

DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

**NOTES AND QUOTES FROM THE TESTIMONY OF ANDREW BARBANO, CHAIR
CITY OF RENO CITIZENS CABLE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE SENATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR
RE: SENATE BILL 278
3-18-2003**

[fn: A6/25 AB 508 Senate minutes/nrs-nac/charter/opsn3]

<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/69th/97minutes/SM/GA/sm6-25GA.htm>

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
Sixty-ninth Session
June 25, 1997

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Ann O'Connell, at 2:00 p.m., on Wednesday, June 25, 1997, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

Mr. Schorr maintained government should not be in the business of competing with private industry, unless government could prove the competition was in the best interest of the public. This amendment informed government if they were going to get into the business of competing with private industry, show reason, show cause and show it was truly in the benefit of the public interest, Mr. Schorr discussed...

Senator Porter questioned the specific purpose of the amendment: what the exclusion of the amendment would prevent from happening, what Prime Cable would like to see happen, and any special interest benefits to Prime Cable.

Mr. Schorr stated the intention of Prime Cable was not one of wresting control from cities or counties. He pointed out some cities and counties have, in the past, determined the need to provide telecommunication services in accordance with the best interest of their residents. Mr. Schorr asserted the importance of counties possessing the right to provide those services.

Senator Porter requested a specific example. Mr. Schorr indicated Churchill County was the sole telephone services provider in Churchill County and expressed the county did an excellent job of providing service once approval had been obtained from voters. Mr. Schorr stressed the concern was the necessary analysis required before a local government spent taxpayer dollars. An analysis was especially important in the competitive environment today, Mr. Schorr opined. Senator Porter questioned whether cities and counties had development plans which provided an impetus for the proposed legislation.

Mr. Schorr noted there had been discussion in some communities of building the infrastructure, the conduit system within a community, and forcing telecommunications providers to utilize the established system instead of their own devices. He testified there had been discussions where communities expressed an interest in participating in the telephone or the cable business. **Mr. Schorr emphasized if that was, indeed, the case, communities should be required to show a reason for the involvement.**

Senator Porter elucidated Mr. Schorr mentioned the underground cabling and stated he fully understood the implications. **The senator requested clarification, however, on the potential involvement of cities and counties in cable television, and, again, requested specific examples.** Mr. Schorr replied there had been recent announcements the city of Fallon planned to involve local government in the cable television field and demonstrated such intentions. He stressed there was a cable provider in the community of Fallon and asserted analysis was not conducted by the city of Fallon. Senator Porter questioned whether there were events occurring in Clark County which unnerved Prime Cable. Mr. Schorr remarked there were not any recent Clark County events of concern, but expressed in the past, there were serious questions raised by local government staff members that frightened the industry. Mr. Schorr testified such occurrences were the potential development of a Master Telecommunications Ordinance, a cable technology system, and discussions surrounding the components of a potential fee structure. He insisted A.B. 508 was very clear maximum fees not exceed \$5. Circumvention of the mandate was harmful to the industry and to the nature of the bill, Mr. Schorr declared. Although discussions subsided recently, there was no guarantee discussions would not recur following this legislative session, he asserted. Mr. Schorr reemphasized Prime Cable did not seek to control the ability of local government to regulate rights-of-way.