

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-ninth Session
June 3, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 2:01 p.m. on Saturday, June 3, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 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 David R. Parks, Chair
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Elisa Cafferata, Chair, Nevada Commission for Women
Brian Wachter, Retail Association of Nevada
Michael Alonso, Caesars Entertainment
Scott W. Anderson, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Stacey Shinn, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Erica Washington, Make It Work Campaign

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
June 3, 2017
Page 2

Marlene Lockard, Nevada Women's Lobby
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 521.

ASSEMBLY BILL 521: Revises provisions governing veterans services. (BDR 37-1236)

ASSEMBLYMAN PAUL ANDERSON (Assembly District No. 13):

Assembly Bill 521 was brought as an emergency measure because, as we near the end of Session, it becomes more important. In addition, other issues have come up over the last couple of years. The need has become greater. It became necessary to bring this bill forward to determine what could be done.

Across Nevada, veterans are buried in private cemeteries in designated veteran areas. They were built to accommodate veterans before the U. S. Department of Veterans Affairs built veterans' cemeteries. One such cemetery is in Boulder City.

Although this bill would not help me directly, I have a personal interest in it because my cousin, who passed away in 1985, was a member of the armed forces. He was in the army and was in a head-on collision during a routine training exercise. He was buried in an area close to my neighborhood, although it is not in my district. I have submitted some photographs of the cemetery ([Exhibit C](#)).

The problem we encountered was that as the private cemetery became full, its maintenance was not on a par with what we would expect for our patriots, our fallen soldiers and those who gave everything for us. Some of the areas in the cemetery are flood zones, where the headstones had sunk into the ground. In other areas, grass had grown over the headstones and they were just mowed over. When the waters recede after a rainfall in Las Vegas, some areas remain flooded for one or two weeks at a time. On Memorial Day weekend a couple of years ago after it had rained, the cemetery was flooded and families were not able to find their loved ones because the headstones were under water.

It is inexcusable to allow that to happen without some remediation. We took this issue to the Nevada Funeral and Cemetery Services Board. The Office of

Military Legal Assistance and the Department of Veterans Services (DVS) were involved also to determine if the situation could be mitigated. As a direct result of our intervention, some small improvements were made but only enough to get past the current regulations.

Families would like to disinter their veteran family members and relocate them to the Southern Nevada Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Boulder City. However, some families are not financially able to do that. The disinterment can cost from \$10,000 to \$12,000. The DVS is often willing to provide those services free on behalf of the veterans and their families.

The purpose of this bill is to create a contingency fund in the DVS that would allow it to develop regulations and qualifications to authorize someone to obtain financial assistance to disinter his or her veteran family member and relocate the deceased to a veterans' memorial cemetery. The bill appropriates \$100,000 from the State General Fund to the DVS to be used over the next biennium. The funds do not revert because time is needed for the DVS to build the regulatory process and for people to understand that process. This is a one-time appropriation, but the DVS would be allowed to come back to the Interim Finance Committee if there is more demand than the money allocated.

SENATOR MANENDO:
Where is this cemetery?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:
It is a private cemetery in Las Vegas off Interstate 95. All of the pictures I submitted are from the same cemetery.

SENATOR MANENDO:
I cannot imagine that it is one of the big-name cemeteries.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:
It is a well-known cemetery brand. I do not want to call it out because it has attempted to work in good faith. It is a large organization with many chains of command, which makes it difficult to get things done quickly.

SENATOR MANENDO:
It is so disgraceful to see this. Have you had communications with this cemetery to determine what the problem is? Is it in financial difficulties? Does it

not want to fix this? I understand the bill, but that is not going to be enough money to apply to everyone who might have a loved one that he or she does not want resting in peace in a place like this. This is disgraceful. Does the cemetery manager need to have a chat with the organization and talk about what can be done? Do the cemetery managers not want to allocate the money to take care of their landscaping? It looks like there is no water in some places and other places are under water. It is a simple irrigation and landscaping issue. I am trying to understand this and it is blowing my mind.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

As it did mine. Those pictures are two years old, maybe a little older. They were taken on a Memorial Day weekend. That is how this came to my attention. There were many other families there besides mine.

The bigger tragedy for me is that my cousin Ray, who is buried there, was an adopted member of the family. He had some rough childhood experiences and when he went into the Army, his life started to turn around. When he passed away, his life had changed significantly. Thankfully, because of the training he had received, he was able to change his life. He left behind a fiancé and some beloved family members.

Because it was a Memorial Day weekend, I went out there with a Boy Scout troop to put flags on the graves and to find a way to remove the water. When I talked to managers at the cemetery, they responded that they had made many great improvements on the rest of the cemetery. That was not acceptable to me. Family members and I brought the issue to the Nevada Funeral and Cemetery Services Board. The Office of the Military was involved to try to express to the cemetery owners that this portion of the cemetery is important because it is the honorable veterans section. I cannot speak to the why's and how's and what would allow them to feel that this is comfortable. I do not want to call them out directly. There are other cemeteries that do better and others that do even worse than this. However, these are the photographs I had available on short notice, [Exhibit C](#).

I appreciate the question; however, there are ways to rectify the situation, and I will not give up on that because families cannot afford to move their family members. It is appropriate that they have that opportunity.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Thank you for bringing this to our attention and for the bill. I am sorry about your family member.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Some cemeteries in the northern rural areas are 150 years old. Unfortunately, this is what happens. In many cases, family members who have veterans buried in those cemeteries have also passed away. Some of these are private, community or Oddfellows cemeteries. There are cemeteries all over the State. Grave markers show they were Grand Army of the Republic Civil War veterans, and there is no family left to take care of those cemeteries.

What agency is going to oversee the disinterment and relocation? Relocating to a veteran's cemetery is fine. However, with the \$100,000 appropriation, there would only be four or five relocations if veterans were taken from Tuscarora to the veterans' cemetery in Fernley.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

The appropriation is a small amount. The idea is that some families have the desire but not the means to move a family member. That issue was discussed; however, we have not been able to gather enough information to determine if this is an appropriate dollar amount. That is why we made sure it is clear that DVS could come back to the Interim Finance Committee to show a need if family members would like to make those relocations.

I realize that Nevada is a disparate State. The DVS would determine by regulation if a family would qualify for assistance.

Provisions for gifts and grants are also in the bill. People have indicated to me that they would like to contribute to a program that would help veterans be relocated to a place their families deem more respectful.

I cannot speak to the Civil War veterans or some of the other cemeteries where there are no family members to maintain them. I hope those communities rally together and are able to show the respect and the honor that is required.

SENATOR RATTI:

In some of the community cemeteries, did you consider a grant to keep the veterans in place and improve the facility instead of spending \$10,000 to

relocate a body? That becomes expensive quickly. In smaller community cemeteries, that small amount of money would enable the community to clean up the cemetery instead of moving people. A grant might make sense.

In the smaller cemeteries, what happens to those left behind? When there are only a few left behind, does that portion of the cemetery continue to decline because 80 percent of those relocated had family members who paid attention and the 20 percent left do not have a living descendant who is paying attention. They are almost abandoned.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

I would not be opposed to helping with community grants if there were a pathway for that. The appropriation is specifically for disinterment and relocation of a veteran to a veterans' cemetery. I am unsure of the demand for that other than for a couple of specific examples. We have not had the chance to vet every opportunity that we could use to help these veterans and their families.

I do not know if this is an accurate answer because I am not an expert in this field. When a person is disinterred from a veteran's section, I assume that those plots would become available either to be resold or to better appropriate monies for the rest of the cemetery. I am unsure of the answer to that question; I just offer that as a potential discussion point regarding those who might be left behind.

SENATOR RATTI:

Unfortunately, my point of reference is a cemetery in Reno that has been abandoned. If you start moving people out, I do not know that it tips the momentum in the right direction.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

I understand that. It is unfortunate that that issue has crowded into several other issues that we have had to talk about this Session regarding cemeteries. It is truly not my intent to empty out any cemetery. It is to help those families who feel that their family members are not being treated properly. I will help guide those regulations so that the money is appropriated to those families in need and those veterans who have been determined by the DVS appropriate to be relocated to a veterans cemetery.

SENATOR RATTI:

I appreciate the dialogue. I am not going to try to amend your bill on June 3. However, it might be more cost-effective in some cases to invest in where they are rather than move them. I would love to see the DVS have that flexibility. Maybe it is something we can talk about next Session or after we see what the demand is.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

I would be happy to continue that dialogue.

CHAIR PARKS:

Is there a representative here from the DVS?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON:

The late hour in the Session did not allow me to reach out to all the entities. Katherine Miller, Director of the Department of Veterans Services, has been working with me on the local issue. She is vaguely aware of the bill as it rolls through; however, because of the late hour, I have not been able to brief everyone on the bill.

CHAIR PARKS:

As an emergency bill, you have covered all the bases. This would be a great start to this process. I am certain that veterans' services in other states have probably undertaken similar programs or have some form of outline of how they process this. As a veteran, I am supportive of this.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 521.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 423.

ASSEMBLY BILL 423 (2nd Reprint): Requires the Nevada Commission for Women to collect and report information related to gender equality in the workplace. (BDR 18-1047)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER (Assembly District No. 5):
Elisa Cafferata will present A.B. 423, which is about gathering data for a gender equality index.

ELISA CAFFERATA (Chair, Nevada Commission for Women):
People have been asking how we are going to get the two bills together that have been traveling on this topic. We have worked out the solution, and it is in your hands. We are proposing to strike sections 1 through 4 of A.B. 423, which would have made the report the responsibility of the Department of Administration. We are going to amend Senate Bill (S.B.) 343 into A.B. 423. That will make the gender equality report the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of State (SOS) as part of its online business portal.

SENATE BILL 343 (2nd Reprint): Requires the Secretary of State to collect and report information related to gender equality in the workplace. (BDR 7-990)

That will incorporate all of the amendments to A.B. 423 that have been asked for by the business community regarding making the report voluntary; focusing on promoting companies that are using best practices to promote gender equality; not penalizing any business that does not respond to the survey; the time line that is in the SOS's bill, S.B. 343; and the five-year limitation that had been asked for by Senator Heidi Gansert. That is what we are proposing to do to bring these bills together and have one, not two gender equality reports.

CHAIR PARKS:

If I might reiterate, you are going to delete sections 1 through 4 of A.B. 423, and then you are going to take the language from S.B. 343 and amend it into A.B. 423.

BRIAN WACHTER (Retail Association of Nevada):

We want to leave sections 5 and 5.5 in A.B. 423. This is a good move and a good first step forward in allowing some funding into the Nevada Commission for Women. That is something we agree with. Therefore, section 5 and

section 5.5 would remain in A.B. 423 as Ms. Cafferata illustrated, but the rest of the language would come from S.B. 343.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):

I was not aware of the amendment but just to clarify, you want to keep the appropriation that is in section 5.5 of A.B. 423. However, the appropriation was specifically intended to help pay for the cost of the Commission to perform the survey. If the Commission is no longer going to perform the survey, I need to know for what the appropriation is intended to be used. Changing the intent of the appropriation would also need to be part of the amendment.

MS. CAFFERATA:

You will see in the language that it makes the report the responsibility of the SOS and that part of the creation of the survey and the report is done through working in consultation with the Commission. Then the language in section 5.5 of A.B. 423 that deals with the appropriation says "is hereby appropriated from the State General Fund to the Department of Administration for personnel and information technology expenses of the Department that are associated with assisting the Nevada Commission for Women to design and conduct a survey of employers... ." Therefore, in our consultation role, this at least covers the expenses that the Department of Administration has been absorbing in terms of supporting the Nevada Commission for Women. Section 5.5, subsection 2 contains the limitation that if we do not spend the money because, for example, I do not think we would need to create a database at the Department of Administration, that money would return to the State General Fund.

MR. WACHTER:

It would be beneficial to add language to make it clear that the appropriation would be used for the Commission to assist the SOS in developing the information. It is important that the fiscal note remains in such a way as to be able to help the Commission use the information or at least facilitate the information that is be generated. Your staff is correct. We could use the language in some way to make sure that the appropriation is intended to support the Commission in assisting the SOS with the information, if that makes sense.

Ms. CHLARSON:

I was not trying to make a policy decision. I want to make sure that if the appropriation is going to stay in the bill that it is directed to the correct department and that we clarify that it is for the purpose you have explained because S.B. 343 designates the SOS as designing and conducting the survey. We want to clarify in section 5.5 of A.B. 423 that the SOS is still going to be designing and conducting the survey and the appropriation would just be used to help facilitate that.

Ms. CAFFERATA:

Yes, that is our intent.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Has the appropriation been made in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means?

Ms. CAFFERATA:

Yes, A.B. 423 went to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. There was a fiscal note from the Department of Administration and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means amended the bill to add the appropriation.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That appropriation is roughly \$200,000.

Ms. CAFFERATA:

Yes, that is in their calculations.

CHAIR PARKS:

It is my understanding that there is no funding identified in S.B. 343.

MR. WACHTER:

That is correct. Through some extensive conversations with all of the parties, especially with the SOS, the SOS arrived at a position where it could absorb the cost. Ultimately, it would have been nice to give the SOS an appropriation to do so. I do not think we want to get into opening that up again on Day 118 but S.B. 343 does not have a fiscal note and the SOS understands that.

SENATOR HARDY:

We are taking out sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of A.B. 423; however, section 5 of A.B. 423 alludes to sections 2 and 3. Are sections 2 and 3 in S.B. 343?

MS. CAFFERATA:

The amendment would need to refer to whatever the new numbers of the sections are. Under the existing language in A.B. 423, the provisions of sections 2 and 3 discuss creating and conducting the survey and all the research around it. It would be the section numbering from S.B. 343.

SENATOR HARDY:

The reason you are doing this is to give S.B. 343 money to do what they are doing. Why are we doing this?

MS. CAFFERATA:

This bill has gone through the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. It provides support for the ongoing work of the Nevada Commission for Women. Having an appropriation allows the SOS to delegate some of the support for creating the survey to the Commission. The business community we worked with prefers the language and the structure of the report living at the SOS. The lesson learned for me is if you have more than one bill, combine them sooner. This is something that everyone could agree to.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is S.B. 343 dead and gone if we do this?

MS. CAFFERATA:

Yes, it is.

MR. WACHTER:

I anticipate that the amendment will include Senator Patricia Farley and Senator Becky Harris being added to A.B. 423 as sponsors.

MS. CHLARSON:

I want to clarify the amendment you are proposing so I understand for drafting purposes. Your intent is to eliminate the substantive provisions that are in the second reprint of A.B. 423, and add into A.B. 423 the provisions of S.B. 343. Then you propose to keep the appropriation found in section 5.5 of A.B. 423 but just clarify that the money will be used to support the SOS performing the

survey. The last amendment that was just proposed would be to add Senator Becky Harris and Senator Patricia Farley as sponsors to A.B. 423. Is that correct?

MS. CAFFERATA:

Yes, to all of the above. I would add the clarification that Senator Hardy pointed out to make sure in the statute for the Nevada Commission for Women that we are adding this survey to its duties by reference to these sections. We make it clear that one of its duties is assisting with the creation of this report.

MS. CHLARSON:

Is that not in S.B. 343 that the Commission is helping the SOS? If it were already in S.B. 343, it would transfer over. I am not sure whether the Commission is involved in the current version of S.B. 343.

MICHAEL ALONSO (Caesars Entertainment):

Senate Bill 343 contains the provision allowing the SOS to work with the Nevada Commission for Women on the survey.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am still not clear on this. Does the appropriation go to the SOS or the Commission?

MS. CAFFERATA:

The appropriation goes to the Department of Administration which is responsible for providing the support for the Commission in the same way it provides support for other commissions. It provides support for the Commission to carry out the duties that have been outlined in law; therefore, the creation of this report would be one of the Commission's duties. The money is earmarked and appropriated to the Department of Administration.

SENATOR HARDY:

Does the SOS get any money for supervising this? I have all these little pieces that have to work.

MR. WACHTER:

While the appropriation goes to the Commission and the Commission is responsible for developing the survey, it is still housed at the SOS. The SOS is responsible for reaching out to businesses and using the survey during the

annual reporting cycle. The Commission is backing up the SOS as it performs this responsibility.

SCOTT W. ANDERSON (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):

I am not sure what to say because we were surprised on the Senate side with the SOS being added in S.B. 343. We were not sure what was happening today until right before the hearing and then having the provisions of S.B. 343 put into A.B. 423. We do not have a problem with the provisions of S.B. 343 being put into A.B. 423. However, we were moving forward with S.B. 343 without any appropriation. We designed how we would do the survey through SilverFlume, Nevada's business portal, instead of touching every system that the SOS had which is how the original A.B. 423 worked. We would have had to make significant changes to our systems. The fiscal note was close to \$2 million to make those changes. By putting it through SilverFlume, we felt that could be absorbed.

I am not going to give you an opinion on section 5 and section 5.5 of A.B. 423. We were fine with those sections from S.B. 343 and we were moving forward with those. We did not request any funding for this nor has it been offered. We expect to go forward with this regardless of whichever way it passes. We will absorb those costs internally.

SENATOR HARDY:

I can save \$200,000 by just letting the SOS do it and still get the same thing.

MR. ANDERSON:

All I can say is that regardless of how we do it, we will do it without any cost to the SOS. We will do this in consultation with the Nevada Commission for Women. We had planned on reaching out and having meetings later on in the summer to go through what the survey might look like and the questions that would be in it. Another one of the reasons we put it through SilverFlume is because we have a platform that can do these types of things and much of the look and feel is going to remain the same as the current SilverFlume platform. We would consult with the Commission on what information would be collected and how it would be reported.

SENATOR HARDY:

I am going to give Ms. Cafferata a chance to justify \$200,000 when we can get it free.

MS. CAFFERATA:

In any case, you are going to have the SOS absorbing the cost of doing the report without a fiscal note to the State as the SOS indicated. The reason for the appropriation is that the staff from the Department of Administration had testified in Assembly Committee on Ways and Means that the support it was providing the Commission was beyond what it had originally planned. Therefore, in order to support this expanded role for the Commission, the Department of Administration was looking for an appropriation to cover the costs of that support so it could continue to do its legally obligated work and fulfill its role of supporting the Commission in taking on this task. The report itself is done by the SOS without a fiscal note. The fiscal note supports the Department of Administration.

SENATOR RATTI:

That is the second time that you said that the money is more about the general support for the Commission than it is about getting the survey done. We heard another bill, it was a Minority Commission bill, and the testimony that came forward was that we create these commissions, we do not give them any funding and then they are impotent. That is something we continue to do. As we were having that other hearing, I was thinking that we should do that for the Nevada Commission for Women also because it is the same thing.

We have asked you to run around the building, do things free and to do that year around and that is great, but it is an awful lot to ask of volunteers to continue to move the mission forward. I would be more comfortable amending the bill to say that so the SOS role is clear. The SOS has already said that it supports the Survey and would love to collaborate with the Commission to get the survey done. The Commission's mission is broader than just this survey so this gives the Department of Administration the money it needs to support the Commission more fully. Is the Department of Administration here? No, because it is not the money hearing.

Was it your understanding from the testimony in the hearing in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means that the money is allocated more broadly than just to the survey?

MS. CAFFERATA:

That was part of the discussion. The Department of Administration carrying out the survey was attached to A.B. 423. If we had more time, we could fine-tune

the amount. The protection for you is that the funds we do not use to support the Commission would revert to the State General Fund.

SENATOR RATTI:

The limitation is that the funds can only be used to do the survey.

MS. CAFFERATA:

It is appropriated from the State General Fund to the Department of Administration for personnel and information technology expenses associated with assisting the Nevada Commission for Women to design and conduct the survey. That could be broad in terms of our work, our outreach and our public meetings, which are specific to the survey.

MR. ALONSO:

As Senator Ratti and others alluded to, Caesars Entertainment supported both S.B. 343 and A.B. 423. We worked with the SOS to remove the fiscal note. I was not aware of the discussion we were going to have on the appropriation. Caesars Entertainment would like a bill with a gender equality survey on it. If this Body sees fit to have that appropriation in A.B. 423, that is fine; if not, we are happy to live with S.B. 343.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Senate Bill 343 has already passed this Committee. I am not sure where it is.

SENATOR PARKS:

It was voted out of the Senate yesterday.

SENATOR MANENDO:

That is what I thought. So it is on its way and it might be cleaner with no appropriation. Caesars Entertainment would be okay with that because that gets to what you need to do and what you can support.

MR. ALONSO:

We will support either bill. We support both bills. If there is a process in place for A.B. 423 to be the vehicle and the amendments include what was described here, with or without the appropriation and also with the amendment to add Senators Harris and Farley to A.B. 423, we support all of that. I see the consternation with the appropriation piece so we are agnostic on that piece. We would like to see either bill make it through the process.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
June 3, 2017
Page 16

SENATOR MANENDO:
I am good with that.

MR. WACHTER:
The Retail Association of Nevada, as well as my counterparts in the business community, is opposed to A.B. 423 as written. We agree that we are agnostic on the appropriation, although to Senator Ratti's point if we are going to create commissions and we expect responsibilities from them, they should be funded to some level.

We are and have been working with the stakeholders on S.B. 343 in this Committee. That is the reason we appreciate and support that language. However, we are opposed to A.B. 423 as written but the conceptual amendments as laid out alleviate our concerns.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
You are fine with the language in S.B. 343.

MR. WACHTER:
The language in S.B. 343 is our preferred language.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
That makes it easy for me.

CHAIR PARKS:
However, you would support S.B. 343 with the addition of section 5 and section 5.5 from A.B. 423.

MR. WACHTER:
That is correct. It would not change our opinion on S.B. 343.

SENATOR HARDY:
I am confused. We had someone testify who was in favor of A.B. 423 but prefers S.B. 343 that does not cost any money, but would be willing to spend \$200,000 to do this one that we could otherwise do free.

MR. WACHTER:

This was a 118-day process that we have gone through with the stakeholders. I do not want to discount all of the conversations we have had with them. We agree that we want something, and I know hard work went into S.B. 343.

It seems that the last thing we are discussing is the appropriation to the Department of Administration, and it would be inappropriate for the Retail Association of Nevada to have an opinion on that.

SENATOR HARDY:

We all have opinions.

STACEY SHINN (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

I am just going to put us in the record and let my colleague Ms. Cafferata carry that discussion.

CHAIR PARKS:

Thank you for your support.

ERICA WASHINGTON (Make It Work Campaign):

We support the bill with the amendments. We support however Ms. Cafferata makes it work, because we need to work and we need transparency.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Nevada Women's Lobby):

We have long sought support for the reactivation of the Nevada Commission for Women. Last Session, we were successful in doing that; however, as Ms. Cafferata stated, no funding was attached to it. I have been to several of the meetings and heard the wonderful projects and ideas that this experienced Commission has, but their arms are tied. There was not even funding to belong to the national organization, which was a small amount of money.

We support the need for this legislation to collect data and we support the amendment to provide the other assistance the Commission needs.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):

I have had a long history of concerns over the Nevada Commission for Women beginning at its inception because it has never represented more traditional women and families. I call it the Commission on Some Women. That is a

continuing concern because it does not represent people who feel as I do about many different issues.

This appropriation concerns me. In the other bill, we have the SOS, which is an unbiased place for the survey to take place. That was a good cooperative resolution of how to do that.

In the Assembly hearing, the sponsor's vision was not for a one-time funding of the Commission but for ongoing support into the future. They did not do that in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. I am concerned that we do not have specific details as to what this money will be used for. If it is a volunteer commission, just like the volunteers that I represent, it ought to be a volunteer commission. I know that that is hard because I volunteer all the time. I am opposed to the appropriation. We have resolved the issue of the survey.

MR. ANDERSON:

I want to go on the record as being neutral on this bill. The one thing we want to make sure is that if A.B. 423 is going to move forward that it contain what is in S.B. 343 because we worked hard to craft that language to ensure that the fiscal note would be removed. Any changes to that could potentially have some sort of fiscal effect. Therefore, we are committed to working with the Commission regardless and moving forward with either bill. I just want to make sure that the provisions relating to the SOS remain intact.

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

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
June 3, 2017
Page 19

CHAIR DENIS:

We are not going to take action on A.B. 423 at this time. That will conclude the hearing on the bills. We have received a letter of opposition to A.B. 423 from the Henderson Chamber of Commerce ([Exhibit D](#)). Having no further business to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, we are adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	2		Attendance Roster
A.B. 521	C	10	Assemblyman Paul Anderson	Photographs
A.B. 423	D	1	Henderson Chamber of Commerce	Letter of Opposition