

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

**Seventy-ninth Session
February 24, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:06 p.m. on Friday, February 24, 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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tom Dunn, Professional Firefighters of Nevada
Donna Cox, Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners, Nye County
Kenny Bent
David Caudle
John Bosta
Don Cox
Juanita Clark, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation
Bonnie McDaniel
Jeffrey Haag, Administrator, Purchasing Division, Department of Administration
Barry Smith, Nevada Press Association
Patti Jesinoski
John Ridgeway

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 24, 2017
Page 2

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the meeting with the work session. This first bill in the work session is Senate Bill (S.B.) 22.

SENATE BILL 22: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 31-236)

JENNIFER RUEDY (Policy Analyst):

I will explain the provisions of S.B. 22 as contained in the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)). Supplemental to the work session document are organizational charts for the Office of Finance ([Exhibit D](#)), the Department of Administration ([Exhibit E](#)) and the Office of the Governor ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 22.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is S.B. 56.

SENATE BILL 56: Provides a charter for the City of Mesquite. (BDR S-434)

Ms. RUEDY:

I will go through the work session document on S.B. 56 ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 56.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTIONED CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill is S.B. 127.

SENATE BILL 127: Revises provisions relating to the election of members of certain local governing bodies. (BDR 20-786)

Ms. RUEDY:

I will explain the provisions of S.B. 127 and its amendment as contained in the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Everyone involved is satisfied with the 100,000-population cap, the opt-in, opt-out provision and the \$6,000 salary cap. I made a commitment to address any issues that might come up later in the Assembly.

It is a decent bill. It accomplishes what is needed for those areas with vacant boards such as Humboldt County.

CHAIR PARKS:

Ordinance amendments require an elaborate process that serves as sufficient public notice. The ordinance amendment must be requested during a meeting of the governing body. The ordinance amendment will then be heard at a subsequent meeting. It would then go through a third meeting for action by the governing body.

SENATOR RATTI:

If a community has grown substantially over time and wants to return to an elected governing body, is there anything in this bill prohibiting that?

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):

In a circumstance where an ordinance has been passed and the local governing body has gone from elected to appointed, assuming there has been no change in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), the board of county commissioners would have to rewrite the ordinance. They would have to switch it back.

SENATOR RATTI:

If a local community chooses to go back to an elected governing body, it does not have to come before the Legislature. It can go back to being elected?

Ms. CHLARSON:

That is correct.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 24, 2017
Page 4

CHAIR PARKS:
The process is reversed.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 127.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Parks:
We will move on to S.B. 128.

SENATE BILL 128: Revises provisions relating to the requirements to levy taxes to support certain fire districts. (BDR 20-454)

MS. RUEDY:
The provisions of S.B. 128 and its amendment are explained in the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
This bill was brought forth at the request of Nye County. The change from "shall" to "may levy" only affects NRS 244. It does not affect the fire districts under NRS 474.

The final section of the bill talks about outstanding obligations that must be met. This must remain in statute. I made the commitment that if there are issues, they will be addressed in the Assembly.

TOM DUNN (Professional Firefighters of Nevada):
A question came up from the City of Pahrump. The City has a special fire district that is not an organized fire protection district under NRS 474; however, it does collect an enterprise fund. The question coming from the firefighters in the local I represent was whether the new county fire district would be able to use funds, enterprise or whatever else is collected, for that specific jurisdiction. Would those funds be applied to the county fire department as a whole?

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 24, 2017
Page 5

After speaking with Senator Goicoechea, we are still working on specific details. His commitment to us was that any issues occurring as we move forward would be addressed in the Assembly.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Nye County is not incorporated and has no town board. The Board of County Commissioners is in control of all county budgets and the county fire district.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 128.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The last bill in the work session is S.B. 160.

SENATE BILL 160: Revises provisions relating to administrative regulations.
(BDR 18-610)

Ms. RUEDY:

The provisions of S.B. 160 and its amendment are outlined in the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 160.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the work session and open the hearing on S.B. 21.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 24, 2017
Page 6

SENATE BILL 21: Abolishes the Nye County Water District. (BDR S-478)

SENATOR PETE GOICOECHEA (Senatorial District No. 19):

Senate Bill 21 repeals page 3396 of chapter 542, Nye County Water District Act, *Statutes of Nevada 2007*, which abolishes the Nye County Water District.

DONNA COX (Commissioner, Board of Commissioners, Nye County):

This bill is intended to repeal the Nye County Water District Act and turn everything over to Nye County. The Board of County Commissioners will work out details such as adding an advisory board or handling everything ourselves.

We are finished with the Act because it is obsolete. It is no longer effective and is no longer needed. It was enacted to import water, which we are not going to do. It would be one more thing out of our way so we can move forward with other plans in the County.

Page 2 of the bill says, "The people of the State of Nevada, Represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows: Section 1. Chapter 542, *Statutes of Nevada 2007*, at page 3396, is hereby repealed." Then line 13, page 2 says, "Any action taken by the Nye County Water District or any member of the Governing Board of the District, any member of the staff or any professional advisor of the District remains in effect as if taken by the Board of County Commissioners of Nye County." That concerns me. Is that part of what will be left? Are we doing away with everything, or is that part of what is moving forward?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The Board of County Commissioners is responsible for any actions that were taken by the Nye County Water District Governing Board.

Ms. Cox:

Is this what we are looking at today?

Ms. CHLARSON:

The language you referenced starting at line 13, page 2, would become the law. I do not understand what the concern is.

Ms. Cox:

My concern is that we might have to make an amendment if the Commission wanted to change something. We do not know exactly what the Board has done that will be passed on to us. We have to be able to do something such as eliminating or changing what was done by the Board.

The bill says it "remains in effect as if taken by the Board of County Commissioners" I do not want to be limited in what we can do with that information if it comes forward. I suggest that "member of the staff or any professional advisor of the District remains in effect" be changed to "member of the staff or any professional advisor of the District may remain in effect" This will enable the Commission to make changes.

Ms. CHLARSON:

This language is not meant to tie the hands of the Board of County Commissioners going forward. It was meant to ease the transition from the time the Governing Board of the District is dissolved to the time the Nye County Board of County Commissioners takes action. It is not meant to prevent the Board of County Commissioners from taking action going forward. If something is in place now, it is going to continue to be in place until the Nye County Board of County Commissioners takes action to change it.

Ms. Cox:

In other words, the fact that something remains in place now will not prevent us from changing it after the transition. This will not limit what we can do. Anything done improperly, or that does not fit into the realm of what is needed, can still be changed.

Ms. CHLARSON:

As long as the action is within the authority of the Board of County Commissioners, it could be changed. This is meant to explain what happens between the time the bill takes effect and when the Nye County Board of County Commissioners takes action. It means that something can be undone or changed as long as it is within the authority of the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Cox:

Other than that, I did not find any problems with the bill and I am comfortable with it. The wording "remains in effect" concerned me.

SENATOR RATTI:

I want to make sure that this is clear. I assume that any contracts in place that are not time limited would remain in place. They would be contractually obligated.

MS. CHLARSON:

That is correct. Line 9, page 2 of the bill says, "Any agreements, debts, duties, obligations and property ... ," become agreements of the Board of County Commissioners. That language is there to clarify that those agreements will remain in effect. It is just substituting the Board of County Commissioners for the Governing Board of the District.

SENATOR RATTI:

Thank you, that was important to clarify.

MS. COX:

In other words, if we are not happy with the contracts or they have monetary effects that we cannot afford to keep, we cannot declare them null and void.

MS. CHLARSON:

I cannot speak to specific agreements of which I do not have the wording. It is possible, pursuant to the terms of a particular agreement or contract, that there is a termination provision that would explain how a contract could be terminated.

Generally speaking, no. The idea is that the agreements entered into by the Governing Board of the District have to remain in place.

MS. COX:

I would be more comfortable if it said that all those contracts were null and void and had to be brought back in front of the Board of County Commissioners to be rewritten.

MS. CHLARSON:

I would have legal concerns about the constitutionality of that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This is just legalese. It is there to ensure that the Board of County Commissioners assumes those agreements, duties or liabilities that the

Governing Board of the District has as of the effective date of the bill. The following day, as long as it is legal to do so, any of the contracts may be terminated. However, you have to abide by the terms of the contract. I am not familiar with the contracts; however, you might have someone who has a three-year contract. As the Board of County Commissioners, if you have the authority, you can do anything on the effective date that the Governing Board of the District would have been able to do.

KENNY BENT:

The Governing Board of the District entered into professional service contracts, and some money remains from studies that were done. The only thing in question was the word "staff," and keeping the staff. This was viewed as an ongoing financial consideration. Keeping staff was the issue. I understand that all obligations and prior contracts have to be settled. The provisions for that are definitely in this bill.

I have submitted written testimony on S.B. 21 ([Exhibit K](#)). The only other thing I want to comment on was how the District came to be. There are differing thoughts on whether it was for a standing in the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) or if it was created as a district to import water. It was originally introduced as water authority, which was for a standing with the SNWA. However, because of the desire to import water it became a district. Looking at viability and the cost of keeping the District, it was decided to eliminate it to trim back expenses. Because of the costs, importing water will not be a priority. Both sides were right about why it was created in the first place. The fact that it was a district instead of an authority was for the importation of water.

In addition, maintaining local control was a concern. I am in favor of that. That is why I support this bill. To me, local control is with the Board of County Commissioners. The unelected Governing Board of the District has much autonomy. In Nye County, the people are much closer to the Board of County Commissioners.

On a personal note, it costs me \$300 every time I appeal a Governing Board of the District decision to the Board of County Commissioners. I cannot afford that anymore.

SENATOR RATTI:

I understand the concern is staff. However, the same issue occurs if an employment contract is in place. The employment contract stands unless it has termination language in its provisions.

MS. CHLARSON:

That is correct. I do not know if the issue is that the Nye County Water District had employees and if those employees continue to have employment, or is it that those employees took certain actions while employed by the District. Can the Board of County Commissioners, upon the elimination of the District, void those actions?

MR. BENT:

The Governing Board of the District issued employment contracts with its staff. The concern is that if the Nye County Water District is eliminated, those contracts end. I do not know if there are termination dates in the contracts. Most things in the budget are done year to year.

SENATOR RATTI:

Duties will still be performed, particularly water planning. We all know that water can be a contentious issue. What will the Board of County Commissioner's approach be to ensure that the water planning duties continue forward and that good water planning and strategies are in your area?

MS. COX:

We have a planning department which oversees many issues that are close to this. The planning department could review or take over certain duties that we may need to keep. Things that are developed, built or need to be reviewed regarding water issues could be handled through the planning or zoning departments. Other than that, we do not have many water issues. We are still small—still growing. We have monies available to continue to do some of those things.

In addition, we had planned on putting a citizen's advisory board together. We have many well-educated people who are willing to volunteer their time so there will be no expense. They will bring their findings to the Board of County Commissioners.

CHAIR PARKS:

It is within your powers as a county commission to have as many advisory bodies as you wish.

DAVID CAUDLE:

I agree with everything Mr. Bent said. I have submitted written testimony supporting S.B. 21 ([Exhibit L](#)) along with my letter of resignation from the Nye County Basin 162 Groundwater Management Plan Advisory Committee to Nye County Commissioner Frank Carbone ([Exhibit M](#)).

JOHN BOSTA:

I am concerned about staff retention. Staff is hired under a memorandum of understanding shared with the County. The Nye County Water District has two employees, a secretary and a general manager, both under contract. In this case, if the District were abolished, those two positions would no longer exist.

What is important is that encumbered contracts are based upon the total budget of the Nye County Water District. Eighty-one percent of the District's money has been encumbered by contracts that have just been approved. One contract was not approved by four out of seven votes, it was approved by three out of five votes. The income for the District is a resolution and not an ordinance. Revenue by a resolution has never been a correct method.

I am concerned about utility districts that have been members of the groundwater management plan. Domestic well owners have never been allowed a seat at that table. Now we have supported the abolishment of the Nye County Water District.

We submitted 355 signatures in protest at the last Board of County Commissioners meeting to bring this item back. It was our understanding that the issue was to abolish the District. Now with all the rules and regulations, it appeared that it was going back to the Board of County Commissioners. They were going to fight the same battle again to abolish what they are trying to accomplish. The thing that is important is what they are trying to abolish is not within the powers of the Governing Board of the District. The Governing Board has never exercised paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (r), (s) and (u) of section 8, of the Nye County Water District Act.

The District hired staff. It has an office. It has done some things. It has gone out on the side and done well testing. Well testing was a responsibility of the U.S. Nuclear Repository Commission. It became a responsibility of the County and was subsequently transferred to the Nye County Water District.

The County has always paid the membership in the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority. In this year's budget, that was eliminated and the Nye County Water District picked up that contract. They paid \$7,500 for the membership, and they are not accounting for it. The District has done many things wrong. This is why people have supported the abolishment of the District. It is not acting within the scope of the original water district which was to import water. It has not formed any kind of an agency. It has no water rights. It is out in left field doing things that are not in the Act. I beseech you, please, to abolish Nye County Water District.

I have also submitted written testimony in support of S.B. 21 ([Exhibit N](#)).

CHAIR PARKS:

Once you have created something like this and then try to reverse it, it is harder to back up than to drive forward.

DON COX:

I was one of the petitioners who got the signatures on the petition. I started on Monday and got 125 signatures. I followed up on Tuesday at the Board of County Commissioners and got another 40 or 50 signatures. The citizens of Pahrump want the Nye County Water District eliminated. I had no problem going into a business and have the owners sign the petition. Their customers also signed it.

CHAIR PARKS:

Senate Bill No. 222 of the 74th Legislative Session went into effect with many conditions. The only way to rectify whatever is in place falls on the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. COX:

That would be fine. We are willing to accept that responsibility. The people feel the District is ineffective and a waste of money. They want a board that has been elected to make the final decisions, not a board that has been appointed to spend their money.

Keeping the Nye County Water District Governing Board can be dangerous because it has unlimited powers. It can levy taxes, and it has a huge budget that gets bigger and bigger. It is like a growing monster.

I spoke on the original bill in the 74th Legislative Session in 2007. I said you should not do this. I can see where it is going. It is going to become a white elephant with a big monster hanging over it. It is going to be a money thing. We can keep making staff jobs to spend the money in order to justify getting more money next year.

I do not want to go into that. This needs to be eliminated now. Since the Act became effective, we have had shortfalls. Neither the County nor the citizens have the money to deal with this. It was done because someone thought we were going to become a big city, which we are not. The people want to keep their rural lifestyle. They want to keep their wells. They want to keep things the way they are. We are not against growth, but we do not want to get carried away. At this point, the District is obsolete. It needs to be repealed.

JUANITA CLARK (Charleston Neighborhood Preservation):
I have submitted written testimony supporting S.B. 21 ([Exhibit O](#)).

BONNIE MCDANIEL:
I am a property owner in Pahrump. Even though there is nothing on my land, I am charged fees in my taxes by the District. I get no benefits whatever. I urge you to support S.B. 21.

Prior to any voting on this bill, the Board of County Commissioners should review all contracts to determine if they are feasible and viable for the Commission to take over. As it stands now, the District has and will have control over the Commission. The District could have gone out and purchased \$20,000 to \$30,000 worth of office supplies that the Commission will have to take over. It is only fair that the Commission is allowed to go over all of the contracts first if they have not already done so. They will know whether they can afford to take over the contracts or if the contracts should be determined null and void. I urge you to vote yes.

CHAIR PARKS:
The Nye County Board of County Commissioners will review all the outstanding obligations of the Nye County Water District.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The Board of County Commissioners voted to abolish Nye County Water District. As it was created, so it is abolished. I ask that you support their request.

Ms. Cox:

Nye County is one of the counties that belong to the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority (CNRWA). It is much less expensive to belong to the CNRWA than it is to promote our own District. Therefore, we will stay with the CNRWA.

The District is receiving monies from northern Nevada residents who are not getting any benefits from their money. It goes to southern Nevada only.

SENATOR RATTI:

Interesting points were raised about the transition because you have staff and contracts to be reviewed. This bill becomes effective upon passage and approval. The day it is signed by the Governor, it becomes your responsibility. Is that really what you want?

Ms. Cox:

Yes, commission staff, along with the Commissioners, will review and take care of those contracts.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The Board of County Commissioners approved Senate Bill 21, as written.

CHAIR PARKS:

We have received written statements from Sarah Chapman in opposition to S.B. 21 ([Exhibit P](#)), from Rosalie Mitchell in support of S.B. 21 ([Exhibit Q](#)), and a minority opinion ([Exhibit R](#)) from Dan Schinhofen and Lorinda Wichman, Board of County Commissioners, Nye County.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 21 and open the hearing on S.B. 39.

SENATE BILL 39: Revises provisions relating to state purchasing. (BDR 27-122)

JEFFREY HAAG (Administrator, Purchasing Division, Department of Administration):

This bill proposes changes to NRS 333.300, NRS 333.310 and NRS 333.370 regarding posting and advertising requirements. If the estimated contract value is expected to exceed \$50,000, NRS requires advertising in at least one newspaper of general circulation in the State. We have an annual budget of \$11,388 to run newspaper ads most Wednesdays in the north and in the south. Additionally, NRS 333.370 requires notices of award to be physically posted in at least three public buildings, including the location of the using agency.

This is directly in line with the Governor's strategic initiative to create a responsive and efficient state government. It will also address ongoing concerns by the vendor community regarding the need for focused communication. This bill strives to create efficiencies and transparencies by consolidating all procurement-related advertisements, postings and communications to the Website of the Purchasing Division.

As we work to move the Division forward, it is important to embrace technology and communicate solicitation opportunities in a manner that obtains the highest level of attention from potential bidders. This initiative to consolidate communication to the Division's Website directly supports the e-procurement technology initiative we are pursuing. The e-procurement system will be tied to the Division's Website providing a one-stop shop for all vendors to see Nevada's solicitation opportunities, view existing contract status and engage directly with State agencies.

Posting solicitation opportunities electronically will also provide us with the analytics to understand who is reviewing our solicitations and begin to understand why vendors are not responding to solicitation opportunities. We cannot get these elements through traditional advertising strategies. This process improvement will allow the Division to focus on the most effective communication channels. It will allow us to focus our attention on educating vendors on the best ways to work with the State in its preferred method of communication.

CHAIR PARKS:

I have reviewed the bill. It is appropriate given the technology available for today's situations.

BARRY SMITH (Nevada Press Association):

I oppose abolishing newspaper notices on advertisements for bids. I use the word advertisement because the bill changes notice to advertisement. However, chapter 238 of NRS refers to notices. This is a public notice. It is not an advertisement. It is not directed at vendors as much as it is directed at the public. The purpose is to ensure that information is distributed and disseminated through the means established in NRS 238. The use of public notices has a long history in the State and nationally.

When notices are placed in the newspaper, a permanent record is created and independent verification is available. Archiving the records clarifies that notification was done as required by statute. I have said many times that the way to do this is to create more public notice, not less.

Nevada Revised Statutes 333.310 was amended in the 76th Legislative Session to require both Internet and newspaper notice. That is the way the tax-paying public, who is the other half of this equation, becomes aware of what is going on, what money is being spent and what State contracts are out there.

There is value in paying \$11,000 per year to place these notices, mostly in Reno and Las Vegas newspapers, to ensure the public is familiar with them. The accountability and the scrutiny that comes with that are valuable. Putting notices out in the public attracts more vendors who will place more bids that are competitive.

The information is available on the Purchasing Division's Website, but you have to go there to find it. There are many Websites and government agencies in the State. Searching each Website every day for changes or information is not possible.

With the current system, public notices can be located county-by-county or where they are published. The notices can be easily found for general information or to realize that contracts are being solicited.

SENATOR RATTI:

I am sympathetic to your argument in a number of cases, such as the Open Meeting Law. We want to make sure people can find an open meeting without going to a Website. However, your argument is less compelling on the posting

of purchasing contracts. Why is it important that every purchasing opportunity be noticed to the public?

MR. SMITH:

It is the scrutiny and awareness by the public of what contracts are out there. I see what is being bid and what is being sought when I read the *Nevada Appeal* in Carson City. It is an opportunity for me to know where taxpayer dollars are being spent. The intent of this bill is State-to-vendor noticing. The reason notices exist in the first place is to ensure that communication is not only transparent but also scrutinized and disseminated to the public. The public does not have to go to the Purchasing Division Website to know what is going on with their tax dollars.

MS. MCDANIEL:

I agree with the person who opposed this bill. Public notice is public notice. The public needs to know how every department in Nevada is spending our money. It is not your money. It is our money. Yes, you are all taxpayers, but there are more of us than there are of you.

Yes, I oppose the bill. Notice needs to be everywhere, not just on your Website or on their Website.

MR. HAAG:

The intent of this bill is to focus communication to the vendor community, to the public and to provide absolute transparency regarding solicitation opportunities and any future spending that may result from that solicitation. That would be available on the State Website but unfortunately is not available in a newspaper of normal circulation.

SENATOR HARDY:

What is the real cost? I see you are going to save \$23,000 per biennium by doing this. Does that include staff time? I see the \$50,000. Are you reducing costs from \$50,000 to \$27,000? Is that what you are looking at?

MR. HAAG:

Expenditures in fiscal year 2016 were \$11,388. Those are State funds spent on advertising solicitation opportunities across the State. The \$50,000 is the threshold identified in statute at which point we need to advertise the solicitation opportunities. If a contract is expected to exceed \$50,000, we have

the statutory responsibility to advertise that solicitation in the newspaper. The hard dollar savings spent on advertising would be approximately \$11,000 per fiscal year.

Staff time is harder to calculate. We do not have dedicated staff who just manages the advertising piece. It is one facet of many shared responsibilities within the office. The win that I see from an administrative labor perspective is that this is a manual process. It is time-consuming to file these advertisements on a weekly basis. That is time that staff can be engaged in other responsibilities such as engaging directly with constituents or with the vendors with whom we are trying to do business.

PATTI JESINOSKI:

One comment made was that notices are on the Website. I sat in the school library hearing yesterday and listened to many teachers talk about how not every home has access to computers on which to do homework. Not everyone has access to or can easily maneuver the different Websites for State information. I urge that we still post notices in the newspapers.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 39 and open up for public comment.

JOHN RIDGEWAY:

Last Session, Elliott Anderson held a town hall meeting at which I brought up the fact that they want to tax this and spend money here. I said let us audit where you are going to put the money. Everyone heard of the ice bucket challenge. I would like to put out a universal challenge to this Legislature to audit everything, please. Add the word audit to all the bills. Instead of "may audit" add "shall audit" in many of the financial situations.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 24, 2017
Page 19

CHAIR PARKS:

Having no further business to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, the meeting is adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator David R. Parks,

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
S.B. 22	C	2	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 22	D	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Finance Office Organizational Chart
S.B. 22	E	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Department of Administration Organizational Chart
S.B. 22	F	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Office of the Governor Organizational Chart
S.B. 56	G	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 127	H	3	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 128	I	4	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 160	J	4	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 21	K	2	Kenny Bent	Written Testimony
S.B. 21	L	1	David Caudle	Written Testimony
S.B. 21	M	1	David Caudle	Letter to Nye County Board of Commissioners
S.B. 21	N	4	John Bosta	Letter to Senate Committee on Government Affairs
S.B. 21	O	1	Charleston Neighborhood Preservation	Written Testimony
S.B. 21	P	1	Senator David R. Parks	Written Testimony from Sarah Chapman
S.B. 21	Q	1	Senator David R. Parks	Written Testimony from Rosalie Mitchell
S.B. 21	R	2	Senator David R. Parks	Minority Opinion from Dan Schinhofen and Lorinda Wichman/Board of County Commissioners, Nye County