

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 7, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Ben Kieckhefer at 8:05 a.m. on Tuesday, April 7, 2015, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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
Senator Aaron D. Ford

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott Sisco, Deputy Director, Support Services, Department of Corrections
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Silvia Villanueva, Boyd Gaming Corporation

Senate Committee on Finance
April 7, 2015
Page 2

Dan Musgrove, Southern Nevada Health District
Rod Woodbury, Chair, Southern Nevada Health District; Councilman,
Boulder City

Chair Kieckhefer:

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 147.

SENATE BILL 147 (1st Reprint): Requires law enforcement agencies to adopt certain policies relating to certain training for peace officers concerning dog behavior. (BDR 23-10)

Scott Sisco (Deputy Director, Support Services, Department of Corrections):

The Department of Corrections (NDOC) is present to remove our fiscal note from S.B. 147. When bill draft requests are introduced, a limited amount of information is available to prepare a fiscal note. The NDOC worked with Senator Parks' research office and pulled the fiscal note back. When the bill was scheduled for hearing, both the Inspector General and I were away from our offices and mistakenly stated that the fiscal note still applied. The fiscal note on S.B. 147 no longer applies.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there any fiscal impact on this bill related to the NDOC?

Mr. Sisco:

There is no fiscal impact.

Senator Parks:

Senate Bill 147 was amended, eliminating the fiscal impact.

Chuck Callaway (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) is already conducting this kind of training, with established policies in place. With the amendment to S.B. 147, the LVMPD no longer has a fiscal note on this legislation.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 147 and open the budget closings. We will begin with the Minerals budget account (B/A) 101-4219.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

MINERALS

Minerals — Budget Page MINERALS-5 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-4219

Mark Krmpotic (Senate Fiscal Analyst):

This budget was not previously heard in Committee or a subcommittee; therefore, staff is responsible for these closing recommendations. The Division of Minerals encourages and assists in the responsible exploration for production of minerals, oil, gas and geothermal energy. The Commission on Mineral Resources directs mineral-related policy for the Division and advises the Governor and the Legislature on matters related to mineral resources.

The Division is primarily funded through mining claim and dangerous mine fees. Those fees are \$6 and \$2.50 per mining claim, filed respectively, geothermal fees, and oil and gas fees for each barrel produced.

There are no major closing issues for this budget account. Other Closing item 1 in the "Senate Committee on Finance, Closing List #4" ([Exhibit C](#)) is the Sagebrush Ecosystem Program. The Base Budget originally included the transfer of support from the Division of Minerals to the Sagebrush Ecosystem Program in the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR). However, it was removed in decision unit E-230 totaling \$141,364 in each year of the 2015-2017 biennium, to correspond with Governor Brian Sandoval's recommendation to fully fund the Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team and the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council with General Fund appropriations in each year of the biennium.

E-230 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page MINERALS-8

Staff notes that transfer to the DCNR Conservation Districts Program was understated by \$5,674 in fiscal year (FY) 2017 as shown in [Exhibit C](#).

The Sagebrush Ecosystem Program was discussed in the Senate Committee on Finance and Assembly Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittees on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation on February 24. A recommendation for funding of the Program will be brought to the full

Committee at the tentative closing date of April 24. Although no decision is required at this time, Fiscal Division staff requests authority to make technical adjustments accurately reflecting the closing decisions made by the Committee in the DCNR, Administration and Conservation Districts Program budgets.

INFRASTRUCTURE

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

DCNR - DEP Administration — Budget Page DCNR-164 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-3173

DCNR - Conservation Districts Program — Budget Page DCNR-34 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4151

The request to transfer from B/A 101-4219 that was approved for the 2013-2015 biennium did not make a strong case for support of the Program. However, the request was approved. It is unlikely the subcommittees would fund this item differently, but this item would be adjusted if an alternative decision is made.

Other closing item 2 in [Exhibit C](#) is for the Geographic Information System (GIS) software in decision unit E-225. It includes reductions to the reserve of \$3,750 in each year of the biennium. This item will enable access to the Abandoned Mine Lands Program database.

E-225 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page MINERALS-7

In closing item 3, the Governor recommends reducing reserves by \$5,411 in FY 2016 and \$4,963 in FY 2017, under decision unit E-226 for the Enterprise Information Technology Services to fund virtual services to house the GIS and Abandoned Mine databases.

E-226 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page MINERALS-7

Other closing item 4, on page 3 of [Exhibit C](#), would replace equipment under decision unit E-710. It requests reductions in the reserve of \$58,411 over the 2015-2017 biennium for replacement of three computer-aided design work

stations, three desktop computers, two laptops, printers, scanners, a projector, software and one replacement truck.

E-710 Equipment Replacement — Page MINERALS-9

Staff finds the recommendations under other closing items 2, 3, and 4 to be reasonable. Fiscal staff recommends B/A 101-4219 be closed as recommended by the Governor, with authority to make technical adjustments necessary.

Senator Goicoechea:

There are a few pieces of legislation regarding this budget — one increases the assessment to 30 cents per barrel of oil and 30 cents on 50,000 cubic feet of gas. If the legislation is passed, will those fee increases impact this budget?

Mr. Krmpotic:

That bill would impact the budget. However, it is not a bill that is required to implement a budget decision. The projected revenues from the fee increase were not built into the budget. If the bill is approved, the agency could return to the Interim Finance Committee to request an increase in its budget. If staff were to seek authority to adjust the budget, the revenue would simply be added to the agency reserve.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO CLOSE B/A 101-4219 AS
RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH AUTHORITY FOR STAFF TO
MAKE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET CLOSED.

* * * * *

Chair Kieckhefer:

The Committee will now move into work session, discussing S.B. 93.

SENATE BILL 93 (1st Reprint): Authorizes certain businesses to apply to the Office of Economic Development for a partial abatement from certain taxes. (BDR 32-291)

Mr. Krmpotic:

Senate Bill 93 was heard in Committee on April 3. The specific businesses authorized for a partial abatement are those aircraft-related businesses that meet certain requirements and own and operate, manufacture, service, test, repair, overhaul or assemble an aircraft, or any component of an aircraft.

Testimony in support of the bill was provided by Steve Hill, Executive Director, Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED). He described the bill and indicated S.B. 93 was specifically for the aviation industry, designed to return jobs to Nevada and assist in bringing the unmanned aerial vehicle industry to the State.

The fiscal note is associated with implementation of the bill; Mr. Hill noted the original fiscal note decreased property tax revenues by \$665,000. However, Mr. Hill stated a consulting firm, which provided information to the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development, projected new and expanding businesses would overcome the projected property tax abatement. Mr. Hill added the consultant provided a low estimate of \$1.1 million in additional tax revenue in the first year and a high estimate of \$4 million.

Terry Rubald, Chief Deputy Executive Director, Department of Taxation testified on the fiscal note for S.B. 93 after the reprint, indicating if 10 percent of the aircraft were eligible for abatement, \$665,047 in total property taxes would be abated, with \$33,252 attributed to the State debt rate and \$161,167 attributed to kindergarten through Grade 12 (K-12) education.

Dagny Stapleton, representing the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) testified as neutral on the bill.

SENATOR ROBERSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 93.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Kieckhefer:

We will now discuss S.B. 170 in work session.

SENATE BILL 170 (1st Reprint): Provides for a partial abatement of certain taxes for new or expanding data centers and related businesses in this State. (BDR 32-765)

Mr. Krmpotic:

Senate Bill 170 was also heard in Committee on April 3. This bill provides for the GOED to grant a partial abatement of personal property taxes or sales and use taxes for up to 20 years to qualified new or expanded data centers and any colocated businesses within the qualified data center.

The amount of property tax is limited to 75 percent of personal property taxes payable by the data center. The amount of sales and use tax is equal to all sales and use taxes imposed in a political subdivision, except the taxes imposed by the Sales and Use Tax Act, which is the State 2 percent rate.

Steve Hill, representing GOED, testified on the bill and indicated S.B. 170 was a targeted measure aimed at retaining and attracting data centers and their customers to Nevada. Mr. Hill indicated if the bill were to pass, the projection called for \$47 billion in investments over 20 years. That would overcome the fiscal impact, if the 2 percent tax rate were calculated over 20 years.

Terry Rubald, Department of Taxation, testified on the bill and addressed the fiscal impact of the first reprint. She indicated that over a 3-year period with a \$100 million investment, of which \$50 million is personal property, approximately \$44,000 would be abated to the State debt rate and approximately \$194,000 under the K-12 school rate.

For an investment of \$50 million, of which \$25 million was personal property, approximately \$22,000 would be abated to the State debt rate and approximately \$97,000 would be abated under the K-12 school rate.

Dagny Stapleton, representing NACO, testified the counties wished to have more participation in the process of granting the abatements.

Senator Goicoechea:

How much participation will NACO have in the process? I see nothing in the bill that specifically allows their participation, but there will be an impact to the counties and school districts.

Chair Kieckhefer:

The bill language sets a notification process to those entities awarded the abatement. I will check on that specifically.

SENATOR LIPPARELLI MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 170 AS AMENDED.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Kieckhefer:

The Committee heard S.B. 147 earlier today. The NDOC reported the bill caused no fiscal impact. The policy has been vetted by the appropriate policy committee. I would entertain a motion to move this bill.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 147 AS AMENDED.

SENATOR ROBERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Kieckhefer:

I will now open the hearing on S.B. 314.

SENATE BILL 314: Revises provisions governing certain health districts.
(BDR 40-957)

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson (Assembly District No. 17):

I served as the cochair of the Southern Nevada Forum's Governance Reform Committee with Senator Roberson.

Senate Bill 314 is a product of extensive discussions with community stakeholders concerning governance reform relating to health districts. Restructuring the current governance model of the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) has been identified as one of southern Nevada's priorities.

This bill has been a work in progress for close to 2 years. After extensive discussions, it was clear that governance reform was important to business leaders, State agencies and local governments. A desire for reform was strongly supported by key stakeholders.

Two large forums were held in southern Nevada, with over 300 in attendance and a voting process was included. Looking at health districts was at the top of the list of items for governance reform.

The advisory board for health districts is proposed to include individuals from the community because they are the consumers and consistently work with the health districts.

Senator Michael Roberson (Senatorial District No. 20):

I echo the comments of Assemblyman Thompson. He has worked diligently over the past 2 years with the Southern Nevada Forum. The genesis of S.B. 314 was a concern expressed regarding the lack of oversight and accountability with the SNHD. The current chief health officer (CHO) is Dr. Joseph Iser, who is somewhat new to his position. Structurally however, there is concern over the skill set differences between a medical doctor and a professional administrator.

Senate Bill 314, section 1, subsection 1 would provide for the appointment of a chief administrative officer.

The second change recommended is for the membership of the SNHD Board. The current Board consists of 14 members, 8 of whom are elected representatives from the county commission and the city councils within Clark County. The other six members are members of the public, chosen by the elected members, based upon their expertise or occupation.

Section 3 of S.B. 314 would reduce the voting members from 14 to 11 and create the public health advisory board, whose members would serve as nonvoting members of the board of health.

The three downsized members of the board of health, who, under current law are selected based upon their expertise, would now serve on the advisory board. The newly created advisory board would consist of one resident from each of the five cities in Clark County and selected by their respective city councils, one licensed physician who has experience working with minority groups and other medically underserved populations, one licensed nurse and one person with an environmental health or environmental health services background.

Section 3, subsection 4 would also prohibit any member of the board of health from designating another person to vote, participate in a discussion, or otherwise serve on his or her behalf. In our experience, with such a large board, many members are not elected representatives and therefore, not directly responsible to the community and they currently have established alternates. Often, many of the regular members do not attend meetings, leaving that responsibility to their alternates and creating a lack of continuity in the proceedings.

Section 4, subsection 2 provides for the conversion of the three current members of the board of health to be transferred to the advisory board and requires the cities to appoint members to the advisory board prior to July 1.

I anticipate opposition from the SNHD. A large fiscal note has been attached to the bill, which I find questionable. This legislation was a top priority of the Southern Nevada Forum, a bipartisan group of southern Nevada legislators, and has received considerable community input.

Senator Goicoechea:

Is the SNHD funded with a dedicated tax rate or some other funding source?

Senator Roberson:

The SNHD was previously under the purview of Clark County. Prior to 2005, the Health Department was a county health district within the County. Senator Parks brought legislation to make the health department operate more

like the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada or the Clark County Regional Flood Control District.

Senator Parks:

My history with the SNHD goes back many years. There was a time when the Clark County Health District was totally funded by the County and incorporated cities. When I was the budget director for the City of Las Vegas, I assisted them with securing the sources of revenue.

In more recent sessions, I have sponsored no fewer than three bills that looked at the organization of the Clark County Health District structure. My concern is fewer and fewer advisory boards support the Health District. In many cases, numerous advisory boards make recommendations to the Board governing the Health District. One of my bills requested that all the members of the Board be elected from the member entities with an advisory structure within. I have always sought a strong administrative division that could address the day-to-day operations, leaving the health officer to make policy recommendations.

Senator Roberson:

The SNHD is given the guarantee of 3.5 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation of property tax. Previously, the Health Department budget was included within the Clark County budget and established by the Clark County Commission. The County budget was approximately the same as the 3.5 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation.

The SNHD sets its own budget and the County Commission is required to approve the SNHD budget. County Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani has notified me that she supports S.B. 314.

Senator Goicoechea:

I understand. The SNHD has the dedicated tax rate and may expend the fee revenue it generates.

Assemblyman Thompson:

I will make some clarifying remarks. I have sponsored Assembly Bill (A.B.) 232 that accompanies Sections 1 through 3 of S.B. 314. It specifically addresses the leadership structure of the SNHD. Much of the fiscal note attached to S.B. 314 is related to A.B. 232. We are in the process of presenting an amendment in another committee.

ASSEMBLY BILL 232: Revises provisions governing health districts.
(BDR 40-694)

The intent of S.B. 314 is to address the SNHD Board with a small fiscal impact of approximately \$15,000. The remainder of the fiscal impact is a part of A.B. 232.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Section 1 of S.B. 314 authorizes the SNHD to hire a chief administrative officer, creating a fiscal impact on the SNHD plus a \$15,000 impact due to the creation of the advisory board.

Assemblyman Thompson:

I presented A.B. 232 approximately 2 weeks ago, so it should appear in work session fairly soon. The primary impact of S.B. 314 is to look at the advisory board.

Senator Roberson:

If there is duplication, I am happy to remove duplicative provisions. I am also the cosponsor of A.B. 232. I want to ensure that whether the final decision is made to pass A.B. 232 or S.B. 314, we consider making the changes described in section 1 of S.B. 314. The addition of the chief administrative officer is important.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is creation of a chief administrative officer also a part of A.B. 232?

Assemblyman Thompson:

That provision is included in A.B. 232.

Chair Kieckhefer:

Is there anyone else to testify in favor of S.B. 314?

Paul Moradkhan (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Chamber is in favor of S.B. 314. The Southern Nevada Forum process started approximately 18 months ago. This bill and these topics are a result of community engagement that is unprecedented in southern Nevada.

Over the 5 years I have worked for the Chamber, I have repeatedly heard complaints that better governance was needed for the SNHD. I have attended those meetings. The members of the Chamber are the clients of the SNHD.

The current Board of the SNHD is comprised of 14 members and 14 alternates. That is 28 different people. If we want to streamline the SNHD, the Board size needs to be reduced to enhance governance, efficiency and transparency.

Silvia Villanueva (Boyd Gaming Corporation):

I urge your support of S.B. 314 on behalf of the gaming industry. It is good legislation for the Board and the gaming industry. We have a member on the Board and are a significant contributor of fees.

Dan Musgrove (Southern Nevada Health District):

The work of the Southern Nevada Forum opened the eyes of the SNHD and I would like to thank the sponsors of this bill for that. There was a breakdown between the regulatory authority and the regulated community. This Forum was a collaboration.

We are addressing things that have occurred in the past. I joined the SNHD in July 2014 as their chief lobbyist. The mission I brought to Dr. Iser was that the Health District needed to work in the community to ensure the role of the SNHD works with business to ensure a partnership.

There is no disagreement that input of the community is valued; however, the Board structure needs to be assessed. Sections 2 through 6 of S.B. 314 are legislation for which we are willing to assist.

The work that Senator Parks and Former Assemblywoman Chris Guinchigliani did in the 2005 and 2013 Legislative Sessions considered the makeup of the Board and determined that the CHO also had administrative abilities. The 2005 legislation placed parameters for qualifications of the CHO. The ideal candidate needs to have the ability to run an agency and to make the difficult decisions regarding the health of southern Nevada citizens and tourists.

I have provided the Committee with an organizational chart for the SNHD ([Exhibit D](#)). An organization needs to be structured with one CEO. Currently, S.B. 314 and A.B. 232 create two equal CEOs. That is problematic in any organization. Whether the Committee chooses to have that person be a

physician or not, it needs to be a physician with administrative capabilities. That is what both A.B. No. 285 of the 73rd Session and S.B. No. 455 of the 77th Session provided, ensuring we had the best candidates nationwide to head this important agency.

An amendment to A.B.232 has been proposed that leaves the structure as shown in [Exhibit D](#), adding a chief administrative officer. The Assembly amendment creates an additional layer of oversight through a district administrative director. That is what the fiscal note was based on. When I drafted the fiscal note, I mistakenly included the salary of the CHO position that is already funded. A chief administrative officer would be a new position with an additional fiscal impact and if a district health director were included, there would be an additional cost. The fiscal note, with those two additional positions, would be approximately \$600,000.

If the Committee wishes to focus on sections 2 through 6 of S.B. 314, the fiscal note would be approximately \$15,000 and the SNHD would be happy to work with you.

Senator Roberson:

What is your suggested fiscal note for S.B. 314, as written?

Mr. Musgrove:

It would include the addition of a chief administrative officer at approximately \$200,000 or \$344,000, including benefits. Either the two positions must be made fiscally equal, or both positions should be reduced slightly because some of the duties of the CHO would be removed. Additionally, the advisory board would have a fiscal impact of \$15,000.

Senator Roberson:

If the salaries were reduced, would that not lower the fiscal note?

Mr. Musgrove:

An executive-level position is being added which would cost approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Senator Roberson:

If the salary of the CHO were reduced, it would lessen the fiscal note, even with the additional position being requested. I like the bill as it is, but whatever

the final fiscal note will be, would it be less than what has been submitted as a proposed fiscal note ([Exhibit E](#))?

Mr. Musgrove:

I agree.

The SNHD has concerns with the makeup of the Board as proposed in S.B. 314. Our Chair will discuss those concerns. In a council form of government such as this Board, there is typically a board of trustees and a board of commissioners with a CEO to manage the boards. The structure has worked well. We are willing to discuss the best structure of this Board.

Rod Woodbury (Chair, Southern Nevada Health District, Councilman, Boulder City):

I have been Chair of the SNHD for 2 years. I also testified in opposition to A.B. 232.

I have heard general concerns with the current Board membership and the governance of the Board with the CHO and the proposed administrative position.

No one has identified what is really broken with the Board. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." In fact, the system works remarkably well.

Some of the positive achievements by the Board in recent years include the recent selection of a new site for the office after the current building was condemned approximately 4 years ago. We are currently in the process of building it out, we are balancing our budget and there is unparalleled cooperation with industry — in part due to both medical and industry professionals having seats on the Board. We settled our differences with Clark County on financial funding and the ability to own property.

Senator Roberson:

I sat through a number of meetings of the Southern Nevada Health Forum and heard numerous specific complaints from members of the business community with regard to businesses not being able to open because of a failure to procure timely health inspections.

There were also complaints regarding the lack of timeliness of the regulatory functions of the Board. Throughout my tenure, since 2011, in the Legislature, I have consistently heard specific complaints from industry and community representatives, and from elected officials, both at the Legislature and in Clark County, about the inefficiencies, inadequacies and brokenness of the SNHD.

The Southern Nevada Health Forum was a bipartisan group of legislators and stakeholders who had widespread agreement that the SNHD has problems and needs to be fixed.

Mr. Woodbury:

I am still hearing generalities in those comments. As a Board, we are willing to discuss those issues. No one has brought their issues to the Board for discussion. I respect the Southern Nevada Health Forum.

There are three reasons adding a CEO in conjunction with the CHO is a bad idea.

Expertise is needed in both administration and medical knowledge addressed by the same position. My justification is that there could be a large disease outbreak; we have a unique gaming community with excess numbers of tourists with high risk of those type events occurring. It may be tuberculosis, Ebola or Legionnaires' disease and someone needs to be in charge who can act quickly. If one person is trying to make a decision based strictly on the "bottom line" and another person with coequal status is trying to make a decision based on medical data, the public is at risk.

Secondly, dividing the responsibilities has been proposed in previous legislation and either been withdrawn or gutted based on the reasons we are discussing today.

Third, the addition of coequal staff will have a fiscal impact. It will be less if only a CEO and CHO are being considered than it will be if a chief district health director position is added. Dr. Iser makes approximately \$250,000 annually, before benefits.

Currently, the County funds the SNHD and there has been a battle that went all the way to the Supreme Court because of that funding structure. If the State does not fund this, who will? The lawsuit was settled in 2014.

I do not know how one would decide which appointed members of the current SNHD Board should be relegated to an advisory position. All of them contribute to the decisions of the current Board. It is great to have the elected members of the Board, as we add jurisdictional perspectives, but not the expertise contributed by the appointed members in fields of nursing, physicians, gaming, waste management or environmental health.

The vote from the smaller jurisdictions under the current Board structure, such as Boulder City and Mesquite, is only counted at half that of Clark County and the City of Las Vegas. That also applies to the City of Henderson, which rivals the larger communities in size.

Removing members would skew the Board makeup and give more decision-making power to the County and the City of Las Vegas.

Concerning the alternate positions, they have been beneficial to the Board. Many attend Board meetings, even if they are not actively serving as an alternate Board member.

It is not true that Board members do not attend and just send their alternates to meetings. The statement was made that we have a large Board that cannot function well together. We function well together and most votes are unanimous and receive input from various perspectives throughout the areas.

We are willing to work through issues and there are areas for compromise. The SNHD is not a perfect institution, but we work together and it is an ongoing process.

Chair Kieckhefer:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 314.

The Committee has been provided Proposed Amendment 6044 to S.B. 111 ([Exhibit F](#)). We have not heard this bill previously. It was rereferred without recommendation to our Committee from the Senate Committee on Government Affairs.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 7, 2015
Page 18

SENATE BILL 111: Providing for the use of portable event recording devices by local law enforcement agencies in certain counties. (BDR 23-618)

An amendment was proposed before the bill was referred to us; however, that amendment was not attached. It is now in our Committee as [Exhibit F](#).

I propose we move the bill from Committee with Proposed Amendment 6044 and without recommendation. That will take S.B. 111 to the Floor of the Senate, at which time it will become eligible for exemption.

SENATOR ROBERSON MOVED TO AMEND S.B. 111 WITH AMENDMENT 6044 AND REREFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Kieckhefer:

The budgets of the Governor's Office of Economic Development will not be heard today. We will now consider closing B/A 101-4466, the Diversity Account for the Department of Wildlife (NDOW).

WILDLIFE

Wildlife - Diversity — Budget Page WILDLIFE-52 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4466

Mr. Krmpotic:

This budget can be found on page 24 of [Exhibit C](#). The Committee has not previously heard this budget; therefore, staff is responsible for making closing recommendations.

Budget account 101-4466 is responsible for management of raptors, shorebirds, water birds, songbirds, nongame mammals and reptiles, the Landowner Incentive Program and the NDOW's portion of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program. There are no major closing issues in this account.

Under decision unit E-350, the Governor recommends General Fund appropriations of \$450,000 distributed among four NDOW budgets to address urban wildlife management issues statewide. In this budget, the Governor recommends General Fund appropriations of \$960 in each year of the biennium to offset a portion of existing personnel costs associated with urban wildlife management activities, currently funded by sportsmen.

E-350 Safe and Livable Communities — Page WILDLIFE-54

The request appears reasonable to staff, with a request for authority to make appropriate adjustments based on the closing actions in the other three NDOW budgets. Those budget closings will be presented to the Senate Committee on Finance and Assembly Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation.

Decision unit E-711 requests replacement vehicles totaling \$28,413 in FY 2016 and \$32,364 in FY 2017 for two replacement pickup trucks with off-road tires and camper shells.

E-711 Equipment Replacement — Page WILDLIFE-55

Decision unit E-800 requests the cost allocation adjustments. Staff recommends the budget be closed as recommended by the Governor with authority for staff to make technical adjustments as necessary, including adjustments related to Committee closing actions in related NDOW budgets.

E-800 Cost Allocation — Page WILDLIFE-55

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO CLOSE B/A 101-4466 CONSISTENT WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING AUTHORITY FOR STAFF TO MAKE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS, INCLUDING CLOSING ACTIONS RELATED TO ALL NDOW BUDGETS.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Finance
April 7, 2015
Page 20

Chair Kieckhefer:

I thank Senator Ford for temporarily joining us on the Senate Committee on Finance and look forward to welcoming Senator Smith on her return tomorrow. We are adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Cynthia Clampitt,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
	C	25	Mark Krmpotic/Fiscal Analysis Division	Senate Committee on Finance Closing List 4 April 7, 2015
S.B. 314	D	1	Dan Musgrove/SNHD	Organizational Chart SNHD Senate Bill 314
S.B. 314	E	1	Dan Musgrove/SNHD	Fiscal Note on Behalf of S.B. 314
S.B. 111	F	4	Senator Kieckhefer	SB 111 6044 V1 MockUp 2