

2025 SENATE INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS

SB 2051

2025 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Industry and Business Committee Fort Union Room, State Capitol

SB 2051
1/8/2025

A bill relating to the fees charged by ND Private Investigation & Security board.

10:11 a.m. Chairman Barta called the meeting to order.

Members present: Chairman Barta, Vice Chairman Boehm, Senators: Enget, Kessel, Klein

Discussion Topics:

- Fees charged by ND Private Investigative & Security board.
- Necessity of additional employee to address backlog.
- Electronic applications in place of paper.

10:11 a.m. John J. Shorey III, NDPI SB, Executive Director, testified in favor and submitted testimony #28180.

10:36 a.m. Steve Lundin, Vice Chairman, ND Private Investigation & Security Board, testified in favor.

10:54 a.m. Chairman Barta closed the hearing.

10:54 a.m. Chairman Barta opened the hearing to discussion regarding SB 2051.

10:57 a.m. Chairman Barta closed the hearing.

Steven Hall for Audrey Oswald, Committee Clerk

Testimony of the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board (NDPISB)
Senate Bill No. 2051
Senate Industry and Business Committee
January 8th, 2025

Chairman Barta and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to comment on Senate Bill 2051. My name is John Shorey, Executive Director of the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board, otherwise known as the NDPISB. My public testimony today is advocating for passage of Senate Bill 2051 as proposed by the Board, and to answer any questions the Committee has on the bill.

COMMENTS ON BILL DRAFT

Senate Bill 2051 does two things 1) changes fee categories charged by the Board, and 2), changes the private security training certificate from one-time fee to an initial fee with a renewal and late fees. All of these changes are under section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code.

1) The fee categories changes are broken down below:

<u>Current</u>		<u>Proposed</u>
Examination Applicant Fee*	\$100	\$200
PI & Security Provider License*	\$150	\$300
Late Fee PI & Security Provider License#	\$50	\$100
Agency Application Fee*	\$100	\$200
Agency License*	\$300	\$600
Late Fee Agency #	\$100	\$200
Security Trainer (one-time fee) *	\$25	\$60 (initial & renewal)
Late Fee-Security Trainer (new) #		\$20
Armed Certification*	\$30	\$60
Late Fee-Armed Certification#	\$10	\$20
Duplicate License*	\$20	\$40
PI and Security Registration*	\$30	\$60
Late Fee-PI and Security Registration#	\$10	\$20
Armed First Responder Course Initial*	\$400	\$800
Armed First Responder Course Renewal *	\$300	\$600

* Denotes the language “may not exceed” is included

Denotes the language “not to exceed” is included

2) The changes to the private security training certificate include changing the fee from a one-time fee of \$25.00 to an initial fee of \$60 with a renewal fee of \$60 and a late fee of \$20. Starting in the year 2019, the Board required security trainers and weapons instructors to complete a renewal application with no fee attached to that renewal. Prior to this the Board contacted trainers and instructors asking if they were still active each renewal season and if they were, would keep the file active, and if not, would inactive the file. The Board found that this was not a very effective method of handling trainer and instructor

renewals nor did it capture pertinent information as far as if the trainer or instructor had any criminal convictions or pending criminal actions since they initially applied to the Board. These two reasons were behind the rationale for the Board requiring trainers and instructors to submit a renewal application. The Board believes since they are processing these renewal applications currently, with no fees assessed to cover Board staff time and expenses, that it would be appropriate to make the proposed changes.

As the Committee is likely aware, the Board does not receive annual appropriations to fund its operations. All funding is derived from the licensing and certification fees the Board assesses. This amendment reflects the increased costs of administrating the licensing and certification of private investigative and private security providers. Senate Bill 2051 would help address those costs and support continued Board administrative functions.

Historically the Board has had two employees, the Executive Director and an administrative assistant. For the last four years the Board has been operating with one employee mainly due to budget constraints. This has led to a backlog in certain Board operations, mainly the processing of renewal applications, due in-part to a lack of staffing. The Board would like to use the increased revenue to hire a part-time administrative assistant to assist in clearing the backlog, and after that, to assist with day-to-day operations of the Board.

The Board has seen increased legal and operating expenses. This includes out of – ordinary expenses related to the Board’s response to the DAPL situation and administrating the Armed First Responder Training Program. The Board’s total expenses for the last several years have been more than its total revenue.

Lastly, the Board would like to explore the possibility of moving its application process from paper based to electronic. This is something the industry has asked for also. With the lack of funds to do so, the Board has not done any research in this area. With the increased revenue, it would allow the Board to explore this as a possibility, and implement it if feasible.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present this testimony. We, the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board, urge you to issue a do pass recommendation on Senate Bill 2051. I would stand for any questions you may have.

John Shorey,
Executive Director, North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board.

2025 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Industry and Business Committee Fort Union Room, State Capitol

SB 2051
1/8/2025

A Bill relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

2:25 p.m. Chairman Barta opened the hearing.

Members present: Chairman Barta, Vice-Chairman Boehm, Senator Klein, Senator Kessel, Senator Enget.

2:26 p.m. Senator Klein moved amendment # 25.8022.01001.

2:26 p.m. Senator Kessel seconded the motion.

Senators	Vote
Senator Jeff Barta	Y
Senator Keith Boehm	Y
Senator Mark Enget	Y
Senator Greg Kessel	Y
Senator Jerry Klein	Y

2:30 p.m. Motion passed 5-0-0.

2:30 p.m. Senator Klein moved a Do Pass As Amended of Senate Bill 2051.

2:31 p.m. Senator Boehm seconded the motion.

Senators	Vote
Senator Jeff Barta	Y
Senator Keith Boehm	Y
Senator Mark Enget	Y
Senator Greg Kessel	Y
Senator Jerry Klein	Y

2:32 p.m. Motion passed 5-0-0.

2:33 p.m. Senator Klein will carry the bill.

2:34 Chairman Barta adjourned the meeting.

Audrey Oswald, Committee Clerk

January 8, 2025

Sixty-ninth
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO

SENATE BILL NO. 2051

Introduced by

Industry and Business Committee

(At the request of the Private Investigative and Security Board)

AB
1 of 2

1 A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code,
2 relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to
3 declare an emergency.

4 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

5 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code is
6 amended and reenacted as follows:

7 **43-30-16. Examination, license, and registration fees.**

8 The board may establish by rule and charge the following fees:

- 9 1. The fee to be paid by an applicant for an examination to determine the applicant's
10 fitness to receive a license as a private investigator or a license to provide private
11 security services may not exceed ~~one hundred~~ two hundred dollars.
- 12 2. The fee to be paid by an applicant for the initial issuance or the renewal of a license as
13 a private investigator or a license to provide private security services may not exceed
14 ~~one hundred fifty~~ three hundred dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~fifty~~ one hundred
15 dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 16 3. The fee to be paid by an applicant to apply for a license to conduct a private security
17 or detective agency may not exceed ~~one hundred~~ two hundred dollars.
- 18 4. The fee for the issuance or the renewal of a license to conduct a private security or
19 detective agency may not exceed ~~three hundred~~ six hundred dollars. A late fee not to
20 exceed ~~one hundred~~ two hundred dollars may be charged for each month the renewal
21 fee is due and unpaid.

04/13 2 of 2

5. The ~~one-time~~initial fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of a private security training certificate may not exceed ~~twenty-five~~sixty dollars. The fee for the renewal of a private security training certificate may not exceed sixty dollars. A late fee not to exceed twenty dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
6. The annual fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of an armed certificate may not exceed ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~tent~~twenty dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
7. The fee to be paid for the issuance of a duplicate license may not exceed ~~twenty~~forty dollars.
8. The initial registration fee to provide private investigative service or private security service may not exceed ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. The fee for the renewal of a registration to provide private investigative service or private security service may not exceed ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~tent~~twenty dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
9. The initial application fee for a certified course instructor for an armed first responder training certification may not exceed ~~four-hundred~~eight hundred dollars. A fee for renewal of a course instructor certification for an armed first responder program may not exceed ~~three-hundred~~six hundred dollars.

SECTION 2. EMERGENCY. This Act is declared to be an emergency measure.

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
SB 2051**

Industry and Business Committee (Sen. Barta, Chairman) recommends **AMENDMENTS** ([25.8022.01001](#)) and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (5 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). This bill does not affect workforce development.

2025 HOUSE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

SB 2051

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivisions Committee Room JW327B, State Capitol

SB 2051
3/6/2025

A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

9:59 a.m. Chairman Longmuir opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Longmuir, Vice-Chairman Fegley, Vice-Chairman Jonas, Representatives Bolinske, Davis, Hager, Hatlestad, Heilman, Klemin, Motschenbacher, Ostlie, Warrey

Members Absent: Representative Toman

Discussion Topics:

- Private investigative and security board duties and responsibilities
- Board member selection process
- Litigation involving the private investigative and security board
- Board licensed individuals and agencies

10:00 a.m. Chris Redmann, Board Legal Counsel for North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board, testified in favor and provided testimony #39095.

10:10 a.m. John Shorey, Executive Director of the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board, testified in favor and provided testimony #39132.

10:44 a.m. Steve Lundin, Retired Sergeant from the North Dakota Police Department, testified in favor.

10:59 a.m. Sara Cote, Owner of Apex Security and Investigations, testified in opposition and provided testimony #39138.

11:12 a.m. Jon Pumphrey, Owner of Elite Security Solutions, testified in opposition and provided testimony #39137.

Additional written testimony:

Justin Blinsky, Board Member of North Dakota Private Investigations and Security Board, submitted testimony in favor #39133

Nathan Anderson, Operations Manager and Security Trainer at Pro Dog DBE: Red River Security, submitted testimony in opposition #38928

Scott Williams, General Manager of Red River Security, submitted testimony in opposition #38607

Jeremie Meisel, Owner of EH Security LLC, submitted testimony in opposition #39150

House Political Subdivisions Committee

SB 2051

March 6, 2025

Page 2

Jason Dockter, Licensed Security Officer at Elite Security Solutions, submitted testimony in opposition #39154

Jon Jacobson, Tucson, Arizona, submitted testimony in opposition #38808

11:17 a.m. Chairman Longmuir closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

Chairman Barta and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on Senate Bill 2051. My name is Scott Williams, General Manager of Red River Security. We are a regulated agency under the authority of the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board (NDPISB). My public testimony today is advocating against passage of SB2051 as proposed by the Board.

In his testimony, Mr. Shorey states that “this amendment reflects the increased costs of administrating the licensing and certification of private investigators and private security providers.” Other than individual licenses now being actual cards, there has been absolutely no indication that there is any more work to be done now than in the past.

Further, Mr. Shorey stated that the Board “has seen increased legal and operating expenses. This includes out-of-ordinary expenses related to the Board’s response to the DAPL situation...” I would encourage the Committee to do a deep dive and ask Mr. Shorey the reason for the legal expenses, as well as why they appealed the lawsuit they lost to TigerSwan, leading to yet more expenses.

My agency, Red River Security, has faithfully submitted our renewal paperwork every year, as well as remitting payment for all renewals. The last time we received renewed licenses and pocket cards was in October of 2020. We have now been operating for five years without valid pocket cards which are required by state law. All we have received from Mr. Shorey is an email stating the Board considers our individual and agency licensure current as our paperwork has been received, and that only after requesting such documentation.

At every meeting I’ve attended for the last two years, Mr. Shorey has promised anywhere from two to six months that the backlog of renewals will be cleared. Yet year after year, we submit our renewal paperwork and receive no licenses in return. When we solicit clients, if they ask for our agency license as part of their due diligence, we have to provide them with Mr. Shorey’s written assurance that our license is in good standing, instead of providing a copy of our agency license.

It's true, Mr. Shorey is currently operating alone in the office. However, up until the DAPL situation, which is now approaching ten years ago, we received our renewed licenses on time. Ever since the legal action surrounding the Board and the DAPL situation occurred, we have faithfully paid for and submitted our renewals and have records of the checks being deposited, yet we have no renewals.

Mr. Shorey testified that “the Board’s total expenses for the last several years have been more than its total revenue.” I would encourage the Committee to ask Mr. Shorey for a breakdown of legal costs as well as costs associated with administrating the Armed First Responder Training Program, and to ask Mr. Shorey what accounts for the lion’s share of the

expense. My gut feeling is that the DAPL-associated legal actions account for the majority of the expenses.

I only learned of SB2051 through a colleague in the private security profession. If a regulator is proposing fee increases this massive, I would like to think the regulating agency would at least alert the associated businesses of the possibility of a rate increase, especially since this is being requested as an emergency measure. Instead, we received nothing, not even an email.

It seems that Mr. Shorey and the Board are attempting to defray their legal expenses by passing them on to the businesses they regulate. I do not and will never approve of this sort of proposed action. In short, it seems Mr. Shorey and the Board are attempting to solve a problem they created themselves, given the nature of the lawsuit they lost and then appealed.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee to issue a DO NOT PASS recommendation on SB2051. Members of the Committee and Chairman Barta, I thank you for your time.

Scott Williams
General Manager, Red River Security

I would like to voice my opposition to this proposed legislation. Doubling the the cost 2 licensees is an unnecessary burden. This would make North Dakota fees for private investigators and security guards and security companies among the highest in the country. I was previously licensed as a private investigator in North Dakota, California and Florida before retiring.

The private investigator and security board has become nothing more than an unelected, unregulated Code enforcement agency. In fact, there isn't a single person on the 5 member board, in addition to the executive director that has any standalone private investigation experience. Not one.

With absolute no oversight whatsoever and the financial straits they find themselves in, due to poor choices, namely the multiple 6 figure legal fees they incurred litigating against tiger swan are the reason they need more money.

They have offered no indication what they plan to use double the money for, how it's going to make their operation more efficient, how it's going to serve the licensees in a more efficient or better manner. What are we getting for our money? More litigation is likely the answer, tiger swan didn't turn out to be the payday they expected, so they're looking for some other deep pockets.

My suggestion is strong financial management and an audit of the board's books period.

Testimony of Nathan Anderson. Red River Security Operations Manager.

Senate Bill No. 2051

Senate Industry and Business Committee

March 5th, 2025

Chairman Barta and members of the Committee, thank you for taking the time to read my testimony. My name is Nathan Anderson, Operations Manager for Red River Security based in Grand Forks, ND. My licensing currently includes, Commissioned Security Officer Armed and Security Trainer. It has come to my attention that the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board (NDPISB) wishes to increase their fees by more than double. I wish to protest this sharp and burdensome increase in costs. I would ask that the Committee consider action to protect myself and the agency I work for from any retaliatory actions, as the testimony I am submitting will not always paint Mr. John Shorey and the NDPISB in a positive light.

In the draft of the bill, I have received, the NDPISB is asking to double current fees as well and add new fees for items that were not previously charged. This places a large burden on small security agencies like Red River security who are already struggling to make profits. Such an increase would be unfriendly to small businesses and may cause some small agencies to close. In my opinion the justifications presented by NDPISB fall flat.

The NDPISB includes in their justification for new fees for security trainers and instructors the following: "The Board found that this was not a very effective method of handling trainer and instructor 2 renewals nor did it capture pertinent information as far as if the trainer or instructor had any criminal convictions or pending criminal actions since they initially applied to the Board." This is easily mitigated by requiring that security trainers and instructors are either actively licensed security officers or have an ND Post license. This eliminates the need to run a new background on renewals for security trainers and instructors as the pertinent questions are addressed in renewing of security officer's licenses or POST certification. I am the Security trainer for my agency and I am also a Commissioned Security Officer. I would guess that most Security Trainers are also active officers who do training as a collateral duty. Can the NDPISB quantify how many Security Trainers are not also licensed Security officers?

The NDPISB has also claimed that they do not have the manpower to clear the backlogs of renewal applications. It is true that they are grossly behind on issuing renewal licenses. However, it is not, in my opinion, strictly a manpower issue. The last physical license I received was in May of 2021 (for renewals submitted in September of 2020). I should have received that card the previous September. Red River Security and other agencies have made numerous complaints to NDPISB about this issue. Every time Mr. Shorey said he would be caught up in a few months. I have gotten so used to Mr. Shorey saying he would be caught up soon that I just don't believe him anymore. We pay our renewal fees every year and Mr. Shorey fails to issue renewal licenses. If a client were to ask to see my license and notice that it expired in 2021, the client would have every right to breach the contract and we would have a claim to file for monetary loss. The renewal season runs from August to the end of September. Rather than hiring a full-time executive assistant who is only needed for a couple of months, perhaps members of the NDPISB could give some time to help Mr. Shorey keep up with his work.

I do not doubt the legal costs have gone up during Mr. Shorey's tenure as director. I have read the briefs on the law suits the NDPISB has defended. However, the increase in legal fees was largely unnecessary and it should not be a reason to pass that cost on to Private Investigation and Security agencies in the state.

I agree that the NDPISB application process should be modernized thus making the process more streamlined and reducing mistakes. However, I do not understand why Mr. Shorey would need such a large increase in funding to make some phone calls and research on google how they would go about implementing the changes. There must be several services online who would be glad to help him with that for reasonable fees. When Red River Security was looking to streamline our time clock, scheduling and reporting we found many affordable options. It shouldn't take more than an afternoons work to come up with a cost range to upgrade NDPISB applications.

I think it is also worth noting that Mr. Shorey is running his own Private Investigation and Security Company while at the same time serving as Director of the NDPISB. This puts him in a position of regulating companies that he is in direct competition with. Many people may view that as a conflict of interest.

In summary, the NDPISB wishes to increase the costs for agencies operating within the state by over 100%. I see nothing in their proposal that quantifies or justifies such a sharp increase in costs to agencies. In fact, Mr. Shorey fails to quantify anything specifically. I see no actual accounting anywhere in the public documents. Thus far Mr. Shorey has only offered general indications of costs, while failing to accept his own responsibility for the situation the NDPISB finds itself in. I think it would be wise to demand a full audit of the NDPISB. I also believe that the NDPISB could reduce their costs by adopting a ethical, judicious and hard working approach that made North Dakota a great place to live and work. What I have witnessed of Mr. Shorys leadership is not that. In all honesty, knowing what I know about Mr. Shorey, I would not hire him as a security officer.

Respectfully: Nathan Anderson

Red River Security Operations MGR

216 Gateway Drive

Grand Forks, ND 58201

218-779-9953

nathan@securitybyredriver.com

THE BOUTIQUE LITIGATION FIRM

IN BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA



Chris Redmann, Special Assistant Attorney General
 Chris Redmann Law, PLLC
 1515 Burnt Boat Drive, Ste. C286
 Bismarck, ND 58503
 (701) 893-2149

March 5, 2025

House Political Subdivisions Committee
 600 E. Boulevard Ave.
 Bismarck, ND 58505

RE: Testimony in Support of 2025 SB 2051 – Establishment of Maximum Fee Schedule for Private Investigation and Private Security Industry Participants

Chairman Longmuir and Members of the Committee:

As the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board's (hereinafter, NDPISB) legal counsel, I write today in support of 2025 SB 2051 which proposes a maximum fee ceiling to allow the NDPISB to more readily adjust fees related to private investigation and private security license holders and industry participants as industry conditions dictate. This measure is critical to ensuring the continued operational stability of the NDPISB, addressing budgetary shortfalls exacerbated by protracted litigation, and reinforcing the Board's ability to fulfill its mandate of active oversight and regulation of the private security and investigative industries.

The Importance of Adequate Funding for Regulatory Oversight

The NDPISB plays a crucial role in safeguarding public safety and maintaining industry integrity. Its responsibilities include licensing qualified professionals, enforcing industry standards, guiding industry members, and ensuring compliance with state laws. However, sustained financial challenges have severely hampered the Board's ability to effectively perform these functions. The ongoing budget deficit, worsened by costly legal proceedings, threatens the Board's operational efficacy and its ability to protect both consumers and professionals within the industry.

Justification for Fee Ceiling Increase

1. **Financial Stability and Operational Continuity:** The NDPISB relies on licensing fees as its exclusive revenue source, unlike some Boards in surrounding states. Without adjustments, the Board faces an imminent risk of budgetary shortfalls to the point of Board insolvency, further delays in licensing processes, and diminished regulatory enforcement.

2. **Enhanced Industry Regulation:** Adequate funding ensures timely background checks, proper vetting of applicants, and swift action against unscrupulous actors in the industry. Insufficient funding will lead to the Board's inability to pursue regulatory enforcement simply because it costs too much money, putting the public at risk and putting a target on North Dakotans from out-of-state actors seeking to exploit the industry without any enforcement mechanism to ensure compliance.
3. **Recovery from Litigation Costs:** The Board has been exceedingly financially conservative and was in a fiscally positive state before protracted DAPL-related litigation and subsequent administrative inquiries drained the Board of funds. The Board attempted to procure a one-time appropriation from the North Dakota DAPL Relief Fund to alleviate substantial fee increases on industry participants, but it was defeated. (*See* 2025 SB 2266). To replenish these funds and restore normal operations, fee adjustments are necessary and reasonable; the proposed fee ceiling increase is the proverbial last-ditch effort to keep the Board solvent and operational.
4. **Comparable Adjustments in Similar Professions:** Other state-regulated industries periodically update their licensing fees to reflect inflation, increased administrative costs, and expanded regulatory needs. The proposed fee increases align with these standard industry practices. Furthermore, the fees imposed on the industry are less than other state counterparts, and in my opinion very nominal for a professional fee. As an exemplar, the current fee to obtain or renew an individual license is only \$30 per year, and the proposed fee to an agency to obtain an agency license is only \$300 for the entire agency. Tersely, an entire agency registration is less than the price of single lawyer to practice law in the state of North Dakota. No one likes paying more money, and I feel we all work harder for proportionally less pay these days, but the reality is the cost of doing business whether is the grocery business, the farm business, the legal business, or the security business increases as well—to assert costs have not increased or fees should not increase is aloof.

Addressing Potential Concerns

While fee increases may impose additional costs on private investigators and security professionals, the long-term benefits far outweigh these concerns. A well-funded regulatory board promotes higher industry standards, enhances public trust, and prevents costly delays or lapses in oversight that could result in greater financial and legal consequences for license holders. Furthermore, a Board who cannot afford to take regulatory action because it does not have the money to engage in litigation is no Board at all; this is entirely unacceptable.

Conclusion

2025 SB 2051 represents a responsible and necessary step toward ensuring the continued effectiveness of the NDPIB. Without these fee adjustments, the Board risks financial collapse, regulatory inefficiencies, and an inability to properly oversee the private security and investigation sectors. I urge this committee to support and advance 2025 SB 2051 to protect the integrity of these vital industries and promote public safety. Thank you for your time and consideration. I am happy to provide any further information or respond to any questions.

Cordially,



Chris Redmann / Bar ID# 07523

Testimony of the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board (NDPISB)
Senate Bill No. 2051
House Political Subdivisions Committee
March 6th, 2025 10:00 A.M.

Chairman Longmuir and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to comment on Senate Bill 2051. My name is John Shorey, Executive Director of the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board, otherwise known as the NDPISB. My public testimony today is advocating for passage of Senate Bill 2051 as proposed by the Board, and to answer any questions the Committee has on the bill.

COMMENTS ON BILL DRAFT

Senate Bill 2051 does two things 1) changes fee categories charged by the Board, and 2), changes the private security training certificate from a one-time fee to an initial fee with a renewal and late fees. All of these changes are under section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code.

1) The fee categories changes are broken down below:

<u>Current</u>		<u>Proposed</u>
Examination Applicant Fee*	\$100	\$200
PI & Security Provider License*	\$150	\$300
Late Fee PI & Security Provider License#	\$50	\$100
Agency Application Fee*	\$100	\$200
Agency License*	\$300	\$600
Late Fee Agency #	\$100	\$200
Security Trainer (one-time fee)*	\$25	\$60 (initial & renewal)
Late Fee-Security Trainer (new) #		\$20
Armed Certification*	\$30	\$60
Late Fee-Armed Certification#	\$10	\$20
Duplicate License*	\$20	\$40
PI and Security Registration*	\$30	\$60
Late Fee-PI and Security Registration#	\$10	\$20
Armed First Responder Course Initial*	\$400	\$800
Armed First Responder Course Renewal *	\$300	\$600

* Denotes the language “may not exceed” is included

Denotes the language “not to exceed” is included

2) The changes to the private security training certificate include changing the fee from a one-time fee of \$25.00 to an initial fee of \$60 with a renewal fee of \$60 and a late fee of \$20. Starting in the year 2019, the Board required security trainers and weapons instructors to complete a renewal application with no fee attached to that renewal. Prior to this the Board contacted trainers and instructors asking if they were still active each renewal season and if they were, would keep the file active, and if not, would inactive the file. The Board found that this was not a very effective method of handling trainer and instructor renewals nor did it capture pertinent information as far as if the trainer or instructor had any criminal convictions or pending criminal actions since they initially applied to the Board. These two reasons were behind the rationale for the Board requiring trainers and instructors to submit a renewal application. The Board believes since they are processing these renewal applications currently, with no fees assessed to cover Board staff time and expenses, that it would be appropriate to make the proposed changes.

I would like to note that the Century Code sets the maximum amount the Board can charge for fees. The Board’s current fees are at their maximum that is allowed by the Century Code. The Board is requesting with SB 2051 that the maximum amounts be raised in the Century Code. The Board will then have to undergo the Administrative Rules process, where it will propose the actual fee increases within the parameters set by the Century Code. The Administrative Rules process includes a hearing where industry members and the public can provide comments, and ultimately goes before the Legislative Administrative Rules Committee.

Comments on the emergency clause. The Senate Industry and Business committee added an

amendment for an emergency clause. This was born out of discussion with the committee regarding the timing of the bill and giving the Board enough time to undergo the administrative rules process and implement the fee increases for the Board's annual license and registration renewal period that ends on September 30th 2025. This bill would need to be passed on an emergency basis for the Board to make the necessary administrative rules changes to capture those increases for this year's renewal season.

The Board conducted a license fees survey of the surrounding States of MN and MT (SD does not have a State-Wide Licensing Program) and FL and CA. I have included that survey at the end of my written testimony. As you can see, the Board's proposed increases are well within the average of those other States sampled.

As the Committee is likely aware, the Board does not receive annual appropriations to fund its operations. All funding is derived from the licensing and certification fees the Board assesses. This amendment reflects the increased costs of administering the licensing and certification of private investigative and private security providers. The rate of inflation alone has increased 19.92% between the years 2020-2024, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. These increased costs include out-of-ordinary ordinary expenses related to the Board's response to the DAPL situation and administering the Armed First Responder Training Program. The Board's total expenses for the last several years have been more than its total revenue. Senate Bill 2051 would help address those costs and support continued Board administrative functions.

Historically the Board has had two employees, the Executive Director and an administrative assistant. For the last four years the Board has been operating with one employee, myself, mainly due to budget constraints. This has led to a backlog in certain Board operations, mainly the processing of renewal applications, due in-large part to a lack of staffing. The Board would like to use the increased revenue to hire a part-time administrative assistant to assist in clearing the backlog, and after that, to assist with day-to-day operations of the Board.

During this period the Board's Office workload has not remained constant and has only expanded, even though we are down one staff member. This is evidenced by the increased number of special meetings the Board holds, an increase in the number of provisional applications being submitted and processed, a different framework in place for reviewing applications that necessitates the need for the Board to review more applications than before, and staff and Board time devoted to the disputed documents litigation that was spun from the TigerSwan Administrative case, to name a few. This includes the massive undertaking of the Board reviewing and redacting 61,988 pages of documents, which took the Board 444.20 hours to complete. This does not include other time involved surrounding the redactions. This litigation is still ongoing, and is currently before an Administrative Law Judge.

Lastly, the Board would like to modernize its operations; which has been a long time coming. This includes exploring the possibility of moving its application process from paper based to electronic. This is something the industry has asked for and would help alleviate a large contributor of the backlog, which are incomplete applications, and would be more efficient for the Board and industry alike. With the lack of funds to do so, the Board has not done any research in this area. With the increased revenue, it would allow the Board to explore this as a possibility, and implement it if feasible.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present this testimony. We, the North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board, urge you to issue a do pass recommendation on Senate Bill 2051. I would stand for any questions you may have.

John Shorey,
Executive Director, North Dakota Private Investigative and Security Board.

License Type	Current ND amount	Proposed ND amount	MT	MN	FL	CA	Average Cost
Security Officer	\$ 30.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 100.00		\$ 45.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 58.00
Security Agency	\$ 300.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 450.00	\$ 770.00	\$ 678.33
Security provider	\$ 150.00	\$ 300.00		\$ 800.00			\$ 416.67
Armed Certification	\$ 30.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 112.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 75.33
Security Trainer	\$ 25.00	\$ 60.00			\$ 60.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 123.75
Weapons Instructor	\$ 25.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 150.00		\$ 100.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 137.00
Private Investigator	\$ 150.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 385.00	\$ 360.00
PI Agency	\$ 300.00	\$ 600.00		\$ 1,800.00	\$ 450.00		\$ 787.50
Registered Investigator	\$ 30.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 150.00		\$ 60.00		\$ 75.00

March 5, 2025

SB 2051

Senate Industry and Business Committee

Chairman Longmuir and Committee Members. My name is Justin Blinsky from Jamestown, ND. I am currently an appointed volunteer board member of the ND Private Investigations and Security Board (NDPISB). I have served on this committee since being appointed by Governor Burgum in 2019. I would like to take a few moments to submit written testimony on why there is necessity for Senate Bill 2051 and to advocate for the passage of SB2051.

The NDPISB is a volunteer appointed state board which helps provide oversight, guidance, and accountability for those agencies and personnel who provide security services; private investigations; trainers of private security; and trainers of armed first responder in schools or ambulance/firefighter crew training programs. The board has one paid employee, which is Executive Director John Shorey. We also currently have at least 1 board member in the Bismarck area who volunteers his time to assist Executive Director Shorey in trying to clear the backlog.

There is no funding mechanism to support the mission of this board, so the board is completely reliant on the fees assessed to the agencies and individuals who provide these services. All board members volunteer countless hours of their own time to attend meetings, research issues coming before the board, review background/criminal history documentation of applicants, and review training curriculums related to the armed first responder program. In certain cases, board members have traveled to board functions on their own dime, so now we try to do most meetings by zoom.

The board provides a critical service to the citizens of North Dakota, as we all want to make sure the services being provided are following ND Century Code and the Administrative Rules previously approved by this legislative body. It goes without saying, but many of the functions provided by the industry we oversee can have serious consequences if it is not done right.

One of the many things that has taken up a lot of board's time is the Armed First Responders in schools or ambulance/firefighter crew training programs. As a ND citizen, father, and a first responder, I want to ensure each application has a thorough review before it is presented to the board for approval. In one such application, I spent dozens of hours going over, researching, and giving feedback on just the 1 application.

Another issue that consumes a vast majority of the boards time is incomplete or improper applications being sent to the Executive Director/NDPISB. This is extremely frustrating, as

each application requires many correspondence exchanges between the Executive Director, the agency submitting the application, and/or the applicant. In many cases, this can be related to issues that come up in background checks. If this occurs, it also requires board members to be mailed Criminal History Information (this type of information cannot be faxed or emailed). The information then must come before the board and many times requires a “Special Board Meeting” to address them. All these background checks, mailings, and agenda postings continue to cost the board money.

When I came on the board in 2019, the NDPISB was involved in litigation over issues from the Dakota Access Pipeline Protests back in 2016-2017. The court process over some of these issues has been protracted as other entities became involved, so this has created another component to the backlog. It also required Executive Director Shorey to go through and redact approximately 61,000 pages of documents. However, the NDPISB was required to be involved in this court process, as it is part of the scope of the board’s duties to ensure the laws and administrative rules were followed and address those situations when they were not followed.

At the start of the backlog, the NDPISB administrative assistant left their position. E. D. Shorey tried to manage the board’s office on his own, but that has not worked. A few years ago, the board advertised to hire an administrative assistant but were unsuccessful in that job market. We also have talked about trying to get software to make applications more convenient and user friendly to the industry. It is also clear, the board needs to have an administrative assistant along with the Executive Director for the board to properly function. However, at the current fee structure, that is not possible.

All these issues have continued to compound the delays which continues to perpetuate the backlog.

In the fall of 2022, we updated our administrative rules to include very nominal increases to some of the application fees we assess. We tried to do this in hopes this would give the board enough money to continue with standard board operations. However, after reviewing our current financials, unfortunately those increases were not enough.

There was also other legislation proposed earlier in this session and the feedback and direction given by a different legislative committee to Executive Director Shorey was the NDPISB should look at increases their fees as an appropriate mechanism, instead of requesting other appropriations.

During our quarterly board meeting in February, Executive Director Shorey presented the board information regarding the fees assessed to the private security and private investigations industries in 2 neighboring states and 2 states on opposite coasts of the US.

The information presented showed even if North Dakota raised their fee structure as highlighted in this bill, it would still be below the average of those 4 states in all but one category (private security officer) and even then, we were only \$2 above the average.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide written testimony and urge every committee member to give a “Do Pass” to SB 2051. Thank You for your time.

Sincerely,

Justin Blinsky

ND Private Investigations and Security Board member

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I appreciate your time and attention to the matter that is before us all today. My name is Jon Pumphrey and I'm the owner and operator of Elite Security Solutions, LLC, located in West Fargo, ND. I've personally been licensed in North Dakota in various capacities at other companies since 2018 and my company has been licensed with the North Dakota Private Investigation & Security Board (NDPISB) since 2022. My company is also licensed for operations in Minnesota and Colorado. Despite fear of potential retaliation for my testimony, I'm coming before you all today to state my complete and direct opposition of Senate Bill 2051.

This bill, in its most basic and simple form, would put a completely unfair and unnecessary financial burden on all security and investigation license-holders. Upon further reflection from a more complex perspective though, this proposed bill, and the way in which the NDPISB appears to have had it pushed through, gives all of us license-holders a much deeper concern with the board's operations and oversight. On Wednesday, January 8th, 2025, while appearing before the Senate Industry and Business committee, the NDPISB Executive Director indicated that all affected members of this state's private security and investigation industry had been made aware of this proposed bill. I, and numerous other license-holders, were not made aware of this bill by NDPISB. Instead, we had the link for the January 8th hearing emailed to us by a fellow professional in the industry on Wednesday, January 29th, 2025. I was very disappointed and alarmed by the statements made in that hearing. I reviewed all physical mail and emails at our office and noted that the last official correspondence that I received from NDPISB were two emails on Monday, December 30th, 2024 at approximately 2:04pm. The emails were indicating a reduced price for Fingerprint-Based criminal history record checks, bringing the price down by \$1.25. As I am a license-holder for both our company's Security Agency License and Private Detective Agency License, I received this email as a notice for both licenses. So, a total of two emails. However, there has been no correspondence, notices, emails, or other such notification to license-holders regarding the proposed SB-2051.

In order to see if I had missed any online notices, I went onto the NDPISB's website and found nothing referring to SB-2051. I searched under Recent News, Meeting Agendas, and Meeting Minutes. Again, this was on Wednesday, January 29th, 2025 and I checked all available meeting minutes and meeting agendas. The only items that appeared to have ever been posted for the previous 13 months, that related to anything involving any Legislative items, was for the following two meeting entries which were printed out by me on 01/29/2025 and are noted on the following page:

“The North Dakota Private Investigation & Security Board (NDPISB) will hold a special meeting on July, 25th, 2024 at 1:30P.M. The meeting will be a Zoom conference.

Special Meeting Agency

1. Discussion regarding Legislative Study S.B. 2249 and questionnaire.
2. Discussion regarding agenda item #1 with Labor Commissioner Nathan Svihovec and Research Assistant Carolyn Laird.
3. Adjourn

“The North Dakota Private Investigation & Security Board (NDPISB) will hold a special meeting on January 15th, 2025 at 8:00 A.M.. The meeting will be a Zoom conference.

Special Meeting Agency

1. Legislative Session Update on Pre Filed Bills
2. Legislative Board funding options
3. Application Procedures, additional information letter and requests, withdrawn application procedure.
4. Adjourn

This information was available online on Wednesday, January 29th, 2025, but as of the writing of this testimony on 03/05/2025 at approximately 9:00P.M., that information appears to have been removed from the NDPISB website. In fact, as of the writing of this testimony, all information relating to previously held meetings, meeting agendas, and meeting minutes appears to no longer on the NDPISB website. On Tuesday, February 25th, 2025 during a NDPISB meeting that I was informed of and attending via Zoom, the board indicated that a letter/correspondence should be sent out to members of the industry, in order to notify them of the proposed changes. To my knowledge, this has yet to happen. These instances, in addition to all other mentioned items, give me and all other license-holders great cause for concern, as it all appears to show an apparent lack of communication, transparency, and professional respect and courtesy towards us.

As license-holders, we look to the board to protect our interests and our ability to provide services in an ethical, professional, and morally upright manner. The board's role is to license and regulate all Private Investigation and Security services in the state. This includes helping us all to ensure that our companies operate within full compliance of all applicable laws, rules, and regulations. As license-holders, how are we supposed to successfully operate within our authorized scope of practice if we have a board that currently appears to not be able to effectively license and regulate all operations? Before the board expects us to pay a 100% increase in all necessary expenses, they should explore options that would allow them to get caught up, develop a practical plan that could be implemented, and then utilize the data learned from implementing that plan to justify all necessary cost increases.

I absolutely do agree that the NDPIB needs to update, streamline, and maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations. However, I do not believe that the answer to this is to increase all fees by 100% before they have a practical and definitive plan of action in place. Since approximately 2021, the board has appeared to constantly blame their delayed and inconsistent operations on this “backlog”. This “backlog” has been the reason given to license-holders who enquire of the status of receiving their wall certificates and pocket cards, which license-holders are required to be in possession of by the NDPIB. Although the board requires us all to be in possession of these items in order for our licenses to be considered valid, numerous agencies and individuals appear to have not received their items in reasonable or timely manner. Not having these items when needed has caused license-holders to have issues with potential clients, law enforcement officials, insurance companies, and database companies.

While I can appreciate how complex and detailed the board’s operations are, I believe that there are still a number of options for the board that could increase efficiency. One option to consider would be in implementing a 2-year license, which would give the board more time to process licensing items, would allow them to justify an increase in fees, and free them up to carry out their operations more effectively. This would prevent an ongoing “backlog”. Since 2021, I also have volunteered my time and energy numerous times in order to assist with the processing of application items in whatever way they needed, if it would help them with their reported “backlog”. I assured the indicated NDPIB party that I would be more than willing to work free of charge, that I’d sign a Non-Disclosure agreement, and that I’d be even be willing to just assist during renewal season if needed. I also indicated that I’d be sure to recuse myself from any work that could potentially cause a conflict of interest, since I would be technically handling licensing items for competing companies. I was told each time by this individual that they preferred to do things in a certain way based off of their personality and organizational habits. While I can respect that, I feel that if the board is attempting to declare an emergency and have SB-2051 passed through, then having authorized and approved license-holders voluntarily come in to assist with the “backlog” should have at least be considered as an option for all of these years. My offer to reasonably assist NDPIB with this also still stands.

Many other license-holders, have made similar offers to NDPIB but it doesn’t appear that any of the offered help has been accepted. All license-holders in North Dakota want our industry to be effective, successful, and professional. In order to accomplish this, we want the board to be equally effective, successful, and professional. I believe that before moving forward with expecting 100% cost increase on its license-holders, the NDPIB must first demonstrate that it can properly and efficiently manage it’s finances and overall operations. I feel that a simple audit of the NDPIB’s overall operations, finances, and plans for improvement going forward would be of great benefit for all involved.

Without a doubt, North Dakota does need a licensing and regulation board. A board that assists all involved with constantly improving overall operations, profitability, and professionalism of the industry. Having a more effective and operational NDPISB is good for all of us. As license-holders, we are all trying our best to work with NDPISB in order to ensure effective operations. However, the board needs to look to us for input and feedback in times like this, while also extending us professional courtesy and respect, as we all have a large collective knowledge and experience in this industry, not to mention the stake we all hold in this industry's success. We all want operations to improve and for everyone to succeed, including NDPISB, but the way to do it is **NOT** with SB-2051. If the board cannot properly manage the funds that are currently coming in yearly, how can we all trust that they will now be responsible with double that amount? Especially without having an actual plan in place? Before increasing ANY costs, NDPISB operations need to be properly audited, researched, and analyzed. Operations can then be more effectively planned out and implemented. If this was done, then potential increased costs could be better justified to all of us. I greatly appreciate your time and consideration in this matter and I trust you all to do the right thing for the collective success in our industry going forward.

Respectfully,

Jon M. Pumphrey

Owner | CEO

Elite Security Solutions, LLC

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Title 43 of the North Dakota Century Code

43-30-05. License required to provide private investigative or security services - Exclusivity. A person may not provide private investigative or security services without a license issued by the board. Notwithstanding any other law or ordinance, a person may not be required to obtain a license to provide private investigative or security services in this state other than the license required by this chapter.

43-30-10. Penalty - Injunction - Unlicensed activity. Any person who violates this chapter or rules adopted under this chapter, or any person who provides a private investigative service or private security service without a current license issued by the board, or falsely states or represents that the person has been or is an investigative officer or employed by an investigative or security officer or agency is guilty of a class B misdemeanor. In addition to the criminal penalties provided, the civil remedy of an injunction is available to restrain and enjoin violations of any provisions of this chapter, without proof of actual damages sustained by any person. An injunction does not preclude criminal prosecution and punishment of a violator. The board is not liable for the lost income, costs, or any other expenses that may be incurred by a person against whom an injunction is sought, and the board may not be required to provide security or a bond. The board may seek costs for reimbursement of expenses for obtaining an injunction, including attorney's fees. In addition to issuing the injunction, the court may impose an administrative fee consistent with section 43-30-10.1 if the person has violated a provision of this chapter. The board may seek an injunction, impose administrative fees, or seek an order of abatement through an administrative action or in district court.

Chapter 93 Administrative Rules

93-02-01.1-09. License - Posting. Each individual who, or agency that, is licensed by the board shall conspicuously display that license at all times in the licensee's place of business. If the licensee has more than one office as a place of business, the licensee shall display a duplicate license at each office. An agency need not display the licenses of all the individual licensees employed or contracted by the agency. If the board revokes, suspends, or disapproves renewal of any license, the board may require the holder of the license to return the license to the board within fourteen days.

93-02-01.1-10. Issuance of pocket cards. To each individual licensed or registered by the board, the board shall issue a pocket card. The board will not issue a pocket card to an individual performing private investigative services for a detective agency on a contractual basis if that individual is already licensed as a private investigator. Each individual licensed or registered by the board shall have on that individual's person, the pocket card issued while providing private investigative services.

93-02-02.1-13. License - Posting. Each individual who, or private security agency that, is licensed by the board shall conspicuously display that license at all times in the licensee's place of business. If the licensee has more than one office as a place of business, the licensee shall display a duplicate license at each office. An agency need not display the licenses of all the individual licensees employed or contracted by the agency. If the board revokes, suspends, or disapproves renewal of any license, the board may require the holder of the license to return the license to the board within fourteen days.

93-02-02.1-14. Issuance of pocket cards. To each individual licensed or registered by the board, the board shall issue a pocket card. Each individual licensed or registered by the board shall have on that individual's person, the pocket card issued while providing private security services.

93-02-03-05. Suspension, revocation, or refusal to renew license. In addition to the causes for suspension, revocation, or refusal to renew a license listed in North Dakota Century Code section 43-30-12, the board may either refuse to renew, suspend, revoke, or place on probationary status any licensee, or issue a letter of reprimand for any of the following causes:

5. Providing private investigative or private security services under a lapsed license - or registration.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

2025 Senate Bill No. 2051
Testimony before the House Political Subdivisions Committee
Sara Cote, Apex Security & Investigations
Thursday, March 6, 2025

Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee: My name is Sara Cote. I am the owner of Apex Security & Investigations. I am speaking today in opposition of Senate Bill 2051. This bill represents a significant financial burden for small businesses and raises serious concerns about the board's management of funds as well as their operations.

Title 43 of North Dakota Century Code provides for an annual renewal of security and investigative licenses with a due date of September 30th each year.

Chapter 93 of Administrative Rules further outlines licensing and registration requirements. Those requirements include license posting for each individual and agency as well as a requirement for possession of a pocket card for individuals while providing private investigative or security services.

The annual renewal applications and payment for my business were submitted in September of 2024. For six months, I have been waiting for my 2024 annual renewals. Despite submitting my applications and payment prior to the due date, I have not received my licenses nor my employee registrations. The board not providing licenses and registration renewals within 6 months of the renewal date is completely unacceptable.

Additionally, the board failed to deposit my check for licensing and registration fees for six weeks after my renewal applications were submitted. Subsequently, prior to the renewal due date I also submitted an additional renewal application. The check for this payment was received by the board in September, again, prior to the due date, and deposited December 5th. These delays demonstrate a lack of responsibility in managing resources and causes me to further question how the board is managing funds. This includes costs for items such as open records requests as was referenced in testimony for SB2266. For reference, the Private Investigation and Security Board requested a grant of \$36,318.11 for expenses incurred due to the DAPL protest and its legal aftermath. As referenced in Executive Director Shorey's testimony, there were numerous open records requests with one such request taking 440.2 hours to complete redactions, costing the board \$6,006.25.

By statute, NDCC §44-04-18(2) outlines various fees that may be charged to the requester of an open records request. One such fee is an hourly charge of up to \$25 per hour (excluding the first hour) for redaction of information. Using the board's information, they had the ability to recoup this \$6,006.25 cost. The calculation for redaction time alone equals \$10,980.00. This is just one example. Who knows how many others there are? I

simply pulled this information from a proposed bill. An audit would likely give a much better understanding of the management of the board's funds.

Given that the board has not demonstrated the ability to properly manage existing funds, it is concerning that they are requesting an increase in fees. If the board cannot appropriately manage the funds it currently receives, how can we trust they will be responsible with twice the amount of funds?

When conducting business with the board, the consistent theme, or root cause of every delay, is the backlog. In an effort to address and remedy the board's backlog, I have offered practical solutions to Executive Director Shorey that are of no cost to the board. One such solution was volunteering to assist with the processing of renewal applications. Another suggestion was to implement a two-year renewal process, similar to the licensing model used by other professional boards in the state. This approach would help alleviate the backlog and provide more manageable renewal cycles for everyone involved.

I called Executive Director Shorey on January 14 of this year to follow up on the status of my renewal, and to discuss a potential two-year renewal. Executive Director Shorey let me know the board had already proposed a bill to increase licensing fees. He indicated they wanted to double the fees but keep licensing at a one-year renewal. This conversation on January 14th was the first I had heard of the board's action related to SB 2051. After that conversation, I located the video of the testimony that was provided by Executive Director Shorey a week prior, on Wednesday, January 8th, before the Senate Industry and Business committee. I was quite surprised and disappointed listening to that testimony to hear Executive Director Shorey provide information to the committee that all affected members were aware of the board's proposed bill to increase the licensing and registration fees, there has been no pushback yet, and the industry is receptive (to the increase in fees).

These comments were incredibly alarming to me. I searched the board's website, my emails, deleted files, and spam folder to ensure I did not overlook a communication related to this bill. There was no such communication. There were no posted meeting minutes, nor were there any recent news posts on the board's website related to this matter. I did, however, receive an email notification from the board dated December 30, 2024 regarding a \$1.25 change in criminal history background checks and an update to the licensing and registration forms. I question why the board found it appropriate to notify members of a \$1.25 change in criminal background fees, yet did not see fit to communicate a proposed change that has a huge impact on member businesses, who are already struggling with skyrocketing liability insurance and workers' compensation premiums.

For comparison, most other industries in North Dakota are experiencing decreases in workers' compensation premiums, such as oil and gas support services which has benefited from a 33% premium decrease the past two years, while premium for security services has increased almost 15%. We have big challenges to face in this industry and we need a board that supports and advocates for its members.

Taking into consideration the information I have provided. The North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board is not protecting the interests of its members. I respectfully ask that you issue a do not pass on SB2051. This board must first demonstrate it can efficiently manage its current resources and implement practical solutions before requesting additional funds from those it serves.

Sara Cote
Apex Security & Investigations
701-651-4576
saracote@apexsecuritynd.com

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. My name is Jeremie Meisel, and I am the owner of EH Investigations and Security LLC, an agency based in Bismarck, ND. I am submitting here today alongside my fellow business owners to voice our strong opposition to Senate Bill 2051. This bill represents not only a significant financial burden for small businesses but also raises serious concerns about the management and operations of the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board (NDPISB).

The proposed fee increase, which more than doubles the current licensing and certification fees, is unjustifiable. This will place North Dakota's fees for private investigators, security guards, and security companies among the highest in the country. As someone who has been licensed as a private investigator in North Dakota, and Louisiana, I can attest that this increase is an unnecessary burden on our industry, especially with getting nothing in return from the Board.

The Board currently finds itself in financial problems, particularly those incurred while litigating against TigerSwan. Yet, they have offered no clear indication of how doubling the fees will lead to improved operations or better services for licensees. As agency owners we would love to know what we are getting for our money or if the situation is so dire, we can help. Other agencies have reached out to the Board to assist with renewals free of charge, but these offers were declined by Director Shorey. There is much a NDPISB could do for our agencies, such as advocate for lower work comp premiums and possibly expand coverage to those similar to the law enforcement. The security industry is overlooked and not much thought is given to our industry and the NDPISB has done a poor job representing our interests to the legislature. I would like a strong voice on the Boards that could advocate for us in matters that affect us.

To steal a phrase from another agency owner; the NDPISB has become, in my view, an unelected and unregulated code enforcement agency, I feel this sums up the Board very well. They operate with little oversight that favors some agencies over others, with timely issuance of their registration cards and certificates. I have personally experienced delays in the processing of our license renewals, which shows you the inefficiencies that plague the Board, year after year, with no end in sight unless a massive increase of fees is passed on to us agency owners, apparently that is the only course of action the Board has come up with. I have not received my certificates since 2021 even though I pay my renewals every year. Despite the financial burden this proposed fee increase would place on small businesses; the Board has not demonstrated an ability to manage its current funds. I cannot trust them to with any additional funds. The funds that could be reinvested into my own company.

Communication from the Board has been severely lacking, there has been no outreach regarding such significant changes to our fees. The lack of communication and transparency raises doubts about the Board's commitment to serving the agencies. In Director Shorey's testimony to the North Dakota Senate Industry and Business meeting on 08 JAN 2025, he stated that he had notified the agency owners of the proposed increases, but he absolutely did not, I had to hear about it from another agency owner. The lack of transparency shown by the board is very telling of their feelings to us and look at us as little more than a revenue stream to be squeezed when they need more money.

The NDPISB must not burden those agencies it serves with this high of a fee increase and must undergo a thorough audit of its financial records. Before requesting additional funds from the licenses it serves,

the Board must first demonstrate its capability to manage existing resources efficiently and implement practical solutions to address its operational challenges.

I'm born and raised in North Dakota, I have always taken pride in our common sense and ability to effectively solve problems together, I feel the course the Board is taking is anathema to those North Dakota values. I hope this committee sees that as well in the testimony provided today.

I urge the Committee to issue a DO NOT PASS recommendation on Senate Bill 2051. The burden of these proposed fees will disproportionately impact small businesses like ours, and the NDPIB must first prove its ability to manage its current resources effectively before seeking additional funds.

Thank you for consideration on this critical matter. It has taken a lot for us agency owners to speak out about this bill, we fear reprisals and that we may be targeted for opposing the Board. They hold the power of our licenses over us and if we step out of line, they could make life difficult for us if they want. We only want fairness and common-sense solutions and would love to be part of that solution. We hope that our collective voices will contribute to a regulatory framework that genuinely supports the growth and sustainability of security agencies in North Dakota.

Sincerely,

Jeremie Meisel

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee,

My name is Jason Dockter, and I am a licensed security officer employed by Elite Security Solutions, LLC. based in West Fargo, ND. Thank you for taking the time to hear and read our testimonies this morning. I regret that I am unable to attend in person, but I did want to provide a brief written statement to voice my opposition to the proposed Senate Bill 2051.

My opposition to this bill is simple: it is focused on a wholly unnecessary and drastic increase of prices for security and private investigation licenses for agencies and individuals throughout the state of North Dakota. Prices are rising on every element of our lives in our country today—it makes sense that there would be a price increase on our licensure as well. However, the amount being proposed in the current bill is not only insulting, it is fundamentally dangerous as well.

There are several large security agencies in the state that generate sufficient revenue to be able to provide these fees, but there are many smaller agencies that provide critical services that the larger services do not, and yet their revenue is much smaller. The increase in license fees would place an undue strain upon these agencies. While an increase in fees may not be the “make or break” item, it has the potential to compound with other expenditures that could result in an agency laying off employees. In our day and age, the security sector is not one that should be shrinking.

The bill and its supporter(s) with the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board (NDPISB) have spoken of the necessary increase in fees in order to hire a part-time position on a temporary basis in order to clear a “backlog” of paperwork for issuing security licenses. Once this backlog is cleared, I imagine this temporary employee will be released from his or her duties. And yet, there has never been any discussion about reducing the fees to their current level.

As they are currently provided, the security licenses are only valid for (1) calendar year. The NDPISB has had no difficulty cashing the checks for the applications of these licenses, and yet there have been periods where I have gone without a valid license on my person for over three years. This is a tremendous problem for several reasons, the least of which is that we are paying for a service and not being provided with a product. This is tantamount to theft. Additionally, each licensed security professional in the state is required to have their license on their person while on duty. If the officer is involved in an incident, the first question a police officer or a lawyer would ask for is that officer’s license. If the officer does not present a license on their person, the problems would only just begin for that individual.

If the discussion today is about amending the fees for the security license, I would submit to you for your consideration that the fees be amended to be valid for a period of (2) or (3) calendar years as well. What this would accomplish is that the majority of licenses issued in the state would not require an annual re-application and the “backlog” of paperwork would resolve itself organically.

We are all called to manage the finances of our households in a responsible manner, and the NDPISB is no exception. An increase in licensure fees as outlined in SB 2051 is not a responsible solution to the problem at hand.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you again for your time and consideration on this matter.

Respectfully,

Jason Dockter

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivisions Committee Room JW327B, State Capitol

SB 2051
3/6/2025

A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

4:02 p.m. Chairman Longmuir opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Longmuir, Vice-Chairman Fegley, Vice-Chairman Jonas, Representatives Bolinske, Hager, Hatlestad, Heilman, Klemin, Motschenbacher, Ostlie, Warrey

Members Absent: Representatives Davis, Toman

Discussion Topics:

- Rate of inflation
- Private investigation and security board spending

4:03 p.m. Committee discussed the private investigative and security board's finances and potential to request an audit.

4:14 p.m. Chairman Longmuir closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivisions Committee Room JW327B, State Capitol

SB 2051
3/13/2025

A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

9:29 a.m. Chairman Longmuir opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Longmuir, Vice-Chairman Fegley, Vice-Chairman Jonas, Representatives Bolinske, Davis, Hager, Hatlestad, Heilman, Klemin, Motschenbacher, Toman, Warrey

Members Absent: Representative Ostlie

Discussion Topics:

- Auditing of the private investigation and security board
- Fiscal impact of the bill

9:39 a.m. Committee discussion on increase of investigative and security board fees.

Additional written testimony:

John Shorey III, Executive Director of the State of North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board, submitted testimony in favor #41338.

Scott Williams, General manager of Red River Security, submitted testimony in opposition #41341.

Chris Redmann, Attorney at Chris Redmann Law, submitted neutral testimony #41339.

9:36 a.m. Chairman Longmuir closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

Good Afternoon, Rep. Heilman:

Attached is the 2025 budget of the Board. The budget used the current fee structure and did not include a part-time administrative assistant.

Attached is the changes to the administrative rules regarding the fees over the years. I pulled this information from the legislature website and placed it into one PDF and placed the dates at the beginning of each change for ease of review. The PDF starts with the oldest and ends with the most recent.

Cordially,

John

John J. Shorey III

Executive Director

State of North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board

513 East Bismarck Expressway, Suite 5

Bismarck, ND 58504

701-222-3063 Phone/Fax

www.pisb.nd.gov

North Dakota Private Investigation & Security Board

Profit & Loss Budget Overview

January through December 2025

	Jan - Dec 25
Income	
Late Fees	1,000.00
Criminal Search	
BCI Search	6,500.00
FBI Search	11,000.00
Total Criminal Search	17,500.00
Investigative Fees	
PI License Fees	9,000.00
PI Agency License Fees	13,500.00
Application-Reg. Investigator	2,000.00
Application-Detective Agency	500.00
Application-Private Invst.	600.00
Total Investigative Fees	25,600.00
Security Fees	
Security Agency License Fee	14,000.00
Security Provider License Fee	5,500.00
Duplicate Certificates	40.00
Application-Security Agency	1,500.00
Application-Security Officer	26,000.00
Application-Armed Security	5,500.00
Security Fees - Other	0.00
Total Security Fees	52,540.00
Study Guides	500.00
Interest Income	13.00
Other Income	250.00
Total Income	97,403.00
Gross Profit	97,403.00
Expense	
Computer Software	2,400.00
Payroll Expenses	70,000.00
Office Equipment	75.00
Bank Service Charges	150.00
Insurance	
Work Comp	900.00
Total Insurance	900.00
Office Supplies	1,500.00
Postage and Delivery	500.00
Professional Fees	
Accounting Services	1,000.00
BCI Searches	17,500.00
Records Management	750.00
Legal Fees	5,350.00
Total Professional Fees	24,600.00
Rent	3,300.00
Telephone	1,039.49
Other Expenses	156.00
Total Expense	104,620.49
Net Income	-7,217.49

Effective May 1, 2000

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. The board charges the following fees:

1. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services.

3. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of three hundred dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual shall pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual shall pay an annual fee of twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of twenty dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual shall pay a fee of twenty dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. There is no charge for renewing an individual's registration to provide private investigative or private security services, but a late fee of ten dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000.
General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04
Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective May 1, 2005

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. ~~The~~ In addition to statutory fees,
the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred ~~fifty~~ thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services.
3. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.

4. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of ~~three~~ two hundred ~~fifty~~ dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual shall pay a fee of ~~twenty-five~~ twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual shall pay an annual fee of ~~twenty-five~~ twenty dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of ~~twenty~~ ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual shall pay a fee of ~~twenty~~ eighteen dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. There is no charge for renewing an individual's registration to provide private investigative or private security services, but a late fee of ten dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective July 1, 2010

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.
3. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.

4. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay an annual fee of twenty dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of ~~eighteen~~ twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. ~~There is no charge~~ An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing ~~an individual's~~ registration to provide private investigative or private security services, ~~but a~~. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective October 1, 2013

CHAPTER 93-02-03

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of ~~twenty~~ twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual must pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective July 1, 2018

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees.

In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal. After this two-month timeframe, a new application, including criminal searches, fees, and testing, is required.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate. There is no expiration date for these certifications.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license or registration.

8. An individual must pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. The registration shall be submitted by the licensed agency. An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013; July 1, 2018.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective October 1, 2022

CHAPTER 93-02-03

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees.

In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred ~~thirty~~fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal. After this two-month time frame, a new application, including criminal history background checks, fees, and testing, is required.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ~~two~~three hundred ~~fifty~~ dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency. A late fee of one hundred dollars also must be paid for each month the renewal fee is late.
5. An individual must pay a fee of ~~twenty~~twenty-five dollars to receive a private security training certificate. There is no expiration date for these certifications.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars to receive an armed ~~private security~~ certificate. Armed ~~private security~~ certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year. A late fee of ten dollars also must be paid for each month the renewal fee is late.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ~~ten~~twenty dollars to obtain a duplicate license or registration.
8. An individual must pay a fee of ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. The registration shall be submitted by the licensed agency. An individual must pay ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars ~~must~~ also must be paid for each month the renewal is late.
9. An individual must pay a fee of four hundred dollars to obtain a training certification as a certified course instructor of the armed first responder program. An individual must pay three hundred dollars for renewal of a course instructor certification for the armed first responder program.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013; July 1, 2018; October 1, 2022.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Political Subdivisions Committee Members:

Attached is a short memo outlining some additional information to consider as your Committee discusses the NDPIB and 2025 SB 2051.

Thanks,

Chris



Chris Redmann, Special Assistant Attorney General
Chris Redmann Law, PLLC
1515 Burnt Boat Drive, Ste. C286
Bismarck, ND 58503
(701) 893-2149

March 12, 2025

House Political Subdivisions Committee
600 E. Boulevard Ave.
Bismarck, ND 58505

RE: Supplemental Information for Committee Consideration

Chairman Longmuir and Members of the Committee:

As you recall, I am the North Dakota Private Investigation and Security Board's (hereinafter, NDPISB) legal counsel. I testified on March 6th, 2025, regarding 2025 SB 2051 which is now in your Committee for consideration. This memorandum containing supplemental information is being submitted in response to the oppositional materials submitted to your Committee and Committee discussions during testimony regarding this Bill.

Legislative Fee Setting

As a reminder, this Bill merely proposes a maximum fee ceiling to allow the NDPISB to more readily adjust fees related to private investigation and private security license holders and industry participants as industry conditions dictate—it does not raise fees. The NDPISB was about to engage in the administrative rules process to set fees to overcome justified expenses the Board previously incurred; however, it is apparent from your Committee's work that there is a overwhelming desire to instead set fees yourselves via legislative initiative.

As your Committee moves to those ends, you must consider the future implications, particularly the need to continually find congressional sponsorship every time modifications are needed. Representative Larry Klemin questioned me as to the preference for the administrative rules process and proffered to the Committee that there is an alternative agency preference for the legislature to set fees in lieu of following the administrative rules process. To be certain, there are pros and cons to each; however, since this is the new direction this Bill is going, the NDPISB will need legislative support and sponsorship for any future fee increase or decrease. Finding a congressman to sponsor agency bills should not be dismissed as ministerial, and with the Committee pushing the NDPISB to modify fees through the legislature, future support and sponsorship will be appreciated.

The Letters of Opposition

As the Committee is aware, several letters of opposition to the Bill were submitted which contained both strawman and ad hominem arguments—particularly protesting fee increases (which was not the focus of this Bill) and personally attacking Executive Director John Shorey (which is amateurish and ill-informed). Notwithstanding the fallacy of the letters of opposition, they seemed to raise concerns of the Committee to a degree which exceeded their weight.

Specifically, those who wrote in opposition made several false, uninformed, and illogical premises to oppose this Bill and oppose fee increases more generally. One such industry consternation is the backlog of issuing paper registration cards, and the ‘easy solution’ proposed by the industry member was to have industry members assist in the NDPISB office. While this appears to be a genuine solution, it naively ignores the fact that the NDPISB office maintains confidential criminal history records information (CHRI) from both BCI and FBI databases, and that access needs to be strictly regulated to ensure compliance with federal law. Notwithstanding the CHRI, each agency file contains confidential and exempt employee information and having one industry member (aka competitor) come in to view and peruse another industry member’s file is entirely unacceptable and violative of state and federal privacy laws.

Other letters of opposition griped that the NDPISB does not advocate or represent the industry enough to the legislature or other state agencies; one example was a desire to have the NDPISB advocate for lower WSI premiums. This viewpoint is entirely ignorant of the exclusive role of an administrative agency. The role of the NDPISB, as all regulatory agencies, is to regulate and enforce the industry; it is not a professional association which advocates or lobbies. The Board of Law Examiners is not the same as the Bar Association just as the Board of Medicine is not to be confused with North Dakota Medical Association.

In addition to commentator confusion and ignorance of issues, patent falsehoods were submitted to the Committee regarding Executive Director John Shorey which further illustrates the amateurish ad hominem argument referenced above. Particularly, it was stated that Shorey owns and operates his own private investigation and/or security agency. While Shorey certainly has a plethora of industry experience, the assertion is entirely untrue. Shorey does have a part-time process service and training company, but he does not hold any agency license or compete with industry participants. Tersely, Shorey does not get paid enough to *not* have a proverbial side-hustle.

A full point-counterpoint breakdown is not productive. However, when the Committee received only a handful of letters of opposition from the 1500+ industry participants discerning scrutiny is merited in lieu of blind acceptance. Of the seven individuals writing “in-opposition” testimony, two individuals are with the same business and two other individuals are with another business—so over half are with two agencies. Four of the seven individuals, either individually or the business they are associated with, have entered into disciplinary stipulations with the Board previously, one stipulation was associated with the DAPL situation involving unlicensed activity. One individual was convicted of a crime while providing private investigation services, had a disorderly conduct restraining order taken out against him associated with that conviction, entered into a disciplinary stipulation with the Board that ultimately led to that individual not being licensed/registered with the Board any longer—and furthermore, this individual is not currently licensed/registered with the Board.

Conclusion

This Committee has taken the position of restructuring the proposed Bill and completely altering the path in which was NDPIB was going to utilize to continue operations. Accordingly, this Committee should not be myopic in its purview or precedent and fully understand the financial situation facing the NDPIB, the causes for that situation, and the facts of operation despite minority dissent.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CRD', is positioned above the typed name.

Chris Redmann / Bar ID# 07523

My name is Scott Williams. I currently serve as General Manager and license holder for Red River Security, based in Grand Forks. I want to relay my thoughts on SB 2051.

I am deeply disturbed by the board's actions surrounding SB 2051, and alarmed at their lack of candor, not only with license holders, but also with Senate and House Committees.

In January, Executive Director Shorey appeared before the Senate Committee. When asked if had notified license holders and agencies of the proposed change, his response was "the talk is out there." Maybe that was true with board members and some members of the industry, but it was certainly not true with me. I learned of this bill through a colleague in Fargo and was immediately concerned. Should a regulating body want to raise fees, I would think they have a duty of candor to the members they regulate and supposedly serve to inform them of the intent to raise fees, or "raise the fee ceiling" as it has been artfully put.

Mr. Shorey also complains that if the fee increase potential would be brought to license holders, they will immediately ask how much the fees are projected to increase by, and he won't have an answer. This seems like a standard question for any regulatory body to have to answer from its constituency, yet Mr. Shorey seems averse to even having the conversation and working with license holders, opting instead to ambush us with the green light from the legislature, then hiding behind the justification of "it's only a fee ceiling" while they work through the administrative rules.

It's true, the board meets at least quarterly. However, there are no emails that go out to license holders inviting them to these meetings or reminding them of when they are. Further, no minutes have been published in years, so if a meeting is missed, the entire content of that meeting is lost. Further, should a fee increase even be on the table, I would think the board has a duty of candor to invite all license holders to that meeting to discuss the potential for increase and the amount of said increase. But we heard nothing.

As has been said before, many of us in the security and investigation industry have expired licenses and have for years. ED Shorey has said that every time he has promised a time frame to clear the backlog, something else comes in which pushes it further back. His own testimony would seem to contradict this, as he has said the board has no money to engage in enforcement action, so it doesn't get done.

As it stands now, I do not trust the board, its director, or its attorney. With no communication from anyone from a board that is supposed to not only regulate the industry, but also advocate for it, I have seen no regulation or advocacy in years. Therefore, I must wonder how the board supervises Mr. Shorey, as well as how Mr. Shorey spends his time and the board's money.

Mr. Shorey and others in favor of this bill also spoke of other states fees. Minnesota, for example, was highlighted. What wasn't mentioned is that Minnesota's renewal is every two years, not every year. Further, Minnesota also has no fees to certify applicants/renewals for armed, only the number of employees.

I believe another example of those in favor of SB 2051 being disingenuous is speaking of vetting checking backgrounds costing money: these fees are paid by the agency licensing the applicant. They are paid to the board and the board then pays ND BCI. The board also charges a fee for their time, which is understandable. Where exactly is the board spending money on applications? Certainly, a percentage requires additional work, but to claim that the board is hemorrhaging money because of this seems hyperbolic.

Members of the Committee, I urge you to issue a DO NOT PASS recommendation on SB 2051. I also urge you to call for an audit of the ND PISB.

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivisions Committee Room JW327B, State Capitol

SB 2051
3/20/2025

A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

11:24 a.m. Chairman Longmuir opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Longmuir, Vice-Chairman Fegley, Vice-Chairman Jonas, Representatives Bolinske, Hager, Hatlestad, Heilman, Klemin, Motschenbacher, Ostlie, Toman

Members Absent: Representatives Davis, Warrey

Discussion Topics:

- Board fees set by the North Dakota legislature
- Process of changing private investigative and security board fees

11:24 a.m. Representative Motschenbacher proposed an Amendment LC:25.8022.02001, testimony #43274.

11:27 a.m. Representative Klemin proposed an Amendment to lower the fee increase from 100% to 50%, include an emergency clause, and remove the phrase "may not exceed" when applicable throughout the bill.

11:35 a.m. Representative Motschenbacher moved to adopt Amendment LC:25.8022.02001, testimony #43274.

11:35 a.m. Representative Bolinske seconded the motion.

Representatives	Vote
Representative Donald W. Longmuir	Y
Representative Clayton Fegley	Y
Representative Jim Jonas	Y
Representative Macy Bolinske	Y
Representative Jayme Davis	A
Representative LaurieBeth Hager	Y
Representative Patrick R. Hatlestad	Y
Representative Matthew Heilman	Y
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Mike Motschenbacher	Y
Representative Mitch Ostlie	Y
Representative Nathan Toman	Y
Representative Jonathan Warrey	A

11:36 a.m. Motion passed 11-0-2.

(The bill was further Amended during the March 27, 2025, 9:01 a.m. meeting)

11:37 a.m. Chairman Longmuir closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

25.8022.02001
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council
staff for Representative
Motschenbacher
March 18, 2025

Sixty-ninth
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FIRST ENGROSSMENT

ENGROSSED SENATE BILL NO. 2051

Introduced by

Industry and Business Committee

(At the request of the Private Investigative and Security Board)

1 A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code,
2 relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; to provide
3 for a performance audit of the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to
4 declare an emergency.

5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

6 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code is
7 amended and reenacted as follows:

8 43-30-16. Examination, license, and registration fees.

9 The board may establish by rule and charge the following fees:

- 10 1. The fee to be paid by an applicant for an examination to determine the applicant's
11 fitness to receive a license as a private investigator or a license to provide private
12 security services may not exceed ~~one hundred~~two hundred dollars.
- 13 2. The fee to be paid by an applicant for the initial issuance or the renewal of a license as
14 a private investigator or a license to provide private security services may not exceed
15 ~~one hundred fifty~~three hundred dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~fifty~~one hundred
16 dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 17 3. The fee to be paid by an applicant to apply for a license to conduct a private security
18 or detective agency may not exceed ~~one hundred~~two hundred dollars.
- 19 4. The fee for the issuance or the renewal of a license to conduct a private security or
20 detective agency may not exceed ~~three hundred~~six hundred dollars. A late fee not to

1 exceed ~~one hundred~~two hundred dollars may be charged for each month the renewal
2 fee is due and unpaid.

3 5. The ~~one-time~~initial fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of a private security
4 training certificate may not exceed ~~twenty-five~~sixty dollars. The fee for the renewal of a
5 private security training certificate may not exceed sixty dollars. A late fee not to
6 exceed twenty dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and
7 unpaid.

8 6. The annual fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of an armed certificate may
9 not exceed ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~ten~~twenty dollars may be
10 charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.

11 7. The fee to be paid for the issuance of a duplicate license may not exceed ~~twenty~~forty
12 dollars.

13 8. The initial registration fee to provide private investigative service or private security
14 service may not exceed ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. The fee for the renewal of a registration to
15 provide private investigative service or private security service may not exceed
16 ~~thirty~~sixty dollars. A late fee not to exceed ~~ten~~twenty dollars may be charged for each
17 month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.

18 9. The initial application fee for a certified course instructor for an armed first responder
19 training certification may not exceed ~~four hundred~~eight hundred dollars. A fee for
20 renewal of a course instructor certification for an armed first responder program may
21 not exceed ~~three hundred~~six hundred dollars.

22 **SECTION 2. PERFORMANCE AUDIT - NORTH DAKOTA PRIVATE INVESTIGATIVE AND**
23 **SECURITY BOARD.** The state auditor shall conduct a performance audit of the North Dakota
24 private investigative and security board, in accordance with chapter 54-10, during the biennium
25 beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027. The performance audit must be in addition
26 to the requirements under section 54-10-27.

27 **SECTION 3. EMERGENCY.** ~~This~~Section 1 of this Act is declared to be an emergency
28 measure.

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivisions Committee Room JW327B, State Capitol

SB 2051
3/27/2025

A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to declare an emergency.

9:00 a.m. Chairman Longmuir opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Longmuir, Vice-Chairman Fegley, Representatives Bolinske, Hager, Hatlestad, Klemin, Motschenbacher, Ostlie, Warrey

Members Absent: Vice-Chairman Jonas, Representatives Davis, Heilman, Toman

Discussion Topics:

- Private investigative and security board rule making process
- Increase in funding

9:02 a.m. Representative Motschenbacher proposed Amendment LC:25.8022.02003, testimony #44287 and additional testimony #44291, #44292.

9:06 a.m. Representative Motschenbacher moved to adopt Amendment LC:25.8022.02003, testimony #44287.

9:06 a.m. Representative Klemin seconded the motion.

Representatives	Vote
Representative Donald W. Longmuir	Y
Representative Clayton Fegley	Y
Representative Jim Jonas	A
Representative Macy Bolinske	Y
Representative Jayme Davis	A
Representative LaurieBeth Hager	Y
Representative Patrick R. Hatlestad	Y
Representative Matthew Heilman	A
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Mike Motschenbacher	Y
Representative Mitch Ostlie	Y
Representative Nathan Toman	A
Representative Jonathan Warrey	Y

9:11 a.m. Motion passed 9-0-4

9:13 a.m. Representative Warrey moved a Do Pass as Amended and rerefer to Appropriations.

9:13 a.m. Representative Hatlestad seconded the motion.

Representatives	Vote
Representative Donald W. Longmuir	Y
Representative Clayton Fegley	Y
Representative Jim Jonas	A
Representative Macy Bolinske	Y
Representative Jayme Davis	A
Representative LaurieBeth Hager	Y
Representative Patrick R. Hatlestad	Y
Representative Matthew Heilman	A
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Mike Motschenbacher	Y
Representative Mitch Ostlie	Y
Representative Nathan Toman	A
Representative Jonathan Warrey	Y

9:16 a.m. Motion passed 9-0-4

9:16 a.m. Representative Motschenbacher will carry the bill.

9:16 a.m. Chairman Longmuir closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

CO
3/27/25
1052

Sixty-ninth
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
FIRST ENGROSSMENT**

ENGROSSED SENATE BILL NO. 2051

Introduced by

Industry and Business Committee

(At the request of the Private Investigative and Security Board)

1 A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code,
2 relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; to provide
3 for a performance audit of the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to
4 declare an emergency.

5 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

6 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code is
7 amended and reenacted as follows:

8 **43-30-16. Examination, license, and registration fees.**

9 The board may ~~establish by rule and~~ charge the following fees:

- 10 1. The fee to be paid by an applicant for an examination to determine the applicant's
11 fitness to receive a license as a private investigator or a license to provide private
12 security services ~~may not exceed one hundred~~ two hundred is one hundred fifty dollars.
- 13 2. The fee to be paid by an applicant for the initial issuance or the renewal of a license as
14 a private investigator or a license to provide private security services ~~may not exceed~~
15 ~~one hundred fifty~~ three hundred is two hundred twenty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to~~
16 ~~exceed fifty one hundred~~ of seventy-five dollars may be charged for each month the
17 renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 18 3. The fee to be paid by an applicant to apply for a license to conduct a private security
19 or detective agency ~~may not exceed one hundred~~ two hundred is one hundred fifty
20 dollars.

- 1 4. The fee for the issuance or the renewal of a license to conduct a private security or
2 detective agency ~~may not exceed three hundred~~ six hundred is four hundred fifty
3 dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed one hundred~~ two hundred of one hundred fifty dollars
4 may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 5 5. The ~~one-time~~ initial fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of a private security
6 training certificate ~~may not exceed twenty five~~ sixty is forty dollars. The fee for the
7 renewal of a private security training certificate may not exceed sixty is forty dollars. A
8 late fee not to exceed twenty of fifteen dollars may be charged for each month the
9 renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 10 6. The annual fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of an armed certificate ~~may~~
11 ~~not exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed ten~~ twenty of
12 fifteen dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 13 7. The fee to be paid for the issuance of a duplicate license ~~may not exceed twenty~~ forty is
14 thirty dollars.
- 15 8. The initial registration fee to provide private investigative service or private security
16 service ~~may not exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. The fee for the renewal of a
17 registration to provide private investigative service or private security service ~~may not~~
18 ~~exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed ten~~ twenty of fifteen dollars
19 may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 20 9. The initial application fee for a certified course instructor for an armed first responder
21 training certification ~~may not exceed four hundred~~ eight hundred is six hundred dollars.
22 A fee for renewal of a course instructor certification for an armed first responder
23 program ~~may not exceed three hundred~~ six hundred is four hundred fifty dollars.

24 **SECTION 2. PERFORMANCE AUDIT - NORTH DAKOTA PRIVATE INVESTIGATIVE AND**
25 **SECURITY BOARD.** The state auditor shall conduct a performance audit of the North Dakota
26 private investigative and security board, in accordance with chapter 54-10, during the biennium
27 beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027. The performance audit must be in addition
28 to the requirements under section 54-10-27.

29 **SECTION 3. EMERGENCY.** ~~This~~ Section 1 of this Act is declared to be an emergency
30 measure.

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ENGROSSED SB 2051**

Political Subdivisions Committee (Rep. Longmuir, Chairman) recommends **AMENDMENTS** ([25.8022.02003](#)) and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** and **BE REREFERRED** to the **Appropriations Committee** (9 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 4 ABSENT OR EXCUSED AND NOT VOTING). SB 2051 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

25.8022.02003
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council
staff for Representative
Motschenbacher
March 24, 2025

Sixty-ninth
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FIRST ENGROSSMENT

ENGROSSED SENATE BILL NO. 2051

Introduced by

Industry and Business Committee

(At the request of the Private Investigative and Security Board)

1 A BILL for an Act to amend and reenact section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code,
2 relating to fees charged by the North Dakota private investigative and security board; to provide
3 for a performance audit of the North Dakota private investigative and security board; and to
4 declare an emergency.

5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

6 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Section 43-30-16 of the North Dakota Century Code is
7 amended and reenacted as follows:

8 **43-30-16. Examination, license, and registration fees.**

9 The board may ~~establish by rule and~~ charge the following fees:

- 10 1. The fee to be paid by an applicant for an examination to determine the applicant's
11 fitness to receive a license as a private investigator or a license to provide private
12 security services ~~may not exceed one hundred~~ two hundred is one hundred fifty dollars.
- 13 2. The fee to be paid by an applicant for the initial issuance or the renewal of a license as
14 a private investigator or a license to provide private security services ~~may not exceed~~
15 ~~one hundred fifty~~ three hundred is two hundred twenty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to~~
16 ~~exceed fifty~~ one hundred of seventy-five dollars may be charged for each month the
17 renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 18 3. The fee to be paid by an applicant to apply for a license to conduct a private security
19 or detective agency ~~may not exceed one hundred~~ two hundred is one hundred fifty
20 dollars.

- 1 4. The fee for the issuance or the renewal of a license to conduct a private security or
2 detective agency ~~may not exceed three hundred~~ six hundred is four hundred fifty
3 dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed one hundred~~ two hundred of one hundred fifty dollars
4 may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 5 5. The ~~one-time~~ initial fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of a private security
6 training certificate ~~may not exceed twenty five~~ sixty is forty dollars. The fee for the
7 renewal of a private security training certificate ~~may not exceed sixty~~ is forty dollars. A
8 late fee ~~not to exceed twenty~~ of fifteen dollars may be charged for each month the
9 renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 10 6. The annual fee to be paid by an applicant for the issuance of an armed certificate ~~may~~
11 ~~not exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed ten~~ twenty of
12 fifteen dollars may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 13 7. The fee to be paid for the issuance of a duplicate license ~~may not exceed twenty~~ forty is
14 thirty dollars.
- 15 8. The initial registration fee to provide private investigative service or private security
16 service ~~may not exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. The fee for the renewal of a
17 registration to provide private investigative service or private security service ~~may not~~
18 ~~exceed thirty~~ sixty is forty-five dollars. A late fee ~~not to exceed ten~~ twenty of fifteen dollars
19 may be charged for each month the renewal fee is due and unpaid.
- 20 9. The initial application fee for a certified course instructor for an armed first responder
21 training certification ~~may not exceed four hundred~~ eight hundred is six hundred dollars.
22 A fee for renewal of a course instructor certification for an armed first responder
23 program ~~may not exceed three hundred~~ six hundred is four hundred fifty dollars.

24 **SECTION 2. PERFORMANCE AUDIT - NORTH DAKOTA PRIVATE INVESTIGATIVE AND**
25 **SECURITY BOARD.** The state auditor shall conduct a performance audit of the North Dakota
26 private investigative and security board, in accordance with chapter 54-10, during the biennium
27 beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2027. The performance audit must be in addition
28 to the requirements under section 54-10-27.

29 **SECTION 3. EMERGENCY.** ~~This~~ Section 1 of this Act is declared to be an emergency
30 measure.

North Dakota Private Investigation & Security Board
Profit & Loss Budget Overview
 January through December 2025

	Jan - Dec 25
Income	
Late Fees	1,000.00
Criminal Search	
BCI Search	6,500.00
FBI Search	11,000.00
Total Criminal Search	17,500.00
Investigative Fees	
PI License Fees	9,000.00
PI Agency License Fees	13,500.00
Application-Reg. Investigator	2,000.00
Application-Detective Agency	500.00
Application-Private Invst.	600.00
Total Investigative Fees	25,600.00
Security Fees	
Security Agency License Fee	14,000.00
Security Provider License Fee	5,500.00
Duplicate Certificates	40.00
Application-Security Agency	1,500.00
Application-Security Officer	26,000.00
Application-Armed Security	5,500.00
Security Fees - Other	0.00
Total Security Fees	52,540.00
Study Guides	500.00
Interest Income	13.00
Other Income	250.00
Total Income	97,403.00
Gross Profit	97,403.00
Expense	
Computer Software	2,400.00
Payroll Expenses	70,000.00
Office Equipment	75.00
Bank Service Charges	150.00
Insurance	
Work Comp	900.00
Total Insurance	900.00
Office Supplies	1,500.00
Postage and Delivery	500.00
Professional Fees	
Accounting Services	1,000.00
BCI Searches	17,500.00
Records Management	750.00
Legal Fees	5,350.00
Total Professional Fees	24,600.00
Rent	3,300.00
Telephone	1,039.49
Other Expenses	156.00
Total Expense	104,620.49
Net Income	-7,217.49

Effective May 1, 2000

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. The board charges the following fees:

1. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services.

3. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of three hundred dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual shall pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual shall pay an annual fee of twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of twenty dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual shall pay a fee of twenty dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. There is no charge for renewing an individual's registration to provide private investigative or private security services, but a late fee of ten dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000.
General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04
Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective May 1, 2005

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. ~~The~~ In addition to statutory fees,
the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual shall pay a fee of one hundred ~~fifty~~ thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services.
3. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.

4. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of ~~three~~ two hundred ~~fifty~~ dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual shall pay a fee of ~~twenty-five~~ twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual shall pay an annual fee of ~~twenty-five~~ twenty dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity shall pay a fee of ~~twenty~~ ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual shall pay a fee of ~~twenty~~ eighteen dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. There is no charge for renewing an individual's registration to provide private investigative or private security services, but a late fee of ten dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective July 1, 2010

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late.
3. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.

4. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay an annual fee of twenty dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual ~~shall~~ must pay a fee of ~~eighteen~~ twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. ~~There is no charge~~ An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing ~~an individual's~~ registration to provide private investigative or private security services, ~~but a~~. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective October 1, 2013

CHAPTER 93-02-03

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees. In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of ~~twenty~~ twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license.
8. An individual must pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective July 1, 2018

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees.

In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred thirty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal. After this two-month timeframe, a new application, including criminal searches, fees, and testing, is required.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of two hundred fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
5. An individual must pay a fee of twenty dollars to receive a private security training certificate. There is no expiration date for these certifications.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of twenty-five dollars to receive an armed private security certificate. Armed private security certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ten dollars to obtain a duplicate license or registration.

8. An individual must pay a fee of twenty-five dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. The registration shall be submitted by the licensed agency. An individual must pay twenty-five dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars must also be paid for each month the renewal is late.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013; July 1, 2018.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16

Amended Effective October 1, 2022

CHAPTER 93-02-03

93-02-03-06. Fees - Amount - Late fees.

In addition to statutory fees, the board charges the following fees:

1. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to take the examination to become licensed to provide investigative or private security services.
2. An individual must pay a fee of one hundred ~~thirty~~fifty dollars to receive an initial license or renew the individual's license to provide private investigative or private security services. In addition, a late fee of fifty dollars must be paid for each month the renewal is late, up to a maximum cumulative late fee of one hundred dollars for a late renewal. After this two-month time frame, a new application, including criminal history background checks, fees, and testing, is required.
3. An individual or entity must pay a fee of one hundred dollars to apply for a license to operate a private security or detective agency.
4. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ~~two~~three hundred ~~fifty~~ dollars to receive an initial license or renew a license to operate a private security or detective agency. A late fee of one hundred dollars also must be paid for each month the renewal fee is late.
5. An individual must pay a fee of ~~twenty~~twenty-five dollars to receive a private security training certificate. There is no expiration date for these certifications.
6. An individual must pay an annual fee of ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars to receive an armed ~~private security~~ certificate. Armed ~~private security~~ certificates expire on September thirtieth of each year. A late fee of ten dollars also must be paid for each month the renewal fee is late.
7. An individual or entity must pay a fee of ~~ten~~twenty dollars to obtain a duplicate license or registration.
8. An individual must pay a fee of ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars to obtain an initial registration to provide private investigative or private security services. The registration shall be submitted by the licensed agency. An individual must pay ~~twenty-five~~thirty dollars for renewing registration to provide private investigative or private security services. A late fee of ten dollars ~~must~~ also must be paid for each month the renewal is late.
9. An individual must pay a fee of four hundred dollars to obtain a training certification as a certified course instructor of the armed first responder program. An individual must pay three hundred dollars for renewal of a course instructor certification for the armed first responder program.

History: Effective May 1, 2000; amended effective May 1, 2005; July 1, 2010; October 1, 2013; July 1, 2018; October 1, 2022.

General Authority: NDCC 43-30-04

Law Implemented: NDCC 43-30-16