

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, PROCEDURES, ETHICS, AND
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
April 10, 2007**

The Committee on Elections, Procedures, Ethics, and Constitutional Amendments was called to order by Chair Harry Mortenson at 4:09 p.m., on Tuesday, April 10, 2007, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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 Harry Mortenson, Chair
Assemblywoman Ellen Koivisto, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Ty Cobb
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblyman Ed Goedhart
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblyman James Settlemeyer

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst
Terry Horgan, Committee Secretary
Trisha Moore, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Joseph Turco, ACLU of Nevada
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum
David Schumann, Vice Chairman, Nevada Committee for Full Statehood;
and representing the Independent American Party
Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System
Leslie Johnstone, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program
Oran McMichael, Area Field Services Director, Nevada, American
Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Roger Maillard, President, State of Nevada Employees' Association,
AFSCME/Retiree Chapter
Danny Coyle, Past President and Director, State of Nevada Employees'
Association, AFSCME/Local 4041
Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association

Chair Mortenson:

[Roll was taken. The Chair reminded Committee Members and the public of Committee rules and protocol.] We will open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 22nd Special Session.

Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 22nd Special Session: Proposes to amend Nevada Constitution to revise provisions governing petition for initiative or referendum. (BDR C-0014)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first measure we are looking at today is Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 22nd Special Session. The measure was passed by both Houses in 2005, and if it is passed again this session in an identical form, it will go to the voters in the 2008 General Election.

This measure proposes to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* to remove provisions requiring that a statewide initiative petition be signed by at least 10 percent of the voters who voted at the last preceding general election in at least 75 percent of the counties in the State. Instead, the resolution declares that an initiative petition shall be proposed by a number of registered voters from each congressional district in the State equal to 10 percent or more of the number of voters who voted at the last general election in the congressional district.

Lastly, the resolution specifies that the number of signatures required on a petition for initiative or referendum will be determined when a copy of the

petition is filed with the Secretary of State before circulating the petition for signatures.

A portion of this resolution will remove provisions in the *Constitution* that were declared unconstitutional. In *Committee to Regulate and Control Marijuana v. Heller* [No. CV-S-04-01035 (D. Nev. Aug. 20, 2004)], the United States District Court ruled that the portion of Article 19, Section 2 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* requiring that signatures on a statewide initiative petition be gathered in 75 percent of Nevada's counties, violated the Equal Protection clause of the *United States Constitution*. Because the geographic-distribution signature requirement applies the same formula to counties of varying population, the Court opined that the signatures of voters from small, rural counties carried more weight than the signatures of voters from larger counties, and this resolution would codify the Court's decision.

Another portion of this resolution was requested to address problems that occurred during the 2004 election cycle. In that case, some initiatives were submitted to county clerks for signature verification after the General Election in November, 2004. The Secretary of State determined the number of required signatures was 10 percent of the voter turnout at the 2004 General Election, rather than 10 percent of the voter turnout at the 2002 General Election. Consequently, those initiatives failed to qualify for submission to the 2005 Legislative Session; a subsequent court decision overturned the Secretary of State's decision, and the initiatives were forwarded to the 2005 Session. This resolution also addresses the court's decision in that case.

Chair Mortenson:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [No response.]

Joseph Turco, ACLU of Nevada:

I have indicated I am neutral on this measure for one small reason. The language on page 2, lines 5 through 9, intends to say that the number of registered voters required to file a petition must be determined at the time a copy of the petition is "initially" filed, but the word "initially" is not used. We think the word "initially" should be in the language; otherwise, it is not clear enough that the number of registered voters required should be calculated on that day—the day the petition is initially filed. As far as using congressional districts for the purposes of this bill, the ACLU of Nevada is in support of that.

Chair Mortenson:

I will re-emphasize the fact that this is a constitutional amendment coming around for the second time and if we pass it again, it will go to the voters in the

next general election. If we were to amend this bill, the five-year process would start all over again.

Joseph Turco:

Even with one word, I suppose?

Chair Mortenson:

Changing one word would send it back to the beginning of the process. Since you are neutral, we will take your suggestion under advisement.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

If the 13-counties rule was found to violate the Equal Protection Clause, do you think we will be safe with the congressional district rule?

Joseph Turco:

I am not an election expert, but I can tell you what I have learned. Other proposals have been suggested such as using Assembly districts or Senate districts. We believe the congressional-district plan is the least likely to fall into the same Equal Protection problem as the county plan did.

Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum:

We are in support of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 22nd Special Session. We believe it is a much better plan than trying to have people petition in all the different Assembly districts. We really would like to see this measure go forward.

David Schumann, Vice Chairman, Nevada Committee for Full Statehood; and representing the Independent American Party:

We are in favor of this measure. Every ten years, the Census Bureau reapportions the congressional districts, so now the Supreme Court cannot say there is no numerical equality, because signatures will be collected based on apportioned districts, and that was their objection to the 13-counties rule. This is a great bill, and we support it. It will allow Nevadans to have the rights to petition and referendum.

Chair Mortenson:

I would take a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1 OF THE 22ND SPECIAL SESSION.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution 8.

Assembly Joint Resolution 8: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to provide for the use of the state budgetary surplus to fund the Public Employees' Retirement Fund and the Fund for the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (BDR C-1123)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Joint Resolution 8, sponsored by Assemblyman Settelmeyer, proposes to amend the Nevada *Constitution* to provide for the biennial transfer, under certain circumstances, of the surplus in the state General Fund, to the Public Employees' Retirement Fund (PERS) and the Fund for the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP).

Assemblyman James Settelmeyer, Assembly District No. 39:

The genesis of this bill is respect for state employees. I have had teachers call me, very worried about the current financial state of PEBP and PERS. As a State, and also as local municipalities, we have made obligations to these individuals, yet in one committee I sit on, mention has been made of ways to reduce the benefits to these individuals we have made promises to. That is not acceptable. We must find a way to make sure our words are meaningful.

The concept is similar to walking along and finding \$100. You are likely to just pick that money up and spend it; yet, if you have a plan and recognize that you owe someone, when you pick up that \$100, payment on your debt should be the first priority. That is what I look at for the State. We need to respect the people who have worked for us. Some people look at the surplus that occurs from time to time and plan to spend it on various items. During one session, it was voted to give money back to the people. When I was going door to door talking to my constituents, they said, "Don't ever vote to give me the money back. I just spend it. Why didn't you take care of the bills we have? Why didn't you spend the money wisely, making sure there will not be any debts in the future?"

Speaking of debt, if you ask PERS what their unfunded liability is, they will tell you it is about \$6 billion. If you look at PEBP, it is reported that the liability is about \$1.8 billion if we choose to fund it today and pay as we go; or it will be about \$4 billion in the future. I like the concept of spending a little bit of today's surplus to offset future liabilities. There are not many ways to double the State's money in the next five to ten years, so it makes more sense to pay

these bills off now. It reminds me of my daughters' education fund. I told myself I would help both my daughters go to college, yet if I never set the money aside that will never happen.

As we know, the GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) provisions will be going into effect shortly. At that time, the State must list its unfunded liability. We do not have to say how we are going to pay for it, but we have to report the number. That number will affect our bond rating, so our projects will cost more money because we have not dealt with the unfunded liability. I propose a concept similar to the "rainy day" fund; any time there is a surplus in the General Fund, 25 percent of that surplus should go to fund PERS and PEBP until they are 85 percent funded.

Chair Mortenson:

Are there any questions for Mr. Settelmeyer?

Assemblyman Goedhart:

Looking at page 2, subsections (a) and (b), 25 percent of the surplus would go to PERS and any remaining surplus would go to PEBP. Is that the way you envision it? It looks as though all of the surplus would go toward the two programs.

Assemblyman Settelmeyer:

Assuming there were a \$100 million surplus, and we had intended that \$25 million would go into PERS, if PERS were at 85 percent funding, any residual amount would roll into PEBP until it was 85 percent funded. When both programs are 85 percent funded, all money goes back to the General Fund. You may hear testimony requesting that be reversed because it seems as though PEBP is in far worse financial shape than PERS, and I am agreeable to that change. From the studies I have read, it would take 267 percent of the state's budget to pay the unfunded liability of PEBP.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

The way I read the language, if there were a \$100 million surplus, \$25 million would go into PERS and any remaining surplus, the \$75 million, would go towards PEBP.

Assemblyman Settelmeyer:

Mr. Guinan, could you clarify the way it reads?

Patrick Guinan:

I agree with Mr. Goedhart, but I will ask our Legal Counsel to give me a clarification.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I appreciate that because it was not my intent.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

Sometimes when these ideas go into bill drafting, they come out a little differently than intended. The intent of the legislation was to send 25 percent of the surplus to both programs.

Chair Mortenson:

I read it the same way Mr. Goedhart did, but it would be more reasonable to split the 25 percent surplus between the two programs if PERS was at 85 percent funding.

Assemblywoman Koivisto:

I need to disclose that I am a PERS retiree and also a participant in PEBP; but this legislation will not affect me any differently than anyone else in the same situation, so I will be participating in the discussion.

Assemblyman Munford:

I need to make the same disclosure, and I will participate in the discussion also.

Assemblyman Christensen:

I, too, will make that disclosure. The 25 percent figure would work and would leave the vast majority to go to other priorities. Was using a resolution mandatory, or did you choose to give voters a chance to let their voices be heard?

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

This is a two-pronged approach. I have proposed this idea both as a bill and as this constitutional amendment. Anything we pass out as a bill affects only this current legislative session and is not binding on any future sessions. To be binding, it must be a constitutional amendment.

Chair Mortenson:

Would those wishing to disclose, please raise their hands. [Several Committee members raised their hands.] It would be a good idea to get disclosures on the record from Mr. Munford, Mr. Segerblom, Mrs. Koivisto, and Mr. Christensen.

Assemblyman Conklin:

There are members of this Committee who buy insurance while they are here as legislators through the Public Employees' Benefits Program, and from that perspective, I believe we should all disclose.

Chair Mortenson:

We have a clarification from Mr. Guinan.

Patrick Guinan:

According to Legal Counsel, the way the bill is written is the way Mr. Settlemeyer intends it.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

How long do you estimate it would take to reach 85 percent funding in the programs? Because you said there may or may not be a surplus, what is the realistic approach? What if the voters did not pass this resolution a second time, are there any safeguards to see that the two benefit programs stay intact?

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

How long it will take is problematic because we may never have a surplus again, so I cannot really say. If any surplus money becomes available, it should be put toward these goals. There have been presentations regarding the unfunded liabilities of PEBP and PERS and ways to decrease those liabilities, but most of the scenarios presented concerning PEBP involved cutting benefits, among other things. I did not find any of the suggestions I heard very palatable.

I have no idea when the 85 percent funded threshold might be attained, but the beautiful part of this bill is if the programs ever do attain those thresholds, there would be no issue; the excess money would go straight to the General Fund.

I do not know whether the voters would be for the proposal or against it, but let them decide. Numerous times in this Committee it has been stated that we should let the voters decide whether an idea is a good or bad one.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I welcome the discussion because we must look for different avenues to decrease the unfunded liabilities in those two benefit programs. A decrease in those liabilities will lead to better bonding terms for the State.

Assemblywoman Gansert:

What is the definition of "surplus"? Are they reversions or does a surplus occur when we have revenues that surpass the prior biennium's revenues?

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

Legal Counsel said it would be money that was left over.

Assemblywoman Gansert:

That would be reversions.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I was told by bill drafting that was the way it had to be done.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

You have brought attention to the fact that we should focus on the promises we have already made to the state's workers before we embark on any more ambitious government building programs.

Chair Mortenson:

Are there any further questions? If not, we will go to the audience.

Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System:

The Retirement Board has taken a neutral position with respect to A.J.R. 8, due to the nature of the resolution as a method for the State to make payments to the Public Employees' Retirement Fund in addition to the State's actuarially required contributions until the System is at least 85 percent funded. The System currently is 75 percent funded. I also cannot answer the question as to when the Fund would be 85 percent funded. All things being equal, the System will be paid in full in 28.3 years, and gains and losses in our unfunded liability have more to do with what is going on in the investment markets than I can predict.

The Retirement System is dedicated to fully funding the actuarially accrued liability over time through its funding policy, which is GASB compliant. This is the difference between the OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits) disclosures that are currently being considered by the Legislature and what to do with that on the health care side, or with other post-employment benefits. The Retirement System's GASB pronouncements are 25 and 27 and we are fully GASB compliant at this point. The Board's funding policy also prevents the Retirement Board from supporting or endorsing any benefit modifications unless the actuarially-determined contribution rate is reduced by a full percentage point. Their funding policy also requires that in the year the rate is actually going to be reduced any benefit modifications can make up only one-quarter of the rate reduction. Each of these commitments, the one contained in this resolution and in the Board's funding policies, focuses on enhancing the financial strength of the System for the benefit of our members and

beneficiaries. Commitment by all stakeholders to the long-term stability of the financing of the program is key to the overall health of the Pension System. The System is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer system with 163 participating public employers. As such, any payments under A.J.R. 8 or otherwise would be for the benefit of all 163 public employers and not just the State; and the payments would be for the benefit of all 140,000 active members and retirees. I want to make that clarification. There is no parceling amongst the various public employers of the actuarially-accrued liabilities associated with their individual employee groups.

Assemblyman Christensen:

If neutral were not an option, which other position would you take?

Dana Bilyeu:

I am bound by what the Retirement Board has asked me to say, so I cannot take a position other than the one I was told to take by the Board of Trustees.

Leslie Johnstone, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program:

The Board of the Public Employees' Benefits Program has not taken a position on this bill. For clarification, the contribution toward the unfunded liability, in order to be accounted for as such, would be contingent upon the Program establishing an irrevocable trust fund.

Another item I would like to clarify is in the definition of actuarial-accrued liabilities. The Public Employees' Benefits Program is funded very differently than the Retirement System in that there is not a defined contribution from the State and/or the employee salaries. To date, we have been on a pay-as-you-go basis, meaning the State funds only the portion that is required to pay the retiree benefits for that year. We do not have any kind of automatic mechanism to incorporate what the funding would be to go towards the liability. The amount that will be required on the financial statements is the unfunded portion of what has been called the annual required contribution, which is the current year's service and the benefits that are associated with that current year's service, plus some amortization of prior service that has been provided by the employees and the retirees. That is a much smaller number than the \$1 billion to \$4 billion figure, which is the total liability. The total liability incorporates future service as well as all past service that has been provided. The annual required contribution is approximately \$200 million per year, but it is a per-year figure, and the unfunded portion of that is what is required to be reported on the financial statement as an outstanding liability. I do not know if the 85 percent of the actuarial accrued liability figure is intended to be 85 percent

of what goes on the financial statements, or 85 percent of the grand total liability, which is the \$1 billion to \$4 billion figure.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

I hear many different figures for the liability, how it accrues, how the liability is accounted for, what has to go on the books, amortization schedules, and how to get caught up depending upon how the stock market does. There are varying opinions on what the short-term liability is versus what the long-term liability is. Everyone says there are deficits, but how much they are and how to account for them is up to many different interpretations. It does seem odd that the people representing these two major trusts for State employees would not gladly reach out for whatever monies could be made available in the future through a bill such as A.J.R. 8. If I had household liabilities equal to two-year's gross income, because what we are talking about now is a figure over \$6 billion, I would be looking for any assistance I could get.

Assemblyman Conklin:

This is not a reliable revenue stream. We have a fiscal problem with the Public Employees' Benefits Program that needs an ongoing, stable plan so that people in the system are made whole.

Assemblyman Cobb:

Has any bill been put forward to consistently fund this deficit?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

There was an interim study done on this issue, and there will be bills coming from the Senate to address it.

Chair Mortenson:

We will now go to those who have signed up against the bill.

Oran McMichael, Area Field Services Director, Nevada American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME):

We appreciate Assemblyman Settelmeyer's sentiments, but our opposition to A.J.R. 8 is not opposition to the concept of funding using 25 percent of the surplus. Our opposition is to allowing the decision to be made by the public. All good intentions are not necessarily good public policy. We support Mr. Settelmeyer's other measure that keeps the matter in the Legislative domain, in statute. If the voters decided against this measure, it could send a message that these benefits are up for grabs and spin off other initiatives that could jeopardize those benefits and programs. State employees, and others, would have to spend a minor fortune to convince the public that this is a good

idea. We can only imagine the misunderstanding any language an initiative would create among the public. We trust the wisdom of this Legislature and trust the process of statute and urge the Committee not adopt A.J.R. 8.

Roger Maillard, President, State of Nevada Employees' Association, AFSCME/Retiree Chapter:

State employees are constantly under attack by the news media and other groups. I would not look forward to months of that rancor during a campaign if this became a ballot issue. I also disagree with the idea of changing the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*. My organization is opposed to this measure, but we support the Assemblyman's other bill relating to this topic.

Chair Mortenson:

Our *Constitution* is small, and we work very hard to keep it simple and uncluttered.

Danny Coyle, Past President and Director, State of Nevada Employees' Association, AFSCME/Local 4041:

I want to apologize to Assemblyman Settlemeyer for indicating to his attaché that I would probably support A.J.R. 8. That was before I read the language in his Assembly bill, which is almost identical language, except for amending the state *Constitution*. Putting this provision in statute would be more immediate than the constitutional amendment process. Given the perceived urgency of addressing GASB liabilities, the Assembly bill would be the more expedient way to go.

Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association:

I support this resolution, but believe it needs amendments. This is only a tool to address one of the most important issues Nevada faces in the long run—making sure our obligations are met, not just to satisfy GASB, but because those were obligations made and agreed to by the Legislature. Whether or not there will be sufficient funds this session to come up with an absolute, specific source of funding that is consistent and as stable as possible, is unclear.

There is a very big difference between the sources of funding for Ms. Bilyeu's program and Ms. Johnstone's program. One program, because of the funding source and the way it was established, does have an actuarial formula so one can approximate when it will be funded. Until the funding source is established for the Public Employees' Benefits Program, it will be very difficult to get an actuarial number. There are not as many actuaries with expertise on this type of medical problem as there are with expertise on the retirement systems.

Let us say you deposit an amount equal to 25 percent of the state's surplus, and I am assuming that is after the money is put into the "rainy day" fund, which is approximately 10 percent. There needs to be more flexibility, so I am proposing an amendment that would say to deposit an amount that is equal to 25 percent of the surplus, and then let the Legislature determine the percentage that would be divided between PERS and PEBP. Because PEBP does not have a funding scheme in place, that program might be the one that takes the greater amount of any available surplus. The Legislature could determine the priorities. I believe you would want to fund PEBP first, but, because it is a constitutional amendment, you want the language very generic and more discretionary for the Legislature.

I appreciate that a bill could be passed through the Legislature every session to do the same thing, but we have a provision in our statutes that does not allow unfunded mandates to local governments. That provision is found in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 354.599, but every bill I have seen so far this session that carries unfunded mandates to local governments has a paragraph in it that says, "and the provisions of NRS 354.599 do not apply." That is why I support having something in the *Constitution*. I appreciate the concern that was raised about trying to sell a constitutional amendment, but several years ago there was a constitutional amendment about PERS that went on the ballot. That constitutional amendment was designed to prohibit the State from taking funds from PERS and using them elsewhere. There was no campaign whatsoever to sell that amendment although there were some good newspaper editorials about it. That ballot question passed very, very easily. If you have a well-written explanation, the people do understand issues like this. When you take a look at that prior PERS ballot question, the voters must have understood the issues because it passed, and it passed with no problem and no campaign. I think it is the way a ballot question is written and the way the explanation is crafted.

Chair Mortenson:

Did you sign in for or against?

Carole Vilardo:

I signed in right in the middle because I supported the bill, but had amendments.

Chair Mortenson:

Are there questions?

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

If this were to be adopted in the *Constitution* as written, would it supersede the current "rainy day" fund and the funding of that from the surplus, or how would that work?

Carole Vilardo:

That is something your staff or the Legal Division will have to confirm. I would think the "rainy day" fund should take precedence, and if it does not, then there should be an amendment, and I would suggest that.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Is the current "rainy day" fund set up statutorily and not in the Nevada *Constitution*?

Carole Vilardo:

It is a statutory fund.

Roger Maillard:

In response to Ms. Vilardo's testimony on the PERS ballot question of several years ago, that was quite a different issue and times have changed. More public employees are coming under attack. The issue back then was that the Legislature was eyeing the PERS fund and wanted to take money out of it to fund other projects. The issue was not one of defending public employees it was an issue concerning protection of the retirees' fund.

Assemblyman Settelmeyer:

Ms. Bilyeu, what bills have eyed the PERS fund?

Dana Bilyeu:

Question 1 on the 1996 ballot was a preventative measure. There has never been a time I am aware of where there was a specific "raid" on the retirement system. There was a fund created in the 1980s to fund post-retirement increases, and that fund was put into the System with the provision that it could be taken back at any time by the Legislature. That fund was taken back by the Legislature so it did not fund the post-retirement increases. It was not part of the actual PERS trust; it was a very specific appropriation of \$20 million.

The Legislature has always been very good about funding the actuarially required contributions to the System. Question 1 was more about making certain the System was independent because there were other states across the country in which there had been very, very extensive pension raids, so the Nevada Legislature as part of a preventative measure, passed the language of

Question 1 twice and then it went to a vote of the people where it was passed by 72 percent of the voters.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

So the Nevada Legislature has never tried to raid the PERS money?

Dana Bilyeu:

Absolutely not.

Chair Mortenson:

I am going to close the hearing on A.J.R. 8.

Assemblywoman Koivisto:

While I appreciate Mr. Settlemeyer's thought in bringing forward this legislation, I tend to agree with the retirees. At least once a week we see something in the newspaper about those "rotten public employees" and all the money we are draining from the State. I cannot see that this would ever pass the voters, so I cannot support it.

Chair Mortenson:

I would be frightened about a referendum. Are there any other comments? If not, the meeting is adjourned [at 5:15 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Terry Horgan
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Harry Mortenson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Elections, Procedures, Ethics, and Constitutional Amendments

Date: April 10, 2007

Time of Meeting: 3:45 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance roster