

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 17, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Barbara K. Cegavske at 2:06 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17, 2007, in Room 2144 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 Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair
Senator William J. Raggio, Vice Chair
Senator Warren B. Hardy II
Senator Bob Beers
Senator Bernice Mathews
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Steven A. Horsford

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Terry Care, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7
Senator John J. Lee, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1
Senator Dennis Nolan, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel
Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst
Brian Campolieti, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

P. K. O'Neill, Chief, Records and Technology Division, Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History, Department of Public Safety
Jeremy Aguero, Applied Analysis
Tom Fronapfel, Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
The Honorable Mark Gibbons, Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court

Bruce T. Beesley, State Bar of Nevada
Jeffrey A. Fontaine, Nevada Association of Counties
J. David Fraser, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Robert Hadfield, Interim County Manager, Lyon County
Nicolas Anthony, City of Reno
Kimberly McDonald, City of North Las Vegas
Mary Henderson, City of Fallon; City of North Las Vegas
Sabra Smith-Newby, Clark County
Lisa Gianoli, Washoe County
Mary C. Walker, City of Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County;
Storey County
Liane Lee, City of Las Vegas
Rob Joiner, City of Sparks
Shaun E. Jillions, City of Henderson

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I will open this meeting with Senate Concurrent Resolution (S.C.R.) 22.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study of background investigations of persons and of records of criminal history. (BDR R-1471)

SENATOR DENNIS NOLAN (Clark County Senatorial District No. 9):

During the interim study, we looked for the ability to unravel what has become a "Rube Goldberg" situation with regard to *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 179. There are at least a dozen different ways individual organizations can request information from the Criminal Repository. With each way, they are supplied different levels of background information. For example, in the case of nonprofit organizations that work with youth, they may request information four different ways. If they access a fund which the state has created through the legislative process, they can only receive information regarding sexual offenses on those volunteers. However, they cannot receive other felony, drug or background information. On one hand, there is a financial incentive to access this information through the legislative process, or if you want to find out more information about the person you are allowing to work around youths, you would want to access NRS 179. The study would allow us to unravel what I have seen in my 12 years in the Nevada State Legislature as a problem.

P. K. O'NEILL (Chief, Records and Technology Division, Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History, Department of Public Safety):

The only study I know of with regard to S.C.R. 22 was a report done by the U.S. Attorney General called "The National Task Force on the Criminal Backgrounding of America." That was a long detailed report lacking any resolution to the methodology for addressing background information in reference to employment or volunteer acts. Depending on how background criminal information is utilized, it could actually disenfranchise about 33 percent of our employed and available population from attaining jobs. This raised a discussion on the applicability of using background information not only for licensing but volunteering. This is why Senator Nolan created S.C.R. 22. We need this study. We provide criminal histories requested by employers in which they can make a decision whether to license or hire the individual. Other agencies are restricted from doing this.

Many people use the title background investigation when all they are doing is a fingerprint-based criminal history check. They are not truly conducting a background investigation. A qualified investigation consists of contacting all sources and confirming a person's life history. We also have civil name checks which is a computerized name check not based upon fingerprints which are unique identifiers. This system could be particularly useful in volunteer organizations where the sports activity may only be two months. This is where a study could help in bringing all this information together in a unified effort.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The reason I signed on to S.C.R. 22 with Senator Nolan is because as a former employer, I would send employees to get their sheriff's card, thinking they would receive a background check. Later, we found that not to be the case, which surprised us. We were informed of employees' backgrounds after they had embezzled money from our store. When I was in the Nevada State Assembly, I took a tour of the Criminal Repository and found they could only do so much because the cost prohibited them from retrieving background information. This Committee needs to give S.C.R. 22 serious consideration for a study to look at what we are getting for the money.

MR. O'NEILL:

My staff and I have gone from a four-month turnaround for fingerprint responses to under three weeks. We have a goal of five days or less.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
April 17, 2007
Page 4

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Three weeks to get a fingerprint check is too long to wait. Why does it take three weeks?

MR. O'NEILL:

Seventy-five percent of our civil fingerprints are submitted to us in hard copy. The hard copy then has to be mailed, scanned and processed.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

My place of employment requires a ten-year background check, fingerprints and an iris scan as well. It takes only three days to get this information back to the employer. So why does it take you longer?

MR. O'NEILL:

It takes us three hours or less for criminal response times because they are electronically submitted and transferred to our system as well as through the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) system. The FBI system currently takes about two months. We handle about 15,000 hard copy civil fingerprint cards per month.

SENATOR NOLAN:

Mr. O'Neill and I have discussed a potential amendment to S.C.R. 22 which would pair down the proposed committee by not including as many Legislators as members. We are proposing to limit Legislator membership to one member.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

You would have one appointed by the Majority Leader of the Nevada State Senate, one by the Speaker of the Nevada State Assembly and one from each Judiciary Committee.

SENATOR NOLAN:

It was suggested the Chair be elected amongst the members at their first meeting. I will provide the proposed amendment to the Committee before you go into a work session on this bill. I will give the Committee a short overview of the proposed amendment now. It would delete the Director of the Department of Corrections or his designee and substitute the Director of the Department of Public Safety or his designee. The amendment also proposes to remove lines 18, 19, 20 and 21 from page 2 of S.C.R. 22. We would remove the number of district attorneys on lines 22, 23 and 24 of S.C.R. 22 and insert the Attorney

General of Nevada or his designee. We would include one member who is a representative of the Judicial Branch of the State of Nevada, one member appointed by the Public Defender's Office and one member appointed by the Governor who uses the Central Repository to obtain information relating to records of criminal history for purposes other than criminal justice which may include but not be limited to determining eligibility of persons for employment or licensure. Because we thought an end user should be involved in this, one member who represents a nonprofit organization that uses the Central Repository would be appointed by the Governor.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 22 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 15.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study of the establishment of a state lottery if the 74th Session of the Nevada Legislature enacts a constitutional amendment authorizing a state lottery. (BDR R-287)

SENATOR NOLAN:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 proposes an interim study regarding the establishment of a state lottery. The study will examine whether or not a state lottery will have an adverse impact on the financial status of Nevada's gaming industry. The study would explore whether a state lottery would create social problems and if these problems would create a new class of problem gamblers. In addition, a study would discover if there could be financial benefits to Nevada with revenue gathered from a lottery. After the study, a trailer bill would be subsequently created in the following Legislative Session in order to discuss where and how to dedicate the revenue.

It is important to understand why we have a resolution rather than a bill. I spoke with members of the gaming industry during the interim who represented three of the largest gaming entities in Nevada. I received their input, which was mostly negative, with regard to a state lottery. After this, the gaming industry did its own study that concluded it would not be in Nevada's best interest to introduce a state lottery. I presented that study to a number of national lottery experts who provided recommendations for a study. Their recommendations concluded it was in Nevada's best interest to pursue a state lottery. With that information, I did not need to go forward with the resolution because there was not enough to create a state lottery at this time. However, we should stop

having anecdotal and second-party information with regard to whether Nevada should have a lottery. We will deal with this every session until we have a nonbiased and impartial study that is complete and allows opinions by all interested parties. That is what S.C.R. 15 intends to do.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Are you trying to withdraw S.C.R. 15?

SENATOR NOLAN:

No, my intent is to move forward with S.C.R. 15 and conduct an interim study with regard to the pros and cons of a state lottery. I am trying to be straightforward with my findings on this subject.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would the people who come to Nevada to administer a statewide lottery be licensed? I have rarely heard beneficial information from legislators in other states with lotteries. I have been told the administration costs are high, and the expected funding for education facilities is not what is expected.

SENATOR NOLAN:

The two sources I contacted asked not to be revealed because they do business with the gaming industry in Nevada. However, the study they conducted showed the net revenue gains could be between \$35 million and \$65 million annually with all administrative expenses paid.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

When they say could be, is that based on other states?

SENATOR NOLAN:

The study was thorough in that regard. They looked at what is done in other states as well as the range of net revenue.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The other concern I have is the competition it will create with the gaming industry.

SENATOR NOLAN:

The study proposes to deal with that issue. The gaming industry has contended we will be in direct conflict by having the state administer a lottery. The

opposition to that idea has stated that is not necessarily true because what discretionary dollars people may use on lottery tickets does not always equate to the amount of money spent in casinos. This study will hear from both sides and attempt to discover the truth those issues raise.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 will provide for an interim study. All items included in the review are necessary and an integral part of such a study. We will probably be limited to six studies, three from this House and three from the other House. Would this study only occur if the other bill being considered in the Senate Judiciary Committee passes? Or would the study be conducted whether or not the proposal to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* is passed this session? As I understand the language in S.C.R. 15, this study would only trigger if that occurred. I have had reservations whether a statewide lottery would be productive. Regardless of who does the study, this could be important to Nevada.

SENATOR NOLAN:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 originally started as a bill. When I withdrew my resolution to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* for a lottery, I asked that this be turned into an interim study. This study will allow the gaming industry to make their case. If this study is done, the Legislature could use it as reference in future Legislative sessions. I will accept any amendments to S.C.R. 15 as the Committee works on it.

JEREMY AGUERO (Applied Analysis):

My firm was employed by the gaming industry to perform a peer-reviewed analysis associated with the potential of operating a statewide lottery in Nevada. Our analysis does not draw any conclusions with regard to whether a lottery is good or bad for Nevada. I provided the details of our study to the Committee ([Exhibit C](#) and [Exhibit D](#), original is on file in the Research Library). We concluded a statewide lottery would generate \$51 million a year in profit to the state. We also concluded if the state taxed the same amount of spending at a rate three times what that spending would be taxed, that would have some negative impact on the economy. The third portion of our study looked at the fiscal impacts associated with a lottery and concluded some of these dollars are currently subject to tax, be those gaming taxes, retail sales taxes and Live Entertainment Taxes. The final portion of our analysis dealt with the social attributes of a lottery. Traditionally, a lottery is viewed as a regressive form of

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
April 17, 2007
Page 8

taxation. Historically, there have been problems with lotteries, although they are used in 42 states and the District of Columbia to fund general programs or special programs.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 15 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 17.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17: Urges the Governor to name the new Department of Motor Vehicles building in North Las Vegas after former Speaker of the Assembly Paul W. May, Jr. (BDR R-181)

SENATOR JOHN J. LEE (Clark County Senatorial District No. 1):

I provided a handout with additional information regarding S.C.R. 17 ([Exhibit E](#)). There are wonderful people in North Las Vegas who have never had the opportunity to be recognized for their work and endeavors. As I was looking for someone to honor, I found former Assemblyman Paul W. May, Jr. While investigating what buildings to put his name on, I could only find a new Department of Motor Vehicles building in North Las Vegas. My goal is not to change the name of the building but to put former Assemblyman May's name on it in honor of him.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Is there a prison in North Las Vegas?

SENATOR LEE:

There is a list of prisons in [Exhibit E](#).

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Why not put his name on a prison?

SENATOR LEE:

Former Assemblyman May had nothing to do with corrections; his forte in the Legislature was transportation.

SENATOR BEERS:

The prison in North Las Vegas is already in the process of being renamed.

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

We do not support naming our facilities after individuals. Historically, we have designated the names by virtue of their locations. In Las Vegas for example, our four metropolitan offices are commonly known as Henderson, East Sahara, West Flamingo and North Decatur. Should the Legislature choose to support S.C.R. 17, there will be a fiscal impact by virtue of any signage required.

SENATOR LEE:

I will pay for that if cost becomes an issue.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you be opposed to the recommendation that you leave the name of the building the same and add former Assemblyman May's name? Is that an issue for you?

MR. FRONAPFEL:

That is not an issue. We will continue to call the facility North Decatur by virtue of customer service. It is easier for our customers to identify locations of buildings by virtue of the street name or the city in which they are located.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Can I put you as neutral on the bill?

MR. FRONAPFEL:

Yes, you may put me as neutral.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 17 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 505.

ASSEMBLY BILL 505: Changes the period for the filing of declarations, acceptances and certificates of candidacy for certain judicial offices. (BDR 24-652)

THE HONORABLE MARK GIBBONS (Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court):

We appreciate the efforts of the Legislature as well as Senator Raggio for making the issue of judicial reform a priority for this Session. Judges are elected in Nevada, and our Judiciary wants to do whatever possible to restrict

unnecessary fund-raising in judicial elections. Judicial elections should be conducted differently than Legislative and Executive elections. The full term of office for judicial races is six years. Our last major judicial election was in 2002. Approximately 60 percent of statewide district court races in 2002 were uncontested, and one of two Nevada Supreme Court races was uncontested as well. Unfortunately, with the current May filing date having an August primary, all judicial candidates must commence fund-raising long before they know they have an opponent. It is critical for the Legislature to address the filing date issue this session since 56 of our current 64 district court races are up for election in 2008, together with two Supreme Court seats and 33 percent of our 60 justices of the peace.

Much like members of the Legislature, judges spend most of their working days in court. We take our reading materials home at night to prepare for court the next day. We also have other duties such as reviewing search warrants and events taking place outside normal working hours. Many times, judges will get calls in the middle of the night to review search warrants or authorize a telephonic search warrant. Judges can do their job best if they are working rather than fund-raising and campaigning. If the Senate sees fit to pass A.B. 505, the majority of the Nevada Supreme Court has agreed to change Canon 5C(2) of the *Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct* to prohibit the solicitation of fund-raising in any Supreme Court, district court or justice court race by any candidate unless the race is contested. Currently, any judicial candidate can commence fund-raising 240 days before the primary election. If A.B. 505 becomes law, the Supreme Court will delay the period to commence fund-raising until after the close of the filing date. Under A.B. 505, the judicial filing date in 2008 will commence on Monday, January 7, and end Friday, January 18. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday is the third Monday of January and would not be affected by A.B. 505. Assembly Bill 505 is supported by the State Bar of Nevada, MGM Mirage Corporation, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada and Craig Walton from the Nevada Center for Public Ethics.

BRUCE T. BEESLEY (State Bar of Nevada):

I am speaking in support of A.B. 505. In order to have an effective judiciary in any system, you must have an impartial judiciary. We have a problem in Nevada where citizens do not think our judges are impartial. It is not necessary in Nevada for a judge to disclose they have received a contribution from someone appearing in front of them. The people who contribute money to judges are

lawyers and large businesses. Assembly Bill 505 will eliminate this impediment and the negative perception much of the population has toward judges.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I would like to make a disclosure. Mr. Beesley is the spouse of one of my law partners, and that will not influence my ultimate decision on A.B. 505.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on A.B. 505 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 10.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning the powers delegated to local governments. (BDR R-446)

SENATOR TERRY CARE (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):

The State of Nevada is not a home rule state and it is not my intent to make it so. It is not a home rule state by virtue of Dillon's Rule. The language in Dillon's Rule is frequently cited with an 1868 Iowa Supreme Court case. In a nutshell, it means that unless a legislature empowers a local government or political subdivision to do something, then that entity cannot do it. I found an 1876 Nevada Supreme Court case in which Dillon's Rule is cited on municipal corporations. The transcript from the Nevada Supreme Court case of *State ex rel. Rosenstock v. Swift*, 11 Nev 128 (1876), states:

It is a well-settled principle of law that a municipal corporation possesses and can exercise such powers only as are expressly conferred by the law of its creation, or such as are necessary to the exercise of its corporate powers, the performance of its corporate duties, and the accomplishment of the purposes for which it was created.

Dillon's Rule has been around since Nevada became a state. Article 8, section 8 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* states:

The legislature shall provide for the organization of cities and towns by general laws and shall restrict their power of taxation, assessment, borrowing money, contracting debts and loaning their credit, except for procuring supplies of water; provided, however, that the legislature may, by general laws, in the manner and to the

extent therein provided, permit and authorize the electors of any city or town to frame, adopt and amend a charter for its own government, or to amend any existing charter of such city or town.

I also bring your attention to Article 4, sections 25, 26 and 32. There is no home rule for counties because no constitutional statutory provision relates to home rule for county governments. With respect to cities, Nevada has an NRS chapter that governs general charter cities like Ely, Fallon, Fernley, Lovelock, Mesquite, West Wendover and Winnemucca and special charter cities like Boulder City, Caliente, Carlin, Carson City, Elko, Henderson, Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Reno, Sparks, Wells and Yerington.

Not all states have adopted Dillon's Rule. There are 31 Dillon's Rule states, 10 home rule states and 9 states that have Dillon's Rule for certain types of municipalities. There are four primary areas in which home rule powers are exercised by government: structural power, functional power, fiscal power and personnel power. I am requesting the creation of a study to determine if we can find a way to make life easier for all of us. Cities and counties would be better off not having to come to the Legislature every session with requests. The Legislature has a limited amount of time to deal with all requests every two years. I provided the full list of bill draft requests (BDR) for the past three Legislative Sessions ([Exhibit F](#)), ([Exhibit G](#)) and ([Exhibit H](#)) as an example of the amount of BDRs we encounter. I can imagine Committee members have felt the frustration that comes from the cities and counties. Some things the Legislature deals with would be best left to the local jurisdictions. [Exhibit F](#) shows of a total of 1,577 BDRs, 180 relate to local functions. Many occasions, I have wondered why the Legislature is dealing with local government issues. These functions should be left to the local governments. This would not be the first time this Legislature has looked at this issue; there was a study conducted following the 1951 Session and another following the 1963 Session. I am unsure what those studies found, but they are probably irrelevant to anything we might examine in 2007.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would the proposed study help reduce the amount of bills those entities would bring forward to the Legislature?

SENATOR CARE:

It would mean fewer bills for us.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This sounds like a worthwhile study. Every time the Legislature has come close to allowing home rule, there was an eruption at the local level with the cities and counties at each others' throats. In addition, there was always a concern we would get a patchwork of provisions dealing with fiscal or non-fiscal matters because of the diversity of the state. We are already experiencing problems with salaries. Some local governments are able to provide high salaries the state cannot match. Certainly the proposed study will help the Legislature find a solution to these problems.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

When we refer to local government, how broad is that term? Does it cover school boards and special improvement districts?

SENATOR CARE:

The *Constitution of the State of Nevada* addresses counties and cities, and that is what I have in mind here.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Could you clarify that? There are issues among our school boards on how their governance operates and how much authority they receive from the Legislature.

SENATOR CARE:

When I requested this, I had primarily cities and counties in mind. However, Senator Horsford makes a good point.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

The study might point that out if S.C.R. 10 is chosen as a study authorized by the Legislature. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 is a great idea, and I support it.

JEFFREY A. FONTAINE (Nevada Association of Counties):

We thank Senator Care for recognizing the significance of this issue and bringing S.C.R. 10 forward. We support S.C.R. 10 and urge the Committee to support it as well. The delegation of powers to local governments has been an important issue for Nevada counties for many years. The role of counties has been to serve as an administrative arm to the state by maintaining records; providing courts, law enforcement, fire protection and building inspections; assessing property and collecting taxes. We hope one of the outcomes of the

proposed study would give counties flexibility and authority to be responsive and efficient in delivery of day-to-day services to our constituents. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 will provide the opportunity to examine how we can best serve the growing and changing needs of Nevada.

J. DAVID FRASER (Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

The League supports S.C.R. 10 and also thanks Senator Care for bringing it forward. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 will grant the opportunity to collect the facts and put them in perspective. In response to Senator Horsford's question, as general improvement districts and unincorporated towns are creatures of the county, they would be incorporated in terms of a study of counties.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

How much do these studies cost and are local governments willing to share in the expense of a study?

BRENDA J. ERDOES (Legislative Counsel):

Two task force studies for this session cost approximately \$22,000.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

It depends on whether the interim study is done without the necessity for hiring outside consultants. This study most likely will not require a consultant group. It will depend on what type input will be needed.

MS. ERDOES:

The amount in the proposed budget for the six interim studies is \$80,000.

SENATOR CARE:

I do not envision a consultant. The resources to do this are in-house.

ROBERT HADFIELD (Interim County Manager, Lyon County):

We support S.C.R. 10. Every session, we continue to bring back a number of bills. Lyon County will provide technical expertise to the study and make our people available to answer questions and collect data.

NICOLAS ANTHONY (City of Reno):

The City of Reno supports S.C.R. 10 as well and will assist the study if needed. The time is right to at least look at the issue.

KIMBERLY McDONALD (City of North Las Vegas):

Home rule has been a reoccurring issue, and we are pleased to hear the receptivity toward S.C.R. 10. We brought forth a bill during the 73rd Session which helped us to improve one of our processes. This bill enabled the City Council to take action on an ordinance at a second regularly scheduled meeting as opposed to their next scheduled meeting. Something as minor as that assisted us internally.

MARY HENDERSON (City of Fallon; City of North Las Vegas):

The issue of home rule is something we need to look at as a state. We support S.C.R. 10 and urge the Committee's support as well. At the city level, we track anywhere from 5 to 800 bills having some kind of impact on us every session. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 will streamline the legislative process.

SABRA SMITH-NEWBY (Clark County):

We support S.C.R. 10.

LISA GIANOLI (Washoe County):

We support S.C.R. 10, and Washoe County will be happy to participate in any way if the study should go forward.

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

The 240 local governments in Nevada make this a complex issue. We support S.C.R. 10 as well.

LIANE LEE (City of Las Vegas):

We support S.C.R. 10.

ROB JOINER (City of Sparks):

We see opportunities to come from the study whether for home rule or something in between. Some of the local community standard issues can be sufficiently dealt with at the local level without taking up the Legislature's time. We will offer our time and support to the study if they request it.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
April 17, 2007
Page 16

SHAUN E. JILLIONS (City of Henderson):
We support S.C.R. 10.

SENATOR CARE:

The intent is to make life easier for all of us. I realize a set number of interim studies may be approved. I hope the Committee sees the point and gives all due deliberation. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 will benefit Legislators and local governments as well.

SENATOR CARE:

This study is overdue, and I support S.C.R. 10. The study will provide Legislators with the answers to local government questions.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 10 and will accept a motion to introduce a BDR for a concurrent resolution to memorialize JohnD Nevers Winters.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO INITIATE A BILL DRAFT REQUEST TO
MEMORIALIZE JOHND NEVERS WINTERS.

SENATOR WIENER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR RAGGIO WAS ABSENT FOR THE
VOTE.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
April 17, 2007
Page 17

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

If there is nothing else to come before this Committee, I adjourn the Senate Committee on Legislative Operation and Elections at 3:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Brian Campolieti,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair

DATE: _____