

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

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

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Warren B. Hardy II at 1:56 p.m. on Wednesday, May 16, 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 Marcus Conklin, Assembly District No. 37

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:

Rob Joiner, Manager, Government Affairs, City of Sparks
John Slaughter, Washoe County
Nicolas C. Anthony, Legislative Relations Administration, City of Reno
Craig Smyres
Erik Holland, Citizens for Sensible Growth

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 16, 2007
Page 2

Lisa A. Foster, City of Boulder City
Kimberly McDonald, City of North Las Vegas
Chris Knight, Director, Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas
Terri Barber, City of Henderson
Jeffrey A. Fontaine, Nevada Association of Counties
Mary C. Walker, City of Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County;
Storey County
Lisa Gianoli, Washoe County
Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County
Danny Thompson, Nevada State American Federation of Labor and Congress of
Industrial Organizations
Raymond J. Flynn, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Dan Musgrove, Clark County

CHAIR HARDY:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B) 513. This bill has already received a full hearing. However, the Committee received an amendment ([Exhibit C](#)), and I wanted to give them an opportunity to fully consider that amendment. The amendment is part of finalizing a negotiated settlement agreement, and we want to get it right.

ASSEMBLY BILL 513 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to general improvement districts. (BDR 25-1380)

ROB JOINER (Manager, Government Affairs, City of Sparks):

This is enabling legislation. It is for a one-time general improvement district for each city. This is supportive of the Regional Plan Lawsuit Settlement Agreement. It is also supportive of cooperative planning that has gone on for several years leading up to this with the cities and Washoe County. There is unified support of the amendment by the three entities involved in the regional planning process. The amendment allows limited community development in areas preplanned for development under specific, high-threshold criteria agreed to in the Regional Plan Settlement Agreement. [Exhibit C](#) contains talking points.

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

Have the board of county commissioners and two city councils taken this issue up and made it part of their process?

MR. JOINER:

On this amendment, I can only speak for the City of Sparks. Our City Council is in full support of the amendment. They agree it supports the dictates of the regional plan.

JOHN SLAUGHTER (Washoe County):

We took the proposed concept to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners and discussed it at length. This is a concept with which they want to move forward. Washoe County is party to all agreements of the regional plan that define where and how a specific development will occur within a city's sphere of influence and service area. We see this amendment as a way to implement those agreements and plans.

NICOLAS C. ANTHONY (Legislative Relations Administration, City of Reno):
The Reno City Council has seen this amendment and is in full support.

SENATOR RAGGIO;

This amendment is not adverse to any litigation.

MR. JOINER:

That is correct.

CRAIG SMYRES:

I am opposed to the amendment to A.B. 513. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

ERIK HOLLAND (Citizens for Sensible Growth):

I am opposed to the amendment to A.B. 513. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR HARDY:

There was no attempt to subvert the process. This amendment is a result of a settlement agreement. These issues of government are best resolved at the level of government closest to the people. This issue has been heard and vetted at that level. We are responding to the request of the local government representatives to provide language in statute to accommodate a settlement agreement. We will close the hearing on A.B. 513 and open A.B. 439.

ASSEMBLY BILL 439 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to developing and maintaining affordable housing. (BDR 22-1302)

ASSEMBLYMAN MARCUS CONKLIN (Assembly District No. 37):

The amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) is a consensus amendment. In the original draft of A.B. 439, section 1 contained a list of items required in the master plan as part of dealing with affordable housing. We have added eight additional provisions for the municipalities to choose from in meeting the requirement for their master plan. Instead of requiring them to have 3 out of 4, they are required to have 6 out of 12. That was agreed to by all parties. Boulder City has concern because the unique nature of their City does not fit into all of the measures. These provisions are what we would like them to have in their master plan; it is measured upon the judgment of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) as to whether they are making diligent progress toward their needs. They will not be fined based on this. It is not my intention to make something impossible, but it is my intention to make it workable.

LISA A. FOSTER (City of Boulder City):

Our concern about the amendment has been over requiring 6 out of 12 measures. We were concerned that Boulder City may have difficulty meeting that number. If we can show intent and that we have taken action, we will be all right.

SENATOR LEE:

Could you discuss the IFC's fining ability?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

The penalty is specifically defined. The provisions for affordable housing have been in statute for over ten years. The master planning did not adequately address the needs nor was it adequately pursued. There was nothing in statute to require it. With the growth in Nevada, there is an outrageous need to do something about affordable housing. We shrunk the need from 110 percent to 80 percent so it focused on the people with the greatest need. In return, we put a provision that every municipality takes a portion of their Real Property Transfer Tax (RPTT) to go into the Account for Low-Income Housing Trust Fund. That is current statute. Over the last two years, that Account had \$11 million. This bill says if IFC determines you have not made adequate progress, you are going to provide a report to the Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry, and the Division will compile a housing report. They

will share the report with IFC. They will view the report and assess a penalty. With the exact same amount of RPTT you put into the Fund, an exact duplicate amount will go into the Fund out of your RPTT. You are the only one that can apply to the Fund for that money exclusively used for affordable housing.

SENATOR LEE:

What could this equate to? What is the dollar amount?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

That last Fund amount in the last biennium was \$11 million with \$9 million coming from Clark County. I would imagine the penalty would be rare. It is designed to make sure we keep their feet to the fire.

SENATOR LEE:

Is that how North Las Vegas understands it? North Las Vegas has an inordinate amount of affordable housing. Are we getting credit?

KIMBERLY McDONALD (City of North Las Vegas):

We are not getting credit for the plethora of affordable housing we have. We met with Assemblyman Conklin, and the additional eight criteria make it more flexible for us to achieve the benchmarks.

SENATOR LEE:

What percentage of affordable housing does North Las Vegas provide to the Las Vegas Valley?

Ms. McDONALD:

I am not sure of an accurate estimate. We have the majority of the Valley. This is nothing new to North Las Vegas. We have been aggressive with affordable housing.

SENATOR LEE:

I do not want North Las Vegas to become the affordable housing center of the Valley. I want us to be recognized, not penalized, for our efforts.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

North Las Vegas may have 100,000 units of affordable housing, and Las Vegas may have 50,000 units because we do not put all of Clark County into a bucket. If you wanted to go to a regional affordable housing board, we could do

that and allocate appropriately. When evaluating affordable housing, you have to assess the need in the community. The need is greatest in North Las Vegas for whatever reason. Las Vegas is landlocked, and the greatest amount of land available is in North Las Vegas. It is unfortunate, but also fortunate because you have the greatest amount of economic growth opportunity. My intent was not for North Las Vegas to take on all affordable housing, but we have to recognize what is in the greater interest. There is a provision the cities brought forward that cooperative efforts are recognized.

People came to me concerned about the penalty. The adjudication process for the penalty was the greatest concern. It was given to the Housing Division to decide. All of these bodies have a working relationship with the Division as they seek to address this problem because the Division manages the Account for Low-Income Housing. There was a potential burden that, instead of having a cooperative relationship, there would be an adversarial relationship because the Division would be doing the evaluations. That is why we took the evaluation out of the Division and gave it to the IFC. I do not know that the penalty will ever be used.

CHAIR HARDY:

Another change to the amendment is that it clarifies the reports regarding affordable housing and development must include an analysis of the need for affordable housing in that jurisdiction. It requires the Housing Division to compile the reports and submit a compilation to the IFC on or before February 15. The amendment requires the IFC to review the report, and they "may determine" whether there is adequate progress and impose a fee. If a local government is assessed a penalty and applies to the Account for Low-Income Housing, any money not used by the government must revert back to the Account within four years after receipt. The final change clarifies that the local government will not be subject to any penalties until after October 1, 2008.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Have the entities in Washoe County agreed this is workable and reasonable? Notwithstanding my earlier concerns about donating land at 10 percent of its value, the rest of the items require some kind of financial commitment from the affected entity.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

All entities were welcome at my table and some attended.

MR. ANTHONY:

I have had conversations with our staff. They are agreeable to these changes. This measure has not gone before the City Council, but it would be staff's recommendation to support A.B. 439 as amended.

MR. JOINER:

Our City Council has taken positions of reticence on mandatory penalties and the obligation of meeting three out of four measures. We had a productive session with Assemblyman Conklin. Some of the measures are things we already do so it will be easier to meet the requirements. We want to meet the challenges of affordable housing. I met with our legislative team, and with the changes made to the bill in the amendment, we support A.B. 439 as amended.

CHRIS KNIGHT (Director, Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas):

This amendment puts a process into our master planning process. There has always been a required housing element. This gives greater clarity and puts us in a position of adopting, identifying, measuring and reporting our need and progress. We are in support of A.B. 439 as amended.

TERRI BARBER (City of Henderson):

We are in full support of A.B. 439 as amended.

JEFFREY A. FONTAINE (Nevada Association of Counties):

There may be problems with some of the rural counties meeting 6 out of 12 measures, but the statements on the record about it being an incentive and permissive helps. Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (e) of the mock-up, [Exhibit F](#), would not pertain to any county outside of Clark County. For all other counties, it would be 6 out of 11 measures.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

In the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, the question was asked whether this even applied to the rural counties. The subsequent answer was no. We will clarify this only applies to Washoe and Clark Counties. If the rural counties would like to be included, I would be happy to change the bill to include them. If not, the original intent was that A.B. 439 be only for urban populations.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 16, 2007
Page 8

CHAIR HARDY:

It is the reference to *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 278 that makes it apply only to those areas.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

That is correct.

MARY C. WALKER (City of Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County):

We believe NRS 278 does apply to us. We request it be clarified to a 100,000 population cap.

LISA GIANOLI (Washoe County):

We are in support of A.B. 439 as amended. This bill has not been taken to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I heard comments that this was permissive. I do not see that in the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

The master planning requirements are statute. That does not mean you have to have done all of the things, but you have to be planning to accomplish these things. There is current statute to have affordable housing in the master plan; we are giving more depth as to what types of things we are looking for in the master plan. The portion about the fine is permissive.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

The Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry is required to make the report and the IFC is required to review the report. Then they make the determination as to whether adequate progress has occurred.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

It says "and may determine." You do not have to make a determination, but if you find something compelling, that is there for you to address the issue.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Without any guidelines, it would be a difficult task for the IFC to make the determination. The IFC has become a depository at times for responsibilities that other entities or committees do not want. It would probably be infrequent, but if

it does happen, there will be many questions as to how we would make that determination.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

My hope would be that you would never have to make that determination. It is there to make sure people recognize the importance of the issue.

SENATOR BEERS:

Early in my legislative career, I learned we had passed a law in a previous session eliminating master water metering for manufactured housing parks and requiring each unit in the park to have its own water hookup. In Clark County, hooking new residents up to the water system costs \$45,000. Those things are responsible for the crisis we are having in affordable housing. Implementing policies or mandating local government to implement policies that would increase the cost of housing for people who do not get affordable housing is not an adequate solution to the lack of affordable housing.

Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of [Exhibit F](#) requires the city to subsidize impact fees. That means the people who do not get affordable housing have to pay more. Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) requires local government to sell land at 10 percent of its value. That takes money out of the pockets of the people who have non-affordable houses, making them more unaffordable. Donating land also makes housing less affordable for some people. When looking for affordable housing solutions, I do not want to solve it by artificially creating affordable housing and making everyone else's housing more unaffordable. I have a problem with an approach mandating local government to make housing less affordable for most people in order to create a few more affordable units. A few elements of [A.B. 439](#) move more toward the real problem, but most measures in the bill will make housing less affordable for the majority of Nevadans.

This bill seems like it is an unfunded mandate for local government as well as having a fiscal impact for the Housing Division and the IFC. Are we going to put those things on the bill if the amendment was processed?

CHAIR HARDY:

I will request a staff opinion.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 16, 2007
Page 10

SABRA SMITH-NEWBY (Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County):
I support A.B. 439 as amended.

SENATOR LEE:

I will make a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 439, but I have a concern. I live in a community of roughly 215,000 people where there is not one house worth \$1 million. We are already affordable, but I am willing to make a motion to work and stay affordable.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 439.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR BEERS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:

We will move to A.B. 12. It is similar to Senate Bill (S.B.) 387.

ASSEMBLY BILL 12 (1st Reprint): Provides for the replacement of the State Public Works Board. (BDR 28-193)

SENATE BILL 387 (1st Reprint): Revises various provisions governing public works and the State Public Works Board. (BDR 28-904)

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This Committee heard S.B. 387. It was declared exempt and rereferred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I spoke to the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau about A.B. 12, and they advised me they are going to declare this bill as an exempt bill under the criteria.

CHAIR HARDY:

I spoke with Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1, about this bill. The major difference is they propose to move the State Public Works Board from under the Department of Administration, making it a separate department. She indicated S.B. 387 accomplished everything else. There is a

proposed amendment germane to this topic that I proposed. I will reserve it for the Senate Floor.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO REREFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION
A.B. 12 TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:
We will move to A.B. 139.

ASSEMBLY BILL 139 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to local governmental administration. (BDR 20-325)

CHAIR HARDY:
This bill is a cleanup bill that became a Christmas tree bill. There are several proposed amendments. Sabra Smith-Newby proposed an amendment in relation to a refund of registration fees or deposits. This is to address an issue in Clark County involving refunds going through the Clark County Commission for approval.

Dan Musgrove, Clark County, proposed an amendment relative to per diem expenses. Currently, travel reimbursement is done on a receipt basis in Clark County. This amendment would change it to a per diem process.

Danny Thompson, Nevada State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, proposed an amendment relative to deputy marshals. Senator Lee also provided an amendment.

DANNY THOMPSON (Nevada State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations):

The law states that a county sheriff or deputy is required to appear in person or in court. When the Clark County courts were set up, it was done on a handshake and the Sheriff had no control or responsibilities over the deputies

who serve as bailiffs. As such, the Sheriff did not want the liability in the event of an incident.

Assembly Bill 139 was amended in the Assembly to say except in counties over 400,000. Our concern was that it left the bailiffs out in space. This amendment was negotiated with the senior judge in Clark County and Raymond J. Flynn, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. It would not upset the current law for all the other counties. The amendment would provide that bailiffs would be called district court marshals and grandfather in the current bailiffs at a Category II peace officer certification. New hires would be given 18 months to attain a Category I peace officer certification. The second provision was asked for by the judges as they needed flexibility to bring in new people.

RAYMOND J. FLYNN (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

We are in agreement with the amendment. We initially started the Christmas tree approach to A.B. 139. Although the Sheriff is required to be in district court by statute, he has not been in the Eighth Judicial District Court since the 1960s.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This would require them to be appropriately trained and certified. Is that a cost to the County? If so, we will have to put unfunded mandate language in the bill.

MR. THOMPSON:

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department provides training for the bailiffs. There would not be any cost.

MR. FLYNN:

When the bailiffs are hired by the County, they already have the certification or the County sends them to the Peace Officers' Standards and Training academy. We provide the in-service training. All peace officers are required to have 24 hours of recertification training a year, and Metro provides that.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will have Committee Counsel look at the bill and determine if we need unfunded mandate language. No one has an objection to Ms. Smith-Newby's amendment. There are three Senators objecting to Mr. Musgrove's amendment. No one objected to Mr. Thompson's amendment.

SENATOR LEE:

I have submitted an amendment ([Exhibit G](#)). Sometimes, Clark County will have a group home that is supposed to have a certain type of person with a certain amount of people, and they expand that. Clark County is looking for a bill that gives them a civil penalty. When it is a criminal penalty, they have to go through the whole legal process and keep the group home open. No civil penalty would allow the County to come in and give them a fine to try to correct the situation. If a state law provision says the fine goes to the state, the County would acquiesce that fine and the money would continue to go to the state.

CHAIR HARDY:

Civil penalties are not a new issue to the Committee. Is there a desire to include that?

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I have consistently opposed the transfer of fines that now go to the state. I could not support the amendment.

CHAIR HARDY:

Because of the Senators' dissenting votes, Senator Lee's amendment will not be included. Let us look at Mr. Musgrove's amendment. I will not support Mr. Musgrove's amendment if it will jeopardize the bill. I will accept a motion to include Ms. Smith-Newby's initial amendment on the refund language, Mr. Thompson's amendment and, if needed, unfunded mandate language.

SENATOR BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 139.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:

We will move to A.B. 253.

ASSEMBLY BILL 253 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the imposition of impact fees. (BDR 22-854)

CHAIR HARDY:

This bill regards impact fees. It was requested by Nye County. There was no controversy on the issue of clarifying the impact fees with regard to the provision of water and sewer services. There was an amendment proposed by the Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission to remove the scope of the measure of impact fees for streets. Representatives of Nye County indicated they have no objection to that amendment.

SENATOR TITUS:

Did we not hear strong opposition to the Washoe County amendment?

CHAIR HARDY:

We did. The Home Builders Association was opposed to it. I cannot support the amendment, but I told them I would bring it forth for a vote. We have gradually allowed impact fees to expand.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I agree that impact fees should be limited and have a nexus to their use. Washoe County has been fortunate to have the Regional Transportation Commission's efforts in our County. We have benefited in many ways. I would be willing to support the amendment because there is a nexus between impact fees and the street and infrastructure situation.

SENATOR CARE:

The argument on the nexus was well laid out. I think of impact fees in a smaller sphere than that.

SENATOR TITUS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 253.

SENATOR LEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:

We will move to A.B. 373.

ASSEMBLY BILL 373: Revises provisions governing general improvement districts. (BDR 25-388)

CHAIR HARDY:

This was a noncontroversial proposal regarding general improvement districts. There was a proposed amendment by Michael D. Hillerby, Coyote Springs Investment, Limited Liability Company.

SENATOR BEERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 373.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CARE:

That motion included the amendment from Mr. Hillerby. I said that I wanted to deliberate on the amendment, and I have found no case annotations under the statute. I understand what is intended.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:

We will move to A.B. 433.

ASSEMBLY BILL 433 (1st Reprint): Further limits the authority of public bodies to close meetings. (BDR 19-892)

CHAIR HARDY:

There was a consensus amendment between Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley, Assembly District No. 8; the Nevada Tax Commission; and the Office of the Attorney General. It mirrors an effort this Committee distributed with minor adjustments. I request interested Senators on this Committee be allowed to add their names as co-sponsors of the bill. All members of the Committee wish to be listed as co-sponsors.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 433.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:
We will move to A.B. 461.

ASSEMBLY BILL 461 (1st Reprint): Makes certain changes to the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005. (BDR S-1333)

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 461.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:
We will move to A.B. 462.

ASSEMBLY BILL 462 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the sale or lease of real property by governmental entities. (BDR 26-901)

CHAIR HARDY:
There are two amendments. Dan Musgrove, Clark County, proposed an amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) concerning agreements for commercial or residential use of an airport or navigation facility. This amendment is similar to what we did for the rural airports with regard to hangars. Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea, Assembly District 35, proposed an amendment making the measures of the bill apply to water districts and authorities. There is a letter from the Southern Nevada Water Authority indicating why those kinds of appraisals are important ([Exhibit I](#)). I am unable to support that amendment.

SENATOR BEERS:
Does Mr. Musgrove's amendment eliminate the requirement for two appraisals on leases around the airports in Clark County?

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 16, 2007
Page 17

DAN MUSGROVE (Clark County):

This amendment does not. This deals with the people who currently have hangars. It would allow them to continue the ownership of the hangar once the lease is up and require an appraisal to ensure they pay full market value.

SENATOR BEERS:

There is a tense mismatch that Committee Counsel will have to fix. Something grammatical is missing from the amendment.

CHAIR HARDY:

We will have Committee Counsel fix the problem.

SENATOR LEE:

I like the bill. I would like to make a motion to amend and do pass with Mr. Musgrove's amendment but without Assemblyman Goicoechea's amendment.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 462.

SENATOR TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CARE:

I have visited White Pine County and appreciate what Assemblyman Goicoechea is trying to do, but this bill is not the place.

SENATOR BEERS:

I am opposing this but reserve the right to change my opinion on the Senate Floor.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 16, 2007
Page 18

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR BEERS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR HARDY:
This meeting is adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Erin Miller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Chair

DATE: _____