

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

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

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:04 a.m. on Monday, February 25, 2013, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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](http://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](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair  
Assemblyman William C. Horne, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Paul Aizley  
Assemblyman Paul Anderson  
Assemblyman Andy Eisen  
Assemblyman Tom Grady  
Assemblyman John Hambrick  
Assemblyman Crescent Hardy  
Assemblyman Pat Hickey  
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan  
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
Assemblyman Randy Kirner  
Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien  
Assemblyman Steven Brooks  
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Michael J. Chapman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel  
Nate Helton, Committee Secretary  
Cynthia Wyett, Committee Assistant

Chair Carlton began the meeting by inviting Assemblyman Hardy to introduce his guests in the audience.

Assemblyman Hardy thanked Chair Carlton and introduced a group of students from Virgin Valley High School and Moapa Valley High School in the Clark County School District. Mr. Hardy said the two high schools had the highest graduation rates in Clark County. He asked that members of the Committee make the students feel welcome while they were visiting the Legislature.

Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Hardy and welcomed the students. Chair Carlton opened the hearing on the budget accounts within the Office of Energy.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
OFFICE OF ENERGY  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE ENERGY CONSERVATION (101-4868)  
BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-22**

Stacey Crowley, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor, introduced herself to the Committee. Ms. Crowley was accompanied by Brita Tryggvi, Deputy Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor. Ms. Crowley informed the Committee she would present a PowerPoint presentation with Office highlights and details of the budget accounts ([Exhibit C](#)).

Beginning on page 3 of [Exhibit C](#), Ms. Crowley said Office highlights over the last two years included:

- Thirteen utility-scale renewable energy projects received abatements for almost 600 megawatts (MW) of production; seven were in operation and the projects provided \$3.2 billion in capital investment.

- Over 460 MW of additional renewable energy projects in Nevada went online in 2011 and 2012.
- Fifteen projects received revolving loan funds from the \$12.8 million fund.

Ms. Crowley had updated figures for the last bullet point on page 3 ([Exhibit C](#)): 220 homes had completed the EnergyFit Nevada home-energy audit and upgrade program, and 369 homes were waiting to complete the program.

Ms. Crowley stated that the Office had conducted a \$1.2 million transmission-routing study through a nonprofit called the Nevada Energy Assistance Corporation (NEAC). The study revealed four primary routes for transmission expansion to western load centers.

Chair Carlton paused Ms. Crowley's presentation to take a question from Assemblyman Aizley.

Assemblyman Aizley asked Ms. Crowley if the abatements were 100 percent of the tax or only a portion of the tax. Ms. Crowley responded to Mr. Aizley's question by stating that the abatement equaled 55 percent of the property tax, in addition to a three-year abatement of [local] sales and use taxes. Mr. Aizley thanked Ms. Crowley for her answer.

Continuing with the Office highlights on page 4 ([Exhibit C](#)), Ms. Crowley said the Office signed a memorandum of understanding with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to collaborate on renewable energy and transmission projects throughout the state to help with permitting issues. She said the two agencies met every 45 to 60 days and that the situation was progressing very well.

Ms. Crowley explained that the Governor signed Executive Order 2011-18 to further transmission planning and business case studies for renewable energy in the state. The case studies were conducted through the New Energy Industry Task Force within the Office of Energy.

Ms. Crowley informed the Committee that she was currently the chair of the Western Interstate Energy Board and a board member of the National Association of State Energy Officials.

Ms. Crowley continued to the last page of Office highlights on page 5 of [Exhibit C](#). She said the state adopted the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code as its first energy conservation code in the last biennium.

The Office also collected energy data for the approximately 3,000 state-owned buildings in Nevada. This was the first attempt at tracking such data, and Ms. Crowley said the Office was moving forward with continuing to track that data for the long term.

Ms. Crowley said the Office was awarded three competitive grants through the United States Department of Energy in 2011 and 2012: the commercial building retrofit grant for \$746,048, set to expire this year; funding for the Nevada Rooftop Solar Initiative for \$609,000 that expired this month; and the public facility retrofit grant for \$715,000, set to expire in 2015.

For the last highlight on page 5, Ms. Crowley said the Office collaborated with the state of California and the state of Utah on the creation of a liquid natural gas fueling station for the regional truck route in Las Vegas.

Moving on to page 6 of [Exhibit C](#), Ms. Crowley stated the Office of Energy conducted its business under two of the Governor's seven core functions of government: Business Development and Services (75 percent) and Resource Management (25 percent). The Office strove to meet three objectives under these core functions: consumer education, economic diversification, and protection of resources.

Ms. Crowley directed the Committee to page 7 of [Exhibit C](#) for an explanation of the Office's activity, which the Office had worked with the Department of Administration to refine down to one primary activity:

Working closely with decision makers, state and local agency partners, and industry stakeholders, the Office of Energy develops programs, plans, and incentives in Nevada to improve the state's economy, reduce energy consumption and fossil fuel use, promote clean energy-related development, and improve the quality of life for Nevadans.

The Office developed three performance measures with those activities in mind. Instead of developing performance measures tied to grants that would expire as the Office had done in the past, Ms. Crowley said the Office developed three long-term, sustainable performance measures: (1) the calculation of renewable energy generated, with a goal of a 5 percent increase per year; (2) per capita energy consumption, with a goal of a 0.5 percent decrease per year; and (3) energy consumption in state-owned buildings, designed to align the Office with state statute [*Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 701.215] that mandated a reduction in energy consumption of 20 percent by 2015. Ms. Crowley stated the Office used 2005 as a baseline year for the third

performance measure. The performance measures were explained in more detail on page 8 ([Exhibit C](#)).

Page 9 included information on budget highlights and a comparison of the Office's budget between the current biennium (fiscal years 2012 and 2013) and the upcoming biennium (fiscal years 2014 and 2015). Ms. Crowley said the goals and objectives of the Office were refocused in the past two years, and the duties of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Authority were merged into the Office of Energy. The Office also completed many American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) programs, said Ms. Crowley, and established the Renewable Energy Fund to begin accepting property tax revenues on July 1, 2012.

Ms. Crowley stated that the operational budgets for FY 2013 and FY 2015 were about the same, but that the dollars were significantly reduced—primarily because of a reduction in federal grant money.

Page 10 outlined the budget accounts within the Office of Energy ([Exhibit C](#)). The first budget account (BA) 4868, was the Office's operating budget. Ms. Crowley said that account was created under NRS 701.150 to operate the Office of Energy. Budget account 4869, Renewable Energy Fund, was created for the renewable energy tax abatement outlined in NRS 701A.450. Budget account 4875, Renewable Energy, Efficiency and Conservation Loan, was the third and final budget account and was created through NRS 701.575. Ms. Crowley said that account was commonly referred to as the "Revolving Loan Fund."

The pie charts on page 11 of [Exhibit C](#) displayed the revenues and expenditures within BA 4868 in detail. Ms. Crowley told the Committee that in FY 2015 the operating budget's revenues came from transfers out of the Renewable Energy Fund and the Revolving Loan Fund rather than from grant funds and other sources.

Ms. Crowley directed the Committee to pages 12 and 13 for the Office's organizational charts. The charts showed a reduction in full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions over the biennium from 14.51 FTE in fiscal years (FYs) 2012 and 2013 to 11 FTE in FYs 2014 and 2015. Two of the FTE positions up for elimination were currently vacant, stated Ms. Crowley.

A list of decision units included in the budget proposal for BA 4868 was on page 14 of [Exhibit C](#). Ms. Crowley did not discuss the items further, but said she would gladly answer questions from members of the Committee on the decision units if requested to do so.

Chair Carlton asked the members of the Committee whether there were any questions for Ms. Crowley pertaining to BA 4868.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick prefaced her question to Ms. Crowley by stating that she felt she was more familiar with the Office of Energy's budget accounts than most legislators were. Mrs. Kirkpatrick inquired about the amount of General Fund revenues included in the Office's approved budget for the 2011-2013 biennium.

Ms. Crowley replied to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick's inquiry by stating that the Office was allocated \$100 from the General Fund in the 2011-2013 budget.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick pointed out that "clean energy" was identified as one of the seven targeted industry sectors in *Moving Nevada Forward: A Plan for Excellence in Economic Development 2012-2014*—a state plan released by the Office of the Governor through the Office of Economic Development. Mrs. Kirkpatrick said she found it interesting that the Office of Energy received virtually no funds from the General Fund, despite clean energy being identified as a targeted industry sector that was key to economic development in the state. Instead, the Office's operations were dependent on property tax revenues and grant funding. Mrs. Kirkpatrick asked whether she was correct in stating that most of the Office's revenue was from grant funding, to which Ms. Crowley said she was correct. Mrs. Kirkpatrick added that she was under the impression the Office of Energy was the only state office that did not charge fees for applications.

Mrs. Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Crowley to explain to the Committee the reason that \$100 from the General Fund was included in the Office's budget for the 2011-2013 biennium. Mrs. Kirkpatrick also mentioned the Office's failure to meet revenue projections for the current biennium and asked Ms. Crowley to expand further on that matter.

In response to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick's first request, Ms. Crowley said the General Fund allocation of \$100 was included in the Office's budget to allow the Office to request a General Fund advance [from the Contingency Account] in each year of the 2011-2013 biennium in case the Office did not receive the projected property tax revenues.

As for the second question from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Crowley conceded that Mrs. Kirkpatrick was correct in stating that the Office had projected to bring in more revenue to the Renewable Energy Fund than it had over the 2011-2013 biennium. The Office expected to begin receiving property

tax payments from counties sooner than the payments were actually received, which Ms. Crowley claimed was a contributing factor to the shortfall.

Ms. Crowley stated that she and her staff had unrealistic expectations because of unfamiliarity with the systems used by counties to assess property taxes. Over the course of the last two years, Ms. Crowley and her staff learned how property was assessed in each county—which she found took place on varying schedules from county to county. She also learned how companies and organizations made property tax payments to the county, which she found differed between monthly, quarterly, annual, and lump-sum payment schedules. This was the reason why the Office did not receive some of the payments right away; the taxes were yet to be collected by the counties.

Ms. Crowley said that for the 2013-2015 biennium, she decided to operate using a 15-month delay from the date operations at a qualifying facility receiving the tax abatement began to the date the Office could expect to receive the first property tax payments for that operation. Ms. Crowley believed the 15-month delay was a conservative expectation for the Office's budget proposal and would help the Office avoid future revenue shortfalls.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Crowley whether she thought securing substantial funding from the General Fund would help to stabilize operations at the Office of Energy.

Ms. Crowley responded to the question from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick by informing the Committee that The Executive Budget included a General Fund allocation of \$115,774 in fiscal year (FY) 2014 for BA 4868. Ms. Crowley asserted that the support from the General Fund would help with the stabilization of the Office.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick reported that she was aware the Office had vacant positions long before Ms. Crowley joined the Office as Director. However, Mrs. Kirkpatrick asked whether the vacancies were contingent upon the grant process.

In response to the question from Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, Ms. Crowley said that the two vacant positions within the Office were funded through grants that had expired. The Office did not have funds to continue the positions, and they would be eliminated at the end of FY 2013. Ms. Crowley said that the Office was continuing to look for grant opportunities, but other than one significant grant proposal currently under consideration, there were not many available. The United States Department of Energy, along with most federal agencies, had reduced the amount of grant funding it made available.

Assemblyman Anderson requested that Ms. Crowley remind him of the number of projects that were currently operating in the state that received tax abatements through the Office of Energy's program.

Ms. Crowley responded to Assemblyman Anderson's question by stating that the value of the projects that had received tax abatements through the Office's program was approximately \$3.2 billion.

Assemblyman Anderson asked Ms. Crowley if she knew how many of the projects were federally funded or federally guaranteed. He was concerned about the possibility of a "trickle-down effect" occurring when fewer federal dollars that went into the projects negatively affected the amount of property taxes collected by the Office.

Ms. Crowley told Assemblyman Anderson that she did not know how many of the projects were funded with federal dollars. She knew of at least one, but knew nothing more.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked Ms. Crowley how the expiration of grant funding that led to the elimination of the positions in the Office was going to affect the Office's ability to accomplish the duties and responsibilities currently carried out by the positions.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Sprinkle, Ms. Crowley said the Office was attempting to "do more with less," just as other agencies had to do in recent years. Unfortunately, some projects would not receive funding and would be put on hold, but Ms. Crowley assured the Committee that the Office would continue to perform the duties and responsibilities required under statute. She hoped that transfers from the Renewable Energy Fund and Revolving Loan Fund would be able to assist the Office going forward.

Assemblyman Sprinkle followed Ms. Crowley's response by asking whether there was a connection between the Office's failure to bring in the projected revenue and the putting aside of some duties because of a lack of funding.

Ms. Crowley replied to Mr. Sprinkle's follow-up question by stating that the failure to meet the projections was almost entirely due to assumptions made concerning the Renewable Energy Fund. After learning how the property assessment process worked, as Ms. Crowley previously detailed, the Office had become much better in making its projections. Ms. Crowley stated the Office's last audit report was satisfactory and that she was pleased with the Office's performance.



Assemblyman Kirner inquired about the automatic across-the-board cuts known as sequestration, necessitated by the Budget Control Act of 2011, and whether Ms. Crowley expected the Office to be affected by such budget cuts.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Kirner, Ms. Crowley said the Office had completed a quick calculation of the effects sequestration could have on the Office, and it was determined that the Office could be negatively affected by about \$20,000 per year. Other than fewer grant opportunities available through federal outlets, she expected the Office had a low probability of being significantly affected by the sequestration.

Chair Carlton questioned Ms. Crowley on the significant shortcomings in the Office's revenue projections. While Chair Carlton acknowledged the difficulty in getting new programs up and running, she was very concerned that the Office would not be able to meet the projections for the upcoming biennium, which Chair Carlton claimed to be high. Chair Carlton asked Ms. Crowley what she planned to do internally should the Office again fail to meet the projections. If the Office was encountering problems with a particular government agency or a particular county in its attempts to collect the property taxes, Chair Carlton asked Ms. Crowley to inform the Committee so that the problems could be addressed.

Ms. Crowley told Chair Carlton she appreciated her remarks. In response to Chair Carlton's concerns, Ms. Crowley assured the Committee the Office was going to receive the property taxes in the projected amounts. Ms. Crowley mentioned again the decision to look 15 months ahead in making the projections, rather than the 3 months that the Office had done previously. If the projects or counties were not bringing in the money to the Renewable Energy Fund, Ms. Crowley said the Office would find a way to work with that agency in making the payments. A problem the Office sometimes encountered was a high level of turnover of staff in counties that the Office worked with on the tax abatement program. Ms. Crowley said she was confident that as the Office continued its efforts, more persons within the counties would understand the process and that problem would lessen.

Chair Carlton asked a follow-up question concerning any difficulties Ms. Crowley might have encountered in maintaining staff in the Office of Energy with the volatility that the Office had seen in recent years.

In response to Chair Carlton's follow-up question, Ms. Crowley said her staff had been very patient and understanding throughout the process. Most of the positions were funded by grants and therefore not affected by the tax

abatement program. Only a small number of positions were funded through the Renewable Energy Fund.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick noted that the Office would need to go through policy changes to begin charging fees for applications to be used as a possible funding source. Mrs. Kirkpatrick disclosed that she had been involved with working groups tasked with development of the clean energy industry sector. The working group had been searching for secure funding sources for the Office, but Mrs. Kirkpatrick conceded the efforts had proven to be very difficult. While Mrs. Kirkpatrick was confident the tax payments would come in as projected, she underscored the importance of establishing a permanent funding source.

When asked by Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick whether Ms. Crowley thought that was a fair statement, Ms. Crowley agreed that the statement was indeed fair. Ms. Crowley pointed out that the Office hoped to add more projects and in turn receive more funds that could potentially help fund various grant programs, incentive programs, and more.

Chair Carlton asked Ms. Crowley to go into more detail on the elimination of positions. She wondered what the costs associated with the eliminations would be, including whether there would be terminal leave payout costs.

In response to Chair Carlton's concerns, Ms. Crowley said the Office was looking at several options to avoid terminal leave payout costs for the eliminated positions. Should a payout be required, it would be approximately \$68,000 out of the budget for FY 2013, Ms. Crowley testified.

Chair Carlton told Ms. Crowley she had reservations about the Office's decision to lay off two staff and deal with the resulting termination costs while also including pay increases for the unclassified salaries in its budget request.

In response to the concerns raised by Chair Carlton, Ms. Crowley said the unclassified salary increases had been discussed for the last several years, and the intent was to make those salaries more comparable to similar positions in the state and across the country.

Chair Carlton thanked Ms. Crowley. Hearing no response to her request for questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on budget account (BA) 4868 and opened the hearing on BA 4869, Renewable Energy Fund.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS**  
**OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY**  
**RENEWABLE ENERGY FUND (101-4869)**  
**BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-33**

Stacey Crowley, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor, began her presentation on budget account 4869, Renewable Energy Fund.

Ms. Crowley said the projects that went through the Office's tax abatement program received a [local] sales and use tax abatement for 3 years and a property tax abatement for 20 years. The property tax abatement was equal to 55 percent of the property taxes assessed at the county level. The property taxes paid by entities receiving a tax abatement through the Office's program were divided into two parts: 55 percent went to the county in which the entity resided, and the remaining 45 percent went into the Renewable Energy Fund. Further, the funds deposited into the Renewable Energy Fund were divided into two parts: 75 percent went to offset the cost of electricity to retail customers of public utilities that were subject to renewable energy portfolio standards established by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) of Nevada; the remaining 25 percent was used to support staffing and operational costs of the Office of Energy. Ms. Crowley said the Office hoped to be able to use some of that portion of the revenues to put towards projects in the future.

Ms. Crowley said the PUC determined the statute that mandated a portion of the funds go toward offsetting the cost of electricity to retail customers would be most appropriately interpreted to state the Office of Energy would provide a rebate to retail customers of renewable energy utilities. The intent was to acknowledge the relatively high cost of renewable energy and to mitigate some of the additional costs for retail customers.

Ms. Crowley said that, if she remembered correctly, the Office decided it would issue the rebates in annual payments. Meanwhile, she hoped to have the fund earn interest and eventually make the transfer of the 25 percent allocated for operations within budget account 4868.

Page 16 of [Exhibit C](#) contained a list of projects receiving property tax abatements through the Office of Energy's tax abatement program. Ms. Crowley pointed out that the list also included the projected revenues the Office would receive from each project.

Ms. Crowley directed the Committee to page 17 of [Exhibit C](#) for a look into the various types of projects that were going through the Office's tax abatement

program. Solar and geothermal projects made up a majority, while solar also had the largest-scale projects of the group. The Office had one wind-energy project that was operating a 150-megawatt facility in Ely.

Page 18 of [Exhibit C](#) included a summary of the fiscal impact of each project. Ms. Crowley said the charts were useful tools in comparing the capital investments made by project developers versus the amount of tax abatements received for each project. The page also included a table that had information on second-quarter construction job figures for each project as well as permanent job figures for each project.

Ms. Crowley concluded her presentation on BA 4869.

In response to a question from Chair Carlton, Ms. Crowley said statute required 30 percent of workers at each project within the program to be Nevada citizens. She said she often found the percentage to be higher than 30 percent. The project developers were required to submit annual compliance reports to the Office and provide driver's licenses and any other necessary supporting documents.

Chair Carlton thanked Ms. Crowley for her response and said she remembered hearing about frustrations several years ago from persons who reported a large number of out-of-state license plates at construction sites. Chair Carlton asked Ms. Crowley to explain the process that occurred in making the determinations on the rebates with the PUC.

Ms. Crowley replied to Chair Carlton and stated that Office of Energy staff joined with PUC staff in making calculations about what the rebate would look like to the average retail customer and also to a large-scale customer. After discussion on several ideas, it was decided that the best method was to issue rebates based on kilowatt-hour (kWh) usage. The method resulted in insignificant rebates for residential customers, Ms. Crowley stated, but large-scale customers would receive a larger rebate. The dollar amount of the rebates would increase as the funds in the Renewable Energy Fund increased. Ms. Crowley informed the Committee that the Office agreed to revisit this matter annually to reassess the rebate program and to continue to discuss new programs that could increase the amount of the rebates to the retail customers.

Chair Carlton asked Ms. Crowley whether the rebate would be in the form of a credit on the customer's bill and in turn go directly back to NV Energy, bypassing the customer completely. Ms. Crowley stated that was correct. Chair Carlton observed that the rebate was very small.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick interjected to say that she would take the blame for the small rebates because it was her bill that created this statute [Assembly Bill No. 522 of the 75th Session was introduced by the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor, of which Mrs. Kirkpatrick was a member]. Mrs. Kirkpatrick said it was important to show the consumers that the state did not want them to pay for the extra costs associated with renewable energy projects, a matter that was discussed during the discussions on A.B. No. 522 two sessions ago. Consumers benefited when in-state companies managed renewable energy projects, said Mrs. Kirkpatrick, noting a 50 megawatts (MW) project in Boulder City that produced 349 jobs at an average wage of approximately \$38 per hour, plus benefits. The wages and resulting economic drivers were significantly higher than those seen in 2007, said Mrs. Kirkpatrick.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick claimed Ms. Crowley had done a very good job in her position considering the situation she inherited when she accepted the job. Mrs. Kirkpatrick said she warned the Office of the Governor against counting on money that was not there when balancing the budget, but the property tax revenue projections were how the Governor decided to fund the Office of Energy. The only way Mrs. Kirkpatrick thought the Office of Energy would be able to succeed was to fund it with General Fund dollars, or the Governor should discontinue clean energy as a targeted industry in his state plan.

Chair Carlton commented that it went without saying that while everyone looked forward to a nice rebate, the reality was that it took time for such a thing to build up. Chair Carlton called on Assemblyman Aizley for a question.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Aizley, Ms. Crowley said the rebate was the result of a calculation that distributed 75 percent of the dollars in the Renewable Energy Fund on a per-kilowatt-hour (kWh) basis; it was not done on an individual basis.

Hearing no response to her request for further questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on BA 4869 and opened the hearing on BA 4875, Renewable Energy, Efficiency and Conservation Loan.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS**  
**OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY**  
**RENEWABLE ENERGY, EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION LOAN (101-4875)**  
**BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-35**

Stacey Crowley, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor, directed the Committee to page 19 of [Exhibit C](#) for a brief overview of the budget

account (BA) for the Renewable Energy, Efficiency and Conservation Loan (BA 4875). Commonly known as the "Revolving Loan Fund," BA 4875 was developed with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds for the purpose of supporting a revolving loan account for the Office to use in granting loans to developers of renewable energy systems in Nevada. The account started with \$8 million, and Ms. Crowley testified that it had grown to \$12.8 million at the present time (most of which was currently loaned out to projects). As an interest bearing account, the Revolving Loan Fund continued to grow as loans were repaid and more loan applications were approved.

Ms. Crowley said that at the time of the last legislative session, the Revolving Loan Fund only provided loans to renewable energy projects in the state. After the last session, the Office expanded its eligible projects to include energy efficiency and conservation projects, which Ms. Crowley said she hoped to see more of in the future. The Office received loan applications on a rolling basis, and as funds were deposited back into the account, the Office would issue another solicitation for loan applications.

Ms. Crowley told the Committee a portion of the funds in the Revolving Loan Fund (BA 4875) was transferred into the Office of Energy (BA 4868) for the administration of the fund.

Ms. Crowley concluded her presentation on BA 4875.

Assemblyman Eisen asked about the status of the loan repayments and whether the Office had seen any delinquencies or defaults.

Ms. Crowley told Assemblyman Eisen there had been a few delinquent payments, but the Office tried to work with loan recipients that were having trouble making the monthly payments. To date, four loans had been repaid in full and no loans had been closed as delinquent.

Assemblyman Kirner asked whether the Office had received any applications for oil projects, saying he was aware that there was an interest in hydraulic fracturing [commonly known as "fracking"] projects within the state.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Kirner, Ms. Crowley said that because the Revolving Loan Fund had a fairly low-dollar threshold (loans were approved for amounts between \$100,000 and \$1 million), big oil exploration companies were not going to the Office of Energy for loans—that type of project required larger loans than the Office could provide. The Office had received requests concerning biofuel and liquid natural gas projects, however,

and Ms. Crowley said the Office would like to leverage those funds with larger pools of funding to help industries with clean energy technologies.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said she thought it was important for the Committee to understand that the initial funds in the Revolving Loan Fund had to be distributed out to loan recipients within three years of the fund's inception because the fund was originally funded through an ARRA grant. Mrs. Kirkpatrick pointed out, if she remembered correctly, that \$1.5 million was also transferred to the Revolving Loan Fund from the funds allocated to the Nevada Energy Assistance Corporation (NEAC).

Ms. Crowley said Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick was correct, but she thought the transfer was about \$1.2 million. Funds from other stimulus programs that could not be expended in time were also moved into the Revolving Loan Fund.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick repeated that she thought that background on the Revolving Loan Fund was important to note because the fund was one of the more successful stimulus projects in the state. Mrs. Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Crowley to talk about the increase in the number of projects the Revolving Loan Fund helped finance.

Ms. Crowley said that the Revolving Loan Fund was starting to receive the funds back into its account from its first loan recipients, and the fund had grown from its original amount of approximately \$8.2 million. Ms. Crowley was proud of what the Office had done with the fund and hoped to leverage the funds with other loan programs and opportunities.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said there had never been funds allocated for the administration of the Renewable Energy Fund except for the transfer out of the fund into BA 4868, which was the amount of interest income paid by loan recipients. Mrs. Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Crowley whether the current interest rate needed to be increased for the Office to have enough funds to adequately administer the Revolving Loan Fund.

Responding to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick's question, Ms. Crowley testified that in her opinion the current interest rate of 3 percent did not need to be increased. She restated her intent to put any additional interest income towards new loan opportunities if that option was available.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Crowley why the amount of interest income projected for fiscal year (FY) 2014 was approximately \$20,000 less than the amount recommended to be transferred to the Office of Energy for administration of the fund in The Executive Budget.

Ms. Crowley told Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick she did not know why the transfer was \$20,000 more than the projected interest income and would have to find out.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick wondered whether the transfer from NEAC into the Revolving Loan Fund had anything to do with the difference. Mrs. Kirkpatrick advised Ms. Crowley that the matter needed to be straightened out so that the Committee would be comfortable with discussing the administrative costs within the budget item.

Ms. Crowley thanked Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick for the question and assured the Committee she would look into the matter.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked Ms. Crowley to go into more detail about her previous comment on the attempts to decrease consumer energy consumption.

In response to the request from Assemblyman Sprinkle, Ms. Crowley said the Office had several successful grant programs that aimed to educate Nevada's citizenry on ways to reduce energy consumption. The EnergyFit Nevada program educated residential customers on the value of energy audits and was a successful program, said Ms. Crowley. Testimonials from participants of the EnergyFit Nevada program were outstanding, Ms. Crowley told the Committee. The Office also awarded a new competitive grant to the commercial building retrofit program. Like the residential audit program, the commercial building retrofit program aimed to find ways to make it easier for building owners to do retrofits within commercial buildings. A similar grant program existed specifically for public buildings as well.

Assemblyman Hogan asked Ms. Crowley whether the Office of Energy already had or would consider establishing employment goals within the Office for women and minorities. The Department of Transportation had such goals, which Mr. Hogan said impressed the Committee.

Ms. Crowley responded to Assemblyman Hogan and said that the Office did not have employment goals for the number of women and minorities employed within the Office, but she would talk with the Department of Transportation to learn more about its actions regarding the matter. The energy industry was set to experience a decline in qualified workforce, and now the Office was concerned with the development of an entire new workforce.



In response to a question from Assemblyman Grady, Ms. Crowley said the average length of the loans from the Revolving Loan Account was about 15 years, although participants were able to pay off the loan early if they desired.

Hearing no response to her request for additional questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton thanked Ms. Crowley for her presentation and called for public testimony.

Jeffrey Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), testified that NACO agreed with the comments made by Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick regarding the Renewable Energy Fund and the need to find additional revenue sources to operate the Office of Energy. Mr. Fontaine also said NACO was concerned about the 75 percent of dollars within the Renewable Energy Fund that went to offset electrical energy rates. The rebate was not a substantial amount, and while NACO would like to see a large rebate possible for residential customers, many counties had an immediate need for those tax revenues.

Lucas Foletta, General Counsel and Policy Director, Office of the Governor, wished to add the Governor's support for the Office of Energy's budget proposal, specifically for decision unit Enhancement (E) 806 in budget account 4868 that increased the salaries of the Director and the deputy director.

Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Foletta and said the Committee was in a tough position when a proposal increased salaries while also eliminating positions. The issue would need to be worked out in the end, said Chair Carlton.

Seeing no additional public comment, Chair Carlton opened the hearing on the Office of Veterans' Policy and Coordination, BA 1008.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS**  
**OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**  
**GOVERNOR'S OFFICE VETERAN'S POLICY & COORDINATION (000-1008)**  
**BUDGET PAGE ELECTED-52**

Caleb S. Cage, Captain, U.S. Army, Executive Director, Office of Veterans' Services (NOVS), introduced himself to the Committee. Mr. Cage was accompanied by Stephanie Day, Deputy Director, Budget Division, Department of Administration.

Pending approval of Assembly Bill 58, the Office of Veterans Policy and Coordination (OVPC) would become a new agency housed within the Office of the Governor. Mr. Cage stated the development of the OVPC was a product of the Green Zone Initiative, a recently completed statewide strategic plan conducted by the NOVS that made recommendations aimed at attracting service members, veterans, and their families to Nevada; mobilizing veterans' services providers throughout the state; and finding ways to improve the current offerings of veterans' services.

Mr. Cage said the OVPC would work to implement activities identified in the Green Zone Initiative through an interagency approach to issues in three main areas: (1) veterans in higher education, (2) veterans in the workforce, and (3) veterans' wellness benefits. A social networking site called the Green Zone Network would also be created to serve as an online platform for collaboration throughout the state. The Network was to be launched at an annual conference in August 2013.

Mr. Cage informed the Committee that the policy aspects of the OVPC were being considered in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs through Assembly Bill 58. Among the different changes to veterans' services in the state found within the bill, A.B. 58 would add the Interagency Council on Veterans Affairs to the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. The Interagency Council was established by the Governor through Executive Order 2012-15 (July 3, 2012) to identify and prioritize the needs of Nevada's veterans and to increase the coordination efforts of the public and private sectors to meet those needs.

Mr. Cage described the close working relationship that he expected to exist between the OVPC and the Interagency Council. The Interagency Council would create the vision, mission, and strategic objectives for the OVPC. More importantly, however, the Interagency Council would act as the "statewide driver," said Mr. Cage. The Interagency Council would work to coordinate the objectives of the OVPC and develop policy recommendations at the state level. The Executive Director of the OVPC would chair the Interagency Council and its members would be made up of agency leadership in the state as well as local government, federal government, and nonprofit organization representatives.

Mr. Cage told the Committee the OVPC would also develop veterans community councils throughout the state. The veterans' community councils would be community-level-equivalents of the Interagency Council and collaborate with local entities to identify veterans' needs and recommend policy changes to the Interagency Council. Their veterans community councils would be led by local elected officials, and its membership would consist of various local figures. The Interagency Council was set to meet on a quarterly basis, while the veterans'

community councils were to meet on either a monthly or a quarterly basis, said Mr. Cage.

Mr. Cage explained that through efforts to carry out the Green Zone Initiative, focus area efforts were created in the aforementioned categories of higher education, workforce, and wellness. Specific efforts were developed within each category, such as the Nevada Veterans Suicide Prevention Task Force within the wellness category. Mr. Cage stated that it was not a secret that suicide in the veteran community was a statewide problem, and the task force would work to generate recommendations to the OVPC regarding that problem.

Mr. Cage said he was currently in the process of developing a memorandum of understanding with the Nevada National Guard to embrace the Green Zone Initiative as part of the Guard's Military and Family Support Services.

All of this was anticipated to launch on August 1, 2013, repeated Mr. Cage, and the cycles would repeat annually thereafter.

In response to a question from Chair Carlton, Mr. Cage said the OVPC would employ three personnel: an Executive Director, a policy advisor, and an administrative assistant.

In response to a follow-up question from Chair Carlton, Mr. Cage stated the Office of Veterans' Services (NOVS) currently had approximately 235 employees.

Assemblyman Aizley mentioned that he thought some of the ideas brought up by Mr. Cage were great, but that he was concerned about the fiscal effect that new programs developed by the Interagency Council would have on the state's budget. Mr. Aizley said that, for example, should the Interagency Council recommend an education program for veterans in the state that was similar to the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 [commonly referred to as the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill] that would mean state funds would be used for a program for which federal funds were already available.

In response to the concerns raised by Assemblyman Aizley, Mr. Cage said the idea behind the Green Zone Initiative was not necessarily to develop new programs within the three focus areas. The initiative recognized that programs currently existed within higher education, and efforts in that area should focus more on success within higher education than access within higher education. The efforts would not attempt to make changes in the higher education funding formula, for instance, but rather work with the system on policy changes for veterans.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Aizley, Mr. Cage assured him the Interagency Council was including veterans in its discussions. Whether the OVPC was created or not, the Interagency Council planned to assist the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education in creating a council on veterans' affairs at the university level to better include veterans in discussions.

Assemblyman Grady asked Mr. Cage whether the position of Executive Director within the OVPC would be similar in salary to Mr. Cage's position [Executive Director of the Office of Veterans' Services]. Mr. Grady also inquired about whether the OVPC would fall under the authority of the NOVS or exist as a separate governmental entity.

In response to the questions from Assemblyman Grady, Mr. Cage said the NOVS [which would be called the Department of Veterans Services after the passage of A.B. 58] would remain as a cabinet-level agency, and the OVPC would exist within the Office of the Governor. The Interagency Council on Veterans Affairs would continue to exist as a subcategory of the Governor's cabinet through the Executive Order that established it.

In response to a question from Assemblyman Hardy, Mr. Cage said the agencies would absolutely work together to leverage resources. The whole idea behind the creation of the OVPC, the Interagency Council, and the Green Zone Initiative was to maximize collaboration with respect to veterans' services, opportunities, and benefits in the State of Nevada.

The NOVS was programmatic in nature, Mr. Cage explained. The agency was funded to run a nursing home, two veterans' cemeteries (in Boulder City and Fernley), and the Veterans Service Officer program. The main purpose of the Office was to provide access to federal benefits for veterans in the state. The OVPC, on the other hand, would work to provide a way for Nevada veterans to access services and benefits at the local, state, and nonprofit levels.

Assemblyman Hardy questioned how the proposals would tie into the priorities and performance based budget (PPBB) funding structure. He also asked how the PPBB would reflect the performance of the collaboration among the different agencies.

Mr. Cage said that while he would expect performance measures would be developed, he asked that Ms. Day provide more information on that matter.

Stephanie Day, Deputy Budget Director, Budget Division, Department of Administration, introduced herself to the Committee. Ms. Day said the budget request for the OVPC included three nonclassified positions and associated

operating costs, including office furniture, computers, and software. The request for fiscal year (FY) 2014 was \$226,862 and the request for FY 2015 was \$277,649. The cost allocations from the Department of Administration for human resources and accounting functions were inadvertently left out of the budget request, said Ms. Day, and would be submitted in a future budget amendment. Ms. Day stated she would be happy to answer any budget-related questions for this budget account.

In response to question from Assemblyman Eisen, Mr. Cage said the OVPC was created as an entity within the Office of the Governor and not within the NOVS because of the special convening authority of the Office of the Governor. Additionally, the policy development and coordination efforts of the OVPC were not in line with the current duties of the NOVS (the veterans' nursing program, administration of the state veterans' cemeteries, and the Veterans Service Officer program).

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked Mr. Cage whether any possible revenue sources besides the General Fund had been identified. Mr. Sprinkle also inquired about any possible recruitment problems the OVPC might encounter because of what Mr. Sprinkle considered low salaries for the positions in relation to job responsibilities, particularly for that of the administrative assistant position.

Mr. Cage responded to Assemblyman Sprinkle by assuring the Committee that many different revenue sources were looked at in drafting the OVPC's budget proposal. License plate gift account funds could be shared between the NOVS and the OVPC to provide funding to veterans community councils; the funds had already supported the planning and establishment efforts of the Green Zone Network website. The Green Zone Initiative included a financing plan that aimed to leverage funds with federal dollars, which would become a major focus going forward. Mr. Cage said additional revenue possibilities included support from nonprofits and the use of AmeriCorps Vista volunteers to assist in staffing needs.

In response to the second question from Assemblyman Sprinkle, Mr. Cage stated he did not anticipate a hiring problem, and performance standards could be adjusted if such problems arose.

In response to a follow-up question from Assemblyman Sprinkle, Mr. Cage said he was very comfortable with having just three staff positions in the OVPC. The duties of the OVPC could be carried out effectively because it would be working side-by-side with the NOVS, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Office of the Military, and other state agencies.

Assemblyman Hogan raised concerns about problems some veterans encountered when looking for employment. Mr. Hogan received occasional complaints from unsatisfied veterans relating to that matter, and he asked Mr. Cage whether there was a plan to monitor the internal complaint workload.

Responding to the question from Assemblyman Hogan, Mr. Cage said he spoke to a matter that the creation of the OVPC and the Interagency Council for Veterans Affairs intended to address. While the NOVS maintained working relationships with organizations in Nevada that it could direct veterans to for employment assistance, the state employees specifically responsible for veteran employment were housed within the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR)—not the NOVS. The NOVS was not funded or structured for such purposes. Mr. Cage also stated the NOVS began an internal feedback process similar to customer service surveys in the last year; Mr. Cage suggested the NOVS would be able to conduct external feedback processes moving forward.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any more questions from members of the Committee. Seeing none, Chair Carlton told Mr. Cage she was most concerned about the potential for competition and a lack of coordination between the NOVS and the OVPC. She was particularly concerned about confusion that could arise from the word "veteran" in both agency titles and a person not knowing which agency to talk to about his particular matter.

Mr. Cage assured Chair Carlton he did not expect any substantial competition to arise between the NOVS and the OVPC. As was mentioned earlier, the OVPC would not be staffed to provide direct services to veterans, service members, families, or families of fallen soldiers. Both agencies would have a responsibility to advance the agenda of the Governor, which Mr. Cage claimed would deter any sense of competition.

Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Cage for his response.

Assemblyman Eisen told Mr. Cage he wanted to emphasize his concerns about separating the OVPC and the NOVS and why separating them was better than combining them. Mr. Eisen felt Mr. Cage's explanation of the reasoning behind that decision was lacking.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked Mr. Cage if he knew whether the services of the OVPC would be provided through other agencies if the OVPC was not approved by the Legislature. Mr. Sprinkle asked whether there would be a way in such a situation to continue to provide the important services—such as suicide prevention efforts—that were proposed to be provided by the OVPC.

Mr. Cage first responded to the concerns expressed by Assemblyman Eisen, noting that he did not view the proposed structural changes as a separation of efforts. The NOVS would continue to be as much of a part of the statewide conversation on veterans' services as it was now; through the proposed changes, the conversation would be "augmented" by other agencies that dealt with veterans (Department of Corrections, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Public Safety, Office of the Military, et cetera) through the Interagency Council on Veterans Affairs.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Sprinkle, Mr. Cage said there was a contingency plan in place in case the changes were not approved—saying that it would be silly not to have one—but that the level of services would be greatly reduced.

In response to a question from Assemblyman Kirner, Mr. Cage said the personnel and operations of the OVPC would be housed in southern Reno. The office space for rent was identified with assistance from the Department of Administration.

Hearing no response to her request for further questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Cage and Ms. Day for their testimony and called for public testimony. There being no public testimony, she closed the hearing on BA 1008 and opened the hearing on BA 3920, Public Utilities Commission.

**COMMERCE & INDUSTRY**  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (224-3920)**  
**BUDGET PAGE PUC-11**

Crystal Jackson, Executive Director, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC), introduced herself to the Committee. Ms. Jackson was joined before the Committee by Anne-Marie Cuneo, Director of Regulatory Operations, PUC, and Donna Skau, Commission Secretary, PUC. Ms. Jackson provided a handout titled "Public Utilities Commission, 2013-2015 Biennium Budget Request" ([Exhibit D](#)).

Beginning on page 2 of [Exhibit D](#), Ms. Jackson provided an explanation of the PUC. The PUC was a regulatory agency that ensured investor-owned utilities complied with state law. The basic regulatory duties of the agency were to provide for safe, economic, and efficient operation and service of public utilities, Ms. Jackson explained, and to balance the interests of customers and shareholders of public utilities. The agency accomplished these duties by

providing utilities with the opportunity to earn a fair return on their investments, while providing customers with just and reasonable rates. Reading from page 2 of [Exhibit D](#), Ms. Jackson explained the duties of the PUC further:

The Public Utilities Commission regulates public companies engaged in electric, natural gas, telephone, water, and sewer services; gas and electric "master meter" service at mobile home parks; some propane systems; and is involved in monitoring gas pipeline and railroad safety.

Ms. Jackson noted the agency's mission, vision, and philosophy statements could be found on page 3 of [Exhibit D](#).

Page 4 of [Exhibit D](#) contained the agency's organizational chart. Ms. Jackson stated that the PUC employed 96 full-time employees. The agency was divided into two general sections: policy and support staff and regulatory operations staff. The regulatory operations staff worked as an independent investigatory arm of the PUC comprised of accountants, economists, attorneys, engineers, and compliance investigators. Ms. Jackson informed the Committee the three commissioners on the Public Utilities Commission were appointed by the Governor to four-year, staggered terms, and one commissioner served as Chair.

An overview of the agency's priorities and performance based budget (PPBB) could be found on page 5 ([Exhibit D](#)). The agency fit into the Business Development and Services core function of government, said Ms. Jackson, and the agency had identified five activities and four support activities within the budget request. Listed on page 5 of [Exhibit D](#), the activities and support activities were as followed:

- Activities
  - Safety programs
  - Consumer complaints, outreach, and media activities
  - Rate and rule makings
  - Electric and water resource planning
  - Certificates, licenses, and permits
- Support Activities
  - Fiscal
  - Information technology
  - Personnel and payroll
  - General administration



Ms. Jackson directed the attention of the Committee to page 6 of [Exhibit D](#) for a summary of information about the annual regulatory assessment related to the agency's budget request.

- The rate would be 2.42 mills for both years of the biennium (statutory maximum rate was 3.5 mills).
- The assessments would generate approximately \$19.7 million in revenue over the biennium.
- The rate was assessed on all public utilities in the state.
- The optimum reserve balance was between \$2.2 million and \$2.7 million or roughly 25 percent of expenditures.
- The projected reserve was estimated at \$1.9 million at the end of fiscal year 2015.

The Public Utilities Commission did not receive any dollars from the General Fund, Ms. Jackson noted for the Committee.

Continuing onto page 7, revenues included up to 50 percent reimbursement from a federal grant for the PUC's gas pipeline safety program ([Exhibit D](#)). Additional revenue came from money received for the PUC's rail-safety inspection program—fees from the Beatty Storage Facility—and a rail assessment on tonnage going into, out of, or through the state. The agency also retained less than 0.5 percent of funds collected from the universal energy charge, which the agency was tasked with collecting and transferring to the Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry, and Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS), Department of Health and Human Services, for weatherization and energy assistance to qualified customers. The revenue collected from those efforts supported the collection costs, Ms. Jackson stated.

Additional information on revenues within budget account (BA) 3920 continued on page 8 ([Exhibit D](#)). Ms. Jackson pointed out the majority of revenue came from the mill assessment.

Ms. Jackson said the Public Utilities Commission had one enhancement request in its budget proposal [decision unit Enhancement (E) 250], outlined on page 10 ([Exhibit D](#)). The decision unit reflected the agency's request for expert consultants on matters involving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The request would allow the PUC to respond to changes in policy direction at the federal level,

especially when state jurisdictional issues were involved. The consultants would be based out of Washington, D.C., Ms. Jackson reported.

Decision unit E-250 also included a request for an expert depreciation studies consultant to assist regulatory operations staff in handling two upcoming cases, one involving Sierra Pacific Power Company [northern Nevada subsidiary of NV Energy, Inc.] and one involving NV Energy. Ms. Jackson maintained the PUC did not currently have in-house expertise in certified depreciation cases.

Ms. Jackson stated the PUC also expected new telecommunication cases to come forward in the upcoming biennium because of changes made by the FCC. Decision unit E-250 included a request for expert consultants for this matter as well.

Ms. Jackson proceeded to pages 11, 12, and 13 of [Exhibit D](#) for an overview of the budget account's expenditures, of which she reported had little significant changes. The PUC was in the process of transferring its agency-owned vehicles to state motor pool leases. Ms. Jackson detailed the vehicle operations, which could be found on page 12 ([Exhibit D](#)).

The remainder of the presentation was in respect to the agency's performance measures, Ms. Jackson noted. Ms. Jackson concluded her presentation on the Public Utilities Commission (BA 3920) and made herself available to answer questions from members of the Committee.

In response to a question from Assemblyman Aizley, Ms. Cuneo said she believed the FCC had jurisdiction over whether or not Wi-Fi, broadband, or another means of Internet access could be regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. Ms. Cuneo admitted that she was more familiar with electric and gas utilities than she was with telecommunications utilities and told Mr. Aizley she would have someone contact him after the hearing.

Assemblyman Hogan stated that he thought some interesting and challenging decisions regarding water issues would be made this year. Mr. Hogan requested background on the work done by the PUC concerning water issues and the role the agency expected to play in those discussions moving forward.

In response to Assemblyman Hogan, Ms. Cuneo said the water issues facing the PUC had changed significantly over the past decade. She talked about the struggles that many water-usage facilities faced about 10 years ago in the state, which led to the use of integrated resource plans by the PUC. The plans contained growth forecasts, usage data, and available water rights. The integrated resource plans had become minimal now, claimed Ms. Cuneo, due to

the decline in building and slow growth in Nevada. In recent years, the PUC focused on safety and water-quality matters, specifically on those pertaining to compliance and operations.

Assemblyman Hogan requested Ms. Cuneo to comment on the size and specialties of her staff.

Ms. Cuneo replied to Assemblyman Hogan with a detailed list of positions within the regulatory operations arm of the Public Utilities Commission. Staff included:

- Nine or ten accountants in the financial analysis division.
- Three water engineers, four gas pipeline safety engineers, and four electrical engineers in the engineering division.
- Eight economists in the resource and market analysis division.
- Seven or eight attorneys in the legal division.
- Six complaint investigators in the consumer complaint resolution division.

Chair Carlton asked Ms. Jackson to explain the increase in the number of complaints received by the PUC in fiscal year (FY) 2012—an increase to over 5,000 complaints through emails and phone calls. Chair Carlton asked whether that was due to rate increases and where Ms. Jackson expected to be with the consumer resolution division's workload in the future.

In response to the question from Chair Carlton, Ms. Jackson said the spike in complaints was primarily due to matters relating to smart meters. There were many questions from the public regarding cost, safety, health, and privacy issues related to smart meters. Ms. Jackson anticipated the number of complaints to drop now that the smart-meter proceedings were completed. The PUC decided on administering a trial opt-out provision for smart-meter usage.

Assemblyman Aizley asked Ms. Jackson whether the problems concerning smart meters were resolved. He said he was familiar with the problems in southern Nevada, but not in northern Nevada.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Aizley, Ms. Jackson said the PUC had finished with its proceedings on smart meters. The problems

started in 2010 when the utility asked to use the smart meters in an integrated resource filing. In 2011, the PUC opened an investigation into the privacy, health, and safety concerns of the smart meters. The investigation was completed, and the utilities recently filed a request to administer an opt-out plan, which the PUC agreed to conduct on a trial basis through December 2014. Ms. Jackson was under the assumption the utility had begun sending letters to those interested in pursuing the opt-out measure. The smart-meter problems were over for the moment, Ms. Jackson opined, but the PUC planned to revisit the matter and would continue to monitor the activities of the program.

Chair Carlton said she had serious concerns about the pilot volunteer project and the potential for other ratepayers to bear the brunt of those efforts. In regard to the mill assessment, Chair Carlton said it seemed as though it had been working out well; the PUC had maintained the correct level of reserves. She asked Ms. Jackson whether a reevaluation was conducted every year.

In response to the question from Chair Carlton, Ms. Jackson said Chair Carlton was correct; the PUC set the regulatory assessment in May for the duration of one calendar year. The figure of 2.42 mills placed in the budget was an estimate, said Ms. Jackson; the actual assessment was presently set at 2.28 mills. The PUC would make an adjustment in May 2013.

Chair Carlton thanked Ms. Jackson for the information. Hearing no response to her request for further questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton called for public testimony. There being no public testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on BA 3920 and opened the hearing on the budget accounts within the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIAL  
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (101-2630)  
BUDGET PAGE LEGISLATIVE-16**

Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, introduced himself to the Committee. Mr. Combs informed the Committee that he would not spend much time presenting the budget account (BA) for the Interim Finance Committee (BA 2630).

The account was funded with the amount that remained in the account at the end of the previous biennium, and there was no funding in The Executive Budget, said Mr. Combs. The fund balance was restored through the Appropriations Act at the end of the session.

**LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIAL  
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU (327-2631)  
BUDGET PAGE LEGISLATIVE-9**

Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), proceeded to his presentation on the LCB, budget account (BA) 2631.

Mr. Combs pointed out that Committee members might notice a few differences from last session's hearing on BA 2631. Mr. Combs' predecessor, Lorne Malkiewich, retired from his position after the end of the last legislative session. Mr. Combs told the Committee he probably did things differently than Mr. Malkiewich, and he apologized if he ended up being worse at testifying than Mr. Malkiewich. Another difference the Committee members might have noticed was the development of performance measures for BA 2631, which the LCB was directed to do after the last legislative session. Mr. Combs noted that he hoped the performance measures would prove to be useful, saying that he thought the process of developing the measures was useful in and of itself.

Mr. Combs presented to the Committee a budget-overview document to accompany his testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

Budget account 2631 included funding for 247.25 full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions. During the budget reductions of the last few years, the LCB decided to leave positions vacant rather than have them eliminated. The LCB currently had 31 vacant, unfunded positions in addition to the 247.25 funded FTE positions. There was also funding for intermittent positions in three division budgets.

A table on page 2 of [Exhibit E](#) contained a brief explanation of revenues and expenditures in BA 2631. The Executive Budget recommended General Fund appropriations for fiscal year (FY) 2014 of approximately \$28.2 million and for FY 2015 of approximately \$28.5 million, an increase of about 2 percent from the approved budget for the last biennium. Mr. Combs believed the slight increase in BA 2631 was attributable to the personnel cost increases from the changes in decision units Enhancement (E) 670, E-671, and E-672 from the current biennium. Mr. Combs noted a reduction in the number of FTE from 248 to 247.25.

In consultation with legislative leadership at the time agency requests were being submitted, Mr. Combs decided to follow the Governor's budget instructions to determine LCB's General Fund cap for the 2013-2015 biennium: the instructions were to multiply the legislatively approved appropriation

from FY 2013 by two. Every Executive Branch agency was given those same instructions, said Mr. Combs. The only decision units contained in the budget request for BA 2631 were Maintenance (M) 100, M-300, and the aforementioned enhancements.

Costs associated with only the legislative session (session hires, legislator pay and travel, legislator operating supplies, et cetera) were not included in this budget request; those charges were funded from an appropriation approved at the start of the session through Senate Bill 1. Mr. Combs explained that at the end of the session, projections would be made for any costs for the remainder of the legislative session, and any requests would be included in the Appropriations Act.

Mr. Combs informed the Committee he would provide a summary of each of the budget highlights from the five divisions of the LCB: Administrative, Audit, Fiscal Analysis, Legal, and Research.

An overview of the Administrative Division began on page 3 of [Exhibit E](#). The Administrative Division was responsible for accounting, human resources, audio and video, communications, inventory, information technology (IT), parking, and shipping and receiving. The Administrative Division currently had 13 unfunded, vacant positions, said Mr. Combs. The only new and major expenditure proposals for the Administrative Division would be included in two "one-shot" bills that Mr. Combs said would come before the Committee separate from this budget account [specific bill numbers were not mentioned]. The bills would request funds for equipment needs and dues and registration fees to national organizations.

The total appropriation for the Administrative Division was recommended at approximately \$8.7 million in fiscal year (FY) 2014 and about \$9.1 million in FY 2015. Concerning total FTEs in the Administrative Division, the budget included a reduction of one-quarter FTE, bringing the total to 84.25 FTE.

Mr. Combs expressed that he felt it was his responsibility to mention challenges the LCB divisions were facing. With respect to the Administration Division, Mr. Combs stated that he thought there would be a need to find a way to address the work issues that were coming up with Information Technology Services Unit and the Broadcast and Production Services Unit. The current structure within those units—that required staff to do what they were asked as quickly as possible—was not the best going forward. Mr. Combs hoped the Legislature would agree to form an interim committee for persons interested in IT issues that could provide guidance and priorities over the interim period. The last interim was very busy in regard to IT projects, including projects such

as Granicus [technology for video streaming of meetings], mobile video streaming, the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) (including the upgrade of the notes functionality), and various other things done on a constant basis. Mr. Combs would like such projects to be tested and ready at the beginning of the legislative session, which was not the case this session.

Mr. Combs explained there were only two notable changes in the budget request for the Audit Division from the current biennium. Funding allocated in the current biennium for an audit of the Board of Medical Examiners was not included in the budget proposal for the upcoming biennium because statute required the audit to take place only once every eight years. With those savings, Mr. Combs stated the Audit Division had requested to purchase CCH TeamMate audit management software to automate the Division's current manual audit documentation and review processes. With the increased workload in the Division because of four vacant positions, Mr. Combs said the LCB thought the audit software could help the Division manage its normal operations. The recommended appropriation for the Audit Division was approximately \$3.2 million for each year of the 2013-2015 biennium, and FTE levels would be maintained at 26 funded positions.

Mr. Combs said the Fiscal Analysis Division currently had one unfunded, vacant position. The only significant increase in the Division's budget was in contract costs related to the EDmin school finance information contract, which was projected to increase by approximately \$21,500 in FY 2014 and approximately \$22,000 in FY 2015. The Division's General Fund appropriation was approximately \$3.3 million in FY 2014 and approximately \$3.4 million in FY 2015, and the Division operated with 26 funded FTE positions.

A major challenge the Fiscal Analysis Division continued to face was related to a high FTE turnover rate, which Mr. Combs called unprecedented. Currently 9 of 21 professional positions within the Division were filled with persons in their first or second legislative session with the Division, and all 5 of the top management-level positions in the Division were in those positions for their first or second Session. When attempting to determine the cause of this problem, Mr. Combs said he found a major factor to be a strange set of circumstances in which many persons retired around the same time. The Division was now experiencing a "vicious cycle" where new employees were tasked with learning the details of various agency budgets and had to put very long hours in at work. This led some new employees to make the decision that the position was not for them, and those positions would again be filled with new employees that needed to go through the training process. In attempting to combat the turnover problem, the Division began bringing in persons who were experienced

in budgeting and retired from normal employment. This was done to help train new employees, increase the knowledge level of the Division, and to decrease the workload for the permanent employees who were trying to learn the ropes. Mr. Combs was hopeful this would help the Division overcome its struggle with high turnover rates.

The Legal Division of the LCB had to make reductions for the upcoming biennium, said Mr. Combs. This was due to the amount of revenues the Division was required to generate on its own, which were gradually dwindling. Because of a lack of revenue and a cap on General Fund appropriations, the Legal Division was required to reduce expenditures for the upcoming biennium. The expenditure reductions were primarily in the areas of contract services and subscription and publication costs. The Division filled some of its vacant positions during the current biennium by eliminating other funded positions as they became vacant. The Division currently had six vacant, unfunded positions and 67 funded FTE positions. The recommended General Fund appropriation was approximately \$8.1 million in FY 2014 and approximately \$8.1 million in FY 2015 as well.

Although the State Printing Office (BA 1330) was a part of the Legal Division, it had its own budget that would be presented separately from the current budget account. The State Printing Office did not have an effect on the General Fund because it was funded entirely with sales revenue from printed items.

Mr. Combs said that challenges within the Legal Division of the LCB included declining revenues from non-General Fund sources. As the world became more technology-driven, the demand for printed materials decreased. To compensate for the loss of revenue, the Legal Division attempted to sell electronic versions of materials with special features, but the Division had not been able to raise much revenue from that venture. When the Division decided to put many materials online for free a few years ago, Mr. Combs explained, that made it so persons did not have to pay for materials that the Division could now sell to them. Mr. Combs said he brought this up to the Committee because it created a budget problem for the Legal Division that would continue to be a problem going forward. Mr. Combs thought the Legislature should look at the situation and decide whether it wanted the Legal Division to focus on legal opinions and bill drafts or on being salespersons. He advised a possible solution was to put the sales revenue into the General Fund, but admitted that it would probably have a negative effect on the General Fund.



The Research Division of the LCB contained no major new items in this budget request. The Division requested an increase in its travel budget, noting savings generated by the transfer of the Constituent Services Unit from nonstate-owned building space into the Sedway Office Building during the current biennium. The recommended General Fund appropriation for the Research Division was approximately \$4.6 million in each year of the biennium, with 43 FTEs in each year (a reduction of 1 FTE from the previous biennium). The Research Division currently had 7 vacant unfunded positions.

Mr. Combs said the workload of the Research Division had shifted in recent years from legislative research requests to more constituent services work. Mr. Combs said he thought the LCB needed to conduct an internal review of the Research Division's workload during the upcoming interim period. The LCB needed to determine whether the Division was structured in a way that was appropriate for the type of work it was asked to do. Mr. Combs felt such a review should request input from legislators regarding the types of research materials a legislator used and how those materials were accessed. With the progression of technology in recent years, activities previously done by the Research Division could now be performed by using a personal computer and a search engine. Mr. Combs also suspected an increased use of caucus staff was a factor in the decreased use of Research Division staff. Mr. Combs stressed the need to find the best way to use the talents of Research Division staff to help legislators receive information and enact good policy.

Three session hires in positions previously located in Carson City were now in Las Vegas for the Constituent Services Unit. According to Mr. Combs, that was a direct result of the Division hearing requests from legislators in southern Nevada for assistance with constituent matters.

Chair Carlton paused Mr. Combs' testimony for a question from Assemblyman Hickey.

Assemblyman Hickey asked Mr. Combs whether he was suggesting that legislators could be making better use out of legislative research staff during the legislative session.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Hickey, Mr. Combs said he did not necessarily know whether Research Division staff was being underutilized, but that he was concerned about the shift in the staff's workload. The shift included a reduction in regular policy research requests that had been the focus of what the Research Division had done in the past. Mr. Combs told Mr. Hickey that he suggested to legislators to never hesitate to call the Research Division if there were policy issues that needed to be researched.

The last portion of the LCB's budget (BA 2631) was on the Legislative Commission and Committees. Mr. Combs said The Executive Budget recommendations for the 2013-2015 biennium, as well as the approved budgets for the current and previous biennia, did not include any funding for out-of-state travel expenses for legislators. Because of the cap on requested General Fund appropriations set at two times the approved amount for fiscal year (FY) 2013, Mr. Combs said it was impossible to include funding for legislator travel. If the Committee wished to restore funding for legislator travel, it would need to be added to the budget later.

Mr. Combs said the challenge with putting the Legislative Commission and committees portion of this budget together was the cap on General Fund dollars. The expenditures for the interim studies usually occurred in the even-numbered years, but the cap was based on twice the FY 2013 funding. Mr. Combs said it was difficult to get this budget back up to the level that it was approved at from the last biennium, and he asked the Committee to consider this budget account (BA 2631) for additional funding during the budget-closing process.

Mr. Combs told the members of the Committee he would assist them by watching the number of bills that went before the Legislature for new interim studies, new statutory committees, and similar projects. He would advise them when he felt the resources did not match up to the need.

The Nevada Legislature was hosting the annual conference of the Council of State Governments-*WEST* (CSG-*WEST*) in Las Vegas this summer, Mr. Combs informed the Committee. Senator Kelvin Atkinson was leading that effort, but Mr. Combs told the Committee that its staff was involved in planning throughout the session. Because the conference was to be held in Las Vegas and staff was located in Carson City, Mr. Combs expected to see a shortfall in funding for travel expenses. While the world would not come to an end if there was not funding for travel for the CSG-*WEST* conference, other travel expenditures throughout the remainder of the biennium would have to be reduced.

Mr. Combs finished his presentation on BA 2631.

In response to a question from Assemblyman Hambrick, Mr. Combs said the Legislative Police budget was part of the Administrative Division. The positions within the Legislative Police were located within the 84.5 FTE positions Mr. Combs said were in the Administrative Division. Legislative Police staffing levels were reduced during the interim, and more staff was hired as the legislative session approached. Mr. Combs said the Legislative Police had

about 29 officers during the session and 11 during the interim. A number of intermittent officers worked during the interim, as well.

Assemblyman Hambrick said there would be a challenge because of overtime pay, an area that produced severe challenges in the past. Mr. Hambrick asked Mr. Combs whether there would be any supplemental changes to the budget going forward to reflect the overtime pay.

Mr. Combs responded that overtime pay would be funded through the appropriations made at the beginning and end of the legislative session. He said either he would find a way to save money elsewhere in session costs to cover the increased overtime, or the costs of the session would require an increase in the appropriation. Mr. Combs told the Committee he was committed to trying to avoid an increase in appropriations.

Assemblyman Hambrick thanked Mr. Combs for his response.

Chair Carlton said she was aware Mr. Combs was tracking legislation that would affect the Legislature in any way. She asked whether there was any such legislation that he found interesting.

In response to the question from Chair Carlton, Mr. Combs noted the proposed resolution that would change the legislative session to meet on an annual basis was particularly interesting.

Chair Carlton told Mr. Combs she wished not to discuss that today. Chair Carlton called on Assemblyman Hambrick for another question.

Assemblyman Hambrick asked Mr. Combs whether he could give the Committee any insight on how the sequester [the automatic across-the-board cuts necessitated by the Budget Control Act of 2011] would affect the operations of the Legislative Building and of the Executive Branch.

In response to the question from Assemblyman Hambrick, Mr. Combs said the LCB—BA 2631—was funded primarily through the General Fund and very little from federal funds. Mr. Combs stated the Legislature was lucky in that regard because the sequestration would not likely have a significant effect on the LCB's budget account. The best place to receive information on the effects of sequestration was the Budget Division, Department of Administration, and the Fiscal Analysis Division of the LCB, Mr. Combs pointed out.

Chair Carlton asked for more clarification on the "one-shot" bills that were coming at the end of the session.

Mr. Combs responded to Chair Carlton by stating that the two bills coming later in the session were for dues to national organizations such as the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and the CSG-WEST, and one-time building maintenance and information technology purchases. Mr. Combs stressed the need to replace old equipment, especially within the Broadcast and Production Services Unit.

Chair Carlton inquired about whether this was the appropriate time to discuss legislator travel allowances. A number of legislators had lobbied Chair Carlton about this matter because they had been hitting the cap on travel allowances on a regular basis. Chair Carlton mentioned that the state previously maintained a contract with Southwest Airlines that produced reasonably priced airfare for legislators.

In response, Mr. Combs told Chair Carlton that the costs for legislator travel expenditures were included in the \$15 million appropriation for session costs already approved through Senate Bill 1. The \$10,000 limit on supplemental travel was in statute, said Mr. Combs, and would require legislation to be changed.

In response to a follow-up question from Chair Carlton, Mr. Combs said that he did not know whether the travel expenditures limit had been increased since 1999. Mr. Combs told Chair Carlton he would look into it and get back to her with more information. Chair Carlton said she would appreciate it.

Assemblyman Hogan said he thought there might have been difficulties in making projections for this budget account because many of the requirements were variable and hard to predict. Mr. Hogan said he had noticed a delay in the work done by the Legal Division this legislative session and wondered whether that was caused by requests being submitted late by legislators or by the Legal Division taking longer than usual to process the requests. Mr. Hogan also requested more information about IssueTrak tickets.

In response to the first question from Assemblyman Hogan, Mr. Combs said that compared to last session, the Legal Division was behind on its work. However, Mr. Combs said that last session was the fastest that bills had ever been drafted and introduced. Mr. Combs stated that one reason the Legal Division had fallen behind this legislative session was due to its services being required for things that did not involve drafting legislation. Mr. Combs told Mr. Hogan he was not concerned that the Legal Division was not at the same output level as last session.

Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, said the Legal Division was more behind than it had been last session and that it was working very hard to catch up. One cause, said Ms. Erdoes, was legislators had waited until the deadline to submit details for bill draft requests (BDRs). Another cause for the backup was the moratorium the Governor placed on administrative regulations. Ms. Erdoes explained that the Legal Division was responsible for drafting and reviewing the administrative regulations of the Executive Branch agencies. Because of the moratorium, the Division was not able to finish those responsibilities by the July 1, 2012, deadline. The Division then had to work on administrative regulations at the same time it should have been working on bill draft requests. Ms. Erdoes assured the Committee the Legal Division was working hard to catch up and perform its duties well.

In response to the second question from Assemblyman Hogan, Mr. Combs explained that an "IssueTrak ticket" was something the Administrative Division used to track matters that required the Division's time and effort, such as computer problems, office moves, and picture frames that needed to be hung. Anytime a legislator had such a problem arise, a ticket would be created to ensure the right person in the Administrative Division received the request and was able to respond to it.

Hearing no response to her request for further questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on BA 2631 and opened the hearing on BA 1330, State Printing Office.

**LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIAL  
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
PRINTING OFFICE (741-1330)  
BUDGET PAGE LEGISLATIVE-20**

Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, told the members of the Committee that the State Printing Office was transferred from the Executive Branch to the Legislative Branch in 2003. As explained on page 1 of [Exhibit F](#), the Office provided offset and digital printing, copying, and related services to all three branches of state government and other government entities.

The budget was funded primarily through fee revenues in addition to a small amount of recycling income, Mr. Combs explained. The budget received no General Fund appropriations. Projected expenditures for the upcoming biennium were approximately \$2.8 million in fiscal year (FY) 2014 and approximately \$3 million in FY 2015. The only adjustments that were made to this budget

account from the previous biennium were to bring the expenditures more in line with what the Office actually experienced in FY 2012 rather than the budgeted amounts for FY 2012 and FY 2013, said Mr. Combs.

Hearing no response to her request for questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on budget account (BA) 1330 and opened the hearing on BA 2626, Nevada Legislature Interim.

**LEGISLATIVE-JUDICIAL  
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
NEVADA LEGISLATURE INTERIM (327-2626)  
BUDGET PAGE LEGISLATIVE-13**

Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), told the Committee that Susan Furlong, Chief Clerk of the Assembly, Nevada Legislature, was in the audience and that David A. Byerman, Secretary of the Senate, Nevada Legislature, had been in the audience earlier as well.

Mr. Combs said almost all of the funds in this budget were to fund position costs. The budget funded the positions of Chief Clerk of the Assembly and Secretary of the Senate as well as two permanent members of the staff for both the Chief Clerk and the Secretary, for a total of six full-time-equivalent positions. Mr. Combs stated the budget request had no significant changes from the current biennium, except for slight increases in personnel costs related to the changes in decision unit Enhancement (E) 670. The General Fund appropriation was \$619,763 in fiscal year (FY) 2014 and \$630,162 in FY 2015.

Mr. Combs pointed out that Mr. Byerman and Ms. Furlong put together performance measures for the Committee that were outlined on pages 1 and 2 of [Exhibit G](#).

Hearing no response to her request for questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Combs for his testimony.

Mr. Combs thanked the members of the Committee for their patience and understanding as he took on the responsibilities of Director of the LCB in the last year. He hoped the members of the Committee felt the staff at the Legislative Counsel had responded to recent matters in an efficient and nonpartisan manner.

Chair Carlton assured Mr. Combs she was very happy with the level of service that the LCB had provided.

Hearing no response to her request for any additional questions from members of the Committee, Chair Carlton called for public testimony. There being no public testimony, she closed the hearing on BA 2626.

Chair Carlton reminded the Committee that the Subcommittees on Human Services were to meet the following day to discuss the Health Division and the Subcommittees on General Government were to meet the following day to review budget accounts within the Department of Administration.

Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting at 10:47 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nate Helton  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

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

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Assembly Committee on Ways and Means

**Date:** February 25, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 8:04 a.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Stacey Crowley, Director, Office of Energy	Budget Overview Presentation
	D	Crystal Jackson, Executive Director, Public Utilities Commission	Budget Overview Presentation
	E	Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Legislative Counsel Bureau Budget Overview (BA 2631)
	F	Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau	State Printing Office Budget Overview (BA 1330)
	G	Richard Combs, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Nevada Legislature Interim Budget Overview (BA 2626)