

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
May 22, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Barbara K. Cegavske at 2:12 p.m. on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, in Room 2144 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 Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair
Senator Warren B. Hardy II
Senator Bernice Mathews
Senator Valerie Wiener
Senator Steven A. Horsford

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator William J. Raggio, Vice Chair (Excused)
Senator Bob Beers (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dennis Nolan, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9
Senator Michael A. Schneider, Clark County Senatorial District No. 11
Senator Dina Titus, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7
Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District No. 40
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kimberly Marsh Guinasso, Assembly Legal Counsel and Bill Drafting Adviser
Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst
Brian Campolieti, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nicolas C. Anthony, Legislative Relations Administration, City of Reno
Katy Singlaub, Manager, Washoe County
Rob Joiner, City of Sparks
Carole A. Vilardo, Nevada Taxpayers Association
John H. Emerson, California-Nevada Conference, General Board of Church and Society, The United Methodist Church
William P. Freed, Religious Alliance in Nevada
Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County
Larry D. Struve, Religious Alliance in Nevada
Robert Cashell, Mayor, City of Reno
Mark R. Vincent, City of Las Vegas
Jacob Snow, General Manager, Regional Transportation Commission
Lydia Ball, Sierra Club
Zev Kaplan, General Counsel, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Richann Johnson, California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission
Pilar M. Weiss, Culinary Workers Union Local 226
Hal Taylor
Lynn Chapman, Nevada Eagle Forum
Matt Griffin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League
Kim R. Wallin, State Controller
Maud Naroll, Budget Division, Department of Administration

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I open this meeting with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 484.

ASSEMBLY BILL 484: Requires the Legislative Committee on Education to study certain issues during the 2007-2009 interim. (BDR S-1372)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BONNIE PARNELL (Assembly District No. 40):

Assembly Bill 484 asks for the Legislative Committee on Education to be given the opportunity to study the issue of testing in the public schools during the interim. The study will include a review of the tests required by the state including, but without limitation, those required by federal law. The State of Nevada administers federally mandated tests, state mandated tests and individual school district tests. The bill allows the Chair of the Legislative

Committee on Education to create a subcommittee and appoint certain members to conduct a study regarding issues of testing. This study is needed as a result of the amount of time preparation for tests takes away from school instruction.

I provided a "Report of District Testing Practices and Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2005-2006" ([Exhibit C](#), original is on file in the Research Library). You will find valuable information within [Exhibit C](#) to help inform you of this issue. Nevada's public school students, including students enrolled in charter schools, participate in various forms of assessment from kindergarten through Grade 12. This includes state-mandated and local assessments. The test results are used for a number of reasons ranging from individual student placement and guiding student instruction to public assessment of school and district academic efficiency and progress. The Nevada High School Proficiency Examination is required to graduate from high school and the National Assessment of Educational Progress test is used to determine compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Approximately \$10.1 million is invested in state and district assessment programs. Of that amount, over \$8 million is spent to support state-mandated assessments alone. School districts and charter schools are responsible for 19 percent of that total budget. Furthermore, school districts and charter schools spent an additional \$3 million. These are some of the reasons which make it important to study these issues in order to maximize instruction time for students.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on [A.B. 484](#) and open the hearing on [Senate Bill \(S.B.\) 392](#).

[SENATE BILL 392 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Directs the Legislative Commission to appoint a legislative committee to conduct an interim study on tolling projects.
(BDR S-815)

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

[Senate Bill 392](#) came about as the result of a bill which initially included the ability for the state to enter into certain public-private partnership arrangements for the construction of capital projects. However, it turned out the state already had the ability to do this. As a result, we thought it would be better to take this bill and incorporate its tenets into the Governor's Public-Private Partnership Advisory Panel which will consider the impact of toll projects on the state. I will withdraw [S.B. 392](#) if this Committee will initiate a letter to the Chair of the

Governor's Advisory Panel on Public-Private Partnerships, urging the tenets requested in this bill be included in their studies.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

If that is what you desire, we will accept your withdrawal. Senate Bill 392 is hereby withdrawn by the request of the sponsor. I close the hearing on S.B. 392 and open the hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution (S.C.R.) 42.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42: Provides for an interim study regarding taxation. (BDR R-1385)

MICHELLE L. VAN GEEL (Committee Policy Analyst):

Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 directs the Legislative Commission to conduct a comprehensive interim study of taxation in Nevada with primary emphasis on—but without limitation to—the equity, distribution and adequacy of all existing taxes, and secondary emphasis on the feasibility and functionality of future revenue sources of all governmental units. The study will consist of three members from the Assembly and three from the Senate.

NICOLAS C. ANTHONY (Legislative Relations Administration, City of Reno):

The City of Reno supports S.C.R. 42. We provided an amendment to the bill ([Exhibit D](#)) which can be used as part of the study or a separate vehicle if you so choose. [Exhibit D](#) asks for an independent audit to be conducted in Washoe County for the cities of Reno, Sparks as well as the County. The audit will be paid for and selected by the three entities. In addition, we provided background information dealing with this issue ([Exhibit E](#)). Since the Consolidated Tax Distribution (CTX) was created in 1998, the City of Reno has lost nearly \$14 million in revenue. That gap will widen to nearly \$74 million by 2015, which is why we need this independent audit.

KATY SINGLAUB (Manager, Washoe County):

I am here in support of S.C.R. 42 and oppose the idea of an amendment to direct a binding study of CTX for Washoe County only. If Washoe County is following state law in allocation of its consolidated taxes, then any study must be a study of state tax law and its statewide impacts on the adequacy of basic revenues to meet local government mandates. If the distribution formula directed by state law is broken, it is broken throughout the state, not just in Washoe County. Neither Washoe County, Sparks nor Reno have enough revenue from consolidated taxes and other sources to keep up. Our 2007-2008

budget will fall far behind inflation and the effects of population growth because consolidated taxes do not keep up. As a result, we will have to dip into our fund balance this year in order to balance the budget. To look at only one revenue source in one county will do nothing constructive to solve the fiscal issues in our region and may do harm. Therefore, we oppose [Exhibit D](#). A study completed by a California consulting firm had significant errors totaling more than \$27 million and reached erroneous conclusions as a result. We would welcome an audit of all revenues and expenditures for all three local governments in our area as well as a statewide review of taxation. However, a study of a single revenue in one county is misguided and fails to respect the complex historical nature of what consolidated taxes were designed to do. Washoe County is an export county for consolidated taxes and provides financial support to rural counties as well. Any change to the distribution formula could affect these rural counties.

ROB JOINER (City of Sparks):

The City of Sparks supports S.C.R. 42. Creating a flexible and adequate revenue structure for state and local governments will be beneficial.

CAROLE A. VILARDO (Nevada Taxpayers Association):

I oppose S.C.R. 42. Rather than initiating another tax study, I suggest the Legislature look at parameters for expenditures and priorities. Expenditures are what drive the need for additional taxes and revenue. I urge this Committee to reject the idea of a tax study.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would your proposed study include counties and cities as well as the entire state?

Ms. VILARDO:

I would have no problem with that.

JOHN H. EMERSON (California-Nevada Conference, General Board of Church and Society, The United Methodist Church):

We support S.C.R. 42. Those of us from the faith community care deeply about fair and equitable taxation policies. The purpose of government is to provide for the general welfare of people. It is important to look at taxation policy within a broader framework of budgetary priority policies. Many changes in the last four years justify the need for a new study. I am tired of Nevada being referred

to as a state near the top of bad lists and the bottom of good lists. We can change that through good taxation policy.

WILLIAM P. FREED (Religious Alliance in Nevada):

The creation of this interim tax study is commendable, and this Committee and the Legislature will rightly have the gratitude of Nevadans. The last comprehensive review of taxation was done by the 1989 Session of the Nevada Legislature and published in 1990 as *A Fiscal Agenda for Nevada* by Robert D. Ebel. The preface of the report stated, "This study provides the tools whereby the Governor and the Legislature can construct a fair and adequate tax structure for the future." Major conclusions of this report were that the state tax system produces revenues narrowly in balance with expenditures; Nevada's state and local fiscal arrangements need to go through a thorough sorting out process; the state and local tax system is unfair; and the system has undesirable built-in institutional rigidities. A majority of your time as Legislators is wasted listening to lobbyists complain and protest against paying taxes. I suggest the creation of a Nevada Master Tax Plan as outlined in ([Exhibit F](#)) as well as a proposal done by a working group drawn from a wide representation of taxpayers. The proposals in [Exhibit F](#) are to be edited and presented by the interim committee to the 75th Session of the Nevada Legislature.

The Nevada Master Tax Plan is patterned after the familiar land use master plans of our various planning agencies. The plan should be updated every ten years with variance hearings by the interim Legislative Commission or in the first two weeks of every session. Once the master plan is adopted, the tax rates are annually indexed by the decrease or increase of budget to provide for a balanced budget. I suggest a reserve of 25 percent to 50 percent of annual expenditures to allow a buffer or rate smoothing of tax rates without the need for emergency sessions of the Legislature. We, as Nevadans, have a unique opportunity to adopt a system of taxation which allows the Legislature to concentrate on the operations of state government and the supporting budgets rather than providing revenue. The increase in oversight will reduce costly mistakes in government, such as the Galena Creek Bridge, and allow the provisions of reasonable and necessary social services at a reduced tax burden. The adoption of this policy needs the agreement by a relatively small number of taxpaying entities in the case of Nevada as opposed to the overwhelming number of approvals necessary in larger states.

SABRA SMITH-NEWBY (Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County):
Clark County generally supports a policy which looks at tax structure. However, we also understand the frustrations of taxpayers. We support S.C.R. 42 as written.

LARRY D. STRUVE (Religious Alliance in Nevada):
I provided a statement from the Religious Alliance in Nevada to the Committee ([Exhibit G](#)). The Religious Alliance in Nevada has been aware of Mr. Freed's discussions with many Senators regarding the subject of taxation. The Committee will find the Religious Alliance in Nevada's basis for support of S.C.R. 42 in [Exhibit G](#). We urge the Committee's support of S.C.R. 42.

ROBERT CASHELL (Mayor, City of Reno):
The City of Reno supports S.C.R. 42. I am unsure why Washoe County opposes an audit. Over the last seven years, Washoe County has had a \$35 million to \$55 million ending balance. We need the Legislature to help us get a binding agreement and audit in order to settle this issue.

MARK R. VINCENT (City of Las Vegas):
The CTX formula is fair and equitable. The City of Las Vegas cannot support a statewide CTX review unless it is part of an overall comprehensive revenue study.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
Is it not possible for a statewide CTX to be part of what the Committee reviews?

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
We can amend the bill however we need.

SENATOR HORSFORD:
The language of the bill speaks of a comprehensive review of state tax structure. Will that include CTX? Is the language in the amendment adequate enough to include that discussion?

KIMBERLY MARSH GUINASSO (Assembly Legal Counsel and Bill Drafting Adviser):
The structure of the bill will allow for a look at CTX. If it is the Committee's pleasure to look at the CTX formula, it should be stipulated in the bill.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 22, 2007
Page 8

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Would that pinpoint one specific-type tax to consider differently than all other taxes under consideration? I do not want an emphasis on CTX alone.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We can add language stating: "to include the CTX." Can we do that?

Ms. GUINASSO:

The language set forth in the bill states the:

Legislative Commission is hereby directed to conduct a comprehensive interim study of taxation in Nevada, with primary emphasis on, but without limitation, the equity, distribution and adequacy of all existing taxes.

We can add "all existing taxes, including without limitation"

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 42 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 43.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study of mass transit for the City of Las Vegas. (BDR R-1003)

SENATOR MICHAEL A. SCHNEIDER (Clark County Senatorial District No. 11):

We need to look at creating a bullet train system from southern California to Las Vegas as well as consider developing a mass transit system from the Ivanpah Valley Airport. We cannot put all those taxicabs and buses on Interstate 15. We need to create a plan of how to move employees in and out of the Resort Corridor; that should be part of the study as well. Las Vegas will benefit from continual busing of people in and out of the work zone. Unless we expand mass transit throughout Las Vegas, we will not be able to build roads fast enough. Every road is at capacity upon completion. I frequently drive from Las Vegas to Los Angeles, which has become a nine-hour trip. It should be a three and a half-hour drive. Traffic is normally stopped between Baker and Barstow, California, for 40 miles. That gridlock will eventually destroy Nevada's budget.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Initially, you had the entire state involved in the study. Do you want to strictly study transportation in the south now?

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Yes, this study will strictly be for the south. If you would like to involve the north, I have no problem with that.

JACOB SNOW (General Manager, Regional Transportation Commission):

We support S.C.R. 43. I provided a colorful graphic showing the demographic density for Las Vegas ([Exhibit H](#)). Thirty percent of auto traffic in the highest job concentration area is from employees. We need to connect the population areas with the employment areas better than we do now. The proposed study will only help improve our quality of life as well as our economy.

SENATOR HARDY:

These are good and important ideas; however, we traditionally set these projects up to fail because there is an expectation they will be self-funding. If S.C.R. 43 is processed, I would like the Committee to consider language indicating that self-funding not be an expectation of the Legislature. We have a mentality that asphalt is the only legitimate expense of taxpayers' dollars. We need to get away from that and find an alternative way to travel.

LYDIA BALL (Sierra Club):

We support S.C.R. 43. I work 11 miles from my home in Las Vegas and it takes me 45 minutes to travel that distance. If mass transit was available in Las Vegas, I would be sure to ride it in order to cut the travel time in half.

ZEV KAPLAN (General Counsel, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):

I presented a proposed amendment to the Committee ([Exhibit I](#)). If you process S.C.R. 43, we would like the study to include the authorizing and enabling statutes. We would like all taxes for transit projects in *Nevada Revised Statutes* consolidated into one meaningful statute enabling the Regional Transportation Commission to perform their functions.

RICHANN JOHNSON (California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission):

We support S.C.R. 43. The Commission is doing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Las Vegas to Anaheim train. We would like

to share this information with the proposed study group in order to address any questions.

PILAR M. WEISS (Culinary Workers Union Local 226):

We support S.C.R. 43. I represent 60,000 members who work in the congested areas presented in [Exhibit H](#) and would welcome the state examining this issue in great detail.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 43 and open the hearing on A.B. 328.

ASSEMBLY BILL 328 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to elections.
(BDR 24-1045)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH (Assembly District No. 30):

Assembly Bill 328 was crafted by a group of Washoe County citizens who wish to improve the election process. They contacted me regarding this legislation and we worked together on it. Although there is one adjustment needing to be made, this is a clean bill which will lead to improvements in our voting process.

HAL TAYLOR:

Assembly Bill 328 is not an omnibus election reform bill. It is focused and intends to facilitate voting as well as protect the integrity of the voting process. Section 1 applies to situations where two or more election boards are in the same locality. Sometimes there will be a long line in front of one and a short line in front of another. This allows a poll manager to reassign election officers to take care of this situation. Section 2 clarifies what the law is regarding the Secretary of State's powers and how he can utilize the resources of the Attorney General's Office or the local district attorney to investigate and prosecute violations of election law. Section 4 addresses situations when election board members do not show up. Section 4, subsections 4 and 5 give the authority to the poll manager to appoint someone who is qualified to fill the vacancy. Section 5 provides that a person of at least 65 years of age or those with a physical disability or condition which substantially impairs their ability to go to the polling place may request an absentee ballot for the election immediately following the date on which the county clerk receives the ballot. Section 8 is clarification language with regard to submitting applications to register to vote. Section 10, subsection 2 is the Attorney General's amendment to the bill. The integrity to the election process is critical to democracy. The

Attorney General inserted this language to dissuade anyone from tampering with the election process by making such interference a Category B felony. Lastly, absentee voting language is found in two places in the bill. One of those refers to the county clerk and the other refers to the city clerk.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Why did you change the language in section 5, subsection 2?

MR. TAYLOR:

That is a change in order. The actual change is in section 5, subsections 5 and 6 with regard to those who have to proactively advise election authorities of a continuing disability in order to maintain their ability to vote by absentee ballot.

MS. GUINASSO:

The reason we had to rewrite the reference to 65 years of age or the physical disability was to put in the two new paragraphs (a) and (b). That was necessary to make the distinction between a request for an absentee ballot on one election or all elections.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Nevada Eagle Forum):

We support A.B. 328. However, in section 2, subsection 2, the county clerks and citizens should have the same ability to report any violations.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Can you already do that?

MS. GUINASSO:

I do not see anything about getting requests. The Attorney General and district attorneys have concurrent jurisdiction.

MS. CHAPMAN:

Instead of the county clerk going to the Secretary of State, citizens should be able to go to the Attorney General and district attorneys as well.

MR. TAYLOR:

We addressed the issue of a possibility of direct requests by citizens, however, given the statutory language, it was a larger issue than we wanted to address.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 22, 2007
Page 12

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would that preclude a citizen or county clerk now?

Ms. GUINASSO:

It will not. I am unsure if the Attorney General or district attorneys can refuse to hear a concern brought forward by anyone other than the Secretary of State.

MATT GRIFFIN (Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State):

Currently, individual citizens can go directly to the Attorney General or district attorney. The Secretary of State's Office is in full support of A.B. 328. However, we have an issue with one provision of which I spoke to Ms. Guinasso.

Ms. GUINASSO:

Section 10, subsection 2 sets forth a minimum and maximum term for the Category B felony of tampering or interfering with a mechanical voting system with the intent of influencing the outcome of an election. The minimum term needs to be at least 40 percent of the maximum term, so the mathematics do not work out properly. To get to a minimum of 5 years, the maximum needs to be no less than 13 years.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on A.B. 328 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 45.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning growth control measures.
(BDR R-1477)

SENATOR HARDY:

I am attempting to accomplish something similar to S.C.R. 42. We may be able to combine both resolutions if we decide to proceed with this concept. I have no concern with a local government deciding they want to have a growth ordinance. However, I want accounting for the impact that decision is going to have on related entities. The state should be able to determine whether it will adversely impact the rest of the state. We have a fiscal responsibility as the state to set parameters so someone cannot make a decision on growth that impacts their neighbors. I propose we fold S.C.R. 45 into S.C.R. 42.

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

Growth control measures can mean many different things to different local governments however they choose to enact them. I have concern about what we are studying. Are we studying existing or future measures?

SENATOR HARDY:

The study can help determine what ought to be included in the final product. That is part of the reason I opted for a study.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 45 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 41. Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 creates a mechanism whereby the Senate can quickly update agreed-upon critical areas of performance. We will demonstrate a detailed understanding of how the performance will be measured and provide detailed analysis on how findings could or should be tied to that performance. We will develop a comprehensive review and agreement on how all departments are implementing safeguards for Nevada's assets, and when a department is not meeting standards, ensure we have compared the way we measure our performance with other comparable states.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study of performance standards for state agencies. (BDR R-1362)

The study will provide for an analysis of performance measures in the departments, increase communication between Executive and Legislative Branches regarding areas of performance, increase our ability to make effective decisions in future sessions, create agreements on how departments should be measured and defined, and provide a solid foundation to make public financing policies. Additionally, there will be a review of Nevada's performance in various departments and how they compare in measurements defined to state results across the country. A policy and procedure manual will be created and distributed to all agencies in the Executive Branch. The manual will include the development of performance measures pursuant to the agency's goals and objectives, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the use of public resources and a tool for reporting the organization's performance.

KIM R. WALLIN (State Controller):

I support S.C.R. 41. However, a study may not be the solution we need right now. Performance measures cannot be standardized. They change over time depending on the environment and circumstances the agency is experiencing. We have been working with the Department of Transportation, State Public Works Board, Department of Administration and the Office of the Governor to improve their performance measures, create more accountability and eliminate waste and inefficiency.

SENATOR WIENER:

The agencies you mentioned are great demonstration projects. If these are the hoped-for successes, do you foresee most or all agencies establishing this as an ongoing practice? How often are you conducting reviews to keep this information vital, appropriate and timely?

MS. WALLIN:

We began by getting the measures established. Depending on the measures created, some are reviewed on a monthly basis, some quarterly and some annually. My plan is to create this as part of the fabric of the agency.

MAUD NAROLL (Budget Division, Department of Administration):

I am available to meet with any Legislator on this subject should they wish to do so. I give a class on strategic planning and performance measures which informs agencies of the need to have a mixture of outcome and caseload measures. I will be available if any issues are raised if the Committee chooses to approve this study.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

The rationale behind this was the frustration behind a lack of performance indicators to match what we want. The problem for us is when we create a budget, these agencies provide incomplete information. As a result, we have to spend additional time gathering this information from them. A manual with terminology would benefit us and the agencies as well.

MS. WALLIN:

If you decide to approve this study, I want to lend my expertise.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 41 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 30.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study relating to certain uses of fuel and other sources of energy in this State. (BDR R-1174)

SENATOR DINA TITUS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):

I provided the Committee an article from today's newspaper called "Sticker Shock: Prices at pump soaring" ([Exhibit J](#)). The price of gasoline nationally is at an all-time high and the price in Nevada is much higher than that. The highest gas prices are located in the Western United States. Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 looks at three topics associated with gasoline prices. It looks at the cost of gasoline, why it is higher in Nevada and what could be done about that. Much of it is restricted because of interstate commerce and federal regulation, but we need to look at what we might do in Nevada. Next, the study will look at the possibility of a second pipeline to southern Nevada. Lastly, the study will look at other types of fuels as alternatives to gasoline. One of these alternatives is biofuel. I learned Nevada has access to a type of algae growing in our geothermal plants which can be developed into a biofuel source.

Most everything is affected by the price of gasoline. We need to remember that much of our tourism economy depends on the price of gasoline. Currently, we have a push to see the eastern parts of Nevada, and that means traveling by automobile to visit our natural treasures. It is a long way to and from Elko, Ely, Winnemucca, Carson City and Walker Lake. We need to address this issue as soon as possible.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I was watching the news this morning and a gas station owner in Reno commented that automobile travel continues to be the cheapest transportation method in the country.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

It is ironic the gas station owner said automobile travel is the cheapest way to travel. It is the only way we have, that is why we need this study. Of course, he said it is the cheapest way to travel because that is how he makes a living. Another reason we need this study is because we have no mass transit alternative to automobile travel in Nevada. We need to look at ways to reduce our dependence on oil.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 22, 2007
Page 16

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I close the hearing on S.C.R. 30 and open the hearing on S.C.R. 47.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 47: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning chancery courts. (BDR R-1516)

MS. VAN GEEL:

If S.C.R. 47 is approved, the Legislative Commission will appoint three members of the Senate and three members of the Assembly to conduct a study of the benefits, costs and feasibility of the implementation of the chancery courts in Nevada. The study includes a compilation and analysis of the economic and legal impacts courts of chancery have had on states in which they have been implemented. Further, the study includes an assessment of expected revenues, estimated costs of operation and any ancillary economic impact to Nevada as a result of implementing courts of chancery.

SENATOR WIENER:

We dealt with this issue several years ago and the end result was the establishment of business courts across Nevada.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Staff will look into that and inform the bill's sponsor.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 22, 2007
Page 17

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

If there is nothing else to come before this Committee, I adjourn the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections at 4:12 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Brian Campolieti,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair

DATE: _____