

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
April 26, 2013**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Vice Chairwoman Dina Neal at 8:40 a.m. on Friday, April 26, 2013, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at 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 Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chairwoman (excused)
Assemblyman James W. Healey (excused)
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Kelvin D. Atkinson, Clark County Senatorial District No. 4
Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1

Minutes ID: 963



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel
Bonnie Hoeffcker, Committee Manager
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Jennifer Dalton, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Olshan, Directing Attorney, Nevada Legal Services
Beatrice Turner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jerry M. Neal, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Deborah Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jon Sasser, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League
Gail Tuzzolo, representing Nevada State AFL-CIO
Mark Froese, Administrator, Division of Information Technology,
Department of Motor Vehicles
Scott K. Sisco, Assistant Director, Administration, Department of
Transportation

Vice Chairwoman Neal

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were explained.]

We are hearing two bills today, Senate Bill 122 (1st Reprint) and Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint). I would like to invite Senator Atkinson to the table and open the hearing on Senate Bill 122 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 122 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing a regional authority for housing in certain counties. (BDR 25-638)

Senator Kelvin D. Atkinson, Clark County Senatorial District No. 4:

I am here this morning to present to you Senate Bill 122 (1st Reprint). It is a little bit different from what we initially proposed in the Senate. Obviously, we had to have some type of compromise with members of the Committee. I think we came to a healthy compromise, but I do know the folks who asked me to bring this bill may have a different opinion and will probably want to discuss that, as well. I will start with what we came with and share it with the Committee.

This bill is regarding the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority, which comprises Clark County and the Cities of Las Vegas, Henderson, and North Las Vegas. It was created and authorized by state law to develop and operate housing and housing programs for low-income families. The Section 8 tenant-based housing choice vouchers program (HCV) is funded by the federal government and administered by the Regional Housing Authority for the jurisdiction defined as all incorporated and unincorporated areas in Clark County.

The officials of the Regional Housing Authority are known as commissioners or, collectively, as the board of commissioners. The commissioners serve in the same capacity as the directors of corporations, establishing policies under which the Regional Housing Authority conducts business, ensuring that policies are followed by staff, and that the Regional Housing Authority is successful in its mission, vision, and goals. The board is responsible for preserving and expanding the agency's resources and assuring the agency's continued viability.

I have sponsored S.B. 122 (R1) because I believe it is important to increase the number of members appointed to the commission so persons served by the Regional Housing Authority are adequately represented. I would like to point out the highlights of the bill.

As amended, section 1 increases the number of commissioners of the Regional Housing Authority from 9 to 12 people. Four of the commissioners must represent tenants and be appointed respectively by the governing bodies of the county and the three largest cities in the county that participate in the Regional Housing Authority. It also specifies the criteria for selecting the commissioners serving on behalf of the tenants.

Section 3 requires the governing bodies of Clark County and the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, and the City of North Las Vegas to make their respective appointments of commissioners who represent tenants to the Regional Housing Authority as soon as practicable, on or after July 1, 2013. As amended, the terms of the newly appointed representatives are staggered so that their terms will not expire at the same time.

Those are the highlights. In short, without all the other language, we are really just adding three more members to the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority. Currently, they have nine members and one of those members is a tenant. I believe some of the folks down south will speak as well, but we felt it was important to make sure we had more community and more people represented on the board. The one member who is a tenant is a rotating member. It could be a member from Henderson for two years, then a member from North Las Vegas for two or three years. It made no sense to have only

one tenant on the board. No disrespect to Henderson, but when the person is represented by Henderson, they have only one or two developments. We all know most of the low-income housing is probably in Las Vegas. Therefore, they are not being represented by a tenant for all those years because it is rotating. We felt it best to have an opportunity where a tenant from each of the cities would be represented at the Housing Authority.

In short, that is really what this bill does. I know there are a few people in Las Vegas who would like to speak, as well; two of whom are my constituents and a couple are Assemblyman Munford's constituents. I would ask for your indulgence if we could hear from them before we take questions.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are these individuals here in support of the bill or are they here to speak on the bill itself?

Senator Atkinson:

They should be in support.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

We normally ask questions of you, as the sponsor, and then we have people testify in support.

Senator Atkinson:

However you would like to do it, Madam Vice Chairwoman.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have a question on section 1, subsection 1, where you are going from 9 to 12 members. Is one of those members, perhaps the chair, a nonvoting member?

Senator Atkinson:

They would be voting members.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The only reason I ask that is because sometimes you can have a six-to-six tie, which causes problems. Usually it is an odd number.

Senator Atkinson:

We thought about that, obviously, and understand there will be times when there is a split vote. However, we were faced with two choices. The first was to not make it four members and not represent all the county, or do away with

one of the commissioners. We did not want to do either, so, unfortunately, it came to a number of 12 and is something they are going to have to deal with.

Assemblyman Ellison:

On some of the other boards we have been hearing from, the chair is not usually a voting member unless it is a tie. You might think about that when you form the committee or add other people. It might save you a lot of heartburn with the Open Meeting Law.

Senator Atkinson:

Thank you. I understand that.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I am really grateful that someone is looking at this agency to make sure it continues to serve our constituents. My question concerns section 1, subsection 4. It states the local governments should seek recommendations from a diverse background of interests. This is the first time I have seen it labeled this way and I am really excited. We have had some issues with other groups. Is there a balance between gender and ethnicity in the group currently?

Senator Atkinson:

I believe the board, as far as that is concerned, has always been balanced. I know there are Latino, African-American, and white members. I do not think that has been an issue. Before getting into this issue, I did not notice the other makeup, which was real estate, financial planning, and legal aid, making sure we had a balance of those represented as well. When I first saw this, I was happy to see it. I think the appointments have more recently covered section 1, subsection 4, which is a balance of gender, ethnicity, et cetera.

Assemblyman Livermore:

After reading the bill, it does not have any mention of compensation. Is the board intended to be compensated or not to be compensated?

Senator Atkinson:

They are not compensated at all.

Assemblyman Livermore:

In absence of that, if they perceived that they could eventually be compensated, there may need to be an amendment to their bylaws.

Senator Atkinson:

I do not know where that type of funding would come from. Certainly, doing that would probably send this bill somewhere else in the building. I do not think we want to do that.

Assemblyman Munford:

I also wanted to commend you and thank you for bringing the bill forward. I have discussed this issue with my constituents on many occasions. Many of my constituents reside in government housing. It is a simple, democratic principle. They have always said they do not have a voice or an opportunity to be represented. They should be afforded that opportunity to have someone speaking for them. This bill has positive, strong merits in the sense of their constitutional, democratic rights.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Again, regarding things not in the bill, are these meetings of the Regional Housing Authority abiding by the Open Meeting Law?

Senator Atkinson:

Absolutely.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I think it is important that there is a balance. By adding these four members, I think it accomplishes that. I also think it is a great transparent representation for these folks. As I was reading through the bill, I did not read anywhere that there is a provision for removal from that board if there should be instances where that might occur. Do you have any comments on that, or is that already in statute somewhere that I have not been able to see?

Senator Atkinson:

The board governs themselves and they elect who their chair is. They have their own bylaws under which they operate. It is not a part of this bill, but they do have their own bylaws and they are structured. In those bylaws, they have provisions and language by which a member can be expelled.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Is there any testimony in support of the bill?

David Olshan, Directing Attorney, Nevada Legal Services:

We deal with thousands of tenants of the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority each year. I do have some personal experience with the Housing Authority and with the board. We are in favor of S.B. 122 (R1). I believe it is a good step toward allowing tenants a greater voice in the Housing Authority.

I think perhaps there is sometimes a culture at the Regional Housing Authority of neglecting some of the tenants—the people whom they serve. I think this is a great step in the right direction to democratize the board and perhaps have the Regional Housing Authority serve the people the federal law requires them to serve.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Mr. Olshan, when you say you deal with a lot of situations with tenants of governmental housing, what kind of issues do they bring forth?

David Olshan:

The issues run the gamut. Recently, we had people with what is called housing quality standards violations. If a dwelling is not up to the federal code, the Regional Housing Authority has to inspect, cite the landlord—or the tenant, if it is the tenant's fault—and they stop the subsidy. They stop the subsidy until the dwelling is brought up to code. One of the things we see is sometimes the Housing Authority will be quick in terminating the subsidy and asking the tenant to move. That is what the federal law allows, but if they were more tenant oriented, perhaps they would consider giving the tenant and/or the landlord more time to fix the issue. We see a lot of terminations.

There is conventional housing where the Regional Housing Authority is the landlord, and there is Section 8 housing where the tenant has a voucher and rents from a private landlord. When the tenant does something bad, the Regional Housing Authority will sometimes terminate that subsidy and try to evict them. We help people in those situations. We often see situations where the Regional Housing Authority could work with the tenant and they could possibly give them another chance, but sometimes they do not.

There is an owner's policy we are aware of that indicates if a tenant owes money to the Regional Housing Authority, the Regional Housing Authority will allow them to pay it back. The policy is the Regional Housing Authority requires 25 percent down. If you are on a low, fixed income, it is sometimes difficult to pay the debt and keep your housing subsidy.

Sometimes the Housing Authority will ask us to participate in informational sessions for new Section 8 tenants. We often go to these sessions to explain the tenant's obligations under the Section 8 program. We see a lot of different issues, from entering into subsidy housing to being evicted from the housing.

Assemblyman Munford:

Do you find that the board will sometimes show favoritism in lending contracts for improvements that need to be done? Does the board sometimes not use

proper bidding procedures and methods? Do they use ethical discretion in choosing people to do some of the improvements? Have you seen any investigations where the board could be doing something that is not just and fair? I do not want to use the word corrupt, so I will say just and fair. Corrupt is pretty harsh.

David Olshan:

Generally speaking, I am aware of only what I read in the paper or hear from other tenants. Our own experiences are with tenant problems, not necessarily in procurement or contracts. Perhaps some of the other witnesses here would be able to better answer that question.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

Beatrice Turner, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the one who asked that this bill be put in because you have one resident sitting on the board after the merger. When they did the merger, each housing authority had a resident commissioner. They should have left it like that, where each housing authority kept a resident commissioner. They did not. They eliminated the resident commissioner. We need to have four residents and five people from the community sitting on the board. We do not need 12 members, we need 9.

Henderson never had a housing authority. It always went through the county housing authority. I do not know how they did this, and it should not have been done. They did not ask the residents or anybody from the community about how they should do this merger. We looked up and it was done.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Ms. Turner, I want to say thank you because you demonstrate how an average Nevada citizen can get involved in the legislative process by working with their legislator. To look at things that may not be going right within your community and bringing it so we can address it and put it on the path for correction.

You are in support of changing the board from 9 members to 12, is that correct?

Beatrice Turner:

No. Not from 9 to 12. We want to keep it nine, but we want four residents and five community people.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Other than section 1, do you like the other provisions of the bill? We may need to reclassify you as in opposition since you do not really like the amended changes to the bill.

Beatrice Turner:

I support everything on the bill except that. At first, I thought it was going to be 11, but it needs to be 4 residents and 5 citizens. If you put 12 people there, then it is not going to work. The residents are always going to be outnumbered.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I apologize for being slow on this, but you want four residents and five citizens. What is the difference between the residents and the citizens?

Beatrice Turner:

The residents would be appointed because they live in Section 8 housing or in public housing. They would not be nonaided members, but would be residents of public housing or Section 8 housing. The lady who sits on the board now as the resident commissioner lives in Section 8 housing. She does not know anything about public housing. She has not lived in public housing, so she does not know what their needs are. She tries to go out there to see, but Section 8 is different from public housing.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

What about the five citizens? What is the difference between a resident and a citizen?

Beatrice Turner:

The Regional Housing Authority needs citizens sitting on this board, maybe with a real estate background or a banking background. You need those kinds of people sitting on the board also. That is how it is done across the country with the housing authorities. Some housing authorities across the county do not have anyone but residents sitting on the board.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Ms. Turner, can you educate me on the difference between Section 8 and public housing? I had always thought they were the same. Can you enlighten me on what the difference is?

Beatrice Turner:

With Section 8, you rent from a private landlord. With public housing, you rent from the housing authority. With Section 8 you go out and find your own place

to live. With public housing, they call you when they have an apartment and that is what you have to accept. In public housing, you cannot choose what area you want to live in, but in Section 8, you can.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Senator Atkinson, are you looking to amend how the commissioners are appointed, such as one from Section 8 and one from public housing? Perhaps that would be a clearer basis of how they are appointed.

Senator Atkinson:

As Ms. Turner told you, she was the one who asked for this bill, so I am trying to appease her. I know she spends a lot of time with this board and I believe she was also a member at one point. She knows the makeup better than I do. I amended the bill in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. At first, we were talking about decreasing the board to seven members. There was not an appetite from the Senate to do that. The only other compromise was to add members, since the Senate was not comfortable with taking someone off the board. I am totally open to how Ms. Turner and her support group want to amend it, but I will caution her that it would have to go back to the Senate to concur. It is fine with me if she wants to amend the bill that way, but she needs to know if it is amended in this legislative process, it will have to go back to the Senate and they will have to agree. That may take us back to square one and we could be without a bill.

Beatrice Turner:

Is there any way we can work on this to keep it from having to go back to the Senate?

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

If you amend the bill and it changes from what the Senate passed, the Senate then has to agree to those changes in a conference committee. We can hear the bill on this side in this format, but the Senate would need to agree. If the Senate does not agree, then you could find yourself without a bill. If it goes back to the Senate and never makes it to a vote, then you are without a bill.

Beatrice Turner:

I do not know where the 12 came from because I first thought it was going to be 11. Twelve does not make it even. Twelve? No. They started out with 11. I do not know how it got to 12.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

That is something you and the bill sponsor can think about. You need to understand what he is cautioning you about. You run the risk of losing the bill.

You can take baby steps, but at least you are moving in the right direction. There may be an option for you to get the bylaws adjusted after you get legislation to flesh out who you feel should be better served.

Beatrice Turner:

I support the bill and I was the one who pushed for the bill. Is there any way we can work this out at a later date?

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Ms. Turner, again, I would like to thank you for being an advocate for your community and working with your legislator to bring change. This is an evolving process. That is one of the things I have learned in my second term here. Even if you find somewhere down the line that it does not necessarily work, there is always the opportunity to come back. Everything is in constant evolution. Do not let wanting it to be perfect stand in the way.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

I will invite the other two testifiers who are in support to the table.

Jerry M. Neal, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a resident, advocate, and officer in the Marvel Manor Resident Council. I came to support the bill because it is my belief that members of the Regional Housing Authority do not consider or do things for the residents or their needs. It is my belief that if we get more residents on this board, they will be able to represent themselves a little better and have a solid base of legal operations. I urge you to do whatever it is you need to do to get this bill passed.

Assemblyman Munford:

I know you and I have talked many times about the situation you are experiencing at Marvel Manor. I know you are a strong advocate and a strong voice in trying to make sure that the residents have some representation. I consider you to be a good candidate to be a representative if that opportunity comes forward. Keep up the good work. I think others in the Marvel Manor complex should feel honored to have you speaking for them.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Currently, the way this body is made up, is it the county commissioners who are the elected officials who represent the Regional Housing Authority? They still have representation, correct?

Beatrice Turner:

You have the county, North Las Vegas, Las Vegas, and now Henderson. They select the people who are on the Regional Housing Authority board.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I was under the impression that most of them were elected. Is it elected officials who make the appointments?

Beatrice Turner:

Yes.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Ms. Turner, could you give us a brief history of why the Regional Housing Authority merged the Cities of Henderson, North Las Vegas, and Las Vegas and the county? I believe the City of North Las Vegas did not have the capacity to continue to fund their own affordable housing program. This is specific to Las Vegas, so the northern representatives here may not know the background as to why they merged.

Beatrice Turner:

You are correct. North Las Vegas could not support their own program. They tried to put North Las Vegas with the county. The county would not accept North Las Vegas. They then decided to merge all of them together. The city took the lead when they did the merger.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Does Mr. Neal have any additional comments?

Jerry Neal:

I am the president and have been secretary of the Marvel Manor Resident Council. Since I have been living in public housing, I have done a lot of work, as you heard Assemblyman Munford say. It is imperative that you take a good look at what is going on with this housing authority operation. It is very important that you do this. A lot of people need to know exactly what is going on with the statutes and regulations and how they connect with the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

There are no additional questions. Thank you for your testimony. We will take Ms. Jackson's testimony at this time.

Deborah Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in support of S.B. 122 (R1). We did originally want 9 members, but to get the bill passed, 12 members is fine. We need to increase the number of residents who are on the board. We go to those Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority board meetings, and it is disgusting, the lack of respect that is shown to the residents. The residents are intimidated. Most of them will not

go to the meetings because if they speak out, then they are intimidated by their managers for speaking out about problems. The residents have things that need to be fixed. They might get fixed or they might not. There is so much concern and money spent to paint the outside of the public housing buildings. They call it "curb appeal." Some of the people who live there have been there since 1999 or 2000, and they have never had the inside of those units painted. Some need new flooring and they do not get it. They come in to inspect every year, I suppose to see if it is clean, but they do not do anything to maintain the inside of the unit.

We need residents to be on the board because I know they would have more sensitivity to what issues the residents face. That is not there now. There are those of us who go to speak on behalf of the residents. I know a lot of people call Ms. Turner. She has been their advocate for years. I have known her for almost 30 years and she has been an advocate for people in public housing. She was also once a commissioner. I once asked her how she could even sit there because of the way they treated her. She would not go along with some of the things the board was doing. Even though I do not live in public housing, I know we have to be concerned about people. This is what they have and this is all they can do, but they have a right to expect a decent quality of life. They have a right to be respected, and they have a right to be represented. They should not be intimidated.

After we spoke on this bill in the Senate, at the last meeting of the Regional Housing Authority, they had armed security. I do not think we are a threat because we want to speak out for the residents. They tried to find a problem. Maybe we are so intimidating and threatening that they had armed security at the meeting to intimidate us. Let me tell you, we are not intimidated and if this is the way they treat us, think about how they treat the residents.

I do hope this Committee will take a look at this. We will take the 12 people to get this passed. We definitely need to add more residents to the board.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are you saying when you testified in the Senate there was security?

Deborah Jackson:

No. At the Regional Housing Authority meeting, the meeting they had last week, they had armed security. They said it was specifically for Ms. Turner. That shows you the lack of sensitivity this Regional Housing Authority has. To me, that is deplorable. I think we have a right to speak as citizens, not only of Clark County, but also of the United States of America. We have the right to advocate for people who are struggling to have better lives for themselves.

We have the right to do that. When I see things like that, it makes me think about the people who had to sit at lunch counters and how they struggled and fought for their rights. To have armed security is a way to intimidate you so you shut up and do not talk. We are not going to shut up. We are going to keep fighting. We hope you see that the residents do need to be represented.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

I appreciate that testimony and your adding to the record that there may be differences in how we express ourselves culturally when we are angered or upset about an issue. Is there any additional testimony in support of the bill?

Jon Sasser, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:

Our program is a nonprofit civil legal services program, and many of our clients rely on the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority for their very subsistence and for the housing in which they live. I have also been involved with a number of public housing authority issues since the early '80s.

I would like to give the Committee a little background. I believe in the '60s there were three separate housing authorities in Clark County. There was the City of Las Vegas Housing Authority, the City of North Las Vegas Housing Authority, and the Clark County Housing Authority. Henderson was just not big enough to have its own housing authority at the time and did not have as many low-income residents. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick brought a bill to this Committee, Assembly Bill No. 478 of the 75th Session, that created the Regional Housing Authority, combining those three and also giving Henderson more recognition because of its change in status and population. As a result, a board was created where two members were appointed by the governing bodies of those four entities, the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, the City of North Las Vegas, and the City of Henderson. A ninth board member was added as a resident. That is why we currently have a nine-member board with, as seen today, only a token representation by the tenants.

As the tenants testified, they are asking for more of a voice and to have more geographic diversity on the commission, having someone from each of those four areas represented on the board. That does make a lot of sense. I believe the reason this bill is asking for 12 members is because of the decision not to remove anyone from the current board. There are currently 8, so if you made it 11 or 9, then you would reduce the number appointed by each of the entities and create some numerical imbalance. The decision was made to go to 12, so I certainly understand that.

The Regional Housing Authority board is largely governed by federal law. Many of the programs are funded through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). I believe the annual budget is \$135 million per year, so it is a very important force for our clients and for the community.

Conventional housing has been mentioned, which has been thought of in past years as "projects," where people actually live in the housing owned by the housing authority. In recent years, there has been a move away from those projects. We still have the older ones, but not too many have been built. They are still maintained by the housing authority. We also have the Section 8 voucher program where you can go out into the community. There is a variety of other kinds of programs that have been put together through other types of HUD funding opportunities with private owners getting lower interest on their buildings and subsidies coming into their buildings. There is a real mix of housing there.

With that background, we are very much in support of increasing tenant participation and moving to four tenants. We think that creates much more balance between tenants and other members of the public, and gives the geographic diversity within the county to tenants.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Do you know when the next meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority is scheduled? There are a few members on this Committee who would like to attend the next scheduled housing authority meeting.

Jon Sasser:

I do not know that date, but someone in Las Vegas may.

Beatrice Turner:

The meetings are always the third Thursday at 12 p.m. at the Regional Housing Authority off Tenth Street.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Mr. Sasser, you mentioned the \$135 million. Does that all come from federal money?

Jon Sasser:

I would say the majority of it does, but not all of it. As I said, there is a real mix where there have been grant monies received, local money, and some standalone projects.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Is the housing authority supposed to be involved with purchasing real estate? What is their main mission?

Jon Sasser:

Their main mission is to provide affordable housing to low-income folks in Clark County. Sometimes, over the years, they have had funds where they bought some older properties, rehabilitated those properties, and either operated them themselves or had private owners operate them. Occasionally, they do get into that role. The majority of their funds are not spent that way.

Assemblyman Munford:

Marvel Manor seems to be a different type of housing arrangement than Sherman Gardens. It seems as though Marvel Manor is based on income, whereas Sherman Gardens is mostly for single-parent housing. I do not see male figures present in Sherman Gardens, but I do see male figures present at Marvel Manor. There seems to be a difference. I do not know what the basic law or policy is. Those two are in my district and I visit them often.

Jon Sasser:

I can answer very generally. Mr. Olshan can probably give a more specific answer. There are different types of housing operated by the housing authority. All of it is for low-income people. Some is for senior housing, as well. However, there is no public housing that would forbid a male presence. It is not limited to female-headed households. Mr. Olshan can speak to those specific buildings and what their funding sources are.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Before you answer that, I believe Senator Spearman has something to add.

Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1:

I was not going to speak, but as I listened to the testimony, it occurred to me that sometimes people think of residents of public housing as down and out permanently. I was living in public housing on April 4, 1968, and I sit here today as a state senator. I think it is probably to people's detriment to look down on people in public housing and not acknowledge their personhood, because they are people too. I believe that just because you are down does not mean you lose your right to speak.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

I appreciate your adding that to the record and putting a personal touch on it. I would like to lend something to that statement. When I graduated from law school and had thousands of dollars in student loans, I ended up staying in

public housing through the county. I was there for five years until I could save to buy my current house. It was five years of two jobs and trying to make it work. Although I was not the candidate who did not have a degree or did not have the ability to move up after graduation, it afforded me the opportunity to save money with the low rent and get my credit together so I could buy a house. I personally know how the system works and I do know it is a way, if you use it appropriately, to get yourself out of a particular situation and have a different life.

David Olshan:

I believe Marvel Manor and Sherman Gardens are both under what we call conventional public housing. They are owned and operated by the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority and you basically qualify by income eligibility, not necessarily the composition of the household. However, as Mr. Sasser pointed out, there are some complexes that are for seniors or the disabled.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Is there any testimony neutral to the bill? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition to the bill? [There was none.] Are there any final comments from Senator Atkinson?

Senator Atkinson:

I will talk to Ms. Turner and Ms. Jackson to see how they want to proceed. If you could give me a little time to get back to you and your Committee, there are different variables we could get to. As I said, in the Senate hearing there was just not an appetite to decrease or remove any members. It would be tough to get to any number other than 12. I will talk to them to see what they are comfortable with.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

We appreciate your bringing this very spirited bill to us. I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 122 (1st Reprint).

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint) and invite Senator Spearman to the table.

**Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing state agencies.
(BDR 19-769)**

Senator Patricia (Pat) Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1:

I would like to thank you all for the opportunity to present this bill to you today. The bill itself is really straightforward. It is an attempt to make what I believe

are some important improvements in the way state agencies interact with the public and with each other. We do this by taking advantage of the technological advances with which we have all become familiar over the last several years.

Briefly, S.B. 236 (R1) amends *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 237 to require all state agencies to make any forms their clients must use to submit information to them available in electronic format on the Internet. The format must also allow a person to prepare, complete, download, save, and eventually submit the form to the agency securely over the Internet.

The provisions found in section 3 are the crux of the bill. My goals in requiring these changes to statute are many. I want to ensure that people with disabilities have the most accessible and convenient means possible to conduct their business with the State. All my life I was right-handed. I had an injury while serving in the military that damaged several nerves in my right hand and in my right arm. For the most part, this injury rendered my right hand useless. I had to learn how to write with my left hand. There are periods of time when I cannot use the right hand at all because it is so weak it will not hold anything. When I have to fill out a form and it requires printing, I usually have to get someone in my family to fill out the form for me. It would be much better if people like me had an opportunity to fill out the forms online. For the most part, we are not in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) because we are not friendly to people with not only physical challenges, but those who may be sight or hearing impaired.

I believe it is important that we continue to move away from paper and toward electronic transactions. I think we need to do this whenever possible because it reduces waste and it saves resources and precious tax dollars. Conducting business electronically online will help eliminate the inevitable errors that occur whenever we deal with individual handwriting and the task of interpreting that handwriting in order to process data. The cost savings will be significant.

There are three general types of paper that the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) users consume:

- Xerox paper, which is used for normal office functions of the LCB. In fiscal year (FY) 2011, they spent \$27,243.16 on that type of paper. In FY 2012, they spent \$23,268.00 on that type of paper.
- Paper purchased by the State Printing Office is for consumption during the manufacturing or printing process to generate

revenue for the State Printing Office. In FY 2011, they spent \$256,721.80. In FY 2012, they spent \$268,059.23.

- Paper purchased by the Legal Division is used to produce documents that are resold to the public. In FY 2011, they spent \$41,094.40. In FY 2012, they spent \$94,642.41.

There has been \$711,029 spent on paper over the last two years. How many staff people could we employ with that savings? How many schools could we repair? How many counselors could we hire? How many furlough days could be eliminated?

Frankly, we are wasting tax dollars and resources on items that could be saving money simply by moving into technology. I understand for some, technology presents a daunting task. I remember all too clearly when computers became part of office furniture. There were several people who were intimidated by that. I recognize that making this transition will probably not be easy because there are those who think, if it is not broken, why fix it? I submit to you, based upon the numeric figures I previously mentioned, it is broken.

State agencies will be encouraged to begin providing the forms online as soon as they can, but they have until June 30, 2015, to do so. In the meantime, the state agencies have the discretion to phase in the online forms as they see fit. Additionally, I am hopeful that more standardization across agencies may provide cost-saving opportunities in several areas. Licensing and training costs, for example, may be reduced if there are sufficient economies of scale.

It also seems to me, if every state agency conducted business in the same or similar manner online, then the ability for agencies to communicate with one another quickly and to share accurate information when necessary will be greatly enhanced.

There are a couple of other provisions in the bill that are important for me to mention. I realize that, at present, our state agencies may use a multitude of different software programs and just as many different types and generations of hardware to conduct their business. Currently, we have agencies that cannot talk to each other to share information because they are buying software and using different protocols. The only way they can talk to each other, if they have to share information, is to generate more paper. To me, that is admirable only for its asininity. It costs us too much money.

I believe that by implementing this, not only will it save us money, but also it saves us time; precious time that some of our employees may be using to try to figure out if that is a 9 or a 4, a 7 or a 5.

Finally, section 4 of the bill contains provisions allowing state agencies to share information with one another upon receiving a written request as long as they do not share anything that is declared by law to be confidential or which the agency itself determines must be kept confidential. Agencies may also share nonconfidential portions of a given record if a part of the record has been deemed confidential.

As I mentioned earlier, my primary goal in proposing this legislation is to streamline the way our state agencies conduct business with the public and with each other. I am mindful of the need for those agencies to protect confidential information. I believe the bill, as it is written, along with the amendment, provides adequate information-sharing flexibility, while ensuring that confidential information is protected. In short, moving to technology with the forms we use will save us money and it makes us more ADA compliant and friendlier to people who have disabilities.

That concludes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I want to go on the record, Senator, to say this is a great idea. Recognizing that folks get forms differently, I do not see anything saying they have to get the form electronically. There are a lot of us, and I think there will be more and more as people get more comfortable with this sort of thing. I know whenever I can get the chance to fill out a document electronically, it saves so much time and it makes it look neater, more professional, easier to read, and you do not have to worry about handwriting and getting the information correct. I think this is a great concept and want to thank you for bringing it forward.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Ditto.

Assemblywoman Woodbury:

I also have to ditto that.

Assemblyman Daly:

I agree with what we are trying to do with the electronic forms. There are several forms that I submit through my regular job that the federal government requires be done electronically.

I do have a question and one concern in section 4. I know you talked about the confidentiality issue, and I know we are talking about interactions between state agencies. Nevertheless, when we start talking about who is determining what is confidential, the language in section 4, page 3, line 9, states, ". . . if

a state agency determines that a record is confidential" We do not allow state agencies to determine that. We either tell them it is or it is not, or they have a protection that says they do not have to release it because it is confidential. Workers' compensation has some information they say they cannot release. We went through this with the business portal on Assembly Bill 139 in this Committee on some of those agreements people have to keep confidential. We understand that. We have never let an agency say they have determined something to be confidential. Is there a way we can address that and fix it? That is counter to the rest of our state laws on public records that already exist. They either have an exemption, or it is open.

Senator Spearman:

That is, in fact, true. However, there are some nuances—for example, police agencies. We do not tell them what they can or cannot share. It is usually based upon predetermined protocols in accordance with public safety, law enforcement, or homeland security. The nuances, as they exist, exist because we are not micromanaging. At the macro level, we tell them the things they cannot share. At the recorder's office, the same thing happens. There is information that is contained on those documents that have come through the Senate. I am sure the Assembly will get the bill in Government Affairs. They asked us to allow them to do some things differently while redacting confidential information. That statement is true at the macro level. However, at the micro level, where they have to make day-to-day operational decisions, it is their call.

Assemblyman Daly:

I understand what you are saying and we went through that on a different bill with the Division of State Library and Archives. They talked about homeland security and police records. When they are confidential, they are confidential up to a point. After all of that, there are about 150 areas in the law where we have given somebody exemptions. It goes down to the bottom level. We have never said an agency can make self-determinations. There is a statute somewhere they have to rely on that gives them an exemption. That language still causes me problems. I heard what you said, but I am saying we need to get on the same page. I think we have either given them an exemption or we have not, all the way down to the police records. We know when there is an active investigation, those records are not normally kept open. However, once it is a report and someone is arrested, those documents are public. Courts have certain exceptions, there are different ones for workers' compensation, and we all have to comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. If they do not have an exemption that is listed, in our state at least, then it is open. We have never allowed an agency to make that self-determination without a statute to back it up.

Senator Spearman:

Thank you for the follow-up because it provides further elucidation and lends clarity to the question. Initially, I probably did not understand what you were saying, but I think we are talking semantics. Once we provide the framework for that decision-making process, then that is provided at the macro level. Then, in an individual or operational capacity, they use the framework that we have provided to them to make those decisions. Every agency may not have to use the same parameters with respect to what the law says is confidential and what they can share, but every agency has access to that. I believe what we are talking about here is really semantics. They make those decisions based upon the provisions we have provided to them in statute.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I really enjoyed the bill and I think it might make it. The biggest problem I have is looking back at the fiscal note. Why did this not go to the Senate Finance Committee? It seems to me, with such a large number, this would be tied up in Senate Finance or Ways and Means. Could you explain that?

Senator Spearman:

The initial fiscal note on the original bill was cost prohibitive. However, once we amended it to say "as soon as reasonably practicable" and they phase it in as they see fit, then the fiscal note was eliminated because we are not asking the agencies to do anything other than what they had already put into practice. We are not telling them to do anything differently. We are not telling them to do anything more. We are simply telling them to try to make it happen. There are provisions in the amendment that will allow for more time. The original bill, without the amendment—yes, the fiscal note was cost prohibitive. With the amendment—they do it in their own time, at their own speed, and phase it in as they see fit.

The amendment is very simple. The language was changed so the agency can phase the requirement in as they see fit and as appropriate for their agency. It also changed January 31, 2015, to June 30, 2015. It also includes a waiver.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I appreciate the intent of this bill. I think it is important as we move further into the digital age. I think that is what we are facing and everything will be done electronically. I really want to tell you I appreciate your extending that deadline. The rural areas do not have access to the Internet. We are working very diligently to get that so they can take advantage of programs and legislation like this. We are headed in the right direction and I think this is a good thing.

Senator Spearman:

One of things I hope will happen is this will provide a sense of urgency for us at this level to make sure that the digital divide that now exists between urban and rural, poor and wealthy, is eliminated. I believe this is one of the steps implicit in this legislation.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I just want to say thank you, Senator Spearman, because I have learned a new way to take a fiscal note off a bill.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are there any additional questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there any testimony in support of the bill?

Jon Sasser, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:

I did not originally plan to speak, but after Senator Spearman educated me in the audience about the impact of this bill on my clients, then I was happy to do so. I also wear another hat, and that is as a member of the Commission for Persons with Disabilities. As the Senator said, this will make it a lot easier on many of our clients who are homebound, have difficulty typing, using voice technology, et cetera, to not have to download and handwrite a form.

In terms of the digital divide between low-income folks and the rest of the community, I have been very active with the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange on their Consumer Assistance Committee. On January 1, 2014, they are going to make available to all Nevadans the ability to sign up for health insurance, either through Medicaid if they are low-income folks, or through the new exchange if they are uninsured and have a higher income. We have been working very hard to have a consumer-friendly electronic application there. If people do not have their own computers and cannot do it themselves, there is a whole series of community partners who will be assisters, navigators, et cetera, to help them sign up for health insurance. I think that model could be spread to other state agencies. I think this is a good thing for our people and, therefore, we support it.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.]

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

This is a pretty straightforward bill for me. This will save some trees if we stop using as much paper. We do not have a lot of trees in the desert, so we need to keep as many as we can. We are in support of the bill and think it is a good piece of policy.

Gail Tuzzolo, representing Nevada State AFL-CIO:

We stand in full support of this measure. We support any way we can save money so we can put those funds toward some of the furlough days and other things our state workers are going through. We would really appreciate your support.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Is there any testimony neutral to the bill?

Mark Froese, Administrator, Division of Information Technology, Department of Motor Vehicles:

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is neutral on this bill. Currently, the Department has many of its forms on the website for customers to access from their homes. The Department agrees with the concept of putting forms on the Internet and making them interactive for the customers. We were actually working on this very idea earlier this calendar year. We estimated a fiscal note with over 93,000 hours, equaling \$9.9 million. Due to the very high cost to implement this bill, we are expecting to request a waiver from the Interim Finance Committee if this bill passes.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

While it does not pertain to this bill, I just want to tell you, I think the DMV does a great job of putting things on the Internet. I can renew my driver's license, renew my registration, and pay fines. I can do all kinds of things on that website that I never imagined could be done. I appreciate the advances you have made in this arena, as well. I am sure you have made it better for some of the homebound folks and other folks. I think DMV is absolutely a leader in that effort.

Assemblyman Stewart:

If you are already doing a lot of this, why is there a fiscal note from the DMV?

Mark Froese:

Currently, the forms we have on the Internet are such that a customer can go to the website, fill it out, print it out, and then come to the office with the form. It is not designed to electronically submit the information to the Department. When the customer arrives at the Department, it would automatically populate the transaction. This would ultimately save trees, save time for the customer, and make the time spent at the DMV a little bit less.

Assemblyman Stewart:

You have two years to do this. Can you develop that technology and that ability within those two years?

Mark Froese:

Here is what the Department faces: We have identified over 800 forms that we would have to make electronically submittable to the Department and then do the interconnection to the transactions themselves. That is where those hours come from.

Senator Spearman:

Part of the amendment says that for those who can do it immediately, they can do it. However, every agency has to determine how they can do it so it does not create a financial impact on them. We have talked with the DMV in terms of how they might be able to phase that in. We know the part about filling out and submitting forms electronically is a little way down the road, but this gets us started in that direction. The two years is not hard and fast, but it is a time frame that we would like every agency to at least make an honest effort to meet. For agencies such as the DMV and a couple of other agencies who have talked to me and who have a huge number of forms, we understand they are not going to make it within two years. By setting these parameters, at least it gives them incentive to get started.

Assemblyman Elliott Anderson:

I know a lot of the other state agencies have this technology. Why is it not more transferable?

Mark Froese:

Part of the reason is we have individual agencies in the state, and each agency is their own entity. As far as being able to just transfer what one agency is using into another agency, that could be very difficult. How we have built our system is not necessarily how the other agencies have built theirs. Does that answer your question?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I am not going to pretend to try to understand all of the things you have to do for implementation, but I will leave that thought with you. If you can find a way to take advantage of what we have in other areas of state government, try to do it.

Mark Froese:

I would like to state that the DMV likes the idea and supports it, but it is just the volume of work that we face.

Senator Spearman:

One of the things that became apparent to us as we walked through the initial stages of this bill is that we have too many software protocols. We are not

using the same protocols to talk. The DMV may not be able to talk with the Health Division or other agencies because every agency is buying their own software. I believe, once we get started down this road, agencies will begin to talk to each other, they will learn what works and what does not work, and at some point, hopefully, we will be able to consolidate. We will be able to use the economies of scale to bring down what is now cost prohibitive to a level where it not only makes sense, but cents.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I am grateful that you pointed that out, Senator Spearman. In some other presentations, the difficulty has been that there is a use of third-party vendors to create a system for an agency. Each agency has their own third-party vendor, which is supposed to help cut costs. However, the interfacing creates a problem—not only an internal problem, but a fiscal note, because in order to have changes, you have to pay the vendor to be able to change the system. It gets very cumbersome. Hopefully, this is the unveiling of a solution and we can come up with a comprehensive note. It is a barrier for a lot of other great ideas people have brought forth that we cannot implement.

Senator Spearman:

I guess you classify that as a subagenda of this legislation. Currently, many of our information technology (IT) departments are operating as silos. We have to go through a different paradigm so that we can save money. It may look like a cost savings on this end, but if the agencies cannot talk to each other, then, as Benjamin Franklin said, it may be penny wise but pound foolish.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] I would like to call Mr. Sisco from the Department of Transportation (NDOT) to the table in reference to the fiscal note. I would like some clarification. Are you in the same position as DMV, where you are going to be seeking a waiver, or have you removed the fiscal note?

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

Actually, I came here today to observe and try to get some clarification. Our IT department looked at this again the other day. No, we have not removed our \$98,000 fiscal note. We are still trying to understand it. If it means that what we have to do is take every form we have, create a program to allow customers to input information into that form, and then email it to us, we are fine with that \$98,000 and hopefully we can accommodate it in that two-year period. If it means that we have to create an access for those forms to automatically go into our different databases, then our fiscal note is grossly understated.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Did this hearing not provide you clarification?

Scott Sisco:

No, but maybe the Senator can answer my questions. There are a lot of applications to create forms, but they do not go straight to the database.

Senator Spearman:

When you look at the amendment, it allows each agency to phase this in, in a manner that is not cost prohibitive, but also in a manner that does not create additional financial encumbrances. The caveat is also there that if you cannot meet that deadline, you apply for a waiver. The intent is that at least we will start doing it. We can look at what the Office of the Secretary of State is doing with the portal. Most of the forms you had to fill out in paper and mail in five years ago are now available online. Voter registration is done online and it is submitted online. We do know the technology is available in-house. What has not been available or accessed is people sharing that technology and leveraging economies of scale. However the Secretary of State is doing it, then they can share that information with NDOT. Putting a form online is probably as easy as turning a Word document into a PDF and then uploading it. The idea, once again, is not to make every agency meet that deadline. Some of them will make it and some of them will not. What we have asked agencies to do is, based upon what they know about what they do with the forms and what the cost would be, to phase it in. It becomes an administrative task and not something that is an additional financial encumbrance.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Mr. Sisco, are you clear as to the steps you could take with the form development?

Scott Sisco:

Yes. We can create a form people could fill out, upload, and then we would enter it into our systems. That would be acceptable. We are good with the original fiscal note in anticipating the creation of these forms.

I also want to touch on the issue of agencies not being able to talk to each other. Please understand, there are a lot of databases. We have a database for permitting trucks, but it is not a database that any other state agency has any connection with, other than sharing information with the DMV. A lot of times, we hire consultants who come in and customize these databases. What I am saying is it is not as simple as saying all state agencies in the future should have all the same minimum datasets and use all of the same applications.

Going back to your question, I believe what I heard is that we can create these forms, the forms can be uploaded to us, and then we can manually enter the information. That solves our concerns about whether or not we can make this work.

Senator Spearman:

If we look at the federal government, all of those agencies have the opportunity because they have a platform. What we are talking about here is a platform that lends itself to multiple users and multiple uses. It is not that the databases have to be comparable, it is that they have to be able to talk to each other. The database that NDOT uses may be different from the Health Division and the DMV, but what we need to focus on when we speak about technology is the platform. A few years ago, if you had a PC, the information could not be shared with a Mac. Now they have figured that out. The technology is there and so is the knowledge. All we have to do is deconstruct the silos and begin talking to each other.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I would like to relate an experience that I was part of. When the Affordable Care Act came out, electronic medical records were a part of the program. Being part of a local hospital system, we started to go through the process of everyone talking to everyone else. It was important that the pharmacy talk to the doctor's office, the doctor's office talk to the lab, and the lab talk to the hospital. It really took an effort to create a task force in order to get all the IT people together to understand what the mission was. I applaud you with this mission of trying to make everyone speak to everyone else. I think you could move toward an overall understanding of putting these IT people together so they understand the platform. I know this can be done because it was done in that case. I think we need to come to an understanding of whose system we are going to use, what platform is the best, and where the resources are going to come from to change what we have. I just wanted to add that to the record about seeing it work before. I am sure you could check on other things related to the Affordable Care Act regarding the electronic medical records and record-keeping system.

Senator Spearman:

You are exactly correct. I am sorry that NDOT did not send someone to talk to me prior to this. If they had, they would have heard the same things I just said to you and what I have said to the other agencies who talked to me about their concerns. I think there are several other states that are already doing this. I do not think they are any smarter than we are or any more concerned than we are. I think it is something we have not done, but now we really need to do. I have encouraged those agencies that came to talk to me about how to get this done.

I have asked them to talk to each other. It is as simple as that—talk to each other. We can list what the DMV and the Secretary of State are doing as exemplars. If they are able to do it, then certainly the other agencies, in talking to their IT people, can figure it out. It is not neurosurgery.

Assemblyman Stewart:

I really appreciate what you have done in this bill and opening the broader issue of agencies talking to each other. Ever since I have been here, we have had that problem and we have been trying to solve it. I would encourage Mr. Froese, Mr. Sisco, and others to work on this. I would like to see that before I pass on. Let me tell you, time is running out, so please hustle.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

You mentioned just briefly, Senator Spearman, that other states may have a better process in how they handle their communication. In your research, has one come up that you can mention?

Senator Spearman:

I think there are some protocols our neighbors to the west use that could certainly be helpful. There are also some that are part of the federal government protocols. I believe I also looked at New York. One of the things we could have done with this bill is require a summit, but in explicitly defining what those steps would be, it would also open up more opportunities for people to say they could not get it done. I think the people we have heading these agencies and the people they have hired have all been appointed or hired because of their knowledge. That tells me, looking at the bill as it stands with the amendment, someone will be able to figure out the steps we need to take in order to talk to each other. This is a matter of if you want to do it, you find a way. If you do not, you find an excuse.

Vice Chairwoman Neal:

Are there any additional questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there any additional testimony in opposition? [There was none.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint). Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

This meeting of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs is adjourned [at 10:21 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lori McCleary
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: April 26, 2013

Time of Meeting: 8:40 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster