

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-ninth Session  
May 12, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 3:03 p.m. on Friday, May 12, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 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 Joyce Woodhouse, Chair  
Senator David R. Parks, Vice Chair  
Senator Moises Denis  
Senator Aaron D. Ford  
Senator Ben Kieckhefer  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Becky Harris

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3  
Senator Julia Ratti, Senatorial District No. 13  
Senator Patricia Farley, Senatorial District No. 8  
Senator Becky Harris, Senatorial District No. 9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Cathy Crockett, Program Analyst  
Lona Domenici, Committee Manager  
Felicia Archer, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

David Walker, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Museum of Art

Katie O'Neill, Chair, The Art Museum at Symphony Park  
Michael Hillerby  
Kathleen Conaboy, Board Member, Nevada Museum of Art  
Elisa Cafferata, Chair, Nevada Commission for Women  
Ally Haynes Hamblen, Director, City of Las Vegas Cultural Affairs  
Ori Vaknin, Board member, Art Museum at Symphony Park  
Bill Arent, Director, City of Las Vegas, Economic and Urban Development  
Scott Anderson, Chief Deputy, Nevada Office of Secretary of State  
Jeanette Belz, American Society of Radiologic Technologists  
Chad Hensley, Nevada Society of Radiologic Technologists  
Cari Herington, Executive Director, Nevada Cancer Coalition  
Tom McCoy, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network  
Barry Duncan, Reno Diagnostic Center  
Jesse Wadhams, Body Heat Tanning  
Joe Pollock, Deputy Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health,  
Nevada Department of Health and Human Services  
Marla McDade Williams, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony  
Michon Eben, Cultural Resources Program Manager, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony  
Will Adler, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe  
Claudia Vecchio, Director, Nevada Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs  
Eugene Hattori, Curator of Anthropology, Nevada State Museum, Carson City  
Jim Lawrence, Deputy Director, Department of Conservation and Natural  
Resource  
Michael Alonzo, Caesar's Entertainment  
John McCormick, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court  
Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties  
Josh Hicks, Bennett Medical Services  
Caleb Cage, Chief of Emergency Management, Division of Emergency  
Management and Homeland Security, Nevada Department of  
Public Safety

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:  
We will open with Senate Bill (S.B.) 187.

**SENATE BILL 187 (1st Reprint)**: Makes an appropriation for the establishment of a fine arts museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, and the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in Reno, Nevada. (BDR S-267)

SENATOR TICK SEGERBLOM (Senatorial District No. 3):

This is a very simple bill. I have with me David Walker and Katie O'Neill. They have partnered in Las Vegas and Reno to create the Nevada Museum of Art. We have picked a location in downtown Las Vegas. We are asking for a \$10 million grant from the State that will be matched by contributions. The State Treasurer would keep the money and disburse it as it is matched.

We would have to show the money up front. It would be used as seed money for a \$250 million art museum near the Smith Center for The Performing Arts in the Symphony Park area.

Las Vegas is the last major city in the Country that does not have an art museum. That is criminal. The amount we are requesting is about 1 percent of the amount we gave the Raiders football team. If we could give them anything, it would be appropriate.

DAVID WALKER (Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Museum of Art):

We are grateful the State is considering S.B. 187 and mindful of the many competing priorities for funding you must consider. We have provided information on establishing a fine arts museum ([Exhibit C](#)) and on Art in Education under the Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics program ([Exhibit D](#)).

The funding we seek is significant. The partnership with the State is what is most meaningful. Your early support and confidence will inspire major funding and participation from a variety of regional and national sources we have had quiet conversations with in the past two years.

I speak on behalf of the Museum's Board of Trustees and staff in recognizing the One Nevada vision that Governor Brian Sandoval has declared. We have been active in southern Nevada for some time now, perhaps best expressed through our Seven Magic Mountains art installation just south of Las Vegas. Our institution and collaboration with the Art Museum at Symphony Park organization stands ready to expand our highly regarded education, exhibition and collections programs in Reno, but more importantly, in Las Vegas, within a new signature museum facility.

Education is our highest priority. It is no secret this aligns with the State's priorities. Art museums are powerful economic drivers that create jobs, attract

and generate investments, and stimulate a local economy through tourism and commerce.

KATIE O'NEILL (Chair, The Art Museum at Symphony Park):

I am a third-generation Las Vegan, dedicated to serving a community my family has called home for 75 years. My involvement in this project is fueled by pride of place and a responsibility to make it even better for future generations.

Our mission for Symphony Park is to establish and sustain a significant, permanent fine arts museum in Las Vegas that inspires and connects diverse people through education, exhibitions and collections. Las Vegas is home to 2 million residents and is visited by 43 million people annually. We still remain the largest city without an art museum.

The Nevada Museum of Art and the Art Museum at Symphony Park have entered into a formal planning relationship to create a Statewide cultural institution with fine arts museums and museum schools in both Las Vegas and Reno, serving our own geographical communities first. Arts matter in a city that is culturally growing. It is critical for families, important for businesses and essential to diversify our economy.

When we presented at the Senate Committee on Natural Resources, there were dozens of letters of support and emotional testimony. Thanks to our partnership with the City of Las Vegas, we have a home in Symphony Park. By working with the Nevada Museum of Art, we have a path ahead. We are closer now than ever before, and we are seeing the community come together in support of our mission. We are gaining momentum every step of the way. Efforts we put forth together as a State are stronger than what we can accomplish separately.

SENATOR DENIS:

When I was on the Las Vegas Library District Board, we were in agreement with you to bring you down to Las Vegas. The hardest obstacle we had to overcome was that when it came to Las Vegas, supporters could not find people who wanted to contribute toward that cause. Has that changed over 16 to 20 years? We even had a facility built to the standards of the Smithsonian. Have we progressed enough now to sustain it?

MR. WALKER:

It is clear our museum has garnered a much larger reputation throughout the world during those 16 years. We receive a significant amount of our funding from the Las Vegas area. We have many trustees in Las Vegas on our board. We have a \$7 million operating budget, which is not huge, but a quarter of that comes from outside the State, on top of the funding we see from Las Vegas. Some of the north-south challenges that existed in the past seem to be diminished. Our role in the Las Vegas area seems to be sought after. Our collaborating skills have improved on both ends. The time is right.

SENATOR DENIS:

That is exciting. I wanted it back then. We just were not quite ready. I think there is a new opportunity. This is great.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

Katie has a great group in southern Nevada.

Ms. O'NEILL:

There are funders who supported both our efforts. What they are most interested in is funding us, Reno and Las Vegas, together. They have made that very clear. People involved in past efforts understand the direction we are going, and there is potential for success.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I am proud to be a joint sponsor of this bill. Could you talk about the value the accreditation brings?

MR. WALKER:

The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) accredits about 5 percent of museums in America. We are fortunate to be one of them. It is a rigorous process. Major universities and colleges go through the same process. Being accredited indicates you have met certain standards and criteria that allow you to have a relationship with other major museums where you can exchange exhibitions, loan exhibits to each other and be part of an elite group of museums that other museums are not part of. For instance, we brought the Emancipation Proclamation from the National Archives to Reno. It only sees light five days a year. Our accreditation made that possible.

A new museum starting from scratch may not be able to get accreditation for 25 years. Working with AAM, we can be very certain the museum in Las Vegas will be accredited when we open the doors.

MICHAEL HILLERBY:

I had the honor of serving on the Board of Trustees of the Nevada Museum of Art for eight years, including two years as its Chair. Sadly, that is another reason I do not like term limits that ended. I know you are focused today on the money matters and not policy. From my own experience, under the leadership of the Board and the tremendous staff under David Walker's leadership, this is an institution that knows how to manage money. You are being asked to spend some of your constituents' money, of which you are stewards. It is a wonderful investment and an organization that will take that seriously. They have a long track record of matching donations when those are required.

Having gone through the reaccreditation process when I was on the Board, I saw what is involved. The accreditation team looks at the physical infrastructure, ability to provide security and climate control systems, finances, quality of staff, scholarship that staff produces and the governance of the institution, which is really the long-term vision. This is an investment of money to be proud of.

KATHLEEN CONABOY (Board Member, Nevada Museum of Art):

We have deliberated long and hard about this proposition of a merger with the southern Nevada entity. We have a high level of comfort with Ms. O'Neill and her board. We have had joint strategic planning sessions and jointly engaged a consultant to help us come to conclusions about the planning. The Board is highly enthusiastic.

We have every confidence that under Mr. Walker's leadership, and with Ms. O'Neill, we can be successful.

ELISA CAFFERATA (Chair, Nevada Commission for Women):

I am representing myself on this bill. As a member of the Nevada Museum of Art, I support this bill. It has been a delight to watch all the things that have happened at our museum in Reno. From a fiscal perspective, I appreciate the impact this has on tourism. It will contribute to the revenue and the economy of our State.

ALLY HAYNES HAMBLIN (Director, City of Las Vegas, Office of Cultural Affairs):

I support investment in the arts and culture community. The City of Las Vegas is a partner in this project that aims to bring an accredited art museum to downtown Las Vegas. I support S.B. 187. Supporting the growth of the arts is a sound investment in our future. A prevalence of the arts in a community elevates quality of life for residents, attracts businesses, and a talented and creative workforce, and it galvanizes improvements to the educational infrastructure of the region. An Americans for the Arts report says the City of Las Vegas has 1,114 arts-related businesses that employ 5,869 people.

Investment in arts has played a key role in revitalization of downtown Las Vegas. The arts elements in the area attract nearly 2 million people annually. A nationally accredited art museum in the area would provide high-quality arts integration and arts education opportunities for area schools that are not available to our K-12 students. It would provide an attraction for families, visitors and world-class art enthusiasts and collectors.

The bill will provide early funding needed to make an arts museum in Las Vegas a reality.

ORI VAKNIN (Board member, Art Museum at Symphony Park):

My company is heavily invested in residential real estate in downtown Las Vegas. I support S.B. 187.

BILL ARENT (Director, City of Las Vegas, Economic and Urban Development):

I support S.B. 187 as amended. The City is committed to supporting the museum by providing a donation of land and funding support in the form of a matching grant. The arts are very important in our community's quality of life and economic development.

SCOTT ANDERSON (Chief Deputy, Nevada Office of Secretary of State):

The fiscal note we had submitted on S.B. 187 does not apply as reprinted.

SENATOR FORD:

I have no doubt this appropriation will be beneficial to our community. I have a great belief in the arts. This is a lot of money, and there is a finite number of dollars to go around. Would there be interest in a smaller appropriation?

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 12, 2017  
Page 8

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:  
Yes.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:  
We will close the hearing on S.B. 187. I will turn the gavel over to Vice Chair Parks as we move to S.B. 219.

**SENATE BILL 219 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to radiation.  
(BDR 40-889)

VICE CHAIR PARKS:  
This bill revises provisions related to radiation.

SENATOR JOYCE WOODHOUSE (Senatorial District No. 5):  
I am here with friends to present the second reprint of S.B. 219 and I have submitted my remarks ([Exhibit E](#)). This was brought to me by Tom McCoy of the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network during the interim. Two sessions ago, as a first step toward providing protection from the harmful effects of indoor tanning, I sponsored Senate Bill No. 267 of the 77th Session. That bill prohibited an owner or operator from allowing a person under age 18 to use tanning equipment, provided that protective eyewear must be used while tanning and required owners or operators to post warning signs informing users of safety procedures that must be followed while using the equipment. This legislation has served to protect many. We are very proud of its success. I am sponsoring this measure before you today to take the next step in providing protection from the harmful effects of tanning beds.

This measure provides for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the State Board of Health to regulate tanning equipment operated in a tanning establishment. The bill received a substantive fiscal note from the Division, when it was first introduced, in the amount of \$559,918 in the first year and \$687,889 in the second year. Because the original bill was amended in the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services, as of today we have received notice that the Division will provide a revised fiscal note this afternoon. I have the number, if they are not here to bring it to you.

I have an amendment provided to you from the radiologic technologists ([Exhibit F](#)). I consider this to be a friendly amendment. Representatives from



that group will address their amendment. There is another amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System from Fennemore Craig. I have not accepted that amendment. I extend my deepest appreciation to Mr. McCoy, Cari Herington, Jeanette Belz and Chad Hensley for their many hours working on this bill. I urge you to join me in taking the next step in protecting our citizens from the risks of tanning beds and subsequent health issues.

I would ask the Vice Chair's indulgence to allow Ms. Belz and Mr. Hensley to briefly describe the amendment I read earlier. Mr. McCoy and Ms. Herington have some comments as well.

JEANETTE BELZ (American Society of Radiologic Technologists):

This bill will raise the standard of patient care in Nevada by establishing a licensing program to make sure those operating ionizing radiation equipment have education and training prior to performing the procedures. Radiation is dangerous. This is all about patient safety and the safety of those operating the equipment.

The program will be housed within the Radiation Control Program in DPBH, which already has the authority to regulate the machines that these people use. Nevada is one of only a handful of states that do not make radiation safety a priority by ensuring those who operate machines, such as X-rays, computed tomography scans, radiation therapy and nuclear medicine have the proper education and training to do so.

As Senator Woodhouse mentioned, we worked with lots of groups to come up with a very good bill that satisfies most of their concerns.

CHAD HENSLEY (Nevada Society of Radiologic Technologists):

The amendments proposed today have been discussed with the Radiation Control Program team and communities of interest. They are meant to remove language not originally submitted, or change wording to provide a clearer explanation of this program's intent. Section 13 of [Exhibit F](#) changes the definition of "direct supervision" to provide a clearer explanation of the supervision needed and to clarify there are different requirements in critical access hospitals. Section 27.1 removes "or physician assistants," as they were not included in the conceptual amendment recommended by the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services.

Section 29.1)(b) defined the scope of practice to make regulations less restrictive than those in other national professional organizations. Section 29.3 removes the term “fees,” since the radiation control program is a fee-based agency and licensing fees will need to be in their budget and not in the General Fund. Section 35.1 removes “without compensation,” because these services will be provided for compensation. Section 35.2 removes “under the direct supervision of a physician, chiropractor or podiatrist, or person who holds a license.” This change was requested by the Radiation Control Program. Supervision details will be explained in regulation. Section 36 removes “mammography” since these licenses already exist and cannot be grandfathered in. It corrects the date of implementation to “2019” and removes “without obtaining a license from the Division,” since those grandfathered in will be registered and not licensed. In Section 39.2, the language adds “and all other applicable requirements established in regulation” to include compliance with federal regulations.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I would like you to hear from Mr. McCoy and Ms. Herington.

CARI HERINGTON (Executive Director, Nevada Cancer Coalition):

I am addressing just the tanning portion of the bill to protect people before they become patients. The World Health Organization has listed certain medical and cosmetology equipment using radiation as a Group 1 carcinogen to humans, or known to cause cancer. This group includes plutonium, radon and tobacco. Ultraviolet emitting tanning equipment was added to Group 1 in 2009, after a combined analysis of more than 20 epidemiological studies showed the risk of cutaneous melanoma, the deadliest form of skin cancer, is increased by 75 percent when a person uses tanning equipment before they turn 30 years old. There is also an increased risk for ocular melanoma associated with the use of tanning equipment.

Nevada became the fourth state in the Nation to take a stand, under Senator Woodhouse’s earlier bill, to restrict the use of tanning equipment from minors. Today, at least 41 states and the District of Columbia do so. These requirements are outlined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 597. Requirements also address the operation of the tanning equipment and the interior temperature. While the cancer control community provides resources, information and education to tanning device owners and operators, and to the public, our laws have not provided for the control and proper operation of the

equipment and its compliance with U.S. Food and Drug Administration performance standards. This bill will leverage the DPBH's existing radiation control system to regulate this equipment.

TOM MCCOY (American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network):

Several of you helped pass the legislation in 2013 to start the process. I am a cancer survivor. What we have learned is skin cancer is the number one cancer overall, but between the ages of 15 and 29, among the female population, melanoma is the number two cancer. That is a very dramatic change we have seen over the last several decades. This bill will help businesses in the tanning industry and the general public to have a better understanding of what needs to be done to protect the user. Anyone under 18 is prohibited from using tanning beds. There is no enforcement. Many salons voluntarily comply, and we appreciate that.

Anyone can set up a tanning salon by getting a business license and buying the equipment. No one is inspecting it. This bill will get the radiation control program people involved so they will be in a position to take a look at the devices to make sure the timers are accurate and the temperatures are correct. We support S.B. 219.

BARRY DUNCAN (Reno Diagnostic Center):

Reno Diagnostic Center is the largest independent diagnostic imaging facility in northern Nevada. We are in full support of the provisions regarding radiologic technologists. We are neutral on the remainder of the bill. The provisions pertaining to diagnostic imaging will provide a greater standard of patient care.

JESSE WADHAMS (Body Heat Tanning):

I want to apologize for being in this position. Senator Woodhouse was thoughtful in taking time to meet with me yesterday. We come to this late in the discussion. The association for the industry had been involved earlier. We have concerns with sections 1-7 of the bill, dealing with tanning licensure.

The State radiological program is a fee-based function. There are only about 40 locations left in the State, so aggregating the original fiscal note across the industry is about \$18,000 per location. We definitely have concerns with that. It is not a large segment of the business. The Affordable Care Act taxed tanning salons. The original bill restricts those under 18 from use. As Nevada tends to be sunny, there is just not a lot of business left.

We offered an amendment in [Exhibit G](#). Senator Woodhouse has said it is not acceptable. We would like to work with the people who are involved to come to some middle ground.

JOE POLLOCK (Deputy Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):

We estimate a need in fiscal year (FY) 2017-2018 for additional staffing and associated costs at \$255,000 and \$544,000 in FY 2018-2019. For the 2019-2021 biennium, we estimate approximately \$1.2 million.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

There has been a proposed amendment. Have you seen it and reviewed its fiscal impact?

MR. POLLOCK:

We have looked at the amendment. We do not believe it changes the fiscal note.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

The hearing on [S.B. 219](#) is closed, and I will turn the gavel back to Chair Woodhouse.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

[Senate Bill 244](#) will be presented by Senator Julia Ratti.

[SENATE BILL 244 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to historic preservation. (BDR 33-515)

SENATOR JULIA RATTI (Senatorial District No. 13):

I was originally contacted by the Reno Sparks Indian Colony about [S.B. 244](#). We had a significant turnout from the tribes at the policy committee hearing. Most of the tribal leaders have submitted letters of support that are included as ([Exhibit H](#), [Exhibit I](#), [Exhibit J](#), [Exhibit K](#), [Exhibit L](#) and [Exhibit M](#)) today.

Native American tribes are not included in many of the private and public forums in which management, treatment and disposition of Native American cultural items, specifically human remains, funerary objects, sacred items and items of cultural significance are discussed and deliberated. There are many

misconceptions of the past and present Native American culture, including its ancestors and their cultural items left behind.

In Western culture, Native American cultural items are often considered items to be scientifically tested and inappropriately studied, collected and displayed as objects of curiosity. From the Native American perspective, these items are still very spiritually connected to the traditional, cultural and existing tribal community. Those items should be respected and managed according to the values, beliefs and traditional practices of the Native community. Ground disturbing activity, such as excavations of areas of cultural significance, on federal and State lands requires a permit. Private lands are excluded from this requirement, which in some circumstances leads to the significant loss of cultural items. Senate Bill 244 will help provide Native American representation on the Nevada State Board of Museums and History, and on the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation.

This bill requires consultation with Native American tribes to ensure the values; beliefs and traditions are respectfully reflected in regulations.

The most effective way to understand the significance and appropriate management of the cultural items is to have meaningful participation and consultation with the tribes. This bill requires notice and consultation with the tribes that are culturally affiliated and in the closest proximity to the cultural items and ancestral remains. While protecting the Constitutional rights of private property owners, the bill will require a person to obtain a permit to excavate a prehistoric Indian burial site or a prehistoric site of religious or cultural importance to a Native American tribe. There is no cost for the permit that is issued by the museum director. Under existing law, the museum director has the authority to issue a permit for such activity on State and federal land. Essentially this will be the same process, just extended to private land.

I want to emphasize "consultation" because that is a very important concept for this bill. This bill provides an opportunity for Nevada tribes to participate in the respectful handling, disposition and repatriation of cultural items and ancestral remains. In cases where human remains and associated funerary objects are discovered, the bill states that those items will not be subject to scientific study, nor will the human remains be separated from the associated funerary objects when reinterred.

If it is necessary, items may be studied with the consent of the tribe. As proposed in the bill, the culturally affiliated tribe will now be given the opportunity to be repatriated with the Native American cultural items being disposed of by the State museum or discovered during a permitted excavation. Civil penalties have also been increased to deter looters or others that deface cultural items.

I want to note for the several members who also sit on the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and who heard the original bill, this bill has had a significant amount of work done on it since that Committee hearing.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Reno-Sparks Indian Colony):

Proposed Amendment 4447 to S.B. 244 ([Exhibit N](#)) offers a major change in the language to say a person shall not excavate a prehistoric site on private lands located in Nevada that the person knows is a prehistoric Indian burial site unless there is a permit obtained from the museum director. There is now an explanation of what is allowed, to clear up confusion. It does not apply broadly to cultural items. Another change clarifies that it is Indian burial sites we are concerned about. We also deleted language that spoke to the Statewide Historic Preservation Plan. There was concern this section would compromise a grant from a federal agency. That is now out.

We worked extensively before and after the Senate Committee on Government Affairs hearing with the Nevada Mining Association, the Southern Nevada Water Authority and Virginia City, to make sure we were not creating more problems. They asked us, if they have an agreement in place as a result of federal law, could this bill recognize those efforts so they did not have to duplicate them. That is the intent of the changes in subsection 7. We deleted language that discussed criminal penalties at the request of private entities. Those are the primary changes proposed.

Our intent is to work with everyone so we can get this bill to a point where we can get it processed. We have had three meetings with State agencies going back to March 16. They will not say there is no fiscal impact. We have gone through the fiscal notes identified. Based on the amendment, the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) reduced its fiscal note, but it is still substantial.

There are concerns about the permit requirement and excavations on private land. We do not quite understand those concerns. The private sector is not advocating for those provisions to be removed from the bill. Any construction project or business opened needs to get permission from government to proceed.

I do not understand the objections regarding extending the provisions to private landowners. That is what results in the high fiscal note from the agencies' perspective. More than 80 percent of land in Nevada is federal land. Just focusing on tribal burial grounds, the percentage of land that will be affected by this bill should be very small. The fiscal notes identify a need to increase by a substantial amount the agencies' budgets because of the provisions related to cultural affiliation of Native remains. An online database for areas of the 27 respective tribes in Nevada exists. We do not understand why additional staff would be needed to identify cultural affiliation. The tribes are willing to work with the SHPO to develop a map that identifies their ancestral areas. This map would be made available to SHPO and the museum director as needed. There is not much work that has to be done to identify those areas.

The fiscal note from SHPO identifies section 6 and section 12 as having direct financial impacts on that Agency. The positions in those sections relate specifically to the Division of Museums and History (DMH), Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. I just do not understand their concern. The bill proposes adding a member representing the Native American community to two commissions that have a role with DMH and OHP. In one case, it is said it will take an additional \$2,000 to add a new member. When I look at the budget, it is just over \$400. Unless those provisions are being handled in a special use category, I do not understand how they arrived at \$2,000.

We have not made substantial progress with the agencies. As Senator Ratti noted, you have letters of support from the tribes that support the bill as written. The fiscal notes do not represent a cooperative approach to Native remains and handling them. They do not recognize that tribes have a role in decisions made related to our ancestral remains.

SENATOR RATTI:

I want to commend the people who have worked hard on this bill. As the sponsor, it is my perspective that even if there is a fiscal note, this is the right thing to do. I hope we will make progress on the fiscal note, but even if we

cannot, I will still strongly advocate for this bill to move forward. We need to evolve our thinking about consultation with Native peoples regarding their own burial sites. I stand firmly behind this bill.

MICHON EBEN (Cultural Resources Program Manager, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony): There is a concern about determining tribal affiliation in this bill. The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) is committed to working with the State agencies prior to any discoveries and immediately upon passage of this bill to assist in identifying the closest culturally-affiliated tribe. The RSIC has a map that identifies our cultural interest, and we are committed to working with the Nevada tribes on a streamlined process to effectively implement S.B. 244.

The RSIC appreciates the passage yesterday of Assembly Bill 203, the cemetery authority bill, which protects human remains in formal historic cemeteries. We are respectfully asking the same principles be extended to our Native American ancestors and their burial sites. Please allow S.B. 244 to move forward so we can continue to work on any outstanding issues.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 203**: Revises provisions governing cemeteries. (BDR 40-723)

WILL ADLER (Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):  
We support the bill.

CLAUDIA VECCHIO (Director, Nevada Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs): The Nevada Indian Commission is part of my Department. I am happy to hear from Marla McDade Williams that they are working on logistics. We agree with the intent. We had not heard that the tribes are working on a map. We lacked that identification up to now. If there is a map, that would be a good step forward.

We were also concerned that this bill requires all 27 tribes be a part of this process. We had concerns about how this bill fundamentally changes the relationship the Division of Museums and History has with its publics. We are a Division that preserves, protects and promotes. We are not a Division that polices. I want to make sure, if this is implemented, our museum directors are not regulators, but that they are seen as protecting and preserving. That is who we are. Language in the bill says we will fully protect the Constitutional rights of property owners. The museum directors are not Constitutional attorneys, so



we would have to better understand what that means and how they would fully implement and protect rights. This is not something we currently do.

We have worked with those who are putting this bill together. We appreciate the progress made to this point. We are asking all tribes to be a part of this. We do have fiscal notes. Museum leadership has spent much time and thoughtful consideration looking at what it would take to implement this bill.

EUGENE HATTORI (Curator of Anthropology, Nevada State Museum, Carson City): My input is that of a technician, as a curator. We manage a permitting process for the State. I estimated that for my administration, two additional full-time equivalent positions would be required conduct the consultation, administer the permitting process and follow up regarding the distribution of the artifacts. Human remains are considered differently as we are obligated to follow another federal law, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, which has precedence over the State's burial laws.

JIM LAWRENCE (Deputy Director, Department of Conservation and Natural Resource):

With me is Rebecca Palmer, the State Historic Preservation Officer. She and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) are within our Department. We are neutral on the bill, but did put a fiscal note on it. Our Department gets requests for numerous fiscal notes throughout the Legislative Session. We take that task very seriously. We do our best to evaluate the bills and make sure we have as accurate an estimate as we can, and if possible, forecast the future costs.

This bill is particularly difficult. It is a shift for SHPO to move from the public land aspect to private land. We did research on what different states are doing. There was not much to go on. I appreciate there is work being done to try to bring everybody together. While it seems SHPO was taken out of section 6 of [Exhibit N](#), there is still a tie in section 30 because, while the permitting would be done by museums, there is still the requirement to bring in SHPO when items are found on private land. There are costs that might be associated with that. We have provisions for the protection of remains and artifacts on private lands, but we do not have provisions for cultural significance and prehistoric sites. That is where we struggled to get the fiscal note in place.

Another thing that gives us pause is that SHPO gets much federal funding to carry out our duties under section 106 of the U.S. National Historic

Preservation Act. There are some sections that we see as possibly in conflict with the Secretary of Interior's standards, which might jeopardize some of our future funding. We are having those discussions with the bill sponsor. Part of our fiscal note is the cost of treatment plan preparation.

SENATOR RATTI:

We have cleared some of the objections from the private sector. We are puzzled by the fact that this is a process that is in place. It is required for federal land or federal dollars. There are conversations still to be had. It is still the right thing to do. If there are barriers, we need help overcoming them. If there is a cost, we need money to fund it.

MS. MCDADE WILLIAMS:

Permitting on private land is one of the new activities required by the bill. It models the process for permits issued by DMH for State and federal projects. We are not asking for anything different. The process is in place. It is a very limited universe. The change to SHPO is the cultural affiliation determination.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 343, which requires the State to collect information as it relates to gender equality in the workplace. Senator Farley and Senator Harris will present the bill.

**SENATE BILL 343 (1st Reprint)**: Requires the Secretary of State to collect and report information related to gender equality in the workplace.  
(BDR 18-990)

SENATOR PATRICIA FARLEY (Senatorial District No. 8):

This bill will shed some light on the critical nature of gender equality in the workplace. While we know parity in the workplace has improved in recent years, full equality among employees is still a work-in-progress. All employees deserve to work in environments that promote and improve gender equality, including equal pay between women and men for equal work. The workplace should foster consultation between employers and employees on issues concerning equality.

Employees should expect to have access to all occupations and industries, including leadership roles regardless of gender. Businesses should take a larger role in removing barriers to the full and equal participation of women in the

workforce and promote the elimination of discrimination on the basis of gender in employment, including family and caring responsibilities.

Advancement of equality in the workplace helps promote productivity and competitiveness among all professions. Senator Harris and I have requested S.B. 343, which requires the office of the Secretary of State (SOS) to design, in consultation with the Nevada Commission for Women, and conduct an annual survey of businesses in Nevada to collect data and information relating to the issue of gender equality. The survey must be provided to each business in Nevada at the same time the business submits its initial State business registration application and at renewal. To improve participation and save costs, the measure specifies the survey may be provided and conducted electronically. Participation is voluntary.

The SOS shall not penalize or take adverse action against any business that does not respond to the survey. The SOS must compile and submit an annual report to the Governor and the Legislature regarding survey responses and make the survey responses available on the internet. Upon request, the SOS must provide aggregate data to institutions affiliated with the Nevada System of Higher Education for research.

The authorization of the survey is long overdue. We, as policy makers, can identify areas where we can improve and recognize industries that have engaged in strong and robust gender equality processes.

SENATOR BECKY HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 9):

Proposed Amendment 4578 ([Exhibit O](#)) makes some minor changes, but the impact for the fiscal note is huge because it takes that fiscal note to zero. The program will stay with the SOS. It is a voluntary survey. The SOS will work in conjunction with the Nevada Commission for Women. The survey will be available through the portal electronically. People submitting the survey will be authorized to submit it, and they will have to attest to the truthfulness of the information. Survey results will be online and searchable. Aggregate data will not be restricted to institutions of higher education. It will be available for anyone for research purposes. It is a five-year pilot.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We also have a fiscal note from the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED).

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 12, 2017  
Page 20

SENATOR HARRIS:

Initially we were placing it in GOED. It is no longer there, so the fiscal note is irrelevant.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Is this optional for businesses?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Yes.

MICHAEL ALONZO (Caesar's Entertainment):

Caesar's Entertainment supports the bill. We recognize the sponsors, Scott Anderson and the Secretary of State for their efforts.

MS. CAFFERATA:

I am speaking in this case on behalf of the Nevada Commission for Women. We conducted workshops and surveys to get information about women's issues in the State. We had more than 500 people participate, which indicates an interest in making strides toward equality for women. We are delighted to hear the changes to the bill so we can gather information in partnership with the SOS. We support the bill.

MR. ANDERSON:

We appreciate the amendment before you. It removes the fiscal note. We can absorb this through the business portal service.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Senator Segerblom will present S.B. 377.

**SENATE BILL 377 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to public defenders.  
(BDR 14-1005)

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

This bill deals with indigent defense in the rural counties. It was brought to us by the Nevada Supreme Court. The rural counties do not generally have public defenders. They hire private lawyers with a limited annual budget, and the lawyer must defend all clients. Some defendants get good service, others may not, as a result of demands made by larger cases. Around the Country, courts

are ruling these agreements unconstitutional because of the limited resources the counties have to defend people.

If we are not willing to fund this, we are looking at a major lawsuit. The American Civil Liberties Union said they will sue the State.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I am not on the committee that heard this. Clark and Washoe Counties must set up their own public defenders' offices. For any county below 100,000, can they choose to use the State's public defender?

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

Yes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Does this apply to counties that use the State's public defender?

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

They do not do that right now. The bill would provide a State public defender for those counties that have this pay-for-service arrangement. It would be up to the counties to decide if they want to join. Most of the rural counties would have to join this because they just do not have the resources. We are basically helping them pay for the big cases they will enter into, such as a serious murder case, where they need expert testimony and legitimate defense.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do we not still have the State public defender?

JOHN MCCORMICK (Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court):  
We have a State Public Defender's Office (SPDO). It services the First Judicial District, which is Carson City and Storey County. The Office has shrunk because of the difficulties the counties have had providing financial resources for indigent defense. This bill would create a Nevada Right to Counsel Commission to oversee indigent defense in the entire State, and would implement standards and rules. It renames the SPDO as the Office of Indigent Legal Services. It removes the new Office from the DHHS to give it the necessary independence. The bill will allow counties to evaluate how they provide indigent defense services and then, if they choose to, transfer those services to the Office of Indigent Legal Services.

Counties would pay to the Office what they are now paying to maintain the services. The State would pick up extra costs going forward. A county can choose to retain its own indigent defense delivery method, so long as that method going forward meets the standards promulgated by the Right to Counsel Commission.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

A commission will set the rules. The counties must provide a public defender, and then they can join you or go out on their own. If they go out on their own, you get to set the rules for the level they have to provide.

MR. MCCORMICK:

That is correct. The financial advantage for the counties is that the costs the counties have paid in FY 2013-2014 to FY2015-2016 will be averaged. If the county chooses to go into the system, their cost will be capped at that. Projections are in ([Exhibit P](#)). The State would pick up cost increases in the future. That would provide the counties some fiscal relief to help meet the new standards. The Nevada Supreme Court has had an Indigent Defense Commission that has been looking at issues related to the 6th Amendment for the last ten years. It has promulgated guidelines for attorneys and also asked counties to not use flat fee contracts.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

Senator Goicoechea, virtually all your counties would really benefit by this.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Thank you.

JEFF FONTAINE (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties):

The Nevada Association of Counties is neutral on this bill. It is our position that Nevada's counties should not have to pay for the State's obligation to provide lawyers for indigent persons under the 14th Amendment. Over time, the costs have been shifted to the counties. It is a growing burden on them. They have budgets constrained by property tax caps and other unfunded mandates. This is especially true in the rural counties.

There is a fiscal note that shows what counties are paying for indigent defense in the State. This year the figure is nearly \$70 million, with \$7 million in rural counties. There are only two states that provide less of a share of indigent legal

defense than Nevada. We had worked for many sessions for the State to share in these costs.

We worked on this bill. We could not reach consensus among our counties. While some saw a benefit to them in the State system, others were not convinced and expressed concerns. The biggest concerns counties had was that they would opt into a State system with costs capped and then see caps lifted.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Some of the rural counties are pushing back because they have public defenders on staff. They do not want to make this change.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

They can keep their current system. They do not have to opt in. It will help the smaller ones that do not have anything.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I will take you at your word.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The hearing is closed. We will open the hearing on S.B. 419 regarding durable medical equipment.

**SENATE BILL 419 (1st Reprint)**: Exempts sales of certain durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment and mobility enhancing equipment from sales and use taxes. (BDR 32-325)

JOSH HICKS (Bennett Medical Services):

Senator Joseph Hardy asked that I present this bill today. We presented jointly at the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development. The bill was referred here due to fiscal notes on the original bill from the Department of Taxation and the SOS. This first reprint deletes several sections and that action has taken care of those fiscal notes. Both the Department ([Exhibit Q](#)) and the SOS ([Exhibit R](#)) and ([Exhibit S](#)) have notified the Committee the action should relieve their fiscal notes.

Question No. 4 in the last election proposed to exempt a variety of items from the sales and use tax. It included durable medical, oxygen delivery and mobility enhancing equipment. That passed in November with almost 72 percent of the

vote. It will be on the ballot in November 2018. Terms were not defined in the ballot question. This bill does that. It provides a definition of the equipment. Section 13 makes the whole bill effective only if the voters in November 2018 approve the question again. The exemption will become effective December 1, 2018 if it passes.

MR. ANDERSON:

With the changes to the original bill, the fiscal note submitted by the SOS does not apply.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The hearing on S.B. 419 is closed. We will hear S.B. 529 regarding the emergency responses made to flood events in 2017.

**SENATE BILL 529**: Makes an appropriation to the Division of Emergency Management of the Department of Public Safety for the costs associated with emergency responses to flood events that occurred in 2017. (BDR S-1183)

CALEB CAGE (Chief of Emergency Management, Divisions of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, Nevada Department of Public Safety):

This bill deals with two Presidential declared major disasters from January and February 2017. We have vendors awaiting payment. The need is urgent. As written, S.B. 529 appropriates \$1.6 million. Because of the unprecedented disasters this year in Nevada, the costs have continued to grow over the last five months. The amount is now at \$2.4 million. We worked with fiscal staff on these numbers.

Once we have a Presidential declaration, the State and tribes in Nevada can seek 75 percent reimbursement for emergency protective measures taken during the disasters. More measures taken were added today. Our intention is to seek reimbursement of 75 percent through the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The last Presidential major disaster declaration was in October 2014, the one before it was in 2008. In the last 20 years we had 8. We had two so far in 2017. We expect a third potential disaster when the record snowpack melts.



Counties have taken extraordinary measures to protect their communities before disaster in a lower-cost way, rather than waiting until after a disaster hits.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The request is for \$1.6 million. Do you truly need \$2.4 million?

MR. CAGE:

Yes. It has grown since the initial request.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Is that enough to get us to July 1 and through the snow melt?

MR. CAGE:

It is uncertain. The State has been extremely generous in supporting local partners in emergency protective measures. We are hopeful.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The hearing on S.B. 529 is closed. We will move to the work session.

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senate Fiscal Analyst):

The first bill is S.B. 221.

**SENATE BILL 221 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing wildlife. (BDR 45-814)

ALEX HAARTZ (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):

This bill was heard on May 4 in Committee. It creates the Nevada Wildlife Public Education Committee (NWPEC) within the Board of Wildlife Commissioners and prescribes composition of NWPEC. It requires a public information program to educate, promote and engage residents of Nevada concerning responsible stewardship of wildlife, and to create an operating plan to implement NWPEC's future goals.

The bill also authorizes the Department to fund activities of the Committee from the Wildlife Heritage Account (WHA). It allows expenditures of 80 percent, instead of 75 percent, of the money deposited in the account in the previous year along with the interest earnings. It authorizes transfers from the WHA not to exceed \$2 million for the period July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2021, unless the unobligated balance falls below \$5 million. In that case, the expenditures from

the account must be reduced. The bill authorizes the Department to request emergency funding of not more than 50 percent of the unobligated WHA principal if a catastrophic threat to wildlife occurs. The bill requires the Board to make sure a \$3 million minimum unobligated balance is maintained in the WHA.

Tony Wasley, Director of the Nevada Department of Wildlife, testified and has removed the fiscal note. There was testimony in support of the bill by Kyle Davis of the Coalition for Nevada Wildlife and from Nevada Bighorns Unlimited. There was no testimony in opposition or in neutral. One amendment was submitted by the Coalition. Sections of the bill become effective on July 1, 2017, while another section becomes effective July 1, 2021.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 221.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

MR. KRMPOTIC:

Senate Bill 503 makes an appropriation to the channel clearance account. The official name is the Channel Clearance, Maintenance, Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program. This is an appropriation totaling \$250,000. It was not submitted in the *Executive Budget*, but in bill drafts submitted by the administration.

**SENATE BILL 503**: Makes an appropriation to the Account for the Channel Clearance, Maintenance, Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program. (BDR S-904)

The bill was heard on April 13. Various members of the Churchill and Carson Valley areas testified on the bill indicating the need to clear channels, given the spring runoff coming up. If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, Staff would make some changes. Recommended changes include: The bill could be made effective upon passage and approval. Reversionary language in section 2 would be removed since, generally, the appropriations for this account do not revert and are used for future channel clearance activities.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 12, 2017  
Page 27

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 503  
WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:  
Senate Bill 514 concerns water resources.

**SENATE BILL 514**: Revises provisions governing the Division of Water Resources of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. (BDR 48-903)

MR. KRMPOTIC:

This bill was heard May 8. It implements budget decisions within the Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. This budget was closed yesterday in the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Joint Subcommittees on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation. The first section would provide monies appropriated for maintenance and operation of the South Fork Dam to be accounted for separately in the General Fund. It adds language for this money not to revert. The Proposed Amendment 4515 ([Exhibit T](#)) suggests alternative language in Section 3.3 to allow the appropriation that was approved for FY 2016-2017 to carryforward and be expended in the next biennium. Based on information from the Division, the balance remaining at the end of the year would be \$67,442.

Under section 3.5, the bill would now provide an appropriation of \$447,310 to include the appropriations that were not included in the Division's budget in each year of the biennium. It would allow those monies to be spent over a four-year period, for reversion June 30, 2021. If approved, Staff has the authority to remove those amounts from the budgets so they are not duplicated. This would accomplish the request made by the Division to have that money available over a longer period of time in order to make the necessary repairs and maintenance, and address the maintenance issues with the South Fork Dam without creating another nonreverting account.

In the amendment, Section 1 would be deleted and the remaining sections remain in effect. The Subcommittees approved the decision to direct these fees back to the General Fund and approve a General Fund appropriation to fund the Division.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

These funds will be appropriated and not revert until September 2021.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 514.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will hear S.B. 516.

**SENATE BILL 516 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing workforce innovation and apprenticeships. (BDR 53-913)

CATHY CROCKETT (Program Analyst):

Senate Bill 516 was heard before the Committee May 4. The bill, as amended, proposes to establish the Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN) within the Office of the Governor. The legislation also requires the Governor to appoint an unclassified executive director for OWINN and outlines responsibilities of OWINN and its executive director. It transfers the Nevada P-20 to Workforce Research Data System (RDS) to OWINN and specifies the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR); the Department of Education; the Nevada System of Higher Education; and the Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as any other department directed by Governor, to contribute educational workforce data to the Nevada P-20 Workforce RDS.

The bill transfers responsibility for the State Apprenticeship Program and the State Apprenticeship Council from the Department of Business and Industry (B&I) to OWINN. It requires the Governor to appoint a nonclassified State apprenticeship director. It specifies the duties and responsibilities of the

position, revises the duties of the Council and modifies the Council's structure to align with federal requirements.

This bill implements the *Executive Budget*. This Committee and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means approved establishing OWINN within the Office of the Governor and approved transferring the Council from B&I to OWINN.

The bill was presented by Andrew Clinger, the Governor's Senior Advisor, joined by Manny Lamarre, Executive Director of OWINN. The Building Construction Trades Council, the Superintendent of the Department of Education, the Nevada Builders Alliance, the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce and the Director of DETR spoke in support of the bill. There was no opposition. One member of the public spoke in neutral.

Regarding amendments, the legislation, as written, proposes to repeal NRS 610.080. Testimony by the OWINN Director indicated it was not intended to repeal NRS 610.080, which provides for the compensation of State Apprenticeship Council members. Staff notes this budget as approved by the Committee contains compensation for those members. The Committee may wish to approve an amendment to remove the repeal of NRS 610.080 from section 31 of the bill. Staff has identified a minor change the Committee may wish make to clarify the Office's nonclassified staffing model, which reflects the budget as approved by the Committee.

A proposed amendment will be necessary as a result of the Committees' action to move OWINN employees to the nonclassified service. The amendment would change NRS 223.085, which specifies the employment of staff, classification, salaries and benefits for staff of the Governor. Subsection 1 specifies the Governor may, within the limits of available money, employ such persons as he or she deems necessary to provide an appropriate staff for the Office of the Governor, including without limitation, the Office of Economic Development, the Office of Science Innovation and Technology, the Office of the Western Regional Education Compact and the Governor's Mansion. Except as provided by specific statute, such employees are not in the classified or unclassified service. Staff would suggest adding the Office of Workforce Innovation.

The bill would be effective July 1, 2017.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 516 TRANSFERRING OWINN TO THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR AND PLACING OWINN EMPLOYEES IN THE NONCLASSIFIED SERVICE AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF AND REMOVING THE REPEAL OF NRS 610.080; TRANSFERRING NEVADA P-20 TO WORKFORCE RESEARCH DATA SYSTEM AND THE STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL FROM B&I TO OWINN.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 12, 2017  
Page 31

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no further comment, the meeting is adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Felicia Archer,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	9		Attendance Roster
S.B. 187	C	27	David Walker / Nevada Museum of Art	Presentation-Establishing a Fine Art Museum
S.B. 187	D	9	David Walker / Nevada Museum of Art	Presentation-Art Education STEAM
S.B. 219	E	5	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Presentation
S.B. 219	F	4	Chad Hensley / Nevada Society of Radiologic Technologists	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 219	G	3	James Wadhams / Fennemore Craig	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 244	H	1	Neil Mortimer / Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	I	1	Bradley Crutcher / Fort McDermitt Paiute-Shoshone Tribe	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	J	2	Vinton Hawley / Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	K	1	Victor Mann / Lovelock Paiute Tribe	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	L	1	Rodney Mike / Duckwater Shoshone Tribe	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	M	1	Amber Torres / Walker River Paiute Tribe	Letter in Support
S.B. 244	N	21	Senator Julia Ratti	Proposed Amendment 4447
S.B. 343	O	3	Senator Patricia Farley	Proposed Amendment 4578
S.B. 377	P	2	John McCormick / Administrative Office of the Courts	Projected Indigent Defense Costs



S.B. 419	Q	1	Sumiko Maser / Nevada Department of Taxation	Testimony Removing Fiscal Note Nevada Department of Taxation
S.B. 419	R	1	Cadence Matijevich / Secretary of State	Testimony Removing Fiscal Note April 27, 2017
S.B. 419	S	1	Cadence Matijevich / Secretary of State	Testimony Removing Fiscal Note May 11, 2017,
S.B. 514	T	5	Mark Krmpotic / Fiscal Analysis Division	Proposed Amendment 4515