

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-fourth Session
February 12, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair William J. Raggio at 8:09 a.m. on Monday, February 12, 2007, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator William J. Raggio, Chair
Senator Bob Beers, Vice Chair
Senator Dean A. Rhoads
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator Bob Coffin
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Bernice Mathews

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary L. Ghiggeri, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Larry L. Peri, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Sandra K. Small, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Andrew Clinger, Director, Department of Administration
Valerie M. Rosalin, R.N., Director, Bureau for Hospital Patients, Office for Consumer Health Assistance, Office of the Governor
Teresa Rogers, Bureau for Hospital Patients, Office for Consumer Health Assistance, Office of the Governor
Mary Keating, Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Department of Administration
Steve Robinson, Deputy Chief of Staff/Legislative Director, Office of the Governor
Hatice Gecol, Ph.D., Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor
Neill T. Dimmick, Deputy Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor
Suzanne P. Brunette, Accountant, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor
Dennis K. Neilander, Chair, State Gaming Control Board
Mark A. Clayton, Las Vegas, Member, State Gaming Control Board
Todd Westergard, Chief, Administration Division, State Gaming Control Board
Peter C. Bernhard, Las Vegas, Chair, Nevada Gaming Commission, State Gaming Control Board
Randall Sayre, Carson City, Member, State Gaming Control Board

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We are scheduled to hear the budgets for the Office of the Governor and the State Gaming Control Board. Does staff have a progress report?

GARY L. GHIGGERI (Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

The Committee has received a copy of the Progress Report as of February 12, 2007 ([Exhibit C](#)). This Committee has heard, or has assigned to staff, 139 of the 426 budgets. There are two bills which have been referred to the Committee. There are 104 capital improvement projects to review. The Committee will receive a progress report on a weekly basis.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Committee should review the list of budgets assigned to subcommittee or staff. If the Committee feels any should be brought before the full Committee, please let us know. Would you give us an update on anticipated collection of the sales, use and gaming taxes?

MR. GHIGGERI:

We received information Friday, February 9, 2007, from the Gaming Control Board concerning the collections in January 2007 for December 2006 business. The collections year-to-date from percentage fees are up 3.9 percent. The Economic Forum projected a 5-percent increase for fiscal year (FY) 2006-2007. To attain that 5-percent annual growth rate, an average increase of 6.3 percent each month is required for the remainder of the fiscal year. Currently, the sales and use tax collections in December 2006 for November 2006 business are up 3.5 percent. The Economic Forum projected a 3.7-percent increase. To reach the 3.7 percent, an average increase of 3.9 percent each month is required during the remainder of the fiscal year.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The last few months have been higher than the required percentage.

Are there any bills for Committee introduction or bill draft requests (BDR)? If any entity requests a bill draft, the Committee policy will be that the representative provide a short introduction about the proposal and a budget if appropriate. At that time, we will consider a Committee action.

We will start with the Office of the Governor's budget.

ELECTED OFFICIALS

Office of the Governor – Budget Page ELECTED-1 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-1000

MR. GHIGGERI:

The Committee has received a copy of the Governor's Office Position Roster, [Exhibit D](#).

ANDREW CLINGER (Director, Department of Administration):

The following adjustments have been made to the Governor's Office budget: two positions have been eliminated, there is a reduction of \$3,400 for the National Governor's Association dues in FY 2007-2008, and copy machine costs have been adjusted in each year of the biennium by approximately \$3,500. There is a total reduction to the Base Budget in FY 2007-2008 of \$73,964 and in FY 2008-2009 of \$79,359. The transfer of the Governor's energy advisor from budget account (B/A) 101-1000 to the Nevada State Office of Energy B/A 4686 is another adjustment recommended by the Governor.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Will the Nevada State Energy Office still be under the Governor's Office?

MR. CLINGER:

Yes, it will. The Governor feels the position should be included in the Office of Energy budget since the position directs that Office.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

What will be the full-time equivalent (FTE) for the Governor's Office as a result of the changes? Will the staffing be adequate? We do not want to limit a new Governor.

MR. CLINGER:

We believe it will be adequate.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Will the total budget for personnel be allocated appropriate to the services required?

MR. CLINGER:

Yes, it will.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is that also true for the Mansion budget?

MR. CLINGER:

Yes, it is.

I want to put on record that before making the transfer of the energy advisor position, the total salaries in the Governor's Office budget from FY 2006-2007 to FY 2007-2008 increased 2.77 percent which is in line with other State agencies for merit increases.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is the amount for travel expense adequate?

MR. CLINGER:

There are increases for in-state and out-of-state travel. The Governor will spend time in Washington, D.C. The in-state travel was increased to allow additional time in Las Vegas.

SENATOR COFFIN:

The Governor has been criticized for making budget changes. During Governor Guinn's fourth term, he was still making budget changes. It is inevitable a new Governor will want to make changes and he probably will all session.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Senator Coffin and I know there has not been a Governor who does not come in frequently with budget amendments.

MR. CLINGER:

With 426 accounts and multiple decisions made in each one of those accounts, it is difficult, especially for a new Governor, not to make changes. We spent as much time as we could during the first two weeks in January making the changes.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The new administration is fortunate to have your experience.

Governor's Mansion Maintenance – Budget Page ELECTED-5 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-1001

MR. CLINGER:

This budget has eliminated one position and reduced the salary of another position resulting in a total 3.5 FTEs in the Mansion budget. All out-of-state travel has been eliminated at the request of the First Lady. In-state travel has not been increased.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

What is the justification for reducing the First Lady's travel?

MR. CLINGER:

The First Lady requested this change. I agree that out-of-state travel should remain in the budget.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Committee should consider this adjustment. The role of the First Lady in this State remains important.

MR. CLINGER:

E-710 Replacement Equipment - Page ELECTED-3

In FY 2007-2008, equipment, primarily a file server, will be eliminated for a \$6,082 savings.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Guinn family used personal belongings in the Mansion. There is a need to determine if further furnishings or maintenance might be required for the Mansion. This is a Nevada facility. It represents our State. Historically, this Committee has designated members who independently look at the Mansion to determine if there are additional needs. This Legislative Session, Senator Cegavske and Senator Mathews will meet with the Mansion staff and report their recommendations to this Committee.

Governor's Office of Consumer Health Assistance – Budget Page ELECTED-23
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-1003

VALERIE M. ROSALIN, R.N. (Director, Bureau for Hospital Patients, Office for Consumer Health Assistance, Office of the Governor):

The Governor's Office for Consumer Health Assistance has been the State's advocacy office for health-related issues since 1999. The Committee has received a copy of my comments, [Exhibit E](#). There are eight staff members who are experts in their areas including managed care, Medicare, Medicaid, Workers'

Compensation and hospital and provider billing. The Assistance program provides understandable information about patient rights and responsibilities. A caseload average of 125 is carried by the four quality assurance specialists. For calendar year (CY) 2006, we saved \$7,031,285 with cumulative savings of \$23,254,944 since CY 2000. These savings represent a small percentage of the 15,837 actual cases worked during this time frame.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
How are the savings calculated?

Ms. ROSALIN:
It is the amount a consumer would have paid out-of-pocket. The benefit would be paid by the health plan.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
Does the Consumer Health Assistance Office intervene to save the consumer money?

Ms. ROSALIN:
Yes. We negotiate either a payment plan or a write-off.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
Are you able to verify over \$7 million in savings for consumers?

Ms. ROSALIN:
Yes. We have documentation to prove those savings.

SENATOR BEERS:
Do you keep separate numbers for the write-offs versus what is paid by a health plan? The write-offs are charged back to the consumers in premiums.

TERESA ROGERS (Management Analyst, Bureau for Hospital Patients, Office for Consumer Health Assistance, Office of the Governor):
We separate the savings into several categories including insurance write-offs, charity and uninsured discounts.

SENATOR BEERS:
Do you also keep statistics on non-financial requests such as quality-of-care issues?

Ms. ROGERS:
Yes, we keep a count.

Ms. ROSALIN:
These statistics are in the Executive Report which was submitted January 24, 2007, to the Governor and the Legislative staff and is now on our Website.

The caseload increased 42 percent during the 2005 - 2007 biennium. The Workers' Compensation caseload increased by 157 percent. The Canadian drug program also increased the number of contacts this Office received. In response to issues brought to our attention, we have requested BDRs concerning billing and collections.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Do you have any information on the Canadian drug program?

Ms. ROSALIN:

We can only count hits on our Website which is not dedicated to Canadian drugs. Approximately 810 Canadian pharmacies are licensed with the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Staff, please contact the Pharmacy Board regarding the current status of the Canadian drug program. Find out who is participating, if there have been any problems and if it is functioning properly.

The major issue in this budget appears to be the Medicaid-related reimbursement. Previously, this Office was reimbursed 100 percent through Medicaid. The new budget is for 75-percent Medicaid reimbursement and 25-percent General Fund.

MARY KEATING (Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Department of Administration):

The previous budget requests for 100-percent reimbursement from Medicaid were in error. Medicaid pays 75 percent for skilled-nursing services and 50 percent if it is not. We have requested confirmation from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy. The match was in the Medicaid budget but should have been in this budget.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Please submit to staff written verification of this limitation.

Increased workload related to Workers' Compensation assistance was mentioned.

Ms. KEATING:

There are three revenue streams in addition to the General Fund: Workers' Compensation, an assessment on hospitals and Medicaid. These three revenue sources are limited to program-specific use. This Assistance office tracks where employee time is spent, then adjustments are made in the next budget to appropriately distribute costs. At the end of FY 2006-2007, we envision the General Fund will have subsidized the Workers' Compensation fund by \$115,000. That is why the FY 2007-2008 General Fund would be reduced by that amount and the Workers' Compensation fund increased by the same amount. This procedure has been used for the last three biennia.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

What effect did S.B. No. 126 of the 73rd Session, which requires at least two experienced persons in the field of Workers' Compensation to carry out duties related to Workers' Compensation, have on your budget?

Ms. KEATING:

From a financial standpoint, I am not sure it made a difference because we still track where time is spent. Ms. Rosalin and another staff person fulfill the requirements of S.B. No. 126 of the 73rd Session.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Why do we want to put General Funds into this account?

MS. KEATING:

The budget shows a reserve for reversion, Category 93 (Transfer of General Fund Appropriation). However, I have agreed with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff to do an immediate offset rather than waiting until the end of the year to revert funds.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is that correct, Mr. Clinger?

MR. CLINGER:

Yes, it is. We need to take the \$115,000 reserve for reversion out of the budget with a corresponding decrease to General Funds.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is that agreeable with the LCB staff?

MR. GHIGGERI:

Yes.

SENATOR COFFIN:

How does the Bureau for Hospital Patients work with the advocate's office? Is the advocate's office just for appeals of Worker's Compensation decisions?

MS. ROSALIN:

You mentioned two parts of the Office for Consumer Health Assistance. We cover everything in health care. We have a section for hospital patients and a section for Workers' Compensation. We do not get into the litigation part of Workers' Compensation. We give clients advice on where they stand or if there is a legal injury that will go forward. We get involved mediating between the attorney and the injured worker.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Your workload will continue to increase. We must make sure, at the first sign of a problem, the worker has a chance to get advice.

MS. ROSALIN:

The Assistance contact information is now on Workers' Compensation Forms C-1 and C-3 resulting in more employees making contact for advice on what they should do. Contact with the Hispanic population has also increased.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I understand some of the Hispanic population is unfairly treated because they are working off the books. Does your Assistance have bilingual capabilities?

MS. ROSALIN:

We have one nurse who speaks Spanish. We had hoped to acquire a Spanish-speaking administrative assistant.

SENATOR COFFIN:

We should pay special attention to the need for bilingual capabilities in the Workers' Compensation area. We could gain a lot of information about who is employing illegal workers.

SENATOR RHOADS:

I am glad to see you visit more rural areas. How do you let people know when you will be in their area?

MS. ROSALIN:

We contact the Chamber of Commerce in each of the areas and ask if there are any committees, senior groups, health fairs or anyone who would want us to speak. We try to reach the largest number of people.

SENATOR RHOADS:

How long are you at any one location? How is the attendance?

MS. ROSALIN:

We average one- to two-day visits in each area. The Tonopah visit attracted three people; there were more vendors than citizens. In other areas, we average 50 to 100 people.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

How many people live in Searchlight?

MS. ROSALIN:

We had 200 people attend in Searchlight.

Governor's Office Energy Conservation – Budget Page ELECTED-28 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-4868

STEVE ROBINSON (Deputy Chief of Staff/Legislative Director, Office of the Governor):

The placement of the energy advisor position has been an issue for several years. The position acts as both an advisor to the Governor and as an agency head supervising staff. That staff is not physically located in the Governor's Office. The Legislature has added responsibilities to the Nevada State Office of Energy. It makes sense to have the energy advisor with her staff while remaining an advisor in this important area. It is similar to the Nevada State Agency for Nuclear Projects under the auspices of the Governor's Office but not within the Capitol Building.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Where is the Nevada State Office of Energy located?

HATICE GECOL, PH.D. (Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor):

The Office is located at 727 Fairview Drive in Carson City.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Please tell us about your background.

DR. GECOL:

I am a chemical engineer on leave from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). I am a professor in the Chemical Engineering Department. I have been with the University the last seven years. I was previously with the University of Oklahoma as a research scientist. My bachelor's degree is from the Istanbul Technical University, Turkey; my master's degree in chemical engineering is from the University of Colorado, Boulder; and my doctorate in chemical engineering is from the University of Oklahoma, Norman. My research area is in renewable and alternative energy environmental remediation.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Are you prepared to answer questions regarding coal liquification? How does the Governor's program differ from coal gasification used by the Germans in World War II?

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Senator Coffin is referring to the Governor's State of the State message where he proposed coal liquification. From where will the coal come?

DR. GECOL:

I have received many questions regarding this area. Governor Gibbons is a strong supporter of renewable energy. The Governor offered me the energy advisor position because of my background in alternative and renewable energy. The coal-to-liquid process was developed in the 1920s by Germans. After that, it was adopted by the South African company Sasol. This is an indirect process which includes gasification and Fischer-Tropsch processes. The Fischer-Tropsch process was named after two German scientists. Gasification is the first step of the process followed by Fischer-Tropsch to convert the syngas which is produced through gasification. Syngas is carbon monoxide and hydrogen. It is diverted to the Fischer-Tropsch to convert it to coal liquid and modified to diesel and aviation fuel.

SENATOR COFFIN:

How do we prevent pollution?

DR. GECOL:

The pollutants, primarily carbon dioxide, hydrogen and sulphur, come in the gasification process. The gasification process captures these three pollutants before the syngas goes through the Fischer-Tropsch process. Carbon dioxide is the primary pollutant from these plants. It can be captured or sequestered geologically. Technologies are available and can be applied but will increase the cost. The important issue for the gasification process is the use of water which we are short of in Nevada. Depending upon the gasification process used, the water amount can be decreased. Wyoming uses the dry gasification method which decreases the amount of water by 90 percent. The water used in the gasification process is for the slurry part of the coal. The coal is placed in water to make a slurry to bring to the system. The water is also used to cool the gasification unit for the heat exchanger. Wyoming is planning to use air to decrease the amount of water by 90 percent. One barrel of water is used for each barrel of fuel. One barrel is equivalent to 42 gallons. Using the Fischer-Tropsch process, you actually produce water. A half-barrel of water is produced for each barrel of liquid. You have a chance of recycling this water after remediation since the water is contaminated with alcohol and hydrocarbon.

If you look at the process, depending upon which gasification process is used, you can decrease the amount of water used.

NEILL T. DIMMICK (Deputy Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor):

The Energy Office was established many years ago. In 2001, it was reorganized as part of the Governor's Office. The Office receives funds from the State Energy Program administered by the federal government. Those federal appropriations have started to decline. Two years ago our allocation of direct funds was \$394,000, and last year it was reduced to \$294,000.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

In FY 2005-2006, the actual federal funding was \$731,000. The FY 2007-2008 and FY 2008-2009 budgets reflect approximately \$450,000 each year in federal funding.

MR. DIMMICK:

The federal funding includes bus retrofits which this Office will administer. We have a \$496,000 grant to retrofit rural and other school buses. There are a number of other smaller grants included in the federal funding lump sum.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The end result is we will have to increase the General Fund contribution by \$150,000 in FY 2007-2008 and \$165,000 in FY 2008-2009 to continue the process. Are there any enhancements recommended in this budget?

MR. DIMMICK:

No, there are not. The primary issues are the transfer of the energy advisor to this budget account and the funding for two positions which we no longer have federal funds to cover.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

There appears to be an enhancement request to cover a portion of the deputy director position.

MR. DIMMICK:

The deputy director position was established in the last budget cycle. A portion of the reserve, dating back from the 1970s in the Petroleum Violation Escrow Account, was used to supplement the original appropriation for the deputy director.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Is there a small enhancement?

SUZANNE P. BRUNETTE (Accountant, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor):

In FY 2005-2006 and FY 2006-2007, the Office had an appropriation to support the deputy director position. We supplemented that with some Petroleum Violation Escrow funds to pay salary and benefit costs. For FY 2007-2008 and FY 2008-2009, there is a small increase to the Base Budget which includes normal salary increases.

MR. DIMMICK:

Assembly Bill No. 3 of the 22nd Special Session gave this Office a series of additional duties: establish criteria for granting tax abatements for energy-efficient buildings; set up a procedure for educating State building managers to meet the goal of a 20-percent reduction in energy by 2015; and establish an energy regulation for areas of the State that have not adopted International Energy Conservation Codes. This Office also participates in supporting the director with respect to the "Memorandum of Understanding Among the Governors of California, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming Concerning Electric Transmission Development" relative to the Frontier Line and the NorthernLights transmission line. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 created a series of transmission mandates by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to analyze and establish corridors in the west, research various aspects of reliability, establish reliability organizations and amend rules and regulations at the FERC to facilitate access by renewables.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Do you have the staff and experience to handle all of these areas? How large is the staff?

MR. DIMMICK:

We have some good experience in the Office. One gentleman has experience in renewable energy and I worked at the Public Utilities Commission. We have a director, deputy director, accountant, part-time office clerk, staff engineer and three grant analyst positions, two of which are vacant.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Will you be filling the analyst positions?

MR. DIMMICK:

The two grant analysts are positions requested for the next biennium.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The budget before us is confusing.

MR. GHIGGERI:

The revised budget shows eight positions in each year.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Legislature does a lot of talking about environmental concerns and dictates a lot of mandates. We must be prepared to fund these energy and conservation projects. I want to be sure you are not limiting your request and you will have the staff in place to meet all of these mandates.

MR. DIMMICK:

We hope to be able to do the job with the requested staff.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Do not just hope. Will this staff be able to do the job?

MR. DIMMICK:

Whether or not this staff will be able to do the job depends on this Session's round of mandates.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

I understand that. Are you adequately funded to meet the mandates in place now and that you have emphasized in your discussion today?

MR. DIMMICK:

More than likely we have a situation where more money would be better. Other money is being appropriated to support renewable projects.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Are you anticipating the receipt of any grants?

MR. DIMMICK:

It is my understanding the federal budget for 2008 will operate on a continuing resolution for the entire year.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Once the Governor mentioned coal, all environmentalists paid attention. We need to make sure we protect what we are doing; we cannot slip backwards. Confidence will increase if we do our best. Please do not hesitate to request what you need just because it is a political issue. The Legislature needs to make the decision.

DR. GECOL:

We need to make sure we are not going backward. Technology is available. We need to make sure, if we adopt this process in Nevada, we incorporate the carbon-dioxide capture. I want to explain that process. The carbon dioxide can be used to grow another biomass, such as algae, which can be converted to biofuel. Carbon dioxide can also be used as a commodity and sold to Canada, for instance, to enhance the methane from the coal mines. Carbon dioxide is a product with a value. We need to adopt that technology. The current break-even point for this technology is \$35 to \$45 for each barrel of fuel. If we adopt this technology, the breakeven point will increase another \$10 per barrel. Governor Gibbons emphasized the use of this clean technology. His vision for energy is to make Nevada independent of other states and other countries but to make sure it is clean energy in addition to renewable and alternative energy.

Nevada does not have coal but Wyoming, Utah and Montana do. We are rich as a nation in coal reserves. The United States has over 30 percent of the world's coal reserves. Currently, the United States is bringing fossil fuel from abroad, South America and the Middle East. Coal is a national resource we must utilize, in a clean way, using the available technology.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We will now hear the budgets of the State Gaming Control Board and Nevada Gaming Commission.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

GAMING

Gaming Control Board – Budget Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-1 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-4061

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

For the record, I must disclose my husband's employer, Crawford Coin, Inc., holds a gaming license.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

For the record, I am licensed as a director of Arcon Corporation which operates the Pioneer Hotel and Casino in Laughlin.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I must disclose I have two clients who are gaming licensees who regularly have business before the Board and the Commission.

DENNIS K. NEILANDER (Chair, State Gaming Control Board):

The Committee has received a copy of the State Gaming Control Board and Nevada Gaming Commission FY 2007-2009 Biennium Budget Presentation ([Exhibit F](#), original is on file in the Research Library). An overview, policy, regulatory structure, mission statement, functional goals and an update are available for you in [Exhibit F](#).

It is the Legislature's declaration that the gaming industry is vitally important to the economy of the State and the general welfare of its inhabitants. The continued growth and success of gaming is dependent upon public confidence and trust that licensed gaming and the manufacture, sale and distribution of gaming devices and associated equipment are conducted honestly and competitively and that gaming is free from criminal and corruptive elements. We look back to the public policy of the State of Nevada which drives what we do every day and our budget.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

What, if anything, is the Gaming Policy Committee? For a long time it existed in name only.

MR. NEILANDER:

The Gaming Policy Committee is a diverse group of people: the Gaming Commission chairman, myself, a member from the Senate and Assembly, two members of the general public, one member from the industry, and one member from a Native American tribe. It only meets at the call of the Governor. The Committee has not met since Governor Bryan was in office. It is an advisory body available to meet on policy matters.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Are nine members currently appointed to the Committee?

MR. NEILANDER:

I believe they are appointed. I believe they are paid per diem when they meet.

We have been active in reorganizing and streamlining our Technology Division. Self-regulation is something we demand of licensees and has allowed us to be a lean agency. A license is not issued in Nevada unless we are absolutely sure a licensee can self-regulate. That is why we are able to keep our staffing levels flat while the industry has grown.

A summary of statistics and trends in gaming is found on page 3, [Exhibit F](#). The gaming tax and fee collections totaled over \$1 billion for FY 2005-2006. Tax

and fee collections from the gaming industry comprise 31 percent of State revenues. Legalized gaming continues to expand, not only in Nevada, but throughout the world. The collection breakdown is shown on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#). Percentage fees are the lion's share of collections.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
Describe the percentage fees.

MR. NEILANDER:
The percentage fees are a product of gaming win which is gross revenue. Gross revenue is defined as the amount the licensees collect less payouts. Every month licensees file their tax returns. The larger licensees pay 6.75 percent of their win. The first tier is 3 percent for up to \$50,000; the second tier is 4.75 percent for up to \$83,000; above \$150,000 is at 6.75 percent. The larger licensees go through the tiers in one day.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
How do these fees compare to other states such as New Jersey and Louisiana?

MR. NEILANDER:
The effective tax rate in Nevada, the percentage fees plus the flat fees, seen on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#), plus the Live Entertainment Tax is roughly 9 percent. In New Jersey, the effective rate is about 10 percent; in Mississippi, the effective rate is about the same as Nevada and New Jersey. Illinois is almost 50 percent in some cases. Louisiana and Missouri, the riverboat states, are higher than Nevada, New Jersey and Mississippi, but the number of licenses is limited. Unlike Nevada, monopolies are created in those states.

CHAIR RAGGIO:
Mississippi has changed its gaming law so riverboats can be land based.

MR. NEILANDER:
Mississippi did change its law to allow land-based casinos. There is no longer the boat-in-the-moat concept.

SENATOR COFFIN:
The creative sports pool item, on page 3 of [Exhibit F](#), caught my attention. What is the concern?

MR. NEILANDER:
That is a reference to a number of proposition bets. Every segment of the industry is trying to do something new in this competitive market. The Board is faced with many new ideas. Some fit within the regulatory concept and some do not. For instance, we had a request to allow pari-mutuel wagering on poker and billiards. Nevada allows sports wagering but does not allow wagering outside of the sporting arena. We do not allow books to take wagers on the Oscars or the Presidential race. People argue that poker is a sport and, therefore, pari-mutuel betting should be allowed as it is on horses or dogs.

SENATOR COFFIN:
I hope none of my clients were involved in these requests. Because we are facing competition in 25 or 30 states, we must be creative and allow as many kinds of things as possible as long as they do not tempt people toward corruption. We need to encourage creativity. Sometimes we err on the side of

suppressing creativity. We are competing worldwide. I do not see anything wrong in taking bets on everything except political races. I would want to see why we are concerned about some of the creative betting.

MR. NEILANDER:

The Board is concerned with complying with the law. The law, as determined by the Legislature, defines sports. We look at these things through a series of hearings.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Did the Board get involved recently with the situation involving the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the three players from the UNR?

MR. NEILANDER:

We did not. The proposition bet you are referring to involved individual players who were part of the University. The NCAA, as well as the University, contacted the licensee. What occurred was legal. The law goes to the licensee not accepting wagers from players or coaches and that did not happen.

The challenges faced by the Board are outlined on page 5 of [Exhibit F](#). Las Vegas is now hosting many high-profile events which are occurring in conjunction with gaming. The weekend of the National Basketball Association (NBA) All-Star Game is also Chinese New Year which is the biggest gaming week of the year for Nevada. This presents enforcement difficulties. The NBA All-Star Game tends to attract a lot of minors. We are working with the licensees as well as the Metropolitan Police Sheriff to make sure we do not have minors on the gambling floors.

We continue to migrate our application database to a new system as we move to a paperless system. We have a backlog of approximately 2 million documents we are trying to image.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Recruiting and retaining professional staff has always been a problem for the Board. How do the salary levels compare to the private sector and other jurisdictions in the United States? What are the restrictions regarding Board employees going to private enterprise?

MR. NEILANDER:

I will get the salary information from other jurisdictions to the Committee. There is a one-year cooling-off period applicable to most Board employees.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Would a two-year period seriously limit your recruiting capability?

MR. NEILANDER:

Yes, it would. We try to attract the best and the brightest because what we do is so important. There are always going to be individuals who do not view government as a career.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Having worked for the Board makes an individual more desirable to the private sector.

MR. NEILANDER:

We know the Board cannot compete, on a salary basis, with the private sector. There is some benefit to the Board when a prior employee goes into the industry. That person knows what the compliance requirements are. They can make our job easier.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Your challenges do not list the problem of private-equity funds. These are faceless, huge money vehicles. How do we know who owns these funds? These funds manage money for other people. Who are these money managers and how do we approve mega-mergers?

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We have the situation where private-equity funds are acquiring existing licensees and their assets. What is the licensing process for private-equity funding?

MR. NEILANDER:

There has been some confusion about that process. We have had private equity in Nevada since 1999. The first group that came in was Colony Capital which purchased Harvey's at Lake Tahoe and was later sold to Harrah's. Colony Capital, when it was licensed, consisted of two primary individuals who ran the fund. They had voting rights in the stock and certain economic rights. Private-equity investors generally are large foundations, institutions and sometimes families. When we licensed the two individuals who ran the fund, they went through full licensing like anyone else would. There was total transparency. We know exactly who the investors are in a fund. We might not license someone if they do not have the ability to control the gaming entity. For instance, someone may have an economic interest, but not a voting interest. We use the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission guidelines, which are mandated by the Nevada Gaming Control Act, to determine the beneficial owner of securities. We licensed Oak Tree which is made up of several funds and eight individuals. All eight individuals had to go through the licensing process.

MARK A. CLAYTON (Las Vegas, Member, State Gaming Control Board):

We have had situations with proposed private-equity investors. We ask for full transparency of those investors. One fund refused to provide that information. They were told the Board needs to know who every investor is, who the real decision makers are, and we put those individuals through licensing. The Nevada Gaming Commission, upon the Board's recommendation, also limits the transferability of investments. Once approved, it is not possible to transfer the equity without going through the regulatory process. Most companies have existing compliance committees. We mandate that those compliance committees monitor the investments to make sure the representations and results of the investigation, as far as who has control, continue in place.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Is the list of investors public?

MR. NEILANDER:

Most of the private-equity funds have a public list. For Nevada gaming purposes, we know exactly who they are. An application would not make it through the system without a public list of investors.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I want to make sure this system works. There could be straw men investing in a dignified, established and respectable investment firm which then buys stock.

MR. NEILANDER:

Keep in mind this only works when the gaming entity is a public company. Under the existing laws and regulations, anyone who holds less than 10 percent of a publicly-traded company is not subject to mandatory licensure. We can call anyone forward. Anyone who has a voting interest in excess of 10 percent must be licensed. The individual investor in a private-equity fund does not have the ability to vote. They do not have depositive power either. They simply invest. They turn their money over to a licensed manager. They cannot even get a short-term return on investment. In the long term, which is seven to ten years, they get a better return on their investment than they would in the public market. That is why it is an attractive financing vehicle for large institutions.

SENATOR COFFIN:

That is why the mob liked gambling. They were in it for the long term and a higher return. I am worried from a policy point of view that we have an accumulation of ownership and it is concentrated in the hands of a few people. The control of the industry can be decided by people sitting at a bridge table. If we find it is attractive for people to sell, who determines the future of Nevada's economy? Will it be European investors or Columbian drug lords? It is something that requires extraordinary scrutiny.

MR. NEILANDER:

We share your concern. We know exactly who the owners are. They are going through licensing just like everyone else.

SENATOR COFFIN:

We have been dealing with the public market and now private-equity funds are the wave of the future. We could end up with a problem of not having enough people making decisions. The decisions could become so homogenized they affect the State's outcomes. There may be bad decisions made on how gambling occurs.

MR. NEILANDER:

The statutes currently prevent monopolization. We look at that carefully with every application. When Harrah's merged and when MGM merged, we not only used our internal expertise but hired experts in the area of antitrust. We have also hired experts to analyze the long-term effects of private equity. We will not allow monopolization.

SENATOR COFFIN:

We have to think about the future.

SENATOR TITUS:

You mentioned the challenges regarding keeping pace with technology changes. I have visited manufacturing places. They say applications for new games take forever. Some places privatize the testing of the new technology. Have you looked at that; is there a good reason not to privatize?

MR. NEILANDER:

Ticket-in ticket-out was tested about ten years ago at Caesar's Palace. People were afraid of it; they wanted to hear the coins and pull the handle. When it came around the second time, it became popular because gamblers were changing and adapting to new technology. We were flooded with ticket-in ticket-out systems. Because we were having difficulty getting them to market in a timely manner, we contracted with an outside lab to get them tested and through the system. Our mission is to protect the integrity of the games. Our employees do that, not out of a sense of profit, but because it is best for the State. Third parties do not necessarily have that motive. Our standards are high, higher than most other states, certainly higher than the tribal casinos. We want to protect the integrity of the games and prevent patron disputes. The public's confidence in those devices is of utmost importance. I would not favor allowing privatization.

SENATOR TITUS:

Do you have enough staff to handle the backlog?

MR. NEILANDER:

Yes, we do. We appeared before the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) on a couple of occasions to revamp our Technology Division. If we had waited until today to make those requests, we would be too far behind to get caught up.

MR. CLAYTON:

We performed an internal and external assessment of our technology challenges. With a backlog and more technology coming, we decided to meet with the manufacturing industry. We improved our process with respect to what we expect from the manufacturers. We provided testing check lists, requirements and details so they would have a better understanding of what our processes are. We also held them accountable. If a program was not fully quality controlled or quality tested, it would be sent back. As a consequence, there is an improvement in the quality of their submission and a shortened turnaround time. We went to the IFC requesting eleven positions as well as a testing facility. Six positions have been filled. We are in the process of filling the remainder.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Governor's transition team on gaming and entertainment raised this issue. There are so many companies manufacturing gaming devices. The competition in that field is extensive. These companies have quality control. In Nevada, it takes an inordinate amount of time to get a device on the gaming floor. In other areas, these devices go on the gaming floor immediately. Technology changes are occurring rapidly. Will we fall behind competitively because we require an inordinate delay in approving gaming devices? Can the companies have a certification process within their manufacturing process which we could audit? How long does approval of a device take?

MR. NEILANDER:

I have not seen the transition team's report. We have been working diligently to be certain the Board is in a position to handle new technology today and in the future. We are testing system-based games.

A platform is the device itself. Most manufacturers operate off of one platform. That platform must go through an initial testing and a field trial. Every new

device must be approved by the Nevada Gaming Commission. A modification to that platform can be processed in less than 30 days.

MR. CLAYTON:

Modifications to a game, for instance changing little green men to hillbillies, require about a 30-day turnaround. New technologies, such as wireless gaming, can present unique questions about policy and security, for instance, over a wireless network. We had regulations and technical standards drafted. Our experience has been the industry does not submit requests as quickly as they claim. I will defend the Board and Commission for what we have done. I am not saying either party is right or wrong, but it is a collaborative process. I am disappointed if people think they cannot come to us about problems they are having.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

One large licensed entity indicates they have had a request in for an update of their software for a casino management system for four years. By the time the software is approved, it will be outdated.

MR. CLAYTON:

I do not know the particular case you are referring to, but I will have a private conversation with you, the staff or the manufacturer. The development of software is not simply programming. The manufacturer has programmers. There are times when we find errors or the manufacturer fails to meet a technical standard. We then advise the manufacturer who may take a week, or weeks, to respond. We can look into the particular case. It is a collaborative process which takes time when the manufacturer has failed in a technical standard, needs time to revise the program and has to come back into the Board's queue which takes more time.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We are in agreement that integrity is extremely important. With all of the technological advancements, everyday adjustments must be made to procedures to ensure Nevada does not give away any economic advantages.

MR. NEILANDER:

We are not doing things the same way just because we always have. We are open to any suggestions. We have been meeting with the operators and the manufacturers on a regular basis to get suggestions and see where they are going. We need to know where they are going to prepare for new technology. We are open to ways to protect the State and keep the industry competitive.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The transition report also raised questions about the requirements for private gaming rooms. It is not our intent to micromanage. We are talking about the necessity of keeping Nevada's gaming economy at a competitive level.

MR. NEILANDER:

The highlights of the Board's budget are shown on pages 6 and 7 of [Exhibit F](#). We have asked for two Investigation Division agents due to the number of applications. We are asking for a supervisor position to replace a data management position which was moved to the Technology Division. Additional travel, training, computer software, replacement equipment, some building

improvements and maintenance, personnel adjustments and upgrades are also requested.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

How many new positions are requested? There is a senior network specialist heading the records and research section and supervising six positions. What duties will the new supervisory position perform?

MR. NEILANDER:

We are requesting three positions.

TODD WESTERGARD (Chief, Administration Division, State Gaming Control Board):
The data management analyst position went to the Technology Division. The requested supervisor position is for the Administration Division. The supervisor will oversee the records area and our efforts to go paperless.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Are these positions in addition to those approved several Sessions back?

MR. WESTERGARD:

The data analyst management position has added functions more in the line of information system support rather than internal document management.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

How long does it take for approval of nonrestrictive licenses?

MR. NEILANDER:

The amount of time varies dependent upon the complexity of the applying entity, location, work history or if previously licensed. Generally, if it is a standard application, it takes four to six months.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

The Board has requested the normal cost-of-living increase and other personnel increases. Please give us more information about those.

MR. NEILANDER:

We are proposing, as shown on page 9 of [Exhibit F](#), an increase of approximately 5 percent for unclassified employees which would be funded by an increase in investigative fees paid by licensees and applicants. That would put fees in line with New Jersey and the National Indian Gaming Commission. This 5-percent salary increase is in addition to the cost-of-living increase. We have had 34 employees terminate in the last 6 months. A number of those employees are going to other State agencies. We do not expect to compete with the private sector, but we need to be in line with other State agencies. During the last Legislative Session, the Board did not participate in the salary survey done for law enforcement and investigative agencies. At the time, we did not have turnover issues.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is this request in the Board's budget?

MR. NEILANDER:

This request is not in the budget. It was in the original budget, but the Governor removed fee increases. The Governor's staff has indicated to me that as long as the industry supports the increase, the Governor will not object to this request.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Will the investigative fees cover the salary adjustments?

MR. NEILANDER:

Yes, they will.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

This request would be 6 percent rather than the 5 percent included in the budget for unclassified salaries, or is it 6 percent plus 5 percent?

MR. NEILANDER:

It is 11 percent due to the turnover rate and increased salaries of other investigative positions. There is a narrative on pages 10 through 13 of [Exhibit F](#) in support of this request.

SENATOR TITUS:

How much do you plan to raise the investigative fees?

MR. NEILANDER:

The fees will be raised from \$70 an hour to \$95 an hour. That is an approximate 12-percent increase.

SENATOR TITUS:

That is an increase in a fee. Did you include this fee increase on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#)?

MR. NEILANDER:

This fee is included in the "Other Collections" amount.

SENATOR TITUS:

Was this fee increase included when you stated the casinos pay roughly 9 percent compared to New Jersey's 10 percent?

MR. NEILANDER:

This fee is not part of the tax. The flat fees, shown on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#), are included as part of taxable revenue.

SENATOR TITUS:

Is this fee included in the figure you gave when you stated Nevada gaming pays roughly 9 percent compared to other states?

MR. NEILANDER:

Yes, it is included. New Jersey and Mississippi also include investigative fees as part of their general fund collections.

SENATOR TITUS:

You can call it a fee, but it is included in the tax.

MR. NEILANDER:

It is a fee in the sense the person paying it receives a service. There is a correlation between what we are doing, completing an investigation and the fee charged.

SENATOR TITUS:

It is a 12-percent increase in a fee which is part of the tax.

MR. NEILANDER:

I would not characterize it as a tax. There is a service provided.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Historically, this fee was authorized so the applicant would pay the full cost of any investigation. The State is not paying the cost of investigating an applicant.

MR. NEILANDER:

That is correct. We perform certain services that benefit the industry. To the extent our services benefit the industry, fees are charged. We perform other services that solely benefit the State. In that case, General Funds are used.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We want to make sure, whatever increases are necessary, the State should not bear the cost of investigating applicants.

MR. NEILANDER:

We do not charge for audits. We have felt that licensees have both internal and external auditors as required by law. The State incurs the benefit when the Board audits the licensee.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We want to be sure of the integrity of the audit.

MR. NEILANDER:

At one time, we did consider relying on third-party auditors. It has proven to be a wise decision not to outsource that function.

SENATOR TITUS:

What is being investigated when investigative fees are charged?

MR. NEILANDER:

The fees are paid by new applicants. When a company wants to be licensed in Nevada, a team investigates corporate and individual officers. The time spent completing an investigation is billed at \$70 per hour.

SENATOR TITUS:

I was surprised to hear you say the investigation benefits the industry and not the State.

MR. NEILANDER:

Everything we do benefits the State. There are some things that also benefit the industry.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

I want to emphasize we do not want to change the State's policy of having the applicant pay to acquire a gaming license. That cost should be borne by the applicant.

MR. NEILANDER:

We are not suggesting any change in that policy.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Are the building improvements and maintenance contracts for the Las Vegas lab a one-time cost?

MR. NEILANDER:

That is correct; it is not a recurring item. Once we move the lab out of the Grant Sawyer Office Building, we will utilize that space for the employee registration unit.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is there any change in credential pay? Has it been helpful?

MR. NEILANDER:

Credential pay remains unchanged and has been helpful in retaining attorneys, engineers and accountants.

Gaming Control Board Investigation Fund – Budget Page GAMING CONTROL
BOARD-13 (Volume I)
Budget Account 244-4063

MR. NEILANDER

There are no changes in this budget. We collect fees and pass them to the General Fund.

Gaming Commission – Budget Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-9 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-4067

PETER C. BERNHARD (Las Vegas, Chair, Nevada Gaming Commission, State Gaming Control Board):

There are no changes of substance from the prior biennium. An organization chart and the responsibilities and primary functions of the Gaming Commission are described on pages 16 through 18 of [Exhibit F](#).

CHAIR RAGGIO:

There is a new member on the Gaming Control Board.

MR. NEILANDER:

The newest Board member is Mr. Randall Sayre.

RANDALL SAYRE (Carson City, Member, State Gaming Control Board):

I have approximately 25 years of experience with this Board. I have been on active duty and with the National Guard for a total of 31 years.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We welcome you and thank you for your willingness to serve.

MR. BERNHARD:

The Commission is made up of five part-time members: two former State Senators, Sue Wagner and Raymond D. Rawson, Mr. Radha Chanderraj and Mr. Art Marshall. I was appointed to finish the term of former chairman Brian Sandoval. My first meeting was October 2001, the first meeting after September 11, 2001. Governor Gibbons has announced he intends to reappoint me when my term expires in April 2007.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

We appreciate your service. You have said there are no major issues in the budget. Is the budget adequate, particularly for out-of-state and out-of-country travel? We want to be certain your travel is paid by the State, as has been the State's policy, to avoid any conflicts.

MR. NEILANDER:

We participate in the International Association of Gaming Regulators (IAGR). I am currently the vice chair of that group. This group is made up of our counterparts all over the world. It has been a valuable group. For a time, we wondered what we could learn from other regulators. I have learned a great deal from these regulators. The meetings alternate between North America and other countries. There are funds in the budget for out-of-state travel. I believe the amount in the budget is adequate.

MR. BERNHARD:

Chair Neilander is a respected member of the IAGR. It has become important for us to understand what is going on in the rest of the world. Chair Neilander will become the chair of the IAGR once his term as vice chair is finished. That gives Nevada a tremendous amount of prestige and a great deal of input on what is going on in other jurisdictions. If there are problems in the gaming industry, we have a voice in what happens. Gaming credibility is important worldwide. The commissioners follow Chair Neilander's lead in making sure we are well aware of what is going on elsewhere in the world. We believe the budget is adequate.

MR. NEILANDER:

The Board and its staff are not allowed to stay at a licensed property. The per diem rate is not sufficient. Our employees are paying out-of-pocket for adequate housing when traveling.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Do you have a per diem recommendation?

MR. CLINGER:

We have a BDR to address the per diem issue.

SENATOR COFFIN:

What type of creative betting is allowed in foreign casinos? Do other countries allow more diversity than our institutions? Mr. Neilander is following the law with respect to creative betting proposals. We want to retain the interest of foreign gamblers who are likely to bet on the time it will rain on December 22.

MR. BERNHARD:

I think those are dangerous areas to get into. There is potential for abuse in things not typically or traditionally controlled by Nevada gaming regulators. I personally do not know what jurisdictions allow. You are talking about off-beat

propositional bets. We are comfortable we can regulate within the context of what we have regulated in the past.

SENATOR COFFIN:

That is the problem. I want us to think creatively, think ahead and stay ahead of other jurisdictions. We have been prohibited from Internet gaming.

MR. BERNHARD:

We also stay in touch with the industry. If the industry asks for accommodations to allow creative gaming, we have a responsibility to the State to make sure we look at the longer-term effect, not just the item of the moment.

SENATOR COFFIN:

If we have straitjacketed the industry by our own laws, is a tune-up required?

MR. BERNHARD:

We are happy to look at that, and we do it all the time. We talk with the industry about their concerns. If there is support to expand areas offered, we will look at those areas. The industry likes having us here to say no. Some of these proposition bets and creative ways to wager are nerve-racking for the licensees themselves. They like having the backbone of a gaming regulatory system to look at ideas. We are adaptable. We will listen to the industry and handle the issue as we see fit.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I have been concerned about the concentration of ownership which reduces the number of ideas that come forward. When we had 25 independent gambling groups here, we had a lot of competition for ideas. Tremendous things were offered by various people to build traffic. Now we are down to four or five entities controlling the industry. We must be careful they do not become too comfortable with things and will not want to compete, thereby inducing the foreign bettor to go outside Nevada for gaming.

MR. BERNHARD:

From my experience, during the days when there were 25 or 30 separate licensees, we had some bad ideas as well as good ideas. We went through a terrible time with a lot of Chapter 11 filings based on bad management decisions. Based on the presentations to the Board regarding the combination of businesses, internal competition for ideas is encouraged within the properties managed by one corporate overlord. The gaming industry has some of the most creative minds from a marketing, financial and operational perspective. The gaming industry, compared to other industries throughout the world, is creating some of the most creative minds because of the excitement of the industry and what it provides.

SENATOR COFFIN:

The Board and Commission are afforded many opportunities to travel, frequently with licensees overseas. I want you to be able to travel on the State's dollar everywhere something is happening. Do you have enough funds for that?

MR. BERNHARD:

We never travel on licensee funds. That is a policy the Board and Commission strictly follow. Any travel is at personal or State expense. Chair Raggio has

raised the issue of funding adequacy. We feel the budget is adequate. We are able to use the Internet by keeping track of events in the rest of the world without traveling. If there were more funds available, I believe they would be of benefit to the State. However, I am not prepared today to say it should be a priority of this Committee or the Legislature to provide additional travel funds.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Are you saying you would or would not want additional funds?

MR. BERNHARD:

I would accept additional funds but would not make it a priority.

CHAIR RAGGIO:

Is there any public comment? There being no further business to discuss at this time, the meeting is adjourned at 10:58 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sandra K. Small,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator William J. Raggio, Chair

DATE: _____