

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

**Seventy-fifth Session  
April 24, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair John J. Lee at 11:37 a.m. on Friday, April 24, 2009, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator John J. Lee, Chair  
Senator Terry Care, Vice Chair  
Senator Steven A. Horsford  
Senator Shirley A. Breeden  
Senator William J. Raggio  
Senator Randolph Townsend  
Senator Mike McGinness

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Assembly District No. 31  
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Assembly District No. 24  
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel  
Michael Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst  
Olivia Lodato, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Gustavo "Gus" Nunez, P.E., Manager, State Public Works Board  
Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General, Construction Law Counsel, Office  
of the Attorney General  
David Bowers, Assistant City Engineer, City of Las Vegas

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 24, 2009  
Page 2

Bradford Jerbic, City Attorney, City of Las Vegas  
Ted J. Olivas, Director, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas  
Lee Thomson, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County  
Mandi Lindsay, Government Affairs Specialist, Associated General Contractors,  
Las Vegas Chapter  
Karen L. Storms, City Clerk, City of North Las Vegas  
Robert F. Joiner, Government Affairs Manager, City of Sparks  
J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities  
Wes Henderson, Government Affairs Coordinator, Nevada Association of  
Counties  
John Slaughter, Washoe County  
Christi Cakiroglu, Executive Director, Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful  
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League  
Constance Brooks, Senior Management Analyst, Office of the County Manager,  
Clark County  
Tracey Woods, City of Reno  
David L. Howard, Northern Nevada Chapter, National Association of Industrial  
and Office Properties

Chair Lee opened the hearing of the Senate Government Affairs Committee with the introduction of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 174.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 174](#): Exempts the State Public Works Board from the requirements relating to construction managers at risk. (BDR 28-992)

Chair Lee said Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick would introduce the bill.

Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1, said she was contacted by the Attorney General's Office. The Attorney General's office said there was a possibility the State would not qualify for \$245 million in federal funds because S.B. No. 201 of the 74th Session removed the ability for Public Works Division to have a construction manager at risk (CMAR). She said it was a contested bill last Session. She said A.B. 174 allowed for State Public Works to be exempt from the CMAR requirement and qualified the State for the federal stimulus money. She said it allowed projects that were "pencil ready" to become "shovel ready." Ms. Kirkpatrick asked that the bill have a sunset provision. She said State Public Works agreed if the money was not allocated by 2011, they would sunset it.

Gustavo "Gus" Nunez, P.E., Manager, State Public Works Board, said he appreciated Ms. Kirkpatrick bringing A.B. 174 forward on behalf of the State Public Works Board. He said one of the provisions for the federal stimulus money required once the funds were appropriated the project had to be ready to go to contract within 60 to 90 days. He said projects in the design phase all had the addition of the CMAR process. He said there were several provisions in S.B. No. 201 of the 74th Session which provided for a construction manager at risk and included the Public Works Board. He said the new provisions under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 338 dealt with the fact the design must be finalized prior to entering into a contract with a CMAR for construction services. He said S.B. No. 201 of the 74th Session required a finalized design before entering into a contract, it created problems for Public Works. Also S.B. No. 201 of the 74th Session required a final list of all the subcontractors. He said in order to move quickly with a contractor, all the numbers from the subcontractors might not be available. He said contractors estimated the cost in order to submit a guaranteed maximum price. He said it would delay the process. He said A.B. 174 exempted the State Public Works Board from the requirement of NRS 338 included in S.B. No. 201 of the 74th Session.

Chair Lee asked where the sunset provision was in the bill.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said it was in A.B. 174 with the date of 2011. She said there was substantial discussion last Session as to why the CMAR was included for State Public Works.

Senator Raggio said there were reasons for CMARs, including oversight. He asked if there was assurance from the State Public Works Board that the earlier concerns would still be addressed even without a project construction manager at risk involved in the process.

Mr. Nunez said the design process on hard-bid projects was accomplished by constructability review.

Senator Raggio said he was not interested in delaying the process, but reiterated a need for the concerns addressed by having a CMAR.

Mr. Nunez asked what Senator Raggio's specific concerns entailed.

Senator Raggio asked what a project construction manager at risk did.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 24, 2009  
Page 4

Mr. Nunez said a CMAR looked at the design during the process with respect to constructability and cost.

Senator Raggio said those were the concerns that were addressed in the earlier bill. He asked for reassurance those concerns would still be considered.

Mr. Nunez replied yes, the concerns would be considered.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said there were earlier problems and that was the reason for the bill from the previous session. She said the Assembly requested a legislative update from State Public Works.

Chair Lee called on other speakers on A.B. 174.

Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General, Construction Law Counsel, Office of the Attorney General, said the problem was with the requirement the design be finalized first. She said it was noticed by the Attorney General's Office. She said they supported the bill and prompted the current process.

Chair Lee closed the hearing on A.B. 174 and opened the work session.

Michael Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst, said A.B. 180 was heard at an earlier meeting.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 180 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Designates Engine No. 40 of the Nevada Northern Railway as an official state locomotive of the State of Nevada.  
(BDR 19-734)

Mr. Stewart said the amendment added in the Assembly allowed other train engines to be recognized as official state locomotives ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chair Lee asked for a motion on the bill.

SENATOR TOWNSEND MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 180.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Stewart reviewed A.B. 226.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 226 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes concerning the financial organization of irrigation districts. (BDR 48-991)

Mr. Stewart said the bill increased the maximum allowable debt for irrigation districts from \$350,000 to \$500,000. It allowed the districts to impose an assessment of up to \$5 per acre ([Exhibit D](#)). He said Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea mentioned several projects that would benefit from the bill, including the ditch breach in Fernley one year ago.

Chair Lee said he received telephone calls from people in the rural areas who hated the bill because it cost more money but realized the importance of it. He said he was contacted by former Assemblywoman Marcia de Braga. She expressed it was the best bill possible considering the circumstances.

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 226.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Stewart reviewed A.B. 338.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 338 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Authorizes a program to provide grants to nonprofit private entities concerning small business start-ups for veterans and senior citizens. (BDR 53-123)

Mr. Stewart said A.B. 338 authorized the administrator of the Employment Security Division to award grants to nonprofits for the purpose of making loans to veterans and senior citizens to start small businesses. He said the source of the money was the Unemployment Compensation Fund. No specific

amendments were offered with the bill. He said the amendments added in the Assembly removed the fiscal impact ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR TOWNSEND MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 338.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Lee opened the discussion on A.B. 48.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 48 (1st Reprint)**: Allows a public body to resolve disputes in a contract for a public work by way of processes other than arbitration. (BDR 28-405)

David Bowers, Assistant City Engineer, City of Las Vegas, said A.B. 48 was brought forth by the City of Las Vegas due to the unforeseen financial impact of the current statute. He said NRS 338.150 required if a dispute arose in a public works contract, it must be resolved by arbitration. He said A.B. 48 allowed resolution of a dispute by means other than arbitration.

Bradford Jerbic, City Attorney, City of Las Vegas, said he testified two months ago concerning the earlier version of the bill. He said a compromise had been worked out between the City of Las Vegas and the contractors.

Chair Lee asked for an explanation of the bill.

Ted J. Olivas, Director, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas, submitted a one-page summary of the bill to the Committee ([Exhibit F](#)). He said the City of Las Vegas worked with the Associated General Contractors (AGC) on the bill. He said there were a number of changes to this section of the law. The Senate Committee on Government Affairs worked with the City of Las Vegas to make changes to chapter 338 of the NRS and the public bidding rules. He said the changes came about as a result of cooperative effort with the local governments and the contracting community. He said a number of things were identified to make the process more transparent. The changes helped each jurisdiction follow the same bidding process. Mr. Olivas said NRS 338.150

specifically described how disputes were settled for construction contracts. He said the statute was enacted in 1969. Prior to 2005, the City of Las Vegas had the ability to use other methods of dispute resolution. He said in the summary, [Exhibit F](#), in 2005 the contracts had to have a clause requiring arbitration of a dispute. He said the City of Las Vegas needed the flexibility to resolve issues on public works projects using tools provided by private industry. He said they were requesting the opportunity to settle contract disputes the way they did prior to 2005. Mr. Olivas said in A.B. 48 as amended, the key was the specifications were drafted in a manner that clearly delineated the method of alternate dispute resolution. He said the contractors needed to know in advance how disputes would be settled. He said the dispute resolutions could be tailored to the individual contracts going out to bid. Different resolutions were needed for various public works projects.

Senator Care said under current law there was a mandate that the drafting of specifications for a public works shall include in the specifications a clause requiring arbitration. He asked if the language in existing law prohibited the parties from modifying the contract and doing something other than arbitration. He asked if the statute as written meant the parties must arbitrate because the clause is in the contract.

Mr. Jerbic stated the City of Las Vegas viewed the clause as requiring arbitration without any other options.

Senator Care asked if the bill were adopted, would the proposed clause have the contract stating alternative dispute resolutions, or would the parties have to agree on a specific method of resolution?

Mr. Jerbic said the City of Las Vegas intended to be specific in the contract as to the alternative dispute resolution that would fit that contract. He said a small contract might fit arbitration. A more complicated contract might have mediation specified as an alternative dispute resolution. He said their intention was to be contract-specific before becoming involved with the courts.

Senator Care asked what would happen if one party wanted mediation and the other party wanted arbitration during the contract negotiations.

Mr. Jerbic replied he did not know. The City of Las Vegas wanted to quickly and efficiently address a contract dispute. He said the City of Las Vegas had

spent \$1.5 million in legal fees on one arbitration dispute. The contractor had spent an equal or greater amount on fees. He said if there was a difference of opinion, the City of Las Vegas would decide the dispute resolution.

Mr. Olivas said public works would put the method of dispute resolution in the contract. The City of Las Vegas would have a prebid conference prior to the submittal of bids. He said that allowed discussion of each of the provisions in the bid document to be identified. He said the contracting community needed to know the process for the project in order to provide the appropriate money in their bids to cover any unforeseen disputes. He said disputes were not common in the contracts.

Senator Care said a contract could state the parties shall enter into mediation and if that failed, the parties may file suit, go to mediation or enter binding arbitration. He said it could be different for each circumstance.

Mr. Olivas said Senator Care was correct. There was not one specific dispute resolution that fit all the public works projects.

Senator Care said he wanted to make it clear as a matter of legislative history. It would be the position of the City of Las Vegas that it would not always be the case of a contract going to mediation first. It was not going to be the same for all contracts. There would be good-faith negotiations on the method of alternative dispute resolutions.

Mr. Olivas said Senator Care was correct.

Chair Lee asked if there were any more questions for the panel.

Lee Thomson, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County, said his primary client since 1985 was the Department of Aviation. He also was involved in other major construction projects for Clark County. He said Clark County strongly supported A.B. 48. Past experience showed arbitration did not fit all cases and actually was not in the best interest of owners or contractors on large cases. He referred to the Regional Justice Center case which had 6 million to 8 million documents and went on for years. He said both sides incurred millions of dollars in attorney fees. He agreed with the compromises reached between the Associated General Contractors and the City of Las Vegas.



Mandi Lindsay, Government Affairs Specialist, Associated General Contractors, Las Vegas Chapter, commended the City of Las Vegas for its efforts to arrive at a compromise on A.B. 48. She said the AGC had concerns originally but now supported the bill.

Senator Care asked if everybody agreed if A.B. 48 was passed and the Governor signed it, it would only affect contracts entered into after the effective date of the bill. He wanted assurance past contracts were not affected by the bill.

Mr. Thomson said the people from the City of Las Vegas requested he confirm Senator Care was correct and past contracts would not be affected.

Karen L. Storms, City Clerk, City of North Las Vegas, said she supported A.B. 48.

Robert F. Joiner, Government Affairs Manager, City of Sparks, said he supported the bill.

J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities, said the League supported the passage of A.B. 48 and thanked the City of Las Vegas for its testimony.

Wes Henderson, Government Affairs Coordinator, Nevada Association of Counties, went on record in support of A.B. 48.

Chair Lee closed the hearing on A.B. 48 and opened the hearing on A.B. 293.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 293 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes concerning appointments by the Governor to certain offices within the Executive Branch of State Government. (BDR 18-761)

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Assembly District No. 31, said A.B. 293 required legislative confirmation of appointments by the Governor to certain boards or commissions and of certain department heads ([Exhibit G](#)). He said the process did not usurp the executive's power to choose, it provided a time allowing for consideration and review of the choice. He said Nevada was one of only six states that did not require confirmation of gubernatorial appointments, [Exhibit G](#).

Assemblyman Anderson said A.B. 293 was different from prior bills because it created a seven-member committee with three members from each House appointed by the Legislative Commission, and the seventh member would be the Chair of the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, who would only vote in case of a tie, [Exhibit G](#). He said only certain appointments by the Governor would be affected by the bill. The Departments of Business and Industry, Conservation and Natural Resources, Corrections, Taxation, the chair of the Gaming Commission and members of the Public Utilities Commission, the Board of Parole Commissioners and the Gaming Control Board, [Exhibit G](#), would require review by the seven-member committee. The Governor would make an appointment, which would be good for 60 days. The Committee would conduct its investigation and hold hearings on the appointee. The hearing would be limited to the professional qualifications, experience and fitness for office, and a criminal history background check of the appointee, [Exhibit G](#). He said if a witness failed to cooperate with the Committee, the bill granted the power to go to court to compel testimony.

Assemblyman Anderson said the bill was not a violation of the separation of powers. He said Nevada case law established the appointment authority was not exclusive to the executive branch, [Exhibit G](#). He added Article 15, section 10 of the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* stated persons "shall be chosen or appointed as may be prescribed by law." He said it was within the power of the Legislative Body to prescribe the process for those appointments. Finally, the bill did not interfere with the Governor's power to choose whomever he wanted. He said the bill was trying to solve the problem of appointments of old friends rather than the appointment of the best-qualified candidate. He mentioned Governors from both parties had made appointments that lacked minimum qualifications. Assemblyman Anderson said the bill was not about second-guessing the Governor or politicizing the appointment process, [Exhibit G](#). He said the bill ensured Governors made reasonable choices of people who were qualified for the position.

Chair Lee asked Assemblyman Anderson if the Governor appointed a person to a department, was it possible for the proposed Commission to reject the person after he began working?

Assemblyman Anderson said that was exactly the way it would happen. If the Commission decided to meet, found the appointee unqualified to hold the position and rejected the appointee within the 60-day period, then the position

becomes vacant. The Governor had the opportunity to appoint someone new to the position. He said the Governor could not appoint the rejected person to another position for a period of one year.

Chair Lee asked why, if another position was available and the person was qualified for that position, he could not be appointed before the year had expired.

Assemblyman Anderson said often qualities were seen in an individual that were not apparent on paper. He said the appointments needed to be proper and the questions asked were about criminal and background information. He said one year out was not an unfair length of time.

Chair Lee said if someone was not as qualified for one position, but had qualifications to head another department, he did not want to exclude the person for future appointments.

Assemblyman Anderson said it was not a group of candidates, it was one individual. He said the Commission needed to realize it was a very serious question to reject an appointee.

Senator Care said there had been problems at the federal level with appointees. He asked how far-reaching the language was concerning inquiring into the fitness to hold an office or examine books and documents.

Assemblyman Anderson said the research department did extensive background research on this issue, [Exhibit G](#). Some states had large manuals that guided a committee through the process. He was anticipating questions concerning the validity of the educational background or qualifications in terms of employment verification. He said the language was left open and he hoped the Committee would show proper self-restraint. He was relying on the integrity of the Legislatures. He did not want the Committee to do an overexamination of the agency and the problems of that agency.

Senator McGinness asked about the fiscal note on the bill. He noted the Committee would meet twice in a nonsession year. He asked if the Committee needed to meet more often.

Assemblyman Anderson said the majority of the appointments took place at the beginning of a gubernatorial term. He said he did not participate in the decision concerning fiscal notes.

Chair Lee asked Assemblyman Anderson about different jurisdictions. He asked if A.B. 293 needed to be rereferred to the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Mr. Stewart said traditionally any committee created by the Legislature for interim activities were handled by the Assembly Committee on Elections, Procedures, Ethics and Constitutional Amendments and in the Senate by the Committee on Legislative Operation and Elections. He said the bill could be referred to that committee.

Assemblyman Anderson said he had anticipated appearing before the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Chair Lee closed the hearing on A.B. 293. He opened the hearing on A.B. 353.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 353 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes concerning certain crimes related to property. (BDR 15-514)

Chair Lee asked Assemblyman Bobzien if he wanted to reschedule the bill when a full Committee was present.

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Assembly District No. 24, said he would have the hearing today. He said A.B. 353 was designed to combat illegal dumping. He said his constituents asked him what was being done to combat illegal dumping and the blight it created in Nevada's quality of life. He said Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, District No. 30, also signed onto the bill.

John Slaughter, Washoe County, provided a handout that highlighted provisions of the bill ([Exhibit H](#)). He provided photos illustrating the problems addressed in the bill, [Exhibit H](#). Mr. Slaughter said a grassroots coalition recognized a need for the legislation. He said A.B. 353 allowed Washoe County to establish a program to control unlawful dumping and provided and strengthened current nuisance abatement procedures and statutes in *Nevada Revised Statutes*. He said where a nuisance was identified, the bill specified the courts order a penalty for a convicted person and provided oversight of the abatement. He said

the current laws did not specify the court demand the properties be cleaned, [Exhibit H](#).

Senator McGinness noted there was no fiscal note on the bill. He said it put responsibilities on local agencies. He asked if there was a fiscal note considered on local governments.

Mr. Slaughter said no, partially due to the civil penalty collected to pay for the abatement. He added local government was paying for the abatement on extreme properties at this time. He said it was not seen as an additional cost to the County.

Senator McGinness asked if there were civil penalties collected on any of the properties shown in the photographs in [Exhibit H](#).

Mr. Slaughter replied there were no civil penalties collected on the examples in [Exhibit H](#).

Chair Lee asked if there were further questions for Mr. Slaughter. He asked for testimony from the audience.

Christi Cakiroglu, Executive Director, Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful, said they were the coordinating entity for the Illegal Dumping Task Force. She supported the bill. She said it was an outgrowth of efforts from the past several years.

Chair Lee asked what "imminent danger" meant. He said if the Washoe County Commissioners considered something to be imminent danger or an immediate hazard it brought in another level of cleanup.

Mr. Slaughter said the determination of imminent danger was decided by a group of experts: code enforcement officers, sheriff officers, and health district enforcement officers.

Senator McGinness asked Mr. Slaughter why more legislation was required.

Mr. Slaughter said statutes do not give Washoe County the amount of authority required to accomplish what was needed to achieve abatement.

Senator McGinness said there were areas in his district that resembled the photographs in [Exhibit H](#). He said local agencies did not have the resources to remove problems from the sites.

Mr. Slaughter said the requirement to abate was on the defendant after a trial or appearance before a judge. He said if that did not happen, the County came in and supervised the abatement.

Senator McGinness referred to page 2, section 1, subsection 2, line 22 of [A.B. 353](#). He read the lines stating the responsible agency may assume responsibility. He said that gave the agency the option to proceed or not.

Assemblyman Bobzien said the key point of the bill was the creation of the civil penalty to provide the tools to local government if they chose to exercise their ability to abate the nuisance.

Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League, said illegal dumping continued to be a problem for the State. He supported the efforts to reduce illegal dumping.

Constance Brooks, Senior Management Analyst, Office of the County Manager, Clark County, said they worked with Washoe County concerning the bill and they supported [A.B. 353](#).

Tracey Woods, City of Reno, offered an amendment ([Exhibit I](#)). She said the amendment needed additional work with some of the stakeholders.

Chair Lee asked Ms. Woods if Assemblyman Bobzien was in agreement with the amendment.

Assemblyman Bobzien said he was neutral on the amendment. There were some concerns about it. He was concerned nothing was added to the bill that would impede its progress.

Chair Lee asked if it was an amendment from the Assembly.

Ms. Woods said it was an amendment on behalf of the City of Reno. It was an enabling amendment allowing cities to enact ordinances requiring vacant buildings to register if they were vacant over a certain period of time. She said it

was another tool for enforcing code. In the urban core there were vacant buildings subject to hazards. She said a vacant building in Reno that was not secured caught on fire and two people died in the building. She said earlier someone got into the same building and froze to death. She said they wanted quick, timely contact information for owners of vacant buildings. She said in addition to penalties, it would allow the City to lien the building if there was no compliance with the ordinance. She said taxpayers were paying for the abatement of the vacant buildings. She said they were willing to work with everybody with concerns about the amendment. They did not want to jeopardize A.B. 353.

David L. Howard, Northern Nevada Chapter, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, said the amendment they saw changed some of the objections they had to the earlier bill. He said they still had concerns with a registry. He said there were other ways for the City to reach its goals without another bureaucratic step for people having trouble keeping tenants in their buildings. He said the testimony referred to the need for another tool. He said the last line of the amendment referred to NRS 268.4122, NRS 268.4124 or NRS 268.4126 which was the product of work by Senator Townsend and the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce in 1997. He said Senator Townsend had problems with nuisance vacant buildings in Reno. He said a law for the City of Portland, Oregon, allowed the City to tear down the problem building and bill the demolition back to the owner. He said the case was adjudicated in the Supreme Court in Oregon and went on to the 9th District Circuit Court. He said the statutes were adopted and supplied a specific due process for the owner of the building and the city in order to take care of the vacant or nuisance property. He said the amendment provided for a penalty of \$1,000. He represented people who had vacant buildings and they had enough problems trying to keep their building occupied without additional penalties.

Chair Lee asked Ms. Woods about section 2 in the proposed amendment. He asked what it meant to exclude single family residences.

Ms. Woods said single family residences were not included in the enabling legislation. She said it was aimed at commercial properties or apartment dwellings of four units or more. She said they wanted something in between the code that was not being complied with and bulldozing down the building. She said they wanted the ability to have code enforcement call dispatch, receive the contact information for the business and deal with the problem immediately.

She said single family residents often involved foreclosure and there was existing legislation that dealt with foreclosed property.

Chair Lee asked if the problem was the Legislature's problem or the assessor's problem.

Ms. Woods said the assessor's rolls had some contact information but did not always have all the information. She said it was simpler to maintain a registry.

Chair Lee said the bill started out in one section of law and now it was attached to another bill.

Senator Townsend said in 1997 he proposed solving the problem of bad buildings in Reno. He said the law was in NRS 268. He said it started as a result of the Kings Inn in Reno. The legislation provided all the tools needed to get rid of every bad property in Reno. The legislation was drafted in a manner that met the same qualifications the City of Portland used. He said the Kings Inn was still standing. He asked if the amendment died in the Assembly.

Ms. Woods replied yes, it had died in the Assembly.

Senator Townsend was unreceptive to the amendment. He suggested looking at the tax rolls to determine the owner of the building.

Ms. Woods said she understood and appreciated Senator Townsend's hard work in previous sessions. She said the issue of the new amendment was the contact information.

Senator Townsend said if there were problems determining the owner of a building, lien the property. He assured her the owner would contact someone with the City quickly, probably within 24 hours.

Chair Lee suggested the amendment be dismissed and let the bill proceed as originally proposed by Assemblyman Bobzien.

Ms. Woods said she did not want to do anything to endanger A.B. 353 and if the Committee preferred, she would remove the amendment.



Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
April 24, 2009  
Page 17

Chair Lee said A.B. 353 would be processed in a future work session. Chair Lee asked if there were any further comments. As there were none, he adjourned the meeting at 1:05 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Olivia Lodato,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator John J. Lee, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_