

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 25, 2013**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairwoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson at 9:03 a.m. on Monday, March 25, 2013, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman James W. Healey
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury (excused)



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Clark County District No. 20
Assemblyman Joe Hogan, Clark County District No. 10

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Bonnie Hoffecker, Committee Manager
Maysha Watson, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mary C. Walker, representing Douglas County and Lyon County
Paul Gardner, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada
Bob Fisher, representing Nevada Broadcasters Association
Kurt A. Mische, CRMC/CRSM, President and CEO, KNPB
Brandy Newman, Chair, Nevada Broadcasters Association
Piper Overstreet, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Steve K. Walker, representing Truckee Meadows Water Authority
John J. Slaughter, representing Washoe County
Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, Washoe County
Barry Smith, representing Nevada Press Association
Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor, representing Nevada Press Association
John M. Hager, Executive Director, Silver State Health Insurance Exchange
Scott K. Sisco, Assistant Director of Administration, Department of Transportation
Yvette Williams, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Carrie Dillard, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Garrett LeDuff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jack Mallory, representing International Union of Painters and Allied Trades Council 15
Ted J. Olivas, representing City of Las Vegas
Gary Milliken, representing Associated General Contractors, Las Vegas Chapter
Yvonne Schuman, Civil Rights Officer, Nevada Department of Transportation

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

[Roll was called and protocol reiterated.] We are going to be hearing three bills today: Assembly Bill 231, Assembly Bill 267, and Assembly Bill 281.

Before I do that, I have some Committee bill draft request (BDR) introductions that I would like to do. I will go ahead and accept a motion to introduce BDR S-1120.

BDR S-1120—Revises provisions relating to the position of fire chief in certain cities. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 420](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON MOVED TO INTRODUCE
BDR S-1120.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Next, I will accept a motion to introduce BDR 43-983.

BDR 43-983—Revises certain provisions governing the enforcement of parking laws. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 416](#).)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 43-983.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will accept a motion to introduce BDR 22-234.

BDR 22-234—Makes various changes relating to redevelopment. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 417](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 22-234.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will accept a motion to introduce BDR 31-1087.

BDR 31-1087—Revises provisions relating to the distribution of proceeds from certain taxes ad valorem. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 418](#).)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 31-1087.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Lastly, I will accept a motion to introduce BDR 23-1119.

BDR 23-1119—Revises provisions governing the Public Employees' Benefits Program. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 419](#).)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 23-1119.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We will go ahead and begin with [Assembly Bill 231](#).

[Assembly Bill 231](#): Revises provisions regarding local governing bodies.
(BDR 20-1039)

Welcome to the witness table, Assemblyman Oscarson.

Assemblyman James Oscarson, District No. 36:

I appreciate the time and opportunity to present [Assembly Bill 231](#) today. I will just give you a very brief overview on some of the things that we have been doing. Existing law provides for the organization and membership of town boards of unincorporated towns, town advisory boards, boards of directors of local improvement districts, and boards of trustees of general improvement districts. This bill provides a variable to a vacancy in the membership of such a governing body must be filled by appointment by the applicable board of county commissioners. Since drafting [A.B. 231](#), several friendly amendments have been brought to my attention, one by Nevada Rural Electric Association exempting *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 318 ([Exhibit C](#)). Doing so would continue the process of filling vacancies of power district boards. Including NRS Chapter 318 was an unintended consequence of this legislation. I have also received several emails on [A.B. 231](#) and look forward to discussing with those who have issues and concerns about this bill.

The intent for this bill is to have county commissions appoint the members of the town advisory boards when there is a vacancy. There has been some ambiguity as to who is supposed to do that, whether it be the county commission or the Office of the Governor. I know specifically in Assembly District No. 36, we have had some concerns about how that is actually supposed to be happening. This was actually brought from several constituents in Assembly District No. 36. I have spoken with the Governor's office, and they have no problem with the county commissioners doing that.

Again, NRS Chapter 318 would be exempted from this because that relates to the power boards and some of the general improvement districts (GIDs) that appoint themselves. The language would stay the same as it was originally, which is that the boards would then have the opportunity to appoint themselves. If they do not do it, then the board of commissioners would do it after 30 days.

This really is just a cleanup, making sure everybody is on the same page with how this happens. Again, I have received several emails this morning that would indicate there is some discussion that needs to be had, and I look forward to those discussions and working it out so everybody will have a good, clean bill with no unintended consequences when it comes through. With that, Madam Chairwoman, I am happy to entertain or answer any questions.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Thank you very much, Assemblyman Oscarson, and thank you to all of those who have reached out to him to talk with him about this piece of legislation.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Can you tell me a little bit more about what is going on in your county? Can you go into a little more detail?

Assemblyman Oscarson:

In Nye County, specifically, there have been multiple vacancies in town boards. Because the County Commission has not been making those appointments, the appointments have been going to the Governor. In a lot of instances, that takes an inordinate amount of time; not for any specific reason but just to get the right candidates, the right applications, and all those things done. Bear in mind that this is only for vacancies that occur during the term. Board members would still be elected. The vacancy would not be appointed until the next election cycle, and then there would be an election process that would take place. This is just in case somebody quits or, as in the case of the Amargosa Valley town board, a member is killed in a car accident—those types

of things. This bill clarifies who is supposed to do those appointments and who has a responsibility for that.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Thank you, Assemblyman Oscarson, for bringing this legislation forth because I am sure it is important to Nye County and the town board that makes this up. Can you tell me a little bit about the membership of the town boards? Are there three members or five?

Assemblyman Oscarson:

In Pahrump, there are five, sir.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Are there three County commissioners?

Assemblyman Oscarson:

There are five County commissioners.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Okay. I did not know the population.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

The population is about 38,000 people, Assemblyman Livermore.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Thank you for that.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Just to remind the Committee, we do have a lot of different pieces of information uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). One of them relates to the amendments coming from the bill sponsor for A.B. 231 ([Exhibit D](#)). It might help to reference the amendments that he is making when considering the legislation as we discuss it today.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

Assemblyman Oscarson, can you go through some of the different unincorporated towns in your counties? I know in Clark County we have unincorporated town advisory boards, but that is a little bit different than an unincorporated town.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I can tell you specifically the ones I am aware of, which include the Beatty Town Advisory Board, the Amargosa Town Advisory Board, and

the Pahrump Town Advisory Board. There are some in the Clark County area, and I am working with Assemblyman Hardy to see where they need to be. There is also the Moapa Town Advisory Board. Those areas all have town advisory boards that are elected in one form or another. It used to be straw poll when I lived in Logandale, but now they have the election process or the appointment process in place. Those are some that I am aware of will be affected by this bill. Again, we have chosen to exclude NRS Chapter 318, which would be the smaller GIDs and the power boards.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I am just trying to get my head around this. In Clark County we have Winchester and Paradise, and those are unincorporated towns. They already do the appointment process. You are talking about basically the same thing as Winchester and Paradise but for the towns that actually do elections instead of the appointment process.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

That would be correct. Again, this is only if there is a vacancy that occurs. Those towns you mentioned would not be affected by this bill. There is some information from Douglas County on NELIS showing that they approve some of these things ([Exhibit E](#)). I am sorry I am not familiar with all of the northern advisory boards that there are, but we know that there is a significant amount of them out there in the area. The whole intent of A.B. 231 is to streamline the process, get the representation on the boards, and make sure that they can continue to function. Sometimes with the smaller boards, they do not have a quorum if a member or two are not there. We are trying to make sure that does not impede their ability to do what they need to do.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? I see none. We will go ahead and open up for testimony in support of A.B. 231.

Mary C. Walker, representing Douglas County and Lyon County:

I am representing Douglas County and also Lyon County, who contacted me late Friday. They are in support of this bill. We would like to thank Assemblyman Oscarson for bringing this forward. We rise in support of A.B. 231 as amended. We do agree that the NRS Chapter 318 districts should not be involved in this. We do also concur that it does provide for a streamlined process to fill the vacancies for the various local governing boards. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions for Ms. Walker? [There were none.] Is there any additional testimony in support? [There was none.] We will open up for testimony in opposition. [There was none.] We will move on to neutral testimony. [There was none.] I will invite the bill sponsor back up for any closing comments.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I think this is a perfect way to start a Monday morning. I appreciate all of the people who have reached out to me and the support that I have received in discussing this bill. I look forward to fine-tuning it just a touch more before we put it into work session and have an opportunity to look at it again. I appreciate the time and effort of the Committee and the people who have approached me.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

I will go ahead and close this hearing on A.B. 231. I will now open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 267.

Assembly Bill 267: Revises certain provisions governing publication of legal notices and legal advertisements. (BDR 19-730)

Good morning, Assemblywoman Spiegel. We will give you a second to get set up.

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Clark County District No. 20:

I am here today to speak with you about Assembly Bill 267, which really is looking to bring Nevada into the 21st century. It deals with public notices, legal notices, and legal advertisements. What it does is enable legal advertisements and legal notices to be placed on the Internet instead of just in a newspaper. What it also does is look to make sure that we do not leave anybody behind. It includes a requirement that newspapers still contain information about legal notices or legal advertisements, telling people where they can find them on the Internet and where they can go to get copies should they not have Internet access or a desire to go on the Internet [([Exhibit F](#)), page 2].

The question is why now? Why is it important to be looking at this today? The Internet has caused a very big shift in our society over the past 25 years. It has changed how we live, how we work, how we play, and how we get information [([Exhibit F](#)), page 3]. Eighty-two percent of all Americans aged 18 and over say they use the Internet or email at least occasionally, and 67 percent do so on a typical day. It does not matter how old you are. People are getting on the Internet. The younger you are, the more likely it is that you have adopted

Internet use. I started working in online media in the late 1980s, and I have seen a dramatic shift in how technology has changed our lives.

Today, 97 percent of people ages 18 to 29 use the Internet [([Exhibit F](#)), page 4]. Ninety-one percent of people ages 30 to 49, 70 percent of seniors, and an overall 82 percent of American adults use the Internet on a daily basis. The Internet is something that has become very prevalent.

Legal notices and legal advertisements are public notices, and the public needs to see them. They need to be approachable to the audience for which it is intended. As we as a society have shifted, we have moved from getting our information through traditional media, such as newspapers and broadcast, to getting our information online.

I have some statistics here for you [([Exhibit F](#)), page 5]. Daily newspaper circulation has been going down. It decreased 20 percent from 2000 to 2011. Thirty-seven percent of Americans said that they read some form of a newspaper "yesterday," but again, this was down from 39 percent in 2008 and 43 percent in 2006. I do not know about you, but I read several newspapers every day. I read them all on the Internet. I am not getting hard copies of my newspapers. Also, U.S. television subscribers have been cutting the cords with their cable providers. There is a prediction that trend will continue. It was predicted that 3.58 million people will have cut the cord with their cable providers by the end of 2012. At the same time, we see that there has been increased usage of trusted online media sources, such as newspaper websites and broadcaster websites. Even though people have been shifting to getting their information and content online instead of from the traditional media, they are looking for trusted brands. They are looking to see if they can trust the information they are getting. They are not going to fly-by-night operations. They are not going to the blogosphere to get trusted information. They are relying on the traditional brands; the newspaper, television, and cable websites.

What this bill does, as I mentioned earlier, is update us. It gives us a way to get this information the public needs and wants in a format where they will be able to access it. Sections 2 through 9 of the bill just give definitions. Section 10 does a couple of things. It allows legal notices or legal advertisements to be published online by a newspaper, television or broadcast website, unless it is prohibited by a specific statute [([Exhibit F](#)), page 6]. There may be some instances where it is prohibited, and that would still stay. Section 10 also requires that the newspaper publish the website URL where the notice appears. If you have seen legal notices, public notices, and legal advertisements in the newspaper, you will see that they are typically big display ads. That would be

shrunk down to something much smaller, giving you the URL where the public notice is located. It also includes a provision that the phone number of the agency or organization that is posting this and the address of where somebody could get a hard copy of the notice be on the website as well as in the newspaper. Again, this is looking to make sure that consumers can get access to the information in the way that they want to get it.

Now, there are a couple of issues that have come up. It is said that no bill ever comes out of drafting perfectly, and this bill is no exception. Some of the issues that have come up are things that just need some cleaning up. The bill, as written, did something in section 10, subsection 2, paragraphs (a) and (b), where originally—and what is in statute today—there was an effort to make sure that the publications that published these legal advertisements be bona fide, not fly-by-night publications [([Exhibit F](#)), page 7]. There were requirements in statute that if a publication was published triweekly, semiweekly, semimonthly, or weekly, they had to have been publishing continuously for 104 weeks in order to be qualified to publish legal notices and legal ads. Similarly, with a daily newspaper, the current requirement is that it needs to have been publishing for a year before it is qualified to accept legal notices and legal publications. Somewhere in drafting the language got changed to say that the legal notice would have to run for either 104 weeks or for a year, depending on how often the publication is published. That was not the intent. The remedy is to amend the bill and bring the language back to how it is in current statute.

The next issue that comes up is also related to this [([Exhibit F](#)), page 8]. At the end of the bill, you will see it repeals *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 238.040, which states that a second-class mailing permit is required for a publication to be qualified to publish legal notices and legal advertisements. Again, the intent of that was to make sure that the print publications—the newspapers that contain these notices—are bona fide publications and not fly-by-night operations where somebody is, let us say, printing something out on their home computer in their garage and distributing leaflets to people. The remedy to this is to not repeal the section because the intent is to make sure that the consumer has trusted brands that they can be turning to for their information.

The next thing that came up, which again will require a little bit of cleanup, was that section 8 expands the definition of "legal notice or legal advertisement" to include any notice that must be published on an Internet website pursuant to any law of the state [([Exhibit F](#)), page 9]. A number of people contacted me and said they believe that this would apply to the open meeting law, which would be problematic for all of our levels of government. I have an amendment that is going to be put forth by Washoe County later that will address this and

modify the language so that agendas and things like that would not fall under this because that was not the intent.

The next issue that came up was that several state agencies approached me, stating they would like to use the provisions of this bill [([Exhibit F](#)), page 10]. These agencies are required by statute to publicize legal notices and legal advertisements. They would like to use the provisions for two reasons. One, it would increase their ability to reach Nevadans. As we have a shift where more people are using online media than traditional print media, this would have the ability to reach more people. Second, it would mitigate cost because it will be less expensive for these agencies. As a remedy, it was suggested that we add a new section, which we are calling section X for now, that says, "Further, state agencies required by NRS to publish notices in newspapers of general circulation may opt to publish those advertisements in accordance with the provisions of this bill." I will tell you that this amendment is going to be controversial. The newspapers are opposed to this, and I suspect that we will be hearing from them later. I included it in this presentation because I think it is important for us to have the conversation. It is also important for me to make the distinction that this bill is not intended to do harm to newspapers; nor is it intended to have the newspapers and the broadcasters be in an adversarial position. This bill is intended to bring Nevada into the 21st century and give access to public information in a way that the public will be most receptive to it. It seeks to expand what we are doing and make sure that Nevadans have the ability to get the information. I am looking forward to that discussion and the ongoing conversations we will have.

The next two pieces were brought to my attention on Friday. The first relates to due process [([Exhibit F](#)), page 11]. A question was raised about whether this approach that is in this bill would satisfy the due process requirements that are set forth by the Fifth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment of the *United States Constitution*. Currently, due process is achieved through the notarized affidavit of publication that is substantiated by the written record in the newspaper. One thought that I have not had a chance to run by the Legal Division yet is that we require the online publisher achieve due process requirements through a constitutionally sufficient means perhaps by using a notarized affidavit of publication that is substantiated by a screen print of the website on the date in question. We get to the same result by a different method. However, I need to speak with Legal about that.

The last issue is a matter of oversight [([Exhibit F](#)), page 12]. A question was raised about how oversight would be performed. I think for that we can require that oversight requirements be put into regulations so that we make sure there is adequate oversight and that the objective is met.

Wrapping this up, you will see on the last page of the presentation I gave you some footnotes of the sources that I used [([Exhibit F](#)), page 13]. You can verify or find additional information if you want. Again, the main objective of this bill is to get information to people in a way that is consistent with how we as a society are obtaining information, bringing us forward, and bringing us into compliance with the 21st century requirements. With that, I will take any questions.

Assemblywoman Neal:

On section 10, subsection 4, paragraph (b), lines 20 through 26, I am trying to understand what the language means right here. Could you further clarify what that paragraph is meant to do?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

This paragraph is looking to make sure that there is a real brand behind the website and the publication. It is looking to make sure that there is a real business there, not just that there is a brand. It is looking to protect the integrity of the data and the Nevadans' perception of that data. There is a difference between getting information from a trusted source and getting it from some unknown place on the Internet. This is seeking to make that distinction and have our legal notices and legal advertisements placed in trusted media sources.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The language is confusing. It talks about not breaking or affecting "the continuity of a publication of the legal notice or legal advertisement if public access to the Internet website is continuous and uninterrupted for the period prescribed by this section." I am trying to understand the circumstances. In section 10, page 4, lines 1 through 10, you want the mailing address and the telephone number of any state agency or local government, and all of this additional information posted on the website. The way section 10 is reading, the actual language itself is not clear. What are we trying to really get at? Going back to subsection 4, your expectation is that if the Internet stops working, we need to then go to the newspaper, which should have this information for a year. Is that what this continuity language is supposed to do?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

That is part of the language I was talking about earlier that needs to be cleaned up. The intention is not to have the notice placed in the newspaper for a year. The intention is to have the notice placed on the Internet site and shown in the newspaper for the amount of time it needs to run based on what that legal advertisement is; to direct people to the Internet site and tell them where they

can get it in print. That is what it says on page 4, lines 1 through 11. It will be clearer once we get the language fixed.

Coming down to lines 20 through 26 on page 4, that is saying that the website needs to be up and running continuously. The website should not be something that goes away because the URL expires or management goes out of business. It needs to actually be there and be fulfilling the public need. However, if you would like, I can go back to Legal and we can get the language clarified.

Assemblywoman Neal:

No. I know that you were explaining it during your presentation. I was just confused about how the intent was actually going to be delivered for that section. I will leave that alone.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Assemblywoman Spiegel, I appreciate your trying to bring us into the 21st century. My children and grandchildren have been trying to do that with me for some time. I am concerned, however, about the 20 to 25 percent of people who do not use the Internet regularly. It is my contention that if a person were reading the newspaper and came across this address telling him where to go on the Internet, he would not want to deal with that. It would be an added task for him, and he would not do it.

This morning my attaché's computer had a virus. Although IT was up there very quickly and fixed the problem within half an hour, I do not think the average person would be able to do that as quickly without access to that type of computer service. I would contend that maybe we need "Internet and" instead of "Internet or" in the language of the bill so that everyone would be covered and we would not leave the 20 to 25 percent out.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

One of the things that I love about how this bill was drafted is that it includes a provision for folks who do not have Internet access. There is still a requirement that there be something in the newspaper that not only points to where the notice is on the Internet but also gives the address and phone number for the agency the reader can contact directly to ask for a copy of the notice. This was crafted in such a way that we are not leaving people behind but are gathering additional people and providing more access.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

I like what your bill is trying to do, but I do not see why we are requiring that this be in a newspaper at all. We require things to be printed in newspapers because government agencies do not print newspapers, but the fact

is government agencies have websites. I am an older person, and I would much rather go look at a government website anytime because everybody else's websites are just full of advertisements that are annoying to us older people. I think that it is time to just say legal notices need to be somewhere on a government website. They need to be easy to find. They need to be easier to read; no more tiny print. We could do this much better and easier. Just cut out the newspapers.

You talked about having this information in a publication that is trusted by people. You and I both live in southern Nevada and know that our major newspaper is not trusted by many people who live in southern Nevada. Your argument is not a good one in this instance. Anyway, I think that we should take the big leap.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

One thing that is important to take note of is that many government agencies do publish their information on their websites. The problem is that Nevadans do not know where to find it. They do not know when it is updated, and they do not know when new information comes out. That is the reason for having things that are in the newspaper and in the media websites. It is so that people can go to those websites, get information, and see that they can go to those governmental websites and access the information. As far as various publications being trusted—media sources and trusted brands—there is a difference between something that is an established publication that has a readership, has circulation, or has viewership, as in the case of broadcasters, versus something that is done in my garage. We are looking to make sure that people are going to sites in which they have a reasonable level of trust. If something says that there is a public notice in there, people trust that it really is a public notice. However, I do understand what you are saying.

Assemblyman Daly:

I just want to be clear. I heard the arguments of Assemblywoman Pierce and Assemblyman Stewart. They both have valid points, but they cannot both be right. On page 3, section 10, subsection 3, it talks about the newspaper or broadcaster who maintains the Internet website. Try to walk me through on who is actually going to be maintaining that website. If I were in Winnemucca and used to getting the information out of the paper, I would go to the paper to find this URL where the information is located. I know the newspaper is going to have a website, which I would go to, but that is not the website where information is. I am going to have to guess which website to visit. Should it not be clarified that it is on the local paper's website? Are you going to be having people compete with each other over where to put the notices?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

What will happen is that various media sources will have the opportunity to bid on having the legal notice placed on their website, and when you go to your local newspaper in Winnemucca and look in the legal notice section, it will tell you exactly where you can find it. I do not know the name of the local newspaper in Winnemucca or even a local television station that might have a website, so I cannot answer you with a specific example for that city. However, let us use southern Nevada as an example because I know that market. The *Las Vegas Sun* would say in the legal notice section that you can find the notice online at <lasvegassun.com/publicnotices> or something similar. You would be directed exactly where to find the notice, and that URL would be in the newspaper.

Assemblyman Daly:

I understand that you are going to direct them to the agency website, but when you said that they are going to bid, who is bidding to whom? Are you bidding to each individual newspaper? Are you bidding to the public agency that posts the information? Who is getting the market, and who is getting the market taken away? That is what I want to understand.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

The media outlets will be able to go to the different agencies and tell them how much they would charge these agencies to put their public notices on the media websites. The agencies would then make the determination that they best see fit and, presumably, make an arrangement that is most advantageous to them. To some extent, this will help mitigate costs. The intention is that it will be increasing access to consumers. The reality is that it will probably also bring down the overall costs to the agencies because advertising on the Internet is much less expensive than advertising in either a newspaper or broadcast.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Today's devices are streaming; not television stations. I can watch football and movies on my phone. However, you do not address that in this bill. If you look at your Internet adoption, 53 percent of the people who have access to the Internet are my age group. I want to make sense of this. When you take notices and move it out of the local newspaper, you are taking local tax money and spending it in another county. Carson City has no broadcast television station. It has a broadcast radio station, but it does not have a television station. If you look at television, you deal with things like cable and satellite providers. Some of these things take subscriptions. You need to pay fees for membership and those kinds of things, and they require passwords. Every time someone hacks a computer, passwords are compromised and you are out of sync for days. However, the newspaper delivers to my front door.

It delivers because I paid a subscription. The *Reno Gazette-Journal* comes every day. There are a lot of examples about things like this here today, and you see the multitude of legal notices that are public within a jurisdiction. If you look at northern Nevada, the only broadcast television stations are in Reno. Now, I cannot speak for Las Vegas because I do not pay a subscription to anything in that city, but let me go a bit further. If I was a DIRECTV subscriber and I lived in Elko, I would not get Reno's television channels. I would get Salt Lake City's television channels.

All these complications are trying to move me to this 21st century that I do not want to be dragged to. I like reading my newspaper. I like the smell of my newspaper when it shows up every day. I trust that newspaper. The print is a size I can read, and I enjoy everything that goes with sitting down to read the paper. When you start putting little legal notices on the back directing me here and there, then guess what? I will fold the newspaper and put it away, and now I no longer have access to the legal notices and legal advertisements. Carson City has a senior population in the neighborhood of 18 or 19 percent, and that population loses that access they had before as they grow closer to their end of life. With my wife's mother, who is 92 today, we save the newspaper and take it to her in her care center. That is the way she gets the news. She does not have Internet access, but she can read what she wishes to read in the newspaper we bring her. Assemblywoman Spiegel, I appreciate the effort to drag me into the 21st century, but I do not want to go.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

There are some points you raised that I would like to address. The first is that even though Carson City does not have broadcast outlets, it has the *Nevada Appeal*. The *Nevada Appeal* actually has a very nice website, and this would still work within that scenario. The printed paper could send you to the *Nevada Appeal* website, which is the same newspaper, and you could get the information there. Additionally, the printed paper would still say where you could get a hard copy of the notices if you choose not to go online.

The other thing I would like to address relates to smartphones. I have one of those. My phone is a little bigger than yours because my eyes probably need to have a larger screen. I can still get to my newspapers and broadcast websites on here.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Do you pay a subscription?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

No, I do not. I read several newspapers a day on my phone without paying a subscription. Also, if you are getting your newspaper delivered to your home, then you are getting a subscription there, as well.

One final comment that I want to make about that is, like you, I also enjoy the smell of newspapers. I was actually one of the first female news carriers in the country. That was my very first job. I grew up with newspapers, and I understand what you are talking about. I understand how our society has changed. I also understand that newspaper readership has been declining over the past several years.

In the early to mid-90s, I worked for The Weather Channel, which was owned by a company called Landmark Communications, a very big newspaper company at the time. They owned newspapers predominantly in the southeast, but they also owned a few broadcast and cable stations across the country. They owned The Weather Channel and The Travel Channel. They own KLAS-TV in Las Vegas. I actually did some online deals that covered the entire corporation, and I became very familiar with what we needed to be doing both to protect our newspapers and to look at ways that we could expand their reach, helping provide a model so that the newspapers could survive in to the future. This bill is not designed to harm newspapers. It is designed to help Nevadans.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Newspapers have been around since Benjamin Franklin started printing newspapers. Readership may be declining and advertisements may be another form for trying to reach and sell to people. However, I can tell you that the newspaper for the most part is still available and is still trusted, and it still comes in a language that you can understand. I know what the front page is. I know where to find the sport page and the rest of it, but most people do not know where to find things on newspaper websites and even government websites. Carson City just recently redid its website, and right now I am having trouble finding where information is on it because it has changed. I can appreciate what you are trying to do here, but I think it still needs a lot of work. I do not think it is timely at this present moment.

Assemblyman Ellison:

On your handout [([Exhibit F](#)), page 5], it says "Daily newspaper circulation was 44.4 million in 2011, down from 55.8 million in 2000—a 20% decrease." The problem is that there are still 44.4 million people who read the paper. My biggest concern right now is with subscriptions. You said that you read three newspapers but do not have to pay a subscription. Somebody has to pay

those people to do those articles. By not doing so, eventually they will dry up because nobody can pay them. That is the fear that is out there, and that is why I subscribe to five newspapers here in the state and then I pass them on to the other legislators. Can you hit on that? If these go away, who is going to be doing these stories?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Websites and newspaper websites all have different business models for how they make money. Most of them make their revenues through display advertising. I have sold display advertising on the Internet. In 1993 I sold \$1.8 million of Internet display advertising, and in 1996 I actually came up with a new type of advertising model for sales of advertising on the Internet whereby advertisers would pay per lead. The advertising world keeps evolving and coming up with new products so that the content providers of websites can remain viable. There have been a number of efforts over the past 20 or so years to sell online subscriptions to content. Unless the content is extremely specialized, typically the subscriptions have not been successful. The newspapers that I read online every morning, mostly on my phone, include the *Sun*, the *Review Journal*, the *Reno Gazette-Journal*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and *The New York Times*. I do not pay subscriptions, but I do click on display ads when there are things that are of interest to me and I sometimes transact businesses with those companies as a result. Rather than talking about the revenue models of either the newspapers or the broadcasters, because their shares are declining as well, it comes back to what is the right way for Nevadans to be getting information that they need in a way that they are going to be able to receive it, and not just for today or next week but into the future.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Thank you. You hit it right on the head. I also do online advertising, but I still think we are not to that point where one deletes and the other one totally takes over. I think this is a multiple thing that we are looking at, and if not today, it is going to be in the future. Probably you are right, in the future you will see that, but I still think there are 44 million people out there who still read the newspaper every day.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I agree with you. That is why there is still a requirement for there to be something in the print publication of the newspaper. This is not cutting the print publications out. This is expanding the reach.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I have a couple of comments on the bill following up on concerns about access for folks who are over 65 years of age. I am looking at Internet access

statistics on the Pew Research Center website. They did a survey at the end of last year, which I believe is the one you cite in your presentation. They broke it down by age, educational attainment, and household income, and I wanted to mention that, in terms of education attainment for folks who do not have a high school diploma, only 51 percent of that population uses the Internet. Sixty-seven percent of people who have a household income that is less than \$30,000 a year do not use the Internet.

I wanted to make a suggestion about the advertisement that appears in the newspaper. As it reads in the bill, it would include a mailing address, a phone number, and the URL of the Internet website. I feel like that is not enough for the amount of information that maybe should go in there so that those other demographics could have more information. Maybe there could be some kind of summary of what announcement they are going to find on the website. I feel like at this point we still need to be sure we are including those folks who are so often left out of the process.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I also saw some of that data, and a question that I had about the data, which I would need to go back and look at, is in regard to how that compares to newspaper readership. Will we be looking at going to extraordinary means to reach people who we will simply not be able to reach? I would want to understand the data a little bit more first. I can go back to the Pew Research Center and look at that. I am not averse to having the newspaper say something about the subject of the public notice.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

My question is related to the due process concerns that you had mentioned in your presentation. One of the things that I am a little nervous about is changing the way constructive service is done. I was curious about what other states do in terms of legal notices. How do they deal with those due process concerns? Also, along the lines of what Assemblywoman Swank said, I find that when you get into constructive service issues, you are dealing with a population that is generally harder to find and might not have Internet service. Could you comment on the due process issues?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I am not an attorney, and I first heard of this issue on Friday afternoon. I know, however, that there are a number of broadcast websites that are doing public notices in other states. After I speak, we are going to have a presentation by Mr. Bob Fisher from the Nevada Broadcasters Association, and I believe that he will be better equipped to answer this question than I.

[Vice Chairwoman Neal assumed the chair.]

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Seeing no further questions from the Committee, we are going to open up for testimony in support of A.B. 267.

Paul Gardner, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada:

I own Elko Broadcasting Company. I have a couple of radio stations there, and I work very closely with other rural broadcasters from around the state. I do not know that I speak for them today, but I certainly know that we work very closely together and we do generally speak with the same mind. It is my belief that a strong newspaper mandates advertising in our community. They set the agenda for advertising. If we have a strong newspaper, we have an easier time selling advertising to our local advertisers. By no means should this legislation be looked at as an attack on newspapers. It is not. The stronger the local newspaper in our communities, the easier time I have of selling advertising and the better business plan I have.

I support A.B. 267 because the system that is currently in place was established over 100 years ago. It made sense 100 years ago to have newspapers print legal notices and public notices such as these because it was the only form of mass media. Over the last century, things have evolved a little bit. They continue to evolve, and the Internet is the next big way of advertising public notices. It opens advertising up to anyone who has access to the Internet. Nothing works well in a monopoly, and I think that everybody understands that it is not the state's job to tell us where to advertise or where to get our information. I am among the small percentage of people who do not read the newspaper, and I do not really look at the legal notices. If something shows up that I should know about, my attorney will call me and let me know. However, as we continue this evolution from print—and even broadcast—over to the Web, I do support the idea that other people should have an opportunity to bid on this business to save the state and local governments money and to give our constituents, our listeners, and our viewers better access to the information that is available to them.

Assemblyman Ellison:

You said that you would like the opportunity to bid. What do you mean by that?

Paul Gardner:

I think that was clarified right before you came into the meeting this morning. This is not an admonition that everyone take their local notices out of their newspapers; rather, it gives the state and local governments an opportunity to

go to a competing media, ask for bids, and get the best price they can. It gives the broadcasters or the local newspaper an opportunity to offer to publish an advertisement for \$500 on their website instead of \$1,000 per page in a printed paper, saving the municipality or the state government several thousands of dollars in the process.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are some newspapers not doing that now? They are directing readers to different webpages. Readers can go to those webpages and bring that information up.

Paul Gardner:

I think that is a very good question. Right now, this is a state law that says that all of these public notices must be printed in the local newspaper or the paper of record in your community. While it might also be online, you have to pay for every one of those insertions. I am not exactly sure what the local cost is. I would like to know that number. Every time I have to put one of these legal notices in the newspaper for some kind of compliance with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), it costs me \$2.50 for every single line. If it is a 15-line notice, that is \$2.50 for every single line that is in there. Some of these state or local municipality notices go on for line after line and end up being several pages long. I cannot imagine how many thousands of dollars that would cost. Again, this is a state mandate that says it has to be printed in a local paper of record.

Bob Fisher, representing Nevada Broadcasters Association:

I want to thank the Committee for the consideration to come before you and the amount of time that has been given. It is very much appreciated. I think I need to bring a historical perspective. This may answer one of the questions that was asked of Assemblywoman Spiegel.

The Nevada Broadcasters Association has only come to the State Legislature four times in the past 20 years. The first time was regarding my insistence that AMBER Alert be codified. It passed. We came back two years later because we wanted a felony penalty for a hoax AMBER Alert. It passed. The third time was in regard to classifying broadcasters as first responders who were trained and credentialed during a catastrophic emergency. It passed. Two years ago, it was my responsibility, working with Governor Sandoval, to update and revise statutes for the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. It passed. Following a lengthy discussion with our board of directors more than a year ago, it seemed that what was happening was technology had really reached a point with regard to television and radio station websites. As a matter of fact, this morning KJUL in Las Vegas put online that they had spent \$40,000 to upgrade

their website. KJUL has the largest audience of seniors listening to radio, and the demand was for the need to expand that website for the seniors.

I think that we have spent an awful lot of time this morning talking about newspapers when we have not talked about what I feel are the two most important things. The first thing is that with this down economy, we need to talk about what it means to have a free market. I am holding in my hand a request for proposal (RFP) from the Division of Insurance who wants to spend \$250,000 a year on a comprehensive educational plan, and this RFP is 54 pages. I do not think there is anybody in this building who can request money or expenditure without a competitive bid. However, because of the way the laws have been for over 100 years, there is a monopoly. The broadcasters are asking for one thing: the option that those television stations, for example, who would like to participate in doing public notices, have the opportunity to do so. There was a question asked quite a while ago about oversight. I want to point out to everybody that there is no oversight for newspapers. It is called freedom of the press. If you want to talk about oversight, then talk about television or radio because we not only have Congress but also the FCC.

The bottom line is we believe that we can direct people through television and radio not only to legal notices in the newspaper but to legal notices that appear in whatever stations will have the infrastructure to post them. We really need to step up with this economy volunteerism. Because of that, the broadcasters provided by certified signed affidavits over \$350,000 in television and radio spots, which were aired in a short period of time. Also, our partners asked us to be involved in helping the whole issue of antibullying. Again, by affidavits certified and signed by stations, we provided over the past 12 months more than \$1,200,000 in television and radio advertising. The potential of newspapers, radio, and television stations working together to raise the status of legal notices to increase the accessibility is profound. I would be very careful with throwing out figures because everybody here is well aware of the fact that AARP has a major push right now to educate seniors about websites and getting them involved. It has to be a priority for AARP.

Basically, 12 years ago when we pushed for AMBER legislation, the technological world did not exist. The plan has been changed. I am asking for your consideration for the option—not the exclusion but the option—for Nevada's television and radio stations that those who will establish the infrastructure will have the ability to put out a bid. We certainly do not want to do public notices alone. If someone wants to advertise, I think in a free market, a free country, and a free state, the time has come.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are we envisioning broadcasting legal notices as some kind of public service announcement (PSA)? The first comment you made was that it is a free market in competition. There is a cost for legal notices in the newspaper, so there will be a cost for them to post on a broadcasting station. I know you said we should not throw out numbers, but at an estimated minimum, what would that cost be?

Bob Fisher:

What we did for antibullying and for volunteerism was an example of the power that television and radio have to bring people to a particular subject. The publishing of legal notices is not a PSA. The PSA would be to bring the public's attention to the fact that legal notices are published in the newspaper and that some legal notices are published on a television or radio website. The website becomes very important for newspapers because a lot of information on public notices is on the website. As far as a cost, it is like going against the windmill at this particular point in time. The only thing that I could answer with any certainty is that there would be a competitive bid and then the government agency or whoever is publishing the legal notice chooses the bid they want. I cannot give you a figure.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Thank you very much for talking about the importance of fair and open competitive bidding. Let me go back to what I said to the bill sponsor. One of the broadcast options is DISH TV. DISH TV has a device called the Hopper. Hopper takes a program and eliminates all of the advertisements so I can watch it without commercials. How would you function if that was my source of information?

Bob Fisher:

As the head of broadcasting, one of the things that bothers me is when people have the tool to eliminate commercials. They are eliminating receiving information about a public service. Nevada's broadcasters are the largest provider of public service in the state of Nevada. To directly answer your question, if you are a person who has something like Hopper, then you would not be getting that information. You would only get that information on a website.

Kurt A. Mische, CRMC/CRSM, President and CEO, KNPB:

I want to thank Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson and the members of the Committee for this opportunity to speak on behalf of A.B. 267. Nevada's broadcasters, as we have been saying, are licensed to serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity. In today's world, serving the public goes beyond

what we broadcast on our airwaves. The service we provide extends to our websites. As we are all aware, and as we have been discussing this morning, these websites have become important sources of information for people of all ages, cutting across social strata and economic strata.

We are fortunate to live and work in a free market economy. For Nevada's broadcasters to be prevented from the opportunity to compete for and earn business from any category is not only wrong, but it is costly to the state and it impedes the flow of information to the public. There should simply be no restraint on free trade. If broadcasters can compete for and earn this business, that is well and good. If we compete and do not earn some of the business, we have to try again. We are not prohibited from competing for business in any other category, so there should be no restriction on our ability to participate competitively for the legal notice business that by statute belongs solely to the print media.

As my colleagues have emphasized, this is not a zero-sum game. We are not asking for the legal notice postings to be taken away from anybody. We are simply asking for the opportunity to compete and to earn some of that business in our free market economy. The state of Nevada and its citizens will benefit from that open market.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are there any additional questions from the Committee? I see none. Is there any additional testimony in support?

Brandy Newman, Chair, Nevada Broadcasters Association:

I am here today in support of A.B. 267. Respectfully, I appreciate everybody's points of view on the newspaper and the competitive nature that we would introduce. However, I would like to remind everybody that despite the change we have undergone as an industry, we continue day in and day out as broadcasters of radio and television stations to figure out how to have more points of contact for our listeners and our viewers. With us doing that, we not only represent free radio and television over the air, we continue to find new ways to contact our listeners and viewers. Our business will not continue if we do not do so. When you look at the option to have a newspaper in combination with the radio or television stations, that becomes a multimedia facet. That just means more people. The retention level that we are going to receive with these public notices is going to be more valuable.

Piper Overstreet, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am just here in support of Ms. Newman. This is her first time testifying. I wanted to be here to assist in the process.

Steve K. Walker, representing Truckee Meadows Water Authority:

The Board of Directors of Truckee Meadows Water Authority supports A.B. 267. Personally, as a water resource lobbyist, I also like the idea of section X. I think it is important that the state agencies have the ability to go one way or the other.

John J. Slaughter, representing Washoe County:

We initially were neutral on this bill, but we do have a proposed amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) specifically addressing Assemblywoman Spiegel's first issue from her presentation. It is from the Washoe County Office of the County Clerk. It is a letter with an attachment showing our Exhibit A and Exhibit B. I have with me Nancy Parent from our Clerk's Office, who will very quickly go through this proposed amendment.

Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, Office of the County Clerk, Washoe County:

We did submit a proposed amendment on Friday, which is on NELIS. The first issue that Assemblywoman Spiegel addressed was with regard to the length of time that the notices had to be published in the newspaper. Exhibit A to our letter dated March 22 shows you how the statute currently reads. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 238.030 currently provides for the qualifications of the newspaper where the notices will be published. At Assemblywoman Spiegel's request, we have drafted proposed language to amend the bill, which would take the intent of the bill back to the original purpose of the statute and provide for the qualifications of the paper as opposed to having the notices published for 104 weeks and one year, respectively. If the bill does pass and that is not changed, you would have a lot of confusion from your public with notices of hearing and requests for bids and things of that nature. We respectfully submit this. Thank you for your time.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Are there additional comments in support for the legislative record? [There were none.] We will move into opposition.

Barry Smith, representing Nevada Press Association:

There is quite a bit that I want to get on the record. This comes to us as kind of an Internet versus newspaper issue when clearly we recognize the benefit of having these notices on the Internet. That is why we do it already. We have a website. It is the first result when you google "Nevada public notices." It is archived, it is searchable, and it is secure. That is what we are doing. That is the reason we do that. It is not just newspapers. We recognize that there needs to be access as broad and wide as possible. We appreciate the broadcasters wanting to increase the exposure of public notices because they

are very important, but they need to be in the newspaper, as well. I frankly do not understand how it would work; that there would be a URL that points to a website. You would not know what that applies to, what it is about, or whether it is relevant to you. The system that we have now goes by city and by county. That is how they are organized, and you know that if it is in the newspaper, it applies to your vicinity and your area.

Again, I am not sure I understand that a notice in Clark County could point to a URL for an Elko radio station. Also, there is no definition for newspapers or newspaper websites. Obviously, the definition of a newspaper has changed over the years, but not as far as what is a newspaper of record and general circulation. That is why it is very important that the section on second-class—now called periodicals—mailing permits remains in the statute. That is what establishes that it is a newspaper of general circulation. We have had problems before with paid circulation.

One of the things I want to stress very much is due process. We also tend to talk about government notices in these hearings. There is a wide variety of notices. Since this goes to the heart of the notice section, it includes not only the government notices like on city and county ordinances and public nuisances, but notices that affect individuals. It includes things like summons for civil lawsuits, notices to sell property and to enforce a judgment, name changes, and termination of parental rights. How you would have a URL that points to a website and have any idea whether this applied to you or not? That is what I am not sure about. There is definitely a better process to go through to do this, and we are willing to work with that. We would like to get to the meat of the issues here because these bills keep coming up over and over again. They need to be discussed. We have had a good discussion, but there are better ways to do it. I am afraid that there are a lot of specific issues in this bill that would not help. In essence, this would actually reduce the amount of public notice that is going out, not add to it.

Thank you very much. I tried to cover that quickly. If I have hit on something that you have a question about, please ask.

[Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson reassumed the chair.]

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

I want you to talk a little bit more about the due process discussion. I think I see on NELIS some documents that you folks have uploaded for the Committee regarding the processes that newspapers currently go through in order to ensure the notification part of due process. I was wondering if you could walk us through a little bit more. I am not a legal person, but there

is an affidavit involved at some point. How does that process fit with Internet-based noticing?

Barry Smith:

If I may, I would like to describe what happens at the newspaper and then ask Ms. DiMarzio-Gaynor to talk about the due process from the legal end. At the newspaper, there is a legal clerk for every notice that is published. Those clerks issue an affidavit of publication with the copy of what was published in the newspaper, showing that it was a true and accurate copy and has been notarized and sent out. Some are mailed out, and some are electronically issued. Does that help? Let me turn it over to Ms. DiMarzio-Gaynor, if I might.

Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor, representing Nevada Press Association:

Many of you may not know, but in addition to being a lobbyist I am also an attorney. One of my areas of practice is First Amendment law. I have been representing clients on issues such as defamation, privacy, open meeting law, public records law, and public notice for a number of years now. In fact, I have been invited by the state bar to present a continuing education seminar on what this Legislature has done as far as passing new laws in the areas of public records, open meeting law, and public notice following the session. I will be talking to some of you to maybe help me out with that.

As an attorney and a First Amendment attorney, I do have particular concerns with the reach of A.B. 267 and its potential unintended consequences. There are traditionally four elements that are required for something to be a valid public notice. The first is that it is published by an independent third party. Notice of government actions in particular have to be published in a form independent of the government, which has typically been in a local newspaper. An independent and neutral third party has an economic and civic interest in ensuring that the notice delivery requirements are followed.

The second is that the public notice must be able to be archived. This is something that I believe Assemblywoman Spiegel's amendment speaks to, but I think we need to take a closer look at that and make sure we are addressing that. Typically, this has been done by storing newspapers in an archive facility. We need to make sure that in a web-only environment we are having archives of public notices and they are not information that is lost over time. Right now, you can look at newspaper archives from years and years ago.

The third defining characteristic of valid public notice is that the public notice must be accessible. It must be able to be accessed by all segments of society. I think that is another concern that was raised here today; that we need to make sure this bill fully addresses this before we can move forward with it.

The final component of a valid public notice is that it is verifiable. The public must be able to verify that the public notice was not altered once published. I am not sure this bill addresses how to do that in a web-only format. As Mr. Smith has explained in the case of a newspaper notice, the way that has been traditionally done is an affidavit is provided by the publisher, and that can be used in an evidentiary proceeding to demonstrate that a true copy was published, showing the exact wording that was used.

To summarize, I know that the bill sponsor, Assemblywoman Spiegel, has been made aware of some of these concerns, and we see that she has proposed some potential amendments to address them. We appreciate her intentions and the efforts put into this, but we are not sure that this hearing provides enough time or information to weigh whether this bill fully addresses all of the due process concerns that we have raised. We would like to have a fuller conversation and involve all of the stakeholders who would be interested in this. In particular, as Mr. Smith pointed out, we are not just talking about notices of government action. We are talking corporations and other businesses publishing when they resolve to protect creditors and consumers, notices of unclaimed property, court notices, et cetera. They make notice of the appointment of an administrator and allow the public to object, to alert unknown creditors, to inform the public and potential creditors that an estate is being divided up and so forth. They lose that right if they do not do so within a certain amount of time.

With that said, I would also propose that we need to include the state bar and perhaps some of our judges as stakeholders in this discussion.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What is the issue in terms of the broadcasters not being an independent third party?

Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor:

I do not think that is a particular problem. Broadcasters would qualify as an independent third party.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Is there an issue around independent third parties in regard to the bill implementing this open competition?

Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor:

I need to look at that a little bit more closely. It might raise some concerns that would allow government entities to post their own notices, but as far as the broadcasters and the independent third party, that is not a problem at all.

Assemblywoman Neal:

That is what I was wondering because you said that the government is not a part of the participation. They are not posting the notice themselves, but the government would be the entity that engages that service.

Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor:

Right.

Assemblywoman Neal:

You talked about whether or not the information is verifiable. What do you see as issues in terms of website access? I know we had a bill similar to this at the very beginning of this session; Assembly Bill 4. There is some very similar language, and I do not recall hearing the same kind of issue with that bill. How does A.B. 267 take you into the issue of due process while the other one did not?

Jennifer DiMarzio-Gaynor:

Actually, A.B. 4 also raises due process concerns, and we did bring up some of them. I know Mr. Smith did address that with his comments, but they may not have been put to the forefront or made extremely clear.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

As a social worker, the only type of notices that I ever dealt with were termination of parental rights notices. There is a consideration for local governments to be able to post notices. Would this mean that in all of those cases in which local governments are the ones taking action, they would not be able to post on their own websites but could potentially post via third party? I just want to get that clear.

Barry Smith:

I do not know. There are dozens of these statutes, and the requirements are various. The distinction between this bill and A.B. 4 is that the other one addressed government notices. That is why we are emphasizing this issue with the independent third party relationship. This bill opens things up to virtually anything, which makes it much more of a due process issue in my mind. Basically, this would affect a great number of statutes and processes on a great number of notices. There should be a lot more examination of what this might do. That is the best I can address that.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? I see none. Is there additional testimony in opposition? Seeing none, I will move to neutral.

John M. Hager, Executive Director, Silver State Health Insurance Exchange:

We have not had a chance to meet with our board, so we do not have a position on this bill. However, based on the language of the bill, we had to submit a fiscal note. You should have a letter dated March 21 from me that has an attachment of a letter that I sent to Assemblywoman Spiegel ([Exhibit H](#)). As you are aware, A.B. 267 authorizes the publication of a legal notice or legal advertisement on an Internet website maintained by a newspaper. Section 8 expands the definition of legal notice to include any notice that must be published on an Internet website pursuant to any law of this state. Section 10 requires that it be published for 104 weeks.

Now, as we have heard from Assemblywoman Spiegel, that apparently is not the intent of the bill. The concern is that any law includes the open meeting law, which requires that agendas be published on websites. It appears that an agenda for our board and committees would have to be posted in a paper or on a website of a publisher for 104 weeks. We did the math for our 42 publicly noticed meetings last year, and that probably would have cost about \$1 million and would have required that agendas be posted on the website long past the actual meeting date. Again, we do not think that is the intent from Assemblywoman Spiegel's comments. Therefore, we have recommended an amendment regarding the definition in section 8; that a legal notice or legal advertisement means any notice or written matter that must be published in a newspaper or on an Internet website maintained by a newspaper or broadcaster pursuant to any law of this state. That language would effectively remove our fiscal note from this bill.

Scott K. Sisco, Assistant Director of Administration, Nevada Department of Transportation:

The only reason we are neutral on A.B. 267 is because you have already introduced the bill, which we certainly hope goes somewhere. However, we did want to mention we spend between \$50,000 and \$100,000 a year for advertisements to contractors to bid on our projects and whatnot. All of those contractors have already gone on our website. They have gotten prequalified. They have gotten signed up, and they bid on our jobs. We pushed the jobs down to their contractor desktop on their computers by law, as it currently states. We have to spend that money and would much rather be spending it putting work out on the street; putting people to work and fixing roadways. Most state agencies have a workaround and have a fix for any situation that may be caused for them, but with the way the law is currently written, we are not able to do anything about that.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there any additional testimony?

Yvette Williams, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the chair of Clark County Democratic Black Caucus. The bill looks great, but we would like to see where print newspaper is still included. We like the idea of radio PSAs because a lot of our population here in southern Nevada listens to the radio. To be able to get those notices via the radio stations that we normally listen to would be great. However, our biggest concern is not having the print notification because many in our community do not have Internet access due to economics. As much as we think that it is easy for them to be able to get to a library, oftentimes there are long waits because people are using all of the computers. It is not as easy as people think. This really does impact a whole class of citizens in Nevada all the way down to something as simple as a rezoning issue or construction that impacts a particular neighborhood. What it does is disenfranchise those community members from being able to have their voice heard on those kinds of issues because they are not aware.

I wanted to mention that a lot of our homeless families who may not have Internet access are working class families. They are working families who are underemployed in a lot of cases. We need to really consider homelessness and think about that. I know you are already aware of the homelessness within our school district, but we are very concerned that whole communities of low-income families will be disenfranchised if we are no longer publishing in print newspapers that they can access.

Carrie Dillard, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am part of the Clark County Democratic Black Caucus, and I concur with what Ms. Williams just said.

Garrett LeDuff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) executive board member. I concur with the previous comments, as well.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Thank you. I appreciate that. I will now invite the bill sponsor back up for her brief closing remarks.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I would like to thank you very much for your consideration and make two additional points and one quick comment. I heard some of the opponents ask about how things would work with a newspaper having an online component, and one of the things that struck me that had not been said—or maybe not thoroughly enough—was in regard to the bidding process done by the

governmental entities. It would be up to those entities to decide and determine if a certain proposal meets their needs, and they would go with that solution.

My second point is that this bill is enabling language. It is not mandating that it be done on the Internet with a tie to the newspaper. It is simply enabling language. If there is a community that is underserved or is predominantly seniors who might not have Internet access, that community would still be free to use the current method. Again, this is enabling language that would clearly give people—broadcasters and newspapers—the opportunity to compete for that business.

I appreciate your time and consideration, and I have also expressed to the newspapers that I am happy to sit down and have a meeting with the stakeholders to work out the issues that have been raised today. I will also be getting back to the Committee members who raised questions for which I did not have answers today.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

I will go ahead and close this hearing on A.B. 267.

While we are allowing the bill sponsor and his supporters to come up, I have another Committee bill that I need to get introduced. I will accept a motion to introduce BDR 42-1151.

BDR 42-1151—Authorizes the State Fire Marshal and the State Board of Fire Services to issue administrative citations. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 424](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN HEALEY MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 42-1151.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 281.

[Assembly Bill 281](#): Revises provisions relating to recordkeeping on public works projects. (BDR 28-1070)

Assemblyman Joe Hogan, Clark County District No. 10:

I appreciate the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 281. It represents a great deal of work by a number of agencies, contractors, labor organizations, and

members of this body. I realize that the time is moving, and I will try not to abuse that situation. I noted two years ago that there was a remarkable level of enthusiasm for active equal employment opportunity practices exhibited by both the then-Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) director, Susan Martinovich, and the current NDOT director, Rudy Malfabon, who was the deputy director at the time. Having noted this, I made the effort to ask each of them if they felt, in view of the large number of employment opportunities that reached the people of our state through the efforts of NDOT and other construction-related agencies, would it be possible to try a trial system to see if we could cause the increase in the rate of employment of women, of Hispanics and African Americans. This would bring a much better representation of the diversity of the workforce that lives in Nevada, which we have never been able to achieve in the past. I was not surprised when these two very outstanding agency heads agreed that was a good idea and a very good objective to force to pursue. They set up a system to invite and encourage the participation of many of their contractors. They set up a monthly meeting that the community activists and people interested in proving our representation could attend and talk with each other about the problems and the opportunities to do better.

This became a two-year program. It was intended to influence the highway construction contractors and subcontractors to seek still greater diversity in their employment. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit I](#)).] Unions were also involved. Their apprenticeship programs are, of course, a very important source of workers for much of the state finance activities. As a result of this success, A.B. 281 was drafted and proposed as a future development of the equal opportunity process. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit I](#)).]

I would like to mention a couple of talking points because we have received a lot of questions. Maybe I could clear up just a few of them before we get into the questioning portion of this hearing. Assembly Bill 281 provides for the standardization of collected information from contractors and subcontractors on their employed workers for all public works projects throughout the state of Nevada. It provides for transparency in government by showing exactly who is being hired and paid to work on the public works projects and to give us an opportunity to observe whether those statistics give us comfort in feeling that the great variation in parts of our workforce are properly represented in those who actually get the jobs and perform the work. Assembly Bill 281 provides the state with the ability to track trends in hiring for public works projects. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit J](#)).] This bill produces data that is similar to the information we use to gauge the effectiveness of our education system, which has been quite helpful in illuminating some of the achievements and problems in that area.

This bill gives us, not quotas, but a measurable achievement of the goals we all share. [Continued to read from ([Exhibit I](#)).]

I would like to see us make A.B. 281 the law of the land and further improve our record in the diversity of our workforce.

Assemblyman Munford:

I just want to applaud and commend you, Assemblyman Hogan, for bringing this forward. You have shown a great deal of commitment to fairness and justice in terms of job placement. You presented something similar to this way back in 2005, and you are still fighting that battle. I do not know exactly what satisfaction you have gotten out of it, but I have attended some of the meetings you have had with NDOT. They seem to be giving in a little bit and wanting to cooperate with you to make some changes. I know they hired a civil rights consultant or something like that with their company. I think you have made some progress. I guess there are still some big steps to take, but I just want to thank you for bringing this forward. It is something that is needed so that everybody has a fair opportunity to make a living and have a job.

Assemblyman Hogan:

One of the real satisfactions that I have experienced in my career has been the remarkable response particularly of the construction contractors doing work for NDOT and of NDOT itself and its senior management. They have been terrific and often one step ahead of me in coming up with ideas. We will hear from them very shortly in this hearing, I believe. They are really the masters of detail in how the data is gathered; how we try to do it in a way that is not overly burdensome. I look forward to hearing them.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I am looking at section 3, subsection 4. I notice that you put "voluntarily" in the language a lot. Were you just further clarifying? I know under federal law it is voluntary for you to put your race, ethnicity, or market on your employment. It is not mandated. You can choose to put "I am orange" if you want. Did you just want to further codify in state law that we are sticking with the voluntariness?

Assemblyman Hogan:

We certainly wanted to avoid any mistakes in trying to deal with people's rights to provide information. We wanted to try to avoid any feeling that we were forcing anyone to disclose personal information that may be in some way protected by the *U.S. Constitution* or by individual laws. We greatly prefer to stay well within the confines of the legal limits. On the other hand, if everything were voluntary, we would not have a data system. I think that we

are hoping to hit a middle course where the people who participate know what we are trying to achieve. I think that today the wide support for diversity in the workforce for assuring that every segment of our population has opportunity for this publicly funded activity will help minimize the hopefully very few people who would want to decline information more to cause a stumbling block than to protect their rights. I think there will be a rather limited number of folks who choose not to provide information. I think they will be few enough that we will still get good, accurate data and be able to chart our course to further success in equal opportunity in Nevada.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there additional questions from Committee members? I see none. I will now open up for testimony in support.

Garrett LeDuff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Let me start off by saying I was very pleased when I received the call to come down and support this legislation. I would like to give accolades to Assemblyman Hogan and the other cosponsors who have been fundamental in this legislation. Also, I would like to recognize Yvette Williams. I think she has been instrumental. I think she has done a fantastic job, and I look forward to working with her in the future.

As I said before, I was very pleased when I came down here to support this legislation. Rarely do I get to see legislation that, on the surface, supports so many different entities. This is going to be beneficial for our legislators in making informed decisions when it comes to choosing our contractors. It is also going to promote diversity amongst the contractors. I have never in my 30 years of working in both the private sector and in the government sector been involved with projects that were successful without collecting data, would allow us to move forward in a professional manner, and accomplish the goals that we need to accomplish.

As far as for this legislation, I would like to touch on some points. It is going to allow our legislators to make an informed decision. The other thing that struck me with this legislation was the transparency. It is going to allow for greater transparency when it comes to dealing with diversity in the workplace, and that is vital in today's society. It is going to build trust with the state and with the constituents.

The other thing I liked about the legislation, as it shows on page 6, section 3, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (b), is that it has reasonable remedies for noncompliance. I believe that is a good thing. I also like the fact that it goes

throughout the duration of the contract, whatever the contract is, so that we will keep the contractors candid and working above board in all aspects.

Also, this legislation is going to allow us to move forward and to really look at race in an honest manner. Until we do that in this country, we are not going to be as effective, and we are not going to be able to represent our constituents to the best of our ability. We have to be candid about the race issue in America, and this is a good step forward. I am glad to be in the state of Nevada to see our legislators move forward in this area.

I cannot express to our legislators enough that this legislation is overdue. We need to be reporting these things. It is going to help us in so many ways in the future. It is time for it, and I believe that this will help us enormously moving forward. I want to thank you in advance for this legislation.

Yvette Williams, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Thank you for allowing us an opportunity to testify this morning. I would like to express my gratitude to Assemblyman Hogan, who has been a staunch supporter on this issue way before I started working with him three years ago on this NDOT diversity pilot program. As you all know, as a result of their own internal disparity report, NDOT thought that this diversity pilot program might be a good opportunity to deal with three particular issues.

The first is working with local community union and nonunion stakeholders to explore and identify strategies to diversify specific construction projects hired by prime contractors. The second is to increase the number of minority, female, and disadvantaged people subcontractor companies hire on a specific construction project. The third is allowing and encouraging dialogue and participation with community members and other interested parties to develop methods to increase diversity on specific work projects, as you all probably remember from last session. In that disparity report, we found only 1 percent of the workforce was African American and women. The Asian American population was much less than that. I think they were about 0.3 percent. Our Native American community was also right around 1 percent. There is a huge disparity when it comes to public works jobs, and we have noticed that trend with other agencies, as well.

The purpose for this bill, again, is not to provide any quotas or advantages, but to track and report the ethnicity and gender of the Nevada workforce. These jobs are public works jobs being paid by public tax dollars. We strongly feel that when a particular community or group has been disenfranchised from the opportunity to participate in the economy here in Nevada, it becomes an issue for our state legislators. We are really pleased that this is before you

today. This is not a trend that we have seen even with Clark County. We are very excited to work with a work group that the Clark County Board of Commissioners put together last year, which worked on it for about eight to nine months with some of the same stakeholders as with the NDOT program. They, in fact, adopted policy similar to this legislation that is being introduced today. We are very grateful to our Clark County Board of Commissioners for adopting that policy here in southern Nevada on their public works projects.

With that said, the only other thing that I wanted to mention as far as our participation and some of the lessons learned were that it was a wonderful experience for us. We were able to establish great relationships and great dialogue, understanding all the stakeholders' needs and working together on other opportunities, such as training programs and the importance of increasing minorities that have been disproportioned in employment in their apprenticeship programs. One of the other lessons we learned was that the data is easily obtained through LCPtracker. It is not anything that will require additional costs. It is not anything that cannot simply be added to the report that is already being provided to you currently. I do not think there should be any reason why we would not want to move forward on this issue. You will be able to see the data and be able to discuss and put in place policy that serves all Nevadans.

With that said, I will close out. You will start receiving emails and phone calls from our members who are constituents of yours. We hope that this will make it to the Floor.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any questions? I see none.

Jack Mallory, representing International Union of Painters and Allied Trades Council 15:

Speaking directly for my organization, Painters and Allied Trades, we do not view our members based on race, creed, gender, or color. All of our members wear the same color when they go to work: white. It is not on purpose; that is just what painters wear when they go to work. Everybody has equal opportunity to pursue and retain employment at their trained craft, and typically, people will retain their jobs based on their skills. With our apprenticeship programs, which is something global for all of the building trades unions, we have diversity goals established. For my organization, I know that not only do we consistently and repeatedly meet those goals for diversity, we strive to go well above and beyond what is required under *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 29 and by the State Apprenticeship Council.

I can say with certainty that building trades unions do not have a great reputation when it comes to the issue of diversity. When I joined my local union 18 years ago, it was the proverbial white boys' club and not something that I am necessarily proud of. However, over the last 18 years we have seen huge growth in diversity within our organization. Today, 62 percent of our membership is minority. You may be surprised with the data that you will gather through this bill, which I believe will be successful and hope that you all support. I think that what you find once you have had a chance to review some of the data that has accumulated over a period of time may surprise you when it comes to the issue of diversity in the construction industry.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any questions for Mr. Mallory? I see none. Is there additional testimony in support? Seeing none, I will open up for testimony in opposition. [There was none.] I will go ahead and move into testimony in neutral.

Ted J. Olivas, representing City of Las Vegas:

I wanted to thank Assemblyman Hogan for proposing this bill. I have personally worked with him on similar bills in previous sessions. Today, I am testifying as neutral because there has been a number of bills on this subject this session, and there has been a great deal of debate within this Committee about what information should be submitted on the certified payroll reports for our public works projects. I have talked to Assemblyman Daly on this because of that. At some point, we will need to reconcile all of these bills and determine what information is appropriate and good public policy. When I say "we," that includes the construction industry, the trades, local governments, the state and this Committee. I echo the comments of Mr. Mallory in his testimony. I do believe that once we decide what is appropriate information to submit, once we gather that data, we will be pleasantly surprised to see that there is diversity in the construction industry. We are hoping that is where this will lead us.

Assemblyman Munford:

I know at the federal level, every contractor and subcontractor has to have some kind of diversity plan in place; something that is available for examination. At the state level, this is the push behind this entire legislation, which is to make sure everyone has some kind of diversity plan in place to see what steps they are going to take to implement this. Mr. Olivas, I appreciate what you were saying and what Mr. Mallory said. I thought that was very appropriate and hit the point pretty well.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

With this bill and with NDOT, the information is already being captured. I am not sure why things would be consolidated or be reviewed because we are already doing the process.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I was asked the question on how this bill was similar to my Assembly Bill 169. If you look at page 7 of A.B. 281, line 10 in subsection 4 of section 3, this bill applies to the workers. Some of the other stuff applies to the contractor and subcontractor and dealing with competition and their ability to work on projects in public works. This is dealing with what was struck out of A.B. 169; the applicants, which would be the workers who are coming under the contract itself. Assemblyman Hogan is trying to capture information on who is actually getting employed, not the contractor but the actual worker. I need the record to be clear. Also, he has had two years or more of work on NDOT collecting this information voluntarily.

Gary Milliken, representing Associated General Contractors, Las Vegas Chapter:

I would like to thank Assemblyman Hogan for this bill. As Assemblyman Munford and Assemblyman Hogan know, we have discussed this. We have not discussed this bill exactly, but we have discussed these issues over past sessions. As I told Assemblyman Hogan, it is good to work with him on this. I agree with most of Mr. Olivas' comments, and I am glad to have Assemblywoman Neal clarify the differences between A.B. 169 and A.B. 281.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

We will go down to testimony in Las Vegas.

Yvonne Schuman, Civil Rights Officer, Nevada Department of Transportation:

On behalf of our director, Rudy Malfabon, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on A.B. 281. We are very pleased to have Assemblyman Hogan as our partner in trying to increase diversity among construction workers on NDOT projects. As he pointed out in his statements earlier, he partnered with us and initiated the pilot diversity program on an earlier project, which was very successful. As a result of that success, we are going to expand that pilot diversity program to other significant NDOT projects. It will not be a pilot anymore; it will be an actual process that we undertake on all major projects where there may be significant employment opportunities. In addition, it has been pointed out by a couple of speakers that we do currently collect this information on the LCPtracker software program, which all contractors who do work with NDOT are required to use and report on. We are collecting this data, and that is the case for both state and federally funded projects, and of course, we will continue to do that. There is nothing in

here that requires us to collect data that we are not currently collecting on our NDOT projects. With that, I will close my remarks.

Chairwoman Benitez-Thompson:

Are there any questions from Committee members? I see none. I will close the hearing on A.B. 281.

I have another Committee bill introduction we need to vote on. I will take a motion to introduce BDR 19-1121.

BDR 19-1121—Revises provisions relating to the posting of notices for public meetings. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 445](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN HEALEY MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 19-1121.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Meeting recessed [at 11:35 a.m.].

[Meeting called to order at 6:01 p.m.]

I will take a motion to introduce BDR 18-572.

BDR 18-572—Abolishes the Nevada Commission on Sports. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 493](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 18-572.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS, OSCARSON, AND WOODBURY WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assembly Committee on Government Affairs
March 25, 2013
Page 41

Meeting adjourned [at 6:05 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Maysha Watson
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chairwoman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: March 25, 2013

Time of Meeting: 9:03 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 231	C	Nevada Rural Electric Association	Letter
A.B. 231	D	Assemblyman James Oscarson	Bill mockup
A.B. 231	E	Mary Walker / Douglas County	Letter
A.B. 267	F	Assemblywoman Ellen Spiegel	Presentation handout
A.B. 267	G	Nancy Parent / Washoe County Office of the County Clerk	Amendment handout
A.B. 267	H	Silver State Health Insurance Exchange	Letter
A.B. 281	I	Assemblyman Joe Hogan	Testimony handout
A.B. 281	J	Assemblyman Joe Hogan	Testimony handout