

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Seventy-Fifth Session
May 12, 2009

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Morse Arberry Jr. at 8:15 a.m. on Tuesday, May 12, 2009, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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:

Assemblyman Morse Arberry Jr., Chair
Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblyman Mo Denis
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan
Assemblywoman Ellen Koivisto
Assemblywoman Kathy McClain
Assemblyman John Ocegüera
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24
Assemblyman William C. Horne, Clark County Assembly District No. 34

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Steve Abba, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Tracy Raxter, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Mark Krmpotic, Senior Program Analyst
Joi Davis, Program Analyst
Jeffrey A. Ferguson, Program Analyst
Eric King, Program Analyst
Linda Blevins, Committee Secretary
Vickie Kieffer, Committee Assistant

Chair Arberry opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 543.

Assembly Bill 543: Temporarily redirects a portion of the taxes ad valorem levied in Clark and Washoe Counties to the State General Fund. (BDR S-1187)

David Humke, Chair, Washoe County Commission, presented the following testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 543:

We understand the state's difficult situation, as Washoe County also has very serious challenges of our own. The taxpayers and employees of Washoe County have undergone cuts of \$64 million in the last three years, and we are cutting another \$47 million next year before taking into consideration what is being proposed in A.B. 543. The County Commission is faced with difficult decisions and will be cutting the budget by an overall 16 percent based on mandates and on citizen input, in order to balance. The revenue shift proposed by A.B. 543 will worsen all of these service reductions. Some of the impacts of fiscal year (FY) 2009-2010 cuts include:

- Some departments, including Parks and Libraries, are cutting more than 20 percent.
- Staff will be 16 percent smaller next year than last year, down approximately 500 positions through either lay-offs, voluntary separations, or vacancies.
- Eighteen of those eliminated positions are sheriff deputy positions, \$4.3 million out of the sheriff's office alone.
- We are cutting 8 percent in the district attorney's office, which will result in prioritizing cases with the elimination of prosecuting lower level offenses.
- We are cutting the public guardian's office, which serves some of our most fragile citizens, by 16.5 percent.
- We will be closing libraries for hours and days of the week.
- We won't be repairing roads as specified by our pavement maintenance system, and our infrastructure will continue to deteriorate.
- Reductions in public health nurse positions in the Health Department may reduce the home visits to at-risk new families.
- The Building and Safety Department is closed every Monday until further notice.
- We are cutting the regional parks by 26 percent and will not be hiring seasonal workers to keep parks clean, open, and maintained. Neighborhood volunteers will have to monitor some regional parks.

Mr. Humke introduced Katy Simon, Washoe County Manager, to continue testimony in opposition to A.B. 543.

Ms. Simon read the following prepared statement into the record:

Employees [Washoe County] agreed to no cost-of-living increase this year and next year and then took an additional 2.5 percent pay cut from that. We are not aware of any other local government labor group that has voluntarily given such concessions. In addition to these employee sacrifices, in many

departments staffing reductions exceed 20 percent with the overall vacancy rate of 15 percent.

- To balance the budget requires about 300 positions to be defunded, more than 90 of which will require layoffs.
- An additional 144 employees are taking voluntary separations, and another 65 vacant positions will be frozen.
- Including the current year vacant positions, there will be approximately 500 positions, countywide, vacant next year.

We are at \$3.64 property tax rate cap with no ability to raise offsetting revenues from property taxes. Combined with Indigent Accident Fund/Supplemental and the capital projects tax from the 2007 state cuts, the state will be getting \$15 million annually from Washoe County taxpayers that formerly came to Washoe County to provide mandated local services, with no ability to make up for this diverted revenue. We respectfully suggest alternatives to this proposal:

- Don't do it, or reduce the amount of shift.
- Find a different way for taxpayers throughout the state to more equitably share this burden.
- Move the tax shift outside the \$3.64 property tax rate cap.
- Impose a \$0.01 Government Services Tax and make the increase for public safety, health, and welfare.

Thank you for your consideration of Washoe County's concerns and suggestions.

Assemblywoman Leslie believed the Government Services Tax (GST) was a growth tax and would be an ongoing revenue source that would grow over time.

Ms. Simon stated that it would depend on the number of motor vehicle registrations. The Board of County Commissioners had not taken a position on the GST, but she wanted the county to have the ability to raise offsetting revenues. She suggested it could be temporary and tied to A.B. 543.

Robert Cashell, Mayor of the City of Reno, supported Mr. Humke and Ms. Simon. The homeless situation in Reno was a concern to Mayor Cashell. Cutting back salaries would affect the retirement of the county employees. He requested the Committee reconsider the consequences of the passage of A.B. 543.

Virginia Valentine, County Manager for Clark County, provided the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). She requested the Committee consider the effects of A.B. 543 on Clark County. Ms. Valentine outlined the following Clark County General Fund operating deficits:

- The County General Fund operating deficit was projected at approximately \$230 million for FY 2010. This was approximately \$30 million higher than previously estimated.
- The projected deficit was partially due to a projected increase in an operating deficit at the University Medical Center (UMC). The deficit was estimated at \$94 million compared to \$41 million in FY 2008.
- The cost savings identified to date would reduce the operating deficit by approximately \$64 million. This left a gap of about \$56 million to be

filled in the short-run by drawing down General Fund reserves and reallocating capital improvement projects.

- Adoption of A.B. 543 in its current form would increase the projected operating deficit by approximately \$30 million to nearly \$87 million, offsetting about half of the deficit reduction initiatives identified thus far.

Ms. Valentine noted the proposed deficit for FY 2010 was projected to be in excess of \$120 million. After implementation of cost-cutting measures, the remaining deficit was projected to be \$56.3 million. If A.B. 543 was implemented, the deficit would be approximately \$86.7 million.

Some of the deficit reduction initiatives described by Ms. Valentine included an increase in authorized positions held vacant to generate budgetary savings. Currently, Clark County held approximately 450 positions vacant in the General Fund and about 200 vacant positions at the UMC.

Additionally, Clark County had contracted for the lease of a 1,000 bed, low-level offender detention facility. According to Ms. Valentine, the facility would be ready for occupancy in the fall of 2009, but because of operating shortfalls, the opening would be delayed indefinitely.

Ms. Valentine said that discussions with the County principal bargaining unit, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), resulted in wage concessions, including a reduction in previously agreed to cost-of-living allowances, a reduction in merit pay increases, elimination of holiday pay, and elimination of overtime for higher paid employees. Where applicable, these concessions were extended to include employees of UMC, employees not covered by any other bargaining unit, and all management employees.

Clark County employees were directed to eliminate all discretionary travel, dues, subscriptions, external training, and purchasing of operating supplies. Ms. Valentine explained that Clark County had extended the replacement schedules for vehicles, heavy equipment, computers, and other equipment. A voluntary furlough and separation program had been implemented in the County.

An analysis of the 2011 tax roll suggested further deterioration of property tax collections would occur in the second year of the biennium, particularly as it related to the devaluation of commercial property. The reduction, according to Ms. Valentine, was expected to be as much as 10 percent of those revenues which translated to \$36 million in FY 2011. When all of the projections were combined with the anticipated impacts of A.B. 543, Clark County was looking at a General Fund operating deficit in excess of \$120 million.

Ms. Valentine stated that other consequences of A.B. 543 and The Executive Budget for 2009-2011 included:

- Redirection of a portion of the property tax collected by Washoe and Clark Counties.
- Reallocation of the Indigent Accident Fund and Supplemental Relief Fund.
- Increase in the state Sales and Use Tax collection allowance.
- Child Welfare Integration Budget salary cuts and vacancy savings.
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) emergency assistance reductions.
- Emergency shelter fund reductions.
- Graduate Medical Education (GME) reductions.

The total annual cost to Clark County would be approximately \$59.7 million.

Ms. Valentine introduced George Stevens, Chief Financial Officer for Clark County and UMC, to address the impact of A.B. 543 on property tax rates.

Mr. Stevens stated that A.B. 543 would divert nearly 10 percent of the total property taxes received by the Clark County General Fund and used to support countywide services such as courts, child welfare, social service programs, juvenile justice programs, and indigent healthcare. These programs operated in partnership with the State of Nevada. Cutting the revenues from Clark County would have a negative effect on the state budget.

The total operating rate for Clark County General Fund was \$0.4662. This would divert nearly 9 percent of the total revenues. A portion of the money would be diverted from family court, the health district, social service programs, emergency room services, and other services.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that it was recognized and accepted that the state was facing unprecedented budget shortfalls, and the availability of new revenue sources was limited. Assembly Bill 543 unfairly placed the entire burden for the proposed property tax shift on Washoe and Clark Counties. Pro-rating the proposed \$0.04 property tax shift over both the unincorporated and incorporated cities would cut the County's burden of the proposal approximately in half. Assembly Bill 543 did not envision shifting any property taxes from the incorporated cities even though the cities, through their redevelopment agencies were already diverting the equivalent of more than \$0.04 in property taxes from the state, Clark County School District, and Clark County. The tables in [Exhibit C](#) displayed an overview of the deficit.

Mr. Stevens was aware that the state budget must be balanced. Clark County had developed an alternative to give the state the equivalent of approximately \$0.04 in property taxes. The alternative used the \$0.05 capital levy in Clark County. Legislation passed by the 2007 Legislative Session diverted \$0.03 of that property tax from the local government to the state to fund transportation projects. Because of the way the bill was enacted, the \$0.03 was diverted over a five-year period. If the state took the balance of that \$0.05 property tax, it would give the state the equivalent of approximately \$0.07 in property taxes over the next two years. The language was provided in [Exhibit D](#).

The final page of [Exhibit C](#) presented the revenue redistribution proposal. Mr. Stevens explained that the \$0.04 property tax in Clark County generated approximately \$60,800,000 over a two-year period. The Board of County Commissioners was in the process of disbanding its Redevelopment Agency. The Commissioners believed it was better to use those revenues to support the state, school districts, and county services rather than for redevelopment projects. Doing this would return approximately \$12 million over the next two years to the state either directly or through the Clark County School District budget.

Chair Arberry inquired whether Mr. Stevens intended to use the language proposed in [Exhibit D](#) rather than amend and pass A.B. 543.

Mr. Stevens stated that the proposed language in the exhibit was intended as an alternative to A.B. 543.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director representing the Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada and the Washoe County Public Attorneys Association, was opposed to A.B. 543. He requested the Committee review [Exhibit D](#). Washoe County was willing to help with the economic downturn in the counties. It appeared that the proposal presented by Clark County could alleviate the problem.

Andrew Clinger, Director, Department of Administration, provided [Exhibit E](#) for the Committee. According to Mr. Clinger, A.B. 543 was necessary to implement the Governor's budget and was a recommendation included in The Executive Budget.

The exhibit contained a table that listed the projections of what the Budget Division believed A.B. 543 would generate for the state. For FY 2010, it was estimated that \$30,380,532 would be generated from Clark County and \$5,630,308 would be generated from Washoe County. In FY 2011 it was estimated that \$27,329,144 would be generated from Clark County and \$5,117,520 from Washoe County. Over the biennium it was anticipated the bill would generate \$68,457,504 for the state.

Mr. Clinger pointed out that the graph on page 2 of the exhibit compared state and local government tax revenue since 1982. As indicated on the chart, the state had collected 38 percent less than local governments in FY 2006.

Jeffrey A. Fontaine, representing the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), expressed opposition to A.B. 543. He provided [Exhibit F](#), which showed the effects on county governments as a result of the pending legislation. He believed it was important to put everything into perspective. The counties had a pending amount of \$151 million in diverted revenues to help address the state's budget shortfall. The bulk of the revenue came from Washoe and Clark Counties.

In addition to the diversion of revenues, Mr. Fontaine pointed out the potential for additional costs on county governments. Some of the pending bills would place additional unfunded mandates on the counties ([Exhibit F](#)). Additionally, there was a pending order from the Supreme Court that could add many millions of dollars in costs to local governments for indigent defense.

Mr. Fontaine addressed a point made by Mr. Clinger regarding the graph in [Exhibit E](#) that indicated the state had received 38 percent less in revenues than local governments. Mr. Clinger did not indicate the amount of expenditures for the state versus the counties.

Mr. Fontaine urged the Committee to work with the counties to lessen the impact when considering measures to balance the state budget.

Stacy Shaffer, Service Employees International Union, Nevada Chapter, expressed opposition to A.B. 543. The revenue diversion would have a catastrophic effect on the vital services that the county employees provided. She urged the Committee to work with the counties to come up with alternative solutions.

Marvin Leavitt, representing the cities of Las Vegas and Henderson, testified in opposition to A.B. 543. Although the bill did not affect the revenues of the cities directly, the residents of the cities would be affected by the revenues lost for the counties. The revenue sources used by the state were the same revenue sources used by the counties.

Robert S. Hadfield, private citizen, opposed A.B. 543. He believed it was bad public policy to balance the state budget by taking money away from other government entities that provided the services the Legislature required them to provide. The local governments needed the authority to recoup that revenue. He was concerned about the social services and public safety of the state.

Mr. Hadfield was concerned the passage of this bill would be setting a precedent. He believed something should be written into the law to ensure this would not reoccur.

Assemblyman Hogan commented that Clark County had sent a lobbyist to oppose a proposal that would have transferred excessive sales tax in Clark County from the water authority to the county general fund. The amount would have been in the hundreds of millions and it would have continued at the rate of \$60 million to \$80 million a year for six years.

Because there was no additional public testimony or comments, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 543 and opened the hearing on A.B. 92.

Assembly Bill 92: Revises the provisions governing the benefits of a retired justice or judge. (BDR 1-400)

James W. Hardesty, Chief Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court, presented an overview of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92. A proposed amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) was distributed to the Committee by Justice Hardesty.

The purpose of the bill was to allow the continuation of the senior justice and senior judge program. Assembly Bill 92 had raised concerns regarding a fiscal note. Justice Hardesty stated he had met with Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) representatives to review the actuarial assumptions that were made, restructure the bill, and present an amendment to change the program allowing a judge in the Judicial Retirement System (JRS) to attain the age of 60 and have a six-month service break before he could be appointed as a senior judge. According to the new actuarial study done as a result of revising this program, the fiscal note was eliminated.

Dana K. Bilyeu, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS), testified that she had worked closely with the court system in restructuring the bill and the proposed amendment. The actuary indicated that because of the limiting nature of the new language, a new experience review period would be necessary to evaluate the cost to PERS. With the new experience review period coupled with a new sunset date, staff recommended that the retirement board adopt a neutral position on the amendment and remove the fiscal note. Additionally, there was no right to re-enrollment for the senior judge program.

There being no additional testimony, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 92 and opened the hearing on A.B. 530.

Assembly Bill 530: Revises provisions governing the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation. (BDR 34-1218)

Andrew Clinger, Executive Director, Department of Administration, provided an overview of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 530, stating the bill was necessary to implement budget reductions that were approved over the last biennium. The Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation (Remediation Trust) was an account that did not revert. In subsection (b) of section 1 of the bill, the language was changed to allow the appropriations in

that account to revert. Without the bill, the Budget Division would be unable to revert \$62.6 million in approved budget reductions.

Assemblywoman Smith knew this change must be made to balance the cuts that had been approved. She was concerned that the bill appeared to make the change permanent rather than one-time. She requested an amendment to ensure the change was not permanent.

Mr. Clinger did not have a problem with an amendment to ensure this was not a permanent change.

Keith Rheault, Ph.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, agreed with Assemblywoman Smith and the proposed amendment. The Remediation Trust would not be a trust fund if it was reverted every year.

Randall C. Robison, on behalf of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS), stated that he was in agreement with Assemblywoman Smith and Dr. Rheault. The NASS was concerned with the ongoing reversion and wanted to ensure the change was for one year only.

Anne Loring, on behalf of Washoe County School District, was in agreement with Assemblywoman Smith, Dr. Rheault, and Mr. Robison.

There being no additional testimony, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 530 and opened the hearing on A.B. 546.

Assembly Bill 546: Revises provisions related to continuation of coverage for health insurance under the group policies of smaller employers. (BDR 57-1308)

Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Clark County Assembly District, provided an overview of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 546 and distributed a proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) to the bill. The bill would typically have been presented to the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor; however, because of issues surrounding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the bill was being presented to this Committee.

Assemblyman Conklin read the following testimony into the record:

Assembly Bill 546 makes health insurance available to a substantial number of Nevada residents who would qualify for federal subsidies under the stimulus act but who may have turned down the chance to enroll for coverage because they had no way of knowing the subsidy would become available.

Under the federal COBRA law, certain group health plans must offer former employees the opportunity to continue to participate for a period of time after a qualifying event, such as involuntary termination. This is called "continuation of coverage." It is typically good for up to 18 months, and the former employee must elect coverage within 60 days after a qualifying event.

Nevada and many other states have continuation coverage laws that apply to employers with less than 20 employees. These are known as "mini-COBRA laws." The stimulus act grants a 65 percent COBRA premium subsidy for up to nine months of coverage for a person involuntarily terminated after

September 1, 2008, and before the end of this year. The ARRA also gives former employees a second chance to sign up for COBRA because they may have turned down the coverage before Congress enacted the subsidy.

Participants in the state mini-COBRA plans also qualify for the subsidy, but the stimulus act does not give them a second chance to sign up unless the individual state adopts such a provision.

A state may choose to provide a second chance for persons involuntarily terminated from September 1, 2008, through February 16, 2009, the date the President signed the stimulus act.

At least 12 states allow a second chance for mini-COBRA coverage: Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia, and second chance legislation is pending in many other states.

If a former employee signs up, he will get the 65 percent COBRA premium subsidy for a maximum of nine months. This 65 percent subsidy is reimbursed to the coverage provider through a tax credit to the federal government. Importantly, in the case of mini-COBRA, the employer's insurer, not the employer, receives the reimbursement and, therefore, covers the cost of the subsidy until the reimbursement is received. Finally, the insurer must give notice to those who qualify with information on how to request coverage within specified deadlines.

Assemblyman Conklin briefly summarized A.B. 546 for the Committee. Nevada's mini-COBRA laws appeared in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 689B and NRS 689C. Sections 1 and 2 of this bill reduced the maximum premium for individual continuation coverage from 125 percent to 110 percent of the premium the insurer charged the employer on the date of the qualifying event. It also changed the premium payments from quarterly to monthly.

According to Assemblyman Conklin, the Division of Insurance recommended these provisions for the benefit of former employees who take advantage of the mini-COBRA coverage. The Division did not anticipate any immediate financial impact on small employers because the former employee, not the employer, paid the premium. In the long-run, if insurers raised their premiums because of this reduction or other factors, the cost would be shared by all insurances.

Assemblyman Conklin noted that sections 3 and 4 of the bill implemented the second chance for mini-COBRA continuation coverage for former employees involuntarily terminated between September 1, 2008, and February 16, 2009. There was not an estimate available of how many people would be affected by this bill. There were approximately 150,000 Nevadans who had made unemployment claims during that period, and about 15 percent of Nevada workers were employed by companies with less than 20 employees. Spouses and children were also eligible for continuation coverage to the same extent they were eligible for coverage prior to the involuntary termination.

Sections 3 and 4 also established the process for giving notice. The insurer must notify the employer of the employer's duties, and the employer must notify its former employees. Section 5 was an appropriation to the Division of Insurance for enforcement of the provisions of this bill.

Assemblyman Conklin pointed out that [Exhibit H](#) was a proposed amendment to A.B. 546 from the Division of Insurance. There were three provisions in the amendment. One of the provisions clarified that it was the insurer who was responsible for the 65 percent premium. The second provision clarified that continuation of coverage began the date the insurer received the enrollment form or provided that continuation of coverage would begin on May 1. The third provision required the eligible beneficiary to elect coverage and make the 35 percent payment within 60 days of receipt of notice.

In summary, Assemblyman Conklin explained that, currently, when a person was involuntarily terminated, they were eligible for COBRA. There were two types of COBRA: one for large employers that was managed federally, and one for small employers, 20 employees or less, that was proctored by the state.

Under current COBRA law, the insurer was allowed to charge 25 percent more than the employer paid as a part of the group plan. The ARRA allowed that to be reduced to 110 percent. The second provision of ARRA said that the insurance company was now allowed to receive a 65 percent tax credit from the federal government. If taxes were not owed, the federal government would reimburse 65 percent for the mini-COBRA participants. That reimbursement would be reflected in the amount charged to the person eligible for COBRA.

Chair Arberry commented that it appeared to be an excellent bill.

Assemblywoman Smith remarked that the bill would be helpful to people who were involuntarily unemployed. She wanted to ensure that the Commissioner of Insurance, the Office for Consumer Health Assistance, and others who dealt with constituents regarding insurance had the information readily available.

Scott J. Kipper, Commissioner of Insurance, was willing to work with the Office for Consumer Health Assistance and others to ensure the information was provided to everyone involved. He believed the provisions of the bill put significant challenges on the insurance industry to reach out to the appropriate individuals.

Assemblyman Goicoechea inquired whether the \$25,000 fiscal note was still applicable.

Mr. Kipper stated there was a \$25,000 appropriation; however, he believed the program would go forward without the appropriation.

Chair Arberry requested further clarification.

Mr. Kipper assured Chair Arberry that the appropriation was not needed for the program to go forward.

Assemblyman Goicoechea inquired what the status of the program would be when ARRA funds were no longer available.

Van Mouradian, Chief Insurance Examiner, Division of Insurance, testified that the subsidy would run out in nine months and no later than December 31, 2009; however, Congress was considering extending the deadline for the subsidy.

Mr. Mouradian confirmed Assemblyman Goicoechea's understanding that when the subsidy ran out, the program would be eliminated.

Assemblyman Conklin remarked that he wanted to ensure the language was very clear in the statutes and that there was no additional burden except if Congress continued to extend the credit. When the credit ended, the provisions associated with the credit would terminate.

Chair Arberry suggested that language should be added to clarify that issue.

Assemblyman Conklin reiterated that there was no funding required for the state. The program was exclusive between the federal government, the insurers, and the terminated employee.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada, echoed the comments of Assemblywoman Smith. He supported A.B. 546 but believed not all employees who were involuntarily terminated received the necessary information regarding their COBRA eligibility.

Jack Kim, representing the Nevada Association of Health Plans, supported A.B. 546 and proposed amendments. He believed it was important for the employees to receive the appropriate information in a timely manner. When the bill was signed, the Association was prepared to send letters to all employers notifying them of their requirement to advise all employees of these changes.

There being no further testimony on the bill, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 546. Chair Arberry noted that at the request of the sponsor, A.B. 522 was removed from the agenda.

Chair Arberry opened the hearing on A.B. 401.

Assembly Bill 401: Extends the bonding capacity of the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR S-884)

Assemblyman David Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District 24, introduced his intern, Taylor Anderson, a student from the University of Nevada, Reno. Mr. Anderson presented an overview of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 401.

Mr. Anderson read the following testimony to the Committee:

I come before you today in support of A.B. 401. Assembly Bill 401 would extend the current authority already given to the Nevada System of Higher Education Board of Regents to issue bonds for projects related to the universities and community colleges. The bill would also update the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) with the current names of colleges around the state.

A brief background, if I may. The Board of Regents has had the authority to issue bonds since 1967 and has done so to build up the institutions. This bonding authority was reauthorized by the Legislature in 1991 and was effective for 18 years. Currently we are at year 18. This authority should be continued another 20 years. If enacted, this bill would allow the Board to approve the issuance of bonds until January 1, 2029.

As you can see, there is no fiscal note with this bill. It simply continues the status-quo and does not cost the state any money.

Sections 2 and 3 of this bill make effective the changes to the names of the colleges in the Nevada System of Higher Education. In March 2007 the Board of Regents approved a request by the students, faculty, staff, and community of the then community colleges, to drop the community from their names. This request was approved by the Board and has been implemented at all the colleges. The Board of Regents already possesses the authority to change the names of these colleges; this bill simply cleans up the NRS to assure there is no confusion.

In conclusion, A.B. 401 simply extends the authority already given and cleans up the language within NRS with zero fiscal impact. For these reasons, I urge the passage of A.B. 401.

Mr. Anderson noted the bill had been passed by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs without amendment.

Daniel J. Klaich, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), supported A.B. 401. The bill extended the bonding capacity for the NSHE to 2029. There was no fiscal impact.

Assemblywoman Smith inquired whether there was a reason the authority was originally granted for 18 years rather than 20 years or more.

Mr. Anderson was not able to find any information regarding a specific reason for the length of time that was originally authorized.

In response to Assemblywoman Smith, Mr. Klaich explained the bill would not change anything for the current biennium. The NSHE had listed the projects in the bonding capacity, and there were still the same bonding capacity projects in the bill. The projects had not been undertaken because of budget constraints of the last biennium. He was uncertain whether or not the bonds would actually be issued.

There being no additional testimony, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 401 and opened the hearing on A.B. 544.

Assembly Bill 544: Revises provisions governing the State Plan for Medicaid. (BDR 38-1266)

Elisa Maser, President and CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood, addressed the Committee regarding Assembly Bill (A.B.) 544. She noted that in addition to the five health care centers that Planned Parenthood had in Nevada, the bill would benefit the other publicly funded, family-planning health centers around the state.

Ms. Maser stated that the overall goal in submitting the bill was to move Medicaid family-planning forward in Nevada. She projected it would result in savings up to \$14 million each year. In her opinion, Planned Parenthood led to healthier mothers and children.

Ms. Maser provided a proposed amendment ([Exhibit I](#)) to the Committee. The amendment proposed to be permissive and allow the Director of the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy to amend the state plan for Medicaid and "opt-in" or to submit a waiver application to provide family-planning.

Ms. Maser stated that as A.B. 544 was written it would cover women from 133 percent to 250 percent of poverty. This language left out many women in the 85 percent to 133 percent poverty range who, she believed, should be covered. The proposed amendment would remove the language "more than 133 percent of the federally designated level signifying poverty," so that family-planning services would be provided for women who had household incomes not more than 250 percent of the poverty level.

Stacy Hardie, RN, Public Health Nursing Supervisor, Washoe County Health District, supported A.B. 544. Ms. Hardie provided written testimony attached as [Exhibit J](#).

Assemblywoman Gansert commented that she did not see a definition for "family-planning services" in the bill. She requested the definition be included to ensure the services were for contraceptives and not for abortion services.

Ms. Maser thought there was a clear definition of "family-planning services" in the Medicaid state plan. It was her understanding it included birth control and counseling services but not abortion. It could be included in the bill if necessary.

Charles Duarte, Administrator, Department of Health and Human Services, provided written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)) on A.B. 544. Mr. Duarte stated that the Division on Health Care Financing and Policy took a neutral position on the bill but discussed the fiscal note.

In response to Assemblywoman Leslie, Mr. Duarte noted that to the best of his knowledge, the match would continue to be a 90/10 match. He assumed the "opt-in" would probably be included since it was a part of the President's budget.

Assemblywoman Leslie inquired whether the passage of A.B. 544 was necessary to "opt-in." In her opinion, the Assembly Joint Subcommittee on Human Services believed the proposal would save the state money.

Mr. Duarte replied that the Division would review whether the bill was necessary. He believed the issue was one of cash flow and ensuring that the resources were available to manage the program, particularly the eligibility component, whether through a state plan option or waiver. He estimated a caseload at the end of 2012 of approximately 44,000 eligible individuals. The staff needed in the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services to determine eligibility would be significant. The cost would probably be less in the next biennium, assuming the planning process was started in the current biennium. He anticipated the full cost impact would occur in the 2014-2015 biennium.

Assemblywoman Leslie inquired whether the fiscal effect would be mainly for staff or for family-planning services.

Mr. Duarte explained that for medical assistance payments, the cost was approximately \$16 million.

Assemblyman Hardy asked how many Medicaid-funded births there were each year in Nevada, how many Medicaid recipients were currently with the family-planning services, and how many Medicaid recipients were projected to become a part of the family-planning services. He was also curious to know how many recipients had to be included in the Medicaid family-planning services to realize the savings mentioned.

Mr. Duarte did not have all of the information readily available but would see that it was provided to the Committee. Approximately 10,000 births per year were paid under the Medicaid program, but he did not know how many births would need to be averted. The projection was not run past the 2012-2013 biennium.

Assemblywoman Gansert asked Mr. Duarte to include the definition of "family-planning services" in the bill.

Mr. Duarte was not aware of a specific definition in state law for "family-planning services" but noted it was defined in the Division regulations. He would research the state law to see whether it was included.

Assemblyman Hardy questioned whether there would be an adverse affect of defining "family-planning services" instead of by regulation.

Mr. Duarte did not believe there would be any adverse affects.

Melissa Clement, Nevada Right to Life, provided a proposed amendment to A.B. 544 attached as [Exhibit L](#). Ms. Clement was concerned that the bill did not define "family-planning services."

Don Nelson, President of Nevada Life, agreed with the testimony provided by Melissa Clement and supported A.B. 544 with the amendment she proposed. He agreed that a definition of "family-planning services" should be included.

Patty Elzy, Director of Public Affairs, Planned Parenthood Advocates, believed that putting a definition for "family-planning services" in the bill could be problematic, as it could be limiting because of new developments in birth control. According to Ms. Elzy, 27 states had applied for the family-planning waiver. She requested the Committee consider the amendment proposed by the Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood.

Constance Brooks, representing Clark County, supported A.B. 544.

There being no additional testimony, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 544 and, following a brief recess, opened the hearing on A.B. 385.

Assembly Bill 385 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning the supervision of convicted persons by correctional officers and parole and probation officers. (BDR 16-523)

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Clark County Assembly District 34, provided an overview of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 385 (R1) and proposed amendment 251 ([Exhibit M](#)). The bill required the Board of State Prison Commissioners to establish a policy for guidelines on setting the maximum number of prisoners who may be supervised by a correctional officer at each facility. Additionally, the bill set a maximum caseload for each parole and probation officer who supervised convicted persons.

Assemblyman Horne pointed out that there was a fiscal note on the bill of \$1.7 million over the next biennium; however, the fiscal note set the staffing at 75 to 1. The bill was amended to set the staffing ratio at 70 to 1 changing the fiscal note.

Assemblyman Horne explained that A.B. 502 (R1) failed to pass out of the Assembly by the deadline. The bill made changes to guard ratios in private prisons and had an effect on the ratio standards in state prisons. Amendment 251 had been attached to A.B. 502 (R1) ([Exhibit M](#)). Assemblyman Horne believed that A.B. 502 (R1) language could be adapted and integrated into A.B. 385 (R1) with the deletion of subsection 1 of section 1. That section addressed the maximum number of prisoners who may be incarcerated in a private facility and the ratio of prisoners to correctional officers. Additionally, in subsection 2 it stated, "The ratio of prisoners to correctional officers established pursuant to subsection 1 must not exceed the ratio established for facilities and institutions of the Department for prisoners subject to the same level of security." This indicated the ratio should be the same for private prisons as that mandated for the state facilities.

The remainder of A.B. 502 (R1) addressed regulation of private prisons built in the state and reimbursement to the state for expenses for capturing escapees. Assemblyman Horne noted this was covered in section 2 of A.B. 502 (R1). He requested that language be included in an amendment for A.B. 385 (R1).

Chair Arberry believed the major concern with A.B. 385 (R1) was the establishment of a ratio of guards to prisoners. He thought that the state should not set the guidelines for a private institution.

Assemblyman Horne commented that the safety of the public was the primary concern. He believed there should be a minimum ratio established as well as guidelines regarding the type of prisoners that could be incarcerated in the state to ensure the public safety.

Assemblywoman McClain liked the concept. Private prisons were beginning to come into the state, and the state was attempting to lease a facility to private industry. She believed it was important to establish standards for the private facilities.

Chair Arberry agreed; however, he did not believe the state should dictate the number of employees a private industry should hire.

Assemblywoman McClain disagreed. This was an exception in that it affected the public safety.

Assemblyman Horne remarked that there was case law regarding a private industry that entered into a business operation typically reserved for the state or city could be regulated outside the normal bounds of private industry. He recognized the concerns of Chair Arberry and the fiscal restraints the state was experiencing.

Bernard W. Curtis, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation in the Department of Public Safety, expressed support for A.B. 385 (R1).

Howard Skolnik, Director for the Department of Corrections, supported A.B. 385 (R1) but requested the Committee consider some modifications. The bill stated "State of Nevada Employees' Association." Mr. Skolnik requested that be changed to "State of Nevada employee associations" because there were numerous associations involved in the Department of Corrections.

Additionally, Mr. Skolnik requested changing the language from "a ratio" to "a minimum staffing pattern." Ratios meant that the Department was locked into a particular number. As an example, Mr. Skolnik explained that if there

was an incident and he pulled all staff but one, locked down the unit, and moved the staff to cover the incident, he would be breaking the law because the ratio would not be maintained.

Mr. Skolnik was neutral on the amendment but supported the bill. He wanted the amendment to reflect that any money collected should offset the expenses of the Department and not go into the General Fund.

Chair Arberry requested that Mr. Skolnik provide his proposed amendment to the Committee. The Committee was concerned that once the ratio was set, it would force the Director of the Department of Corrections to also follow those guidelines.

Mr. Skolnik stated that the original amendment developed with the associations indicated that minimum staffing patterns would be designed for each institution as a part of the administrative regulations. He was uncertain how or why the language had been changed, but he preferred reverting to the original language. He provided [Exhibit N](#) for the Committee's consideration.

Kevin R. Ranft, representing American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) No. 4041, supported A.B. 385 (R1). Mr. Ranft stated that he was employed as a correctional officer and wanted the minimum staffing. The Department of Corrections needed the flexibility to be able to lock down a unit and move staff as necessary to cover an emergency situation. The primary concern should be the safety of the officers and the public.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director representing the Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada and the Nevada Corrections Association, supported A.B. 385 (R1) and the proposed amendment. Mr. Dreher agreed with the proposed changes discussed by Mr. Skolnik. In his opinion, the issue of minimum staffing was crucial.

Chris Ferrari, representing the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), was neutral on A.B. 385 (R1). To the best of his knowledge, there was only one private prison facility proposed for Nevada. The CCA was contracting with the Department of Justice to build a 1,072-bed federal detention center in Nye County, Nevada. According to Mr. Ferrari, 88 percent of CCA facilities were accredited by the American Correctional Association (ACA), but no State of Nevada facilities were ACA accredited.

Laurayne Murray, Town Board, Town of Pahrump, supported A.B. 385 (R1) and appreciated the concern of the Committee regarding public safety. She was happy that Nye County had been selected for the Department of Justice project.

Patti Chipman, a contract lobbyist from Nye County, supported A.B. 385 (R1) and the Department of Justice project.

Mr. Ferrari requested that if the Committee passed A.B. 385 (R1), they consider an exemption for the facility to be constructed in Nye County to avoid the potential implications that could arise.

There being no additional testimony, Chair Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 385 (R1).

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 64 and A.B. 65 (R1).

A.B. 64 (R1) Increases the number of judges in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts. (BDR 1-371)

A.B. 65 (R2) Provides for the collection and disposition of additional court fees. (BDR 2-372)

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, advised the Committee that proposed amendments had been distributed for A.B. 64 ([Exhibit O](#)) and A.B. 65 (R1) ([Exhibit P](#)).

Mr. Stevens explained that A.B. 64 provided for ten additional district judges: one in Washoe County and nine in Clark County. The judges would be elected in the next general election and take office in January 2011. Their salaries would have to be paid in the final six months of the current biennium. In its original form, A.B. 64 included an appropriation of approximately \$1 million to pay those salaries, a State General Fund responsibility.

Mr. Stevens addressed A.B. 65 (R1), which was a bill to increase various court fees to be used by local governments to offset some of the costs of expanding courtrooms and providing additional courtrooms for new district judges. In addition, the amended bill contained a \$50 fee to be used for A.B. 149 (R2), which was the bill addressing foreclosure mediation and the use of senior judges for negotiations between lenders and borrowers. The revenue estimated from the A.B. 65 (R1) fee would be approximately \$15 million in the Eighth Judicial District and \$2.7 million in Washoe County.

There was an amendment on A.B. 64 that would allow some money generated by A.B. 65 (R1) to pay the \$1 million salaries of the district judges in the current biennium. The General Fund would assume those costs for the next biennium.

Mr. Stevens advised the Committee that an additional amendment was recently received requesting proceeds from the \$50 fee to support A.B. 149 (R2) not be reverted. Fiscal Analysis Division staff believed this was not necessary. The language in A.B. 65 (R1) indicated that the money would be deposited in an account for foreclosure mediation, which was created in the state General Fund. As long as that account included only the \$50 fee, none of the money would be reverted.

Assemblyman Goicoechea stated that it was his understanding that no fiscal note was attached as long as the funds generated in A.B. 65 (R1) were used to pay the costs in A.B. 64 for the current biennium.

Mr. Stevens confirmed that there would not be a state General Fund cost for the current biennium, but there would be a General Fund cost for the next biennium. The cost for the current biennium was approximately \$1,061,000 and would be double that amount in each fiscal year of the next biennium.

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 64.

ASSEMBLYMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
A.B. 64.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Leslie abstained. Assemblywoman Buckley, Assemblyman Conklin, and Assemblyman Ocegüera were not present for the vote.)

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 65 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS A.B. 65 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley, Assemblyman Conklin, and Assemblyman Ocegüera were not present for the vote.)

Having been informed of a problem with the passage A.B. 99 (R1), Chair Arberry requested Mr. Stevens provide additional information for the Committee.

Assembly Bill 99 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to public safety. (BDR 15-410)

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the bill was passed from the Committee on Ways and Means as Amend and Do Pass; however, no amendment was necessary. Therefore, Fiscal Analysis Division staff recommended the Committee rescind their previous action and move the bill as Do Pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RESCIND THE COMMITTEE'S ACTION ON A.B. 99 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

Chair Arberry requested a motion from the Committee on A.B. 99 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 99 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 227 (R1).

**A.B. 227 (1st reprint) Revises provisions relating to the provision of foster care.
(BDR 38-187)**

Assemblywoman Smith explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 227 (R1) allowed foster care agencies to be licensed. The bill originally had a large fiscal note, but proposed amendment 4815 ([Exhibit Q](#)) allowed for regulations to be set. It was permissive so that the counties could do the licensing. A fee was included in the amendment whereby the agencies would pay for their licensing. The Division of Child and Family Services, providers, and counties all agreed on the amendment.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
A.B. 227 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and
Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 246 (R1).

**Assembly Bill 246 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to hunting.
(BDR 45-512)**

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, noted that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 246 (R1) was heard in Committee on May 4, 2009. The bill allowed additional wildlife tags. There was a proposed amendment for the bill.

Assemblyman Goicoechea noted that the amendments were presented, but there was no vote on the bill.

Assemblywoman Smith stated that the bill had incorporated Assemblyman Goicoechea's bill and the language from one of her bills, as well as language from Assemblyman David P. Bobzien's apprentice hunting license bill.

Assemblyman Hogan commented that the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture and Mining did not hear the bill. He had received a considerable amount of input from the wildlife community. The Chairman of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners had advised Assemblyman Hogan that the Commission had voted against the bill in a special meeting. A concern was that if the additional fees included in the bill prompted a veto, it would threaten the two bills that were merged with A.B. 246 (R1).

Assemblywoman Smith responded that there was a large contingency of the wildlife community that supported A.B. 246 (R1). The Commission had become very political, and at the last meeting, the Commissioners indicated that they wanted to see the amended language of the bill and reconsider their position; however, that was not permitted. They had received erroneous information regarding the bill, which Assemblywoman Smith believed was unfortunate.

Assemblywoman Smith further explained that the original version of A.B. 246 (R1), the apprentice hunting bill, required a two-thirds majority vote and included a fee. The proponents of the "Dream Tag" met with the Governor

to discuss the bill. She requested that her colleagues support the bill and move it to the Senate.

Assemblyman Goicoechea concurred with Assemblywoman Smith and believed it was essential that the bill move to the Senate so the policy discussions could take place. The amendments that were offered for A.B. 183 (a bill that died) were heard in the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture and Mining and received unanimous approval, as did A.B. 246 (R1). He commented that the original A.B. 437 ("Dream Tag") proposal was significantly amended. He believed that A.B. 246 (R1) was a good bill and should be moved to the Senate.

ASSEMBLYMAN OCEGUERA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
A.B. 246 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblyman Hogan and Assemblywoman Koivisto voted no. Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 430 (R1).

Assembly Bill 430 (1st Reprint): Prohibits certain activity regarding unsafe cribs and other children's products. (BDR 52-464)

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 430 (R1) was presented to the Committee by Senator David R. Parks and involved unsafe cribs and other children's products.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 430 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblywoman Smith remarked that at the hearing on this bill, she had a question and believed an amendment had been requested. Section 5 of the bill mentioned section 8, but section 8 had been deleted from the bill. Additionally, there was concern because the bill stated that "the Consumer's Advocate may ban or designate as a health safety hazard any children's product." She thought the amendment was being processed.

Chair Arberry agreed to hold the bill for further information.

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 349 (R1).

Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain emergency medical technicians. (BDR 40-1022)

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, noted the bill had been presented by Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District 40. There was concern regarding the fiscal note. The Fiscal Analysis Division had received an email

from the Health Division that indicated the amendments removed the fiscal impact.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 349 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and
Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

* * * * *

Chair Arberry requested the Committee consider A.B. 505 (R1).

**Assembly Bill 505 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing pupils enrolled in
high school. (BDR 34-784)**

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the
Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained the bill was introduced to the Committee
by Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell, Assembly District 40.

Assemblywoman Smith noted that Assemblywoman Parnell testified when the
bill was presented that the effective date of the bill could be amended for the
implementation of the requirements because there was no money available.
The language would be changed to read "to the extent money is available."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
A.B. 505 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and
Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

Assembly Bill 522: Makes various changes relating to energy. (BDR 58-1139)

This bill was not heard at the request of the sponsor.

ELECTED OFFICIALS

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE—SPECIAL FUND (101-1031)

BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-66

Joi Davis, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel
Bureau, presented an overview of the Attorney General's (AG) Special Fund
budget account (BA) 1031 for Committee consideration. Although the
AG budgets were closed on April 27, 2009, two items were held.

According to Ms. Davis the major closing issue for this account involved the
funding for Yucca Mountain High Level Nuclear Waste Repository. The budget
was held based on the ruling of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC),
which was released on May 11, 2009. The order indicated that out of the 229
contentions put forth by the State of Nevada, 222 were approved to move
forward with the licensing proceedings.

At the previous budget closing hearing, Fiscal Analysis Division staff was directed to work with the Agency and discuss possible revisions based on the number of contentions that might need General Fund support.

Ms. Davis noted that the Agency had worked with outside counsel and indicated that although the number of contentions had only dropped slightly, the outside counsel reduced the funding projection by 29 percent based on the current economic situation of the state.

Ms. Davis noted that the original request was for \$2,406,735. Based on the latest information received, the new request projection for General Fund support to continue the efforts regarding Yucca Mountain would be \$1,406,735 in each year of the upcoming biennium.

Additionally, the Agency learned from the federal government that the President's budget reduced funding for Yucca Mountain, but the administration would continue to seek an alternative to Yucca Mountain and to continue the NRC licensing proceedings. The federal funding of \$5 million in each year that was anticipated for this budget had been reduced to \$3,182,900 in each year of the upcoming biennium.

Ms. Davis requested the Committee consider whether to include \$1,406,735 in each year of the biennium to continue efforts and to seek authority to reduce the federal funding authority in this budget for the upcoming biennium from \$5 million to \$3,182,900.

Assemblywoman Leslie inquired whether the Senate had approved the budget with the \$1,406,735 in each year of the biennium.

Ms. Davis advised that Senate had approved the \$1,406,735 and approved the Agency to request additional funds, if needed, from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) Contingency Fund.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO APPROVE AN INCREASE OF \$1,406,735 FOR EACH YEAR OF THE 2009-2011 BIENNIUM, ALLOW THE AGENCY TO APPROACH IFC IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS WERE NEEDED, AND TO AUTHORIZE FISCAL STAFF AUTHORITY TO ADJUST THE FEDERAL AUTHORITY ACCORDINGLY.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

ELECTED OFFICIALS

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE—DEPARTMENT-WIDE ISSUE **BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-47**

Joi Davis, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, advised the Committee that the Attorney General's Office budget request included a request to move 38 unclassified law enforcement investigators to the classified service. This was not included in The Executive Budget, but the Office requested consideration of the proposal during its budget hearing.

Following the budget closing hearing on April 27, 2009, Ms. Davis was directed to work with the Office to determine the impact of the proposal. The table below provided a comparison of the unclassified salaries and the classified salary range with the 4.6 percent salary reduction approved by the money committees.

Unclassified Position	Unclassified w/4.6% cut	Classified Position	Classified w/4.6% cut	Grade-Step
Investigator	\$63,051	Criminal Inv. 3	\$49,106 to \$73,699	40-1 to 40-10
Sr Investigator	\$66,471	Sp. Criminal Inv. 1	\$53,717 to \$80,805	42-1 to 42-10
Sp IF Investigator	\$66,471	Sp. Criminal Inv. 1	\$53,717 to \$80,805	42-1 to 42-10
Sr WC Investigator	\$66,471	Sp. Criminal Inv. 1	\$53,717 to \$80,805	42-1 to 42-10
Dep Ch WC Investigator	\$69,686	Sp Criminal inv. 2	\$56,113 to \$86,618	43-1 to 43-10
Dep Chief Investigator	\$67,776	Sp. Criminal Inv. 2	\$56,113 to \$86,618	43-1 to 43-10

Ms. Davis noted that 29 of the requested positions would be considered for a criminal investigator 3 or above, based on the number of years they had served in that capacity. According to the Department of Personnel, if an employee had been in the position for more than two years, the individuals would begin at the criminal investigator 3 level. The table attached as [Exhibit R](#) included a list of all 38 investigators and where they appeared on the classification schedule.

Ms. Davis stated that the Department of Personnel would be required to review each position to make a determination as to whether the criminal investigator series was appropriate based on the duties of those positions. Based on this analysis, and if this proposal was approved, the incumbents in these positions would receive a compensation increase of approximately \$1,100 to \$2,700 in each year of the upcoming biennium.

Ms. Davis provided the following three options for the Committee's consideration:

1. Approve the Agency's request to move the 38 unclassified investigator positions to the classified service and allow Fiscal Analysis Division staff to make any technical adjustments necessary. The impact for the non-General Fund budgets was a reduction of approximately \$47,520 in each year of the upcoming biennium. For the General Fund budgets, the Agency would increase vacancy savings by \$6,845 in each year of the biennium. Although this appeared to be insignificant, when merit increases were restored there could be a significant impact.
2. Do not approve the Agency's request to move 38 unclassified investigator positions to the classified service.
3. Request that the Department of Personnel prepare a study over the interim to determine whether the positions should be placed in the classification series as criminal investigators or in another existing classification. The agency could request reclassification at the 2011 Legislative Session based on the results of the study.

Assemblyman Denis stated he was willing to make a motion to accept option 1 to move the 38 unclassified investigator positions to the classified service.

Chair Arberry inquired how the Senate had voted on the issue.

Ms. Davis responded that the Senate had approved option 3, which would require the Agency to return to the 2011 Legislature to request reclassification based on the results of the study by the Department of Personnel.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO APPROVE OPTION 3 TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL TO PREPARE A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE CORRECT CLASSIFICATION SERIES FOR THE INVESTIGATOR POSITIONS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

* * * * *

Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Clark County Assembly District 30, Chairwoman for the Joint subcommittee on Human Services/CIPS, read the following closing report for the Division of Buildings and Grounds:

THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES AND CIPS HAS COMPLETED ITS REVIEW OF THE BUDGETS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS DIVISION, AND HAS MADE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM BUDGETS. IN ADDITION, THE DIVISION INDICATES THAT DUE TO RENEGOTIATION OF NON-STATE-OWNED BUILDING LEASES FROM JULY 2008 TO APRIL 2009, STATE AGENCY MONTHLY LEASE COSTS HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY \$50,336.

BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS (BA 710-1349) ADMIN-64: THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO DECREASE MONTHLY STATE AGENCY OFFICE RENT FROM \$1.09 TO \$1.02 PER GROSS SQUARE FOOT IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE RENTAL RATE REDUCTION WAS APPROVED BASED ON DECREASES IN EXPENDITURES AND AN EVALUATION THAT INDICATED SUFFICIENT RESERVES WOULD BE MAINTAINED FOR AGENCY OPERATIONS. AN ADJUSTMENT REQUESTED BY THE GOVERNOR WAS APPROVED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE THAT REDUCED RESERVES BY \$427,546 IN FY 2011 FOR AN OVERSTATEMENT OF RENTAL INCOME FOR THE LAS VEGAS BELROSE BUILDING.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED \$146,278 IN FY 2010 FOR BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND RENOVATION PROJECTS. AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR. ALTHOUGH THE SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINED THAT THERE IS AN APPROXIMATELY \$2.5 MILLION BACKLOG OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE ITEMS IN STATE-OWNED BUILDINGS, ONLY PROJECTS THAT INVOLVE LIFE SAFETY ISSUES ARE AMONG THE PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR FOR THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO APPROVED THE ELIMINATION OF AN ELECTRICIAN POSITION, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR AS A BUDGET REDUCTION MEASURE.

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF AN ADJUSTMENT TO REDUCE INFLATIONARY INCREASES FOR BUILDING MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS BY \$1,409 IN BOTH YEARS OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM, THE SUBCOMMITTEE CLOSED THE REMAINDER OF THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS BUDGET AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR, WITH TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS NOTED BY FISCAL STAFF.

CLEAR CREEK YOUTH CENTER (BA 101-1353) ADMIN-82: THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE TRANSFER OF \$7,155 IN FY 2010 AND \$7,158 IN FY 2011 IN GENERAL FUNDS TO THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS BUDGET IN ORDER TO CONSOLIDATE FUNDING FOR THE SITE'S UTILITIES AND OPERATING EXPENSES IN THAT ACCOUNT. A DECISION UNIT APPROVED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE IN THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS BUDGET ACCOUNT CHANGED THE FUNDING SOURCE FOR THE SITE'S UTILITIES AND OPERATING EXPENSES FROM GENERAL FUNDS TO RESERVE FUNDS AND REDUCED FUNDING FOR THE SITE'S OPERATING COSTS BY \$2,351 IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM.

MARLETTE LAKE (BA 712-1366) ADMIN-85: THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED \$37,808 IN THE BASE BUDGET FOR PERSONNEL OVERTIME COMPENSATION TO PROVIDE CONSTANT MONITORING AND ADJUSTMENT OF THE WATER SYSTEM DUE TO THE UNPREDICTABILITY OF THE SYSTEM'S COLLECTION OF WATER AND THE VARIABILITY OF DEMAND FOR WATER. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF AN ADJUSTMENT TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE GENERAL FUND PAYBACK IN FY 2011 BY \$1,479 FOR THE FINAL PAYMENT OF IMPROVEMENTS TO THE WATER SYSTEM APPROVED BY THE IFC IN 1978, THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE REMAINDER OF THE MARLETTE LAKE BUDGET AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO REVIEWED THE BUDGETS FOR THE MAIL SERVICES (713-1346) AND MAIL SERVICES – EQUIPMENT PURCHASE (713-1347). THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THESE BUDGET ACCOUNTS BE CLOSED AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR, WITH TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS RECOMMENDED BY FISCAL STAFF.

Chair Arberry requested a motion from the Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE CLOSING REPORT FOR THE DIVISION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

BUDGET CLOSED.

Assemblywoman Kathy McClain, Clark County Assembly District 15, Chair of the Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation, read the following budget closing report for the Office of Veterans' Services into the record:

COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS' AFFAIRS (101-2560)
VETERANS-1: IN CLOSING THE BUDGET FOR THE COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS' AFFAIRS, THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO TRANSFER THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES OFFICER II POSITION FROM THE VETERANS' HOME

ACCOUNT TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS' AFFAIRS. THE POSITION IS BETTER SUITED IN THE COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS' AFFAIRS BUDGET BECAUSE IT IS LOCATED IN NORTHERN NEVADA AND PROVIDES SUPPORT TO ALL AREAS OF THE NEVADA OFFICE OF VETERANS' SERVICES. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO APPROVED BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. 125, WHICH PROVIDES GENERAL FUNDS OF \$23,762 IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM TO ACCOUNT FOR INCREASES IN COPIER LEASE COSTS AND WATER COSTS BASED ON UPDATED PROJECTIONS.

IN ORDER TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUND SAVINGS, THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE AGENCY'S PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE FIVE LAPTOP COMPUTERS IN THE SECOND YEAR OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM, PROVIDING A GENERAL FUND SAVINGS OF \$7,945 IN FY 2010-11. ALTHOUGH NOT INCLUDED IN THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET, THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE AGENCY'S PROPOSAL TO UTILIZE THIS \$7,945 IN GENERAL FUND EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT SAVINGS TO INCREASE TRAVEL COSTS FOR THE AGENCY'S COMMISSION MEMBERS, THEREBY ALLOWING COMMISSION MEMBERS TO ATTEND ALL ANTICIPATED COMMISSION MEETINGS.

VETERANS' HOME ACCOUNT (101-2561) VETERANS-7: THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE ONE NEW REGISTERED NURSE IV AND ONE NEW REGISTERED DIETICIAN II FOR THE VETERANS' HOME. THE REGISTERED NURSE WILL PROVIDE NURSING COVERAGE FOR PLANNED AND UNPLANNED LEAVE THAT HAS HISTORICALLY BEEN PROVIDED THROUGH CONTRACT NURSES AND OVERTIME FOR EXISTING STAFF. THE NEW REGISTERED NURSE IS FUNDED THROUGH REDUCTIONS TO OVERTIME COSTS AND CONTRACT COSTS. THE REGISTERED DIETICIAN WILL REPLACE THE CURRENT DIETICIAN PROVIDED BY THE FOOD SERVICE CONTRACTOR, AND WILL PROVIDE NUTRITIONAL CARE AND DIET THERAPY FOR GERIATRIC RESIDENTS OF THE HOME. FUNDING FOR THE NEW DIETICIAN IS THROUGH REDUCTIONS TO THE FOOD SERVICE CONTRACT. AS A STATE EMPLOYEE, THE REGISTERED DIETICIAN WILL PROVIDE A HIGHER LEVEL OF SERVICE THAN A CONTRACT EMPLOYEE.

IN ORDER TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUND SAVINGS, THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE AGENCY'S PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE SOME OF THE REPLACEMENT AND NEW EQUIPMENT RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR, PROVIDING GENERAL FUND SAVINGS OF \$60,071 OVER THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE ELIMINATED EQUIPMENT INCLUDES COMPUTER HARDWARE, PHYSICAL THERAPY EQUIPMENT, AND REPLACEMENT WOOD PANELING. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO APPROVED BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. 173, WHICH REDUCES GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS IN THIS ACCOUNT BY \$167,741 IN FY 2009-10 AND \$100,779 IN FY 2010-11, BASED ON A CALCULATION ERROR AND UPDATED REIMBURSEMENT RATES FROM THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

General Fund Changes - Subcommittee Closing				
Nevada Office of Veterans' Services – 2009-11				
B/A	Acct Title	FY 2010 Change	FY 2011 Change	Total
2560	Commissioner for Veterans' Affairs	\$27,644	\$19,700	\$47,344
2561	Veterans' Home Account	-\$192,334	-\$136,257	-\$328,591
	Total NOVS GF Changes	-\$164,690	-\$116,557	-\$281,247

Chair Arberry requested a motion from the Committee.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSING REPORT FOR THE OFFICE OF VETERANS' SERVICES.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

BUDGET CLOSED.

Assemblywoman Kathy McClain, Clark County Assembly District 15, Chair of the Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation, read the following budget closing report for the Department of Transportation into the record:

THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, NATURAL RESOURCES AND TRANSPORTATION COMPLETED ITS REVIEW OF THE BUDGETS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPED THE FOLLOWING CLOSING RECOMMENDATIONS.

NDOT, BOND CONSTRUCTION (201-4663) NDOT-1: THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET INCLUDES THE PROJECTED EXPENDITURE OF \$20 MILLION, REPRESENTING THE BALANCE OF BOND PROCEEDS IN FY 2008 THAT IS PROJECTED TO BE CARRIED FORWARD INTO FY 2010. THE GOVERNOR DOES NOT RECOMMEND THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE BOND CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION (201-4660) NDOT-3: THE DEPARTMENT TARGETS A HIGHWAY FUND BALANCE OF \$100 MILLION TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT CASH TO COVER OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENSES. BASED ON STAFF'S ESTIMATE, THE HIGHWAY FUND BALANCE IS CALCULATED TO BE BETWEEN \$75 MILLION AND \$80 MILLION BASED ON REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR. THE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES UPDATED ITS HIGHWAY FUND REVENUE PROJECTIONS THROUGH APRIL 15, 2009. FOR THE THREE-YEAR PERIOD BEGINNING IN FY 2009, HIGHWAY FUND REVENUE IS CUMULATIVELY PROJECTED AT APPROXIMATELY \$73.5 MILLION BELOW THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED LEVEL. BASED ON REVISED REVENUE PROJECTIONS, HIGHWAY FUND RESOURCES WOULD

NOT PROVIDE FOR A TARGETED ENDING FUND BALANCE OF \$100 MILLION AT THE END OF THE BIENNIUM. IN RESPONSE TO DECREASES IN PROJECTED HIGHWAY FUND REVENUE, THE SUBCOMMITTEE SUPPORTED A SCENARIO PROVIDED BY THE AGENCY THAT REDUCED CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES BY \$32.1 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$49 MILLION IN FY 2011 TO ASSIST IN MAINTAINING A HIGHWAY FUND BALANCE OF \$100 MILLION. IN ADDRESSING THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE'S MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT REQUIREMENT TO RECEIVE ARRA FUNDS, THE AGENCY PROVIDED THE STATE'S CERTIFICATION TO THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INDICATING THE STATE WOULD MAINTAIN ITS EFFORT WITH RESPECT TO STATE EXPENDITURES AT \$71.3 MILLION. THE AMOUNT CERTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT IS BASED ON TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY LEVELS AFTER REDUCTIONS IN CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES OF \$32.1 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$49 MILLION IN FY 2011.

A KEY ASSUMPTION IN THE DEPARTMENT'S ABILITY TO REDUCE THE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES IS THE AVAILABILITY OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND AUTHORITY OF \$15 MILLION. THE GOVERNOR HAS NOT RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND AUTHORITY BE DIRECTED TO THE DEPARTMENT'S CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM. THE SUBCOMMITTEE PROVIDED STAFF THE AUTHORITY, IF LEGISLATION IS APPROVED, TO ADD GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND AUTHORITY TO THE BOND CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT AND REDUCE HIGHWAY FUND APPROPRIATIONS BY THE SAME AMOUNT TO REFLECT THE USE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION AUTHORITY IN LIEU OF HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION.

THE ARRA PROVIDES NEVADA WITH \$201.4 MILLION IN FUNDING TO ADDRESS HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THE SUBCOMMITTEE SUPPORTED A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO ADD \$125 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$66.4 MILLION IN FY 2011 IN ARRA FUNDS TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS IDENTIFIED FOR ARRA FUNDING. THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE, AT ITS APRIL 20, 2009 MEETING, APPROVED THE ADDITION OF \$10 MILLION IN ARRA FUNDING IN FY 2009.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE CONCURRED WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO ADD \$2.2 MILLION OVER THE BIENNIUM TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ELECTRONIC BIDDING SYSTEM. S. B. 409 HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO REVISE STATUTE TO ALLOW FOR BIDS TO BE ACCEPTED ELECTRONICALLY BY THE DEPARTMENT.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE SUPPORTED THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO ADD 23 POSITIONS, WITH CORRESPONDING DECREASES IN FUNDING FOR SEASONAL SALARIES, AND CONTRACT SERVICES TO CONVERT 59 OF THE DEPARTMENT'S SEASONAL AND CONTRACT POSITIONS TO PERMANENT POSITIONS.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO CONCURRED WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO RECLASSIFY A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER TO AN UNCLASSIFIED ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR TO ESTABLISH A CIVIL RIGHTS OFFICER WHO WOULD MANAGE THE DEPARTMENT'S INTERNAL, EXTERNAL AND CONTRACT COMPLIANCE CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAMS.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSING REPORT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley and Assemblyman Conklin were not present for the vote.)

BUDGET CLOSED.

* * * * *

Assemblyman Moises Denis, Clark County Assembly District 28, Chair of the Joint Subcommittee on General Government and Accountability, read the following closing report for the Commission on Tourism into the record:

THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY HAS DEVELOPED THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM. THE RECOMMENDATIONS DECREASE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMISSION BY \$8.1 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$8.6 MILLION IN FY 2011; HOWEVER, THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALSO REDUCE THE TRANSFER OF ROOM TAX REVENUES TO THE STATE GENERAL FUND BY APPROXIMATELY \$36.4 MILLION OVER THE BIENNIUM.

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT FUND (225-1522) – ECON DEV & TOURISM – 27: THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED NOT TO APPROVE THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO TRANSFER ALL OF THE ROOM TAX REVENUES THAT CURRENTLY FUND THE COMMISSION'S OPERATING BUDGET TO THE STATE GENERAL FUND. THE GOVERNOR HAD RECOMMENDED DEPOSITING ROOM TAX REVENUES TOTALING \$17.7 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$18.7 MILLION IN FY 2011 TO THE GENERAL FUND AND FUNDING THE COMMISSION'S OPERATIONS THROUGH A DIRECT GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATION TOTALING \$8.1 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$8.6 MILLION IN FY 2011. THE SUBCOMMITTEE INSTEAD VOTED TO CONTINUE TO FUND THE COMMISSION'S OPERATIONS WITH ROOM TAXES, BUT VOTED TO TRANSFER THE PROJECTED ROOM TAX REVENUES, EXCEEDING THE COMMISSION'S APPROVED OPERATING EXPENDITURES, TO THE STATE GENERAL FUND DURING THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM TO OFFSET THE GENERAL FUND REVENUE SHORTFALL CREATED BY NOT DEPOSITING THE ROOM TAX REVENUES DIRECTLY TO THE GENERAL FUND. THE FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM THE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT FUND ACCOUNT TO THE GENERAL FUND WILL TOTAL APPROXIMATELY \$2.4 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$3.3 MILLION IN FY 2011.

ALTHOUGH THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROJECTED ROOM TAX REVENUES TOTALING \$17.7 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$18.7 MILLION IN FY 2011, THE COMMISSION INDICATED IN LATE APRIL THAT ITS PROJECTIONS OF ROOM TAXES FOR THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM TOTALED ONLY \$14.4 MILLION IN FY 2010 AND \$14.8 MILLION IN FY 2011. THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO AUTHORIZE THE FISCAL ANALYSIS DIVISION TO ENSURE THAT THE ROOM TAX REVENUES BUDGETED FOR THIS ACCOUNT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE ECONOMIC FORUM'S MAY 1, 2009, FORECAST OF THE REVENUES THAT WILL RESULT FROM I.P. 1. THE ECONOMIC FORUM PROJECTIONS RESULTED IN INCREASING THE ROOM TAX REVENUES BY \$271,665 IN FY 2010 AND \$1,208,150 IN FY 2011 FROM THE PROJECTIONS THAT HAD BEEN PROVIDED BY THE COMMISSION.

BASED ON ITS DECISION TO CONTINUE TO FUND THE COMMISSION'S OPERATIONS WITH ROOM TAX REVENUES, THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO APPROVE THE CREATION OF A RESERVE BALANCE OF \$300,000 IN FY 2010 AND \$450,000 IN FY 2011 TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMISSION'S CASH-FLOW NEEDS AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH FISCAL YEAR AND TO PROVIDE THE COMMISSION WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO REBUILD THE RESERVE LEVEL OVER TIME. THE COMMISSION'S RESERVE HAS BEEN DEPLETED DURING THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR AS A RESULT OF DECLINING ROOM TAX REVENUES AND THE REQUIREMENT IMPOSED BY LEGISLATURE DURING THE 25th SPECIAL SESSION TO TRANSFER \$2.835 MILLION TO THE GENERAL FUND TO OFFSET REVENUE SHORTFALLS DURING THE CURRENT BIENNIUM.

AFTER HEARING TESTIMONY REGARDING THE IMPACTS THAT WOULD RESULT FROM THE GOVERNOR'S PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCTIONS FOR THE COMMISSION, THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO INCREASE EXPENDITURES FOR THE COMMISSION BY \$2.3 MILLION IN EACH YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM. THE ADDITIONAL FUNDING INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY \$336,000 OVER THE BIENNIUM TO RESTORE TWO OF THE NINE POSITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR ELIMINATION BY THE GOVERNOR AND APPROXIMATELY \$3.0 MILLION OVER THE BIENNIUM TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR ADVERTISING BUYS AND FUNDING TO FULFILL REQUESTS FOR PUBLISHED MATERIALS ABOUT THE STATE RESULTING FROM THE RESTORED ADVERTISING BUYS. THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS ALSO INCLUDED APPROXIMATELY \$2.0 MILLION OVER THE BIENNIUM TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR THE COMMISSION'S RURAL GRANTS PROGRAM AND APPROXIMATELY \$536,000 OVER THE BIENNIUM TO RESTORE FUNDING TO SUPPORT THE COSTS OF PRINTING THE VISITORS' GUIDE AND EVENTS AND SHOWS PUBLICATIONS. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO VOTED TO DECREASE FUNDING FOR THE CHINA OFFICE BY \$126,075 IN FY 2010 AND \$144,175 IN FY 2011 AND TO USE THAT FUNDING TO INCREASE FURTHER THE MARKETING AND ADVERTISING EFFORTS OF THE COMMISSION. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO DIRECTED THAT IF ROOM TAX COLLECTIONS EXCEED THE AMOUNTS INCLUDED IN THE LEGISLATIVELY-APPROVED BUDGET, THE ADDITIONAL REVENUES SHOULD ALSO BE DIRECTED TO MARKETING AND

ADVERTISING EFFORTS. THE COMMISSION INDICATED THAT IT WOULD STILL BE ABLE TO MAINTAIN A PRESENCE IN CHINA WITH THE REDUCED FUNDING FOR THE CHINA OFFICE.

AS A RESULT OF NOT APPROVING THE MERGER OF THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM WITH THE COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, THE SUBCOMMITTEE RESTORED THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR POSITION THAT WAS ELIMINATED IN THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET. THE DECISION NOT TO MERGE THE TWO AGENCIES RESULTS IN INCREASED EXPENDITURES IN THIS ACCOUNT TOTALING APPROXIMATELY \$115,000 IN FY 2010 AND \$186,000 IN FY 2011.

BASED ON THE DECISION TO RESTORE ROOM TAX REVENUES FOR THIS ACCOUNT AND THE CURRENT PRACTICE OF USING THOSE REVENUES TO OFFSET TOURISM-RELATED ACTIVITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES, THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO RESTORE THE TRANSFER OF ROOM TAX REVENUES THROUGH THIS ACCOUNT TO FUND TOURISM-RELATED ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE NEVADA FILM OFFICE, THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND THE DIVISION OF STATE PARKS. THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE COMMISSION TO OTHER STATE AGENCIES WILL REDUCE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS IN THOSE ACCOUNTS BY APPROXIMATELY \$1.4 MILLION IN EACH YEAR OF THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM.

NEVADA MAGAZINE (225-1530) – ECON DEV & TOURISM – 37: THE SUBCOMMITTEE EXPRESSED ITS CONCERNS THAT THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO REDUCE THE STAFFING FOR THE NEVADA MAGAZINE FROM 11.43 FTE TO 6.65 FTE WOULD PLACE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL WORKLOAD ON THE REMAINING POSITIONS IN THE ACCOUNT AND MIGHT IMPACT THE QUALITY OF THE MAGAZINE. THE COMMISSION INDICATES THAT THE STAFFING REDUCTIONS WERE PRIMARILY THE RESULT OF DECREASED TRANSFERS OF FUNDS FROM THE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT FUND ACCOUNT TO THE NEVADA MAGAZINE ACCOUNT, BASED ON THE BUDGET REDUCTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR. BASED ON THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET, THE COMMISSION INDICATED THAT IT WOULD ELIMINATE PURCHASES OF NEVADA MAGAZINE AND REDUCE ITS TRANSFERS TO THE NEVADA MAGAZINE ACCOUNT TO OFFSET THE COSTS FOR EVENTS AND SHOWS. AS INDICATED PREVIOUSLY, THE RESTORED FUNDING FOR THE COMMISSION APPROVED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE INCLUDED APPROXIMATELY \$536,000 OVER THE BIENNIUM FOR THE COSTS OF DISTRIBUTING EVENTS AND SHOWS AND TO OFFSET THE COSTS OF PRINTING THE VISITORS' GUIDE.

WITH THE ADDITIONAL FUNDING TRANSFERRED FROM THE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT FUND ACCOUNT, THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO RESTORE AN ADVERTISING AND SALES REPRESENTATIVE POSITION TO FULL-TIME TO ENSURE THAT NEVADA MAGAZINE HAS THE RESOURCES NECESSARY TO MAXIMIZE ITS POTENTIAL TO RAISE REVENUES TO SUPPORT THE MAGAZINE AND THE OTHER PUBLICATIONS FUNDED IN THIS ACCOUNT. THE POSITION WAS REDUCED FROM

FULL-TIME TO 0.90 FTE IN THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET. THE SUBCOMMITTEE ALSO VOTED TO RESTORE AN ELIMINATED PART-TIME PRODUCTION ASSISTANT POSITION AND TO INCREASE THE POSITION TO FULL-TIME DURING THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE POSITION WILL CONTINUE TO ASSIST WITH THE DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF NEVADA MAGAZINE, EVENTS AND SHOWS AND THE NEVADA TRAVEL PLANNER PUBLICATIONS AND WILL PROVIDE THE COMMISSION WITH A POSITION THAT CAN MAINTAIN THE EVENTS AND SHOWS WEBSITE LISTING.

FINALLY, THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO RESTORE \$20,000 IN EACH YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM FOR EXPENDITURES ASSOCIATED WITH USING FREELANCE PHOTOGRAPHERS AND WRITERS AND \$72,100 IN EACH YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM FOR INCREASED PRINTING AND POSTAGE EXPENDITURES FOR THE VISITORS' GUIDE, AS WELL AS INCREASED ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES ASSOCIATED WITH THE VISITORS' GUIDE. THE COMMISSION HAD INDICATED THAT WITHOUT THE INCREASED FUNDING FOR FREELANCE WRITERS AND PHOTOGRAPHERS, THE MAGAZINE WOULD BE FORCED TO RELY ON VOLUNTEERS TO SUBMIT ARTICLES AND PHOTOGRAPHS FOR PUBLICATION IN THE MAGAZINE.

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT (225-1523) – ECON DEV & TOURISM - 44: BASED ON THE LIMITED FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR THE COMMISSION'S OPERATIONS DURING THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM, THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVED THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION NOT TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT FUND ACCOUNT FOR THE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT MATCHING GRANTS PROGRAM DURING THE 2009-11 BIENNIUM. THE PROGRAM, WHICH PROVIDES GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLICLY-OWNED PROPERTY AND INFRASTRUCTURE WITHIN THE STATE, IS TYPICALLY FUNDED THROUGH A \$200,000 TRANSFER FROM THE COMMISSION'S OPERATING ACCOUNT EACH BIENNIUM.

Chair Arberry requested a motion from the Committee.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSING REPORT FOR THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley was not present for the vote.)

BUDGET CLOSED.

Assemblyman Moises Denis, Clark County Assembly District 28, Chair of the Joint Subcommittee on General Government and Accountability, read the following closing report for the Commission on Economic Development into the record:

THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY HAS COMPLETED ITS REVIEW OF THE BUDGETS FOR THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (NCED) AND THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON TOURISM (NCET) AND UNANIMOUSLY AGREED NOT TO ENDORSE THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO MERGE THESE TWO AGENCIES.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINED THERE WERE FEW SYNERGIES AND EFFICIENCIES THAT WOULD OCCUR AS A RESULT OF THE MERGER, EVEN IF MORE THOUGHTFUL PLANNING HAD OCCURRED PRIOR TO THE RECOMMENDATION. THE ONLY SAVINGS IDENTIFIED AS A RESULT OF THE MERGER WAS THE ELIMINATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR POSITION WITH THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM AND SAVINGS ACHIEVED BY ALLOCATING A PORTION OF TOURISM'S RENT TO THE COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. THESE SAVINGS WERE OFFSET BY ONE-TIME COSTS FOR FURNISHINGS, EQUIPMENT, WEB REDESIGN, AND THE REPRINTING OF MARKETING MATERIALS. ALTHOUGH THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM AND THE NCED ARE BOTH RESPONSIBLE FOR MARKETING NEVADA TO PEOPLE OUTSIDE THE STATE, THE TARGET AUDIENCES OF THE TWO DIVISIONS ARE VASTLY DIFFERENT. THE NCED'S MISSION TARGETS KEY BUSINESS DECISION MAKERS, SUCH AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS AND RISK MANAGERS, IN AN EFFORT TO ATTRACT AND INFLUENCE BUSINESSES TO RELOCATE AND/OR ESTABLISH NEW OPERATIONS IN NEVADA. THE NCED'S BUSINESS ATTRACTION EFFORTS ARE TARGETED TOWARD CREATING LONG-TERM TAX REVENUE STREAMS AND JOBS. THE NCED ALSO SERVES EXISTING NEVADA BUSINESSES THAT ARE SEEKING OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPORT PRODUCTS INTERNATIONALLY OR SELL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES TO FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM'S MISSION IS MORE TAILORED TO PROMOTING NEVADA THROUGH MARKETING AND ADVERTISING IN ORDER TO ATTRACT VISITORS TO THE STATE. ITS EFFORTS TARGET PROMOTIONS FOR TOURIST ATTRACTIONS AND DESTINATIONS THROUGHOUT NEVADA. BECAUSE THE TARGET AUDIENCES ARE DIFFERENT FOR THE TWO AGENCIES, THE SKILL SETS OF THE EMPLOYEES ARE DIFFERENT AS WELL. AS A RESULT, THE SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINED THAT COMBINING THE TWO AGENCIES DOES NOT CREATE SIGNIFICANT EFFICIENCIES THAT WOULD RESULT IN STAFF MEMBERS FROM ONE AGENCY BEING ABLE TO PERFORM WORK ASSIGNED TO THE OTHER AGENCY.

IN THE COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT'S BUDGET, THE GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS ELIMINATING FOUR EXISTING AND FILLED POSITIONS AS A BUDGET REDUCTION MEASURE UNRELATED TO THE PROPOSED MERGER. THE SUBCOMMITTEE DETERMINED TWO OF THE FOUR POSITIONS, THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL/GLOBAL TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, IF ELIMINATED WOULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE NCED'S ABILITY TO ACHIEVE ITS MISSION AND PERFORMANCE GOALS, ESPECIALLY IN

SOUTHERN NEVADA. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR MANAGES THE LAS VEGAS OFFICE AND IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS SUPPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES AND RURAL COMMUNITIES IN NYE AND LINCOLN COUNTIES. THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL/GLOBAL TRADE REPRESENTATIVE IS THE POINT POSITION ASSIGNED TO WORK WITH AND ASSIST FOREIGN GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES, INTERNATIONAL TRADE GROUPS AND DELEGATIONS, AND CONSULAR CORPS. THE SUBCOMMITTEE BELIEVES THE NCED CANNOT ABSORB THE LOSS OF THESE TWO POSITIONS BY SPREADING RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE REMAINING STAFF AND THEREFORE RECOMMENDS THE POSITIONS BE RESTORED. THE SUBCOMMITTEE WAS ABLE TO IDENTIFY SAVINGS IN THE TRAIN EMPLOYEES NOW (TEN) PROGRAM THAT OFFSET THE COSTS FOR RESTORING THE TWO POSITIONS. THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS APPROVING THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO ELIMINATE THE REMAINING TWO POSITIONS, SINCE THE NCED HAS A REASONABLE CONTINGENCY PLAN TO REDISTRIBUTE THE RESPONSIBILITIES ASSIGNED THESE POSITIONS TO OTHER STAFF IN THE AGENCY.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS APPROVING \$2,842,000 IN EACH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE URBAN, RURAL AND INNER-CITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES. ALTHOUGH THE ALLOCATIONS ARE A REDUCTION FROM THE AMOUNTS APPROVED BY THE 2007 LEGISLATURE, THE FUNDING LEVELS ARE GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS AVAILABLE DURING THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR, DUE TO BUDGET REDUCTIONS. THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS REALLOCATING \$100,000 OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDING TO THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES. THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION REDUCED THE ALLOCATION TO THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES IN AN AMOUNT PROPORTIONALLY LARGER THAN REDUCTIONS TO THE URBAN AND INNER-CITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES. THE REALLOCATION OF FUNDING WILL PROVIDE THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES THEIR BASE AMOUNT FOR OPERATING CAPITAL AND \$200,000 IN EACH FISCAL YEAR IN SUPPLEMENTAL GRANT FUNDING THAT WILL BE COMPETITIVELY ALLOCATED FOR SUCH ACTIVITIES AS RESEARCH AND PLANNING, SMALL BUSINESS TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL PARK DEVELOPMENT.

THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDS THE NCED'S MARKETING BUDGET BE REDUCED BY OVER 50 PERCENT COMPARED TO THE LEVELS APPROVED BY THE 2007 LEGISLATURE. THE REDUCTIONS SIGNIFICANTLY LIMIT THE NCED'S ABILITY TO FUND OUTREACH, TRADE SHOWS AND MARKETING CAMPAIGNS. IN ORDER FOR NEVADA TO STAY COMPETITIVE AND VISIBLE DURING THIS PERIOD OF ECONOMIC STRESS, THE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THE MARKETING BUDGET BE INCREASED BY \$100,000 IN EACH FISCAL YEAR, PARTIALLY OFFSET WITH SAVINGS FROM THE TEN PROGRAM. THE ADDITIONAL FUNDING WILL ALLOW THE NCED TO DEVELOP A PUBLIC RELATIONS CAMPAIGN FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, SUPPORT A SIX-MONTH CAMPAIGN TARGETING SPECIFIC COMPANIES THAT WOULD BENEFIT BY LOCATING IN NEVADA,

AND ALLOW ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION IN AT LEAST FIVE TRADE SHOWS. THESE MARKETING AND PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS ARE IN ADDITION TO ONGOING ACTIVITIES THAT RELY ON DIRECT MAIL, PRINT, THE INTERNET AND RELATED COLLATERAL MATERIALS AND MEDIUMS.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEWED THE BUDGETS FOR THE NEVADA FILM OFFICE AND THE RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE PROCUREMENT OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND RECOMMENDS THESE BUDGETS BE CLOSED BASICALLY AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR, WITH TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS. THE NEVADA FILM OFFICE WILL CONTINUE TO BE FUNDED WITH ROOM TAX REVENUES BASED ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON FUNDING THE COMMISSION ON TOURISM.

IN TOTAL, THE RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE INCREASE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMISSION BY \$97,602 IN FY 2010 AND \$171,118 IN FY 2011.

Chair Arberry requested a motion from the Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE CLOSING REPORT FOR THE COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Buckley was not present for the vote.)

BUDGET CLOSED.

There being no public testimony, comments, or questions, Chair Arberry adjourned the meeting at 11:17 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Blevins
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:



Assemblyman Morse Arberry Jr., Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Ways and Means

Date: May 12, 2009

Time of Meeting: 8:15 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 543	C	Virginia Valentine, Clark County, County Manager	PowerPoint presentation
	D	George Stevens, Chief Financial Officer, Clark County	Revenue redistribution proposal
A.B. 543	E	Andrew Clinger, Director, Dept. of Administration	Supportive documentation
A.B. 543	F	Jeffrey A. Fontaine, Nevada Association of Counties	Impact on Counties
A.B. 92	G	James W. Hardesty, Chief Justice, Nevada Supreme Court	Proposed amendment
A.B. 546	H	Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Clark County Assembly District 37	Proposed amendment
A.B. 544	I	Elisa Maser, President & CEO, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood	Proposed amendment
A.B. 544	J	Stacy Hardie, RN, Public Health Nursing Supervisor, Washoe County Health District	Testimony supporting the bill
A.B. 544	K	Charles Duarte, Administrator, Dept. of Health and Human Services	Written testimony
A.B. 544	L	Melissa Clement, Nevada Right To Life	Proposed amendment
A.B. 385	M	Assemblyman William Horne, Clark County Assembly District 34	Proposed amendment no. 251 for AB 502
A.B. 385	N	Howard Skolnik, Director, Dept. of Corrections	Proposed amendment
A.B. 64	O	Mark Stevens, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed amendment
A.B. 65	P	Mark Stevens, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed amendment
A.B. 227	Q	Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Washoe County Assembly District 30	Proposed amendment no. 4815
	R	Joi Davis, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Investigator Classifications