

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-fourth Session
May 2, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Warren B. Hardy II at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 2007, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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 Warren B. Hardy II, Chair
Senator Bob Beers, Vice Chair
Senator William J. Raggio
Senator Randolph J. Townsend
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Terry Care
Senator John J. Lee

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Joe Hardy, Assembly District No. 20
Assemblyman William Horne, Assembly District No. 34
Assemblywoman Ellen M. Koivisto, Assembly District No. 14

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Candice Nye, Assistant to Committee Manager
Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel
Michael J. Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst
Erin Miller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chris Collins, Executive Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Janine Hansen, Independent American Party
John E. Jeffrey, City of Henderson

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 2, 2007
Page 2

Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County
Diana Alba, Assistant Clerk, Clark County
Margaret Flint, Chapel of the Bells
Tom Fronapfel, Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
George W. T. Flint, Chapel of the Bells
Paula Berkley, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, Washoe County
John Brumley, Deputy Administrator, Contracts and Finance, Clean Water Coalition
Steve K. Walker, Truckee Meadows Water Authority
John Slaughter, Washoe County
Tony F. Sanchez, Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Michael G. Alonso, Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority

CHAIR HARDY:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 301.

ASSEMBLY BILL 301 (1st Reprint): Revises the qualifications for the office of county sheriff. (BDR 20-539)

ASSEMBLYMAN WILLIAM HORNE (Assembly District No. 34):

I was asked to bring this bill forth because of the elections in Clark County between Jerry Airola and Sheriff Doug Gillespie. After all the facts and qualifications came out, it was silly that we had someone who, for the most part, was not qualified to be sheriff. In today's world, with the growth of southern Nevada, it is important that your chief law enforcement officer be qualified with certain skills and insight to deal with threats and complexities of growth. They must also have the administrative skills to deal with their own department and the departments of other law enforcement agencies throughout the state. Oftentimes, you have to collaborate with other agencies. If a larger threat or terrorism were to occur where the agencies have to work together, a number of them may not have the appropriate skills to assist.

Assembly Bill 301 was amended in the Assembly to address concerns the rural areas had because they still have very small communities and sheriffs who have done a wonderful job. If your population exceeds 100,000 or more, section 1 of the bill requires 5 years of employment as a police officer or officer of an agency of the United States with Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST)

certification as a category I peace officer or successful completion of a federal law enforcement training program. If your population is less than 100,000, you would not have to meet the education and work requirements but forfeit your seat if you fail with a year of election to earn your POST certification as a category I, II or III peace officer. That gives an exception to the rural communities.

Some people have said that the current process works in Clark County. We had one very qualified candidate and one not very qualified candidate, and it worked how it was supposed to work. However, I have seen judicial races where the final two candidates were not the best choice. I would like a quality field of sheriffs from which to choose. I believe in the vote of the people, but this is not new territory. We do not allow non-judges to be district court judges or Nevada Supreme Court justices. We have qualifications for those positions. It is not a leap to say that we want our chief law enforcement officers to have certain qualifications to do the job. Our rank and file law enforcement officers would want somebody of quality who is qualified to run those departments.

CHRIS COLLINS (Executive Director, Las Vegas Police Protective Association):

I represent the Las Vegas Police Protective Association and the Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs. I am here to support A.B. 301. When I became a police officer for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department 23 years ago, you had to have 4 years of service within our organization to test for the rank of sergeant. It did not take long for Metro to realize officers did not have the maturity and experience after four years to be frontline supervisors. The standard was changed to a minimum of six years. You had to hold the rank of sergeant for two years to test for lieutenant and hold that rank for two years to test for the rank of captain. Why would we not expect the Sheriff of the largest law enforcement organization in Nevada to have at least the same amount of experience of a captain who is not the highest-ranking member of Metro? Some of our city departments would be subject to significant criticism if they decided to hire a chief of police with little or no experience compared to candidates in the pool. We should not expect any less from the Sheriff. By instituting the minimum qualifications for the Clark County Sheriff, voters will be given the best possible options.

SENATOR LEE:

It is 15 years experience before you can be a Nevada Supreme Court justice, 10 years to be a district court judge and 5 years to be a justice of the peace.

The five consecutive years' employment is too low. I am thinking 15 years because you are not just a police officer, you are running a business. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department has a \$500 million to \$600 million budget. I question whether a police officer, even with 20 years experience, can run a \$500 million business. A chief executive officer with administrative skills or a retired general from Nellis Air Force Base would bring something to the table. Therein, the qualifications of undersheriffs would be where he could pull in quality police officers with a lot of experience. I am looking at the business quotient and the protection of our citizens. Would a gentleman who has run Nellis Air Force Base and had security forces be a good candidate for sheriff? I understand you are looking to our future, but I question narrowing it down to someone who has only worked in law enforcement.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE:

I mentioned my qualifications with military service and security in the first hearing, but would you want me to be your sheriff? I would hope not. The original bill had ten years. It was amended in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs to five years. Someone who commanded Nellis Air Force Base could be sheriff, but there is one component missing. When I envision a person rising to the position of sheriff, they have attained leadership, administrative skills and baptism by fire coming up through the ranks and understand the intricacies involved in law enforcement. They have firsthand experience on what it is like being a patrol officer or sergeant.

Someone asked me why we do not shop outside Nevada. We may have a population one day that requires us to do that, but the departments are small enough now where our sheriffs have all been from Nevada. Sheriff Gillespie and former Sheriff Bill Young were in the department during the growth period and have seen the critical changes in southern Nevada. They make appropriate candidates for sheriff because they understand the changes unlike someone from outside the jurisdiction. You could tell an outsider what the city and state has gone through in the 20 years, but they would not have experienced it.

SENATOR LEE:

If you did have a candidate who was an administrator of a big organization, would you not agree that an appropriate undersheriff, such as Doug Gillespie or Bill Young, would have been pulled up the ranks to help support them? I do not require an answer, I am just leading.

SENATOR CARE:

The candidate for sheriff, Jerry Airola, finished second in the primary and was in the run-off with Sheriff Gillespie. The public determined he ought to be one of the two primary candidates. As more information came out about his lack of background, his numbers in the public opinion polls dropped. Does it not work that voters can decide who they want and who is qualified?

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE:

The problem is the deficiencies of Mr. Airola did not come to light until after the primary. Had the deficiencies come out earlier, another candidate who was more qualified to be sheriff could have made the primary, and people would have had two good choices instead of a good choice and a bad choice.

MR. COLLINS:

When I hired on with METRO 23 years ago, a police officer might not have been able to rise to position of Sheriff. Many officers had General Education Development diplomas. Now, many police officers have a college education, and many are educated beyond a bachelor's degree. Police officers should be allowed to be sheriff.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will take opposition testimony.

JANINE HANSEN (Independent American Party):

We are happy with the changes made in the Assembly. We support the section that requires sheriffs who do not have law enforcement training to receive it after they are elected. We have concerns with some mandates, and the letter I have submitted from my son may explain some concerns ([Exhibit C](#)). The office of sheriff has a long history essential to represent and defend the people. It is a different office than some because the sheriff is directly accountable to the people who are the sovereigns under American law. My son was a candidate for sheriff in Elko County last year. There were seven people running for sheriff in Elko County. Six of them had law enforcement experience and my son did not. During the debates, much of the innovations and challenges to the system came as a result of what my son had to say. He discussed alternatives for jail facilities and defending county residences against encroachment by the federal government. My son was not able to pursue the candidacy because of personal issues, but he was happy that he ran. One of the major roles of the

sheriff is as a business manager. The will of the people is important because the sheriff is representing and defending the will of the people in their county.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 301 and open the hearing on A.B. 406.

ASSEMBLY BILL 406 (1st Reprint): Revises various provisions relating to marriage licenses. (BDR 11-523)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ELLEN M. KOIVISTO (Assembly District No. 14):

Assembly Bill 406 requires the county clerk to open a marriage license bureau in Henderson, the second largest city in Nevada. It is not out of line that they would expect to have a marriage license bureau. I handed out correspondence I have received since introducing the bill ([Exhibit D](#)). The Chamber of Commerce in Henderson supports the bill and suggests there is office space available in Henderson so it will not be an expense for the county.

CHAIR HARDY:

This is similar to what we did last session in the City of Mesquite.

JOHN E. JEFFREY (City of Henderson):

I am representing the Little Chapel on the Corner. I have a letter from the City Clerk in the City of Henderson offering to make office space available ([Exhibit E](#)). She is also to have one of her staff deputized by the County Clerk to perform this function if needed. Henderson City Hall is becoming a full-service operation to accommodate the residents. There is a letter of support from Bob Cooper, Economic Development Manager, City of Henderson ([Exhibit F](#)). I have talked with Henderson Mayor James B. Gibson and he supports the bill.

SENATOR LEE:

Can we get a friendly amendment on this bill to bring in North Las Vegas? I would like to give them a chance to look at this bill and see if this is an issue.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO:

The numbers used in the bill are based on the last census. By the numbers in the bill, Henderson is the only city affected. North Las Vegas did not ask to be included.

MR. JEFFREY:

The way the bill is drafted, North Las Vegas would have to make the case they are over 150,000 in population. If they were, they would be included.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

The person applying for the license having identification was an issue in the original version of the bill. What is the problem with this? Why do we not want someone to prove who they are when they get a marriage license?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO:

The language dealing with identification comes from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and Assemblyman Bernie Anderson hated the language.

CHAIR HARDY:

There is an amendment on that issue we can consider as well.

SABRA SMITH-NEWBY (Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County):

We provided an amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) that would delete the language about the population cap and replace "two branch offices" with "no more than five branch offices." This allows us the ability to grow and establish these offices without tying it to a certain population size. We have been in contact with the City of Henderson and others and have committed to establishing an office in Henderson. However, the language would allow us to expand before the next census.

CHAIR HARDY:

That would allow you to address Senator Lee's concern if the City of North Las Vegas petitioned to have this done. I want to make sure Henderson gets their marriage license bureau.

MS. SMITH-NEWBY:

We talked with the City of Henderson and Mr. Jeffrey about doing a letter of intent or something to give them comfort so they know we are committed.

CHAIR HARDY:

I support the intent of going to five or more branches so we do not have to keep going through this exercise, but I am going to ask Committee Counsel to look at a way to mandate the Henderson branch and allow the County to have discretion on the other bureaus.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 2, 2007
Page 8

SENATOR LEE:

I will follow up on my concerns.

DIANA ALBA (Assistant Clerk, Clark County):

The Clark County Clerk's Office supports the amendment that would allow us the five offices and give us flexibility. We have concern about the mandate for Henderson. We have no problem with an office in Henderson, but we have a branch in Mesquite and Laughlin. We do not want to be in a position where we might have to sacrifice one of those branches in the future. We will do a letter of intent to provide an office in Henderson, but we know things change and would like flexibility.

SENATOR LEE:

That just leaves North Las Vegas out of the equation. I am going to try to piggyback onto this bill.

MS. ALBA:

That was a reason we like the option of having five branches. A Website showed North Las Vegas with a population of more than 150,000 so we assumed they might be included. As Clark County expands, we see opening branches in further out in North Las Vegas.

SENATOR LEE:

I am going to still work with this.

MARGARET FLINT (Chapel of the Bells):

I am here today on behalf of my family's wedding chapel, Chapel of the Bells. I have been asked by Silver Bells Wedding Chapel and Arch of Reno Wedding Chapel to speak on their behalf. It has come to our attention that the original proponents of the bill are now opposed. Assembly Bill 406 started out as an innocent bill to establish a branch satellite office of the Clark County Marriage License Bureau in Henderson. The increasing population there has earned that, and we support the bill in its first reprint. We are opposed to section 2, subsection 2 of A.B. 406 as introduced and any proposed amendments to the bill. Somewhere along the line, the DMV decided the bill was the perfect vehicle to insert extremely restrictive language that would rewrite the identification requirement for obtaining a marriage license. This language could be devastating to private industry and state entities that receive revenues from marriage license sales. I prepared a packet on A.B. 406 ([Exhibit H](#)). Page 3 of [Exhibit H](#) outlines

the decline in marriage license sales. Clark County has maintained an annual increase until 2006 when their sales fell almost 10,000 licenses in one year. I have no explanation for the decline. Washoe County has continued to decline almost 1,000 licenses annually for several years. The fiscal numbers on page 4 of [Exhibit H](#) are even scarier. I have compiled the breakdown so you can see how much each state entity lost in revenue from the sale of marriage licenses in 2006. I do not understand why the Washoe County Clerk would support this bill. She is willing to support a bill that would reduce revenue to her office, yet she is asking for an increase in certain court fees.

I cannot imagine how much revenue the private sector has lost, and that is not just about wedding-related dollars. Ninety percent of the weddings performed in Nevada are from out of state. Every tourist wedding performed accounts for a minimum of two tourists visiting Nevada. Tom Fronapfel, Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles, testified in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary that the system is broken and needs a Band-Aid. The only thing I see broken in the wedding business is the decline. Mr. Fronapfel is not proposing a Band-Aid; it is a nail in the coffin.

CHAIR HARDY:

You liked the first reprint of A.B. 406. We will have the DMV present their amendment and allow you to speak to it after we have heard it.

TOM FRONAPFEL (Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

Current law does not require an individual applying for a marriage license to show proof of identity and age unless the applicant is less than 18 years of age. In addition, individuals can go to a county clerk claiming they have lost their identification and be issued a marriage license by signing a affidavit stating the information on the application is accurate under penalty of perjury. Enacting a requirement to show proof of name and age will not burden residents of or visitors to Nevada. Based on information I have received from Clark and Washoe Counties, less than 0.2 percent of applicants in Clark County and 1 percent of applicants in Washoe County do not have proper identification. A survey of all 50 states was conducted as to the requirements for proof of identity. Nevada, Oregon and North Dakota only require proof of age. Minnesota requires only a Social Security number. The requirements for Kentucky are undetermined. The other 45 states require proof of identity.

Language in current law is a problem because certificates of marriage are the de facto proof of change of name. Once issued, they are presented to the DMV to obtain a new driver license or identification card that reflects the person's change of name. We have no way to confirm whether the individuals whose names appear on the marriage certificate are who they claim. Requiring proof of age and identity at the time of applying for a marriage license will increase the validity of the documents presented for evidence. I have submitted a handout with a copy of A.B. 406 as originally introduced ([Exhibit I](#)). It reflects language worked out between the Washoe County and Clark County Clerks and the DMV. [Exhibit I](#) also contains proposed amendments to the original bill that address concerns raised during the hearing on April 4. The issues from the hearing dealt with the definition of "full legal name" and the connotation with that in relation to real identification. These amendments address those concerns and issues. With the amendments, we require they show identity as to who they are and what age they are, and those names as they appear on the documents presented are what appears on the application for marriage license and certificate. We request the Committee consider A.B. 406 as originally introduced in conjunction with the proposed amendments presented in [Exhibit I](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO:

I like the Clark County amendment. It is a good amendment, and it takes care of many concerns including Senator Lee's. The amendment from the DMV was amended out in the Assembly. If it is put back in, I do not know what will happen to the bill when it goes back.

CHAIR HARDY:

It is your bill, and we want to accommodate your desires. Do you have a concern with what was proposed by the DMV other than it was previously amended out?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO:

I do not have a concern, but I would like to see the bill passed.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Why are we not requiring someone to show identification? All other states, except five, require some form of identification. What is the concern?

GEORGE W. T. FLINT (Chapel of the Bells):

Whether the statute specifically demands identification, it is commonly asked for and presented. The clerk has changed her policy from the perspective of the wedding chapels in as much as they have been less or more demanding in requiring identification. The statements about less than 1 percent is not a fair statement to make because page 3 of the bill as originally drafted sets out a new set of requirements as to what kind of identification is acceptable. That could cost us thousands of weddings a year. Many women let their driver licenses expire when they know they are getting married soon because they will have a new name. Under the bill as originally drafted, an expired license is not acceptable. Approximately 20 percent of our wedding applicants do not have picture identification. The wedding chapels do 75 percent of the weddings in Nevada, and the DMV and county clerks have never come to the chapels to work out any differences.

CHAIR HARDY:

Are you willing to sit down with the DMV and work out some language?

MR. FLINT:

I would like to do that.

CHAIR HARDY:

That is what we are going to do. Please meet with the DMV and report back to me.

MS. FLINT:

Nothing in existing statute states the county clerk cannot ask for identification. It says the county clerk "may" require identification.

PAULA BERKLEY (Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence):

We would support the amendment that encourages marriage licenses because that is directly related to how many dollars come into domestic violence programs.

NANCY PARENT (Chief Deputy Clerk, Washoe County):

I am willing to work with the DMV and the wedding chapels to come to an agreement. Margaret Flint stated that the clerk could ask for proof of identity. That is not what the statute says. It only allows us to ask for identification to determine if a person is of age. There is a difference between making sure you are who you say and making sure you are as old as you say. If there is no doubt

you are over 18, we do not feel we have the tools we need to make sure the person is who they say. If we are to go somewhere with identification, a provision in statute allows one party of a marriage license to come to our office and apply. If they can answer questions about their perspective spouse, we have to issue them a license. We prefer to only do that in extraordinary circumstances. If the clerk still does not feel comfortable issuing them the license in that circumstance, they can go to the courts and have them decide.

People expect to show us their identification when they apply for a marriage license. Some are offended if they are not asked. They are worried that someone can pretend to be them and perpetrate a fraud. We support identification requirements to close the loopholes.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

We should not ignore this. There should not be onerous identification requirements. I understand from where the Flints are coming. We need some piece of legislation to require a reasonable form of identification from people who apply for a marriage license. Proof of marriage is too important, especially with security situations.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 406 and open the hearing on A.B. 415.

ASSEMBLY BILL 415 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the financing of projects by a local government through the issuance of commercial paper. (BDR 30-1067)

ASSEMBLYMAN JOE HARDY (Assembly District No. 20):

Assembly Bill 415 deals with local government security law and commercial paper as a type of short-term borrowing instrument that may be a one-time program or have provisions similar to a revolving line of credit that allows payment and reissuing. This measure provides for the use of both types, and the term of any commercial paper issued under these provisions must not exceed 270 days. Time limits are placed on commercial paper programs that allow payment and reissue. The program terminates within six years in the case of general obligations and within ten years for a special obligation of the municipality. It allows an entity to have a revolving line of credit, borrow up to the revolving line of credit, pay off the credit with a more permanent loan and

continue their line of revolving credit without a reapplication fee of up to \$400,000.

JOHN BRUMLEY (Deputy Administrator, Contracts and Finance, Clean Water Coalition):

I support A.B. 415 which modifies the regulations regarding the use of short-term borrowing instrument commercial paper. I have submitted written testimony for the record ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR HARDY:

Is this financing mechanism used elsewhere?

MR. BRUMLEY:

This is a financing instrument that the Clean Water Coalition is familiar with as well as other units of local government in Clark County. The Truckee Meadows Water Authority also uses commercial paper for their capital-improvement needs and to buy water rights.

CHAIR HARDY:

Do we not have statutory authority?

MR. BRUMLEY:

It does not allow it to revolve. If you receive \$200 million in authority to do a commercial paper program, once you exhaust that, it dies. You have to go back and get reauthorization. It costs more money to have an \$800 million program. You try to size it right, but it allows us to avoid negative arbitrage.

CHAIR HARDY:

The application fees and so forth are going to save you the \$700,000 to \$800,000.

MR. BRUMLEY:

It is approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 to create a commercial paper program.

SENATOR LEE:

It says the term must not exceed 270 days. However on page 6 of A.B. 415, it says the program terminates within six years.

MR. BRUMLEY:

Commercial paper has a limit of 270 days in itself. When it times out, it resells on the market. That is called churning. It resells until you redeem it. You can redeem it by issuing long-term debt or receiving grants. If you have a large amount of money, you can redeem your commercial paper and that debt goes away.

SENATOR LEE:

Assemblyman Hardy said it would be a line of credit. A line of credit rests every year. One month out of 12, it rests.

MR. BRUMLEY:

For us, commercial paper acts like a line of credit. In reality, it operates as a short-term borrowing instrument, and it is resold on the public market as a tax-exempt instrument.

STEVE K. WALKER (Truckee Meadows Water Authority):

I support A.B. 415. The Truckee Meadows Water Authority uses commercial paper to acquire water rights without using any of the rate base. It stabilizes the water rights market and makes water rights available to individuals. That did not happen before we started using this instrument.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 415 and open the hearing on A.B. 22.

ASSEMBLY BILL 22: Authorizes the State Land Registrar to transfer certain real property owned by the State of Nevada to Washoe County and the Sierra Fire Protection District. (BDR S-367)

JOHN SLAUGHTER (Washoe County):

I have submitted handouts from the Division of State Lands, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources ([Exhibit K](#)) and one explains the history of the Verdi Justice Court property ([Exhibit L](#)). Assembly Bill 22 authorizes the transfer of two parcels. One parcel will be transferred to Washoe County from the state. The other parcel will be transferred to the Sierra Fire Protection District from the state. Washoe County has been working with the Division of State Lands, Division of Forestry (NDF) and Verdi community on these two properties for years.

The property being transferred to Sierra Fire Protection is on Joy Lake Road in the south part of Washoe County. It was provided to the state at no cost by the developer in 1998. Fire services previously provided by NDF are now provided by Sierra Fire Protection. There was a requirement that the property come with a deed restriction to keep it as a fire service property.

The other parcel in Verdi has a long history. At one time, it was owned by the County. It was provided to the state for fire protection services. The fire department moved, and the building was used as a justice court. The justice court merged with Reno so the property has been vacant. We were approached by the Verdi Historic Preservation Society that would like to turn the building into a museum. In researching the property, we discovered the parking lot is owned by the state. We seek to have the parking lot transferred to Washoe County so we can open up a museum.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 22 and open the hearing on A.B. 101.

ASSEMBLY BILL 101 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Commission on Tourism. (BDR 18-772)

TONY F. SANCHEZ (Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority):

Assembly Bill 101 is a cleanup bill with respect to how the Commission on Tourism has operated in the past relative to the appointees. The basic provision gives the two ex officio members of the Commission the ability to vote. Those members are the executive directors and presidents of the two largest fair and county recreation boards which are Washoe County and Clark County. Rossi Ralenkotter, president and chief executive officer, Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) sits on the Commission on Tourism in an ex officio capacity so he can participate but not vote on the matter. This bill would give him voting authority.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Tony Sanchez and Michael Alonso are members of the law firm of which I am associated. However, nothing in this bill precludes me from voting.

CHAIR HARDY:

Is there a policy reason why we are changing the County Fair and Recreation Board to the Convention and Visitors Authority Board?

MR. SANCHEZ:

There is not. We would be comfortable maintaining the County Fair and Recreation Board. We were not aware of the change.

CHAIR HARDY:

The convention and visitors authorities are moving away from their responsibility as the fair and recreation board. However, they do a wonderful job of supporting the fair. I do not want to move away from that. In addition, it would be consistent with the rest of statute if we were to keep it as the County Fair and Recreation Board.

SENATOR LEE:

At this point, Rossi Ralenkotter is a nonvoting, ex officio member and you are asking for him to be a voting member. I thought he was hired to run and advise. This would put him in the position to vote on his own raise and personnel items.

MR. SANCHEZ:

Mr. Ralenkotter heads the LVCVA. The Commission on Tourism is a different entity. In his capacity as head of the LVCVA, he has an automatic nonvoting, ex officio seat on the Commission. This bill would give him the ability to vote on matters in front of the Commission. The two largest convention authorities account for over 80 percent of funding by the Commission.

MICHAEL G. ALONSO (Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority):
We are in support of this bill for the same reasons as the LVCVA.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 2, 2007
Page 17

CHAIR HARDY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 101. This meeting is adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Erin Miller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Chair

DATE: _____