

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session
May 15, 2007**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick at 8:34 a.m., on Tuesday, May 15, 2007, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblyman Bob Beers
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell
Assemblyman James Settelmeyer
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman RoseMary Womack

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dennis Nolan, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst
Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel
Emilie Reafs, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dana Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System
Greg Smith, Administrator, Division of Purchasing, Department of Administration
Kimberlee Tarter, Department Administrator, Division of Purchasing, Department of Administration
Dan Musgrove, Associate Administrator, External Relations, University Medical Center
Leslie Johnstone, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program
Jim Richardson, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Martin Bibb, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada
Ted Olivas, representing City of Las Vegas
Madelyn Shipman, Washoe Legal Services

Chair Kirkpatrick:

[Call to Order, Roll Call] I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 183.

Senate Bill 183: Revises provisions governing administrative positions in the Public Employees' Retirement System. (BDR 23-281)

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

[Read from prepared statement, ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in favor, neutral, or in opposition?
[There was none.] I will close the public hearing Senate Bill 183.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 183.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BOBZIEN AND WOMACK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Stewart, will you do the floor statement?

I will open the public hearing on Senate Bill 210 (First Reprint).

Senate Bill 210 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to reimbursement of subsistence and travel expenses relating to the conduct of public business. (BDR 23-569)

Greg Smith, Administrator, Division of Purchasing, Department of Administration:

We are here to request your concurrence and approval on Senate Bill 210 (1st Reprint). The long and short of the language discussed and approved in the Senate, is that per diem rates be established consistent with the United States General Services Administration (GSA) as opposed to what is established in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

Assemblyman Christensen:

What is the difference between the two?

Kimberlee Tarter, Department Administrator, Division of Purchasing, Department of Administration:

That is what we are here to address. Currently, the dollar amount for state travel reimbursement is established in statute at a cap of \$84. That amount is then split to create \$26 for meal and incidental reimbursements and \$58 for lodging reimbursement, regardless of where one travels. Travelers to Las Vegas are consistently having difficulty trying to find a room for \$58, inclusive of all the taxes and other expenses, and eat for \$26. They are having problems finding locations that are safe and well-lit. Those are the primary concerns that were brought to the Department of Administration, which precipitated the request for the change to the GSA rates.

The GSA rates are reviewed on an annual basis and are broken out regionally. There is considerable research before those rates are established.

Assemblyman Christensen:

You said it was \$80 or \$90 a day, even in Las Vegas?

Kimberlee Tarter:

It is \$58 for the lodging, and \$26 for meals totaling \$84 dollars.

Assemblyman Christensen:

What is the reimbursement under the federal program?

Kimberlee Tarter:

The federal program is broken out, not only by region, but by season. One has to look at where they are going and when. If one were to travel to Las Vegas now, the reimbursement would be \$100 for lodging and \$48 for meals.

Greg Smith:

That is where we see the largest difference. Rural and northern Nevada are relatively consistent with what we now pay.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

Do the Legislators get the GSA cost reimbursement for gas?

Greg Smith:

In my understanding, that is correct.

Assemblyman Beers:

I noticed in the bill that the annual expenditure rate had not been changed; you have just changed the rate for lodging and travel. Is there a reason for that?

Greg Smith:

The net effect of this bill is that state agencies will have to be very frugal about spending money because we do not want to come back to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) and say that we do not have enough travel money. I have talked to three different administrators who are happy to see this change, if approved, but recognize there will have to be work on the backend.

Assemblyman Beers:

Page 15, line 32 has had some amendments, but line 31 states "The annual expenditures from the account may not exceed \$2,500." This bill has higher allowances which could lead to a problem down the line.

Greg Smith:

Section 19 refers to the Board of Regents, so I am not familiar with it.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Page 13, line 26 and 27, is that consistent? Are we going to change who is going to establish this or has it always been the State Board of Examiners?

Kimberlee Tarter:

The statute that we are proposing to modify is often used as an example or the benchmark for the localities. That is what has occurred here. We have several different statutes that reference this specific statute and so that change is being incorporated.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

In Section 15, line 17 and 18, I am trying to figure out what "employees generally" means.

Greg Smith:

That was language inserted on behalf of a request of cities, counties, and some of the political subdivisions. It was a friendly amendment in the Senate to have some consistency.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

So did that same amendment apply in Section 18? Mr. Musgrove, I understand you gave a friendly amendment in the Senate.

Dan Musgrove, Associate Administrator, External Relations, University Medical Center:

That is not our language. Our amendment was not accepted. That is what Legislative Counsel Bureau did; I think they were cleaning it up throughout the statute so it was consistent.

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel:

The main change in the bill is from a specified rate of reimbursement to what is established by the State Board of Examiners. As we went through the various sections that either referenced the specific section where the dollar amounts were previously set, or generally referred to reimbursement, we discovered the language among the various statutes was not consistent, and the language "travel expenses and per diem allowances provided for state officers and state employees generally" was already used in most, but not all, of the sections. The idea was to make the sections consistent.

Assemblyman Claborn:

Is this bill a guideline for legislators? Will this bill cut legislators' expenses?

Kimberlee Tarter:

The legislature travels under different statutory authority, so they are exempt from this statute. This only affects state employees and some of the local commissions and boards.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone who would like to speak in support of S.B. 210 (R1)? [There were none.] Is there anyone who is neutral? [There were none.] Is there anyone who is in opposition? [There were none.] I will close the public hearing on S.B. 210 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PIERCE MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 210 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mrs. Pierce, would you please make the floor statement?

While we are waiting for Senator Nolan we will move to the work session.

The first bill is Senate Bill 101.

Senate Bill 101: Amends the Charter of the City of Sparks. (BDR S-335)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I spoke with Senator Mathews and she is fine with the proposed amendment.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED SENATE BILL 101.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Bobzien, would you like to make the floor statement?

The next bill is Senate Bill 117 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 117 (1st Reprint): Exempts certain contracts entered into by the Board of Trustees of the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority from certain requirements. (BDR S-809)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit E](#)).] Behind the mock-up you can see a copy of the federal code that is cited in the mock-up.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

For clarification, I spoke with Senator Raggio and he was okay with the amendment. I spoke with Senate Government Affairs who heard this and we were able to verify that this was a one-time project. Is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 117 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Settelmeyer, will you please do the floor statement?

Senator Nolan has arrived. We will move out of work session and let you get started with Senate Bill 391.

Senate Bill 391: Revises provisions governing the participation of Legislators in the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (BDR 23-289)

Senator Dennis Nolan, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9:

Senate Bill 391 is a straightforward bill. It would allow legislators to continue to participate in the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) if they already do, after they complete their term of office. They would pay for all of the benefits themselves.

This bill was initiated last session when some former legislators approached me with a dilemma: for years they had been paying out of pocket for their benefits at no cost to taxpayers following their long terms in office. One day they received a call from the PEBP who said they were going to disallow it. It was an administrative decision because there is nothing in statute that does or does not permit it. There was no opposition to the bill in the Senate. This is a bill of

equity and fairness to those who have served in the legislature and if they wish to continue with their health care benefits, they may do so at their own expense.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Could a legislator, through the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA), carry the coverage for 18 months? Or can you not even get that now?

Senator Nolan:

Legislators can maintain those benefits through COBRA. If one is a recipient of the full benefit package, one has the option, following the legislative session, to continue the legislative PEBP benefits or not. One is only eligible for 18 months to continue those now but this bill would allow one to go beyond that.

For disclosure, I have always been fortunate enough to have my own health care benefits plan. In my 12 years here, I have never participated in the PEBP program, but I know there are a number of people who do. For years the PEBP has allowed them to carry on and pay premium out of pocket.

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

The PEBP board has not taken a position on this bill. It has a very minor impact on the program, which would extend eligibility that is not currently in place. The Legislative Retirement System (LRS) currently provides a state subsidy for legislators who have eight years of service, regardless if they are drawing on the retirement system. The PEBP's interpretation is, if the legislator has at least five years of service in the system, they would be eligible. There would be a small impact of legislators who have between five and seven years of service that now would be eligible for the subsidy, but those who leave the legislature with less than five years of service in the retirement system would be subject to the full cost.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Where does it say that about the years in the bill?

Leslie Johnstone:

The interpretation would come from NRS 287.046, subsection 2, which allows some special provisions for legislators on retiree status that have more than eight years of service. It has been PEBP's interpretation that as a retiree they are eligible for the subsidy like any other eligible retiree from state employment.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

On page 2, subsection 2, we are taking out the part where it says eight years and replacing it with "whose term of office has expired." Is that for those facing term limits or for someone who just does not run after two years?

Leslie Johnstone:

The situation could be that someone could serve one two-year term in the Assembly, they would now be eligible to continue in the program, but because they do not have five retirement years of service they would still be subject to 100 percent of the cost.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

What is the implication if Senate Bill 544 does pass? Would it grandfather them into this as well as local government and school district folks?

Leslie Johnstone:

I do not think that would impact this, because in PEBP's eyes, State legislators fall under the same umbrella as State employees.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I am curious, if you were a legislator for eight years, retired, and chose to utilize PEBP, how would the premium be calculated? Would it be subsidized?

Leslie Johnstone:

Currently, they would fall under state retiree rates and be eligible for eight years of service subsidy. They are retirement years of service, not calendar years.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

Do you have any idea what that might equate to?

Leslie Johnstone:

No, I do not have that with me.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

If that person had some service time with a local government, they could also apply that, correct?

Leslie Johnstone:

Yes, we would bill all involved employers.

[The Chair stepped out.]

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

With this language, once a legislator passed five years, say three terms in the Assembly, then they would be able to access the PEBP program with a subsidy.

Leslie Johnstone:

It is my interpretation that after any length of service in the Legislature, a legislator would be able to participate in the PEBP program. After five retirement years of service, they would be eligible for the subsidy.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Do we receive a credit for every year we are here?

Leslie Johnstone:

I am not sure how the calendar year elapses with the years of service that you are credited.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I was curious because we are only here every other year for 120 days.

Leslie Johnstone:

I can get that clarification from the retirement system. We use them as our agency to certify the years of service on which we base the subsidy.

[The Chair returned.]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone who is in favor of S.B. 391?

Senator Nolan:

One of the legislators who came to me was Bob Sader, who served before me and was Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. I had not met him before; this is not a partisan issue. It is a matter of equity.

Jim Richardson, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

We are supportive of this effort. It seems like a fair solution to a problem that arose.

Martin Bibb, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada:

We see this as an equity issue as well and support it.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any one else who would like to speak in favor of S.B. 391? [There were none.] Is there anyone who is neutral? [There were none.] Is there anyone who is in opposition? [There were none.]

I have a question for Legal. Page 2, line 1 says "retires on or after July 1, 1985." Does this make it retroactive? I am wondering why that is in there, or was it existing language?

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel:

This is an existing section of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). I would not read subsection 1 as retroaction. Subsection 2 relates to legislators, whereas subsection 1 refers to state officers and employees generally. This goes back to when the change was made in the 1985 session to allow for state officers and employees to continue participation after retirement.

Leslie Johnstone:

The legislators that retired after 1985 would be eligible to come back into the program through our biennial late enrollment or reinstatement, just like any other state employee.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any other testimony on S.B. 391? [There was none.] I will close the public hearing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 391.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BEERS AND BOBZIEN
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Ms. Parnell, can you do the floor statement?

We are going to go back to the work session. We are going on to Senate Bill 137 (1st Reprint).

[Senate Bill 137 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to local governmental purchasing. (BDR 27-365)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

There was concern about leaving in the word "annual."

Ted Olivas, representing City of Las Vegas:

I wanted to give some information for consideration. I heard that this could somehow circumvent prevailing wages, but that is absolutely not true. This is NRS 332, which relates to goods and services. Public Works is covered under a different statute.

The term "annual" is an appropriate clarification so there is no question. A sneaky purchasing person, and I am not saying that there are any, could say "well I am only spending \$30,000 a quarter" and that to me is a \$120,000 contract. Besides local governments budget on an annual basis, so I think this is appropriate to keep so the legislative intent is clear.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Does the Committee want me to pull this bill back until tomorrow? The amendment was, I think, by Ms. Belz.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

My discomfort with leaving "annual" in is because we are going from the old language which relates to the overall contract being more than \$10,000 but less than \$25,000. It seems a large leap to go from an entire contract that is \$25,000 to a contract that is \$25,000 annually. There are contracts that could go out a couple of years.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

Existing law says "which the estimated amount required to perform. . ." and does not have the word "annual." We are looking at a twofold change; we are adding the word "annual" and then upping the ante. Could you explain why you decided to add the word "annual?"

Ted Olivas:

The addition of the word "annual" was to provide an additional safeguard so there was no question. You cannot do funny numbers to get around this. If the project is over \$50,000 on an annual basis, you have to advertise. This is an appropriate clarification for those who work with this bill and NRS 332 on a daily basis.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 137 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BEERS AND BOBZIEN
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Christensen, would you do the floor statement?

We will now do Senate Bill 198 (First Reprint).

**Senate Bill 198 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to certain public
contracts. (BDRS-231)**

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit G](#)).]

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE
BILL 198 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BEERS AND BOBZIEN
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Claborn, since this is a lease-purchase bill, would you do the floor
statement?

**Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint): Revises certain provisions relating to state and
local governmental purchasing. (BDR 27-782)**

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I would like to ask a question of Legal; Mr. Bobzien brought it up. Page 4,
line 44 says "or otherwise provide input with respect to;" does this make it
vague?

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel:

The members of the Committee would have to determine if they feel the present language in the bill is a bit too loose. As I had explained to Mr. Bobzien, if it were the Committee's wish, the language could be tightened to include something like the person was able to affect the outcome of a purchasing decision in their official capacity. That is the Committee's choice to make.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

If we eliminated "or otherwise provide input with respect to" and just had it state "allowed him or her to influence the awarding of the contract," it makes more sense.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Can you specify what page and line?

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I am referring to page 4, line 44. I guess I am discussing the concept of an amendment by deletion of the words "or otherwise provide input with respect to . . ." so if you were to just read that section, it would read "The position held by the former public officer or employee at the time the contract was awarded allowed him to affect, or influence . . . the awarding of the contract."

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I am seeing a lot of nods.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Mr. Settlemeyer is right, we had some of this discussion in the Committee and it was just too broad-based. One would have to have the ability to affect the outcome. Just because you are an employee and you have some information that someone was going to bid a job, you should not have to report that to your supervisor.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I agree. I would want to make sure that we would leave in "affect" and "influence" and then delete the other.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

I like the language that Mr. Settlemeyer articulated.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

On page 4, line 44, deleting "or otherwise provide input with respect to" tightens up the language and makes clear who we are looking to go after.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. McKenna, are you clear on the direction the Committee wants to go?

Scott McKenna:

Yes, Madam Chair. If I understand correctly, I am beginning half way through paragraph (c) "at the time the contract was awarded, allowed him to affect or influence the awarding of the contract."

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Settelmeyer is that your motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 307 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Settelmeyer, will you do the floor statement? Could you also let Senator Titus know about the amendment?

Senate Bill 419 is next.

Senate Bill 419: Revises provisions relating to certain county clerks.
(BDR 20-1161)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit I](#)).]

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 419.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mrs. Womack, will you do the floor statement?

Senate Bill 500: Authorizes contracts between legal services organizations and local governmental agencies for the provision of insurance.
(BDR 23-1367)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:
[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I know this did not come up in the testimony, but I wanted to clarify, are there other organizations that could come under this legislation? Are we going to see other bills from other organizations that wish to be brought under the umbrella?

Madelyn Shipman, Washoe Legal Services:

Under this particular bill no other entities would be eligible because it is only for entities that receive funding through a legislative mandate in NRS 19.031 to deal with child abuse and neglect. There are five potential organizations and two of them are already covered under group health. The Senior Law Project is an example. It is a nonprofit that provides legal services for elders.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

The Senior Law Project is one example and there is one other. I want to get a sense of what they are.

Madelyn Shipman:

There are Clark County Legal Services, Washoe County Legal Services, and a statewide Nevada Legal Services.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I wanted to clarify that the scope of possible organizations that have this sort of a relationship, beyond the one contemplated in the bill, but provide some sort of adjunct support for the local government.

Madelyn Shipman:

Under the language in this bill, there are currently only three eligible entities currently in the state. There may be more in the future.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 500.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Atkinson, would you do the floor statement?

Senate Bill 515: Provides a declaration of legislative intent regarding the use of certain lease-purchase and installment-purchase agreements. (BDR 31-229)

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document, ([Exhibit K](#)).]

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 515.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Goicoechea, would you do the floor statement?

Yesterday, we heard Senate Bill 374 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 374 (1st Reprint): Makes certain changes concerning tax increment areas. (BDR 22-816)

There was some discussion, so I asked that we pull it back for some clarification. In your work session materials ([Exhibit L](#)), on the last page, you will see we have that from NRS 278C.250 (d) "For the support of the public schools within a county school district pursuant to NRS 387.195, must be allocated to, and when collected must be paid into, the appropriate fund of the taxing agency."

We have a mock-up that includes both the original language and the amendment. I think it is clearer to see it this way.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 374 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I did speak with Senator Hardy and he is fine with the amendment.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I wanted to thank Mrs. Vilardo for sending the clarifying follow-up email.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Stewart, will you do the floor statement? I guarantee there will be questions, so study it inside and out.

That completes the work session document for today. The work session document for tomorrow will be emailed later this morning. There may be some additions. Senate Bill 84 (R1), S.B. 92 (R1), S.B. 106 (R2), S.B. 140, S.B. 200 (R1), S.B. 201 (R1), S.B. 222 (R1), S.B. 497 (R1), and S.B. 508 are scheduled for tomorrow. Is there anything from the Committee? [There was nothing.] I do not see any reason to be in Committee on Monday morning. We are adjourned. [9:38 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Emilie Reafs
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: May 15, 2007

Time of Meeting: 8:34 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 183	C	Dana Bilyeu, Public Employee's Retirement System	Prepared Statement
S.B. 101	D	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 117 (R1)	E	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 137 (R1)	F	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 198 (R1)	G	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 307 (R1)	H	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 419	I	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 500	J	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 515	K	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 374 (R1)	L	Amber Joiner, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document