

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Fifth Session
May 11, 2009**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick at 9:37 a.m. on Monday, May 11, 2009, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/75th2009/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Aizley
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Ed A. Goedhart
Assemblywoman April Mastroluca
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce
Assemblyman James A. Settlemeyer
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Steven A. Horsford, Clark County Senate District No. 4

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel
Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Cyndie Carter, Committee Manager
Denise Sins, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve K. Walker, Minden, Nevada, representing the Board for Financing Water Projects, Carson City, Nevada
Ardell Galbraith, Deputy Director, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
Rose McKinney-James, representing Enhanced Capital Management, Las Vegas, Nevada
Gingee M. Prince, representing Enhanced Capital Partners, Inc., New York, New York
Nicole J. Cannizzaro, representing the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I want to start with the work session. Our first item is Senate Bill 37.

Senate Bill 37: Authorizes the award of subgrants for certain purposes relating to the control of water pollution. (BDR 40-360)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

Senate Bill 37 ([Exhibit C](#)) is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Natural Resources on behalf of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. The bill was heard in this Committee on April 15. The bill authorizes the Division of Environmental Protection to award subgrants for set-aside programs authorized by the federal Safe Drinking Water Act and also subgrants under the Clean Water Act.

No amendments were proposed. The vote in the Senate was passed with one Senator absent.

Chair Kirkpatrick:
Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 37.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN AND
ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Bobzien will handle the floor statement. We will go to
Senate Bill 44.

Senate Bill 44: Designates certain employees of the Department of Corrections
as category II peace officers. (BDR 23-304)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 44 ([Exhibit D](#)) is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on
behalf of the Department of Corrections. The bill was heard in this Committee
on April 16. Senate Bill 44 designates the Inspector General and the criminal
investigators of the Department of Corrections as category II peace officers.

There were no amendments proposed at the hearing. The vote in the Senate
was 19 in favor with 1 opposed and 1 absent.

Chair Kirkpatrick:
Do I have a motion on Senate Bill 44?

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 44.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND
CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Munford will you do the floor statement?

Assemblyman Munford:
Yes.

Chair Kirkpatrick:
We will now go to Senate Bill 105.

Senate Bill 105: Revises the provisions governing the matching funds required for grants made by the Board for Financing Water Projects. (BDR 30-502)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 105 ([Exhibit E](#)) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands. The bill was heard in this Committee on April 15. The bill revises the matching funds provisions for grants made by the Board for Financing Water Projects. Instead of calculating the grant award based on the matching funds as a percentage of the total amount of the grant, the bill requires the grant award to be based on the matching funds as a percentage of the total cost of the project.

There were no amendments proposed and the Senate vote was unanimous.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 105.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Aizley:

On page 2, lines 18 and 19 it says the scale must be based upon the average household income of the customer. How are they going to compute that?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

That language already exists in the bill. I will ask Ms. Scholley or Mr. McKenna to research that. I know they already compute those figures.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Do you think there is already a procedure in place?

Susan Scholley:

I believe this is the criteria that has been in existence for awarding these grants. That has been in effect for awhile and was not part of the discussion on the bill. If you would like some more information, I will need more time to get the answer to you.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Walker, can you enlighten us on how this already works? I think you testified on this bill.

Steve K. Walker, Minden, Nevada, representing the Board for Financing Water Projects, Carson City, Nevada:

Every grant has a median household income determination referencing that specific grant requirement.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Is that based on the federal tax that was filed the year before?

Steve Walker:

Staff provides the figures so I do not know the methodology. I think it comes from Census Bureau data, based on a median household income from each individual county.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

The grants processes that I have been involved in with the Carson Valley Conservation District and the Nevada Conservation Commission, have always utilized the census data for determination of the household income.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

That does not change again until 2011. I have a motion by Mr. Aizley and a second by Mr. Bobzien; is there any further discussion? All those in favor please say "Aye." Is anyone opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Settlemeyer, will you do the floor statement on that? [He nodded yes.] We will now go to Senate Bill 111 (R1).

Senate Bill 111 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing membership on the Western Regional Water Commission and the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission. (BDR S-240)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 111 (R1) ([Exhibit F](#)) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Natural Resources on behalf of the Legislative Committee to Oversee the Western Regional Water Commission. The bill was heard in this Committee on April 17. It revises the membership of the Commission to allow the Mayor of Sparks to be a member. It also revises the membership of the Northern Nevada

Water Planning Commission to include a representative of the largest Indian reservation that is contiguous to the planning area of the Western Regional Water Commission and a representative of the Washoe County Water Conservation District, rather than the incorrectly referenced Washoe Storey Conservation District. According to testimony, both of those changes to the Water Planning Commission were to correct oversights from last session.

No amendments were proposed, and the Senate vote was unanimous.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Thank you, Ms. Scholley. Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 111 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Aizley:

I have been trying to understand legal talk, so this is a question as to why it is done one way and not another. Instead of making the mayor of the city a member of the council, why not just say the two members of the City Council of the City of Sparks or, the mayor and one council member. Would that not have done the same thing?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Aizley, the testimony was that currently, the City of Sparks does things a little bit differently. This clarifies that the mayor is not a voting member, but he could be considered as one, because there may come a time when the mayor does not want to be on this particular board. Then you would limit yourself to one city councilperson and one mayor, but if the mayor should choose to be on the City Council, he would have that option.

Is there any other discussion? All those in favor please say "Aye." Is anyone opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND
CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Bobzien, being as you live in Washoe County, you can do the floor assignment. We will go on to Senate Bill 124 (R1).

Senate Bill 124 (1st Reprint): Expands the number of members of the boards of trustees of certain general improvement districts. (BDR 25-196)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 124 (R1) ([Exhibit G](#)) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and heard in this Committee on April 30. It expands the membership of the Board of Trustees for the Overton Power District which is a General Improvement District (GID) under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 318. It expands the membership from 5 to 7 members. The bill specifies that one additional member must be elected from the election area comprised of the City of Mesquite. The other additional member will be elected at-large from within the boundaries of the district.

The measure also sets forth the initial election and term of the two new members and provides that the existing five election areas remain as presently set by law.

An amendment is set forth in the attached mock-up ([Exhibit H](#)) and was proposed to conform to the bill's original intent to limit its impact to the Overton Power District. The amendment excludes from the scope of the bill a GID in Clark County, for which the Clark County Board of County Commissioners serves as the Board of Trustees for the GID.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 124 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? This is one of those bills that I have seen since my first session in 2005 so I am happy to send it to the floor. All those in favor please say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND
CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Stewart, will you do the floor statement?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I would be delighted.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

We will now go on to Senate Bill 213.

Senate Bill 213: Revises the Charter of the City of Sparks to make various changes in provisions concerning city government. (BDR S-462)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 213 ([Exhibit I](#)) was sponsored by Senator Washington and heard in this Committee on May 2. It revises the City Charter of Sparks to permit the City Manager to appoint department heads and various executive and administrative employees without confirmation by the City Council.

The measure also clarifies the classes of persons protected from employment discrimination. In addition, the bill authorizes the Mayor rather than the City Council to nominate the Mayor pro tem, subject to the approval of the Council. In the event of a vacancy in the office of Mayor, the Mayor pro tem shall serve as Acting Mayor until the next general election.

No amendments were proposed and the Senate vote was unanimous.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 213.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? I personally do not agree with this bill, however the residents have a Charter Committee and if the residents of Sparks want to clarify it, so be it.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I have a concern about the City Council giving up its oversight ability in the appointment of all those offices. Does anyone know if the city councils in other cities exercise that right and whether or not they have that right?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

There are a lot of cities that let their City Manager do that. The argument would then be, why do we have a City Council if we have a City Manager? Many City Managers do a lot of appointments, but the difference in Sparks is that they have a Charter Committee that is composed of a variety of

constituents who play an active role in this issue. If the constituents are happy with this, then we are too.

I have a motion by Mr. Bobzien and a second by Mr. Stewart. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor please say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Ms. Pierce will do the floor assignment. We will now go on to Senate Bill 267.

Senate Bill 267: Makes various changes concerning governmental administration. (BDR 18-62)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 267 ([Exhibit J](#)) was sponsored by Senator Weiner and heard in this Committee on May 4. The bill provides that a state agency's 30-day notice of intent to act upon a proposed regulation can be made only after the agency receives the approved or revised text of the proposed regulation from the Legislative Counsel Bureau. The bill also provides that each agency workshop or hearing on a proposed regulation is subject to Nevada's open meeting law. The bill also provides that the Legislative Commission or the Subcommittee to Review Regulations of the Legislative Commission must affirmatively approve or object to an administrative regulation. Regulations will no longer become effective by default.

The sponsor proposed an amendment at the hearing clarifying the definition of a university foundation as set forth on page 9 of the attached mock-up ([Exhibit K](#)). I did not include the other 8 pages as they were not relative to the amendment. It is kind of a stand-alone amendment. It clarifies the definition of a university foundation for purposes of applicability of the open meeting law.

The vote in the Senate was unanimous, but the amendment would not have been subject to that.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 267.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PIERCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? Some of you may recall that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had concerns on their portion of the bill. I spoke to the bill's sponsor and she wants to leave the bill as it is. I have a motion by Ms. Spiegel and a second by Ms. Pierce. All those in favor please say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Mr. Goedhart, you did such a good job last time, how about handling this one on the floor?

Assemblyman Goedhart:
Okay.

Chair Kirkpatrick:
We will now go to Senate Bill 396 (R1).

[Senate Bill 396 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing an investigation of a peace officer by a law enforcement agency. (BDR 23-1098)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 396 (R1) ([Exhibit L](#)) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary and heard in this Committee on May 2. Senate Bill 396 (R1) authorizes a peace officer who is subject to an investigation certain rights and requires the law enforcement agency to provide written notice to the peace officer and any other peace officer believed to have relevant knowledge of the case if the agency intends to conduct an interrogation. The agency is prohibited from taking certain actions against the peace officer prior to the interrogation or hearing. It also addresses written statements by the peace officer. It provides that limitations in existing law concerning the amount of damages that may be awarded do not apply to the award of damages to a peace officer.

Amendments were proposed by Dave Kallas on behalf of the Las Vegas Police Protective Association with the concurrence of other employee groups and Frank Adams from the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association. This amendment would delete certain sections of the bill which were supposed to be taken out on the Senate side but were not. The vote in the Senate was 18 in favor with Senators Carlton and Mathews voting no.

If you look at the mock-up, ([Exhibit M](#)) the amendment deletes subsections 4 and 5 on page 3, lines 13 through 24, relating to audio, video, and written

evidence, and also relating to knowledge of a belief of a peace officer would be subject to punitive action.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PIERCE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 396 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN MUNFORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or discussion? All those in favor please say "Aye." Is anyone opposed? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CLABORN AND
CHRISTENSEN WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Who would like to do the floor statement? Mr. Aizley, would you do the floor statement? [He nodded yes.]

For the Committee, if you have a floor statement, please pay attention and do the floor statements because the public needs to know what the bills are about.

That ends our work session for today. Possible bills on the work session for tomorrow are S.B. 42, S.B. 147, S.B. 175, S.B. 190. We will also have two bills, S.B. 412 and S.B. 414. Friday is the deadline for work session.

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 239 (R1).

Senate Bill 239 (1st Reprint): Provides for greater coordination of Nevada's economic development and workforce development goals. (BDR 18-1080)

Senator Steven A. Horsford, Clark County Senate District No. 4:

[Senator Horsford referred to prepared text while speaking ([Exhibit N](#)).]

Senate Bill 239 (R1) provides for greater coordination of Nevada's economic development and workforce development goals. This bill follows up on a bill we sponsored in 2007 which tried to achieve some of the same goals, but failed. A lot has changed since then. We are now faced with an unemployment rate that is above 10 percent. I recently heard that in Washoe County the unemployment rate in the construction sector is 70 percent. Clearly, we are going to have to think more innovatively about how we approach our workforce development

and economic development strategies and how we can leverage those resources more effectively.

With the opportunities that have been afforded us with the federal stimulus money, we have some ability to do that. Senate Bill 239 (R1) will enable Nevada to meet our current unemployment challenges and take the greatest advantage of the workforce development opportunities contained in the stimulus bill as well.

Thanks to the ongoing work of the Economic Development Commission, we have an economic development plan that has been reviewed by your Chair and some of the other Committee members. This is a good starting point. We know we need to align the work that is in the economic development plan with the work of the Governor's Workforce Investment Board (GWIB) so that the programs reach their maximum effectiveness ([Exhibit O](#)). Tying many of the incentives the Economic Development Commission provides to the businesses and industries we are attempting to attract or develop, helps to ensure the bottom line is achieved—diversifying our economy to help grow our workforce, and providing great careers that lead over time to sustainable communities throughout the State of Nevada.

Under S.B. 239 (R1), the GWIB, through the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR), will identify our state and industry needs and take responsibility for acquiring and distributing federal funds for training programs that meet those needs. This process will ensure that we not only receive the maximum amount from the federal stimulus, but also maximize the impact of the money.

The model that we are proposing is the establishment of Industry Sector Councils. Similar councils have been established in other states, including Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Washington. These states have developed industry councils that support the workforce needs of employers in major industries. The councils typically consist of employers, labor organizations, public and private postsecondary institutions, trade associations and other stakeholders that share a common occupational employment and training need of a particular industry. A study was done for the National Governors Association which found that job seekers who participate in sector-based programs have earnings that increase from \$8,500 to over \$14,000, had reduced turnover, and decreased poverty rates.

This session there is a lot of debate and discussion about the role of economic incentives and abatements, many being led by the Chair of this Committee. Many worthwhile recommendations are being made to improve the system and

how it works for the people of Nevada. As we move forward, we also need workforce and economic development agencies, as well as industry and labor stakeholders, to develop long-term strategies that improve our efforts over time. The plan developed by the Nevada Commission on Economic Development (NCED) should be aligned with and mirror the State plan for workforce development offered by the GWIB. Further, these plans should have direct input from the stakeholders who have the expertise to make these plans a reality.

When these industry councils work collaboratively, and when they work best, benefits can be achieved. They provide a greater focus on a particular industry workforce need, such as renewable energy, not a particular employer. This helps to address the barriers many employers and unemployed workers may be experiencing in that particular industry.

The councils can also benefit from direction from the private sector for our K-12, as well as postsecondary education levels, on how to improve outcomes to better meet the needs of business and industry.

The final benefit is better identification of worker-skill gaps and industry workforce needs. In the past, states have implemented sector strategies, such as those proposed in S.B. 239 (R1), and they have received matching private dollars from foundations such as the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation, because of the efforts to move workers from one rung to the next.

In my private capacity I do a lot of work in employment and training. I want to clearly state that this bill would not benefit my organization or my interests. It will benefit the workers and employers of this state.

When we first introduced this bill last session, one of the concerns was that we were not processing all of the available resources due to lack of funding. Today that problem continues to exist. The funding provided in the federal stimulus allows for this type of allocation for the development of sector councils to help our economy recover and grow toward prosperity once again.

It is estimated that DETR will receive over \$25 million in Workforce Investment Act formula grants, a portion of which could be used to support the workforce development measures that are offered in S.B. 239 (R1).

The bill proposes the establishment of industry sectors by the GWIB, and those sectors would be based on opportunities to grow businesses or industries in a particular area or region of the state. If we use renewable energy as an example, we have seen maps that show us that in certain parts of the state,

geothermal will be more effective than solar, and in other regions it might be wind power that is developed. The opportunity is in knowing that there are other ancillary opportunities that an industry may bring, perhaps manufacturing or construction. By identifying the needs within an industry sector or particular region, you can identify the people who could ultimately be promoted into a higher ranking position. Workers could then be trained over time so they meet the goals of the region. The goal is to align and coordinate those efforts, something that has not occurred in the past.

Establishment of sector councils would include participation by employers, organized labor, universities, and community colleges that have a focus on a particular industry and any other relevant group of people deemed to be appropriate by the Board. Once the industry councils are established, based on funding available from the stimulus, we will be able to move these initiatives forward.

In addition to the specifics on the sector councils, we were asked to allow an amendment to S.B. 239 (R1) to be used as a vehicle for an additional program that is aimed at bringing additional private capital to our state. There is a representative here today, Ms. Prince, who will address the specifics on the establishment of the Nevada Small Business Investment Credit Program (SBIC) and how that will work.

Assemblyman Stewart:

There is a state fiscal note. Will the stimulus money from the federal government eliminate the need for state funds or will there still be a need for a small amount of state money?

Senator Horsford:

It is my understanding that there is no fixed fiscal note to the bill. The testimony on the Senate side was that the sector councils would be established with no cost to the state to the extent that there are dollars available from the stimulus to support the work of the sector councils. That is all the fiscal impact there would be.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Once the councils are established, will there be an ongoing need for financial assistance?

Senator Horsford:

The Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) testified on the Senate side that this would help them better coordinate the work of the

GWIB. It is part of what they do now in support of the Board, so there would not be a fiscal note involved.

Assemblyman Stewart:

So the Board would determine the number of councils established and their location?

Senator Horsford:

Yes, that is correct. The GWIB would make the determination on the number of councils, which sector they need to focus on, and how many members are appointed to each council.

Assemblyman Stewart:

We have career and technical high schools that do a lot of training and I noticed this bill addressed only colleges and secondary education institutions; could we bring in some of the high school programs as well? Would that be possible?

Senator Horsford:

That is a great suggestion and one that I had not considered. The bill does allow for other representatives to be appointed as the Board sees fit, and we would like to name some of those collaborators. Through the Department of Education there are current technical education councils that have been established. We can align K-12 councils with higher education councils which would be an effective tool to make sure that what we are teaching young people in these current technical programs is what they will need to know when they go out into the workforce or go on to postsecondary education.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I strongly encourage that be done.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Along the same line, you left out the Nevada State College in your description, and I think it should be included with community colleges and universities. We now have a state college.

Senator Horsford:

Point well-taken. That may be a drafting issue. I think they intend for it to be any postsecondary institution, public or private.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

On page 3, section 4, lines 32 through 44 it talks about adopting regulations. I would like to see something within the regulations that talks about some type of clawback to guarantee that people are meeting the criteria that is set forth. In

2005 we passed a bill to audit some nonprofits and other boards and we have never utilized it. I want to have some mechanism in the regulations to be able to verify that they met their own criteria.

Senator Horsford:

I think that relates to the new provision based on the new program that is being proposed as well.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I think my question would be answered best by the person who can explain SBIC.

Assemblyman Munford:

The ultimate goal of these industry sector councils, once they are selected, is to locate in various regions and have the responsibility to propose and promote economic development in these areas; is that their primary function?

Senator Horsford:

There is a two-part objective in the establishment of these councils. The Commission on Economic Development has a plan for attracting certain types of businesses and industries to a region for economic development. This is to be coordinated with the Governor's Workforce Investment Plan so that it will also help the workforce in that region to benefit or take advantage of the ability to move ahead within that industry.

Typically, what happens is the Commission may attract a business or have an emphasis on an industry, say biotech for example. I know the City of Henderson was promoting biotech in a particular region of their economic development. What was missing was the solution as to how the workers in that region would benefit from being able to have that industry emerge.

If I am a Certified Nurses Assistant (CNA), I need to be able to learn about the career opportunities that are available in biotech in order to go into a specific career field or to advance my career. I now know what the steps are to accomplish that. This program will coordinate efforts based on the goals of the Commission on Economic Development along with the goals of workforce development groups to get the maximum benefit possible.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Senator, do you know at this time how the dollars will flow? Will the stimulus dollars go to the Governor and then to the different agencies or will they go directly to the agencies?

Senator Horsford:

On page 3 of the bill, it refers to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). We receive what are called formula dollars. Based on our unemployment rate and the number of workers who are unemployed, there is a formula for every state to determine how much money they get. Every year that changes based on the new formula allocation.

There is about \$25 to \$30 million available from ARRA coming to the State of Nevada for adult dislocated worker employment and training services. We can use a portion of those dollars to help establish these industry sector councils. The money that we spend training people is spent based on a strategy to train them based on the location of job opportunities now and in the future. This is where new industries emerge.

The money will come from the Department of Labor and go to the GWIB. The Department of Employment and Training will administer the funds and will be responsible for those funds. The funds are allocated on a competitive bid basis to local regions. There is Nevada Works in northern Nevada that oversees all of the money in Washoe County and the rural counties, and the Southern Nevada Workforce Board administers the money in Clark, Nye, Esmeralda, and Lincoln Counties.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Senator, we lack data processing centers so we send our tax dollars to Arizona so they can send it back. We send our Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) money to Florida while most utility bills go to Arizona.

Senator Horsford:

That is a great point, Madam Chair. Data processing is an industry that would help in many industry sectors including the government sector. If that is something we think that would help move workers and also meet an employer need, then why not have a strategic focus in that particular area. That is a great example of ways in which we can better coordinate our efforts and leverage public dollars with private resources.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

This is a very interesting bill. It got me thinking about what the sectors are and I agree with the Chair's point of view. She has an idea for one sector that we should study which I think is good, because I share her frustration over the same issue.

We had something a number of years back in Washoe County called the Target 2010 Plan which was created by the Economic Development Authority of

Western Nevada. We went through this process and I cannot say I was a big part of it, but I definitely stayed aware of it and watched it evolve. I thought it was a good public process that began an attempt to try to figure out what sectors were going to be important to northern Nevada in the years ahead. My concern is making sure that whatever process the GWIB goes through to identify those sectors is not just the same old rehash. It really is a full process that looks at everything. Have you thought at all about what sort of a process you would like to see after the bill passes?

Senator Horsford:

I recognize Mr. Galbraith in Las Vegas. He is the Deputy Director of the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (DETR). He can speak about the process. The National Governors' Association's Center for Best Practices and the National Network of Sector Partners is the report I was referring to earlier ([Exhibit O](#)). I can make copies available.

The approach that was taken in the other states, for example in Michigan, where they have huge unemployment, they make their workforce programs very strategic. They have an extensive process by which they calculate how to move these hundreds of thousands of workers who have lost their jobs into alternative employment. We need to create opportunities for training and placement of those workers into new sectors so we can reduce our unemployment rate.

There are extensive approaches that can be taken to achieve this. The bill helps to support some of the work of the GWIB. Their chair, Cass Palmer, testified on the Senate side that it helps to have some legislative guidance for establishing these sector councils in order to achieve and implement a new strategy. They will take the framework used by other states, and through consultation with their board and other stakeholders, determine the process to be used. Public hearings, workshops, and the development of a plan based on the economic development plan will assist us in deciding what approach to take in developing our process. The bill does not speak to that factor specifically because I did not want to mandate the definition of a sector. I do not know what sectors should go where and what their composition should be. Sectors should be determined by the residents, workers and industries located in those areas.

I will defer to Mr. Galbraith to elaborate further on the process that they were planning to use and see if it meets your intent based on the question Assemblyman Bobzien just posed.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Does anyone else have any questions for Senator Horsford? [There were none.]

We will go to those in Las Vegas who wish to testify. Mr. Galbraith, can you answer the Vice Chair's question, please?

Ardell Galbraith, Deputy Director, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:

Yes, Madam Chair, I certainly will attempt to do so. Senate Bill 239 (R1) does not require any General Fund match, therefore there is no fiscal note attached to the bill. The bill is supported by DETR because it will allow Nevada's workforce development system, known as Job Connect, to focus intently on industry sector initiatives and multiple employers within industries over a sustained period of time.

It will also allow the GWIB to formally identify and create demand-driven sector councils that will provide feedback or intelligence regarding job training and education, those needs that best meet the regional or industry workforce goals.

It will aid the GWIB and the State of Nevada by utilizing economies of scale and employment and training resources to provide public and private partnerships to ensure achieving the best of both worlds. It will position the GWIB to effectively plan and allocate its training dollars to create new pathways for low-income workers in industry sectors that will lead to good jobs and creative careers. By aligning with the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board and the northern Nevada workforce board, known as Nevada Works, the GWIB would be in a position to make systematic changes that would be a win-win situation for employers, job seekers, and the communities throughout the State of Nevada.

The partnership requirement will also assist the State of Nevada in acquiring additional funding through the process under DETR and the Department of Labor by applying for the competitive grants available. There is almost \$500,000 in place for competitive grants for those established public/private partnerships. Nevada will have an advantage when we apply for these additional dollars through DETR and the Department of Labor. We want to make sure we do include higher education—community colleges, state colleges and universities, to help us along with the impetus as needed to drive this workforce initiative and to transform our system to one that meets the demands of businesses and employers throughout the state.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I am not sure you answered Mr. Bobzien's question. Can he ask it again?

Ardell Galbraith:

Yes, please do.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I wanted to know what process the board will use in determining the sectors. Hopefully it will leave no stone unturned and involve the public as much as possible and will be targeted so that we realize we cannot be all things to all people economically. We have to focus and determine what our core strengths are. Could you comment on the process, please?

Ardell Galbraith:

Typically, the process would be to coordinate with a variety of employers and businesses in different areas. For example, we currently have an informal process using what are called business relation groups in different areas such as manufacturing, health care, and gaming. The plan would be to develop these same groups in areas such as mining and renewable energy, by inviting representatives from these areas, both public and private, to join these groups. The intent is to ensure transparency and open communication with the general public, as well as with State officials.

We want to be sure that everything is above board and that the citizens in all Nevada communities have a part in determining what input is needed to drive their workforce needs. We will do everything possible to ensure that the industries that are represented in the sector councils are providing comprehensive representation for different areas throughout the state, and to provide input to the GWIB.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I agree that outreach and collaboration with industry is clearly a major component of whatever process you move forward with, but I would encourage you to not leave it there. I am concerned we may get into a situation where we reinforce the existing biases that industry leaders already have. If you come to me and ask me what I think is important, I would tell you that interactive marketing is very important because that is the sector that I come from. Working with industry is step one, but I would like to see some other process where we step back and take a very hard, brutal look and say not every single industry in the room is going to make it. We need to buckle down and be honest as to what sectors are going to be the most important in the coming years.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Ms. James, would you like to enlighten us on the amendment?

Rose McKinney-James, representing Enhanced Capital Management, Las Vegas, Nevada:

This session, one of the things we are attempting to focus on is the notion of economic development and economic diversification. We want to make sure the state has the tools to advance our efforts on a variety of levels. The amendment to this bill takes us in that direction. The portion of the bill we are discussing begins at section 1.7 and continues through the end of the bill. This takes into consideration a gap when it comes to providing support to small business. It has been a problem for some time. The identification of capital is a problem and particularly within a certain range of capital.

The opportunity for a state to advance economic development is something that many states are taking very seriously. Within your packet, there is an article that appeared in the Reno Gazette-Journal on May 2, 2009 ([Exhibit P](#)). It is an interesting case study that addresses precisely what we are attempting to achieve through this amendment. The bottom line is, we lost a company that was within our reach in terms of advancing renewable energy, to the State of Michigan. One hundred twenty potential jobs were lost because we did not have a set of tools that provided the financing needed to advance their program. As you take a look at this article, consider it as one of many that we will probably see until we find a way to capture this important segment of our economy. Small business is the part of the economy responsible for creating the largest number of jobs. We need to marry and leverage resources, which is why we thank the majority leader for giving us the opportunity to include this in the bill.

I have with me Gingee Prince who is an expert in the Small Business Investment Credit (SBIC) program. I would like to ask her to review with you the provisions of the bill. I will respond to Assemblyman Stewart's question with respect to fiscal impact. On the last page of the bill in what I believe is still section 1.7, on line 10, there is reference to a fee. That fee is a placeholder. It is important to know there will be some state responsibility for administering this program. The thought is to require this fee if it is determined by the state that there are additional costs and this fee does not cover those costs. In other states they have increased this fee. The industry pays for the cost of administering the fee.

Gingee M. Prince, Director, Enhanced Capital Partners, Inc., New York, New York:

Enhanced Capital Partners is a national private investment firm specializing in investments in small and growing businesses. My firm participates in 12 programs in five different states that are similar to the Nevada SBIC bill before you today. I am here to talk to you about the need for access to capital for small businesses in Nevada, to provide information, and discuss the results of

the SBIC program in the nine other states in which it exists. I will answer any questions you may have based on my company's experience participating in these programs in other states.

As many of you are aware, small businesses are having difficulty obtaining capital to start up and expand. Due to the current economic downturn, banks are not lending and adventure capital firms are reserving their capital for existing portfolio companies, and therefore not investing in new businesses. This is a time when small businesses are suffering in greater number than ever before.

Even before these challenging economic times, there existed a capital gap for funding for small business start-up. I come from an entrepreneurial background and the Thompson Foundation has termed this area of capital gap the "valiant death" for entrepreneurs. This gap occurs between the initial start-up phase, where you are getting angel financing, and then the traditional venture capital investments which are provided later and later because they are lower risk.

This capital gap has now widened due to the tightening of the financial markets and the Nevada SBIC is designed to fill this capital gap by providing early stage venture and debt financing for small businesses. If you look at the entire capital spectrum available for small businesses there is a gap from \$200,000 up to \$3 million. Once a business starts up, it may be able to cobble together a couple hundred thousand dollars from friends and family in order to launch the business, but then there is limited capital to take that business to the next level.

Because the traditional venture capitalists are reserving their money right now for existing portfolio companies, and because they are doing later stage, they usually do not invest in a company that does not have a proven track record and is seeking something in excess of \$3 to \$5 million.

This gap exists in the start-up's growth where they still do not qualify for bank financing. They might be a viable company, but they have no access to capital.

This bill will address this gap by creating a series of venture capital funds totaling \$50 million, exclusively to help small businesses grow in Nevada. The focus of this capital will be directed toward companies that are developing renewable energy sources, helping rural Nevada companies obtain financing, providing capital for companies located in enterprise zones, and creating significant opportunities for minority-owned businesses.

On a national level, programs like the SBIC have realized investments in small businesses of more than \$1 billion, have created over 21,000 jobs, and the

capital has attracted in excess of \$6 billion in Follow-On capital or co-investment capital from outside sources.

To give you an example, the most recent state to adopt this program is Texas. They did it in an economic downturn, which is similar to what we face today. It authorized its first \$200 million program in 2003 and reauthorized another \$200 million program in 2007. They are currently considering an additional \$200 million program in 2009 to address lack of capital due to the economic downturn.

The first three years of the program in Texas has created or retained more than 1,600 jobs and it has been considered a resounding success by the Legislature, the Governor, and the office that administers the program, the Comptroller's Office.

In each of the nine states where this program has been implemented, it has given small businesses within the state a much-needed infusion of venture capital and financing options. With states facing their toughest deficits in years, those states that have adopted economic development programs such as Nevada SBIC will likely recover earlier.

I also wanted to address one issue that has been brought up and that is, is there potential risk to the State? Please look at the one page color document you have ([Exhibit Q](#)). The funds are going to be raised in 2009 and the first tax credits which are granted to insurance companies through the premium tax collections do not hit until the year 2013. By statute, it is required that at least half of that money be invested in small businesses, which is \$25 million before the first tax credits even hit. An analysis that is being done by the University of Nevada shows it is expected to create 400 jobs per year. The idea of the delay in the tax credits is to ensure the money gets out into the state, creating jobs and returning economic benefit to the state.

This is risk capital, so there are downsides, but of all the participants in the program there has not been one decertification of a company in the program's history. The laws and timeline investments have been followed. Please look at your PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit R](#)) on the second to the last page. It talks about the program performance in other states, because it began back in 1983 in Louisiana. We do not have complete information on some of the earlier programs, but information on the latest programs indicates they have all benefitted the respective state.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

I would like to see the definition of a small business because we have had three bills go through the Assembly using the term small business, and I wondered if you would be agreeable to have defining language amended into the bill. For example, include a definition that says a business with 50 employees or less worth less than \$5 million. The reason I do this is that all states vary on these numbers. I am a Region 9 Ombudsman for the Small Business Administration. There is no good definition in any state of what a small business is. By national standards, it varies by business, so it is hard to define. Do you have any better verbiage from any of the nine states that have participated in this program?

Gingee Prince:

It is very different in every state. It has been determined by what the actual need is for a particular state. Sometimes we follow the Small Business Administration's definition for a small business, and in other states it has been very specific that early stage capital needed to go to companies that were less than five years old and had fewer employees. From my perspective as a company that might participate in this program, that is a policy decision for you to decide; what is best for the state and where this money needs to go.

You want to keep it as open as possible. I think five years is probably a fair amount of time, but 50 employees might be too few. My first company, for example, was a PC card manufacturer that grew from 7 employees to 150 employees in 3 years. We raised our third round of venture financing in that third year. If you have high scale manufacturing going on, 50 employees might be too low a figure.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

You are talking about expansion, while I myself am more interested in the concept of new job generation.

Assemblyman Munford:

If someone had all of their business arrangements in order but had no start-up capital, who would they go to; an investment bank?

Gingee Prince:

Are you speaking of right now or after the program is implemented?

Assemblyman Munford:

I am referring to the time after the program is implemented.

Gingee Prince:

The State would certify private investment firms and those firms would raise money from insurance companies who will then receive tax credits against the insurance premium taxes they pay. It is private money that these venture capital firms invest, and that is where you get that \$50 million immediately. A new start-up could easily come to one of these firms and say here is my business plan, I am looking for start-up capital, and this would fill that gap that exists right now.

Assemblyman Munford:

If a business was started and then collapsed, would the business owner still have to pay the money back?

Gingee Prince:

Assemblyman Munford, the nice part about this program is that private investment firms come in and raise money under this program. There is no incentive for those firms to not do the appropriate due diligence and ensure that these companies are going to grow and that those private investment firms will see a return on their capital. The way the bill is structured, the private investment firm can take no distributions from the business until 100 percent of the capital is invested, which could take 6 to 10 years. It is in their best interest to make very smart investments. This is the key to the program's success.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

How do we, as Nevadans, working with a company with proven technology who has a guaranteed line of credit and a good track record, keep from running into regulatory hurdles? I see we are pretty good at addressing the need to structure an investment method for companies who do not have it. What is more frustrating is seeing companies that have a good plan and a good mission running into a regulatory buzz saw. Do we have some type of agency or group here in Nevada that is willing to serve as an ombudsman to smooth out some of the overlapping regulations, allowing companies to invest and create opportunities for employment?

We have a lot of solar power companies looking for prospective land in southern Nevada. A month ago, we had the regional director of the National Park Service, Pacific Coast Region, write a letter to the Death Valley National Park Service and also to the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) saying that if there was going to be any water usage by any solar company in southern Nevada, they would urge the BLM not to process the applications, even in areas where they would buy or lease water rights from existing owners and redirect the water so there would be no additional water being pumped.

In Amargosa Valley, we are seeing a \$1.5 billion project potentially paying \$12 million a year in State property tax being derailed because of regulatory heads overstepping their bounds. We have a lot to gain focusing on that issue as well.

Rose McKinney-James:

I am not aware of any agency whose mission is to investigate and/or coordinate regulatory matters. There may be some bills being processed this session that may address some portion of your concern, particularly through renewable energy.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I want to tell a different side of the story about the article you mentioned earlier. We had film industries coming to our state saying we are going to take away all your film business if you do not give us tax abatements. I adamantly said no way, no how, no shape, no form; not happening. There are 16 states trying to accomplish the same things we are by passing this bill so we need to wait and let it happen. In New Mexico, after one year of implementing all these great incentives, they gave out \$38 million and have only received \$5 million worth of jobs. I do not want to see the same thing happen in Nevada. It worked out to 14.4 cents per person and that is not beneficial to our state. I want to say we have to do things Nevada's way, not follow other states' examples. We are unique.

When you bring these large insurance companies to our state, they receive a premium tax abatement so they do not pay on their property tax. This was put in place in 2003 and to date we have only had seven come to fruition. I put in a bill to repeal the whole thing; why do it for only seven people? What, specifically are you going to be able to do to make sure we use this type of program? There are only seven insurance companies headquartered in our state.

Gingee Prince:

A nice thing about this program is that you can tap anyone who writes policies within the state. All 26 programs and more than \$1.8 billion have been allocated under these programs that have been oversubscribed in every single state. There are 161 insurance companies that currently participate in these programs in other states. For a \$50 million program, my guess is that you will have \$250 million of allocation requests that come in. It gets divided pro rata amongst the firms that are certified by the state. Am I answering your question? Is that what you were looking for? Will there be participants in the program?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

That is what I am looking for. It is great to give the incentives, but if they are not being utilized, then why give them? I tried to revisit the issue but unfortunately I ran out of time to make Assembly Bill 444 happen. In theory, those types of insurance companies bring in the higher paying jobs. We are not getting any movement on it. I envision the insurance premium piece headquartered in Nevada with a hundred employees, but I want to know for sure if it will be utilized.

Rose McKinney-James:

It might be helpful if Ms. Prince walks you through the process because it is somewhat confusing in terms of the role of the insurance companies versus the role of the premium tax. The insurance companies, who have a fairly healthy appetite for tax credits because of the way they are structured, would be targeted by the people who are doing the investments to take advantage of that. That would be abated by the premium tax starting four years from now. When the Chair says the full range of insurance companies that do business here would be targeted for that, it is not whether or not they are just headquartered here, but whether or not they do business here. If we find they do business in multiple states, and those states include programs like this, they are familiar with it and they would want to take advantage of it.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Another thing is, if they do business in other states, there is a reciprocity agreement that has to be upheld. We need to look at that in the future. Currently, if you are headquartered in Nevada, you have to pay Arizona a fee for coming to Nevada. I want to make sure everything is clear. When you walk through the process can you tell me about section 1.7 on adopting regulations; how is the state going to get that information to verify that we are moving forward with our program?

Gingee Prince:

What occurs in other states is that the regulatory department sets forth rules and guidelines for reporting. That process takes place during rule-making and obviously everyone has input on that. In other states, you look at job creation, the industry of the businesses, how much has been invested in these companies, where these companies are located, and how much follow-on or co-investment capital goes along with that initial investment from this particular program. Those are the areas that are covered in some other states. An annual report, which is not included in this portion but will be in the amendment, is required.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

What department is that in Nevada; is that DETR?

Rose McKinney-James:

That is what is proposed.

Gingee Prince:

What this bill initially does is to provide for the creation of venture capital firms that can raise up to \$50 million under this program. They raise this capital from insurance companies who would otherwise not be investing in an economic development program within the state. The private investment firms monetize these future tax credits and turn it into what looks like a ten year treasury bond for an insurance company. This gives the insurance company incentive to invest with a slightly better yield on their money. The insurance companies think this is a great product. The private investment firms wrap it and give it a triple 'A' rating.

The group that my firm works with is Bircher Hathaway who insures this bond that is sold to the insurance companies. The insurance companies give the money to the private investment firms up front and then the firms make investments according to the areas we have covered, such as the number of employees, a state residency requirement, and the requirement to employ a certain percentage of Nevada residents.

There are also investment timelines that must be met by these private investment firms. They have to get the money out the door in a certain period of time to ensure that the money is working within the state and the economic benefit to the state occurs before those first tax credits hit. Earlier iterations of this program did not have that delay factor. That has been implemented to make sure there is no negative impact to the state.

Following that, these portfolio companies receive capital, and then the investment managers take a more hands-on approach than a traditional venture capital firm would, because these companies need more oversight in the earlier stage, and then those small businesses grow and expand the state's tax base.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Would a company be able to get two separate loans at the same time?

Gingee Prince:

Madam Chair, there is a requirement or restriction in the amendment that says no one company can receive over 15 or 20 percent of the total amount of capital raised by that investment firm. For example, if a company raises

\$10 million under this program, then \$1.5 million would be the maximum that particular company could receive. It could be \$500,000 initially, another \$500,000 and then another \$500,000 again, at different times, certainly that is possible. Another nice part of this program is it can be a combination of both debt and equity. Entrepreneurs are getting smarter these days. They do not want straight equity investments anymore. They want to do some sort of debt with warrants and this allows for creative financing options for these companies and entrepreneurs. If you already qualify for an investment in the first round of funding, I believe you are still qualified to receive later stage investments. The first investment cannot be more than 15 percent of what that investment firm raises under the program. The idea behind that is that we are targeting that gap range of \$500,000 to \$3 million.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Thank you for going over it time and again. I just want to be very clear on this bill. I always get nervous when you have two sections of the bill that talk about adopting regulations. I want it all on the record.

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of S.B. 239 (R1)? Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify? Is there anyone in Carson City?

Nicole J. Cannizzaro, representing the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada:

We want to voice our support for S.B. 239 (R1). Anything that provides for coordination of economic and workforce development can only help to improve our state and will help bring the best to Nevada, which is especially critical in these economic times.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Are there any questions? Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in support of S.B. 239 (R1)? Is there anyone who is neutral? Is there anyone in opposition? Senator Horsford, is there anything else? [There was nothing else.] We will close the hearing on S.B. 239 (R1). There are some things that need to be ironed out on this bill.

[Assembly Bill 444 was mentioned, no jurisdiction.]

Assembly Bill 444: Repeals certain tax abatements and credits granted to certain businesses. (BDR 32-48)

[Meeting adjourned at 11:12 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Denise Sins
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: May 11, 2009

Time of Meeting: 9:37 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 37	C	Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, LCB	<u>Senate Bill 37</u>
S.B. 44	D	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 44</u>
S.B. 105	E	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 105</u>
S.B. 111 (R1)	F	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 111 (R1)</u>
S.B. 124	G	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 124</u>
S.B. 124	H	Susan Scholley	Proposed Amendment Mock-up to <u>Senate Bill 124</u>
S.B. 213	I	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 213</u>
S.B. 267	J	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 267</u>
S.B. 267	K	Susan Scholley	Proposed Amendment to <u>Senate Bill 267</u>
S.B. 396	L	Susan Scholley	<u>Senate Bill 396</u>
	M	Susan Scholley	Proposed Amendment Mock-up to <u>Senate Bill 396 (R1)</u>
S.B. 239 (R1)	N	Senator Horsford	Testimony on <u>Senate Bill 239 (R1)</u>

S.B. 239 (R1)	O	Senator Horsford	National Governors Assn. Center for Best Practices and Nat'l. Network of Sector Partners paper on State Sector Strategies
S.B. 239 (R1)	P	Rose McKinney-James	RGJ Article on Michigan Wind Effort
S.B. 239 (R1)	Q	Gingee M. Prince	One page color document describing the Nevada Small Business Investment Act
S.B. 239 (R1)	R	Gingee M. Prince	PowerPoint presentation on Nevada Small Business Investment Credit