

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

**Seventy-fifth Session
February 16, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair John J. Lee at 1:33 p.m. on Monday, February 16, 2009, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator 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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel
Michael Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst
Cynthia Ross, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bru Ethridge, Notary Administrator, Office of the Secretary of State
Nicole J. Lamboley, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Kate Thomas, Deputy for Operations, Office of the Secretary of State
Wes Henderson, Government Affairs Coordinator, Nevada Association of Counties
Doug Johnson, Douglas County Commissioner; Nevada Association of Counties
Renny Ashleman, City of Henderson
Russell M. Rowe, Board Member, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Alumni Association
David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Mary Walker, Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County
Barry Smith, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association, Incorporated

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 16, 2009
Page 2

SENATOR LEE:

We open this meeting with Senate Bill (S.B.) 92.

SENATE BILL 92: Makes various changes relating to the regulation of notaries public. (BDR 19-414)

BRU ETHRIDGE (Notary Administrator, Office of the Secretary of State):

The office of the Secretary of State (SOS) is testifying in support of S.B. 92 (Exhibit C). Section 2 defines the term "Notarial Record." The definition will eliminate the confusion regarding "What constitutes a Notarial Record?" Sections 3 through 25 addresses the Nevada Electronic Notary. Many states are moving toward electronic notarizations (e-notarizations), and we want Nevada to have the authority to allow for e-notarizations. Chapter 240 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) describes how a document is notarized. The language for the e-notarization is similar to criteria for notaries. It is a separate appointment. The electronic notary or e-notary is explained in Exhibit C. The law does not give the SOS the ability to grant an individual a notary appointment if a crime was committed of moral turpitude. Sections 30 through 32 amend the requirements for a nonresident applying for a notary appointment to include a copy of the state business license for the business of where they are employed in this State. We have given many individuals a Nevada notary appointment, only to discover there is no physical location in Nevada where the notary can conduct notary business.

CHAIR LEE:

Addressing section 2, lines 9 and 10, how does one become a notary?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

The requirement is a notary must hold the standard notary appointment for four years. This provides a solid foundation of education for the notary so they may properly notarize signatures. After four years, a notary can become an electronic notary.

CHAIR LEE:

Is there job performance follow-up?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

We require an education course by the SOS when a notary is first appointed. If one has no violations against notary law during one's career, there is no

requirement to take the standard education course. For e-notaries, we will ask for a small training period to show the technology and how to apply it. This includes how signatures are attached to documents.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

When a person uses a notary, they must appear before the notary and must show identification. Is there a personal appearance in the same room at the same time using e-notarization?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

The document signer is required to appear.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

What are the advantages of using an e-notary?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

An advantage is when a document must be expedited. County recorders do not know how to accept notarized electronic documents because they are unsure if notarizations have been done correctly. This bill facilitates county recorders in accepting electronic documents because the electronic notary provides faith and credit of signatures. The document signer will always be required to appear. The only thing that is different is the signing of the document, [Exhibit C](#), page 3.

SENATOR CARE:

The bill states that sections 3 through 26 enact the Electronic Notary Public Authorization Act. Is there an existing act put together by national notary organizations?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

Fifteen states allow for e-notary. We work with the National Association of Secretaries of State. We are developing procedures on how this is done. North Carolina is in the forefront of doing e-notarizations. We have modeled our bill and our statute after North Carolina. They have approximately 300 e-notaries.

SENATOR CARE:

Is their act the Electronic Notary Public Authorization Act?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

I believe it is the electronic e-notarization act of North Carolina.

SENATOR CARE:

Section 13 discusses the surety. The language states, " ... be conditioned to provide indemnification to a person determined to have suffered damage as a result of an act by the electronic notary public" Does this provide an exclusive remedy for someone who has been damaged by the negligence or even the intentional act of a notary public? A notary can do a tremendous amount of damage. The extent of damages one can receive from a notary is the surety amount.

MS. ETHRIDGE:

The minimum surety bond is \$10,000. They are reluctant to raise the limit because it is discovered more claims filed against surety bond result. When there are allegations of fraud on a signing of a document, the case moves into the courts and the courts determine whether a document was notarized properly or if signatures are valid.

SENATOR CARE:

There is a case where a notary takes all the steps to verify the identity of this person, and the person executes a document which is not what it purports to be. How about when one uses a false identity or in the instance of a husband and wife, the husband says, "Trust me, this is my wife's signature." The notary notarizes it when, in fact, the wife has not signed off, and damages can result in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. This leads me to ask the question, does this mean I can only proceed against the surety? I recommend the Legal Division look into this matter. In section 22, how would an executor of an estate know the existence of a document that has been notarized electronically?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

Section 22 addresses the disposal of the notary counterpart of the journal. We are requiring the e-notary to also keep a journal. An executor of an estate contacts the SOS and lets them know the notary is deceased and will no longer be notarizing. This provides a paper trail as to whether any documents notarized after that time would be associated with that notary but with a forgery. These provisions are in place. We are simply moving them on into e-notarization.

SENATOR CARE:

Section 23 concerns criminal penalties and Category C and Category D felonies. Is there a category of felony assigned? Arguably, this could mean additional

prosecutors, judges and prison space, meaning additional costs. I am interested in knowing where Categories C and D felonies originated?

NICOLE J. LAMBOLEY (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):

This is modeled after NRS 240 concerning paper notaries. Penalties would be the same for e-notaries. Most violations result in a monetary fine to the notary.

CHAIR LEE:

Does responsibility lie upon the notary to contact the SOS if a notary stamp cannot be located or if equipment is lost, stolen or damaged?

MS. ETHRIDGE:

When a journal or a stamp is lost or stolen, notaries are required to file a report with the SOS. If they believe theft has occurred, they are asked to also file a report with area law enforcement to create a paper trail. When the SOS is contacted that a notary's stamp is lost or stolen, we ask the notary to file an amended form, modifying their name, and we change the number of their appointment. We nullify the stamp by the issuance of a new stamp with a new number.

SENATE BILL 53: Makes various changes relating to the Office of the Secretary of State. (BDR 18-415)

MS. LAMBOLEY:

There are three distinct issues with S.B. 53. The first deals with the creation of the Nevada Lockbox. This is modeled after the Registry of Advance Directives for Health Care, more commonly called the Living Will Lockbox. Taking that similar legislation, we came up with the idea that has been tried in one other state. This is to create a virtual electronic safety deposit box where individuals could file copies of their wills, marriage licenses and birth certificates. In the event of a disaster or other need, individuals could electronically access their lockbox documents and retrieve copies of documents. These copies would not be originals but pictures that would assist in replacing records. In some instances, when a person is victim to a house fire, they may lose all of their personal affects and do not have records. The Nevada Lockbox would be a virtual safety deposit box.

In the legislation, it is drafted as mandatory. I did propose an amendment that would change the language to "the Secretary of State may establish ... "

([Exhibit D](#)). A cost is also involved. We can absorb much of the cost through existing staff resources; however, in order to ensure a secure, redundant network, we would need to invest in technology. We also have asked for permission to potentially charge a user's fee. In the fiscal note, we have estimated a \$10 filing fee for the purposes of the individual to maintain their electronic copies of personal documents.

SENATOR CARE:

In section 9, subsection 1, what is contemplated under, "or other document," a codicil for one, since we are talking about a will?

MS. LAMBOLEY:

We are trying to allow an individual to file a copy of any relevant legal document with our office. This is modeled after language used in the state of Idaho. They have a lockbox-type function for wills called the registry of wills. We used this wording to define some of the types of documents. We are not verifying the legitimacy of any documents just as with the Living Will Lockbox. The advance directive is a legal document between the individual and their health care provider. The Nevada Lockbox is to serve as a storage facility for these documents should they need them. We anticipate that it could include copies of wills, marriage licenses, birth certificates and insurance records. In actuality, it could include copies of any formal legal document that one may need to retrieve, particularly in light of a disaster or if one is traveling. One may pull up the document copies in need. These copies are not legal documents but pictures with valuable information.

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

If these documents are not legal documents, what then is the purpose of this lockbox?

MS. LAMBOLEY:

By accessing a scanned picture, one is provided important information needed to replace documents. It facilitates retrieving legal documents and can provide identification. Instead of storing information at a bank, this would be an electronic version. As our society increasingly becomes mobile, individuals would have access to their documents for information purposes anywhere.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 16, 2009
Page 7

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

Does the private sector provide a similar service to your electronic safety deposit box?

MS. LAMBOLEY:

I do not know.

CHAIR LEE:

Page 4, line 3 of S.B. 53 states, "Access to the lockbox is required pursuant to the lawful order of a court" Can these records be subpoenaed or are they locked away? When can a lockbox be opened?

MS. LAMBOLEY:

This language is the same as it is in the Living Will Lockbox of the Registry of Advance Directives. In order to allow access, a court needs to determine beneficial use of these documents. I do not believe they can be subpoenaed. This would be a question for the Legal Division to answer. It is more for the purpose of a court saying we need access to find out if a person has a will because of a terrible accident and there may be minor dependents who do not know. The court needs access to know if a will was filed and where and who executed the will. In these purposes, a lockbox can be accessed.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Committee Counsel):

I need to research whether a court would be able to subpoena these lockboxes.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

What is the purpose of section 18, changing the classification of the Securities Division Administrator? What does this have to do with this bill?

KATE THOMAS (Deputy for Operations, Office of the Secretary of State):

This piece of the bill cleans up items that affect our office. This section places the Administrator of the Securities Division into the unclassified service of the State. We need to change language because last session, the budget committees moved this position into unclassified status through the paybill, but our statute, NRS 225, did not reflect this change. We are simply bringing this section into conformity.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This should go with the money committees that deal with this issue.

MS. THOMAS:

Secondly, section 17 repeals the Special Services Account for the expedited fee generated by the Secretary of State's Commercial Recordings Division. The General Fund receives 49.8 percent of this Special Services revenue and the Secretary of State's Office retains 50.2 percent. This change would place revenue into the General Fund and fund the Secretary of State's Office accordingly. This corollary legislation allows for the changes provided in the Governor's Recommended Budget. With the elimination of this account, no longer would a portion of the staff and the operations of the Secretary of State's Office be funded through Special Services; rather, it would be funded by the General Fund.

As you may know, Nevada is only second to Delaware as one of the top filing states per capita in the nation. However, the Special Services Account has been a declining revenue source. In the past, an increasing reliance to fund positions in technology has left this administration with tough decisions during these economic times. Since Secretary of State Ross Miller took office, we have stated concerns about this account and the heavy reliance to fund general operations in our office, including operations that have nothing to do with commercial recording activities. We are faced with addressing this budget issue now and for fiscal years to come. Despite our office saving about \$1.5 million, we have had to request a supplemental appropriation to fund positions and operations allocated to the Special Services Account. Despite staff reductions, we needed a long-term solution. Our office met the Governor's requested 4.5-percent budget reduction last year. We considered several options. In working with the Department of Administration, it was determined the best policy would be to eliminate this account and deposit the expedited revenue directly into the General Fund. While the expedited revenue may be down, our agency's revenues remain generally flat. New filings are down, but we are up in the number of entities that remain in good standing.

We continue to promote our efforts to Nevada's positive business climate so we may maintain our position as a top filing state and continue to generate substantial revenue that we do contribute to the General Fund. The Secretary of State's office is the third-highest, generally-funded, revenue-generated agency for the State.

SENATE BILL 32: Makes various changes to the Open Meeting Law.
(BDR19-459)

WES HENDERSON (Government Affairs Coordinator, Nevada Association of Counties):

Speaking on behalf on the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), we are in support of S.B. 32. The NACO is a firm believer in transparent government and accountability of public officials. We support the allowance of boards of county commissioners to conduct performance evaluations of county managers and other direct reports in a private forum. This bill does not limit the public's access to information regarding performance evaluations. Rather, it will allow direct-report employees to receive candid and frank evaluations of their performances. It will also prevent undue or unfounded harm to the public's faith in the employee ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR CARE:

I am looking at NRS 241.010, legislative declaration and intent. "In enacting this chapter," it states, "the Legislature finds and declares that all public bodies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly." Explain to me how this language of the intent and legislative declaration is consistent to that asked for today? I am in opposition of this bill.

DOUG JOHNSON (Douglas County Commissioner; Nevada Association of Counties):

In 2005, this had unanimous support from the Nevada Association of Counties and the entire board of NACO's Legislative Committee. This is not specifically about transparency. This bill is more about the fair and equitable treatment of county managers or whoever is getting appraised in front of the public. There is even a discrepancy on whether we allow public comment on these evaluations. On behalf of the NACO, I support a closed session in order to have a good evaluation followed up 30 days later with a full report. This would lead to better and more fair evaluations.

SENATOR CARE:

Action had to take place concerning the Nevada Open Meeting Law four years ago. I stand behind this legislation; thereby, I oppose S.B. 32.

RENNY ASHLEMAN (City of Henderson):

We support this bill. In general, the cities and counties meet with their direct reports one-on-one so they do not violate the law. There are many ways to discuss deficiencies. One does not want to destroy confidence in a city manager

by having them in a personnel session for relatively minor matters. However, it also is not productive to have numerous people counsel someone. In these cases, the public does not find anything out. If one is able to have the private session and then bring the results out, the public would learn more. Personnel sessions with frank discussions about issues, advances the public interest and, most likely, these issues will be brought to the public's attention.

SENATOR CARE:

Chancellor Jim Rogers commented in support of the Legislature's action on the Open Meeting Law in 2005. He even said he was looking forward to an open evaluation. There have been others. Any new county manager hired after the law went into effect knew ahead of time that an open meeting was a condition of employment. When I look at the bill, those not included would be back next session also wanting inclusion.

MR. ASHLEMAN:

First, the other people are already protected, so they would not want inclusion. There are provisions for them. It is only the direct reports. Secondly, the Chancellor can certainly have his wish. We are clear in this law that anybody who wants to have an open meeting may have it open. My concern is not for the feelings of the staff but the people who are elected. They are probably not calling their staff in on minor- to midlevel issues under the law because free interchange is not present. This is a major concern, and this is why we support the change.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I question the worthiness of having these meetings open. It sounds good and is about transparency, but the information wanted by evaluating individuals is curtailed. People asked to make comments for evaluation purposes are reluctant to bring forth information important to government. We talk about transparency in government and how everything that pertains to governmental function should be open with few exceptions. Let us examine the area where government is mostly involved—80 percent to 90 percent of budgets are personnel issues such as salaries. Collective bargaining is closed. If we are to have transparency in government, why do we allow for collective bargaining to be closed? This is where all the money is spent on all levels of government. If we really want to say we are for openness in government, let us talk about it.

RUSSELL M. ROWE (Board Member, University of Nevada Las Vegas Alumni Association):

We would like to submit an amendment to S.B. 32 clarifying the definition of university foundations. Several years ago, university foundations were brought under the umbrella of the Open Meeting Law, and we were required to conform. The definition of a university foundation was so broad that an alumni association can be interpreted to be a university foundation which, clearly, they are not. Alumni associations are meant to support the university. We were not a part of the legislation when the university foundation was brought into the Open Meeting Law, and it was not the intent. Our amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) simply clarifies the statutes to exclude alumni associations from the definition of a university foundation.

DAVID FRASER (Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

We support S.B. 32. City managers need frank and specific discussions with their bosses to do their best job, and this is diminished in the public meeting as the council may be less inclined to be as candid as they could be. Another issue brought forth is council members can meet individually with a city manager and discuss performance issues, yet the city manager works for the council as a body, not as individuals. Conflicting direction can occur meeting individually, leaving the city manager to decipher what to follow, and what is most important, how does the majority feel or who will feel put off. A closed session allows all councilmen and the city manager to be on the same page. One councilman can say, "I expect this from the manager," while another councilman can say, "Wait, that's not what I expect." The meeting allows for a consensus as to what is expected of the city manager. Candid group conversation needs to take place for the city manager to make adjustments to do the best job possible.

MARY WALKER, CPA (Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County):

We support S.B. 32. I have sat through a public hearing on a manager's performance and witnessed comments read on the record that were small, picky personality issues. They were embarrassing. The 30 to 35 citizens attending the hearing were commenting on how embarrassing and demeaning the process became to the manager. For contrast purposes, I attended another evaluation, but the meeting occurred before the new law went into effect. At this board meeting, I was outside waiting for the next agenda item and I could hear screams coming from the room. Frustration was vented and the evaluation went

on for hours. The end result, however, was not negative but positive. The five board members and the manager learned where the problem existed, where issues of concerns laid and what needed to be addressed. This evaluation's success occurred because the meeting was closed, allowing for frank discussion. This vital-spirited discussion would not take place today in an open meeting. Senate Bill 32 is balanced. Policy and the ultimate decisions are made public, but the personal innuendos and those things that demean both the person and the office can be left behind. The bill provides for improved service and professionalism.

SENATOR CARE:

Under section 1, subsection 4, the public will be provided a summary of its findings and a description of any bonuses or changes in salary. Would a transcript be kept at a closed hearing?

MS. WALKER:

There would be a transcript, but it would not be public.

SENATOR CARE:

If there is a transcript, can it be a public document?

MS. WALKER:

Before the law was changed, there was a transcript, but it was not public because of a closed hearing. After the law was changed, there is a transcript open to the public. We are trying to provide a summary. More specificity can be added in regard to what constitutes a summary. More specifics can address the overall policy of the general performance of the individual or include areas of improvements. All things concerning policy should be made public, but getting into personalities to embarrass the manager should not be presented.

SENATOR CARE:

Why is it not okay to release a transcript of an uninhibited closed hearing after the fact?

MS. WALKER:

It goes back to the demeaning of the office and to the person. If the closed hearing was made public, the discussion would be stifled. I have seen an evaluation of a manager that was fairly subdued. After a couple of weeks, they came back and fired the person because they did not want to get into specifics

during the evaluation. We may consider details in the bill that will provide parameters for openness of policy and not the demeaning of the person.

BARRY SMITH (Executive Director, Nevada Press Association, Incorporated):
I am testifying today in opposition to S.B. 32. An open meeting allows the public to see how well elected board members are doing their job. What questions did they ask? What issues did they think were important? Are they concerned about the same things that concern me? To close an evaluation session is to deny constituents an opportunity to watch their elected representatives perform one of the most important aspects of their jobs. Closing a meeting somehow presupposes that what went on will not become a matter of public knowledge. As a representative of the press, I would expect a reporter to immediately ask questions to members as to what occurred at the meeting, not wait 30 days. I would expect members of the public to do the same. Problems can only be exacerbated by a secondhand or thirdhand account. My overall point regarding open government is trust. In public institutions, accountability of elected officials and public officeholders can only be maintained by doing things in the light of day ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR LEE:

Our work session will begin with S.B. 63. This bill indicates changes to better align financial practices with the Generally Accepted Accounting Practices. The bill removes the Office of the State Controller as the recipient of various financial reports and statements prepared by local government. The measure also shifts deposits from two accounts relating to special license plates from the Motor Vehicle Fund to the State Highway Fund and changes the origin of the Revolving Account for the Issuance of Salvage titles from the Motor Vehicle Fund to the State Highway Fund. Senate Bill 63 also clarifies that the Nevada College Savings Trust Fund is administered by the Office of the State Treasurer and limits the money deposited in the Trust Fund to that which is deposited in accordance with the savings trust agreements and earnings made on that money. Finally, S.B. 63 provides that the Administrative Account and the Endowment Account in the Trust Fund is part of the State General Fund.

[SENATE BILL 63](#): Makes various changes concerning public financial administration. (BDR 31-493)

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 63.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR LEE:

Senate Bill 74 makes various changes relating to assistance to finance housing. This bill removes the sunset on provisions adopted in 2001 and 2003 concerning assistance to finance housing. The bill repeals sections 2 and 4 of chapter 383, *Statutes of Nevada* 2003.

MICHAEL STEWART (Committee Policy Analyst):

This technical amendment clarifies what sunsets versus what is repealed from the *Statutes of Nevada* 2003. This is a cleaner version of the bill.

SENATE BILL 74: Makes various changes relating to assistance to finance housing. (BDR S-699)

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 74.

SENATOR TOWNSEND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR LEE:

Senate Bill 76 provides that an agency's order for the summary suspension of a license may be issued by the agency, the executive head of the agency, a member of the governing body of the agency, or an officer or employee of the agency acting within the scope of his authority. The bill further provides that a member of the governing body of an agency who issues an order of summary suspension must not participate in any further proceedings relating to that order. Finally, S.B. 76 requires the agency to complete its proceedings against the licensee within 60 days after the date of the order of summary suspension unless the licensee and the agency agree to a longer period.

SENATE BILL 76: Revises provisions governing the administrative procedures for the summary suspension of licenses issued by certain state agencies. (BDR 18-263)

CHAIR LEE:

Senator Townsend has concerns about Senator Maggie Carlton's thoughts on this bill because she is the Chair on the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor. We have had some dialog with Senator Carlton, and she wants to go from 60 days down to 45 days. We are willing to do whatever we need to do. There is also a change on who will order the summary suspension.

SENATOR CARE:

The literal reading of the amendment states an employee can issue the order. My concern is does the word employee mean anybody in the agency? There is to be an amendment reflecting only the agency or the governing body chair of the agency may issue the order. We do not have the amendment.

MR. STEWART:

There was discussion about this issue, and we do not have a specific amendment. There is a question whether the employee is acting within the scope of his authority issuing the summary suspension. We can look into changing the language of the scope of the employee authority to issue a summary suspension.

CHAIR LEE:

We do not have the amendment; therefore, we will postpone this bill.

MR. STEWART:

I did speak with Keith Lee concerning Senator Carlton, and he indicated that the Chair of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was looking at an amendment as it relates to the Board of Medical Examiners. Senator Carlton's concerns regarding the issuance of a suspension in 45 days is handled in that bill specific to the Board of Medical Examiners. She is sponsoring this as Bill Draft Request (BDR) 54-757, and it will be heard in the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 54-757: Makes various changes concerning the Board of Medical Examiners.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 16, 2009
Page 16

CHAIR LEE:

Senate Bill 96 makes the District Attorney of Humboldt County the ex officio Public Administrator of Humboldt County.

SENATE BILL 96: Makes the District Attorney of Humboldt County the ex officio Public Administrator of Humboldt County. (BDR 20-374)

SENATOR CARE MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 96.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR LEE:

Senate Bill 105 revises provisions concerning matching funds for grants made by the Board for Financing Water Projects. Instead of calculating a grant award based on the matching funds as a percentage of the total grant, S.B. 105 requires that the grant be calculated based on the matching funds as a percentage of the total cost of the project. There was discussion on an amendment. Senator Dean A. Rhodes, representing Humboldt County, favors this bill without an amendment, and a Humboldt County Commissioner is also satisfied. There will be no amendments.

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

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 105.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 16, 2009
Page 17

CHAIR LEE:

This work session for Senate Committee on Government Affairs is now closed.
This meeting is adjourned at 2:24 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Cynthia Ross,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator John J. Lee, Chair

DATE: _____