

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

**Eighty-second Session  
March 6, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 3:33 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 2023, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair  
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair  
Senator Skip Daly  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Lisa Krasner

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Julie Pazina, Senatorial District No. 12  
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jered McDonald, Policy Analyst  
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel  
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Joanna Jacob, Clark County  
James Chrisley, Senior Director, Department of Aviation, Clark County  
Nancy Amundsen, Director, Comprehensive Planning Department, Clark County  
Ashley Cruz, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance  
Paul Moradkhan, Vegas Chamber  
Virginia Valentine, Nevada Resort Association  
Nicole Rourke, City of Henderson

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 2

Rick McCann, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition

Todd Ingalsbee, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada

Carla Scott, President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees

Kelly Richter, Vice President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees

Sean Gallagher, President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association

Anthony Gonzales, Vice President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association

Troyce Krumme, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association

John Abel, Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association

Randy Soltero, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International

Susie Martinez, Nevada State AFL-CIO

Kent Ervin, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Ricky Gourrier, Nevada Police Union

Fran Almaraz, Teamsters Local 14

Carter Bundy, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International

Dolly Jones

Marlene Lockard, Service Employees International Union Local 1107

Bruce Snyder, Commissioner, Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Nevada Department of Business and Industry

Al Rojas

Cyrus Hojjaty

Margaret Ann Coleman

CHAIR FLORES:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 19.

**SENATE BILL 19**: Revises provisions relating to local governments. (BDR 21-397)

JOANNA JACOB (Clark County):

Clark County submitted this bill to continue the planning process for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport (SNSA), also known as the

Ivanpah Valley site. The existing airport, Harry Reid International Airport, is a vital economic resource for southern Nevada and the State.

Clark County's Department of Aviation owns and operates various airport facilities, including the Harry Reid International Airport. The County has experienced robust growth because Las Vegas has become a major leisure destination market and conference venue. The forecasted growth for aviation demand cannot be accommodated in the future at the Harry Reid International Airport. Therefore, the County has been planning the construction and operation of the SNSA for several years. The SNSA is intended to provide long-term aviation capacity by primarily serving operations such as charter, long haul domestic and international flights.

JAMES CHRISLEY (Senior Director, Department of Aviation, Clark County):  
Planning for SNSA began more than 20 years ago and was moving forward until the Great Recession of early 2000. At that time, planning was paused due to economic conditions, but as always, the economy recovered.

As more visitors returned to Las Vegas and the entire southern Nevada region, it became apparent Harry Reid International Airport would once again approach capacity and a second commercial service airport would be needed. In 2018, Rosemary Vassiliadis, Director of Aviation, Clark County, went to the Clark County Board of Commissioners and received approval to resume planning for SNSA.

I will provide a brief presentation of the historical planning efforts as well as an update on efforts since planning resumed in 2018 ([Exhibit C](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library.)

From the first round of planning, three congressional acts supported and defined the SNSA project. The first was the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act of 2000 that conveyed 6,000 acres to Clark County for construction and operation of an airport. As you look at the map on [Exhibit C](#), page 2, that is the orange rectangle to the east of Interstate 15 between Jean and Primm on the way to southern California. The Act also identified joint lead federal agencies for the environmental impact statement process that included the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). As a result of the Act, Clark County purchased those 6,000 acres.

The second act was the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002, [Exhibit C](#), page 3. This Act allows the County to acquire 17,000 additional acres. That is the area enclosed in the dot and dash line around the orange rectangle that proceeds north then south to the State line. The area is designated for airport compatibility. Upon a successful record of decision through the environmental impact statement process, the 17,000 acres will be given to the Clark County Department of Aviation for airport-compatible development. The County will not acquire the 17,000 acres until the record of decision has been issued.

The 2002 Act also established a nonexclusive half-mile-wide transportation and utility corridor defined in the gray shading area beginning at the north end of the orange rectangle on the east side of Interstate 15 and proceeding all the way to Sloan. This corridor will be used for any transportation and utility support for the development of the airport and to provide access to and from the Las Vegas Valley.

The third act, as shown on the map, [Exhibit C](#), page 3, is the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. It identified land for flood control basins to help protect the airport from major flooding events during storms. One is west of Interstate 15 labeled Goodsprings Modified Retention Facility on the map, and a second area is east within the 17,000 acres labeled Lucy Gray Modified Retention Facility. These will be stormwater retention facilities.

The Ivanpah Valley was chosen as the SNSA site for user convenience, [Exhibit C](#), page 4. It offers a direct route via Interstate 15. With redundant access provided by the transportation/utility corridor, there will be an alternative route to the airport instead of Interstate 15. This site also offers the potential for a transit connection via the transportation/utility corridor with rail or other modern technology to support the connectivity of the sites.

The SNSA will be located farther out. The County is constantly fighting compatible land use with the Harry Reid International Airport. The SNSA will be away from all development and could be developed at a lower cost.

The County has revalidated all studies regarding the SNSA site. This site is the only viable location for a second commercial service airport for the southern Nevada region because of the U.S. Department of Defense airspace restrictions due to Nellis Air Force Base, its training range to the north, the mountainous

terrain that defines the Las Vegas Valley and the fact that Harry Reid International Airport is surrounded by development.

Harry Reid International Airport has a finite capacity, [Exhibit C](#), page 5. In November 2022, the FAA determined that in 2023, the demand at Harry Reid International Airport will begin to exceed capacity on a regular basis. [Exhibit C](#), page 5, depicts multiple growth scenarios as we move into the future and indicates that delays for passengers will continue to grow. A second commercial airport will be needed to support that forecasted growth of customers coming to the southern Nevada region to meet air travel demand and to ensure the successful growth of the southern Nevada economy.

The County has been working on this project since 2018 when planning resumed, [Exhibit C](#), page 6. The County has an updated airport layout which includes parallel runways, a terminal facility, cargo facilities and all the ground support needed to be done to create this airport. The County has completed agency and stakeholder coordination and has been working with a high-speed rail company since coming back to plan its project.

Because Interstate 15 is a key portion of this project, the County has been meeting with the Nevada Department of Transportation on a regular basis for the last few years, identifying utility needs and required plans. As a result of these efforts, the entire southern Clark County region is now on the Southern Nevada Water Authority master plan for water development. There is a concept of how to get water to the entire south Clark County area to include the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.

The County has reached out to the public a few times to get residents' input on how they would like to transit to and from the airport and to understand that the SNSA is coming.

The County must continually analyze the demand and capacity at Harry Reid International Airport; part of that is showing it has a finite capacity and secondary commercial service access will be needed. The County is working on a runway length assessment and planning for and protecting the 17,000 acres.

To ensure the usefulness of the 17,000 acres, it must be protected now. The County reviews all proposals in the area with the BLM and other County departments.

Last November, the FAA initiated an airspace feasibility study. This is the first phase in which the FAA will determine the need for SNSA and how it will fit into the overall airspace system which includes Harry Reid International Airport and other general aviation airports in the Las Vegas Valley.

The conceptual schedule, [Exhibit C](#), page 7, shows we are at approximately Year 3 in planning efforts. We would have been further along, but there was a slowdown during COVID-19; however, we have resumed efforts. The County is underway in all planning tests, including the environmental impact study which is limited to two years through the federal process. The County must complete the notice of intent soon to start the two-year clock so it can get the final record of decision.

A meeting with the FAA in May 2023 will help us get this project moving. The final goal is the end date of construction—by 2035 to 2037 the airport will be operational.

The next steps, [Exhibit C](#), page 8, are to finalize the aviation forecast which continues to change; continue to explore utilities such as work on electrical and sewer systems and wastewater reclamation; prepare a complete financial analysis of how this airport will be paid for; continue to develop the ground access plan of wildlife hazard assessment; update the airport layout plan; and—finally, the big challenge—determine opening day requirements.

Ms. JACOB:

Sections 2 and 13 of the bill pertain to Clark County, but they also apply to counties with populations of 700,000 or more. This bill was drafted to apply Statewide at the request of the Legislative Counsel Bureau to conform to existing Supreme Court caselaw about special acts.

Section 13, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (b) permit counties to form an unincorporated town which will allow the Clark County Board of County Commissioners to create a town by ordinance subject to a public hearing. The criteria are if the land has been conveyed or transferred to a county under a federal law enacted after January 1, 2000, and "conveys or transfers to the county, or authorizes to be conveyed or transferred to the county, at least 5,000 acres." The County owns 6,000 acres.

This section is limited for the purposes of developing an airport and any related infrastructure and addressing the noise compatibility issues related to an airport. This is because of the additional 17,000 acres that may come to the County under the process of completing the environmental review. When that process is completed, section 13, subsection 1, paragraph (b) will allow the County to ask for additional territory in the town be considered if it is located not more than one mile from any territory described in section 13, subsection 1, paragraph (a). That is the area on the map surrounded by the solid green line ([Exhibit D](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library.) The County wants to ensure it is developing the site for compatible use. This is the area the FAA and the BLM will review.

Section 2 of the bill states, "The governing body of a city shall not annex into the corporate limits." Section 2 is the same area of the town as section 13. That is the area defined as coming to the County by federal act for the noise management area, noise compatibility and a one-mile buffer.

Section 2, subsection 2 allows for the annexation of territory into a city under certain circumstances. This replicates what is in law about annexation which will allow it to go forward if approved by resolution of the board of county commissioners that occurs before the effective date of this bill and the effective date of any federal law.

Section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (d) says, "The territory is located within the boundaries of an area subject to an interlocal agreement." The County has an interlocal agreement with the City of Henderson from April 2022. The orange diagonal lines on the map to the north of the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport site, [Exhibit D](#), depict the area in which Clark County and the City of Henderson have engaged in a joint land use planning study in contemplation of future development. That is why the County wants any annexation to be permissible under the terms of the interlocal agreement.

Sections 4 through 7 address annexation law. The annexation of any area defined in this bill would fall under the bill's annexation rules. Section 4 addresses the process for annexation by a city under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 268.570. This town would be exempt from those rules because the annexation rules are set forth separately in statute. It is the same in section 5. Section 6 also sets forth criteria for a city's annexation, which was addressed in section 2 of the bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 8

Section 7 is an alternate procedure for annexation by petition of the residents. This area is exempt from that process as well. We tried to incorporate and stay consistent with section 2. We are setting an alternate process specific to this town only.

Section 3 and sections 8 through 12 apply to the annexation of territories by cities and counties with populations under 700,000. While working on this bill, we reached out to the Nevada Association of Counties and our northern counterparts for their comments or concerns about those sections. There were none.

Sections 14 to 16 permit a county to defer the creation of a town board. When a town is designated, a town board is usually created to oversee the town. These sections allow the deferring of the timing as the site is developed and the airport is constructed. This will be addressed via the ordinance properly noticed and heard in front of the board of county commissioners.

SENATOR DALY:

In section 2, subsection 2 regarding the annexation, unless the county commission approves, nobody is ever going to meet those qualifications. However, section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (d) would allow the City of Henderson to annex that hash mark area in the northeast section because it is under an interlocal agreement lasting more than five years. Could the City of Henderson annex that without county approval?

Ms. JACOB:

The interlocal agreement contemplates joint planning. I would have to review it to determine if the annexation would occur before or after the County's approval. However, it did set forth separate annexation criteria and agreement. I will file that with the Committee or send it to you, Senator Daly.

The idea behind it and why we exempted it from the prohibition on annexation is because we contemplated collaboration between the City of Henderson and Clark County. There was a promise between Clark County and the City of Henderson to have a study completed before we talked about annexation, and we would jointly agree to that.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 9

NANCY AMUNDSEN (Director, Comprehensive Planning Department, Clark County):  
The joint land use study the County is working on with the City of Henderson is in anticipation of the land disposal boundary being expanded down Interstate 15. We wanted to ensure the County and the City of Henderson understand what the land use would be. We want to protect the airport to ensure there is no encroachment impacting the operation of the supplemental airport.

When the County entered the interlocal agreement, it was determined there would be no annexation. The County would not recommend any land for disposal. We are working together to make sure the planning initiative down Interstate 15 in that hatched area is consistent with what the citizens, the City of Henderson and Clark County want.

SENATOR DALY:

Are you are saying the interlocal agreement may have a prohibition until planning is done on the annexation? Senate Bill 19 says if only one of the circumstances apply. Theoretically, under section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (d), they could annex, except the interlocal agreement contemplates differently. The annexation could then expand further south in the hash mark area, but the plan is only in the buffer zone and not into the dotted line area.

MS. AMUNDSEN:

The area of the joint land use study is touching the area of the buffer for the airport in just a small area down Interstate 15. The interlocal agreement prohibits annexation and the recommendation of disposing anything. We are trying to create a land use planning area to have continuity that would be adopted by both the Clark County Board of County Commissioners and the City of Henderson. Today, there could be no annexations in that hatched area.

MS. JACOB:

When we talked to the City of Henderson, we explained the County was working on the joint study. The County wants any part of that development under the terms of the study. That is why we wrote it into the bill.

SENATOR DALY:

This technically applies to all the other 16 counties in the State. However, they could not actually meet the requirement to institute it. If this happens in Washoe County or maybe one of the adjoining counties, they could still do it.

The counties would probably have to come to the Legislature and present a different bill. Even though this applies to the whole State, no one can meet the criteria. Is that your understanding?

MS. JACOB:

That is our understanding. We could talk for hours about whether this would ever happen again on a land grant this size coming to Nevada. In our conversations with the Nevada Association of Counties, Reno Airport and other counties in the north, nothing in the bill interferes with plans they may have.

If those plans should change, they would probably have to come to the Legislature. We are coming to the Legislature because we need legislative approval to create this town. It would require future legislation should this happen again. As far as we know, Clark County is the only place where the criteria set forth in the bill occurs with respect to this site.

ASHLEY CRUZ (Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):

Air travel in southern Nevada supports the State's travel and tourism economy. It also supports nongaming economic development opportunities. The Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA) knows Harry Reid International Airport will soon be at maximum capacity. The ability to find solutions to increasing air travel in southern Nevada is important. This bill is largely administrative in nature to give the County the ability to move forward with its various impact studies.

The LVGEA supports S.B. 19 to ensure this project moves forward.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Vegas Chamber):

The Vegas Chamber supports S.B. 19. The Chamber has supported the SNSA for over a decade. At the local, State and federal levels of government, Clark County has made the economic case for this from an economic diversification perspective for the tourism sector, manufacturing and shipping hub.

Section 13, subsection 3 is extensive in its community outreach, notification process and public hearing.

VIRGINIA VALENTINE (Nevada Resort Association):

The Nevada Resort Association support the efforts of Clark County to ensure the orderly planning for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport. The Association would like to see it continue on schedule and supports S.B. 19.

The southern Nevada economy continues to improve with a record number of visitors to the community. The Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority reported that Harry Reid International Airport served 52.7 million passengers, beating 51.5 million passengers in 2019. Over the past year, the Harry Reid International Airport single-month passenger record was broken three times with October being the first month ever to surpass 5 million travelers.

With business travel still recovering in 2022, leisure travel has exceeded expectations as visitors flocked to Las Vegas to enjoy expanded sports offerings and other world-class dining and entertainment options. The ability to support increasing visitor demand is critically important. It is a top priority for all of us.

We appreciate that the County has done a lot of planning work. Creating this new township will allow it to provide for the orderly and logical development around the airport area, protect airport environs and prevent the kind of development that would prohibit optimization of airport lands.

NICOLE ROURKE (City of Henderson):

Although the County has already explained the process with the City of Henderson, I am establishing its position as neutral for S.B. 19. Although the City would normally support or even be neutral, taking away its power to annex is a unique circumstance. The City is working with the County under the interlocal agreement described to you for the SNSA. The purpose of the interlocal agreement is to jointly fund a study to determine potential future land uses and design standards that both of our elected bodies will approve. The City's understanding is that some portion of that area will be within the City of Henderson's jurisdiction someday. Through that process, the City is confident it will be able to annex areas in the future, although currently prevented.

The City understands the importance of the SNSA to the region's and the State's economy. The City appreciates working closely with the County to plan for future growth.

CHAIR FLORES:

I remember some conversations years back in 2002 or 2003 about annexation around the Harry Reid International Airport. A discount store and a soccer park were eventually constructed, and many houses were removed. There was some backlash and some pushback around those conversations. Could you provide information? We will be having these conversations again in 14 or 15 years. This is information for the Committee to review and consider as we continue with this conversation.

Ms. JACOB:

I do not know the details of the 2002 and 2003 issues you described. I can follow up on that afterward. What you are alluding to is the challenge of a landlocked urban airport with people living around it. We are trying to avoid this as future planning is done with the airport in mind so we can provide compatible use. This is a long process. To help the public understand as we do this planning, there will be ample opportunities for them to engage with the Clark County Board of County Commissioners and the Department of Aviation about what they would like to see in that area. That would be a fruitful thing for community members to do so we can work together on compatible use. I can follow up if that does not address your concern.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 19 and open the hearing on S.B. 166.

**SENATE BILL 166**: Revises provisions relating to collective bargaining by public employees. (BDR 23-556)

SENATOR JULIE PAZINA (Senatorial District No. 12):

The Legislature approved S.B. No. 135 of the 80th Session which authorized collective bargaining between the State and certain State employees in the classified system of employment. It provides for collective and supplemental bargaining between the Executive Branch of State government and an exclusive representative for a wide range of subjects including but not limited to salary or wage rates, leave and employee safety. The bill defined bargaining units for specific employment groups, including separate units for category I, II and III peace officers.

Senate Bill 166 seeks to resolve some of the collective bargaining challenges for supervisors who are grouped in with the peace officers and firefighters they supervise. There is also a proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) to this bill.

This bill allows law enforcement and firefighter supervisors to engage in collective bargaining and allows them to create a collective bargaining unit separate from the employees they supervise. The bill also recognizes the unique nature of the work conducted by civilians who provide support services in a law enforcement agency and allows them to participate in collective bargaining.

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

Section 1 of the bill addresses NRS 288.138 which defines a supervisory employee as a person who exercises one or more of a list of tasks in the performance of duties. However, in certain paramilitary structures such as law enforcement and firefighting, employees are often required to perform some of these tasks in a temporary fashion, such as acting sergeants, lieutenants and officers in charge who are assuming supervisory goals and tasks but are not considered permanent supervisors.

In 2019, the statute was amended to prohibit employees within paramilitary command structures such as police and fire departments from being deemed permanent supervisors solely due to the exercise of certain duties.

Senate Bill 166 seeks to exclude civilian law enforcement employees who work under the same paramilitary police structure from being deemed supervisors solely due to the exercise of those duties. Civilian employees who provide support services to law enforcement agencies include crime scene investigators, dispatchers, abuse and neglect specialists, cold case investigators and many others. They are vital to police paramilitary structure, and it is necessary to provide them with the same exclusions and protections given to their police command.

Addressing section 2 of this bill, law permits collective bargaining units for each of a number of occupational groups employed by the State, including category I, category II and category III peace officers but not the supervisors of those three groups. In fact, supervisors of all occupational groups are lumped into one collective bargaining unit because of S.B. No. 135 of the 80th Session. This has been proven to be unmanageable because there is no community of interest

in having law enforcement, accounting, physical therapy, mental health agency, State maintenance worker, and administrative and clerical worker supervisors, all in the same bargaining unit. This is unworkable. You cannot get a good collective group of people to represent all those interests at the same time. For this reason, no supervisors in the State have been able to collectively bargain as a cohesive unit in the past four years since we have had collective bargaining for State employees. That is what we are trying to fix.

Section 2 of this bill addresses that issue for category I, category II and category III supervisory peace officers. Referring to the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#), we are looking to put that in statute as well for firefighters.

By establishing separate bargain units for these four supervisory occupational categories, we give them the opportunity to collectively bargain their wages, benefits and working conditions within units that have communities of interest with their supervisory coworkers.

Section 2, subsection 2 mirrors language in NRS 288 which applies to city, county governments and peace officers under NRS 288.140. This bill will extend that to State peace officers. It states that any bargaining unit established for State peace officers must be composed exclusively of peace officers. This maintains the community of interest of peace officer bargaining units. For these reasons we ask your support of [S.B. 166](#).

ASSEMBLYMAN BRIAN HIBBETTS (Assembly District No. 13):

When I learned of Senator Pazina's bill, I asked if I could be a primary cosponsor because I believe in this as a retired peace officer supervisor. I spent approximately 14 and a half years supervising police officers. From my perspective, having the separation between not only supervisors and their employees in a separate bargaining unit but supervisors and nonpolice personnel in their own bargaining unit was instrumental in us doing what we needed to do. I urge you to pass this bill.

SENATOR PAZINA:

In section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (j) of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#), states, "supervisory employees from all occupational groups other than category I, category II or category III peace officers and firefighters"—firefighters have been added.

Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (l) has been changed to include only supervisor employees who are category I peace officers. Paragraphs (m), (n) and (o) have been added to include supervisory employees who are category II peace officers, category III peace officers and firefighters, respectively. It separates them into supervisory employee categories I, II and III and supervisory employees who are firefighters.

CHAIR FLORES:

Why do firefighters need that? What is happening now?

TODD INGALSBEE (Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada):

Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada (PFFN) represents Nevada Division of Forestry firefighters through the State. The PFFN represents all its members except the 18 supervisors because they are included in a general supervisors' contract.

This bill would allow them to negotiate a contract as their brothers and sisters do which are based in all local municipalities. There are supervisor and nonsupervisory contracts. This would give supervisors the same benefits that most of our municipalities have.

SENATOR DALY:

Does anything with what you are trying to do in this bill correspond with the Government Employee-Management Relations Board (GEMRB)? Are there any rules to make those determinations? There is no process set up under the GEMRB.

MR. MCCANN:

There are certain requirements within the GEMRB for public employees. We do deal with the term "community of interest." It is frowned upon to have supervisors in the same bargaining units as the people they supervise.

SENATOR DALY:

I agree. Supervisors in the private sector are not allowed to bargain in most cases. Allowing supervisors to bargain is the way to go. I support the bill and the inclusion of firefighters. It is necessary to fix the problem.

We will let the other supervisory categories, whichever union might be representing them that has an issue, bring their own bill later.

This bill will not interfere with any negotiated collective bargaining agreement. This is wide open and would create a lane for what you need to do which is appropriate.

MR. MCCANN:

Yes, to everything you said.

CARLA SCOTT (President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):

The Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees supports S.B. 166 and appreciates your consideration and support for this bill. There is value in this for the Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees.

KELLY RICHTER (Vice President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):

I support S.B. 166. This bill would go a long way in supporting the civilian law enforcement professionals and supervisors.

SEAN GALLAGHER (President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association):

I represent many officers employed by the State. I am involved in negotiations and representing them. In some instances, this might be considered a pro-union or pro-labor bill. This is a pro-efficiency bill.

All of you, as lawmakers, have a lot of work to do. It would be better if the union and State human resources worked out much of the administrative and contract issues instead of you getting caught up in it. The money and the pay bills could then come to you. That is what you focus on, so you are paying more attention to all the issues affecting the citizens of this State.

This bill creates inequity in the system which is an unintended consequence. In addition to being the president of the Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association (NSLEOA), I am also a State-employed law enforcement officer. What is the incentive for me to promote? The State has invested money and time in me to create a law enforcement professional. It seems the State would want me to stay, promote and use the supervisory skills it has invested in me. However, if I promote, I do not have any say at the table. I do not get to talk about my wages with anyone as do the officers I would supervise. There is no incentive for me to promote.

This is new to the State. Many supervisors who are members of the NSLEOA have said they will demote. Why would they remain a supervisor? There is no incentive. That was not the intended consequence of putting collective bargaining at the State level.

This is a housekeeping bill. Once everything is worked out, we will not have to come back to the Legislature except for the contract part at the end. This bill will increase efficiency.

ANTHONY GONZALES (Vice President, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers Association):

Senate Bill 166 fills a gap that needs to be addressed. It encompasses the supervisors who have not been able to collectively bargain. It fills the need that has been there for quite some time. Supervised employees have had the benefits of having a contract over the past two years. I have seen the impact on the supervisors who see the collectively bargained perks that have a lasting effect. This bill will remedy the problem, and I support S.B. 166.

TROYCE KRUMME (Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association):

I support S.B. 166. This bill addresses an issue that exists specifically at the State level and should be fixed for that individual group. There appears to be some confusion among civilian employees in police organizations, specifically at the supervisor level of State law enforcement.

As the Vice Chairman of the Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association and the lead bargaining member in the last two contract negotiations, bargaining runs smoothly at the local level. I look forward to our State counterparts having the same smooth-running collective bargaining that we enjoy in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

JOHN ABEL (Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association):

I support S.B. 166 as the bill that addresses an issue specifically at the State level and should be a fix for that individual group.

RANDY SOLTERO (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International):

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International (AFSCME) thanks the bill's sponsor and everyone involved in it.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 18

The AFSCME International had great discussions. Although there were difficulties in trying to get bills passed last Session, we found a way to work together. The AFSCME International supports S.B. 166.

SUSIE MARTINEZ (Nevada State AFL-CIO):

The Nevada AFL-CIO supports S.B. 166. Law enforcement officers work hard every day to protect communities across Nevada. However, the civilian employees working within each department often do not get the recognition they deserve. This bill would extend worker protections to civilian employees by ensuring they are not misclassified as supervisors and can still participate in union activities.

Supervisors should have the right to join a union like regular employees can. That is why this bill creates separate bargaining units for State law enforcement supervisors so they can collectively bargain and receive the full rights and benefits they deserve.

We must make sure everyone can freely and fairly participate in unionization activities. This bill is an essential next step to ensuring that every employee can be protected in their workplace. I urge the Committee to support S.B. 166.

KENT ERVIN (Nevada Faculty Alliance):

The Nevada Faculty Alliance supports S.B. 166 as amended. Our colleagues in the campus police in the southern and Northern Commands at the Nevada System of Higher Education are category I peace officers.

It makes sense for their supervisors to have their own bargaining unit. They meet the community of shared interest standard, which is a big stretch if they are in the same unit as supervisors for other categories of classified employees.

There are many vacancies among campus police. They have a hard time keeping people on their police force. Anything that helps keep people on the force is a good thing.

RICKY GOURRIER (Nevada Police Union):

The Nevada Police Union represents all category I peace officers in the State. We want to thank Senator Pazina for bringing this forward and especially for the carveout of the supervisors in the different classifications, category I, category II and category III. For every other reason, I say ditto.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 19

FRAN ALMARAZ (Teamsters Local No. 14):  
I say ditto.

CARTER BUNDY (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International):

The AFSCME International thanks Senator Pazina and Assemblyman Hibbetts for their sponsorship of this bill for the reasons previously stated and supports the bill with the amendments. The AFSCME International also wants to thank Mr. McCann, Mr. Ingalsbee and others who have worked with AFSCME International to bring this to a good place.

DOLLY JONES:

I am a category II supervisor with the Youth Parole Bureau, Division of Child and Family Services, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services. I support S.B. 166.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Service Employees International Union Local 1107):  
I am a ditto also.

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

The Government Employee-Management Relations Board (GEMRB) is neutral on section 2 of the bill.

When S.B. No. 135 of the 80th Session was first drafted, it provided ten bargaining units. Each of those ten bargaining units was to include both supervisory employees and rank-and-file employees.

I was brought in as a technical resource to the Governor's Office to look at potential pitfalls of that bill. I pointed out that at the local government level, supervisors had their own bargaining unit apart from the rank and file to avoid conflict-of-interest situations.

One of the things changed in S.B. No. 135 of the 80th Session was to create a separate supervisory bargaining unit. Various alterations were considered—one was to have a separate supervisory bargaining unit for each of the ten rank-and-file units. That was considered too many. Another consideration was to have supervisory bargaining units—one for uniformed employees such as police and fire and one for regular white- and blue-collar employees. In the end,

right or wrong, the enacted bill provided for one supervisory bargain unit which would consist of all supervisors, no matter what type.

The GEMRB stands ready and is willing and able to support administering whatever decision this Committee and the full Legislature thinks is best as to whether there should be separate supervisory bargaining units for police and fire departments.

AI ROJAS:

I am neutral on this bill. I have a vision for our community which defines law-abiding as a community in which law-abiding citizens and law enforcement have the upper hand. I ask that you take that definition in your guidance. It appears that most of the people in law enforcement support this bill.

Since I am not knowledgeable in law enforcement, I do not want to take a position. However, I want to take the position that you put law-abiding citizenship and the safety of our community first and to encourage people to become police officers.

We have a 30 percent understaffed law enforcement force in Clark County. We are losing officers. We want to make it appealing so that people become law officers. When law enforcement and law-abiding citizens have the advantage over the criminal element, that is going to make the law enforcement field more appealing. We want to keep that margin.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

I support law enforcement. There are many great things about this bill. I am concerned about it because I hear the term collective bargaining. I hear that we do not follow in the footsteps of states like California, New York and Illinois with high salaries and high pensions. This results in high taxes. There are constant articles about people leaving those states in the hundreds of thousands every year.

I am also concerned because this State used to be among the fastest-growing states. Given its policy changes in the last few years, it is no longer in the top ten. Please consider my concerns.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 21

SENATOR PAZINA:

Thank you for the opportunity to present S.B. 166. This bill is important because it gives our civilian employees an opportunity to join their brothers and sisters in collective bargaining. It also gives supervisors the opportunity to join those who have been working with them for so long. It is difficult to hear someone say, what is their incentive to be promoted to a supervisory level?

I urge you to support this important legislation.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 166 and open public comment.

MARGARET ANN COLEMAN:

I am placed under hardship matter for 43 years now. This is due to an employee injury on the job at the Golden Nugget Casino. ... supposed to gotten paid by the payroll department. The conduct and misconduct, all money collected by all under conspiracy of the state staff of the government embezzling me just to take over my living arrangements and my workman's compensation and my pension to overthrow my court order won March 4, 1982, and October 14, 1981. This is due to noncompliance by deputy administration staff. Deputy Shauna Moore Hughes used me for her self-alliance and taking my name for herself to keep all amount.

I am a citizen of the United States and of Nevada. They have only wanted to kick me outside because of my color, as a woman and using the insurance policy of the insurer contract issued to pay injured employee under summons—all lump sum—credit due going on for 43 years now. Placing themselves under contempt of court order A204984. Now they are blaming me, Margaret Ann Coleman, for standing up for equal rights under the bill act of collection on my behalf for injured party on the job of the legislation. Marilyn Kirkpatrick and all the board members due to the employment contract signed January 31, 1980, as a slot personnel.

I have been deprived as of today 2023, since 1980, I have received nothing.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 22

CHAIR FLORES:

Thank you for sharing your story. It may be wise for you to reach out to our staff and maybe we can help point you in the right direction, whether it be a State agency or whoever could potentially help you with your issue.

Feel free to reach out directly to our staff, and we will try to direct you to the correct agency or individuals that can help.

Ms. COLEMAN:

Do you think consumer affairs could help?

CHAIR FLORES:

I do not want to misguide you, but if you email me, we can direct you to the right agency.

Ms. COLEMAN:

"I do not know you, Edgar Flores. Excuse me."

CHAIR FLORES:

No worries. I will have our staff in Las Vegas provide you with my email and my office number. They can then coordinate and hopefully point you in the right direction.

Ms. COLEMAN:

"I appreciate you, and my name is Margaret Coleman."

MR. ROJAS:

I wanted to bring attention to your task force there or to your group that I have been talking. You know, I am involved in the community and I have been talking to a lot of the people that are citizens and people that are leaders and there seems to be an interest in what I call a homeless task force forum summit in an effort to have a more say for community, which I defined as one in which law-abiding citizens and law enforcement have the upper hand over criminals.

Unfortunately, everybody agrees that people are using the word homelessness to be a giant tent which includes people that have

mental problems, people that have health problems and handicaps that can't get a job. People who have lost their jobs and are trying to get back in the game and people who are just loitering and, looking for opportunities to rip people off. And as you know, there's an increase in people stealing catalytic converters, breaking into cars. I had my car broken into and stolen. Luckily, we got it back because we got a great law enforcement, and we were able to track them down by them using my credit cards. But when I went to do my report, another lady was telling me she wanted to go walk her dog in a walk park and when she came back, they broke into her car and stole her purse. So, I have been talking to people that are in the police department. I can't say who. People that are in the firefighting department, people who have a background in criminal justice, people who are judges, people who are therapists and they all think that somewhere down the road, we should have a yearly task force where people of all these disciplines in policing, mental, criminal, concerned citizens, FBI for security theft. Because they did, they stole my security and I am going to be filing FBI postal that got into my mail. They are actually going into the post office and picking up my mail with my ID. So we need to have a safer community. You know that we are going to be hosting the Super Bowl. And you know, we are the entertainment capital of the world, and we want to keep it safe for our community. Nobody wants to come to a community where they get ripped off and they are concerned about their safety.

So, I guess what I am trying to say is that hopefully, maybe one of you guys can come up with the bill or maybe I can supply a bill. But I want you to know that there's an interest for a task force and eventually somewhere down the line, the fact that we have so many homeless people who are eventually going to have to go there and break this problem up into manageable pieces.

Usually, problems are unmanageable. As a retired electronics, degreed engineer with two patents, I know you have to know how to break a problem into its pieces. And I just wanted to bring that, and I am glad that there's a lot of law enforcement people there listening, and they probably would agree that, like some of the others, that this may be a good first approach and that somewhere

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 24

down the road, we are going to need something like this for the State of Nevada.

CHAIR FLORES:

This Committee will have numerous bills discussing our homeless population. Hopefully, you can participate in that process as well. Feel free to reach out to my office. There are local jurisdictions with versions of a task force with which you could engage in conversation. Feel free to reach out to us so we can put you in contact with them.

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

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 6, 2023  
Page 25

CHAIR FLORES:

This meeting of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs is adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Suzanne Efford,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Introduced on Minute Report Page No.</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 19	C	3	James Chrisley / Department of Aviation, Clark County	Presentation
S.B. 19	D	7	Joanna Jacob / Clark County	SNSA Map
S.B. 166	E	13	Senator Julie Pazina	Proposed Amendment