

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-ninth Session
April 17, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:01 a.m. on Monday, April 17, 2017, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator 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 Joseph P. Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jason King, P.E., State Engineer, Administrator, Division of Water Resources,
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Omar Saucedo, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Mary Walker, Carson City, Douglas, Lyon and Storey Counties
Dagney Stapleton, Nevada Association of Counties
Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Bob Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 2

Janet Murphy, Deputy Chief, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor
Barbara Richardson, Nevada Commissioner of Insurance, Nevada Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry
Craig Stevens, Clark County School District
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association
Patrick Gavin, Director, Public Charter School Authority, Nevada Department of Education
Lorne Malkiewich, K-12 Inc.
Ed Gonzalez, Clark County Education Association
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents and the Nevada Association of School Administrators
Terry Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Nevada Department of Business and Industry
Reesha Powell, Deputy Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 74

SENATE BILL 74 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to water.
(BDR 48-178)

JASON KING, P.E. (State Engineer, Administrator, Division of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I have provided my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)). This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance after receiving an amend and do pass recommendation from the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. The bill was requested as a recommendation from the Western Governors' Drought Forum. The Forum identified a need to focus, in part, on increased information gathering and provide technical assistance to water suppliers, public education, conservation, conservation planning, drought response and resiliency in conducting water-use inventories.

In addition, S.B. 74 adds certain policy changes related to conservation and drought. This bill contains statutory changes that complement enhancement decision units for our Agency and are included in the *Executive Budget*. In my opinion, these policy changes do not have any fiscal implications.

Policy changes are found in sections 1 through 3 of S.B. 74 concerning rainwater capture for domestic and wildlife uses and considerations of our office during an officially designated drought. My testimony will focus on the remaining sections.

Section 4 sets up sections 5, 6 and 7. Section 5 adjusts the current water planning law to also cover drought issues. It gives the State Engineer discretion to create an advisory committee on water conservation and drought. The intent is to advise him or her on matters of statewide importance related to water conservation: near- and long-term drought, drought resiliency, amendments to the water planning statutes measures that may help to recharge and recover rivers, aquifer storage and recovery, changes in water policy and resource planning. It will also assist in emerging science. It will include technological advances, best management practices, outreach and education regarding water conservation, dissemination of water conservation and drought resiliency information.

The authority to operate the proposed Advisory Committee has been included in budget account 101-4171, decision unit E-355, "at a cost of \$43,020 in each year of the biennium."

INFRASTRUCTURE

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

DCNR - Water Resources — Budget Page DCNR-72 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4171

E-355 Safe and Livable Communities — Page DCNR-76

Sections 6 and 7 make the current law on fines and penalties applicable to the failure to comply with statutorily required water planning. Those requirements are found in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) chapter 540. As with current fines and penalties, it is the goal of the Agency to do everything possible to help an entity come into compliance with the requirements. This provision would be enhanced with additional technical assistance staff as referenced earlier.

If an entity chooses noncompliance after assistance has been provided, the Agency needs the ability to enforce existing statutory water planning requirements.

Sections 8, 9 and 10 are further policy changes, adding drought resiliency to the current water planning statutes.

Section 11 was amended to make the statute flow better, clarify and update the duties of the Water Conservation and Drought Resiliency Section of the Division of Water Resources. The duties, as outlined in section 11, will be the responsibility of the new unit in the Agency to be staffed by the combination of three existing positions and four new staff. Together, the staff will focus on near- and long-term drought resiliency, water conservation, statutory water planning duties and flood plain management. They will also provide staff assistance to the Advisory Committee discussed above. The four new staff are included in decision unit E-353. That concludes the sections of S.B. 74 that may have a fiscal impact.

E-353 Safe and Livable Communities — Page DCNR-76

Section 12 provides the Division with a more realistic time frame for the review of currently required water conservation plans.

Section 13 adds additional information surveyors must include in water conservation plans submitted to our office and provides an exemption for those water providers serving less than 500 connections. These additions were recommended by the Drought Forum.

Section 14 is cleanup language that addresses a separate Western Regional Water Commission Act, currently in statute. The language as changed, makes it clear that any appointment to the Commission is the responsibility of the State Engineer and not a member of our staff.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
This is a good bill.

OMAR SAUCEDO (Southern Nevada Water Authority):
As a participant in the Drought Forum, we appreciate the recommendations of S.B. 74 and its additional tools for support of the Office of the State Engineer.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 5

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one in opposition or neutral on S.B. 74, I will close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing on S.B. 88.

SENATE BILL 88: Revises provisions relating to the Contingency Account in the State General Fund. (BDR 23-105)

SENATOR BEN KIECKHEFER (Senatorial District No. 16):

I requested the bill through the Senate Committee on Finance during the previous interim to address a concern expressed to me from certain rural communities regarding anticipated legislation mandating the use of body cameras by law enforcement.

Ultimately, S.B. 88 allows cities and counties with a population of less than 100,000 to come before the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to request an allocation from the Contingency Account to assist with the cost of implementation, if the mandate should become law.

MARY WALKER (Carson City, Douglas, Lyon and Storey Counties):

Senate Bill 88 allows rural counties and cities to come to the State for a grant to pay for the first-year cost of implementation of S.B. 176, requiring implementation of portable recording devices. It is meant to be a one-time grant only.

SENATE BILL 176 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 23-666)

Senate Bill 176 mandates public safety implementation of portable recording devices. It is a responsible bill because it also provides a mechanism for funding through the 911 surcharge. However, the enactment of the 911 surcharge is not feasible for several rural counties. Some of the counties have small populations. In fact, one county has less than 1,000 people in the entire county, and a 911 surcharge would not generate sufficient funding to pay for the body cameras. Senate Bill 88 will allow the counties to request a one-time grant through the State Contingency Account to implement S.B. 176.

Through the funding mechanisms in both bills, all counties should have the ability to implement S.B. 176. I have offered my assistance to the Governor's Office to implement the S.B. 88 grant program and to assist the

smaller counties applying for the grant. Many small counties do not have staff to take on these additional duties.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Will the grant program contain a cap provision?

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

A cap would be at the discretion of the IFC. Requests would be made through the usual process and reviewed for necessity and efficacy. The IFC would make a determination of whether the request is a justifiable allocation. Part of that consideration would be whether the county has done everything within its existing means to fund the mandate without State support. That would include implementation of the 911 surcharge and any other funds that may be available.

DAGNEY STAPLETON (Nevada Association of Counties):

The Nevada Association of Counties supports S.B. 88. This bill is an additional mechanism for smaller counties to seek needed funding to complete the implementation of body-worn cameras. Counties support the policy for use of body cameras, and the mandate proposed is accompanied by a funding mechanism. However, there may be a lag time for enacting the 911 surcharge and accruing sufficient funding to pay for the mandate.

WES HENDERSON (Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

We support S.B. 88 and thank the sponsor of the bill. It is important for cities because the 911 surcharge can only be imposed by the Boards of County Commissioners.

BOB ROSHAK (Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We support S.B. 88. As mentioned previously, this bill will assist some of the rural counties. Many of the rural agencies have applied for various grants, seeking whatever funding sources might be available. Certain grants are specific to the size of an agency making an application. Many grants become extremely competitive.

SENATOR PARKS:

What is the status of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program? That grant program used to be a good source of grant funds.

MR. ROSHAK:

The program still exists, but it is my understanding the funding in all federal grants has been significantly decreased.

JANET MURPHY (Deputy Chief, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor):

The Governor's Office placed a fiscal note of an undetermined amount on S.B. 88. The Nevada Board of Examiners approved a contract for the Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) at its January 2017 meeting. The costs in the contract were \$1,415 per camera and \$1,980 per docking station to upload the data. There is not a docking station for each camera. Other costs included \$15,000 for one-time training and \$79 per camera for each month of data storage. We are unable to determine a fiscal note amount for S.B. 88 because we do not know what counties may request assistance from the IFC Contingency Account. However, we wanted you to know the costs that we have experienced to provide the units for the NHP.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We appreciate that information. I will now close the hearing on S.B. 88 and open the hearing on S.B. 135.

SENATE BILL 135 (1st Reprint): Requires that an applicant for certain insurance-related licenses have the option to take an examination in Spanish. (BDR 57-684)

SENATOR JOSEPH P. HARDY (Senatorial District No. 12):

I had a Hispanic neighbor who told me that people who speak Spanish sometimes do not trust people who speak English. Therefore, the Hispanic population is underinsured.

Senate Bill 135 proposes insurance exams to be given in Spanish allowing more of the Hispanic population to obtain insurance and feel safer in many different ways. Ms. Barbara Richardson will address the fiscal note.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is the bill proposed because the insurance exams are not currently offered in Spanish?

SENATOR HARDY:

That is the rationale for S.B. 135.

BARBARA RICHARDSON (Nevada Commissioner of Insurance, Nevada Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry):

The Division placed a fiscal note on S.B. 135 because seven examinations must be translated. Because we want the exams translated accurately, we do not utilize our staff for that purpose. The cost is \$7,500 for translation of each examination. Without this bill, the only option for those who request an examination in another language is that they be given extra time to complete the examination. The bill will allow us to accommodate those underserved populations.

SENATOR HARRIS:

How frequently do the examinations change? Would this be a one-time expense?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

The second portion of the fiscal note would cover the annual cost of approximately \$3,000 to \$3,500 per exam for a total of \$21,000 to \$24,000 annually to keep the examinations updated.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is there an estimate of how many individuals might request to take the insurance examination in Spanish?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

There were 66 requests in 2016, and this is a growing population. Previously that number was 30 to 40 requests annually.

SENATOR DENIS:

How many examinations are done each year?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

We provide approximately 1,000 producer examinations each year.

SENATOR DENIS:

Does your office have the ability to grade the examinations, or will you also need a person who understands Spanish to grade the examinations?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

The same vendor who translates the exams would also grade the examinations.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 9

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there a requirement that policies be written in a specific language?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

At this point, all policies are written in English.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If a person cannot adequately take an examination in the language in which policies are written, does that create a concern for your Division?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

Not in the manner one would suspect. The reason for keeping all the policies in English is that they are legal contracts. We are trying to get to those particular sales people who can explain the legal issues without having to delve into the legal requirements. We checked with the three other states that are currently providing examinations in Spanish. They have not had any problems. New York has had the Spanish examinations in place since 2004, Texas since 2005 and Florida since 2013.

If there is a policy issue, the companies will address it, because they have translators available.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Have those three states maintained their policies in English?

Ms. RICHARDSON:

That is correct.

SENATOR DENIS:

With the history in other states, can you surmise the amount of increase in the number of examination requests? I understand the intent is to make the individual purchasing insurance confident in the person selling them insurance. That is somewhat a part of the Hispanic culture.

Ms. RICHARDSON:

Florida had a significant increase, but New York did not. The rate of those passing the examination for Spanish speakers and English speakers is nearly the same. The translations do not change the level of competency of the sales individuals.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 10

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one else to provide testimony, I will close the hearing on S.B. 135 and open the hearing on S.B. 132.

SENATE BILL 132 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public high schools. (BDR 34-47)

SENATOR BECKY HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 9):

Senate Bill 132 ensures high school students will have access to valuable graduation planning tools. It ensures students, their families and their schools are actively engaged in seeing those plans to a successful conclusion. The intent of this legislation is to graduate as many students as possible from high school with a diploma.

Section 1 creates individual graduation plans for credit-deficient students or students who struggle to learn with an additional three semesters to finish high school and achieve a diploma. Their lack of graduation would not be calculated as long as they are current in their graduation plan and making adequate progress.

Section 2 concerns students who are at risk of remediation, who may be credit-rich but not knowledge-sufficient. They would be allowed to continue their senior year of high school on a full schedule so they can be prepared for career readiness or a higher education institution.

With regard to the fiscal note placed by the State Public Charter School Authority, section 1, subsection 1, states that "school districts shall, but charter schools may ..." provide individualized graduation plans. Some charter schools only offer 9th grade, and others offer up to 10th grade. They do not have full course offerings. Section 1 would not apply until their course offerings are complete.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If students are staying in high school longer, are they still receiving a full distributive school account (DSA) allotment for those extended years? If so, is there a fiscal impact?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Section 2 provides that "as long as a student is in their senior year of high school, whether they are in attendance or not, the DSA allotment would apply." If they extend their education beyond the four traditional years, a DSA allotment would be necessary. Considerable support was expressed for students continuing to a high school diploma conclusion.

The Senate Committee on Education heard from communities and schools that a student who graduates from high school is likely to contribute an estimated value of \$1.5 million to society during their adult lifetime. A student who does not graduate is likely to consume from society \$1.5 million in their adult lifetime in needed support services from the criminal justice system, welfare, alcohol and substance abuse costs and additional health care needs. This is a good use of our dollars.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I agree. Was there a projection offered as to how many students might take advantage of extending their time in high school?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Both school districts and charter schools will be offering testimony that will better answer that question.

CRAIG STEVENS (Clark County School District):

We are in support of S.B. 132. Clark County School District (CCSD) is already performing certain functions addressed in this legislation. The amendment added in section 2, subsection 6, changes the mandate to permissive language requiring parents to be present when creating an individualized graduation plan and removes the CCSD fiscal note. I do not have the information as to how many students will be served, but I can provide that for the Committee.

CHRIS DALY (Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association):

I represent 40,000 educators across the State including school counselors. We spoke in support of S.B. 132 before the Senate Committee on Education. We appreciate the concept of individualized graduation plans. We expressed concern about the cost of the measure, specifically to high school counselors, many of whom have 400:1 or 500:1 caseloads.

SENATOR FORD:

I spoke with individuals this past weekend regarding special education. They discussed expansion of graduation opportunities for those students, and I referenced S.B. 132. Are special education students a part of this measure? How do you contemplate this bill's intent regarding special education students? Why would we not require charter schools to provide the program, if they have reached a senior class level?

MR. DALY:

It is my understanding that special education students have other accommodations.

SENATOR FORD:

Would there be an additional fiscal note if we were to consider the need for special education in this same context?

SENATOR HARRIS:

There is another piece of legislation in the Senate Committee on Education that allows students to remain in the system until age 22. With regard to charter schools, I have no problem holding charter schools to the same standard as we would any other public high school. The challenge is that they have not developed a full complement of high school resources at this time.

SENATOR FORD:

Would it be feasible to make the provisions permissive for those schools that do not have a full complement of teaching staff through senior year, but if they provide 12th grade, require them to meet the same standards? If so, what would be the fiscal impact of bill?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Mr. Patrick Gavin can better answer that question.

PATRICK GAVIN (Director, Public Charter School Authority, Nevada Department of Education):

We support S.B. 132. With regard to the fiscal impacts of suggestions made during this hearing, several fiscal notes were filed by charter schools. Most of those schools are not yet fully kindergarten through grade 12. Therefore, the fiscal notes address anticipated future costs that are not likely to occur during the 2017-2019 biennium.

By making the provisions mandatory, the bill simply provides a vehicle for schools to do something they should have already been providing. That is, ensuring for a student who is academically behind by a few credits could achieve high school graduation within 18 months. The bill holds the schools harmless for the negative impact of their graduation rates.

SENATOR FORD:

I am still interested in the fiscal impact. I am not comfortable with holding a charter school to a different standard than public schools.

MR. GAVIN:

We will do our best. The Public Charter School Authority does not have access to some of the data regarding the numbers of credit-deficient students in a charter school. That information is specific to the school, and the school is not mandated to share that information. We can request the information.

SENATOR FORD:

I am confident you will find a way to get the information for me.

LORNE MALKIEWICH (K-12 Inc.):

We support S.B. 132 whether it is mandatory or discretionary. I have had extensive discussions regarding the fiscal note. Because the provisions are discretionary, the fiscal note is hypothetical with respect to charter schools. The result of this bill will be that a number of students who otherwise would not receive high school diplomas will now achieve that goal.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will look to Senator Harris as sponsor of this bill to provide the information requested by Senator Ford.

ED GONZALEZ (Clark County Education Association):

We testified in support of S.B. 132 before the Senate Committee on Education and we continue to support this legislation. Many school counselors testified in support in the Education Committee. They recognize the proposal may cause additional work, but anything that helps students graduate is good public policy.

Approximately 6,000 students in Clark County did not graduate. I do not know if all those students were credit-deficient.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 14

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents and the Nevada Association of School Administrators):

The ideas behind S.B. 132 are excellent. It gives students an additional opportunity. Our only reservation is that some of the rural schools may require some additional counselor assistance. If the bill moves forward, we will work hard to make sure that happens.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I will provide the information the Senate Committee on Finance has requested. The potential of the bill is it will invest in our students, and the return on investment will be an increase in high school graduates.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 132 and open the hearing on S.B. 501.

SENATE BILL 501: Extends the prospective expiration of the Consumer Affairs Unit of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 18-908)

TERRY REYNOLDS (Deputy Director of Administration, Nevada Department of Business and Industry):

Senate Bill 501 is a simple bill. It extends the expiration date of the Consumer Affairs Unit of the Department of Business and Industry (B&I) to June 30, 2019. This is an effective Unit of our Department.

SENATOR DENIS:

Do we have consumer affair issues in Nevada?

MR. REYNOLDS:

We do. Typically, the individuals assisted by this Unit are those underserved by the traditional system. In calendar year 2016, we processed approximately 2,065 cases through which we recovered approximately \$200,000 in restitution to approximately 1,000 individuals. There is approximately a 93 percent clearance rate for these cases.

SENATOR DENIS:

Are there others who are not being served in the State? The Consumer Affairs Unit used to be a much larger Department. It was closed down, and then it was brought back on a limited basis.

MR. REYNOLDS:

The Department of B&I has done considerable outreach in the last year. We have held special work sessions. We have worked with the Fight Fraud Task Force in southern Nevada. There is now a Carson City office staffed with 1.5 full-time equivalent positions. We have worked with AARP, the Legal Aid Society, and law enforcement agencies in Carson City and the Reno/Sparks area. The efforts have increased the number of individuals we have served. We could perhaps be more effective, but are limited with five staff in southern Nevada and two staff in northern Nevada.

SENATOR DENIS:

Do you foresee a day when there will be no fraud?

MR. REYNOLDS:

Unfortunately, no. There is a fertile field of fraud to be investigated. We receive substantial numbers of inquiries each day. There are approximately 50 calls each day and approximately 300 referrals from the Office of the Attorney General each year. That has increased. We are also seeing active issues with law enforcement agencies directing individuals to the Unit.

SENATOR DENIS:

If the problem is not going away, why do we have a sunset for expiration of the office?

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

That is a good point.

Seeing no further comment, I will close the hearing on S.B. 501, and open the hearing on S.B. 510.

SENATE BILL 510: Revises provision governing the eligibility of a child for assistance from the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Program. (BDR 38-901)

REESHA POWELL (Deputy Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

Senate Bill 510 was heard and passed by the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services a few weeks ago. It revisits the current eligibility requirements as outlined in the NRS for the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Program. The

Social Security Act was modified with the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act in 2008. It gave states the option to enter into kinship guardianship assistance agreements or to provide assistance payments on behalf of children to relatives who have assumed legal guardianship of those children.

The Program was codified in NRS 432B in 2011. However, it restricted the program to youth who were eligible to receive maintenance payments as relatives of the youth, pursuant to Part E of Title IV of the Social Security Act. Senate Bill 510 requests the removal of the specific eligibility criteria. It would make the provisions available to all children in foster care who meet the eligibility requirements. Those requirements are: the youth has been placed with a relative who is a licensed foster care provider for at least six months, that all other permanency options such as reunification and adoption have been ruled out, that the child has demonstrated a strong attachment to the prospective relative guardian and that the relative guardian has also demonstrated a strong commitment to care for the child permanently. If the child is 14 years old or older, they must also agree to the guardianship.

Subsidized guardianship is often appropriate with a family member when they do not wish to have parental rights terminated. Sometimes these provisions are an option due to love or respect for the parent or for cultural reasons. All youth in Nevada, who are in the custody of a child welfare agency and meet the other requirements or criteria, should be afforded the Program.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Have federal rules changed that no longer require Title IV-E eligibility?

Ms. POWELL:

The federal law is open to all. The difference is that Nevada will not receive the maintenance payments for children who do not meet that requirement. State General Fund allocations will be necessary.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is it correct that State law had previously restricted the Program to protect our budget, but since that is no longer a concern, the change in payment makes sense?

Ms. POWELL:

It simply makes this an opportunity for all children in Nevada, not just those that met the previous federal eligibility criteria.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 510 and open the hearing on S.B. 515.

SENATE BILL 515: Revises provisions relating to the financial administration of the Securities Division of the Office of the Secretary of State. (BDR 7-894)

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

This is a budget implementation bill to implement decisions within the Office of the Secretary of State (SOS). The SOS budgets were closed approximately two weeks ago. The bill eliminates the requirement to deposit monies received by administrators because of enforcement actions related to securities of the SOS operating General Fund budget account. Instead, such monies would be required to be deposited in the State General Fund for unrestricted use.

There is a corresponding decision unit in the SOS budget to fund some of the expenses through the General Fund. Fiscal staff expressed a concern at the bill hearing that the language repealing NRS 90.851 has a potential unintended consequence to the SOS operating General Fund budget account. It could be eliminated as a result. However, since that time, Staff has worked with the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Members will find an asterisk bill before them that corrects the Legislative Digest in terms indicating that the account will be eliminated through the repeal of NRS 90.851.

Staff has no other concerns with S.B. 515.

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 18

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 515.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

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

Senate Committee on Finance
April 17, 2017
Page 19

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one wishing to testify under public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 8:53 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Cynthia Clampitt,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
S.B. 74	C	4	Jason King, Administrator, Division of Water Resources, DCNR	Written Testimony