# MINUTES OF THE MEETING
# OF THE
# ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR

## Seventy-Fourth Session
## April 18, 2007

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair John Oceguera at 2:39 p.m., on Wednesday, April 18, 2007, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**:

Assemblyman John Oceguera, Chair
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Francis Allen
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson
Assemblyman Morse Arberry Jr.
Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblyman William Horne
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Garn Mabey
Assemblyman Mark Manendo
Assemblyman David R. Parks
Assemblyman James Settelmeyer

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**:

Brenda Erdoes, Committee Counsel
Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst
Patricia Blackburn, Committee Secretary

Gillis Colgan, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT**:

David Noble, Assistant General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission
Shawn Elicegui, representing Utilities, Inc. and Utilities, Inc. of Central Nevada
Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Joseph Johnson, representing the Sierra Club

[The roll was taken and a quorum was present.]

**Chair Oceguera:**
We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 86 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 86 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions regulating utilities that furnish water or provide sewage disposal services. (BDR 58-554)**

**David Noble, Assistant General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission:**
This bill is brought forward by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to address changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) as they affect water and sewer utilities. Currently the Commission regulates 18 water utilities and 7 sewer utilities. They range from a low of 19 customers to a high of 4,000 plus customers with gross operating revenues from $7,000 to $1.4 million. Some of the major hurdles these companies face are how to address customer growth, system degradation, water quality and quantity issues, and how to obtain and maintain the managerial, technical and financial capabilities to address these problems.

The Commission has been able to help these utilities address these problems on a case-by-case basis. The changes that are proposed in S.B. 86 (R1) are what the Commission feels are needed in statute to apply to all water and sewer utilities. Substantively, Section 2 of this bill allows the Commission to consider whether or not another public utility is capable of providing service to an area that is currently requesting a certificate of operation. What this proposes to do is minimize the proliferation of small water utilities in this State. We found, through our experience, that small water utilities just do not have the wherewithal to handle these issues. By consolidating the different infrastructures and increasing the customer base to their service territories through amendments, these companies increase operating revenues which allow them to address water quality and quantity issues, system degradation, and the like.

Section 3 of this bill proposes to have all water utilities with gross operating revenues of $1 million or more to file resource plans on a tri-annual basis. This would require these utilities to map out what their infrastructure is, how to address growth coming into their service territory, and allow them to preplan. Instead of reacting to customer growth, they are proactive in their placement of pumps, looping of different system infrastructures, oversizing tanks to address future growth, et cetera. It allows them to plan ahead. The reason why we chose the $1 million threshold is that the initial master plans are both labor intensive and costly. Once those plans are in place, the upkeep and amendments to those plans are negligible.

The resource plans would need to be approved by the Commission in 180 days. That is consistent with a proposal you will see in Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint) for electric utilities. Any system infrastructures in those plans that are deemed acceptable will be deemed prudent and those costs can be recovered. That is also consistent with the language of the NRS statutes that apply to electric utilities.

Section 4 of this bill raises the monetary threshold in the definition of a water public utility from $5,000 to $25,000. That $5,000 threshold has been in place since 1979. What we have found is it is cost prohibitive for those companies that meet the minimum threshold to be regulated by the Commission through rate regulation. The advantages of having Commission oversight do not balance out with the additional costs that are borne by those very few customers that are represented by the $5,000 to $25,000 in gross operating revenue companies. Last session the Legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 125 of the 73rd Legislative Session, which dealt with the review of subdivision maps. It included the Commission in the review and approval process of subdivisions to insure that if a subdivision plans to create another water utility in the future, we put in place the appropriate managerial, technical, and financial benchmarks in order to provide reasonable and adequate service over the long haul.

Section 5 of this bill requires that water and sewer utilities with gross operating revenues of $500,000 or more file general rate cases with the Commission at least once every three years. There is also a provision that would allow the Commission to adopt regulations in which it may waive that requirement. That situation may occur if there has been static customer growth and the costs of filing and prosecuting a general rate case before the Commission do not justify the needs. The reason we would like to require, in statute, these water utilities file general rate cases is we found these utilities are either over-earning or under-earning. There is still hesitancy by some of these utilities to come in because a general rate case is a very large undertaking. There is a certain

amount of expertise required to put these together and bring them before the Commission. By requiring these larger utilities, at least on a triennial basis, to do this, the expertise is not lost over time, and the product they present before the Commission is good and the outcome is reasonable and good for the customers.

The final substantive section is Section 8. This would require water utilities that the Commission regulates to be responsible for fire hydrant maintenance. What we have found is in half of the water utilities we regulate, the local fire departments are responsible for maintaining the fire hydrants. The utilities are responsible for maintaining the remainder. It has happened where the local fire department and a county have been responsible but the rural counties had difficulty with both the expertise and obtaining the money to keep these fire hydrants in working order. Since these fire hydrants are an extension of the water utilities, the experts on maintaining these are the water utilities, themselves. Either through surcharges or through the general rate cases, provisions can be put in so any costs needed by these utilities to maintain these fire hydrants can be recovered through rates, and the actual people who benefit from having working fire hydrants are the ones who are paying for their upkeep.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any questions? Mr. Horne.

**Assemblyman Horne:**
In Section 2, are you saying that the PUC is going to make a determination on that? If there is another utility there, can the PUC make a determination not to grant it and therefore limit competition?

**David Noble:**
The Commission basically regulates monopolies. So, there is no competition between water utilities. There are no crossovers in service territories of water utilities. They are very distinct. There should not be a crossover in which one utility is pumping water out and it is being used by another utility. Each system is a closed system. What we contemplate is that if there is growth in an area just outside the service territory of an existing water utility, the Commission would look to that existing water utility to amend its operating service area to envelope that new subdivision. If there are no synergies directly connected, we would still look to other regulated water utilities, municipalities, or local governments to see if they are ready, willing, and able to provide service to that area as a satellite system. Again, it goes to the economies of scale. The small water utilities in the long run just cannot keep up with the operation and maintenance of the utility system.

**Assemblyman Horne:**
So, when the PUC is determining this "certificate of public convenience and necessity" and they see there is already a public utility ready, willing and able to provide the services in a geographic area—is that the small utility you are talking about?

**David Noble:**
It would be anybody that is able to provide the service. It could be a utility that we regulate or it could be a county which provides service to a certain territory. With a subdivision that is not connected to a system, we would look to anybody that is providing water service in that area to see whether or not they would be willing to extend service to those new customers.

**Assemblyman Horne:**
In Section 3, subsection 5, the "all prudent and reasonable expenditures made by a public utility"—is this standard language for other utilities?

**David Noble:**
Yes, NRS 704.751 subsection 2 is the specific statute that applies to electric utilities. That is the exact same language.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there other questions?

**Assemblywoman Gansert:**
Is it correct that the PUC does not regulate all utilities, including municipally owned utilities?

**David Noble:**
That is correct. There are currently 18 water utilities and 7 sewer utilities which we regulate. We do not regulate municipal water service. We do regulate General Improvement Districts (GID) and cooperatives to some degree, but we do not regulate the rates that they charge.

**Assemblywoman Gansert:**
In your bill, when it talks about certificate of convenience, I thought there was some territory language, but it does not apply to any municipal authorities or entities.

**David Noble:**
That is correct. We are not looking to expand the definition of a public utility with this bill.

**Assemblywoman Gansert:**
I have another question about fire hydrants. I know in some localities the firemen take care of the fire hydrants. So, in those places, would this dictate that the water utilities would be doing that instead of the firemen?

**David Noble:**
That is correct.

**Chair Oceguera:**
The fire department always thought that the utilities should take care of the hydrants, however, out of necessity because they do not, the firefighters take care of them. They spend a lot of time taking care of them but there are all sorts of different situations. In a rural community there are volunteers that do not take care of the hydrants because they have full-time jobs and they cannot be out turning hydrants all day. In North Las Vegas, my crew spends two full months turning hydrants. I would love to give that responsibility to the utility, but I would also want to be sure when I go to a hydrant that there is water coming out of it.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
I think you raised the very issue that I was concerned about. I always assumed when firefighters pull hydrants open, they want to make sure that the apparatus is working and they do so to reassure themselves. Fire departments would be concerned to know if the utility company has done their due diligence. Secondly, in reviewing building plans and architectural designs for new developments, the fire department has to sign off on the plans to assure themselves that not only the driveways have the correct dimensions, but there are water services being provided. Are we going to limit the ability of the fire departments to sign off on design plans which necessitate fire protection?

**David Noble:**
With regard to your second question, this bill is not meant to usurp any authority as far as review of the infrastructure. This is simply for upkeep and maintenance of the hydrant.

With regard to your first question, I would think that the fire departments would still be going out to spot check these hydrants as part of their operations. A good example is the Dutchmakers Water Company which is just outside of Winnemucca and has had an ongoing dispute between the local volunteer fire department and themselves as far as who should be responsible for upkeeping these hydrants. As a result, the fire hydrants are neglected. What I envision is if the fire department is checking them on a somewhat regular basis and they come across fire hydrants that are not in working order, I believe they would

notify the utility right away, and the utility would immediately get out and fix them. If there were any problems whatsoever, the fire department would file a quick complaint with the Commission, and the Commission would get after those utilities immediately. The utility would have no excuse for not fixing those hydrants with the appropriate funds in place. What has happened so far is a disconnect in some of the jurisdictions and these fire hydrants are not being addressed.

**Chair Oceguera:**
There are disconnects within municipalities. If they call and tell us of a hydrant that is knocked over we will go out, pick it up, throw it on the truck, and call the utility. It may or may not get fixed. We keep a big map of all the hydrants that are out of service. It would be nice to have a hammer.

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**
My question concerns Section 8 as well. When it says "public right-of-way" or "upon private property," are you saying if there is a fire hydrant on private property, then when the rate case goes forward everyone would pay it, or just that person who owns the private property?

**David Noble:**
Everybody would still pay for that. The reason why that language is in the bill is because it was a proposal by Utilities, Inc. of Central Nevada, which contemplated the scenario where there may be a gated community with fire hydrants located on private property. As long as the utility can gain access to that hydrant, they would be responsible for making sure it is in working order.

**Chair Oceguera:**
That is different also because we do not do that now. A hydrant on private property is a crap shoot. We do not check them now in my municipality.

**David Noble:**
So this would be something where the public utility would address that situation.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there further questions?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
I just want to be reassured. You anticipate, in light of the language in Section 8, that maintaining the hydrants is the responsibility of the utility and the ratepayer. So, the fire departments are not going to get in trouble by opening your hydrant, is that correct?

**David Noble:**
That is correct.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
Even though that may be considered water wasted?

**David Noble:**
I guess that would be on a case-by-case basis. If the fire department is going to come out and flush the line for 30 or 45 minutes, that might be a waste of water, but is necessary to ensure that a fire hydrant is in working order.

**Chair Oceguera:**
We get complaints all the time; we try to check hydrants at a time of year when water is not in high usage. We employ water saving methods and diffusers and other things, but if we are doing a static test versus a flow test, we sometimes have to open one down the line and try to determine what the drop in the residual pressure will be, so we do get complaints.

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**
I have a question on Section 5, subsection 3(c). How long would the utilities actually go without a rate case? It looks like if they have not had one done in the past year, they have three years to do one. Would they be required to do one immediately, and then again in three years? How long are they actually going to go without a rate case?

**David Noble:**
Utilities, Inc. of Central Nevada just finished filing their last general rate case and it is under review at this time. They are one of the utilities which would be subject to this provision, but they would fall into the subsection (d) category. They would be three years out from that date. Spring Creek Utilities Company is one of the other utilities—they just finished their general rate case in December. Also Utilities, Inc. of Nevada filed in around July of last year. Three of the four will fall into subsection (d), the only one in subsection (c) is Edgewood Water Company and their last general rate case was 2001. They would be the only one subject to subsection (c), so it would have to have a general rate case by June 30, 2008. It generally takes about two to four months to put together a general rate application, depending on the complexity of it.

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**
So, this just buys them an extra year? Currently they would have to do them more often, is that correct?

**David Noble:**
Actually, there is no requirement for any of the water utilities to come in for a general rate case. We have had some utilities that have not come in for ten years or more. These provisions will require the largest of the water utilities to come in on a regular basis for general rate cases.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any further questions? I see none. Are there others wishing to testify in favor of S.B. 86?

**Shawn Elicegui, representing Utilities, Inc. and Utilities, Inc. of Central Nevada:**
I simply wanted to indicate that my client, which operates four water companies within the State of Nevada, three of which would fall subject to the provisions of this bill, supports the legislation and I am available to answer any questions that the Committee may have. [Distributed written statement (Exhibit C).]

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any questions from the Committee? I see none. Are there others wishing to testify in favor of this bill? I see none. Are there others wishing to testify in opposition? I see none. Are there any neutral testifiers? I see none.

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 86 (1st Reprint ).

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing public utilities. (BDR 58-552)**

**David Noble, Assistant General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission:**
This bill is requested by the Commission and addresses four things:

- The definition of a public utility;
- Railroad crossing applications;
- Resource planning; and
- Construction permits.

Section 1 of this bill repeals language in the definition of a public utility that the Commission now believes is obsolete. Subsection 1(c) refers to radio and broadcasting companies and that jurisdiction is federally preempted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). In subsection 1(d) the first sentence deals with the definition as it pertains to railroad trains. Railroads are already addressed in subsection 1(a) and subsection 3 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 704.020. In the second sentence in subsection (d), which goes

from lines 15 through 25, we do not believe it is applicable to the definition of a public utility and we recommend that it be removed. The last section that we request be repealed is in subsection 2(a), which pertains to ditches, flumes, tunnels, and drainage systems. Those deal with the delivery of non-potable water. It appears to be legacy language when the Commission at one time regulated ditches and flumes. We no longer regulate those and the definition of water utility is in the current subsection (b) which is water for business, manufacturing, agricultural, and household use which we believe is more encompassing.

Section 2 of S.B. 95 (R1) proposes to amend NRS 704.300. This pertains to railroad crossings. Currently, in any railroad crossing application, the Commission must hold a hearing, whether it is contested or not. We believe if there are no contested issues of fact or law with regard to a railroad crossing application, that a hearing is not necessary. We are requesting that the hearing requirement be removed.

Section 4 proposes to eliminate the need to hold a hearing in a resource plan filing within 60 days of the filing. Currently, a resource plan is filed, and the Commission, regardless of what the issues are, whether they are complex or simple, must hold a hearing of some sort within 60 days. We do not believe that requirement is necessary. If it is a contested case, we will hold a hearing, but we believe that having a hearing within 60 days does not provide the parties enough time to prepare and present the evidence for the Commission to make a determination.

Section 5 proposes to amend NRS 704.751. This would lengthen the time of review for a tri-annual resource plan by an electric utility. Currently, it is 135 days and we propose 180 days. This came up in the last resource plan of Nevada Power Company. There was over $3 billion of infrastructure proposed in that resource plan and the Commission had 135 days to review it, obtain testimony, have a hearing, and issue a final decision. With regard to amendments to resource plans, of which there are many, they would still be handled on a 135-day basis as well as the energy supply plan portion of the triennial resource plan. The reason why the energy supply plan needs to be dealt with in 135 days, is because the utility begins to actually act on the plan between the 135 and 180 days with regard to hedging activities and dealing with supply issues. The utility had asked on the Senate side for an amendment that addressed that and we were amenable to that request.

The final substantive section is Section 6 which proposes to amend NRS 704.860. The Commission via the Governor, both the current administration and the past administration, was asked to look at its review of

renewable energy projects. We were asked if there was anything we could do to streamline that process. We eliminated any red tape that we thought was possible. What we have proposed is in subsection (b), renewable energy projects of 150 kilowatts or less, which coincides with the net metering standard threshold that did not need to obtain a Utility Environmental Protection Act (UEPA) permit. The Commission acts as the catchall last stage for obtaining a construction permit. We felt that by eliminating the distinction of 150 kilowatt projects and applying that to all renewable energy projects, it would be a way of eliminating some of the red tape. In light of discussions with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Davis I believe they are going to propose instead of eliminating the application of the UEPA in total, they would raise the threshold to 1 megawatt. The Commission would be amenable to that, if that is, in fact, what they are going to propose.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
I have questions on two different areas of the bill. On page 4, Section 2 of the bill, the new language states "the Commission chooses to conduct a hearing." How will the public know you are about to change the crossing if you do not provide public notice on the hearing?

**David Noble:**
Every single railroad crossing application that comes into the Commission is noticed throughout the affected area. If a hearing is required, then there actually will be a second notice. For anybody who would be affected, there would be a notice that the application has been filed with the Commission and this railroad crossing is under consideration by the Commission.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
So, they would have to dig through this long list of items that come up at one time and then give you notice that they want a public issue so that they may give testimony? Is that how the process is going to work?

**David Noble:**
It would work just like any other case before the Commission. Once the initial notice goes out, if someone is interested in that case they can either file an intervention and participate as an intervenor or they could file a public comment. They could also file an intent to participate as a commenter. So there are three different avenues where they can make their interest known to the Commission. Those are all in the initial notice and they are given a time frame of when they need to get that information into the Commission. It is no

different than if they are unaware of a hearing on the railroad crossing and the notice is published by the same newspapers and the same publications as the initial notice of application. The notification is no different.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
Many times word of mouth is how the information is disseminated to interested individuals and they show up at the hearing having never noticed your original notice.

**David Noble:**
That is always a possibility.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
So, that opportunity will be eliminated?

**David Noble:**
Those applications will be treated like every other application the Commission has. There are only so many safeguards and so many notices the Commission can put out there. The agenda notice will also go out. If there is a concern and they see it on the agenda notice, that is a third spot where they could find out information.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
In Section 1 of the bill, where you are going to be deleting language about the operation of cars and makeup of trains, one of the more difficult questions dealing with the railroad industry generally is that state laws seem to be preempted by the federal government. Questions of health and safety are always paramount in my mind, regarding this particular group of workers and their particular location. There have been incidents in the past where sanitary conditions in the front end of the train were such that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) needed to make sure that the facilities were being maintained. If the PUC had not done so, no one would have taken care of this problem. If this section is dropped, where will the rail workers turn for relief?

**David Noble:**
We believe that they would still turn to the Commission and our rail inspectors. The definition in that first sentence is still encompassed by subsection (a) and also in subsection 1(a) and subsection 3. We feel it was unnecessary to reiterate it. Railroads are addressed in three different spots in this definition of a public utility and we did not feel it was necessary to keep that first sentence. However, if the Committee believes the sentence is necessary, we are fine with keeping it in.

**Assemblyman Anderson:**
It seems to me that (a) deals with trestles rather than the rolling stock.

**David Noble:**
I believe if you look at line 5 on page 2 "or cars or other equipment used thereon," it is covered.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there other questions?

**Assemblyman Conklin:**
Looking at Section 5 of this bill, regarding the triennial plan, I understand the need for the 135 days and I think I understand the need for the 180 days. How does this coincide with the general rate case filing? Under the triennial plan we are trying to determine where supply meets demand, what our resources are versus what we anticipate needing, and then compensate on both ends of the spectrum so there is a match for the next three-year period. Is that correct?

**Dave Noble:**
That is correct.

**Assemblyman Conklin:**
So, if that is correct and we currently have 135 days in statute under 704.751, why are we adding the additional 180 days for the demand-side coverage? I am trying to understand the concept that you are asking for.

**David Noble:**
The energy supply plan is basically what the current resources are, the demand, and their forecasts of what they are going to need on both the supply side and the demand side for that next three years. The resource plan is the additional resources they are going to bring online, whether it is transmission or generation to meet those needs. They may generate the supply themselves or they may buy it on the open market or acquire it through contracts. The supply plan is needed first so that the parameters are known. The resource plan is the actual physical resource that will be used along with the purchasing power to meet that entire demand.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any other questions? I see none. Are there others wishing to testify in favor of this bill? Are there any in opposition? I see none. Are there any others wishing to offer amendments to S.B. 95 (1st Reprint)?

**Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League:**
I apologize for just handing you this amendment (Exhibit D). I will let Mr. Johnson go into what the process was intended to be. Eliminating that language would streamline the process for renewables and, in fact, there could be impacts from renewable projects which we would want to have some kind of environmental review. The UEPA process acts a as clearing house for that information. We do want to make sure that we streamline the process so that net metering customers can put in the hardware without going through the process themselves. We are not trying to get at customers who are putting photovoltaic cells on top of their homes. Basically, what my amendment does is maintain the language which is in statute but it changes the upper limit from 150 kilowatts to 1 megawatt which coincides with the language in the net metering cap bills in both houses this session.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there questions for Mr. Davis? I see none.

**Joseph Johnson, representing the Sierra Club:**
I would like to go into the background of the UEPA process. The Legislative finding contained in NRS 704.825 states that "the Legislature hereby finds and declares that . . ." and item (d) "existing provisions of law may not provide adequate opportunity for natural persons, groups interested in conservation and protection of the environment, state and regional agencies, local governments, and other public bodies to participate in the proceedings regarding the location and construction of major facilities." I would like to include in that the definition of renewable projects so that it includes municipal waste, a restrictive part of converting tires into energy, some biomass projects, and major wind projects. We feel that these projects should be subject to review. There are provisions in the statute that state if they are presently required to do other environmental studies, there is an exclusion of duplication and a direction in NRS 704.877 that would prevent any duplication.

We feel that the proposed amendment will simply streamline the process for small projects and still allow the review of projects of major importance. In NRS 704.823 paragraph 2, it continues "the Legislature, therefore, hereby declares that the purpose of NRS 704.820 to 704.900, inclusive, to provide a forum for the expeditious resolution of all matters concerning the location and construction of electric, gas, and water transmission lines and associated facilities." We feel that the renewable projects of a larger scale ought to be included therein. We recommend that you adopt the amendment that was proposed.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any questions? I see none. Mr. Noble, have you now had the opportunity to see this amendment?

**David Noble:**
[He was given a copy of the amendment.] The Commission would be fine with this amendment.

**Chair Oceguera:**
Are there any further questions? I see none. Anyone else wishing to testify on S.B. 95 (R1)? I see none. I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint).

[The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Patricia Blackburn
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman John Oceguera, Chair

DATE: _____

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name: Committee on Commerce and Labor**

**Date: April 18, 2007 Time of Meeting: 2:39 p.m.**

| Bill | Exhibit | Witness / Agency | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| | A | | Agenda |
| | B | | Attendance Roster |
| SB 86 (R1) | C | Shawn Elicegui | Written statement |
| SB 95 (R1) | D | Kyle Davis | Proposed Amendment |