

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session
May 16, 2007**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick at 8:34 a.m., on Wednesday, May 16, 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 Settlemeyer
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman RoseMary Womack



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst
Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel
Mary Kay Doherty, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rusty McAllister, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
John Slaughter, AICP, Management Services Director, Washoe County
Alex Kukulus, President, Sierra Fire Fighters Association
Richard Nachtsheim, President, Reno Fire Fighters, Local 731
Mary Walker, representing North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District,
Carson, Douglas, and Lyon Counties
Dan Musgrove, representing Clark County
Raymond Flynn, Assistant Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
Department
Steve Holloway, Executive Vice President, Associated General
Contractors, Las Vegas Chapter

[Call to order, roll call]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

We have a work session. There is the tradition that if we completely change a bill it should come back to a full hearing. We are going to do that because Mr. Bobzien has proposed some amendments to Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint) and Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint). The amendments drastically change the bills. We are going to open the hearing on S.B. 288 (R1) and S.B. 289 (R1).

Assemblyman Bobzien:

What we have in S.B. 289 (R1) and S.B. 288 (R1) is close to where we wanted to go in the negotiations with representatives of the two fire districts that are affected by this bill. The one thing we are missing in S.B. 288 (R1), is it in Section 3?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I believe it was Section 9, and was an original amendment that was agreed upon when we first heard the bill, that it would say one or more counties.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

That has to come back in. There was some discussion as to whether or not there were any *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 474 Districts

[County Fire Protection Districts] in one or more counties. There is one. It is also important to have the word "contiguous" back in the bill.

Rusty McAllister, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

The only other change to S.B. 288 (R1) was to delete Section 4, subsection 2(b), because we found other parts of the statute where it already states that one can establish, regulate, and operate volunteer fire departments.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I just want to be clear. You are going to delete Section 4, subsection 2(b)?

Rusty McAllister:

Yes.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Senate Bill 288 (R1) and S.B. 289 (R1) together make a huge difference to the way the fire departments in northern Nevada work. That is why it is important that these two bills are heard together.

Assemblyman Beers:

With the additions and deletions in Section 9, how would that read now? You are going to have to remove some of the new language if you are going to reinsert one or more counties back in. It is going to say "within one or more counties, a county, or incorporated territory" It would not make sense.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

It would read "one or more counties, or incorporated territory" Thank you for pointing that out.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Time is of the essence and we need to make the decision on whether to move these bills out of Committee today or not. If we are clear, Mr. McKenna can do his job and if the Committee is comfortable, we will vote these out.

Assemblyman Settelmeyer:

The bill will still be able to accomplish its original intent, which was to prevent ambulance companies from operating in areas with an exclusive contract. Those were the concerns brought up in reference to North Lake Tahoe. That was one of the things that Mary Walker testified on.

Rusty McAllister:

I talked this morning with the Chief of the North Lake Tahoe Fire Department and he said that he is okay with the amendments.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

Thank you.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

For the record, Mr. Bobzien, I, and the firefighters who were directly affected by this bill were all in a meeting. I think everyone is on board and they are here today. Representatives of the two groups that were directly affected are here and can come to testify.

The bigger problems are in S.B. 289 (R1). Let us go back through S.B. 288 (R1) so that Mr. McKenna has a clear understanding.

The first major change is in Section 9, line 40, to reinsert "one or more counties."

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Then strike "a county" and insert a comma before "or."

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. McKenna, is that clear? [He nodded yes.] All of the other modifications, everyone is okay?

John Slaughter, AICP, Management Services Director, Washoe County:

I have a question. On the second page of the mock-up where lines 17, 18, and 19 have been stricken, what is the impact to volunteer fire departments?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Slaughter, we did cut the lobbyists out of this bill and worked directly with those who were affected.

Rusty McAllister:

That subsection was initially added by one of the chiefs of the Reno Fire Department, because he said that he did not have the ability to get volunteers to do what they are supposed to do. We found other parts of the law that say "to support, regulate, and administrate volunteer fire departments." So, there is no need to add this language. We were looking at the language to integrate volunteers into departments that have existing contracts, and it raised concerns. We talked about removing the word "integrate," but since we found other parts of the law with related language we have left it in.

John Slaughter:

My confusion was I thought existing statute was stricken. Our concern is that we have a number of volunteer fire departments. Are we still capable of

financially supporting our volunteer fire departments if we strike this out of existing statute?

Rusty McAllister:

The language here is new language, so we are removing the new language. Under (NRS) Chapter 474.160, General Powers and Duties, the Board of Directors of a Fire Protection District, under subsection 3 states, "Organize, regulate, establish and disband fire companies, departments or volunteer departments in their districts." That gives the power and ability to do everything they need to do with volunteer fire departments. It is already in law.

John Slaughter:

We are comfortable now.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Are there any other comments on S.B. 288 (R1)?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

This, in no way, impairs the ability to have and maintain volunteer fire departments?

Rusty McAllister:

You are correct. We are not changing existing statute.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone else who would like to speak on S.B. 288 (R1)? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 288 (R1). I will be happy to take a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 288 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN AND
ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We are now going to open the hearing on Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint). We will allow Mr. Bobzien to do the floor statement for both of these bills.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint) is the bill that needs a little more work. We have a good concept in place, but it did not quite get in during drafting.

The heart of what we discussed was in Section 4, subsection 4. The language that you see here contemplates more the idea of an overall consolidation between two 474s [County Fire Protection Districts], but we wanted to provide a mechanism for reorganization of the different service areas. We are talking more about a swap. This bill would put in some safeguards for how to do it appropriately. From the original hearing, there were situations where there is a firehouse that is across from the other district's service area. The new subsection 4 ([Exhibit C](#)) would state that we would not want a service area to be swapped unless it could be found that "(a) The total assessed valuation of taxable property in the districts proposed to be consolidated" or "swapped" is substantially equivalent. Then "(b) The total ad valorem tax levied within the boundaries of the districts proposed to be consolidated is substantially equivalent." We want similar criteria to those in the bill, but the final one, "(c) The size of the districts proposed to be consolidated is substantially equivalent," will come out.

There is some new language for Section 4. I will read it to be clear ([Exhibit C](#)).

Two or more contiguous fire protection districts located within a county and organized pursuant to NRS 474.460 may adjust boundaries of the fire protection districts to include all or any part of the area of those fire protection districts; 2. The fire protection district boundary adjustment" rather than consolidation "must be initiated by: (a) a petition signed by a majority of the owners of property located within the districts proposed to have their boundaries adjusted and (b) a resolution of the board of county commissioners of the county in which the districts are located, which resolution must be approved by the governing bodies of the fire protection districts proposed to have their boundaries adjusted; 3. If, after notice and a hearing, the board of county commissioners determines that the proposed boundary line adjustment is feasible and in the best interests of the county and the districts proposed to be adjusted, the board of county commissioners shall adopt an ordinance adjusting the boundaries of the districts. The ordinance must include the name and boundaries of the adjusted districts.

Then we go into the new subsection 4:

For the purposes of subsection 3, the board of county commissioners shall not determine that the proposed boundary adjustment is feasible and in the best interests of the county and the districts proposed to be adjusted unless the board concludes, after conducting a reasonable investigation, that: (a) The total

assessed valuation of taxable property in the districts proposed to be included in the adjustment is substantially equivalent; (b) The total ad valorem tax levied within the boundaries of the districts proposed to be included in the adjustment is substantially equivalent.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Sections 3 and 4 were the ones that we spent hours trying to understand. So, it is important to be on the record about what situation Alex Kukulus was in.

Alex Kukulus, President, Sierra Fire Fighters Association:

We have been working with Local 731 from the Reno Fire Department and also representing the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District in an effort to allow for some redistricting of boundaries. We protect the rural areas of Washoe County outside of the incorporated areas, mostly along the western side of the county. It was established as an NRS Chapter 473 fire protection district in the 1940s. The land was primarily ranchland at the time and it has since developed significantly to include West Washoe Valley, Galena, Verdi, and some of the North Valleys area. These areas are now developed to the point that they are high all-risk areas. There has also been significant annexation into these areas by the City of Reno and we now have one of our career [paid] fire stations within the city limits. We also have a second of three fire stations located across the street from a neighboring fire protection district.

What we want is the ability to redraw district boundaries to better reflect the service areas that those stations lie within. There could be station and personnel movement. For example, the Verdi area that lies within the City of Reno could be provided service by the City of Reno, whereas we currently provide that service. It is better for the citizens because they will be served by those to whom they actually pay their tax dollars. Section 3 of this bill would allow us to transition from a Chapter 473 county fire protection district, which is intended more for ranch and wildland fire protection, to a Chapter 474, which encompasses the all-risk environment. We have worked together on this bill and it works for all involved.

Richard Nachtsheim, President, Reno Fire Fighters, Local 731:

I agree with Mr. Kukulus. We have come to an agreement on this. Section 3 talks about moving their fire protection district from a Chapter 473 to a Chapter 474; we think it is the right thing to do. We were concerned, in Section 4, that our fire protection district could be divided and the boundaries moved without any consideration by the board of county commissioners. The board of county commissioners is the fire protection district commissioner

of both fire protection districts. The proposed language satisfies all of our concerns.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Is it possible to keep all things level as we move from a Chapter 473 to a Chapter 474 district? There is probably no real way to balance that out, but we do not want the guys stationed at the Sierra Front being dispatched out to Cedarville. The only way to get the tax base would be to make an enormous district. That is not the intent, correct?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

We will be revisiting this in the future. The point is that we are trying to respond to the changing circumstances in northern Nevada. If you look at the Cold Springs situation with Sierra Front, and then if you look at the other end of the map in Washoe Valley, it is workable. With this language there can be some service changes.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

The taxpayers will be able to maintain their tax rate if these changes are made. It might be difficult to balance out the ad valorem tax base in some regions, given the difference between the rural and urban areas. The intent is understood.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

There is one other section that needs to be addressed. A large part of this bill is allowing for reorganizing from a Chapter 473 to a Chapter 474 district. Section 3 as written speaks more to annexing one district and what we need is to speak to the reorganization of a Chapter 473 into a Chapter 474. We have new language ([Exhibit D](#)).

Assemblywoman Parnell:

In case of an emergency, neither of these bills will prohibit anyone from going where they need to go.

Richard Nachtsheim:

This bill will allow for boundary line readjustment to better serve the public. As it is now, we are way off on where our stations are. Reno Fire and Truckee Meadows Fire respond into Sierra Forest Fire territory all the time and it responds into Truckee Meadows Fire and Reno Fire territory and that will not change. It will get better with this bill.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

That was the crux of this bill. There is the mutual aid and exchange, but what was occurring was that sometimes they were not getting called out, even though they would have been the closest.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

The day that we met was the day there was a fire across the street from Alex Kukulus's home, but Reno Fire was called. The changes are important for response time. I suggested that we do what was done in Clark County and consolidate into one, but that made everyone nervous. The biggest concern was that the constituents got the service they needed within the shortest amount of time and that the tax base served the right people. We got to the heart of the problem. The fire departments know there may be some changes in the future. There was an area on the map that neither fire agency could determine who would serve, so these details need to be worked out.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I want to reinforce the fact that whether it is a paid, part paid, or volunteer department, we have the capability of providing equipment to those departments and they have to have mutual aid between them. When rural and urban firefighters interface, they do work well together. It did concern me when I heard that one department is not called out when they are clearly in the response area.

Richard Nachtsheim:

When we were not called, it was a dispatch error. Anytime there is a fire in our area and the Sierra Forest firehouse is closer, we do not drop our apparatus off, we add it on. If we usually send three engines and a truck, we should have sent three engines and a truck and Sierra Forest should have been alerted, as well. It was obviously a mistake. We do not cut anyone out because they are a different agency.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

We see it occur a lot in rural Nevada, especially when there are federal agencies involved. It gets a little territorial.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone who would like to speak on S.B. 289 (R1)?

John Slaughter, AICP, Management Services Director, Washoe County:

The Washoe County Commission sits as the Board of Trustees for Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District as well as the Sierra Fire Protection District. We are still trying to figure out what the impact of this bill will be. We would

request rolling this to tomorrow to give us 24 hours to review it. It would be appreciated.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

We have no problem doing that because the mock-up is not what we needed. I am not sure how much time Mr. McKenna would need to get the mock-up completed, so it would probably be at the end of the day today. [To Scott McKenna] Is it possible to add Mr. Bobzien's amendments to the mock-up by the end of the day?

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel:

Yes, Madam Chair. Were you referring to the two types of districts under the two chapters?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I refer to allowing the service units to make the boundary changes.

Scott McKenna:

That could be included as a conceptual amendment. A good portion of last session was spent making the changes and covering every technical detail that no one was able to agree on.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

This is the third time it has come before a session, so it is making progress.

Mary Walker, representing North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, and Carson, Douglas, and Lyon Counties:

I would like to echo Mr. Slaughter's comments. We appreciate all of the work that has gone into this bill. We would like to take a look at it and come back tomorrow.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Are there any other speakers? [There were none.] We will roll this bill until tomorrow so we can get a conceptual amendment. We will close the hearing on S.B. 289 (R1).

We are going to move to the work session. We will start with Senate Bill 92 (R1).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).] Behind the mock-up there is a copy of the Clark County definition of "Firearm."

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I worked with Senator Lee on the amendment. It addressed some of the concerns this Committee had on the spring-loaded weapons and the paint guns.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 92 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN PIERCE AND
WOMACK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Kihuen will do the Floor statement. We will go to
Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 84 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Beers will do the Floor statement. We will move to
Senate Bill 106 (2nd Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any discussion on this?

Assemblyman Christensen:

I had discussions with the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. They feel like they need this bill. What I have not been able to get a pulse on is their feelings on the amendment. Is there anyone here from Clark County or someone who would be able to speak to that?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

The way the bill was written originally it was so broad that when I checked with the Legal Division, it appeared that maybe even a janitor could qualify, because it said only "an employee of the health district" or an employee of this or that. The amendment was changed from the original a little because we wanted to narrow it so that the right people were included.

Dan Musgrove, representing Clark County:

We appreciate the tightening of the language, as long as the agency is required to make the finding of the "operational need to know." We offered a conceptual amendment and the Chair captured our intent and made it stronger, so we are in complete support of the bill.

Raymond Flynn, Assistant Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We looked at the change and this is exactly what we need.

Assemblyman Christensen:

That addresses my question.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 106 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any more discussion?

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I still cannot get comfortable with this. I cannot put my finger on it. I will vote to support the bill in Committee, but reserve the right to change my vote on the Floor.

Assemblyman Christensen:

I would be happy to spend some time with Ms. Parnell to address her concerns.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Christensen, will you make the Floor statement? Next,
Senate Bill 139 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 139
(1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Munford will do the Floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 140.

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I will state that there is something about this bill that bothers me. I am willing to let the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation try and do what they need to for the people they are trying to help. They have agreed to come back with a report next session when Purchasing comes to make their presentation. That will give us the opportunity to review the report.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

On balance, this bill will provide some more promotion for the fact that these services are available. Hopefully, it will allow for more development of those opportunities. The amendment about the progress report is a good one.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 140.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Ms. Parnell, will you make the Floor statement? We will now move to Senate Bill 145 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 145 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Settelmeyer will do the Floor statement. Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint) is next.

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

All of you know my concerns with this bill. I did do some checking with the bonding company and if I were to put a sunset change in it or require a report within two years, it could be taken into consideration when they were allowed to bond out. I am hoping that during their presentation next session they give us an update on where they are headed with redevelopment. However, within four years they could come back and make a full report. The intent is to keep the process moving.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED SENATE BILL 200 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MUNFORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Mr. Munford will do the Floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 201 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

You will remember there were 14 amendments on one page and then a couple on another. We worked with all of the people involved. This is a bill that everyone can live with.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 201 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any more discussion?

Assemblywoman Parnell:

The amendment on page 2, line 30, could someone please define "preconstruction?" The word "design" has been deleted and I do not know if everyone knows what preconstruction means.

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel:

The word "preconstruction" is not specifically defined. As the parties who were interested in this concept presented their ideas to us, it became clear that under the broader concept of a construction manager at risk, the term "preconstruction" services is commonly used. Although it is not specifically defined in the bill, within the context of the bill it is clear that preconstruction services refers, in essence, to the first phase of services that the construction manager at risk is providing, those of design, et cetera.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

It is very typical in the bid process and is required in some bid documents that the preconstruction meetings are held to establish what is to be done. Preconstruction would be where one would review the subcontractors list.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I do not have a problem with it; it just concerns me when we have a word in statute that could, in the future, be misconstrued.

Steve Holloway, Executive Vice President, Associated General Contractors, Las Vegas Chapter:

On the first page of the mock-up, under 2(a) there is an outline of what the preconstruction services would encompass, which would be assisting the public body with determining whether scheduling or design problems exist that could delay construction, et cetera.

Assemblyman Claborn:

When we sign union contracts, have union contractors, and there are other contractors from other states, we have a pre-job conference to review the job. This allows the contractors to bring in their key people and make sure everything is squared away before the work begins.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Claborn will do the Floor statement. We are going to move to Senate Bill 222 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

ASSEMBLYMAN BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 222 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I am going to let Mr. Goedhart make the Floor statement on this because this is his district. Next is Senate Bill 497 (1st Reprint).

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I want to commend the sponsor of the bill on a creative way to deal with the costs of a program that many consider important.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I want to make sure that Clark County hears this from me. Senator Lee and I discussed the ordinance that is currently in place to decide what type of advertisement is done. He has assured me that he will go to the Clark County Commission to ensure that it is not Cheetah's Topless Bar or something like that being advertised on the front of the shooting range, which is meant to be a public facility. That concern has been addressed.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 497 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Mr. Goicoechea will make the Floor statement. Our last bill is Senate Bill 508.

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst:

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

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 508.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOMACK WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Atkinson did that on purpose so he would not have to make the Floor statement. Mr. Stewart will make the Floor statement.

Is there any public comment? [There was none.] Is there anything from the Committee? [There was none.] After Thursday we will meet at the call of the Chair. We are adjourned. [9:45 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Emilie Reafs
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Committee Name: <u>Committee on Government Affairs</u>			
Date: <u>May 16, 2007</u>		Time of Meeting: <u>8:34 a.m.</u>	
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 289 (R1)	C	Assemblyman Bobzien	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 289 (R1)	D	Assemblyman Bobzien	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 92 (R1)	E	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 84 (R1)	F	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 106 (R2)	G	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 139 (R1)	H	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 140	I	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 145 (R1)	J	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 200 (R1)	K	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 201 (R1)	L	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 222 (R1)	M	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document

S.B. 497 (R1)	N	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 508	O	Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document