MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Seventy-Fourth Session April 2, 2007

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Morse Arberry Jr. at 8:09 a.m., on Monday, April 2, 2007, in Room 3137 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 Morse Arberry Jr., Chair
Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley
Assemblyman Mo Denis
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Joseph P. (Joe) Hardy
Assemblyman Joseph Hogan
Assemblywoman Ellen Koivisto
Assemblyman John W. Marvel
Assemblyman David R. Parks
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith
Assemblywoman Valerie E. Weber

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea, Assembly District No. 35

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark W. Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst Steve Abba, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst Linda Blevins, Committee Secretary Patti Adams, Committee Assistant

Chairman Arberry opened the hearing on <u>Assembly Bill (A.B.) 10</u> and recognized Assemblyman David Parks.

Assembly Bill 10: Provides an exemption from the governmental services tax for vehicles registered by a resident of Nevada who is on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States. (BDR 32-196)

Assemblyman David Parks testified in support of $\underline{A.B.}$ 10. The bill exempted Nevada residents from paying the government services tax when they were



both an active duty member of the military and were required to serve outside of Nevada. The nature of military service often compromised the ability of service members to fulfill their financial obligations and to assert many of their legal rights. The U.S. Congress and most state legislatures had long recognized the need for protective legislation. Mr. Parks stated that as far back as the Civil War, the U.S. Congress enacted an absolute moratorium on civil action brought against federal soldiers and sailors. During World War I the U.S. Congress passed the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1918. In 1940 the law was rewritten expanding legal protections to service members. In 2003 the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act was rewritten and renamed the Service Members Civil Relief Act. The bill was signed into law in December 2003.

Mr. Parks explained that A. B. 10 was created to correct an inequity. An active duty service member and resident of Nevada stationed outside of Nevada must pay the government services tax when registering his automobile. If a service member was a non-resident of Nevada, a vehicle could be registered in Nevada and be exempt from paying the government services tax. Nevada residents who were active duty military and driving a vehicle in another state were required to pay the government services tax if they wanted to maintain Nevada license plates on the vehicle.

According to Mr. Parks, the fiscal impact was less than previously believed and was outlined in Exhibit C. The copy of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Military Licensing webpage was attached to the exhibit and provided the requirements for military personnel vehicle registration.

In response to Assemblyman Marvel's question regarding the amount of the fiscal note, Mr. Parks indicated that Exhibit C showed a breakdown for the requested exemption. The reason for the 1 percent difference between inside and outside Clark County was a supplemental 1 percent governmental services tax collected by Clark County. Mr. Parks had estimated Clark County had approximately 75 percent of the total registrations. The percent of active duty exemptions for the State was estimated at 25 percent. It was Mr. Parks' belief the fiscal note of \$6 million was inaccurate and should be approximately \$750,000.

Assemblyman Denis recognized that the bill provided a financial incentive for military personnel and asked whether it was a possibility the exemption would encourage military personnel to return to Nevada upon completion of their enlistment. Mr. Parks agreed that was a possibility.

Chairman Arberry inquired about the impact of the reduction in the government services tax on the General Fund. Mr. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, indicated that the amount of money that flowed to the school districts from the governmental services tax was calculated when the General Fund obligation was determined in the Distributive School Account. To the extent the exemption reduced governmental services tax to the school districts, the General Fund obligation would increase by a like amount.

Mr. Parks commented that a fiscal note relative to the DMV Motor Carrier Division was submitted, but it was his opinion the fiscal note would not be an issue. The possibility that an individual who operated a motor carrier vehicle outside of Nevada would have an unfair advantage seemed remote, but that concern could be fixed by the Committee.

Assemblywoman Smith advised the Committee there was a bill which originated in the Natural Resources Committee regarding what constituted active duty in

the armed forces. Mrs. Smith requested clarification on exactly who was to be included under <u>A.B. 10</u>. Mr. Parks responded the definition of active duty personnel was a previous concern, especially for veterans, but there was other legislation which addressed the issue.

Mr. Tim Tetz, Executive Director, Office of Veterans' Services, testified on behalf of A.B. 10. The Office of Veterans' Services supported the intent of the bill to assist active duty service members who bear the burden of the war. The language of A.B. 10 stated a person must be "a member of the Armed forces of the United States or the National Guard or any reserve component thereof," and must be serving "outside the State of Nevada in support of a worldwide contingency operation of the Armed Forces of the United States." The first concern was the loose interpretation of "worldwide contingency operation." Mr. Tetz noted that to provide coverage to all active duty service members, the phrase "worldwide contingency operation" should be removed. All active duty service members were considered equally important and could be transferred to combat locations at any time.

Mr. Tetz continued by explaining there were 20,020 active duty military who claimed Nevada as their home state, which contrasted with the 2000 U.S. Census report that only 8,000 active duty military personnel claimed Nevada as their home. A strict interpretation of A.B. 10 eliminated active duty reservists from the 20,020 active duty personnel. The elimination of those reservists brought the total active duty military number to 14,323. According to Mr. Tetz, it was believed approximately 1,000 active duty personnel at Nellis Air Force Base and Fallon Naval Air Station considered themselves Nevadans. That reduced the number further to 13,323 on active duty. Therefore, the fiscal impact of \$6 million noted by DMV was high.

Mr. Tetz agreed the estimate of 25 percent of active duty personnel taking the exemption as noted in Exhibit C was a fair assumption.

Mr. Edgar Roberts, Administrator, DMV Motor Carrier Division, testified that DMV worked with Mr. Parks in preparing a proposed friendly amendment to $\underline{A.B.\ 10}$. The proposed amendment ($\underline{\text{Exhibit D}}$) to section 1 of $\underline{A.B.\ 10}$ would add the following language as subsection 8: "Vehicles used for commercial purposes or vehicles registered through the Department's Motor Carrier Division are not exempt from the governmental services tax." This amendment would eliminate any unfair competitive advantage over others registering commercial vehicles with DMV through the Motor Carrier Division. In addition, the amendment to $\underline{A.B.\ 10}$ would eliminate the fiscal note submitted by the Motor Carrier Division that estimated a \$223,744 revenue loss over the next biennium.

Ms. Martha Barnes, Administrator Central Services Records Division, DMV, noted that a fiscal note was submitted for A.B. 10 by DMV. The fiscal note was based on 20,020 active duty military personnel claiming Nevada as their home of record. Pursuant to the office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense, there were 14,323 regular active duty and 5,697 active duty reservists. Ms. Barnes further noted the loss of revenue was based on one registered vehicle per Nevada active duty personnel and used an average governmental services tax of \$144. Loss of governmental services tax was projected at \$1,558,607 for six months of fiscal year (FY) 2007-08 and \$3,245,019 for FY 2008-09. Included in those amounts was a 6 percent commission DMV received for collecting the governmental services tax for the Department of Taxation. According to Ms. Barnes, expenses to DMV for programming and forms were \$9,150 in FY 2007-08 and \$1,050 in FY 2008-09. The total fiscal effect was \$1,567,757 in FY 2007-08 and \$3,246,069 in FY 2008-09. The Motor Carrier

Division requested that the effective date of the bill be delayed until January 2008 to allow time for DMV to implement programming changes and to conduct in-house training for DMV personnel.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 10.

Assembly Bill 149: Makes an appropriation to the Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services in the Department of Health and Human Services for the prevention of the abuse of methamphetamine. (BDR S-1038)

Chairman Arberry opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 149, recognizing Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie. Ms. Leslie stated the bill appropriated \$2 million for prevention and education activities associated with methamphetamine (meth). The limited prevention dollars available in the State were previously designated for all illegal substances, particularly marijuana. According to Ms. Leslie, money had not been specifically designated for the prevention of methamphetamine abuse. She said the practice of "scrapping" was recently associated with meth abuse. Scrapping occurred when methamphetamine addicts searched for copper and other metal wires to sell as a way to raise money for drug purchases. The scrapping process caused serious damage at construction sites and on power lines. It had become an industry-wide problem and caused serious financial loss.

Ms. Leslie further explained that when the Governor recommended \$2 million in the budget to address the methamphetamine issue, the specifics of how it was to be used were not outlined, leaving that to the Attorney General's task force. Ms. Leslie was the Assembly representative on that task force. The task force had determined the money would flow through the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA). The SAPTA would be responsible for monitoring the expenditures of the money through Nevada's 13 substance abuse coalitions listed in Exhibit E. It was the recommendation of the task force that the coalitions expand their memberships to include local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, courts and child welfare and juvenile justice programs.

Ms. Leslie urged the Committee to earmark the \$2 million specifically for the prevention of abuse and education programs related to methamphetamine as recommended by the task force.

Mr. Kevin Quint, Executive Director, Join Together Northern Nevada (JTNN), testified in support of A.B. 149. Mr. Quint stated that JTNN also facilitated the Washoe County based Meth Community Response Alliance. The Alliance was formed in 2005 in response to the community's growing need to get ahead of the methamphetamine problem. The Alliance consisted of approximately 200 representatives from local businesses and county, state, and city government agencies. According to Mr. Quint, Nevada was number one in lifetime use of methamphetamine and also number one for usage in the past year and usage in the past 30 days, indicating the seriousness of the problem in the State. Mr. Quint encouraged the passage of A.B. 149 to further efforts to address the meth problem.

Ms. Belinda Thompson, Director, Goshen Community Development Coalition, supported $\underline{A.B.\ 149}$. Ms. Thompson expressed appreciation for the efforts of Ms. Leslie in addressing the methamphetamine problems. According to Ms. Thompson, the Clark County methamphetamine efforts had included the

hosting of town hall events, youth summits, and the addressing of multi-cultural issues.

Chairman Arberry asked whether meth abusers came to the Coalition for assistance. Ms. Thompson explained the Coalition was tasked with the education of the communities regarding methamphetamine issues. As access to resources was made available and campaigns to increase awareness were provided, there was an increase of individuals seeking treatment services. The Coalitions identified treatment resources for these individuals.

Mr. Quint further explained that <u>A.B. 149</u> was specifically for prevention: treatment was not a part of the programs funded through the bill. However, meth abusers required long-term treatment plans. Chairman Arberry and Mr. Quint further discussed the services provided by treatment programs and coalitions.

Ms. Linda Lang, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership, provided written testimony (Exhibit E) in support of A.B. 149. Attached to the exhibit was supportive testimony from Ms. Cathy McAdoo, Partners Allied for Community Excellence Coalition in Elko County; Ms. Stacy Smith, Nye Community Coalition, Nye and Esmeralda counties; and Ms. Jenney Sartin, Bring Everyone's Strengths Together (BEST) Coalition, Clark County.

Ms. Lang stated the 13 substance abuse prevention coalitions listed in the exhibit were prepared to work together to prevent meth abuse. In Ms. Lang's opinion, to create an entirely new system to address the methamphetamine epidemic in Nevada did not make sense. Valuable time and resources would be lost while creating a new system, and the current methamphetamine efforts in place would be weakened. Ms. Lang listed three reasons for support of A.B. 149:

- 1. All 13 coalitions followed the same process in addressing substance abuse issues.
- 2. The infrastructure to efficiently address the methamphetamine issue was established.
- 3. Prevention funding in Nevada was one of the lowest in the nation.

Ms. Christy McGill, Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon and Storey Counties, expressed additional support for $\underline{A.B.\ 149}$. Ms. McGill pointed out that the coalition model had worked well in the rural communities of Nevada and believed that through collaboration the coalitions would make a difference with the methamphetamine issue.

Mr. Monty Williams, Statewide Native American Coalition, was representing the 27 reservations and tribal colonies and the 2 urban populations, north and south, of the American Indian population within Nevada. Mr. Williams supported A.B. 149 and the collaborative efforts of the coalitions in communities.

Ms. Cheryl Bricker, Director, Partnership of Community Resources of Douglas County, provided supportive testimony for <u>A.B. 149</u>. Ms. Bricker noted that Douglas County had focused on methamphetamine for two years without sufficient funding. The program was in need of moving to the next level. A plan was in place which included county government, law enforcement, district attorneys, teachers, businesses, and the religious community.

Mr. Eric Ohlson, Director, Community Council on Youth in Carson City, testified in support of <u>A.B. 149</u> and noted that without a solid prevention structure in place, there would never be enough treatment resources to meet the needs of the methamphetamine problem.

Ms. De Vere Karlson, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Churchill County Juvenile Probation, supported <u>A.B. 149</u> and the model for the coalitions. Ms. Karlson advised that Churchill County established a methamphetamine prevention task force in March 2006.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 149 and opened the hearing on A.B. 270.

Assembly Bill 270: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for the distribution of grants to certain public broadcasting organizations. (BDR S-455)

Assemblywoman Leslie disclosed to the Committee that she was a volunteer on the Board of Directors for KNPB Channel 5 and would abstain from both the discussion and vote on the bill.

Mr. Lamar Marchese, President Emeritus, Nevada Public Radio, expressed support of A.B. 270 and provided written testimony attached hereto as Exhibit F. Mr. Marchese noted the bill was intended as a one-time request to assist with building long-term infrastructure and with building a partnership between stations and the State to help leverage private funds.

Mr. Kliff Kuehl, President and CEO, Channel 5 Public Broadcasting, testified in support of A.B. 270 and provided written testimony attached hereto as Exhibit G. The funds appropriated by the bill would address critical strategic initiatives to expand the public broadcasting service to rural locations, replace outdated equipment, and enhance the public service through new broadcast and online program production, according to Mr. Kuehl.

Mr. Lee Solonche, Director of Educational Media Services and Programming for KLVX, expressed support for <u>A.B. 270</u> and provided written testimony attached hereto as <u>Exhibit H</u>. Mr. Solonche stated that KLVX was the first and only public television station to work with the U.S. Department of Education and National Association for the Deaf to provide a captioned media program. Mr. Solonche urged passage of <u>A.B. 270</u> to provide rural translators for digital television to provide homeland security and emergency response information to be carried as part of the television signal.

There being no public comments, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 270 and opened the hearing on A.B. 302.

Assembly Bill 302: Makes an appropriation to the Pershing County Water Conservation District for certain emergency repairs. (BDR S-371)

Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea testified in support of $\underline{A.B.\ 302}$. Testimony is attached hereto as $\underline{\text{Exhibit I}}$. Mr. Goicoechea realized the bill requested a large appropriation but stated any appropriation was appreciated. Mr. Goicoechea explained that when $\underline{A.B.\ 302}$ was proposed, a budget surplus was anticipated; however, the budget shortfall had not diminished the need for this appropriation. Pershing County Water District could not fund the needed repairs on the Rogers Division and the stabilization of the upper Pitt Taylor structure, nor could they abandon the 38,000 acre feet of water storage in Pitt Taylor,

especially in a drought year. Failure to rebuild the two structures could cause a catastrophic flood. A breach of the control structures would result in total devastation. Any appropriation would help to protect the city of Lovelock and the state park at Rye Patch Reservoir.

Mr. Goicoechea introduced Mr. Bennie Hodges, Manager, Pershing County Water Conservation District.

Mr. Hodges presented <u>Exhibit J</u> and <u>Exhibit K</u> to the Committee. The map (<u>Exhibit K</u>) was outlined to indicate the boundaries of the 40,000 acre Pershing County Irrigation District and the location relative to the city of Lovelock. The main commodities produced in the area were alfalfa hay, wheat and cattle. The water source was the Humboldt River which fed into the Rye Patch Reservoir.

Mr. Hodges began his presentation with a brief history of the funding received from A.B. No. 198 of the 66th Legislative Session. In January 2006 the Pershing County Water Conservation District (PCWCD) received a \$4.6 million grant with a 15 percent local responsibility from the State Board for Financing Water Projects. The grant was for construction and repairs to the Pitt Taylor System originally constructed around 1910. The System consisted of the Pitt Taylor Diversion Dam, the Pitt Taylor Reservoir outlet gates, and lower Pitt Taylor Reservoir outlet gates.

Mr. Hodges continued his testimony by description of the photographs in Exhibit J as follows:

- Page 3 and 4 The Pitt Taylor Diversion Dam on the Humboldt River near Mill City.
- Page 5 The lower Pitt Taylor diversion structure and the outlet gates.
- Page 6 The disintegration of the diversion dam.
- Page 7 Pitt Taylor wooden outlet gates. The middle gate was the only one operable for the past 25 years.

According to Mr. Hodges, in July 2006 the Rogers Dam, constructed in the late 1940s, failed and approximately 21,000 acres of land could not be irrigated. Because of the failure, Rye Patch Dam gates were closed and irrigation was not available until repairs could be made. An emergency meeting of the PCWCD Board was held with the State Board for Financing Water Projects (SBFWP). The PCWCD Board requested a portion of the Pitt Taylor grant funds be transferred to the fund for emergency repairs to the Rogers Dam. The SBFWP agreed and also allowed grant money to be used to construct a Rogers Dam Bypass.

With funds transferred from A.B. No. 198 of the 66th Legislative Session, a temporary Coffer Dam was constructed to resume irrigation. The temporary Coffer Dam was constructed by district employees, farmers, local residents, and an independent contractor. The cost was approximately \$706,000. Mr. Hodges continued with explanations of the photographs.

- Page 9 The Rogers Dam failure. On the left the water is running under the failed cutoff wall.
- Page 10 The right side of the Rogers Dam wing wall failure.
- Page 11 Construction of the Coffer Dam.
- Page 12 Construction of the Coffer Dam drainage system.
- Page 13 The finished Coffer Dam.

After the flood years of 1983 and 1984, a bypass was constructed around Rogers Dam. The bypass remained unused until 2006 when 5,000 cubic feet per second of water was released over the spillway. The bypass began to fail immediately. In the winter of 2007, the PCWCD employees and local residents built a new Rogers bypass at a cost of \$709,000. Total cost for Coffer Dam and bypass was approximately \$1.4 million used from the \$4.6 million grant, according to Mr. Hodges, who then continued to identify the photographs.

- Page 15 and 16 The failed Rogers Bypass.
- Page 17 The newly constructed Rogers Bypass completed in 2007.

Mr. Hodges further explained the need for construction of a new Rogers Dam was to manage and regulate future normal and high river flows. During non-drought years, 21,000 acres of land irrigated by Rogers Dam produced gross revenue of \$13,230,000. The estimated cost for a new Rogers Dam was \$3.5 to \$4 million.

Responding to Assemblyman Marvel's question, Mr. Hodges explained that when the Pitt Taylor Dam failed, the water flowed into the Rye Patch Reservoir. If Rye Patch was full and Pitt Taylor Dam failed, there would be flooding in the valley below the dam.

Assemblyman Grady asked whether the PCWCD had spent money to maintain Rye Patch Dam. Mr. Hodges responded that PCWCD had spent a considerable amount on Rye Patch Dam which was built in 1935. Money had also been spent on the Rye Patch title transfer. The Rye Patch Reservoir was a Bureau of Reclamation project bought by PCWCD in 1995. The PCWCD was now in the final stages of the transfer.

Mr. Goicoechea further explained that approximately ten years ago the Bureau of Reclamation required that PCWCD spend \$10 million on upgrading Rye Patch Reservoir, a state recreation area. The Pershing County farmers, ranchers, and residents raised the needed \$10 million through a bond. The bond was paid off and then the Rogers Diversion failed.

There being no further public testimony, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 302 and adjourned for a short break. When the meeting resumed, Chairman Arberry opened the hearing on A.B. 543.

Assembly Bill 543: Makes supplemental appropriations to the Department of Motor Vehicles for various costs. (BDR S-1263)

Ms. Virginia (Ginny) Lewis, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), testified in support of $\underline{A.B.\ 543}$. The bill was for a supplemental appropriation from the Highway Fund for various DMV budgets. The original request was for \$2,214,497 for five budgets. Upon completion of a final analysis, the projection for remaining expenditures through fiscal year (FY) 2007 was reduced to \$994,518. Ms. Lewis submitted $\underline{\text{Exhibit L}}$ which outlined the five budgets and the supplemental requests.

Ms. Jeanette Belz, Association of General Contractors (AGC), Nevada Chapter, testified in support of <u>A.B. 543</u>. The AGC worked closely with DMV and appreciated Ms. Lewis' stewardship of the Highway Fund. Ms. Belz stated that AGC had no problems with the bill.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 543 and opened the hearing on A.B. 548.

Assembly Bill 548: Makes supplemental appropriations to the State Department of Agriculture. (BDR S-1261)

Mr. Rick Gimlin, Deputy Director, Department of Agriculture, testified in support of $A.B.\ 548$. The bill made a supplemental appropriation to the Department for \$23,391. The first appropriation was for a transfer of \$10,202 to the Plant Industry Account. The second was for an appropriation from the General Fund in the amount of \$13,189 for unanticipated utility costs for fiscal year 2006-07 related to the occupation of two buildings and for \$1,000 to pay stale claims.

There being no public comments, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 548 and opened the hearing on A.B. 555.

Assembly Bill 555: Transfers certain money appropriated to the Interim Finance Committee to the Rehabilitation Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. (BDR S-1459)

Mr. Michael T. Coleman, Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, testified in support of A.B. 555 which provided supplemental appropriations to the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation [BA 3265] and the Bureau of Services to the Blind and Visually Impaired Assembly Bill No. 576 of the 73rd Legislative Session held a [BA 3254]. portion of the Rehabilitation Services grant match in the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to ensure the Bureau would expend the entire match and grant resources during fiscal year (FY) 2006 and FY 2007. The Bureau was able to meet the requirements, and in FY 2006 IFC released the withheld resources that resulted in services being provided to 1,433 clients. Since IFC cannot authorize funds while the Legislature is in session, a supplemental appropriation is needed. This legislation will provide the remaining match to bring down the federal allocation for this year. The request for an appropriation from the General Fund of \$83,139 for BA 3254 would bring in \$307,187 federal dollars. The request for an appropriation from the General Fund of \$294,503 for BA 3265 would bring in \$1,088,140 federal dollars. These funds would be used to support client expenditures, and without the funds, client services would be curtailed in April 2007.

Mr. Jack Mayes, Chairman, Nevada Strategic Plan Accountability Committee (NSPAC), testified in support of $\underline{A.B.\ 555}$. Mr. Mayes expressed concern on behalf of the NSPAC over the potential reduction in services for people with disabilities. Additionally, there was a concern that the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation had not used all of their federal money in the past which could result in a reduction of federal funds that would greatly impact services to people with disabilities.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 555.

Assembly Bill 30: Revises certain provisions governing the distribution of proceeds from certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-558)

Mr. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, provided background on <u>A.B. 30</u> for the Committee. The bill was a cleanup measure related to the allocation of administrative assessments. The original language stated that administrative assessments would be provided for the operation of the "Highway Patrol." The bill changed the language from "Highway Patrol" to the "Department of Public Safety."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 30.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

* * * * *

Assembly Bill 165: Creates the Justice Assistance Grant Trust Fund in the State Treasury. (BDR 43-1083)

Mr. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, explained to the Committee that a federal requirement for Justice Assistance Grant Funds was that interest earned on the funds while in the state treasury would accrue to the grant funds. Because this was a General Fund account, the State Treasurer did not allocate interest on these funds. The bill directed the State Treasurer to allocate interest on the grant money to the grant funds. There was an amendment to the bill to change the word "fund" to "account" throughout the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS A.B. 165.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

* * * * *

Assembly Bill 555: Transfers certain money appropriated to the Interim Finance Committee to the Rehabilitation Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. (BDR S-1459)

Mr. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, explained that the money appropriated to the Interim Finance Committee by the 2005 Legislative Session was the state match for federal funds received by the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR). The Interim Finance Committee held the match to ensure that DETR expended all of the allocated federal funds. The request to release the money did not come until March, and the IFC did not have the statutory authority to allocate funds during the legislative session. As a result, A.B. 555 was introduced.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 555.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

* * * * *

<u>Assembly Bill 5:</u> Revises provisions relating to the registration of certain heavier motor vehicles. (BDR 43-528)

Mr. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, explained that A.B. 5 allowed commercial vehicles to be registered during the calendar year rather than at the end of the calendar year. There was a fiscal note that was removed. There would be no fiscal impact if the Department of Motor Vehicles received a new programming position recommended in the automation budget. The Subcommittee had reviewed the budget, and Mr. Stevens had not been advised

of any concerns regarding the requested position. The bill was not exempt and must be out of the Committee on Ways and Means by April 13, 2007.

For clarification, Mr. Stevens advised that the approval of this bill was not an approval of the recommended position; however, the effective date in the bill was January 1, 2009, and if the Department was not awarded the position, it would be difficult to meet the effective date.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 5.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

* * * * *

There being no further public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Blevins
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:	
Assemblyman Morse Arberry Jr., Chair	
DATE:	

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Ways and Means

Date: April 2, 2007 Time of Meeting: 8:09 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	Α		Agenda
	В		Attendance Roster
AB 10	С	Assemblyman David Parks	Active Duty Exemption
AB 10	D	Edgar Roberts, DMV, Motor Carrier	Proposed Amendment
AB 149	E	Linda Lang, Statewide Coalition Partnership	Prepared Testimony
AB 270	F	Lamar Marchese, NV Public Radio	Prepared Testimony
AB 270	G	Kliff Kuehl, KNPB Channel 5	Prepared Testimony
AB 270	Н	Lee Solonche, Vegas PBS	Prepared Testimony
AB 302	I	Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea	Prepared Testimony
AB 302	J	Benny Hodges, Pershing Co. Water	Prepared Testimony
AB 302	K	Benny Hodges, Pershing Co. Water	Pershing County Map
AB 543	L	Virginia Lewis, DMV	Supplemental Request