LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS AS REQUIRED BY NRS 233B.066 LCB FILE R043-13

The following statement is submitted for adopted amendments to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 288.

1. A clear and concise explanation of the need for the adopted regulations.

The regulations establish a settlement conference program which hopefully will resolve some cases without the need for a formal hearing. It also makes minor changes to the procedure in prohibited practice and declaratory order cases, and helps conform the regulations pertaining to petition for rehearing with the requirement for judicial review.

2. A description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of this summary.

Copies of the proposed regulations, notices of workshop and notices of intent to act upon the regulations were sent by U.S. mail and/or email to all local governments and employee organizations who filed an annual report with the agency, to persons who were known to have an interest in the subject of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board as well as to any persons who had specifically requested such notice. These documents were also made available at the website of the Employee-Management Relations Board (EMRB), www.emrb.state.nv.us, mailed to all county libraries in Nevada and posted at the following locations:

State of Nevada Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board 2501 E. Sahara Ave., Ste. 203 Las Vegas, NV 89104

Supreme Court Library 201 S. Carson Street #100 Carson City, NV 89701

State of Nevada Bradley Building 2501 E. Sahara Ave., Main Lobby Las Vegas, NV 89104

State of Nevada Department of Business & Industry 1830 College Parkway, Ste. 100 Carson City, NV 89706 Attorney General's Office Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89101

Nevada State Library & Archives 100 N. Stewart Street Carson City, NV 89701

Clark County Personnel 500 S. Grand Central Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89101

State of Nevada Department of Business & Industry 555 E. Washington Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89101 A workshop was held on January 22, 2014, and the minutes of that meeting, attached hereto as Exhibit A, contain a summary of the discussion held regarding the proposed regulations. Two written responses were also received. Thereafter, on or about January 29, 2014, the Commissioner issued a Notice of Intent to Act Upon a Regulation.

A public hearing was then held on March 11, 2014, and the minutes of that public hearing, attached hereto as Exhibit B, contain a summary of the discussion held regarding the proposed regulations.

On June 23, 2014 the Legislative Commission objected a section of the proposed regulations pertaining to runoff elections and requested that the proposed change not be made. Thereupon the Board held another public hearing on July 10, 2014. No comments were made at the public hearing. The Board then readopted the regulations, making the change to exclude from the proposed regulations any provision concerning runoff elections, as requested by the Legislative Commission. The minutes of the July 10, 2014 meeting are attached hereto as Exhibit D.

A copy of the summary of the public response to the proposed regulation may be obtained from the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, 2501 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 203, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 or via email to emrb@business.nv.gov.

3. The number of persons who:

(a) Attended each hearing:

January 22, 2014 Workshop: 7 in Las Vegas and 4 in Carson City via teleconference (not including EMRB Board members and staff)

March 11, 2014 Public Hearing: 3 in Las Vegas (not including EMRB Board members and staff)

July 10, 2014 Public Hearing: 0

(b) Testified at each hearing:

January 22, 2014 Workshop: 2 March 11, 2014 Public Hearing: 2 July 10, 2014: 0

- (c) Submitted to the agency written comments: 2
- 4. A list of names and contact information, including telephone number, business address, business telephone number, electronic mail address, and name of entity or organization represented, for each person identified above in #3, as provided to the agency, is attached as Exhibit C.

5. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response, and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Comments were solicited from affected businesses in the same manner as they were solicited from the public, namely via mailings to all local governments and employee organizations who have filed an annual report with the agency plus to others who were known to have an interest in the subject of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board as well as to any persons who had specifically requested such notice. Comments were received at both the workshop and the public hearing plus written comments were also received. The minutes of both the workshop and the public hearing, the small business impact statement and the summary may be obtained as instructed in the response to question #2.

6. If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting the regulation without change.

The only comments at the public hearing concerned a change in the regulations for runoff elections, making runoff elections discretionary instead of mandatory (i.e., changing "will" to "may"). The discussion revolved around the possible need for standards when the Board might exercise its discretion. After discussion the Board considered this to be a different topic which could be addressed in a possible future round of rulemaking. However, at the June 23, 2014 Legislative Commission meeting the Legislative Commission objected to the proposed runoff election change to the regulations. As described above, the Board reconsidered its prior action on July 10, 2014 and after a public hearing on that date, agreed to the Legislative Commission's request not to change the runoff election provision and thus removed that proposed change.

7. The established economic effect of the adopted regulation on the businesses which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:

(a) Both adverse and beneficial effects; and

There will be no adverse effects on the businesses that the EMRB regulates. On the contrary, the proposed regulations have several features that may minimize the impact of the law firms that represent clients who appear before the agency.

Section 1 provides for settlement conferences. To the extent that a case may settle prior to the hearing, a law firm may save a significant number of hours in the representation of its client. Moreover, the regulation provides that the EMRB may not require additional statements or briefs for the settlement conference. Neither may the EMRB create any guidelines that would impose an undue expense.

Sections 3 and 4 do away with the requirement that a complaint be verified or that an answer be sworn. This would save the expense of a law firm having to identify

the appropriate person to sign the pleading and then having the lawyer meet and explain the requirement to that person.

Finally, Section 6 of the proposed regulation requires parties to exchange exhibits at least five days prior to a pre-hearing conference. This feature may reduce the printing costs of preparing exhibits in that duplicative exhibits may be converted into joint exhibits.

Neither will there be any adverse effects on the public. This is for the same reasons as stated above.

(b) Both immediate and long-term effects.

There will be no immediate or long-term adverse effects on the businesses that the EMRB regulates. For the reasons stated in #7a above, the proposed regulations will have both immediate and long-term beneficial effects on those businesses.

There will be no immediate or long-term adverse effects on the public. For the reasons stated in #7a above, the proposed regulations will have both immediate and long-term beneficial effects on the public in that any cases filed have the potential of being handled more efficiently through settlement conferences and other features as described above.

8. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulations.

There is no additional cost to the agency for enforcement of this regulation.

9. A description of any regulations of other state or government agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.

There are no other state or government agency regulations that the proposed regulation duplicates.

10. If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation which regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.

There are no federal regulations that apply.

11. If the regulation provides a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.

This regulation does not provide a new fee or increase an existing fee.

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

2501 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 203, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 (702) 486-4504 Fax (702) 486-4355 www.emrb.state.nv.us

January 29, 2014

MINUTES OF THE WORKSHOP TO SOLICIT COMMENTS FOR NEW REGULATION, OR CHANGES TO EXISTING REGULATION

A workshop of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations, properly noticed and posted, pursuant to the Nevada Open Meeting Law, was held on <u>Wednesday</u>, <u>January 22, 2014</u>, at the hour of 1:30 p.m. at the **Grant Sawyer State Building**, Room #4412, 555 E. Washington Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Legislative Building, Room #2134, 401 S. Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The meeting was conducted by EMRB Commissioner Bruce K. Snyder.

Also present representing the EMRB were: Philip E. Larson, EMRB Chairman

Scott Davis, Esq., Deputy Attorney General

Yvonne V. Martinez, EMRB Board

Secretary

Present from the public in Las Vegas were: Jen Sarafina, Kamer Zucker Abbott

Barbara King, Clark County Human

Resources

Mark Olson, Las Vegas Convention &

VisitorsAuthority

Doug Spring, University Medical Center

Yolanda Givens, Clark County Matthew Cecil, Fisher & Phillips Sara Cholhagian, Snell & Wilmer

Present from the public in Carson City were: Chris Syverson, City of Sparks

Steve Driscoll, City of Sparks Frank Flaherty, Dyer Lawrence

Johan Childers, AFSCME Local 4041

The Agenda:

Item 1 General Public Comment.

No public comment was offered.

Item 2 Review of Proposed Regulation to Establish an EMRB Settlement Conference Program.

Frank Flaherty inquired as to the rationale for excluding declaratory orders from the proposed settlement program. Commissioner Snyder asked the Deputy Attorney General to respond, who stated that declaratory orders by nature do not have a remedy and therefore there is little leverage for a settlement. He further stated that the proposed regulations do change the procedure for declaratory orders, which will be discussed later in the meeting. Commissioner Snyder stated that the purpose of a declaratory order is for the Board to interpret its statute. If the parties ended up drafting a settlement under the program then the process could result in the parties determining the meaning of the statute instead of the Board.

Flaherty then asked if the EMRB would be willing to voluntarily assist the parties in discussions on such matters. Commissioner Snyder responded by stating that it is always good for parties to talk and that he would be willing to assist in informal negotiations.

- Item 3 Review of Proposed Changes to Requirements for Runoff Elections.

 No questions or comments were offered by those in attendance.
- **Item 4** Review of Proposed Changes Relating to Board Procedure in Prohibited Labor Practice.

Cases

Steve Driscoll asked about the paperwork submission requirements in sections 4, 5, 6, and 11 of the proposed regulations and whether they could be replaced with some form of electronic filing of documents. Commissioner Snyder responded that this is also a topic for the following open forum. However, since becoming the Commissioner he has learned that the agency scans all filings and thus only needs one copy in that scanned copies are circulated to those who need to see the document. Moreover, in reviewing the proposed regulations, Department of Business & Industry Director Bruce Breslow also commented that the agency should move in the direction of the electronic filing of documents and that as the Commissioner he concurs in this assessment. The only issue is how best to do so.

Frank Flaherty commented that there should be an option for parties to either electronically file documents or to file paper documents, as some individuals, including those representing themselves, may not have access to electronic devices. He also stated that the agency should only require one paper copy instead of the current five copies.

Item 5 Review of Proposed Changes Relating to Board Procedure in Declaratory Order Cases.

Commissioner Snyder asked Deputy Attorney General Davis to explain the revised procedure. There were no questions or comments by those in attendance.

Item 6 Review of Proposed Changes Relating to Board Procedure for Petitions for Rehearing.

Frank Flaherty inquired about section 18 of the proposed regulations, which would repeal NAC 288.366. In response, Commissioner Snyder asked Deputy Attorney General Davis to respond, who stated that under the Administrative Procedures Act NAC 288.366 was redundant and that the new procedure for rehearing was to provide for a Board decision on the motion for rehearing prior to the deadline to file for judicial review.

Item 7 Additional Period of General Public Comment.

Commissioner Snyder mentioned that he had received written comments from Tammara Williams of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Commissioner Snyder asked if anyone would like the three-page letter read, and hearing no response, the Commissioner stated that the letter would be placed into the record. No other public comment was offered.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Bruce K. Snyder EMRB Commissioner

EXHIBIT B

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

2501 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 203, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 (702) 486-4504 Fax (702) 486-4355

www.emrb.state.nv.us

March 13, 2014

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

A public hearing of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, properly noticed and posted, pursuant to the Nevada Open Meeting Law, was held on <u>Tuesday, March 11, 2014</u>, at the hour of 8:00 a.m. at the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, 2501 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 203, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The following Board members were present: Philip E. Larson, Chairman

Sandra Masters, Vice - Chairman

Brent C. Eckersley, Esq., Board Member

Also present: Bruce K. Snyder, EMRB Commissioner

Scott Davis, Esq., Deputy Attorney General Yvonne V. Martinez, EMRB Executive

Assistant

Present from the public: Thomas J. Donaldson, Dyer Lawrence

Scott Johnson, IAFF Local 1607 Eric Myers, McCracken, Stemerman,

Bowen & Holsberry

The Agenda:

Item 1 The public hearing was called to order by Philip E. Larson, Chairman, on

Tuesday, March 11, 2014.

Item 2 General Public Comment.

No public comment was offered.

Item 3 Public hearing pursuant to NRS 233B.061(3) on proposed permanent regulations

that pertain to Chapter 288 of the Nevada Administrative Code: Legislative

Counsel Bureau Assigned Number R043-13.

a. Oral public comment pertaining to Proposed Permanent Regulation R043-13. Eric Myers stated he was here on behalf of Kristin Martin, who could not

attend due to a scheduling conflict. He stated his comments were in

response to changing the word "will" to "may" in section 2 of the proposed regulations, which would amend NAC 288.110. He offered several reasons for rejecting the proposed change, including that there were no standards for the exercise of the Board's discretion and that the Board had a duty to resolve a representation issue and not stop the process once it had begun. Instead he offered a change, which would amend subsection 10(d) and add subsection 11 of the regulation in question as an alternative means of resolving representation disputes under the so-called supermajority rule. Upon request of Chairman Larson, Mr. Myers stated he would submit written comments to the Commissioner regarding his proposal.

Thomas Donaldson stated that he could provide comments in writing to the Commissioner regarding this issue. After discussion the Board considered this to be a different topic which could be addressed in a possible future round of rulemaking.

- b. Board consideration of all oral public comment and any written comments previously received pertaining to Proposed Permanent Regulation R043-13. Commissioner Snyder stated that in addition to today's oral comments that the Board has the minutes of the workshop conducted on January 22, 2014, which contain oral comments offered on that day, as well as two written comments offered prior to the workshop. Chairman Larson stated it was his opinion that it would be best to adopt the proposed regulations as is and make possible further changes in a subsequent round later this year.
- Item 4 Final Adoption of Proposed Permanent Regulation R043-13.

 Upon motion, the Board adopted Proposed Permanent Regulation R043-13, as presented.
- Item 5 General Public Comment.

 Eric Myers stated his position that the adoption of the proposed regulations should not affect outstanding cases involving elections.

1 2	
/s/	
Bruce K. Snyder	
EMRB Commissioner	

Respectfully submitted.

EXHIBIT C

Exhibit C

Jen Sarafina, Esq.

KAMER ZUCKER ABBOTT 3000 West Charleston Blvd., Suite 3

Las Vegas, NV 89102 Phone: (702) 259-8640 Email: jsarafina@kzalaw.com

Yolanda Givens, Esq.

Clark County

Deputy District Attorney 500 South Grand Central Pkwy.

PO Box 552215 Las Vegas, NV 89155 Phone: (702) 455-4761

Email: yolanda.givens@clarkcountyda.com

Matthew Cecil, Esq.

FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP

3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 950

Las Vegas, NV 89109 Phone: (702) 252-3131

Email: mcecil@laborlawyers.com

Sara Cholhagian

SNELL & WILMER, LLP

3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 1100

Las Vegas, NV 89169 Phone: (702) 784-5200

Frank Flaherty, Esq.

DYER, LAWRENCE, FLAHERTY, DONALDSON. & PRUNTY

2805 Mountain Street Carson City, NV 89703 Phone: (775) 885-1896

Email: fflaherty@dyerlawrence.com

Thomas J. Donaldson, Esq.

DYER, LAWRENCE, FLAHERTY,

DONALDSON & PRUNTY 2805 Mountain Street

Carson City, NV 89703 Phone: (775) 885-1896

Email: tdonaldson@dyerlawrence.com

Doug Spring

University Medical Center of Southern Nevada

1800 W. Charleston Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89102 Phone: (702) 383-2557

Email: doug.spring@umcsn.com

Scott Johnson

I.A.F.F., Local #1607 Vice President PO Box 751510

Las Vegas, NV 89136 Phone: (702) 429-3294

Eric Myers, Esq.

McCracken, Stemerman, Bowen & Holsberry

1630 S. Commerce Street, Suite A-1

Las Vegas, NV 89102 Phone: (702) 386-5107 Email: ebm@dcbsf.com

Barbara King

Clark County Human Resources Employee Relations Manager

PO Box 551791 Las Vegas, NV 89155 Phone: (702) 455-5598

Email: <u>bking@ClarkCountyNV.gov</u>

Chris Syverson City of Sparks

Human Resource Manager

431 Prater Way Sparks,NV 89431 Phone: (775) 353-2345

Mark Olson

Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority Senior Vice President of Human Resources

3150 Paradise Road Las Vegas, NV 89109 Phone: (702) 892-7529 Email: molson@lvcva.com

Steve Driscoll City of Sparks City Manager 431 Prater Way Sparks, NV 89432 Phone: (775) 353-2345

Johan Childers

AFSCME Local 4041-Comstock Chapter

PO Box 141

Virginia City, NV 89440 Phone: (775) 813-4547

EXHIBIT D

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

2501 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 203, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 (702) 486-4504 Fax (702) 486-4355 www.emrb.state.nv.us

July 11, 2014

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

A telephonic board meeting of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, properly noticed and posted pursuant to the Nevada Open Meeting Law, was held on <u>Tuesday</u>, <u>July 10, 2014</u>, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. at the <u>Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board</u>, 2501 East Sahara Avenue, Room 203, Las Vegas, NV 89104.

The following Board members were present: Philip E. Larson, Chairman

Sandra Masters, Vice - Chairman

Brent C. Eckersley, Esq., Board Member

Also present: Bruce K. Snyder, EMRB Commissioner

Yvonne Martinez, EMRB Board Secretary Scott Davis, Esq., Deputy Attorney General

The Agenda:

Item 1 The Board meeting was called to order by Philip E. Larson, Chairman, on

Thursday, July 10, 2014.

Item 2 Public Comment.

No public comment was offered.

Item 3 Approval of the Minutes.

The Board approved the minutes as presented for the meeting held on June 10, 2014.

Item 4 Regulation R043-13.

A. Public Hearing for LCB File No. R043-13.

No comments were received on the regulation or the proposed change

thereto.

B. Discussion and Possible Adoption of LCB File No. R043-13. Upon motion, the Board adopted LCB File No. R043-13 with the recommended change by the Legislative Commission that deleted Section 2 concerning runoff elections.

Item 5 <u>Deliberations/Discussions/Pronouncements of Orders.</u>

A. Stipulations.

- 1. Consolidated Case No. A1-046067, <u>International Association of Firefighters</u>, Local 1607 v. City of North Las Vegas and Case No. A1-046069, North Las Vegas Police Officers Association v. City of North Las <u>Vegas</u>. Upon motion, the Board granted the Stipulation and Order to Dismiss, as presented, with each party responsible for its own attorney's fees and costs.
- 2. Case No. A1-046099, <u>July Wright v. Lyon County</u>, <u>Jeffery A. Page in his official capacity as Lyon County Manager and Robert Auer in his official capacity as Lyon County District Attorney</u>. *The Board tabled this item as the proposed stipulation was not received prior to the Board meeting*.
- 3. Case No. A1-046114, <u>Tammy Bonner and Bachera Washington v. City Of North Las Vegas</u>. *Upon motion, the Board granted the Stipulation and Order to Stay Proceedings*.
- 4. Case No. A1-046119, Shannon D'Ambrosio v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Case No. A1-046121, Shannon D'Ambrosio v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Upon motion, the Board granted the Stipulation to Consolidate Cases.

B. Motions and Other Pleadings.

- 1. Case No. A1-046119, Shannon D'Ambrosio v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Since the stipulation in item number 5A4 above included a provision withdrawing the motion to dismiss that had been filed by the respondent, the Board took no action on this item.
- C. Cases in the Queue for Possible Future Hearing.
 - 2. Case No. A1-046082, <u>SEIU, Local 1107 v. University Medical Center.</u>
 Commissioner Snyder stated that since the time that the agenda had been issued, the agency had received a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal filed by the Complainant, which will be placed on the August agenda for consideration by the Board. Therefore, the possible scheduling of this case for hearing was tabled by the Board.

Item 6 *Status of Cases by Commissioner.*

A. Consolidated Case No. A1-045847 - A1-045864, <u>Deborah Boland, M.D., a Local Government Employee and member of the UMC Physicians'</u>
<u>Bargaining Unit of Nevada Service Employees Union, SEIU Local 1107, AFL-CIO, CLC, et al. vs. Nevada Service Employees Union, SEIU Local</u>

1107, AFL-CIO and Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC. Commissioner Snyder reported that the hearing in August would consist of witnesses appearing in response to the issuance of subpoenas for records and that the Board may be called upon at that time to rule on various motions that might be made by the attorneys in this regard. The hearing would then be continued until December, at which time the actual hearing on the merits would commence.

Item 7 Agency Personnel, Administrative & Budget Matters.

A. Review of Attorney Hours.

Commissioner Snyder reviewed the report on hours worked by the Deputy Attorney General for the past two years. He also stated that per the request of Chairman Larson he had subsequently written a letter to the Attorney General to advise her that the budget proposal had been withdrawn and to request monthly billing statements in the future so that the agency could monitor its usage of the Attorney General's Office.

Item 8 <u>Public Comment.</u>
No public comment was offered.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Bruce K. Snyder EMRB Commissioner