

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Third Session  
March 17, 2005**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order at 8:17 a.m., on Thursday, March 17, 2005. Chairman David Parks presided in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Parks, Chairman  
Ms. Peggy Pierce, Vice Chairwoman  
Mr. Kelvin Atkinson  
Mr. Chad Christensen  
Mr. Jerry D. Claborn  
Mr. Pete Goicoechea  
Mr. Tom Grady  
Mr. Joe Hardy  
Mrs. Marilyn Kirkpatrick  
Mr. Bob McCleary  
Mr. Harvey J. Munford  
Ms. Bonnie Parnell  
Mr. Scott Sibley

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3  
Assemblyman Mark Manendo, Assembly District 18, Clark County  
Assemblyman Lynn Hettrick, Assembly District No. 39, Douglas County,  
Carson City (part), and Washoe County (part)

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst

Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel

Nancy Haywood, Committee Attaché

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association, Carson City, Nevada

Jeanette Belz, Legislative Advocate, representing Associated General Contractors Association, Nevada Chapter

Paul Enos, Manager of Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada, Carson City, Nevada

Richard Daly, Business Manager, Laborers' International Union of North America Local No. 169, Reno, Nevada

Jim Nadeau, Government Affairs Director, Nevada Association of Realtors, Reno, Nevada

Madelyn Shipman, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County, Nevada and the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association

Michael Pennington, Public Policy Director, Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce, Reno, Nevada

Douglas Hunt, Habitat Bureau Chief, Division of Wildlife, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Robert Romer, Representative, State of Nevada Employees Association, Carson City, Nevada

Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees Retirement System of Nevada, Carson City, Nevada

Ron Kruse, Chairman, Nevada Veterans Services Commission, Nevada Office of Veterans Services

Steve Walker, Legislative Advocate, representing Truckee Meadows Water Authority, Carson City, Lyon County, and Douglas County, Nevada

Andrew List, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties, Carson City, Nevada

John Slaughter, Legislative Affairs Manager, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County, Nevada

Michael Harper, Planning Manager, Department of Community Development, Washoe County, Nevada

Cheri Edelman, Legislative Lobbying Team, City of Las Vegas, Nevada

Nancy Howard, Assistant Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities, Carson City, Nevada

Bjorn Selinder, Legislative Advocate, representing Churchill County and Eureka County, Nevada

**Chairman Parks:**

[The meeting was called to order. Roll was taken. Chairman Parks opened the meeting on S. B. 17.]

**Senate Bill 17 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing review of administrative regulations by Legislative Commission. (BDR 18-647)**

**Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3:**

Senate Bill 17 amends provisions that require the Legislative Commission to review permanent administrative regulations. This measure does require that every permanent regulation be reviewed by the Legislative Commission at its next scheduled meeting after submission of the regulation.

There are some exceptions, such as when the Commission refers the regulation to a subcommittee or when the adopting agency has an emergency that requires the regulation to become effective before the next scheduled meeting of the Legislative Commission. In either case, S. B. 17 provides for the review of the regulation by the established subcommittee. If the Commission does not review a regulation, it must refer that regulation for review to the subcommittee. The subcommittee must be appointed by the Legislative Commission as soon as possible after the legislative session.

If an emergency regulation submitted by an agency must become effective before the next regular meeting or scheduled meeting of the Commission, the agency may notify our legislative counsel, who shall refer that regulation to the subcommittee for review. The subcommittee shall meet to review as soon as practicable at the request of one of the agencies. We did have a day count in there, and we changed that language to "as soon as practicable." The bill also changes from 10 to 3 the number of working days before a commission meeting that the regulation must be received and reviewed by the Commission.

Finally, S.B. 17 removes a requirement, which was kind of a catch-22 for us, that the Legislature ratifies any objection to a regulation made by the Legislative Commission. A lot of things slipped through because of that ratification requirement.

In essence, what this bill does, and this is one of those simple bills, is to help ensure that the legislative intent that we craft so carefully and consider so

religiously when we process every single bill through this Legislature will be respected and followed. This is crucial to the legislative process and the work we do in the Legislature. Equally important, if not more important, it is critical that we preserve the legislative intent in the regulation process for the people we serve. This is a protection that they deserve, that they expect, and that we need to deliver. This bill will close some loopholes we've had in the past.

[Senator Wiener, continued.] I provided a packet for you ([Exhibit B](#)), and there are a couple of letters of support. By the way, Ray Bacon [Nevada Manufacturers Association] is not able to be here today, but, for his industry, he is endorsing the bill. The one letter that is telling is the handout, the chart (on page 2 of [Exhibit B](#)) prepared by Brenda Erdoes, our Legislative Counsel. You will see in the last year's tally that only 22 percent of the regulations from state agencies were reviewed by the Legislative Commission. That is why we are here, to ensure that all regulations will come before the Legislature, which passed the law with the legislative intent. This is to help see that that occurs, and I urge your support for S.B. 17.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

On page 2, lines 28 and 29, the Legislative Commission probably is interested in being a public meeting and noticing what is going to happen in that public meeting. In the City of Boulder City, we found that we had to have at least five days to be able to notice in the appropriate places in the city. I suspect it is even a little more complicated with the Legislative Commission, so when we say that if it is received more than three working days before the meeting, you won't be able to do a public notice of what the Legislative Commission is going to do—at least in Boulder City and, probably, in most of the municipalities—if it's less than five days.

I am wondering why we changed from ten days to three days. Ten days actually gives you some time to print it out and figure out what you are going to notice. I think there is a noticing requirement that even if we are exempt from it in the Legislature, we probably ought to abide by the spirit of it. There's probably been some discussion of why you went from ten days to three days that I am not privy to.

**Senator Wiener:**

Actually, our Legislative Counsel, Brenda Erdoes, helped us draft the language to meet the legalities. One of the intents was to move some of these a little more quickly. If I am not mistaken, three days is the required open meeting notice. That particular number was not addressed in the hearing in the Senate; that wasn't questioned.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

I recognize that the law is "three days," but you have to prepare it. If it comes on a Friday, there is a deadline in the newspaper. You have to have it in by Thursday in order to get into the Tuesday paper, or on Tuesday to get into the Thursday paper. You really can't notice something in less than five days in Boulder City. I suspect it is the same in some other jurisdictions. I would recommend that we look at that particular part of it to make sure that we are compatible with the spirit of the public Open Meeting Law.

Does the Legislative Commission review the Tax Commission? Or, is it the IFC [Interim Finance Committee] that would review that regulation?

**Senator Wiener:**

Unless it deals with the regulations, I know that we have done regulatory work, but I don't remember reviewing the Tax Commission substantively. I don't recall that we have done substantive reviews. I don't know if that is in our jurisdiction or not.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

That goes to the heart of my question. Who does the Tax Commission? I suspect the IFC would be in a little better position to review the Tax Commission than the Legislative Commission.

**Senator Wiener:**

I have been sitting on the Commission for a few sessions. The Legislative Commission has the charge, a key responsibility that has expanded to be so, because of some of the concerns I brought forward in this bill. We have expanded substantially on the need to review the regulations. Where that may not have been intended to be one of the major responsibilities, it has certainly become one. Any of the state's agencies that would have regulatory change, which are adopted based on new laws, those new regulations would come to this Commission. I don't know if there is excepted out of that any particular agency or commission—such as the Tax Commission—that, when a new law is passed, doesn't come to us. I don't think the Tax Commission would be an exception to that regulatory review, because we review the regulations for the intent of the law—not so much the substance part, but the intent of the regulation—to see if the regulation satisfies the intent of the bill that was passed by the Legislature.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

With Senate Bill 8 of the 20th Special Session (2003), which came out with the "financial institution" definition, it was not the intent of the law to get every single institution that had an accounts receivable reviewed. Did the Tax Commission then get reviewed by the IFC? Did it get reviewed by anybody? Did it get reviewed by the Legislative Commission? The intent was that issue, and it obviously played a role in the revenue that we were going to generate or not generate, depending on which direction we went. I feel the Tax Commission made the right decision, and we went with it, but I don't know who reviewed it.

**Chairman Parks:**

Senator Wiener, we have an expert sitting in the audience. May I invite her to join us for clarification? Ms. Vilardo, please come forward.

**Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am speaking in support of S.B. 17. We have been supportive of the changes being made, starting in 1979, to beef this up.

On Assemblyman Hardy's first question, relative to the notification in state law, regulations are not required to be published in the paper such as is the requirement you have which, for the local governments, is a requirement under the Open Meeting Law. Local governments are not subject to NRS [Nevada Revised Statutes] 233B.

The 3-day notice normally should be enough time for the Commission's hearing. It is 3 working days, and what happens on the regulations, for anyone who is concerned with the regulation, the law is much more stringent on the state level with the workshops that are held. You have to notice a workshop to all parties that are on your mailing list or have expressed an interest in your agency. You have to provide 15 days' notice of the intent to workshop a potential regulation, and you then have to put it to the governing body, which may be a board, something like the Tax Commission, or may be the agency head who then has to formally adopt the regulation.

Relative to the Tax Commission, which I can speak to easily because I cover those workshops, the Commission, by standards that it has adopted, sets the regulatory hearing, at which time it will adopt a regulation that has been heard in a workshop within 30 days. Relative to the review of the regulation, it is not the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) that actually would be the appropriate body to review a Tax Commission regulation.

It would more often than not be a standing committee on taxes, if there were one. But the issue of this review of regulations has actually had a number of us

in the room from the private sector involved in cases where the Legislature—I can think of one particular situation—chose to amend a provision out of a bill. This was either in 1995 or 1997. The agency, since it has general regulatory powers, literally took the amendment that the Legislature amended out of the bill and adopted a regulation to put it into law. In that particular instance, the Legislative Commission, because of the old time frames, was not in place to review it. There was an appeal made to the Commission to ask them to bring it back and hear it. This would allow every regulation to absolutely be heard except under those specific conditions.

[Carole Vilardo, continued.] In all cases for regulations, the big difference between the local governments and the State is the fact that, if a regulation is going to be promulgated, that agency, right from the get-go, has an obligation to notify all people interested; all of us who track regulations are very aware that we have the Legislative Commission that has a power that the voters gave to the Legislature, when the voters approved the fact that the Legislature could review regulations. Prior to that, there had been a court case that was about an interference of the separation of powers, because the agencies are Executive Branch agencies. There is quite a bit of difference between the local and the state when it comes to the adoption of the regulation or, in the case of a local, an ordinance.

**Jeanette Belz, Legislative Advocate, representing the Associated General Contractors Association, Nevada Chapter:**

We are in favor of S.B. 17.

**Paul Enos, Manager of Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada, Carson City, Nevada:**

We also are in favor of the bill ([Exhibit C](#)).

**Richard Daly, Business Manager, Laborers' International Union of North America Local No. 169, Reno, Nevada:**

I am in support of S.B. 17 to get the regulations reviewed by a legislative body, people who were elected to review laws before they go into place. I could tell you some of my experiences, where agencies are required to hold workshops and various things to get to a regulation before the Legislative Commission. I have attended workshops with agencies that say, "This is our general idea," and they don't even have a draft of what they are proposing to write.

They will then have the subsequent workshop and take your testimony, but there is no incentive and no need for that regulatory agency to have any cooperation with the regulated. The regulator and the regulated have vast splits, and there is no cooperation. They are required to have the workshop but are not

required to listen to what you say; they are required to have the hearing but are not required to listen to what you have to say. They can adopt the regulation based on what they think is right, and, based on the old laws, pass the thing through in a window, and the Legislative Commission is not there. Unless you know the process fairly well and have someone on the Legislative Commission willing to pull that thing off and get it heard, it goes into effect.

[Richard Daly, continued.] I think this bill will foster better cooperation between the regulator and the regulated. If that agreement cannot be reached between those parties, I am in favor of having elected officials—who are elected to make law—making the law, and not the regulators. I am in favor of what Ms. Vilardo said and am in favor of separation of powers under the Constitution.

I believe that this bill will do several things. It will also address what is reverse legislation, if you ask me. On the last part where, if the Legislative Commission did object to the removal, in order for it to be not implemented, some legislator would have to take one of their bill draft requests and introduce a bill in order to say that this will not go into effect, rather than someone, a regulator, who could say that he/she is going to use one of that person's bill drafts to see that this does go into effect. I think this bill will clean those things up and make the process better. It will also, hopefully, foster cooperation and put the powers in the proper place when we are making law.

**Chairman Parks:**

I know that, although I haven't been on the Legislative Commission, but having attended a number of the meetings as well as watching it over the Internet, there have been several occasions where the agencies have proposed regulations. That is what they do; they propose the regulation and submit it for ratification by the Legislative Commission. There have been a couple of instances where the proposed regulation has been sent back for modification, change, or, in one case, some fairly extensive revision.

**Jim Nadeau, Government Affairs Director, Nevada Association of Realtors,  
Reno, Nevada:**

We are supporting this bill.

**Madelyn Shipman, Legislative Advocate, representing Washoe County, Nevada:**  
We are in support.

**Michael Pennington, Public Policy Director, Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce,  
Reno, Nevada:**

We are in support.



**Chairman Parks:**

We do have two people who have signed in opposition to S.B. 17.

**Doug Hunt, Habitat Bureau Chief, Division of Wildlife, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources::**

We are not in opposition to the bill, but we are neutral and have some questions. The Department of Wildlife has some concerns regarding S.B. 17, but perhaps we're not sure how the changes to NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 233B, as proposed, will affect our ability to implement administrative regulations affecting the department's many programs ([Exhibit D](#)).

The Department of Wildlife has specific wildlife chapters of administrative regulations, including Chapter 488, watercraft; Chapter 501, administration and enforcement; Chapter 502, licenses, tags and permits; Chapter 503, hunting, fishing, and trapping; and miscellaneous protective measures: Chapter 504, management and propagation; Chapter 505, fur dealers; and Chapter 506, wildlife violator compact. Often, our time frames for implementing these administrative regulations are very tight.

In Section 1, subsection 3 of the bill, with the deletion of the "within 35 days will review the regulations," we're concerned that the time to implement a new regulation or revise an existing regulation may take longer than 35 days. Because of the nature of our business, many of our programs are deadline-driven. Boat renewals, hunting, fishing, trapping, and special permits all have critical time frames. We must have regulations in effect and enforceable.

Nevada Revised Statutes 233B.033 and NRS 233B.0613 define "emergency regulation." Section 1 of this bill deals with permanent regulation. The use of the word "emergency," in Section 1, subsection 4, is confusing because we do not believe it is referring to an emergency regulation, but rather some event that occurs while the agency's permit regulation is being reviewed by the Legislative Commission, but before the review is final. Could an agency ever be challenged that the term "emergency" in Section 1, subsection 4 means an "emergency regulation?" Could an alternative word be used for "emergency" in this section? The Department asks that if subsection 4 is necessary as it appears—that, if an emergency really arises during the dependency of Legislative Commission review—the agency could promulgate a separate emergency regulation rather than try to hurry through this standard procedure. This would fall under the rules of Chapter 233B for emergency regulations and under the rules in NRS 501.339, which allows the Department's director to seek approval from the Governor for emergency regulations.

**Assemblyman Grady:**

Mr. Hunt, did you bring these concerns up on the Senate side, or did you talk to the sponsor of the bill about your concerns?

**Doug Hunt:**

We did speak with Senator Wiener this morning briefly. We did not testify on the Senate side.

**Chairman Parks:**

Our legal counsel, Eileen O'Grady, is watching it over the closed circuit TV, and what we can do is ask her to take a look at the concerns that you expressed. Do you have a copy of your statement for the secretary? If so, if you could leave that, I'm sure it would help Ms. O'Grady.

We obviously won't be acting on this bill today, but we'll certainly take a look at that and see what concerns you had. We will close the hearing on S.B. 17. We will wait to hear from Eileen O'Grady and Brenda Erdoes, relative to those concerns.

We will now open the hearing on A.B. 113.

**Assembly Bill 113: Authorizes certain public employees with active military service to purchase up to 2 additional years of service in Public Employees' Retirement System. (BDR 23-696)**

**Assemblyman Mark Manendo, Assembly District No. 18, Clark County:**

I have brought forth A.B. 113 at the request of one of my constituents who is actually a state employee and not a member of the Armed Forces. He was thinking of creative ways to do something for our military and came up with this idea.

Assembly Bill 113 allows members of the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) to buy two additional years of service credit based on time served on active military duty. As some of you know, public employees who take a leave of absence from their jobs to serve in the military do not lose retirement service credits while they are away. In fact, their employers continue to make contributions on their behalf, and by virtue of state and federal law, they do not lose seniority or similar benefits while they are gone.

I think the intent and the motivation behind the bill are obvious. We are all aware of the extraordinary sacrifices that have been made by Nevadans while

serving on active military duty in postings all over the United States and the world. Today almost 2,000 Nevadans are serving overseas in the global war on terror, in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Daily, these men and women face danger. Daily, these men and women wish they were back at home with their parents, their families, their friends, their neighbors, their kids, and at home working. This is a way to recognize the extraordinary sacrifices made by public employees who leave their homes, families, and jobs to serve on duty and to show our appreciation for what they do.

[Assemblyman Manendo, continued.] It is my understanding that this bill will not cost the Retirement System any money, because the employee will be required to pay the full actuarial cost of any of the time purchased. I do want to mention that it has come to my attention that there is a bill in the Senate, S.B. 122, and the difference between the two bills is that S.B. 122 extends the purchase of service credit to three years while A.B. 113 is for two years. That is something the Committee may want to think about as far as their debate. If we want to move that to three years, I do not have a problem with that. Also, S.B. 122 is a match—a year for a year. With my bill, once you serve, even for one year, you can buy up to two years. You may want to go there. Maybe we could work that out in Conference Committee.

It is a privilege to be before the Committee, and on behalf of all the brave men and women who are serving overseas, I felt this would be a very good thing we could do, a very nice gesture on our part as the State of Nevada.

**Assemblyman McCleary:**

I actually ran into a constituent campaigning during the summer, and I was really shocked. There was a mother with three children whose husband was in the National Guard and deployed. He was earning \$5,000 a month in his civilian job but only earning \$1,200 in the National Guard being deployed overseas. His family is losing everything. I couldn't believe it, and I didn't know what to tell her. She is looking to me and asking, "Can you help me?" What a tragedy. This is really a story of commitment and sacrifice.

When I heard about this bill, I wanted to thank you, Assemblyman Manendo, for bringing this about. I wish we could do something for all of the people serving from the private sector. I don't know what to do, but I am glad that someone is doing something for those serving who work in state government. I appreciate that.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

As I read the bill, it applies to volunteer firemen as well. What does this part of the bill mean? . . . "or released from active duty," on page 2, line 23, and on

page 5, line 9. What other than "honorably discharged" are you looking to include in that?

**Assemblyman Manendo:**

I guess I don't know enough about the military to say what other releases there are, but that is something we can certainly look into. That was drafting language. It may be compatible with other places in NRS.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

I am listening to the voice behind me who talks about National Guard or reserves kinds of things. Members of those armed services can be released from active duty, but they are still eligible to be called back. If we looked at "released from active duty" as someone who was kicked out of the service, do you want that person captured in that definition, too? Or, is the intent for the "honorable" issue and the "continuing to serve" issue? I suspect we can define that a little better.

**Assemblyman Manendo:**

The intent is for the "honorable" and "continuing to serve" issues.

**Robert Romer, Representative, State of Nevada Employees' Association, Carson City, Nevada:**

We are very much in support of this bill and urge the Committee to pass it. We can't do enough for our men and women who are risking their lives fighting in foreign countries so that we can be free to do what we want to do. We can't say enough, but we really urge the support of this Body.

**Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada (PERS), Carson City, Nevada:**

The Retirement Board has taken a neutral position with respect to A.B. 113, because it is actuarially neutral to us. The costs for purchasing are going to be at the full actuarial cost to the individual, so that makes the retirement system whole ([Exhibit E](#)).

There is one issue that I did want to point out to the Committee. It is not a tremendous policy issue, but there is a tax code implication for purchases of service credit above five years. The federal tax code allows purchases of what we call "air time," which is the five-year purchase, without implication for the individual, from a dollar contribution amount leveled into the system. As soon as you go above five years, the federal tax code requires limitations to be placed upon the amount of money that can be voluntarily added to a retirement system like Nevada PERS.

[Dana Bilyeu, continued.] What we will do is look at each of the individual purchases as they are coming to us, and we will have to apply a test or limitation to them if the purchase costs more than the dollar limit that is within the tax code right now. I believe it's currently \$42,000 per year, so a two-year purchase could have the effect of being more than that. We will have to require that individual to make that purchase over a couple of years, rather than in one particular year, to maintain our tax-qualified status. I just wanted to point that out to the Committee and to say again that the Retirement Board remains neutral on A. B. 113.

**Chairman Parks:**

Assembly Bill 113 would permit the purchase of two years' credit. I will disclose that I am a PERS retiree, and I did purchase three years based on my four years of military service, which was a 1979 change. An individual could purchase, as it stands now, up to five years. This bill will, then, permit an additional two years?

**Dana Bilyeu:**

That is correct.

**Chairman Parks:**

Would there be other time windows? Would someone need to have a certain number of years in public service before they could purchase up to seven years of service credit? Would there be a limitation or a first number of creditable years that they would have to have before they could purchase the seven years?

**Dana Bilyeu:**

The current requirement in the statute is that a member is allowed to purchase the 5 years of service, and the 2 years as well, once they are vested in the system. They are required to have 5 years in the system first. Assemblyman Manendo did point out that there is a federal law for an individual who is called to active duty, who leaves his current post—for instance, an individual with 3 years of service in the State is called to active duty as a Nevada National Guardsman, goes over to Iraq, does a 2-year deployment, and comes back—that their employer is required to make the contributions for that individual such that he would not lose his State service credit. He would become vested in the system because those contributions would come back to us, and he would have 5 years in the system. As soon as that occurs, he can also purchase the 7 that we are discussing here, the 5 air-time years plus the 2 military ones. Ultimately, you could have an individual with 3 years of active service who ends up with 12 years of service but only having worked 3. There is a fairly lengthy purchase that can happen there.

**Assemblyman Manendo:**

I was just looking through S.B. 122. It is the same language that Assemblyman Hardy was talking about. Maybe we can look in the Senate to see if that was brought up or if they are planning to do any clean-up language on that.

**Ron Kruse, Chairman, Nevada Veterans Services Commission, Nevada Office of Veterans Services:**

I have had the privilege of being on the Veterans Services Commission for the last six years. I am the current chairman, and I fully support this bill wholeheartedly, along with the 268,000 veterans we have living in the state. Personally, in my own community of Indian Hills just south of Carson City, have four retired employees, retired military themselves from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. They will be most interested and, perhaps, participating in this program once this thing goes through.

Also, on the firefighting end, being an old Navy firefighter for 21 years—1952 to 1973, a little of Korea and all of Vietnam, I saw a lot of it—I was a professional firefighter for aircraft carriers. That was my specialty and also working with POWs [prisoners of war]. I give my full support of this bill, and you have the backing of the Veterans Commission, as far as I know.

**Steve Walker, Legislative Advocate, representing Truckee Meadows Water Authority:**

The Truckee Meadows Water Authority supports this bill, too.

**Chairman Parks:**

Is there anyone else in our audience who would like to speak on A.B. 113? If not, we will go close the hearing.

[Opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 187.]

**Assembly Bill 187: Authorizes governing body of local government to revise procedure for adopting certain minor amendments to master plan. (BDR 22-591)**

**Andrew List, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), Carson City, Nevada:**

Assembly Bill 187 is a bill draft that was brought before our Board of Directors at our August 13, 2004, Board of Directors meeting and approved by our Board, receiving the endorsement of all 17 counties. It is applicable to all 17 jurisdictions.

**John Slaughter, Legislative Affairs Manager, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County, Nevada:**

The idea for this particular legislation was generated through Washoe County's Community Development Department. I have with me today Michael Harper, Planning Manager for that department. He will go through the bill, explain what it does, and then explain the need for the bill.

**Michael Harper, Planning Manager, Washoe County Department of Community  
Development:**

I am here to support A.B. 187. We do thank the Nevada Association of Counties for moving this bill forward. A.B. 187 is intended to provide a simple process for amending local master plans from minor technical amendments. It also intended to exempt these minor technical amendments from the maximum number of amendments of four per year that is currently in the state's statutes. The bill identifies a simplified process and the types of technical amendments that would be permitted. If I may, I would like to go through the bill with you ([Exhibit F](#)).

Section 1 and subsection 1 allow the local government to choose whether they wish to use a simplified process. Therefore, it is enabling legislation. This was important to one of our sister communities in southern Nevada. Subsection 1 and paragraph 2 of subsection 1 permit a local government to bypass the Planning Commission on a minor technical master plan amendment and have the public hearing only by the elective governing body. Proper notice would still be required for the public hearing before a governing body, and they would have to take the appropriate decision-making process to approve a minor technical amendment.

Subsection 3 of Section 1, which I think is the heart of the bill, enumerates the three areas of minor technical amendments that would be permitted in the simplified amendment process. I would also like to thank the Legislative Counsel Bureau for helping us craft the language to make sure that this was very specific to the types of minor technical amendments that we think are appropriate.

First, a minor technical amendment would be when there would be a change in the boundary that was based on a geographical feature when an error had been discovered. A second technical minor amendment would be a change in the name of a department or an agency. A third would be a change to update statistical information that was contained within the master plan. I would like to provide some examples to you.

[Michael Harper, continued.] Main jurisdictions are sensitive to protecting natural resources such as wildlife habitat, steep slopes, and important water bodies. They are also interested in protecting developing or developed land from natural hazards such as landslide, seismic, and flood areas. These areas are often protected through local master plans and are usually contained on a map so that the public has an understanding of how those types of natural hazard or natural resource areas affect their property and the development of their property.

It's common practice that we use other sources of information, such as the United States Geological Service or other services within our State departments, such as Department of Wildlife, to actually have the mapping done for us. Sometimes those maps aren't exactly as we would like them to be. Technology has certainly increased to the point where, as we have new information to provide, we often find that those boundaries tend to be broader than we had anticipated. When that occurs, we, in fact, have restricted development on property that we should not have restricted through the master plan.

The intent of this bill would be that when we discover that error, and when a property owner is essentially being penalized for having a mapping error, we would be able to make that change very quickly. Many of these changes come to us during the time of an application for development. We want to make sure that we aren't holding up that development application for the appropriate type of development that should be occurring because we had a mapping error that could be corrected. Right now it takes a lengthy amount of time to do that, while holding up applications that should be appropriately done in a timely manner. This bill would allow us to do that in a quicker manner and through a process that would be technical in nature.

You will find that master plans are filed documents for the public. Every so often, departments like to change their names. When that happens, it is important to make sure that the reference is contained within our master plans. Otherwise, we have the public looking at our master plans for information from a particular department that they may think no longer exist when, in fact, they have just made a name change. The biggest issue we had a few years ago was when the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) changed its name to the Natural Resources Conservation Service. A lot of folks thought that the SCS had gone out of business. It was important to make sure that our master plans had, in fact, the appropriate reference.

Maybe more important, though, is the statistical information that is contained within our master plans, such as census information; information from an assessor's office that deals with numerical statistical information on land use; or, for instance, the annual number of building permits issued by a building



department. These help us to show the progress of development within a master plan, such as how it's being implemented. That statistical information is important; it is used a lot by realtors and developers, and we want to make sure that it's timely.

[Michael Harper, continued.] Sections 2 through 4 reference, basically, the proposed processes in Section 1. Section 3 and section 4 do indicate that we would exempt this from the "four times per year" that we are now permitted to amend a master plan.

This bill is very important to local governments, primarily because it saves time and money. It would eliminate the dual-noticing costs and the costs that we encounter right now. I can only tell you what Washoe County encounters. Right now, it takes about four months to go through a master plan process through our Planning Commission and our governing body. We would be able to reduce that to about one and a half months for minor technical amendments. It costs us about \$2,000 for an amendment to a master plan, because the noticing requirements are replicated both at the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

I want to make sure that it is clear to the Committee that we are not eliminating the public hearing process that has to occur before the governing body. We are not suggesting that the noticing of the affected property owners would be eliminated. What we are essentially saying is that a step be removed for a minor technical amendment that, in many instances, affects property owners and their ability to develop property to the fullest extent that a city or county allows. When that error is quickly corrected, property owners can move forward more quickly.

These requirements for public hearings before the governing bodies and for noticing still exist in state law and are not being proposed to be changed. We are asking that the technical amendments that have been enumerated be allowed, because they can be verified by data that is existing. We are not suggesting that we want anything major; we are trying to reduce the cost to government and, at the same time, facilitate the ability of property owners to develop their property to the fullest extent, as it should be when errors have been created through mapping processes.

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

I would like you to give me an example of—in Section 1, referring to the definition of "minor amendment"—what you consider a "jurisdiction" to be.

**Michael Harper:**

One of those jurisdictions would be a change in a department. I believe the State changed the name of a department that used to be called the Historic Preservation and Archaeology. I think it is now the Department of Cultural Affairs. That is referenced throughout our master plan. That is a source that many of our developers use in order to make sure that they can contact that department to be sure the information contained in the master plan is accurate. Developers get a little concerned when they see a department referenced that they can no longer find referenced in state law.

A change in jurisdiction occurs when a general improvement district changes its boundaries. We would like to go in and change the boundaries of that general improvement district. That would be another change. A jurisdiction may change its name, and if it's not showing up in our master plans, which are heavily used as reference documents by the development community, we find that there is a lot of confusion occurring. Sometimes, we are giving wrong information, or they are getting wrong information.

I do want to indicate to you that Washoe County is a little unique in this state, in that we use our master plan as part of our regulatory process. That is because we use what is called a one-map process. Our zoning map and our master plan map are one and the same. This has, probably, a stronger interest to Washoe County than some of the other counties that we've dealt with, but each of those jurisdictions that we have visited with has indicated that they would like to have the minor amendment process to clear up mistakes that have occurred.

**Assemblywoman Parnell:**

I have no problem with Section 1, subsection 3(a), "a change in boundary that is based on a geographical feature," or even (c). To me, (b) rises to a higher level. I would have some concern with that section.

**Assemblyman Claborn:**

I have a problem with Section 1, subsection 1, line 5, which states, "Without action by the planning commission." Would this eliminate public input?

**Michael Harper:**

No. In fact, it will not eliminate public input. The public input is still required, by having notice of public hearing before the governing body that has to make the final decision. No master plan can be amended in this state by the Planning Commission. They are purely a recommending body. The governing body must give notice and must hold a public hearing on a master plan amendment. What this would do is to eliminate one step of that process, but it would not eliminate

the public hearing or noticing process and would not eliminate the noticing of public process for the body that has to make the final decision, according to *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

**Assemblyman Claborn:**

If it does not eliminate public input, I have no problem with it.

**Chairman Parks:**

I know from my experience of having sat on a town advisory board, I saw applicants having to come back just to get approval—of course, town boards are only recommending bodies—just for something very, very simple—that was minor in nature—especially the change in a boundary.

**Steve Walker, Legislative Advocate, representing Carson City, Lyon County, and Douglas County, Nevada:**

Carson City, Lyon County, and Douglas County are in support of this legislation.

**Madelyn Shipman, Legislative Advocate, representing Southern Nevada Home Builders Association:**

The Southern Nevada Home Builders Association has looked at the bill. We have talked with Mr. Harper, we understand what the intent is, and the Builders Association feels that this would free up staff time to do the more substantive amendments that are more critical to the home building industry. We support A.B. 187.

**Cheri Edelman, Legislative Lobbyist Team, City of Las Vegas, Nevada:**

The City of Las Vegas wants to echo our support of this bill.

**Nancy Howard, Assistant Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities, Carson City, Nevada:**

I just want to echo our support for A.B. 187. Also, to Assemblywoman Parnell, I want to give you an example of a jurisdictional change, a name change. We have the possibility of an area incorporating in the near future, and, when they do, they will change their name from their existing GID [general improvement district] name to a new name for the incorporated city. That might help there.

**Bjorn Selinder, Legislative Advocate, representing Churchill County and Eureka County, Nevada:**

I am here to express support for A.B. 187 and the simplification of what is a very complicated process. It is noteworthy that these changes can be made, it appears, without compromising public notice.

**Chairman Parks:**

[Closed the hearing on A.B. 187.] At this time, we do have scheduled a work session on a number of bills. We also have a memo from Assemblyman Manendo relative to A.B. 160 ([Exhibit G](#)).

Everyone should have their work session documents ([Exhibit H](#)). The first bill is A.B. 125.

**Assembly Bill 125: Revises provisions to clarify role of Public Utilities Commission of Nevada in approval of certain proposed subdivisions. (BDR 22-653)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Assembly Bill 125 clarifies the role of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) of Nevada, in the review of tentative and final maps for subdivisions. It was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, on behalf of the PUC, and was heard by this Committee on March 4, 2005.

No amendments were proposed at the hearing; however, in response to questions that came up after the hearing, I did have some questions with legal counsel and Dave Noble from the PUC. There is a proposal to amend the bill, simply to add a cross-reference to the NRS section, Chapter 704, to the PUC's role in approving the final maps in Chapter 278. To explain that or illustrate it, there is a mockup of the bill. On page 3 of the mockup, and we have not worked out the precise language of the cross reference, somewhere there in Section 3 of the bill would be a cross reference to Chapter 278.377 so that people would understand the PUC role, whether they were in Chapter 704 or in Chapter 278. Mr. Noble from the PUC has agreed that this would be a beneficial change.

As I mentioned, there was no testimony in opposition to the bill, and I have provided a brief recap of the background of the need for the bill, which was to clarify the PUC role, to make sure that they weren't overlooked in the subdivision review process. Fiscal impact at both the state and local government levels was none.

**Chairman Parks:**

I know that we had some question dealing with the tentative maps and the final maps. Do we pretty well have that squared away?

**Susan Scholley:**

Yes. The cross reference in Section 3, I think, will be sufficient to take care of that issue. I also believe there was a question, which perhaps some of the

Committee members may recall and that you may be referring to, as to whether or not a local jurisdiction can approve a subdivision map without the approval of the PUC. The answer is that, if the map is subject to the jurisdiction of the PUC, the local jurisdiction could not approve the subdivision map if the PUC has not approved the subdivision map.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

On the last line of the bill, it doesn't make sense to me without the word "area."

**Chairman Parks:**

The word "area" was set forth but is removed as I read it.

**Susan Scholley:**

That must be a glitch in the mockup. I didn't go into the body of the bill, so I am not sure how that happened. No, that is not a proposed amendment; that is just a glitch.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

So "area" will stay. [Ms. Scholley replied in the affirmative.]

**Chairman Parks:**

On your mockup, the word "area" goes back to black.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 125.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

The next bill we have in front of us is Assembly Bill 141.

**Assembly Bill 141:** Increases maximum balance allowed in district fire emergency fund of certain fire protection districts. (BDR 42-593)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Assembly Bill 141 was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Nevada Association of Counties. It was heard in Committee on March 14, 2005.

[Susan Scholley, continued.] The bill would increase the amount in the emergency account, so that the limit on that emergency account of \$250,000 would be raised to \$1,000,000. No amendments have been proposed, and there was no testimony in opposition to the bill.

The bill was brought forward, primarily, on behalf of the East Fork Fire Protection District. Washoe County also supports this bill, based on testimony from Mary Walker, in response to a question from the Chair. It appears that there are only two such fire protection districts in the state that would be affected by the bill. There was no fiscal impact noted at the State or local levels.

**Chairman Parks:**

We had some good testimony on that, and I think we all fully understand that these can be very expensive circumstances.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 141.

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Assembly Bill 158:** Requires state agency to provide notice of access to computer of officer, employee or contractor under certain circumstances. (BDR 23-1008)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

This bill was sponsored by Assemblyman Hettrick and heard in this Committee on March 10, 2005. The bill requires State officers, employees, and contractors to be notified when a State agency accesses a computer that has been assigned to them. In the alternative, if notice is not given to those persons, then the State agency must create a record log of such access, including the justification for accessing the computer without notice.

In the hearing on the bill, Assemblyman Hettrick proposed amendments that he had worked out with Randy Potts from the Department of Information Technology [DoIT]. They also indicated that they had consulted with Keith Monroe, Legislative Counsel from the Governor's Office, and proposed several amendments:

- They would authorize an appointed authority to make determinations on behalf of the head of the State agency.
- They would provide for the routine access for upkeep and upgrades—by definition, maintenance and other things like that.
- It would broaden the definition of “State agency” to also include the Judicial and Legislative Branches.

[Susan Scholley, continued.] Troy Dillard, Department of Motor Vehicles, also proposed an amendment to address access to computers that was undertaken in the course of an investigation.

I have a mockup of the proposed amendments, which compiles the changes that were proposed. I would caution you that, although this was the language proposed by Mr. Potts and Mr. Hettrick, the Legal Division has not necessarily reviewed this language at this time, and while the intent will be carried forward into the first reprint, this will not be the exact language you will see.

On page 1, the head of a State agency may appoint an authority to take care of these matters. On page 2 of the mockup, there is the exemption for the routine maintenance in subsection 4. Mr. Dillard’s amendment is in subsection 4(a)3, in reference to the authorized investigative practices and the information being maintained in the investigative case file as an alternative. I am also going to mention that the term “inappropriate use” is a bit vague, so, again, that will be a place where the Legal Division will be providing some more specificity. On page 3 is the amendment which would broaden the definition of “state agency” to include, for example, the courts and the legislative agencies.

I should also point out that there was an addition, on line 35 of page 2 of the mockup, of “written consent” of the agency’s appointed authority through the original data owner would be required. I think, at the hearing, it was just “consent.”

I would point out that there was no testimony in opposition to the bill, and there was no fiscal impact identified at the state or local government levels.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

In the new language, subsection 4, part 2, it says that if, during the course of accessing, inappropriate use is found, the accessing employee must not destroy, without the express written consent of the agency’s appointed authority or the original data owner. Does that say that if something inappropriate is found, the original data owner can tell the accessing employee that he can destroy it?

**Susan Scholley:**

We are guessing, perhaps, but the idea would be that the accessing employee generally would leave everything alone when they found something that was illegal, or however "inappropriate" is ultimately defined. However, there may be instances, in terms of maintaining, archiving, transferring, or transmitting, where they could do so with the agency's consent. "Original data owner" will have to be discussed with DoIT to see what they mean by that. As far as "destroy," that is a good question, and we don't have an easy answer for you. We would propose to talk with them to find out whether "destroy" is needed in there. I can't think of any instances, offhand, where an accessing employee should be destroying any information.

**Assemblywoman Pierce:**

Who would be the original data owner? If the agency is the original data owner, that's one thing. I have a question about that. It could be the employee.

**Susan Scholley:**

If the Committee is comfortable with that, we can attempt to clarify that with DoIT, and if there are any concerns, we can either bring it to the Chair's attention and decide where to go from there, or if it is a fairly simple fix, bring it forward in the amended version.

**Assemblyman Hardy:**

I have the same concerns in a real life situation. I get an email on this computer [referencing the laptop computer checked out to him by the Legislative Counsel Bureau] that is graphic in ways that I choose not to do otherwise. So, I tell my attaché to have staff make sure that I don't get that anymore. I haven't put that in writing, but, hopefully, they have destroyed that. There has been nothing illegal done, but these are certainly inappropriate and came without my consent. Is this going to help us or hurt us if we take the "destroy" out of there? I am not anxious to write down something that says, "Take this ugly email out of there." Maybe that is what it takes, but I think there has to be some provision that allows the State people or the staff who does the computer work to clean up my computer if I don't like what's in it.

**Chairman Parks:**

I certainly don't have an answer for that, and I also have a bit of a concern over that subsection 4, where we are using "and." Should it be an "or?" I am in subsection 4, and between each of those subsections, there's the word "and." I also noticed that the requester, the sponsor of this bill, Assemblyman Hettrick, is in the audience. I would ask him if he has a comment or question relative to this.



**Assemblyman Lynn Hettrick, Assembly District No. 39, Douglas, Carson City (part), and Washoe County (part):**

I just had the first opportunity to see this rewritten language, and I think that the question regarding "destroy" is a reasonable one. My understanding of the way that was to be interpreted was that the "accessing employee," on line 33, "must not archive, maintain, store, transfer, transmit, or destroy." In other words, they are supposed to leave it alone.

They came across it in doing their routine job. They are not supposed to do anything to it. They are supposed to leave it alone unless they get consent from the agency, which could say, "You have to take that off the computer. It's illegal," or from the person who owns the data. That person could say, "I didn't realize that was illegal. Destroy it; take it off of there. Get it out; I don't want it." I think that was the intent. If it doesn't say that, then I think the language should be changed, and we should have Legal fix it, but I think that the intent, as I understood it, was that if you found this by accident, you couldn't just take it off somebody's computer. You had to notify and get permission from someone before you did that, because you stumbled on this in the course of doing your routine job. I think that was the intent of that.

It says, on line 31 of subsection 4(1), "The accessing employee must report the details of the alleged inappropriate use to the appointed authority; and..." I think the word "and" there is appropriate. Actually, as I think about it, Mr. Chairman, I think "and" on line 36 is as well, because it then says, "The agency's appointed authority must follow the provisions set forth in subsection 3(b) unless the information is found through . . . investigative authority." That means that you either have to have a note, or the permission, or whatever. You would have to go back and notify.

I think the ands are okay, and I think the intent of "destroy" was okay, but I think you may want to make sure the language says that.

**Chairman Parks:**

What I would prefer doing is to not act on this bill today but, rather, to take another look at it and bring it back for consideration at our next work session. If there is something that someone sees at this point, we would like to have that fully explored.

**Assemblyman Hettrick:**

I will see if I can contact Mr. Potts and try to verify that that was the intent. If I can do that, we will. Then we will try to get something back to you, whether it is a letter or a comment or having him here for your next work session, so that he could clarify what the intent is.

**Chairman Parks:**

There will be no more discussion of A.B. 158 today. We will move on to A.B. 164.

**Assembly Bill 164: Amends Charter of City of Sparks to increase term of office of Municipal Judges. (BDR S-963)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Assembly Bill 164 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Debbie Smith and was heard in this Committee on March 15, 2005. The bill does amend the Sparks City Charter and increases the terms of its two municipal judges from four to six years. No amendments have been proposed to the bill. There was no testimony in opposition. The bill was sponsored on behalf of the Charter Committee of Sparks, which convenes and is charged with making recommendations for amendments to the city's charter prior to every legislative session. Also, the testimony was that Sparks would be the last city to switch over to the six-year terms for its municipal judges. Again, no fiscal impact was noted at state or local government levels.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 164.

ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

[Opened hearing on A.B. 167.]

**Assembly Bill 167: Authorizes acquisition of municipal securities issued by certain wastewater authorities. (BDR 20-799)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Assembly Bill 167 was sponsored by Assemblyman Hardy and was heard in this Committee on March 15, 2005. The bill defines and includes wastewater authorities within the county bond law provisions of NRS Chapter 244A, and it would allow wastewater authorities to have their securities purchased, held, or sold for infrastructures by the county bond bank or the State Treasurer.

[Susan Scholley, continued.] Assemblyman Hardy testified that he sponsored the bill on behalf of the Clean Water Coalition, which is a joint powers agency created by the cities of Las Vegas, Henderson, and the Clark County Water Reclamation District.

There were some minor amendments proposed to the bill to clarify the definition of "wastewater authority." If you look in the mockup, you'll see that the definition of "wastewater authority" has been added to Section 1 and is in the county bond law provisions. Another change in that section is from "and" to "or" on line 6. The other change is in Section 6, which is over in the state financial chapter, again changing the "and" to "or," so that a wastewater authority would not have to necessarily provide all of these services, but would provide one or more of them.

There was no testimony in opposition to the bill. In addition to several persons with the Clean Water Coalition testifying in support of the bill, the Nevada Taxpayers Association also testified in support. I did recap some of the background and provided, for your reference, a copy of their legislative briefing with financial information on the fiscal benefits to the Clean Water Coalition of allowing them to participate in the county and state bonding process.

**Chairman Parks:**

I am going to defer any questions to Dr. Hardy. I do commend Dr. Hardy for bringing forward a very comprehensive and well-presented bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 167.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCLEARY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Parks:**

The final bill that we have in our work session is S.B. 114.

**Senate Bill 114 (1st Reprint):** Clarifies that certain hiring preferences apply to all circumstances under which persons are employed in construction of public works. (BDR 28-532)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:**

Senate Bill 114, in its first reprint, was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, on behalf of the City of Reno, and was heard in this Committee on March 14, 2005.

Senate Bill 114 clarifies that all contractors on a public works project are required to give preference to the hiring of veterans and residents. No amendments were proposed, and there was no testimony in opposition to the bill. Ted Olivas, as Chair of the Nevada Public Purchasing Commission, testified in support of the bill.

The motivation behind the bill, as we heard in testimony, was that a legal opinion by the Labor Commissioner concluded that the addition of the phrase "by a public body" in amendments during the 2003 Legislative Session had changed the effect of NRS 338.130, so that private contractors on public works projects were no longer subject to the hiring preferences. This bill would correct that situation. The fiscal impact identified was none at the state or local government level.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 114.

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Assembly Bill 160: Requires participation in approved program of apprenticeship by bidder and certain subcontractors on public works project. (BDR 28-890)**

**Chairman Parks:**

I have only one other item to come before us today. I did receive correspondence from Assemblyman Mark Manendo ([Exhibit G](#)) asking that we withdraw A.B. 160 from further consideration. He indicates that, based on discussions with various interest groups affected by the bill, he has decided against going forward with the bill during this Legislative Session. We don't need to take action but simply be sure it is in the record. A.B. 160 will be withdrawn.

Assembly Committee on Government Affairs

March 17, 2005

Page 29

[Chairman Parks, continued.] There is nothing further to bring before us at this time. We will adjourn [at 9:54 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Haywood  
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman David Parks, Chairman

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

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Government Affairs

**Date:** March 17, 2005

**Time of Meeting:** 8:00 a.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	Agenda	Agenda, 1 page
<u>S.B. 17</u>	B	Senator Valerie Weiner, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3	Packet, 4 pages
<u>S.B. 17</u>	C	Paul Enos, Manager of government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada, Carson City, Nevada	Letter, 1 page
<u>S.B. 17</u>	D	Douglas Hunt, Habitat Bureau Chief, Division of Wildlife, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Information, 2 pages
<u>A.B. 113</u>	E	Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees Retirement System of Nevada, Carson City, Nevada	Information, 4 pages
<u>A.B. 187</u>	F	Michael Harper, Planning Manager, Department of Community Development, Washoe County, Nevada	Testimony, 4 pages
<u>A.B. 160</u>	G	Assemblyman Mark Manendo, Assembly District No 18, Clark County, Nevada	Letter, 1 page
	H	Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada	Work Session documents, 18 pages