

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
May 15, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Ben Kieckhefer at 6:05 p.m. on Friday, May 15, 2015, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Chair  
Senator Michael Roberson, Vice Chair  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Mark A. Lipparelli  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Debbie Smith (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Scott T. Hammond, Senatorial District No. 18  
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9  
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Lona Domenici, Committee Manager  
Emily Cervi, Committee Assistant  
Jason Gortari, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Steve Hill, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor  
Tara Hagan, Senior Deputy Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer  
Deonne E. Contine, Executive Director, Department of Taxation  
Mike Bertoldi, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife  
Patrick Cates, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife  
Joel Blakeslee, Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife  
Caron Tayloe  
Margaret Flint, Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I will open tonight's hearing with Senate Bill (S.B.) 507.

**SENATE BILL 507:** Revises provisions relating to economic development.  
(BDR 18-1204)

**Steve Hill (Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor):**

Senate Bill 507 relates to the Catalyst Account. Currently, the Legislature has funded and approved the Nevada Catalyst Fund. Over the past two Sessions, they have provided \$11.5 million in funding for that program. The Catalyst Fund allows us to attract new businesses to our State, helps grow businesses in our State and has been the most effective economic development tool in the State. Senate Bill 507 proposes to create the Catalyst Account, which is a transferable tax credit program. The Catalyst Account is different from the Catalyst Fund, which is currently a cash-funded program. Governor Brian Sandoval's original recommendation for this budget was a \$10 million additional contribution to the Catalyst Fund. As of this morning, the \$10 million contribution was removed from the budget.

Senate Bill 507 would allow transferable tax credits of \$500,000 in FY 2016, \$2 million in FY 2017 and then \$5 million a year for subsequent years after the next biennium. The Governor's recommended budget proposed the elimination of a \$10 million contribution to this program. The transferable tax credits included because of this bill would result in a net savings of \$7.5 million to the budget in the next biennium.

The typical agreements we reach with companies are between 3 to 5 years. The Catalyst Fund program is a performance-based program that is not called out in legislation. We implemented the Catalyst Fund program to reach out to companies that will create jobs. The companies must have jobs in place prior to receiving funding from the Catalyst Fund.

We will implement the program under the Catalyst Account with transferable tax credits in a way similar to the Catalyst Fund program. We will administer the program in a way similar to the film tax credits and the tax credits in Senate Bill No. 1 of the 28th Special Session.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Are these tax credits paid for in advance, which is different than what we have seen in others we are dealing with now?

**Mr. Hill:**

The Catalyst Fund currently requires cash in a checking account to pay for tax credits in advance, which will allow the expenses to be paid when costs are actually incurred.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Is the \$2.5 million in this bill accounted for in the General Fund projections for the Economic Forum?

**Mr. Hill:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Does the bill itself not present a fiscal deficit of \$2.5 million in the upcoming biennium?

**Mr. Hill:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

The bill was heard and passed by the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development. I will close the hearing on S.B. 507 and move into work session on S.B. 276.

**SENATE BILL 276**: Revises provisions governing the registration of certain medical marijuana establishments. (BDR S-996)

**Mark Krmpotic (Senate Fiscal Analyst):**

Senate Bill 276, as introduced, establishes a one-time increase in the number of registration certificates the Department of Health and Human Service's Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) may issue to medical marijuana dispensaries. A mock-up amendment was presented in the past hearing, Proposed Amendment 7200, which provides for the transfer of certificates, ownership transfers and transfers to new locations within the same government jurisdiction. It also provides for certain sections of the bill to become effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of performing preparatory administrative tasks. The remaining sections will become effective October 1 for all other purposes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I have a second mock-up prepared by Senator Tick Segerblom.

**Senator Tick Segerblom (Senatorial District No. 3):**

I have prepared a mock-up that includes the State's recommended changes entitled "Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7200 To Senate Bill No. 276" ([Exhibit C](#)).

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Is it your desire to process Proposed Amendment 7387?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes. The amendment is explained in "Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7387 to Senate Bill No. 276" ([Exhibit D](#)). This amendment transfers one of the dispensaries from Reno to Sparks.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Based on the previous bill hearing, is that change reflected in section 5 of the bill?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Instead of placing one dispensary in Washoe County and two in Reno, does Proposed Amendment 7387 relocate the dispensaries so one dispensary is in Washoe County, one is in Reno and the other is in Sparks?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Are there any additional changes between [Exhibit C](#) and [Exhibit D](#)?

**Senator Segerblom:**

There are no significant changes. The State recommended a few changes with respect to the transfer.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Does the bill indicate that if a dispensary wanted to change location, it could as long it was under the same local government jurisdiction?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes. The dispensary in Washoe County could move anywhere in the unincorporated area of Washoe County.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Will a dispensary located in Clark County have the ability to move to a different location in the same local government jurisdiction?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Once the dispensary has relocated, does it have to be a certain distance away from its original location?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes. The transfer is subject to local approval. The Chair recommended requiring a public hearing when a dispensary relocates so it will not be a surprise to local residents when the dispensary transfers into their area.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I do not see that language in this bill. Is that the legislative intent?

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes. We will make an oral amendment on the public record.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I see additional changes in section 2 in regard to transferability. The changes include suggestions relating to the Division's oversight of people who would be either purchasing an interest in a license or the license in its entirety.

**Senator Segerblom:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I want to make one additional amendment based on what Senator Segerblom has submitted to us in Proposed Amendment 7387. Section 3, subsection 2 on page 3 of S.B. 276 discusses the transferring of a location.

I want to allow the medical marijuana establishment to move to a new location under the jurisdiction of the same local government as its original location, regardless of the distance from its original location, if the operation of the medical marijuana establishment at a new location has been approved by the local government following a public hearing on the matter.

I want to be sure in that section of the bill the local government is required to have a public hearing on the location transfer and that residents are notified of the new location before it is adopted.

For the record, "Is that clear?"

**Senator Parks:**

Are we discarding Proposed Amendment 7200?

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Proposed Amendment 7200 was replaced by Proposed Amendment 7387. The language suggested by the City of Sparks was incorporated into the amendment as well. The City of Sparks has submitted a prepared document reflecting their

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 15, 2015  
Page 7

suggested language, "Senate Amendment To Senate Bill No. 276, Adam Mayberry On Behalf Of The City Of Sparks" ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 276 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 7387 WITH THE REQUESTED CHANGES TO SECTION 3.

SENATOR ROBERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

We will now discuss Assembly Bill (A.B.) 70.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 70**: Provides for the administration and enforcement of excise taxes on medical marijuana. (BDR 32-322)

**Mr. Krmpotic:**

Proposed Amendment 7232 is described in "Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7232 To Assembly Bill No. 70" ([Exhibit F](#)).

In its introduced form, A.B. 70 establishes various administrative provisions within the Department of Taxation to administer the medical marijuana program including penalties, refunds, basic administrative duties and other forms of taxation. At the hearing, Proposed Amendment 7232 was discussed which provided for a reduction, primarily in section 23 in the amount of the proceeds of the excise tax distributed to the Distributive School Account (DSA), calling for that percentage to be reduced from 75 percent to 71 percent with 2 percent transferred to jurisdictions for fire fighters and another 2 percent for police, with respect to local administration costs.

A revised Proposed Amendment, is described in "Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7372 To Assembly Bill No. 70" ([Exhibit G](#)). Proposed Amendment 7372 contains changes that are included primarily in section 29. Proposed Amendment 7372 keeps the 75 percent distribution of the DSA intact and provides for a new assessment or fee under section 29, which takes the Department of Taxation out of the process. The Department of Taxation will

have to program its system, distribute the fee under section 29 and try to implement the provisions in the bill by July 1.

Proposed Amendment 7372 addresses the concerns Ms. Contine had with respect to administrative costs and implementation of the bill.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

The intent of this replacement amendment was to relieve the burden placed on the Department of Taxation by the effort to help police and firefighters. The implementation of the new statute would then transfer the burden, of imposing a cost-based fee on the regulating industries, over to the local government. That is incorporated into this revised amendment in section 29. It maintains the language regarding independent contractors and also strikes language in section 33 of Proposed Amendment 7232 for a Legislative Commission study in the interim.

We also have a proposed amendment from the Nevada Medical Marijuana Association on behalf of Marijuana Awareness Management that was presented at the hearing earlier this week entitled "Requested Amendment to A.B. 70" ([Exhibit H](#)).

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Is the Committee interested in entertaining an amendment to A.B. 70 that allows for some type of education or instruction?

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I will entertain it if that is the pleasure of the Committee.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

There should be some education mechanism in this bill and I would think the DPBH would be comfortable with it. A certification should be required for people working in a medical marijuana dispensary. I do not see provisions for that in this bill.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS A.B. 70 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 7372 AND THE AMENDMENT SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF MARIJUANA AWARENESS MANAGEMENT.

SENATOR ROBERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.



Senate Committee on Finance  
May 15, 2015  
Page 9

**Senator Parks:**

There was another medical marijuana awareness document that had an amendment on a single page. Is that amendment included in the motion?

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I do not have that document in front of me, Senator Parks.

**Senator Parks:**

The document was handed to me in my office.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I do not have that document uploaded as a formal amendment. Is it listed as a proposed amendment?

**Senator Parks:**

The document is titled "Amendment proposed for Education for A.B. 70."

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

That document is consistent with the second amendment that is already in the motion.

**Senator Parks:**

The amendment referenced to "anyone in medicine." Does that reference relate to someone who is a licensed medical provider?

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

The amendment is fairly long. Can you reference the specific portion of the amendment where that is stated?

**Senator Parks:**

I do not find that reference in Proposed Amendment 7372. I find it in the document that was handed to me in my office.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

That document is something that is outside of Proposed Amendment 7372.

**Senator Parks:**

Yes. The document I was handed appears to be irrelevant to the proposed amendment.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I want to amend my motion. There needs to be some type of certification and training for dispensary employees. It does not have to be as extensive as what is called for in this amendment. I am in favor of a conceptual amended regulation that allows for the training and/or certification of employees working in medical marijuana establishments.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

A conceptual amended regulation is difficult to make at this point.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I am trying to make this easier for the Committee. I know this is a lengthy and extensive amendment.

**Senator Woodhouse:**

Since this amendment is rather extensive and we are struggling with it, I suggest we take care of A.B. 70 with the amendment that has been worked out. If there is an appetite for an educational certification requirement, we could make that change in a floor amendment.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Do you want to amend your motion, Senator Goicoechea?

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Yes. As long as there is a commitment from the Committee to work with, and look at, a training and/or certification course for this.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

We are going to amend the motion.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS A.B. 70  
WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 7372.

SENATOR ROBERSON CONCURRED WITH THE AMENDED MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

I will close the discussion on A.B. 70 and open the discussion on S.B. 412.

**SENATE BILL 412**: Provides for a credit against taxes imposed on certain employers that make a matching contribution to certain college savings plans. (BDR 32-1033)

**Senator Becky Harris (Senatorial District No. 9)**

I will present S.B. 412. This bill is aimed at providing an incentive to employers to help their employees and families save for college. Senate Bill 412 is designed to ensure our future generations have the tools they need to succeed. Education should not stop at kindergarten through Grade 12. We need to ensure all Nevadans have access to pursue some form of higher education.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, only 22 percent of Nevadans have a bachelor's degree or higher. By 2030, studies show that 70 percent of all jobs will require some form of higher education degree or certificate. To remain competitive in recruiting new and diverse companies to grow our economy, something must be done to alter this pattern and instill the importance of an education in students and their families.

Internal Revenue Code (IRC) section 529 college savings plans are designed to help families of all incomes levels, backgrounds and statuses save for college with a few additional benefits. Currently, only about 4 percent of Nevada families with children under the age of 18 are investing in one of Nevada's 529 plans.

Senate Bill 412 would assist families by providing an opportunity to have their contributions matched by their employers, further incentivizing them to save for college. Other states provide direct tax incentives to those who save for college by allowing them to claim a credit against their personal income taxes. Nevadans do not have that opportunity.

When looking for tools we could use to encourage more college savings, tax credits for businesses were the next logical choice. By providing a value to both the employer and the employee, we can develop a collective effort in making Nevada a more college-bound culture.

Senate Bill 412 provides a tax credit to employers who match 529 plan contributions for their employees. The contributions by employees must be

made into a qualifying Nevada 529 college savings plan. The tax credit is in an amount equal to 25 percent of the matching contribution, not to exceed \$500 per employee per year. If the total amount of credit exceeds the total tax liability for the year, unused credits may carry forward for 5 years. In the event credit from multiple years is available, credits from the earliest year must be used first. Credits cannot be applied retroactively.

Through conversations with members of this Committee, I have learned that there is interest in making some simple amendments to this bill. I am happy to work with members from the Committee to accommodate that. One suggestion was that the contributions from the employers should be submitted directly to the Office of the State Treasurer by check or by an electronic transfer. We can add those provisions in the bill so that there is some integrity. Members from the Committee are also interested in seeing a tax cap.

My family has used 529 plans as investment vehicles to help our children go to college. The 529 plans we have were very helpful and continue to be helpful as my children continue on their educational journey. It would be my pleasure as a business owner in Nevada to be one of the first companies in this State to provide this benefit to my employees.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

From the Treasurer's Office perspective, is there a similar mechanism in place that you could mirror in terms of how the money flows from the business to the Treasurer's Office? Will the employee make a contribution followed by a contribution from the employer into the 529 plan?

**Tara Hagan (Senior Deputy Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer):**

There is not a program with the same setup, but we would envision that it would mirror an IRC 401(k)-and-Profit-Sharing-Plan programs. The employer would send the money directly to the company via Vanguard or by State Street Global Advisors.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

How many 529 plans are there in Nevada?

**Ms. Hagan:**

In Nevada, there are 441 plans in the direct payroll deposit.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Does the bill require a direct payroll deposit?

**Ms. Hagan:**

No. That is our best mechanism for employer-related deposits that we receive and employer-related accounts that we have.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

There are 441 plans that are direct-deposit specific. Does the bill restrict plans to only be direct deposit?

**Ms. Hagan:**

No. That is our best measure for employees who are utilizing their employer for the payroll direct deposit.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Can you estimate what the potential tax liability would be if we open it up to everyone?

**Ms. Hagan:**

That is why we looked at the 441 plans. We thought those plans would be a good gauge for this initiative since they are directly through the employer. The cost for those plans was about \$200,000 a year at the \$500 per employee cap.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Was the cost \$200,000 annually?

**Ms. Hagan:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Is the \$200,000 cost at the 25 percent credit rate?

**Ms. Hagan:**

The maximum cost is \$500 per employee.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Would it make sense to expand the initiative outside of direct deposit? For example, if I have an account for my child and my employer decides to make a matching contribution is there a way to verify the transaction?

**Ms. Hagan:**

The employer would send two files to the banking institution for the college savings fund. They would send a wire with the bulk money and then a data file. This would allow us to know which account to populate. The employer would be the one sending that information regardless of whether they received a check or direct deposit.

**Senator Harris:**

In my company, one of the benefits that we offer to our employees is a 401(k) plan that we submit electronically. You could work something out with a 529 plan provider where financial information was submitted, with regard to what you were going to match. The 529 plan provider could then send you back a receipt with a confirmation number confirming that they had received the money and invested it. This process would create a forensic method to track the contributions being submitted and the collection of the money.

**Deonne E. Contine (Executive Director, Department of Taxation):**

The Department of Taxation's fiscal note is a small additional cost for a programming change to our unified tax system to track the credits as they are used on the modified business tax. It will cost \$26,770 to make the programming changes. There will be costs to administer the program, but the program can be administered by existing staff.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Can you administer the program using existing resources?

**Ms. Contine:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 412 and open the hearing on S.B. 163.

**SENATE BILL 163 (1st Reprint)**: Creates the Council on Nevada Wildlife Conservation and Education within the Department of Wildlife. (BDR 45-616)

**Senator Scott T. Hammond (Senatorial District No. 18):**

When we presented S.B. 163 in the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture and Mining, we discussed a wildlife education bill that would be modeled after a similar program in Michigan. Since the hearing, we have had to change course because there were concerns about the federal monies that would come into our State using Michigan's program model. We are still going forward with the wildlife program, but will base it on a model from Colorado.

We will also be taking care of the fiscal note on this program by not including it in the end.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I have received a proposed amendment document entitled "Mock-Up Proposed Amendment 7102 To Senate Bill No. 163 First Reprint" ([Exhibit I](#)). Is that your amendment, Senator Hammond?

**Senator Hammond:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Do you want us to work from that amendment as we go through the bill?

**Senator Hammond:**

Yes.

**Mike Bertoldi (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):**

We have worked closely with the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) to construct this bill with Senator Hammond. There was a diversion issue in the original wording of the bill. Proposed Amendment 7102 modifies those issues and clarifies the funding structure from the Nevada Wildlife Heritage Trust Account.

The Council on Nevada Wildlife Conservation and Education was created because of the diversion issue. The members are now appointed by the Director of NDOW instead of the Governor. The Director has final say on the programs

the Council decides to issue. The program is funded solely through funds raised in the Nevada Wildlife Heritage Trust Account. This wildlife education program receives \$250,000 for 4 years from the principal amount in the Wildlife Heritage Trust Account and 25 percent of what is raised through the Wildlife Heritage Trust Account every year. Currently, this money is not being spent.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

How is the revenue generated?

**Mr. Bertoldi:**

It comes from revenue generated by NDOW's Heritage Tags and Silver State Tags. Heritage tags are Governor's tags that are auctioned off. Silver State Tags are awarded through a lottery process. Lottery tickets can be purchased when you apply for big game hunting tags.

**Patrick Cates, Deputy Director (Nevada Department of Wildlife):**

Most of the tags auctioned off are auctioned off at charity events or sportsmen groups. The wildlife education program would be consistent with how the Council is being funded.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

What is the goal of this program and what is it that you are trying to accomplish with it?

**Mr. Bertoldi:**

This is an educational program. The program's goal is to enhance the public's relationship with hunters through television ads, billboard ads, a Facebook page and a Web site. The program will educate people about Nevada's wildlife and on how NDOW has been successful in restoring wildlife populations in Nevada. The program will also educate the public on the role that sportsmen play in helping manage wildlife in the State. Colorado's program was successful in their state and it has now been adopted in Michigan.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

How is success judged?



**Mr. Bertoldi:**

When Colorado first started the program, the public had an approval rating of about 30 percent on sportsmen. After 3 years of conducting this program, Colorado now has a 70 percent approval rating on sportsmen.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Are the ratings based on public opinion polling on hunting?

**Mr. Bertoldi:**

Yes. The Council would hire a public relations firm to conduct a public opinion poll on hunting and to prepare the educational campaign ads.

**Senator Hammond:**

During the original bill hearing, we displayed a commercial created in Colorado for their wildlife education program called Hug a Hunter. This program is designed to show people how sportsmen contribute to wildlife and trail restoration. Nevada's program would be similar to Hug a Hunter.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Will this entire program be managed by an external contract through a public relations firm with no additional NDOW staff, or full-time equivalents (FTE), associated with the program?

**Mr. Bertoldi:**

No additional FTE positions will be created for this initiative.

**Mr. Cates:**

No, we do not envision creating any staff for this. The Council will be managed under NDOW's Conservation Education Division. The Division will assist the Council in procuring a contractor and by supporting the program using its existing resources.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

What is the makeup of the Council? Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b) of the bill states that the makeup of the Council will consist of three residents of this State who are selected from the list of candidates compiled pursuant to subsection 9 of *Nevada Revised Statute* 501.181.

**Mr. Bertoldi:**

The Council will consist of seven members. Three of the members will be sportsmen who have purchased a hunting or fishing license in at least 3 of the past 5 years. One of the members will be a public relations person to advise the Council in that regard. Finally, there will be a member from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, or his or her designee, and one member from NDOW.

**Mr. Cates:**

The Council member from NDOW will be appointed by the Director of NDOW. The last Council member will be a resident of the State who represents a small business that is substantially affected by hunting, fishing and trapping in the State. The public relations member must be a resident of the State, must not be an employee of NDOW and must have a background in media or marketing to sufficiently advise the Council.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Would there be a small expense incurred in the per diem and travel costs for the Council members even though they would serve without compensation?

**Mr. Cates:**

Yes.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Was your fiscal note related to the original draft of the bill?

**Mr. Cates:**

Yes. The original draft of the bill had a fee increase on sportsman licenses to fund the program. We negotiated to work without a fee increase and replaced it with the funding from the existing Wildlife Heritage Trust Account. The funding will come from the 25 percent of annual revenues generated from Heritage Tags and Silver State Tags. The other 75 percent of the revenue generated from the Silver State and Heritage tags will be added to the principal amount in the account. The principal amount being requested is an additional \$250,000 of funding each fiscal year. The principal amount request would equate to \$1 million over a 4-year period. Currently, the Wildlife Heritage Trust Account's principal amount continues to grow and stands at about \$7 million. We do not earn much interest from that account's principal amount.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I will hear testimony in support of S.B. 163.

**Joel Blakeslee (Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife):**

I am here in support of S.B. 163 representing the Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

I will hear testimony in opposition to S.B. 163.

**Caron Tayloe:**

I have submitted a prepared statement entitled "Testimony AGAINST S.B. 163" ([Exhibit J](#)).

I am here in opposition to S.B. 163. Senate Bill 163 is a request to fund the media campaign for Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) No. 11, which is a poor piece of legislation trying to give special State constitutional rights to sportsmen.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11 (1st Reprint)**: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to preserve the right to hunt, trap and fish in this State.  
(BDR C-1001)

Senate Bill 163 also requests funds to attract people to the fur trapping industry. Adding an advisory council to NDOW will not help wildlife. The money could be used to fund guzzlers or other initiatives that benefit wildlife. The public is waiting for laws that will actually help wildlife and not for laws to help the people who kill wildlife. The Wildlife Heritage Trust Account should be used for habitat restoration instead of being used to pay a public relations person to make hunters look better.

The Department has not defined a problem as to why they need a special media campaign. My reasoning is because NDOW needs the funding for S.J.R. 11.

**Margaret Flint (Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management):**

I am here in opposition to S.B. 163 representing Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management. We do not need another council. There are enough wildlife organizations and groups already. If NDOW wants to promote and educate the public about sportsmen, they could do a fundraising event. No law

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 15, 2015  
Page 20

prohibits NDOW from developing a fundraising event to generate money for this initiative.

**Chair Kieckhefer:**

Seeing no further business before this Committee, this meeting is adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Jason Gortari,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Chair

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

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	2		Attendance Roster
S.B. 276	C	5	Senator Tick Segerblom	Mock Up Proposed Amendment 7200 To Senate Bill No 276
S.B. 276	D	5	Senator Tick Segerblom	Mock Up Proposed Amendment 7387 to Senate Bill No 276
S.B. 276	E	1	City of Sparks	Senate Amendment To Senate Bill No 276 Adam Mayberry On Behalf Of The City Of Sparks
A.B. 70	F	14	Mark Krmpotic	Mock Up Proposed Amendment 7232 To Assembly Bill No 70
A.B. 70	G	13	Mark Krmpotic	Mock Up Proposed Amendment 7372 To Assembly Bill No 70
A.B. 70	H	8	Nevada Medical Marijuana Association	Requested Amendment To AB 70 Submitted By Nevada Medical Marijuana Association
S.B. 163	I	8	Senator Scott T. Hammond	Mock Up Proposed Amendment 7102 To Senate Bill No 163 First Reprint
S.B. 163	J	1	Caron Tayloe	Testimony Of Caron Tayloe