

I am absent tonight from my son's and wife's visit. They are attending a Yale University meeting tonight. I want to extend my best wishes to my son for this great opportunity and wish him a good meeting. Fingers crossed, guys, we might be talking about a Yale student pretty soon.

SENATOR DENIS:

While I am here, tonight, my son is going to have his first solo on the French Horn with the Las Vegas East Orchestra Philharmonic. I want to wish him good luck. I am sure I will get to

hear a recording of it. I am grateful to serve, but I am going to miss him, and I know he will do a great job.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF SENATE FLOOR

On request of Senator Harris, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Rich Hoggan.

Senator Roberson moved that the Senate adjourn until Friday, October 14, 2016, at 10:00 a.m.

Motion carried.

Senate adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

Approved:

JOSEPH P. HARDY
President pro Tempore

Attest: CLAIRE J. CLIFT
Secretary of the Senate