

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
April 24, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 11:08 a.m. on Monday, April 24, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblyman Chris Brooks  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblyman Skip Daly  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner  
Assemblyman Al Kramer  
Assemblyman Jim Marchant  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman William McCurdy II  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senate District No. 17



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst  
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel  
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Bruce K. Snyder, Commissioner, Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Department of Business and Industry  
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada  
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.  
Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers  
Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration  
Deonne E. Contine, Executive Director, Department of Taxation  
Edgar J. Roberts, Chief of Contributions, Contributions Section, Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation

**Chairman Flores:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have two bills on the agenda today. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 460.

**Senate Bill 460: Revises provisions governing the membership of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board. (BDR 23-556)**

**Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senate District No. 17:**

I represent all of Douglas County, Lyon County, Storey County, and Churchill County. However, this bill has nothing to do with those counties. This bill comes from the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission, of which I was Chair this last session. It relates to the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board (EMRB) within the Department of Business and Industry. I am bringing the bill on behalf of the Sunset Subcommittee which, as you know, is charged with looking at boards and committees to see whether they should be continued, modified, consolidated, or terminated. A revision of this Board is being recommended by the Sunset Subcommittee.

Before we get into the provisions of the bill, let me give you a brief background on the Board. The Board was established by the Legislature in 1969. Its purpose was to provide agreed upon methods for resolving disputes between public employees and public management. The Board hears complaints relating to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 288. It currently consists of three members appointed by the Governor. The Governor must ensure that not more than two members may be from the same political party.

One of the things the Sunset Subcommittee has come to realize is that most of the boards and commissions have little opportunity to appear before a legislative committee to talk about their operations. When the Sunset Subcommittee reviews a board or commission, we always make sure to ask the entity if it can identify any revisions to the statutes that govern their operations and functions that might make them more efficient or some changes that might come to them in that respect.

The EMRB was reviewed by the Sunset Subcommittee on March 15, 2016. At that time, a representative of the EMRB observed that a revision of NRS to increase the size of the Board from three members to five members would improve its efficiency. The EMRB does not receive any state general revenue. It is funded by charging each local government employer a fee of \$6.75 per employee. As the fiscal note indicates, the EMRB has reserves and does not anticipate increasing the fee to provide for the additional two members.

Commissioner Bruce Snyder is present at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas and is prepared to answer any questions regarding the operations of the Board. Please keep in mind, due to his position, Mr. Snyder is neutral on the provisions of the bill. If it is acceptable to you, Chairman Flores, I would like to turn this over to Mr. Snyder for comment on the issues.

**Bruce K. Snyder, Commissioner, Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Department of Business and Industry:**

I think Senator Settelmeyer has summarized things very well. The original purpose of the Board was to drive down the waiting period before a case was heard. We are self-funded, we do have reserves, and we do not anticipate raising the fee. I should note for the record, this item has not been included in the proposed *Executive Budget*. I will answer any questions you may have.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I have read the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) which adds a few things. However, my concern is the three members from southern Nevada and three members from the same political party in section 1, subsection 1. I am wondering how that works when there is a board of five members.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

In that respect, it would mirror what is in existing law. Existing law states that two of the three have to be of the same political party. We are trying to keep the same percentage by having three members of the same political party. Again, this process is meant to allow the Board to review these cases in a quicker fashion because, currently, it creates problems trying to have a quorum and conduct meetings. Again, as far as the makeup of the Board, it was felt to keep the same percentage to not allow any one party to have a monopoly of the Board and keep the same consistency.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Also in section 1, subsection 1 regarding the three Board members who reside in southern Nevada, I understand that 90 percent of the cases are in southern Nevada. If three members are from southern Nevada, through this bill, what do we seek to gain in terms of perspective having the three southern Nevada members on this Board.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

I would like to ask Mr. Snyder to answer that question. However, my opinion is by having three people from Clark County on the Board hearing Clark County matters—because the bulk of the cases are from Clark County simply due to the population reality—would create a situation of timeliness when scheduling meetings and things of that nature. There will not be the same travel concerns having someone from the north fly to Las Vegas for meetings of this nature. However, that was my opinion while reviewing the bill in the Sunset Subcommittee. I cannot speak on behalf of the entire Subcommittee. However, Mr. Snyder, since the Board did request this change, may be able to provide more clarity if the Chairman would allow.

**Bruce Snyder:**

The reason for requesting a majority of the Board come from southern Nevada is that 90 percent of the cases are from southern Nevada. The Board is trying to minimize travel costs. We currently have three Board members; two from the Reno/Carson City area and one from southern Nevada. Currently, 90 percent of the Board meetings are held in Las Vegas so two of three Board members travel from northern Nevada. In addition to minimizing the travel costs, adding two Board members would increase the amount of compensation.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

This is not actually about having a perspective for 90 percent of the cases; this is about reducing costs. How much was the travel for the northern members? We are looking at a \$9,600 increase per year for adding two members.

**Bruce Snyder:**

Yes. The pay would be \$4,800 per Board member, so that would be \$9,600 added for pay for two additional Board members. They receive \$80 per day, so on average they make \$4,800 per year. If we keep the provision for having the majority of the Board in southern Nevada, the travel costs will not increase at all. The members from northern Nevada would fly to southern Nevada slightly less often than they currently do. The additional mileage being paid, which is all that would be paid for the members in southern Nevada, would equal out and the travel budget would not be increased at all.

**Chairman Flores:**

I am looking at the proposed amendment provided by the Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada ([Exhibit C](#)). Have you had an opportunity to review the amendment?

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

I have not seen any amendments offered in that respect. Again, I must remind you, I am the Chair of the Sunset Subcommittee and cannot weigh in on their full opinion. It would be up to you whether or not you wish to accept an amendment. I am not aware of any amendments at this time.

**Chairman Flores:**

The amendment adds language to section 2, subsection 1 and states, "When meeting as a quorum of 3 members, at least one member of tht [that] quorum must be a member of the opposite political party." The concern is there may be three Republicans or three Democrats in the quorum.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

I think that would be very wise. No offense, but I could see a situation where the three members from Clark County may all be of the same political party, and if they met in Clark County, there would not be an opportunity for the other political party to weigh in. This would probably be a very wise amendment. However, again, that is my own personal opinion.

**Chairman Flores:**

I just wanted to get some feedback from you, specifically to make sure it was not something that was discussed during the interim and the Sunset Subcommittee would not want that for some reason.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

That issue did not come up during the discussion of the Sunset Subcommittee.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

In section 2, subsection 1 of the amendment, it says, ". . . a quorum may exercise all the power and authority conferred on the Board." Before this change, what was the rule? Clearly, the quorum was not able to exercise all powers.

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

Originally, what occurred was by having the three members, two was a quorum. Sometimes it was difficult to get members down to Clark County. By having the concept of five members and having three of them operate as a subgroup, that subgroup could then operate to dispense and have the hearings.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

There is a difference in having the hearing and then exercising all power and authority conferred on the Board, which would be the full Board. I guess it was those three and now it would be those five. For the education of this Committee, what are some of the decisions this quorum—which would be two to one, which is basically the three members—would be

making? The bill adds two members; the amendment allows a quorum of three members to make all power and authority conferred on the Board. It is almost like the bill never changed.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

In that respect, what this does is extend from three members to five members in the current process that is going on now. It might be best to have Mr. Snyder weigh in on the concept of what you are asking, if that would be acceptable.

**Bruce Snyder:**

Our original proposal was to have groups of three hear cases and decide those cases. There are a few other issues the Board needs to do annually such as set the rate and approve administrative regulations to send to the Legislative Commission. The Board also has the power to hire and fire me and the other staff member. We are a two-person office. When it comes to those things not related to a case, I would imagine all five Board members would sit.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

But that is not what the amendment says. It says in section 2, subsection 1 ". . . a quorum may exercise . . .," even though that is permissive, ". . . all the power and authority conferred on the Board." That means three people could sit and fire or set a rate and it would not have to be all five members. The question is, when would the circumstances exist where that permissive ability would kick in or not kick in? Who decides that?

**Bruce Snyder:**

The only thing I can state is the language was developed by the Legislative Counsel Bureau and if this Committee believes it should be altered slightly, I do not think the EMRB is against that. The original intent was to hear more cases and, therefore, hear them in groups of three. There are a few instances when the Board does make decisions that are not related to cases, such as those I previously mentioned.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Assemblywoman Neal, I think that is an excellent catch in that respect, and I am sorry we did not see that in the Senate. It would make sense that three members would only be able to conduct hearings for cases, but all other matters would have to go to the full Board.

**Chairman Flores:**

Thank you, Assemblywoman Neal, for bringing that to our attention. As a Committee, we will work on an amendment somewhere down the road. Is there anyone here wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 460?

**Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:**

The Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada is in support of S.B. 460. We did provide an amendment to the bill ([Exhibit C](#)). I apologize; I knew there was a Sunset Subcommittee a while back in talking to Commissioner Snyder. We have been in good communication with him during the past couple of years regarding this issue. We do support the increase of the Board going from three members to five. We had hoped there would be more members and a couple of panels going to expedite the process. However, we can obviously live with increasing the Board to five.

Unfortunately, when the bill first was heard in the Senate, I was tied up that day and could not address the issue. I had addressed the issue with Commissioner Snyder about one of the three members of a quorum being from a different political party. That is why we brought the amendment forward today; it was too late to bring the amendment to the Senate. I made sure Commissioner Snyder was in the loop on the amendment for the reasons mentioned.

In addressing the issue that Assemblywoman Neal brought up, I think that is appropriate also. If there is going to be a panel of five and they are going to be deciding those issues, it would be the same principle. Our amendment says that at least one member of a quorum of three must be of a different political party. We would obviously like to see the same thing if there is a Board of five. I believe it is that way currently, and I think Commissioner Snyder could address that. Of the five members, all are appointed by the Governor, with three being one political party and two being the other. I know under the current system of three, that is the way it works. It has been pretty objective over the years, but the problem is, when you now have a different panel and three of those members are from southern Nevada, we would like to ensure there is some autonomy by having one member of the opposite party.

With that in mind, we would appreciate the Committee taking into consideration the amendment we proposed for S.B. 460 ([Exhibit C](#)). With the amendment, we would definitely support the bill.

**Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.:**

We mirror what our colleague, Mr. Dreher, has stated. We thank Senator Settlemeyer for bringing the bill forward, and we are in support.

**Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:**

I frequently appear before the EMRB and have active involvement with them. While they do an outstanding job right now, I believe this bill would give them significant flexibility in being able to handle the cases. There are many cases filed each year before the EMRB with local government effects. There is no fiscal concern, which is not this Committee's concern, I know, but it has been testified to. The Board is a self-funded organization through the billing of the local government employers. With the amendment, and the good catch by

Assemblywoman Neal relative to the three versus five conducting business of the Board, and those modifications, we would absolutely support S.B. 460, as well as including the proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)).

**Chairman Flores:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks?

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

I would like to thank Assemblywoman Neal for the catch she made in the bill. It will make the bill substantially better. Thank you for your time and consideration.

**Chairman Flores:**

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 460. At this time, I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint): Repeals certain provisions relating to governmental administrative tasks. (BDR 22-241)**

**Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration:**

I am here today to present Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint). The Department of Administration is sponsoring this omnibus bill on behalf of the Department of Taxation, the State Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. I am joined today by representatives of those agencies to help answer any questions you may have.

Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint) seeks to make various changes to governmental administration to enhance the efficiency of operations by eliminating duplicative or obsolete reporting requirements. In *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 271A, the bill would eliminate the Department of Taxation's semiannual report to the Legislature regarding Sales Tax Anticipation Revenue (STAR) bonds districts. This is due to the lack of available data with which to create an accurate report.

In NRS Chapter 562, the bill would eliminate the State Board of Agriculture's biennial sheep report to the Governor. The reporting requirement dates back to 1919 and is redundant with the information submitted as part of the biennial budget process.

In NRS Chapter 612, the bill would eliminate two requirements for the Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. The first is a biennial report to the Governor regarding unemployment compensation. This report is redundant with the biennial budget and legislative process. The second is a requirement to print and distribute laws, regulations, and reports. This is an antiquated requirement in an era of electronic records. These requirements date back to the 1940s and 1950s.



After an amendment to remove reference to a Nevada Equal Rights Commission report, thereby continuing to require the report, this bill was approved unanimously by the Senate. Today, I ask your support for S.B. 12 (R1), and I would be happy to answer any questions. [Written testimony was also submitted ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Assemblyman Daly:**

My question is regarding section 1 and the STAR bonds information. I do not know if there is someone here from the Department of Taxation to answer my question. I know that language was added in 2011, and I worked on the bill [Assembly Bill 376 of the 76th Session]. Most of that information was needed to determine if what was put in the proposals by the developer for the STAR bonds were all designed around having a majority of the dollars coming from people who are not residents of the state. That language was put in the bill to try to find out if the reports of the developers when they were asking for the STAR bonds actually came to fruition. You indicated there is a lack of data. Maybe that is because STAR bonds were not such a good idea. There are not too many of the tourism improvement districts (TID) left anymore. I know Cabela's Inc. had STAR bonds and you should still have those Department of Taxation's Tourism Improvement District Reports. The Sparks Marina Park is still under STAR bonds and has several businesses that should be able to get you some of that information. I am not seeing why the reports are not relevant. The reports were requested for a very specific reason: to make sure the incentives that were given were actually paid for in the fashion agreed to and the taxpayers are getting the desired effect from the STAR bonds being implemented and utilized. Eliminating the information on the report defeats the purpose. If you would comment on that, I would appreciate it. Taking the reporting requirements out is a problem for me.

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

The issue we have with this is it is a self-reporting concept. What the Department of Taxation ends up getting are blank reports with no information provided. Sometimes the business will write "I don't know" in the columns. Sometimes the business will line out several months on the form and then put a figure of 27 percent in the "percent of sales from nonresidents" column, for example. The problem is the accuracy of the data that is being provided by the businesses. On the form, the business is required to report the taxable sales. We may have the taxable sales from their Combined Sales and Use Tax Returns, but sometimes those numbers are different. It is a matter of not getting the relevant information, not really having any authority in the statute to compel the information, and frankly, I think taxpayers in those areas do not have the ability to even collect the information. We have had some issues over the last several years in that we have to put together the report, but we know the data is not particularly good. It makes it difficult to prepare the report when we know the data is not good and we have no ability to get it.

**Assemblyman Daly:**

Some of the data the businesses should be able to get—the sales tax collected, how much they are paying their employees, and how many employees they have. If they report they do not know that information, you should be able to ask them about that information. Every one of the developers had a pro forma that had a projection on how many sales were going to be from nonresident customers. They must have had some data in order to come up with that information. It seems to me there would be a way to collect that data. Not everyone pays in cash, so there is information that can be collected. I know there is a bill in another committee [Assembly Bill 143] that will hopefully start an interim committee to examine these types of

incentives to see if the residents of Nevada are actually getting the bang for their buck for the incentives being provided. If these businesses are not collecting the data, such as how many customers were from out of state, that should be reported to the city or whoever agreed to the STAR bonds. They have to meet the criteria in order to continue with the STAR bonds because it is a requirement. When the businesses that have STAR bonds first open, over 50 percent of the revenue has to come from people out of state or they cannot enter into the agreement.

**Deonne Contine:**

I do not really have a lot to add. Again, this is a voluntary process for the businesses. When they provide the information, the Department of Taxation does not have employees to audit their books. Mostly the information excluded from the report is the percentage of sales from out of state. The other information we could verify with other tax types they pay. Even if we had a team of auditors to audit where people who buy things at those locations live, I do not know that many of these retailers actually capture that information when customers pay. It makes it difficult to produce the report knowing the information has not been reported.

**Assemblyman Daly:**

It seems to me, rather than get rid of the report, we should change the law so you are able to get the information you need for the report. Either that, or get rid of the STAR bonds altogether. To say the Legislature does not need the report is not the direction we should go in.

**Deonne Contine:**

I will make one more comment and then I will be quiet. The Department of Taxation audits taxpayers and our job is to collect revenue. When we decide how to audit businesses, we try to audit businesses to ensure compliance with payment of tax. If we wanted to invest additional resources into working with taxpayers to provide percentage information, that would be a decision the Legislature can make. In terms of the resources the Department has and the ability we have in putting this report together, that is why we do not send auditors out there, basically because the taxpayers do not collect the information and we would have a difficult time getting the information just by looking at their books.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I am looking at the Department of Taxation's Tourism Improvement District Semi-Annual Report form from your website. It asks for taxable sales; percent of sales from nonresidents; gross wages paid; and number of employees, both full-time and part-time. Is this the form you use for the STAR bonds?

**Deonne Contine:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

What if there was a narrowing of what is captured? What I see on the form is that the Department does collect the STAR bonds by the sales tax distribution by month. You also have the local school support tax (LSST) report. Is there any way, using those two reports, to start doing some kind of derivative around how much is being used in certain areas? On the

LSST report, it is done by month. I was looking at one of the older reports from 2009; then I was looking at the annual report from 2014-2015 where STAR bonds are being discussed and what is going out in terms of tax revenue. Is there any way to use those factors that are being collected in order to give an indication of what is happening with those tourism improvement districts?

**Deonne Contine:**

We can always tell you what taxable sales are in an area. That is information we collect notwithstanding the STAR bond report.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

A local TID has boundaries, with only so many businesses within the boundary. Is that correct?

**Deonne Contine:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

How many businesses are currently within the boundary?

**Deonne Contine:**

There are several TIDs in the state. I do not know all the businesses.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I want to know the businesses that are getting the STAR bonds.

**Deonne Contine:**

There are a few in the state.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

But there are not a lot. Is that correct?

**Deonne Contine:**

I think there may be five districts.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

These districts are mostly spread around in the rural counties. Is that correct?

**Deonne Contine:**

I think there is one TID in Clark County and a couple in the north. Let me get back to the question you originally asked. I think you were asking about taxable sales. There is always the ability to get the information regarding taxable sales. We collect that information, and we post it by the NAICS [North American Industry Classification System] code on the Internet. For these specific districts, we could likely tell you without the report what the taxable sales are. It is more about the other information, such as the percentage of sales from

nonresidents. That is the information that is difficult to collect. To Assemblyman Daly's point, when the districts were approved, one of the selling points was the business would bring people to these districts. Without some type of mechanism to collect the information, either from the purchaser or some other way to get the purchaser's information regarding residency, we rely on the business reporting. In some cases, the business does not ask the customers where they are from.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

That is the part that is causing concern. If the business was supposed to be the driver to bring customers into a certain area, then that is a finite group. No one is accessing STAR bonds anymore. They are currently in place and the time just needs to run out on them. Are we talking about the individuals or the business?

**Deonne Contine:**

The businesses report whether the customers are from in state or out of state.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

That is why I am confused. When I go to Burlington Coat Factory, they ask me for my ZIP Code. I know you said it is self-reported. My ZIP Code goes into the system. Is that system no longer in existence? I remember having this discussion in 2011 or 2013 about having a system that collects that data. If Burlington Coat Factory can do it, why is Cabela's not doing it? That was a requirement of the law.

**Deonne Contine:**

Those systems exist. I have had that information asked of me as well. However, not every business has that system.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

We created a law, we gave incentives to businesses, and then the businesses did not implement the system that would have helped them report the information we expected. In order to get the incentives, the businesses are required to report certain information. Now you are saying those businesses did not create the system to collect the data. That is noncompliance with the law, not just for this year but for several years. What activity has happened around the noncompliance? How many bills have walked through this Committee telling the businesses to get a system in order to report what is required?

**Deonne Contine:**

I do not know. I just know the businesses put on the report, "I don't know."

**Chairman Flores:**

Are there any additional questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks?

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Before you give your closing remarks, I have a question on section 3 of the bill. In the Legislative Counsel's Digest on page 2, lines 16 and 17 of the Digest, it says section 3 repeals the requirement that the Employment Security Division distribute certain ". . . regulations, rules, reports and other materials relating to unemployment compensation." What is not clear to me is what exactly are we not going to be finding in the unemployment data or the reports?

**Patrick Cates:**

My understanding is when regulations are changed, the law requires the Division to print the material. The Division does not necessarily print regulations, but they post them online. Mr. Roberts may be able to answer that question.

**Edgar J. Roberts, Chief of Contributions, Contributions Section, Employment Security Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:**

Mr. Cates is correct in his answer.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

What does "other material" mean? That is something other than regulations, rules, and reports.

**Edgar Roberts:**

That would be brochures.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Brochures on what?

**Edgar Roberts:**

On unemployment.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

Section 3 is going to delete the brochures used to let people know about services that exist. Is that correct?

**Patrick Cates:**

It does not eliminate any publication that is currently produced: any publication, report, brochure, or regulation. If the bill is approved, it just means those things do not have to be printed. All the information is available online. We want it available online without the requirement by law to print the material.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

If I show up at the Nevada JobConnect Office Resource Center in North Las Vegas looking for a brochure I can take home about the unemployment services that JobConnect offers, will I now be told to go online and get it?

**Edgar Roberts:**

No, those brochures are printed and are in the offices.

**Chairman Flores:**

Do you have any closing remarks?

**Patrick Cates:**

At the risk of opening another topic, but to respond to the discussion about the Department of Taxation, the only thing I would add is the STAR bonds were an agreement with the developer. What we are talking about now are a variety of small businesses that are leasing space in the area. Those businesses do not necessarily have the tools or information to report the data in the manner the developer negotiated with the local government. I do not know if that helps or adds any clarity, but I did want to try to clarify the issue. I do urge your support of S.B. 12 (R1).

**Chairman Flores:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 12 (R1). Is there anyone here for public comment? [There was no one.] Having no further business, this meeting is adjourned [at 11:51 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lori McCleary  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 460, dated March 27, 2017, presented by Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony regarding Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint), dated April 24, 2017, presented by Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration.