

**MINUTES OF THE
JOINT MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
AND THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
February 21, 2013**

The joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Jason Frierson at 9:09 a.m. on Thursday, February 21, 2013, in Room 4100 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).

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Andrew Martin
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler



SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chairman
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chairman
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Justin C. Jones
Senator Greg Brower
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Mark Hutchison

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Clark County Assembly District No. 34

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst
Mindy Martini, Senate Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Nick Anthony, Senate Committee Counsel
Thelma Reindollar, Committee Secretary
Lynn Hendricks, Senate Committee Secretary
Gariety Pruitt, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Sandoval, Governor
A. G. Burnett, Chair, State Gaming Control Board
Peter C. Bernhard, Chair, Nevada Gaming Commission
Pete Ernaut, representing Nevada Resort Association
Behnam Dayanim, representing Caesars Entertainment

Chairman Frierson:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] Good morning and welcome to the Joint Committee on Judiciary. It is an honor to have our Governor here along with our Majority Leader, Assemblyman Horne, to present Assembly Bill 114.

I will open the hearing on A.B. 114. Welcome, Governor. Welcome, Majority Leader Horne. I know this is your old territory. Some days I get a sense that you miss it, but we are lucky to have you as Majority Leader. I will welcome your introductory remarks on A.B. 114.

**Assembly Bill 114: Revises provisions governing interactive gaming.
(BDR 41-97)**

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Clark County Assembly District No. 34:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, members of the Joint Committee on Judiciary. I appreciate your taking the time to allow me to present Assembly Bill 114 which will allow for the practice of online gaming in our state. I am here today with Governor Brian Sandoval. He and I have worked closely together in developing this language, and it is something that we have both advocated vehemently for. The bill before you today is not a partisan issue, it is a Nevada issue. It is good for our state and it is common ground that we can all stand on.

Online gaming has grown exponentially in popularity in recent years and is a multi-billion dollar industry. As everyone knows, Nevada's primary industry is gaming. The latest and greatest in gaming technologies are tried and true here in Nevada. We have offered a gold standard in gaming regulation as well as the assurance of safe betting for nearly 60 years. We have the Center for Gaming Research at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming at the University of Nevada, Reno. Finally, we have over 250 brick and mortar operating casinos. Nevada is gaming.

What you may not know is Nevada is becoming a leader in the tech industry as well. Forbes listed Las Vegas number 6 on its "America's New Tech Hot Spots" list in January of this year. Companies such as Switch, a data center for Fortune 1000 companies, and IT Strategies, a technology consultant, are headquartered here and are even marketing this state to their colleagues. As you can see, Nevada possesses the infrastructure needed to provide online

gaming; the soil in which to grow and thrive. We have gaming and we have technology.

This session Nevada will be one of two states to allow gaming enterprises to offer legal online gaming within, and potentially beyond, our state borders. This bill incentivizes those companies to be headquartered in our state allowing Nevada to pioneer this new and growing industry. This will create new jobs, grow our economy, and provide tax revenue for education, healthcare, and the well-being of our citizens. [Continued to read prepared statement ([Exhibit C](#)) along with a slide presentation ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Brian Sandoval, Governor:

Thank you, Majority Leader Horne, Chairman Frierson, Chairman Segerblom, and members of the Committee. It is a privilege and honor to be with you today. I can also claim to be an alum of this illustrious Committee, so it is good to be back home. I am very proud to be here today to support A.B. 114. This bill represents an important and historic step in our state's proud history of leading the world in the regulation of gaming. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my comments, I want to extend my gratitude to Majority Leader Horne, who agreed to sponsor the legislation that you have before you. It is through his tenacity, leadership, and vision that this bill is before you today. It has been an honor to work with him on this bill. Mr. Horne has been a leader on this issue, and he deserves the credit for taking on the issues reflected in the bill before you.

For me personally, this bill represents the culmination of a commitment I made long ago to ensure that Nevada was ready to lead the world in the regulation of online gaming. In 2001, as chairman of the Nevada Gaming Commission, I supported the state's first effort to regulate online gaming. I recognized then, as I do now, that online gaming is a crucial component in the evolution of our state's most significant industry. It also gives Nevada the opportunity to become the technological hub of online gaming.

I think Gaming Commissioner Tony Alamo, Jr. said it best when he said Nevada can become the new "silicon valley" for Internet gaming. The bill offers a unique opportunity for our gaming companies to someday reach thousands, if not millions, of new players in this country and around the world. [Continued to read from prepared statement ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Governor. Thank you, Majority Leader. I think you both are equally responsible for my being here. I have learned a great deal from you both. It is great to see you both here today with an effort to put Nevada at the

forefront of something for which we are already the gold standard. With that, Mr. Horne, are you going to go through a presentation and the bill?

Assemblyman Horne:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to walk through the bill and show what the bill does. Section 6 of this bill authorizes the Governor to enter into agreements with other states to allow patrons of those states to participate in interactive gaming. In other words, this will allow companies offering online poker in Nevada to accept wagers from players in other states. The proposed amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) would allow the Nevada Gaming Commission to establish regulations for these agreements, including negotiation of revenue sharing. Those regulations would then be subject to review by the Legislative Commission.

Sections 2 through 5 specify the terms for licensure. Section 8 adds a representative of academia who possesses gaming knowledge to the Gaming Policy Committee. The proposed amendment would delete this section in order to lessen the fiscal impact of this bill.

Section 10 removes the condition of federal legislation for licensure and prohibits the issuance of a license for a period of 10 years after the bill's effective date for entities that, after December 31, 2006, operate interactive gaming websites involving patrons in the United States. In the proposed amendment, this reduces that period from 10 years to 5 years. This is to prevent those companies that violated the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 from obtaining a license for that period of time.

Section 11 increases the fees for initial issuance and renewal to ensure the licensure of established and reputable companies. The proposed amendment would restore those fees to existing rates of \$500,000 and \$250,000 for original licensure and renewal respectively, and allow the Nevada Gaming Commission to increase or decrease the fees under certain circumstances. The fees could not be increased to more than \$1 million and \$500,000 nor decrease below \$150,000 and \$75,000 respectively. A decrease in the fees must be approved by the Legislative Commission before they take effect.

Section 12 removes the provision of allowing a federal tax to supersede our state tax, should one be implemented. The amendment restores the existing language. [Written testimony also provided, but not read ([Exhibit G](#)).]

That concludes my quick walk-through for the provisions of the bill. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Horne. Are there any questions for Mr. Horne?

Assemblyman Hansen:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In section 6 where we are going to enter into agreements with other states, if another state does not allow their citizens to participate in online gaming, are we going to have an interstate agreement where we do not allow people from say, Wisconsin, to participate in online gaming in Nevada if they actually have some prohibition in their state?

Assemblyman Horne:

I will allow the Governor to address that, but it is my understanding that if we enter into agreements with another state, it is because that state is going to allow its citizens to participate in online gaming.

Governor Sandoval:

I agree with the Majority Leader. To use the example of Wisconsin, and I do not know what the law of Wisconsin is, but if it is not legal in that state, we would not be able to compact with that particular state.

Assemblyman Hansen:

We are talking about attracting people to Nevada through this bill. If I am a guy living in Sacramento and I can now go online to gamble, what is the incentive for me to go to Sparks to John Ascuaga's Nugget and gamble? I am curious as to how this is going to be an incentive to bring people into the state.

Assemblyman Horne:

I believe that any type of exposure, such as online gaming, is another marketing tool for our state. It is one thing to be online, but it is also another thing to actually go to a bricks-and-mortar casino and enjoy all the amenities that Nevada offers, not just in its gaming establishments, but even marketing the state in general, with our natural resources with skiing and Lake Tahoe.

Assemblyman Duncan:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader and Mr. Governor, for being here today. I have a couple of questions. First, in looking at the language of A.B. 114, I am curious if the compacts that we enter into with other states are limited solely to Internet poker, or are they more broad than that? Secondly, in September 2011, there was a reinterpretation of the Wire Act by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). I am curious, Mr. Governor, if your office has had contact with the DOJ to speak specifically about the legality of entering these compacts? There may be a worry that if the DOJ reinterprets the

Wire Act at a future time, or revisits that issue, that our licensees may be put into jeopardy. I was just wondering if you could expand on those two questions.

Governor Sandoval:

I will take the second question first with regard to the DOJ. We do have that opinion now, and that is why we are here today, as I mentioned in my opening remarks—to remove that. With regard to the compacts, we feel we are in good legal standing to do that. Of course, we would never take any action that would jeopardize the license status of any of our licensees. We feel that we have the authority. There is similar language included in at least one bill nationally that would allow another state to do the same thing. As the Majority Leader mentioned in his remarks, those compacts are going to be subject, with Mr. A. G. Burnett, Chair of the State Gaming Control Board, as well as the Nevada Gaming Commission doing the due diligence in terms of the research and the ability for us to compact. But, we will be in contact with the DOJ.

Mr. Duncan, with regard to your first question, it would be exclusively poker.

Chairman Frierson:

Do you have a follow-up, Mr. Duncan?

Assemblyman Duncan:

Is that going to be set out in regulations?

Governor Sandoval:

Yes, so you will have a process similar to the process that the Gaming Control Board and the Gaming Commission conducted in the interim between last session and now, in the regulation of online gaming.

Assemblyman Duncan:

Thank you.

Senator Hutchison:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Governor and Mr. Majority Leader, good morning and thank you for your presentation. I am curious about the signatory states and their interaction with our governing bodies here in Nevada, and with the regulatory bodies here with the Board and the Commission. What role do those signatory states have with our regulators here in Nevada? Do they have counterparts, or will they have counterparts in their states?

Governor Sandoval:

I am not sure what you mean by signatory states?

Senator Hutchison:

I am referring to section 6 where it says that "the Governor, on behalf of the State of Nevada, is authorized to: 1. Enter into agreements . . . to enable patrons in the signatory states"

Governor Sandoval:

Right now, we will be one of the first states that will be given the legal authority to enter into these compacts. As we speak now, I am not aware of any signatory states. We are hopeful that we will be able to enter into these agreements with these other states. The key term is liquidity—the number of players that would be available in a particular state. It would be very important for Nevada, given its small population, to have the ability to enter into a compact with another state, which would be that signatory state to which you reference. But at this time, there are none because this is new ground that we are plowing here today.

Senator Hutchison:

When you enter into the contracts with these other states and these relationships, do you anticipate that it is going to be short-term or long-term contracts? Are you concerned that if it is just short-term, that maybe these other states will see some of the revenues that may be generated and want to take that back to their own states? Is there some wisdom in having our lawyers locking them in for a long-term contractual relationship?

Governor Sandoval:

I think it is premature to comment on that. Obviously, it is going to have to be mutually beneficial to those particular states. They are going to want a piece of the action in terms of the length of these compacts. I would assume that if it works out as we believe it is going to work out, it will be a positive and they will want to continue a long-term relationship.

Senator Hutchison:

Thank you, Governor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Mr. Majority Leader, Governor, thank you very much for coming today. In your presentation, you say we are going to pick up about \$3 million of new tax revenue through this bill. How much have our bricks-and-mortar businesses lost to illegal or unlicensed online gaming? Do you happen to know that number?

Assemblyman Horne:

I do not have that number. I know there are industry officials that may have some estimates. The \$3 million that I mentioned in my presentation was from Applied Analysis. That number has likely changed now.

Governor Sandoval:

Mr. Chairman, if I may. I agree with Mr. Horne. There is just one other comment that I want to make in response to Senator Hutchison's question regarding compacts. There will be the ability, pursuant to Chapter 233B of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), for the Legislative Commission to approve or disapprove those compacts. Is that correct, Mr. Horne?

Assemblyman Horne:

The Governor is correct on that. There is going to be some oversight on the agreements that the Governor is proposing to enter into with these other jurisdictions. In these agreements, we are hoping that our regulatory framework that we have developed over the decades is what is going to be part of the selling point to some of these jurisdictions who do not have that. It will save them the time and money to try to develop it and mimic what we already have. That is what is going to make that partnership viable and attractive.

Senator Jones:

The focus of this bill is on interstate compacts with other states. We know that the markets for online gaming reach globally. The reason that we are here today is because operations in other countries have pushed us to this point. What, if anything, can be done to allow for those who are outside of our country to use our licensees as the location for their gaming activities?

Assemblyman Horne:

Thank you, Senator Jones. There had been discussions on this language on whether or not we wanted to extend this beyond the borders of the country but we thought, in this regard, to start here with interstate. Having future discussions on how we expand that, we certainly know that there are some pros and cons, particularly when Congress has failed to act on it on a broader scheme. We thought it wise to keep it within the borders of the country for now, and then work on expanding later.

Senator Kihuen:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Governor and Majority Leader Horne, welcome to our Committee and thank you for coming to testify. Can Americans gamble offshore currently?

Assemblyman Horne:

Thank you, Senator Kihuen. Not legally, I would say. That is one of the problems. This has been occurring for years now. They have not had a legal U.S. platform to do it from. This will allow us to enter into that industry and those players will be able to do that legally.

Senator Kihuen:

Do you have any projection of how much money we are losing to other countries around the world by not having legalized online gaming in the whole country?

Assemblyman Horne:

This is a multi-billion dollar industry that we have not been participating in. The market share that the U.S. is likely to gain—I could not give you a true estimate—10, 30, or 40 percent of that. The gaming executives that are here can probably give you a better idea what they estimate can be gained by entering into this market.

Senator Kihuen:

Would it be safe to say that it is in the billions?

Assemblyman Horne:

I think it is safe to say that as of two years ago, online gaming was basically \$5 billion.

Chairman Frierson:

Mr. Horne, I have a question about the actual rates that are going to be benefitting the state of Nevada. If there is federal legislation, it would potentially change what we are currently receiving. In a previous section of this statute, NRS Chapter 463, we currently collect 6.75 percent. While we cannot dictate what the federal government does, is there any plan in place to deal with making sure Nevada continues to receive at least 6.75 percent, and what we would do in the event that the federal government's calculations come up with a split that is less than that?

Assemblyman Horne:

Yes. Currently because there is no federal law, we would get the 6.75 percent as the statute now reads. If there is a similar tax at the federal level, that would not exist. How it is proposed to work is that a percentage of the tax revenue generated would go to the state of licensure, the domicile of the player, and to the federal government.

It is anticipated that we would not necessarily lose money under that, particularly if Nevada is the primary licensing jurisdiction. My discussion with the gaming industry is that all the various iterations of the federal bill listing going forward have maintained that portion of the tax which, I believe, was stated at 16 percent that they are anticipating. This has been what the gaming industry has proposed themselves. They have no anticipation or efforts to lower that rate, so our percentage would come from that rate. That said, I cannot give you a guarantee that it would not drop below that, but we are not anticipating that to be the case.

Chairman Frierson:

That may be something for those planning on testifying for the gaming industry to address as well. In the event that the federal government comes back with a calculation that is less, we need to be prepared to deal with that in the future to ensure that Nevada does not suffer loss as a result of it. In theory, this is a gain of what we do not have to some extent, with the support of the federal government.

Assemblyman Martin:

Governor, I was very pleased to hear your comments on "heightened scrutiny for taking online bets." Part of the big objection to the overseas gaming, as we all know, is the fear of fraud and the fear of lost money from our citizenry. I think this is a wonderful competitive opportunity that Nevada has, with our security systems in place and our casinos. We have an opportunity to really exploit that advantage, but I would love to hear if you have additional thoughts to add to your commentary about heightened scrutiny for taking online bets to make it safe as well as, of course, legal. Certainly this is leadership by example, and I think it is a wonderful opportunity for Nevada.

Governor Sandoval:

That was a topic that was covered through the Gaming Policy Committee that you are going to be hearing about today from A. G. Burnett, chair of the Gaming Control Board. He can take you through the litany of safeguards that we have already put in place with regard to our regulatory structure. He has been a global leader in terms of making sure that Nevada has those mechanisms to preserve the integrity of online gaming in the state of Nevada.

Assemblyman Duncan:

I have a hypothetical question. If we have a compact with another state, and that other state licenses someone who cannot get a license here pursuant to the "penalty box provisions" of our bill, do Nevadans have the capability to access their online gaming?

Governor Sandoval:

Hypothetically, I would imagine that would be an obstacle in terms of entering into a compact with that particular state. Again, I would probably defer to the regulators to respond to that question, but it would be an issue with me.

Assemblyman Horne:

If I understand your question, Mr. Duncan, if another state licenses someone who would not be able to be licensed here—correct me if I am wrong, Governor—it is not likely that we would necessarily license with a jurisdiction who is doing licensing because that is what we are going to be trying to provide. In looking to compact with states with large populations, they may not have the regulatory structure. But if they have a large population and the regulatory structure to do licensing, why would they be inclined to compact with Nevada? Again, as the Governor said, this would be a good question for the regulators.

Chairman Frierson:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Thank you, Mr. Governor and Mr. Majority Leader, for coming in and presenting this important legislation before us today. One of the issues that has been a stumbling block related to online gaming is payment vehicles—banking regulations, credit card companies, use of chargebacks, the ability for consumers to have adequate payment methods, and protection for financial institutions. Is there going to be companion legislation going forward to smooth out some of those issues, or is that going to be taken care of during the regulatory process?

Assemblyman Horne:

Assemblywoman Spiegel, I anticipate that the regulatory bodies would address that. Our Gaming Control Board and Gaming Commission do an excellent job in screening applicants for licensure as well as wrongdoers in the industry. These issues that you bring up are not only on their radar screen but have been for some time.

Chairman Frierson:

I see no other questions. Thank you, Mr. Horne, for going through not only the bill in great detail, but the proposed amendment to save time. It helps us manage our questions and vet these issues out. I would like to open it up to testimony in support of A.B. 114.

A. G. Burnett, Chair, State Gaming Control Board:

It is an honor and a privilege to appear before this Joint Committee. I look forward to answering any questions that you may have. The chair of the Gaming Commission is also present via videoconference.

Senator Hutchison:

Currently if there is a patron who has a complaint against a licensee, is that something that the Board gets involved in and has responsibility for?

A. G. Burnett:

Online interactive poker is not being offered from the state of Nevada, and so there are no patron disputes to speak of, in that context. However, yes, that is the case. We do have statutory and regulatory requirements that address patron disputes. Should online interactive poker go forward, our new Regulation 5A [Regulations of the Nevada Gaming Commission and State Gaming Control Board] also speaks to that.

Senator Hutchison:

Great, that was my question because you will have patrons in, say, California, who are going to be participating with a licensee in this Internet gaming opportunity. How do you envision a patron complaint with the licensee under these interstate compacts?

A. G. Burnett:

I imagine that those types of terms would be worked out in a compact, as needed. What we have tried to do—and this may answer many of the Joint Committee's questions in advance—is carefully craft a set of working regulations pursuant to this statute that will essentially regulate gaming in the context of interactive poker in almost the same fashion as it is regulated in the bricks-and-mortar basis. We have taken great pains to ensure that there are requirements, such as postings on websites as to where to go if you have a problem with gambling, or if you have a dispute with the operator or the offeror of the interactive service.

Senator Segerblom:

Mr. Burnett, assuming that this bill passes relatively quickly, are you prepared to reach out to other states and see if they want to enter into these compacts?

A. G. Burnett:

We stand ready to do what is required of us. Chair Bernhard and I have been looking at the issue of compacting, or memorandums of understanding, in whatever form of agreement it might take to add liquidity to the state of

Nevada's player pools. We have not entered into any such negotiations. We are waiting for the appropriate time which may, in fact, be during this session to go forward.

Senator Jones:

Is it contemplated that operators of online poker establishments will extend credit, or is it all paid by the player?

A. G. Burnett:

It is contemplated that credit can be offered, and that is something that is in our Regulation 5A. There are certain restrictions. I thank my colleagues on the Board, my colleagues on the Gaming Commission, and our staff who have traveled the world over the last two years to understand how interactive poker is regulated overseas. We have been the recipients of much knowledge from our colleagues in places such as the United Kingdom and other areas.

Senator Jones:

If a casino marker or credit is extended to a player in another state, what is going to be put into the interstate compact to ensure that there is enforcement and ability to collect on a marker?

A. G. Burnett:

That is a very good question. We would identify that in legal terms much like the issuance of debt, or the taking out of a marker by a patron in one of our land-based casinos. We have not looked into that issue specifically, as of yet, because we have not encountered it. It is my thought that we would be able to allow our licensees to collect on those types of debt and credit instruments in the same fashion as they do now. I believe the regulatory scheme would allow the licensees to utilize the district attorney's office to go forward in making those collections. However, as to what types of jurisdictional issues there might be, those types of things would have to be hammered out in the interstate agreements.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

In a similar vein, would consumers be able to place money on account in the bricks-and-mortar casino accounts that they could then use for online wagering? If so, would we then have to be entering into a process to be turning our casinos essentially into banks?

A. G. Burnett:

That is a very astute question. Indeed, our casinos have been considered banks previously in some federal context. Right now the interactive Regulation 5A

speaks to a patron opening up a separate account within which they can utilize monies to wager. Those accounts would be separate: one for land-based wagering and another for interactive poker.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Nevada is well known for thoroughly vetting anybody before we have granted them a license. Section 10 of this bill calls for a 10-year window. If a person has been found unsuitable prior, for a 10-year window, they cannot get a license. There is an amendment to change that to 5 years. I would like your thoughts on that.

A. G. Burnett:

In all honesty, Assemblyman Hansen, I do not have any thoughts on that. This is the culmination of ten years of the Gaming Control Board and the Gaming Commission, the Legislature, and our Governor attempting to interpret federal law, or lack thereof.

Beginning about 12 to 13 years ago, there was a study commission called the National Gambling Impact Study Commission. At that time, Internet gaming was brand new and no one really understood it. That Commission, which reported to Congress and to the President of the United States, reported back to those entities and indicated that Internet gaming in its nascent stages should be banned outright.

I believe the language in the bill that you referenced is the result of what has occurred between then and now. There have been many attempts in the federal government to either outright legalize Internet gaming, or to ban it. All those attempts have been fraught with peril and were not successful except for one, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act (UIGEA) which was tacked on to the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (SAFE Port Act).

In an attempt to be reverent and respectful of the federal process, after UIGEA there were several attempts at prosecution by the Department of Justice (DOJ) of Internet gaming companies that continued to take bets post-UIGEA. Upon the passage of UIGEA in 2006, Internet companies had a choice. It is important to note that these Internet gaming companies, for the most part, are not fly-by-night operations run out of a garage somewhere. Some of them are, but the majority are the large players, and are companies traded on public stock exchanges around the world who have shareholders and boards of directors. They are very large, well-run companies. They had a choice and had emergency meetings once that law was passed. Some of those companies decided that while UIGEA may not have been the most clear piece of legislation, the intent

was certainly clear—the Congress did not want Internet gaming operators to offer online poker or other interactive games to citizens in the United States, and they backed out.

That was a very difficult decision for them to make as publicly traded companies responsible to shareholders, subject to shareholder litigation. Once they backed out, their share prices dropped incredibly, but they did what they felt was pursuant to the Congressional intent at the time. There were some companies who did not take that course of action, and there were companies that decided to continue taking bets in the United States. I would defer to Assemblyman Horne and to our Governor in providing you with a more specific response. I believe the language that you were referring to is an attempt to be deferential to the federal government and what they had been doing in that context over the last seven years.

Assemblyman Hansen:

What is the current policy? If you have someone that comes to you to get a gaming license and they have had some shady past, is there a window of time that must pass before considering granting them a license?

A. G. Burnett:

We do not have a current written policy except for what is contained in our statutory, regulatory requirements that speak to any applicant having to be a person or entity of good character, honesty, and suitability to take that license. Indeed, we have received applications for interactive operators, interactive service providers, manufacturers, and distributors of interactive gaming equipment, and we have approved many of those companies. Our policy and regulatory scheme stands strong and I believe that were we to encounter a company that did willfully and knowingly violate the Congressional intent, or what is stated in UIGEA, that would be something that would be difficult to overcome. It would certainly be something that is vetted in an open and public hearing, which might be an uncomfortable thing to discuss for that applicant.

Assemblyman Hansen:

We certainly want to protect our reputation for being very thorough in these matters. Thank you very much.

Peter C. Bernhard, Chair, Nevada Gaming Commission:

I am sorry to interrupt but I did have a couple of additions for Chair Burnett's comments along the same line, if this would be an appropriate time.

Chairman Frierson:

Please, go ahead.

Peter C. Bernhard:

Thank you. I am the Chair of the Nevada Gaming Commission. I want to thank Governor Sandoval for resurrecting the Gaming Policy Committee and Majority Leader Horne for his leadership. In essence, this bill contains the recommendations of the Gaming Policy Committee. The provision about which Assemblyman Hansen was asking was not brought before the Gaming Policy Committee. As Chair Burnett said, we, as regulators, do not take a position on what it should contain in that area. We see this as one of the conflicting policies which, for better or for worse, we are able to punt in your direction as legislators. On the one hand, people who have complied with the law since UIGEA in 2006 would have no incentive to comply with laws in the future if, in fact, those who chose not to comply are awarded the privilege of operating interactive gaming in Nevada without any consequences.

For people who do not comply, or have not complied with UIGEA, then it would become a policy question. What, if anything, should be done with respect to them, to recognize the fact that they did not comply with UIGEA? These are all issues that we, as the Commission, based on the staff's investigation and the recommendations of the Board, work with on a regular basis in making our decisions. We evaluate, on a case-by-case basis, the suitability of any applicant. As Chair Burnett indicated, we have had people come before us, at this point, who have had checkered pasts and involvement in illegal interactive gaming. Those facts have been brought to us through our staff, and we have considered those facts in determining how to act on a license application. I assure you that the Board and the Commission are both ready, willing, and able to implement whatever the legislators decide in this area. We do not have a position, however, on whether or not these provisions are necessary, desirable, what the time limit should be, or what the test should be. We will be happy to implement whatever the legislature tells us the standard should be.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Bernhard. Along those same lines, is the 5-year period in deference to what the federal government is doing in keeping Nevada as a gold standard or, if no other state is doing it, would that put us at a disadvantage?

A. G. Burnett:

Mr. Chairman, I think you are correct. That is probably a better question for Assemblyman Horne and, perhaps, Governor Sandoval.

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

In section 9, there are regulations to monitor minors. Would you elaborate on that, and how we prevent the minors from being involved in that?

A. G. Burnett:

We have crafted in our Regulation 5A a multitude of requirements that direct the Internet service provider or the operator, with the operator being ultimately the one liable to account for those standards, such as age verification, geolocation, and essentially, finding out that you are the person who you say you are. There is an initial list of requirements for the patron upon registration which includes identifying information, such as a social security number. There is a verification process that the operator has to undergo whereby they conduct due diligence upon the patron prior to the patron being able to go forward. Once the patron is verified, they are allowed to play. Then there are further procedures to ensure that that patron continues to be who they say they are throughout the course of their play with the operator.

As part of our due diligence, I, among others on the Gaming Control Board, have been around the world and visited the companies that currently do this. I am very comfortable in testifying to you today that it is very impressive what they can do. In fact, it is almost scary. These are things that are being done right now outside the context of gaming. Geolocation services can triangulate where a person is through global positioning system technology. Our operators are required to use the same type of technology. I have been overseas and witnessed the companies stop hackers or stop people who are essentially not who they say they are. They have teams of mathematicians who develop algorithms in-house, thereby enabling operators to understand who you are and how you play poker. They will analyze and watch how you play, how you bet, and how you bluff. If the algorithm determines that, perhaps it is not you, it might be your son, your daughter, or someone else entirely who has stolen your identity, they will call you. You have to have a registered cell phone or a phone number which they can use to contact you immediately. They will call you and say, "Is this you?" You may say, "Yes, it is. I am just doing things differently," or sometimes, you may not pick up the phone, in which case they will be required to shut down your account. The Internet service providers that we are currently vetting for approval are the entities that our operators will utilize to conduct those types of services.

Senator Brower:

My question follows on Mr. Hansen's question previously. I am not clear on how a change from ten years to five years shows some deference to the DOJ. Mr. Horne, when you have an opportunity, would you please address that?

A. G. Burnett:

Mr. Chairman, at your deference, I can leave the dais or remain for further questions.

Chairman Frierson:

If we can continue with further questions for Mr. Burnett or Mr. Bernhard, then we can wrap it up with some follow-up.

Assemblyman Duncan:

Mr. Burnett, I was wondering if you had thought through the hypothetical that I had posed regarding a compact with another state. Our state had said that we are not going to allow them to have a license here, but another state that we have a compact does allow it. Do Nevadans get to take advantage of their services? I would like to know your thoughts on that.

A. G. Burnett:

I am happy to give you my thoughts, with a caveat that we have not developed a forum, memorandum of understanding, or compact. I feel that we need to be fluid. As I was quoted by Assemblyman Horne in his presentation earlier, this is essentially unhinging some barriers that are in the statute that would allow our operators to go forward and use their best practices in realizing revenue in this already present interactive poker space. I envision that the compacts would probably have to be fluid. There would have to be discussions with those other states as to how they would want to do things and how we would want to do things. In those other states, there may be interactive gaming operators already present, licensed, and up and running, or there may be no interactive operators in which case, I agree with the previous comments. It would be my own personal hope that Nevada can be seen as the regulatory agency that handles the regulation, auditing, compliance, due diligence of vetting the applicants into the industry, and remits some form of remuneration back to the state where certain players may be allowed to wager. I am not sure if that fully answers your question.

I believe you may have also posed the question as to whether people in Nevada can currently play online poker. The clear answer is yes. People in the United States—despite UIGEA, despite our laws—still can wager with offshore companies as Assemblyman Horne indicated in what the DOJ terms an illegal fashion. This essentially legitimizes and regulates what is already going on.

Senator Kihuen:

What other states are we competing against to try to pass this type of legislation?

A. G. Burnett:

It is my understanding that New Jersey is moving fairly fast in enacting its own intrastate online lawful scheme. I believe Pennsylvania is looking at it. There are probably a multitude of other states that have it on their radar in their legislative sessions. I believe Delaware has already enacted some laws.

Senator Kihuen:

So Delaware already has enacted laws?

A. G. Burnett:

I believe they have. I cannot speak in an educated fashion as to what those laws say. I believe there is a strong lottery component to their legislative scheme. If the Legislature were to act now, I believe that Nevada would be seen as the first true regulatory state to be up and running.

Senator Kihuen:

In other words, time is of the essence.

A. G. Burnett:

I would concur.

Chairman Frierson:

I see no more questions. Thank you, Mr. Burnett and Mr. Bernhard. Is there anyone else here to testify in support of A.B. 114?

A. G. Burnett:

Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to thank the Joint Committee, our Governor, and Assemblyman Horne for the leadership in going forward here.

Chairman Frierson:

Mr. Ernaut, I would like to go ahead and address the amendment. If there are no other witnesses here to testify in support, I would invite you up to talk about the proposed amendment.

Pete Ernaut, representing Nevada Resort Association:

I would like to state our emphatic support for A.B. 114. I commend both Majority Leader Horne and the Governor for their leadership in this area. The historic nature and importance of this legislation cannot be overstated. When we look back on this in a few years, we can look with pride to say that Nevada maintained its leadership position in yet another new frontier of gaming.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a couple of quick questions before we get into the nature of my testimony, which will be focused almost entirely on section 10 and the issues surrounding the higher scrutiny for suitability.

With regard to Assemblyman Duncan's question, the discussion about the limitation to poker bears a little bit of history in Assembly Bill No. 258 of the 76th Session. The bill originally, as written, was focused primarily and specifically to online poker. However, Mr. Burnett's predecessor, Chair Liparelli, explained that there were some legal issues of restraint that needed to have the Legislature contemplate this in a greater fashion and expand it to all online gaming. That said, Regulation 5A that Chair Burnett focused on is also the regulation that limits this just to Internet poker.

The second reference, Mr. Chairman, and some of the other Committee members was about the taxation issue. That is a very important issue for everybody to understand. Over the last four or five years, there have been a number of efforts federally—unfortunately, that had failed—dealing with this issue, but one very consistent method to all of that was how they deemed to tax this activity. I would say that if federal legislation does pass, it is likely it would follow the pattern they have had over the last four or five versions of this bill, and it goes to this. Generally, the rate would be about 16 percent, but the most important part is it also contemplates a distribution method to the states within that 16 percent. The first 2 percent would go to the federal government. The other 14 percent would be divided along this method—70 percent of the 14 percent would go to the state in which the player resided, and 30 percent would go to the state in which the business or the licensee was domiciled. If the federal government does not pass the bill, or it takes some time, the current statute would say that the gross gaming tax would apply at 6.75 percent. Any concerns that the state would not be getting their fair share, or that there would be double taxation, would be allayed because the current statute takes care of the double taxation. If the federal government does pass a tax plan similar to what they have done, 70 percent of 14 percent is 9.8 percent as an effective rate; 30 percent of 14 percent is 4.2 percent as an effective rate, but you have to blend those two, of course, because the gross gaming tax would take in that entire activity. If you blend that rate, you are at about 7 percent so that tax rate should be effectively similar to our current gross gaming tax. I think the state is well protected in either fashion, whether there is a long duration before the federal tax is passed or not.

Also, regarding Assemblywoman Spiegel's question on financial instruments and their ability to be applicable here, in UIGEA, which I am going to explain, there are two very specific exemptions—for intrastate gambling and for compacts.

A major portion of UIGEA was to ban the use of any financial instrument that was associated with illegal activity, but that would not apply in this instance. With that, I hope I answered some of the other questions that were left hanging the last few minutes.

You are going to hear more about UIGEA throughout this discussion and in the future. The Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act was passed in 2006 and effectively did two things. It clarified the illegality of the action of Internet gaming. There had been some dispute, and it is very important that you understand specifically what it focused on. It said that this activity is unlawful under any applicable federal or state law in which the wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made. The reason for that was there were a number of arguments that if there was an offshore business and their server was located offshore, was that really a violation? This really underscored that it did not matter where it happened or where it was received. It tried to encompass all of the activities and make them illegal in the underlying state and federal laws making UIGEA apply. The second part, in reference to Assemblywoman Spiegel's question, is the difficulty in enforcing this, as you might imagine, since it is an Internet activity. The strategy from UIGEA was to focus on making financial transactions associated with this activity illegal, such as credit cards and bank transactions.

The other very important basis of UIGEA for our part of the presentation is it establishes a dateline, which is December 31, 2006. That became the baseline for not only federal efforts but other state efforts and in this bill, our effort to address what we believe is a very important need for a higher level of scrutiny for suitability for licensees. As Chair Burnett explained, there are two sets of companies—those who were in this business prior to 2006, and after the passage of UIGEA, those who either stopped and played by the rules, and those who decided to continue and violate this law. That was the basis for any federal higher level of scrutiny.

The question came of the duration and this is not science, but five years is exactly the time and duration in which most of these companies were in violation of the law. Why is that important? The question that may hang in your minds is why do we need this if we trust our regulators to be the gold standard of this world in regulations to not make their own decisions? With the current makeup of the Board and the Commission, it is a well thought-out question because we do have some of the best regulators that I have seen in the 25 years that I have been doing this; however, times change and we do not know who all will be there. I think that is important, but the other important part is the issuance of their licensure needs to be discussed—not just that there

should be an obvious higher level of scrutiny for those who chose to break the law but also remember, in that group there is at least one company that enjoyed, over that five years, accruing almost 70 percent of the market share as a result of unlawful activity. Now why is that important? You are getting to hear this term: liquidity. What it basically means is your player database, or how many players are there that you are able to have on your side at any given time. To give you some perspective, before this all came to a crashing halt on April 15, 2011, which coincidentally was in the middle of the discussion of our online poker bill, there were poker sites that had 100,000 to 125,000 players on any minute of any day, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. This is big. Our companies played by the rules and so, if you allow these companies to have an enormous head start, and in some respects were able to be licensed, our companies would never have the opportunity to effectively compete. That is why, in the original bill, it contemplates that any company doing business here would have to do so in partnership with the bricks-and-mortar licensee. That is a protection for us; a very important protection.

But also, this time frame means they cannot apply for licensure for five years. It then comes up to the discretion of the regulators whether they are ever licensed. There is also a waiver provision in here for those who do not think they violated the law. That is the policy background for having a higher level of scrutiny and for having the duration of five years. It sends a very direct message. If we are this gold standard of regulation and enforcement, not only in the United States but across this world where online gaming is going, we take this seriously. That is the basis of section 10.

At this time, I would like to introduce my colleague, Behnam Dayanim. He is widely recognized as an expert in this area. He will walk you through the language.

Chairman Frierson:

It looks like the proposed amendment is fairly straightforward. If we could go through that so we can have an opportunity to discuss it, if necessary.

Behnam Dayanim, representing Caesars Entertainment:

I am an attorney with the law firm of Paul Hastings LLP in Washington, D.C. I am pleased to be here in connection with the Nevada Resort Association (NRA) to help elucidate some of the provisions of this bill. Mr. Ernaut already has covered the policy reasons behind heightened scrutiny, so I am going to go straight to the language and talk about what it is intended to do. I am going to start with section 2 of the bill, which defines "covered assets." Again, the heightened scrutiny measures here to apply to certain categories of persons and

assets that were involved in activity that took place post-UIGEA. The definition of covered asset is intended to cover any tangible or intangible asset that were specifically designed for and used in offering interactive gaming to U.S. patrons during that time period. That includes software and trademarks, et cetera. There are two key points that I think are important to note in connection with this section. One is that it is only those assets that were specifically designed for use. You may question why we do not intend to cover telecommunications, media, and other things; this deals only with those things that are specifically designed for use in interactive gaming. Secondly, it is only in the case where it is knowingly and intentionally used. There may be some technical changes suggested later on to make that even more clear—that it is only where it was knowingly and intentionally used.

The second provision worth mentioning is section 3, which is the "covered person" definition. That basically follows the same outline as covered asset. In addition to saying if someone is proposing to use a covered asset, we also want to apply heightened scrutiny if someone is a "covered person." That would be a person who owned or operated an interactive gaming facility post-UIGEA that offered wagers to U.S. residents knowingly and intentionally.

As Mr. Ernaut indicated, the 5-year time period that has been discussed today is simply a time period within which there is a presumption against licensure, but that presumption will expire after 5 years. That would not mean that a "covered person" would automatically then be entitled to a finding of suitability, which means they would go through the ordinary process.

The amendment goes into detail of what presumption entails. That presumption says that if you are, in fact, a covered person or are proposing to use a covered asset, meaning if you knowingly and intentionally offered bets or wagers to persons in the U.S. after December, 2006, you may not be licensed. However, you may appeal for a waiver. You can obtain a waiver if the Commission determines that you did not violate the law. This gives the person an opportunity to state that he did not violate the law. If he can show that, then he can overcome the presumption. The provision sets out a due process that allows the person an opportunity to be heard and present relevant evidence. We want to ensure we have a thoughtful and deliberative process.

Section 9 of the amendment makes clear that the Commission should make that determination without regard to whether there has been any federal or state prosecution for that matter of the covered person that did not result in a conviction. In other words, the Commission is intended to make an independent determination of whether the activity violated the law. Again, there will be

a technical change to make clear that the proceedings that should be applied should not be the proceedings associated with disciplinary action, but instead should be proceedings that are associated with suitability and licensing determination. [Also provided proposed technical changes ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you. Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Duncan:

Thank you for your testimony. Right now it seems these companies that are not allowed to apply for an interactive gaming license could, however, apply for a bricks-and-mortar license within the state if they owned a casino. I was wondering if you would touch on that if it is an incongruity, or what the reasoning behind that is.

Pete Ernaut:

That is actually a real-life example; not here in Nevada but in another jurisdiction. I would not speak for our regulators but, clearly, they would have to answer for those actions to be licensed in any operation whether it was a bricks-and-mortar casino versus an online license. I would suspect that they would have to have some pretty good answers to pass any of those tests. That actually is happening now in New Jersey, so we are going to have a test case to look at.

I have just one follow-up to Mr. Dayanim's testimony on having this higher level of scrutiny versus simply allowing it to be the discretion of regulators. There also is this issue between covered assets and covered persons, and I think that bears one last explanation. An application goes to a person. Covered assets in this are very important because these companies were allowed to amass substantial player databases through illegal activity for a number of years that give them an incredible advantage over all the people that either decided to follow the law, or in the time that has passed since 2006, have now developed software and a business model to enter this marketplace. Clearly, that database—that head start—would give somebody a fatal advantage to our entry into this market. So you cannot just cover the person; it has to cover the assets because, clearly, one of those companies could take that database and simply sell it to another company, and then the covered persons issue becomes moot so it has to cover both.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Ernaut. I realize that we have a lot of questions, but this is on the amendment that Mr. Ernaut has before us. If we could confine it to that, I believe Mr. Horne is going back for the bill itself.

Assemblyman Hansen:

What I hear you saying then is that you do not favor that amendment. You think that it would give unfair advantage to those who took advantage of the law and gained a greater database than their competitors. Is that accurate?

Pete Ernaut:

We would agree to the compromise of 5 years.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Thank you.

Senator Brower:

I think that may have clarified it for me, but for my benefit, and maybe for the benefit of my colleagues, I am not tracking the logic of the 10 to 5 years. If it is a compromise, I get that. We have to pick a number and, as Chair Burnett mentioned, that is our call. Is there something more to it than vis-à-vis federal law, or DOJ policy that I am not understanding?

Pete Ernaut:

The 5 years is not a science. It just simply tracks just about every version of the federal legislation as it went through. This last iteration of the federal legislation had 10 years, but the starting date was different than ours. We felt it a more prudent course to keep consistent with the federal legislation as it has been written. Secondly, that tracks with the number of years that these companies were able to act unlawfully and gain this advantage.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you. Are there any other questions? I see none. I do not see anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify. We will come back to Carson City. Mr. Horne?

Assemblyman Horne:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I only came up because I did not know if Senator Brower's questions were adequately answered for him.

Chairman Frierson:

I think the pending questions were answered. Certainly mine were.

Senator Brower:

Mr. Chairman, thank you. I think so, Mr. Horne, unless you have something that you think might add to my understanding.

Assemblyman Horne:

I believe Mr. Ernaut touched on all the points in line with the federal timeline but, also as a policy, the message we sent as a legislative body. In speaking with the Governor, he agreed with me that 10 years was being kind of excessive. In the message that we send, I would equate it to what kind of punishment, for lack of a better term, are we going to put on it. Are we going to make this a "Pete Rose sanction" or are we going to make it a "one game suspension," or somewhere in between? I think we struck that with the 5 years.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Horne, for coming back to answer that question. I am going to open it up for those in opposition to A.B. 114. I see none in Carson City. Is there anyone in Las Vegas in opposition? I see none. Is there anyone in Carson City to testify in the neutral position? I see no one else here to testify in Carson City or in Las Vegas.

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

I would like to thank the Governor and the Majority Leader for bringing this wonderful bill forward with great bipartisanship. I would like to, at this time, amend and do pass Mr. Horne's amendment and the Nevada Resort Association amendment.

Chairman Frierson:

There has been a motion to amend and do pass with both amendments, and a second. Is there any discussion on that motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 114.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Hansen:

We may be fighting the tide, but I have a concern over the whole bill. What is the impact on the smaller casinos in the state, especially in northern Nevada which are already hurting? I am hoping that this is actually going to be beneficial to them. I just want to go on record that that is my concern—it is for the little guy in this whole arrangement.

Chairman Frierson:

Thank you, Mr. Hansen. Are there any other discussions? While I think most of us share the concern, we are also concerned about being left behind by other states. If we are going to have an opportunity to be competitive, now is the time. Seeing no other discussion, as this is an Assembly bill, this would apply to members of the Assembly only for the purposes of the motion.

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

At this time, I am going to close the hearing on A.B. 114. I am now going to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 127 and invite Mr. Horne up to introduce that bill.

Assembly Bill 127: Authorizes the Nevada Gaming Commission to adopt a seal identifying certain licensees of interactive gaming and prohibits the unauthorized use of such a seal. (BDR 41-99)

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Clark County Assembly District No. 34:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a smaller bill. I thank the Committee for indulging me for a second bill. The purpose of Assembly Bill 127 is to ensure Nevada's expansion into Internet gambling moves ahead smoothly. The State Gaming Control Board and the Nevada Gaming Commission must first draft and adopt rules and regulations governing such gambling. It is important to have a system in place, such as this seal, to protect the consumers from fraudulent interactive gaming websites, mobile applications, or other means of fraudulent interactive gaming. [Continued to read prepared statement ([Exhibit I](#)) along with a slide show presentation ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Basically, the idea is to allow the regulatory body to create a seal that licensees can place on their websites to say that they have been licensed by the state of Nevada, they have gone through the process of being vetted, and they have the seal to show that. This will give the consumer comfort knowing they are on a quality site to conduct his gaming activities. This bill also provides for penalties for those who would usurp our name brand. I think it is valuable and we need to protect it. That is what this bill is proposed to do. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Segerblom:

Is this something you feel that needs to be in companion with the bill we just passed?

Assemblyman Horne:

I think it is supplemental; it is not as great an importance as the previous bill. This is another arrow in the quiver for us.

Chairman Frierson:

Any other questions for Mr. Horne? I see none. I will now move to those to testify in support of A.B. 127. I see no one. Is there anyone in Las Vegas to testify in support of A.B. 127? I see no one. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas to testify in a neutral position? I see no one. Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 127? I see no one. I will now close the hearing on A.B. 127.

I will open the meeting for public comment. I see none. Thank you very much. At this time, I will adjourn the joint hearing on Judiciary [at 10:49 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Thelma Reindollar
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Chairman

DATE: _____

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: February 21, 2013

Time of Meeting: 9:09 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 114	C	Assemblyman Horne	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 114	D	Assemblyman Horne	PowerPoint Presentation
A.B. 114	E	Governor Sandoval	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 114	F	Assemblyman Horne	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 114	G	Assemblyman Horne	Talking Points
AB114	H	Behnam Dayanim, representing Nevada Resort Association	Proposed Technical Changes
AB127	I	Assemblyman Horne	Talking Points
AB127	J	Assemblyman Horne	PowerPoint Presentation