

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

**Seventy-ninth Session
April 26, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:40 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 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:

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Randall E. DeVaul, P.E., Director, Utilities, City of North Las Vegas
Kelly Crompton, City of Las Vegas
Tammi Davis, Treasurer, Washoe County; Association of County Treasurers of Nevada
Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
John Fudenberg, Coroner, Clark County; Clark County

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 26, 2017
Page 2

Rose Marie Floyd

Arlene Rivera, Ombudsman, Office of Ombudsman for Victims of Domestic Violence, Office of the Attorney General

Annette H. Scott, Director of Advocacy, S.A.F.E. House

Kimberly Mull, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence

Robert Roshak, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

John T. Jones Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association

Ryann Juden, City of North Las Vegas

Omar Saucedo, Southern Nevada Water Authority; Las Vegas Valley Water District

Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce

Scott Anderson, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 8.

ASSEMBLY BILL 8 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the collection of delinquent municipal utility charges. (BDR 21-323)

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

Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 268.043, the governing body of a city has the authority to adopt an ordinance to have delinquent sewer bills placed on the property tax roll for collection. This bill seeks to expand this authority to include other municipal utilities. As introduced, the bill changes the word "sewerage" to "utility service." The word "utility" is overly broad and could lead to confusion.

We became aware of a similar statute, NRS 244.36605 that authorizes a board of county commissioners to place delinquent bills for sewerage, storm drainage or water service, or any combination of these services on the property tax roll for collection.

Assembly Bill 8 was amended in the Assembly to define utility services as sewerage, storm drainage or water service or any combination of those services. This aligns the authority that incorporated cities will have with the existing authority that counties have. In addition, it makes clear what municipal utilities could be placed on the tax roll for collection. We are seeking this authority as a collection method of last resort.

Our members are aware that placing a delinquent bill on the tax roll can have serious consequences. These consequences could possibly include selling property at a public auction to satisfy the property tax bill. Our members would not use this authority lightly or without careful consideration but only as a last resort.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
Is waste disposal included in utility service?

MR. HENDERSON:
No, only sewer, water and storm water are included.

SENATOR RATTI:
I understand that would place a lien against the property on the property tax bill. What level of priority is that lien?

MR. HENDERSON:
It is our understanding that it would have the same priority as property taxes.

SENATOR RATTI:
Before we get to the work session on this bill, perhaps Counsel could confirm how the priority lien status would work in this situation.

CHAIR PARKS:
What is the difference between sewage and sewerage?

MR. HENDERSON:
That may be a question for Counsel also.

CHAIR PARKS:
I always thought sewerage was an archaic term. However, it is well-embedded in our statutes.

RANDALL E. DEVAUL, P.E. (Director, Utilities, City of North Las Vegas):
The City of North Las Vegas supports A.B. 8 for all of the reasons that Mr. Henderson has mentioned. However, it is important that the City of North Las Vegas is able to do this. We have always been able to do it on the sewerage end; however, it has never been done because water and sewer fees

are billed at the same time on the same bill. It is quite tedious to separate the two.

This will be another tool in our arsenal. Approximately \$1.8 million in delinquent sewer charges are over 2 years old. We want to focus on those charges. We have several delinquent multifamily accounts. They simply do not pay their water and sewer bills. Our options are to place a regular lien on the property, which we will not collect until or if the property is sold; to shut their service off, which is problematic from a health standpoint; or try to sue, which we may or may not win. We spend much money trying to sue. Typically, that results in a settlement agreement that is much less than what we would like to collect. This penalizes the rest of our customers. We have 87,000 water customers. They are subsidizing the people who do not pay. I want to reiterate that being able to collect on past due accounts is another tool in our arsenal.

SENATOR HARDY:

Does that mean that they are also delinquent on their water bills because it is difficult to separate water and sewer?

MR. DEVAUL:

Yes, they are delinquent on both water and sewer. They get one bill but it is separated into a water bill and a sewer bill.

SENATOR HARDY:

So that means the water bill is delinquent. Do you need authority for water bill delinquencies also, or do you already have that?

MR. DEVAUL:

At this point, we do not put any kind of tax lien on the books, even for sewerage. This will be used as a last resort. If they are delinquent on their sewerage, they are also delinquent on their water bill because we bill them together. They are going to stay delinquent until we shut off their water, sue them, or put a lien on their property and then decide to sell their property.

SENATOR HARDY:

Do you need authority to put a lien on their property for their delinquent water bills also because you cannot separate it?

MR. DEVAUL:

That is correct. For the City of North Las Vegas, the bill is for water predominantly. We do not have any charges for storm drainage. We are interested in water specifically. We need this authority to apply a tax lien.

SENATOR HARDY:

Does the bill address water as well as sewer?

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas supports A.B. 8. The City of Las Vegas already does this for its sewer utilities. It does charge for any other utility services.

TAMMI DAVIS (Treasurer, Washoe County; Association of County Treasurers of Nevada):

The Association of County Treasurers is neutral on A.B. 8. We recognize that it is a policy decision to add this to the tax bill. However, from a treasurer's perspective, I would like to add the implications. This would be something I would do regardless of what charges were being added. It is important to be aware of the implications as these decisions are made.

Nevada Revised Statutes 268.043 directs that these charges, if they are added, be "collected on the tax roll in the same manner, by the same persons, and at the same time as, together with and not separately from, the county's general taxes." To us that means they carry that same super priority lien. At the end of the day, if they remain unpaid I would be required to sell that property. That may or may not be appropriate.

Because this is a method of last resort for collections, I want to make sure that you are aware that I have seen quite a few instances where this can double someone's tax bill. Perhaps someone is going along and is able to pay his or her bill; however, with these additional charges he or she is no longer able to do that. It could cost that person his or her home or property. That does not happen often, but this year in Washoe County at least four properties were in those circumstances based on the current authorized additions to the tax bills.

SENATOR RATTI:

I want to make sure I understand. It is correct that we are able to do this for delinquent sewer bills now.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 26, 2017
Page 6

Ms. DAVIS:

Cities can do it for sewer bills now. The county can do it for water and sewer bills. They want this language for the cities.

SENATOR RATTI:

This would make it consistent across counties and cities.

Ms. DAVIS:

That is correct.

SENATOR RATTI:

I agree with you. In my eight years on the Sparks City Council, there was only one. Does that sound correct?

Ms. DAVIS:

Actually, in Washoe County this year, Sparks and Reno together had over 2,500 parcels that were added to the tax roll. Washoe County added another 500. Therefore, this affects 3,000 parcels for the current tax year.

SENATOR RATTI:

We only pushed one to the point of selling.

Ms. DAVIS:

I do not know how many were pushed to the point of selling.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Do taxes have to be delinquent for three years or five years before they can be offered for sale?

Ms. DAVIS:

They are delinquent for four years by the time we go to sell.

CHAIR PARKS:

I received a call from a constituent who had apparently not paid a sewer bill for some time. She was saying that there was a compounding effect on the penalties. She was charged interest and penalty fees in Clark County. Do other jurisdictions impose both penalty and interest fees?

MS. DAVIS:

She is likely referring to the fact that late fees accrue during the time the delinquency runs on the city or county books. Those are turned over to the treasurer. If they remain unpaid, they accrue penalty and interest charges as a delinquent tax would.

MR. HENDERSON:

I want to point out that within Clark County the only two entities that cannot put delinquent water or storm drain bills on the property tax rolls are the Cities of Henderson and North Las Vegas. The Las Vegas Valley Water District, the Virgin Valley Water District and Clark County have authority to do that.

SENATOR RATTI:

If I recall correctly, the City of Sparks has a sewer appeals board. Therefore, before a sewer bill is put on the tax rolls, there is a process where the resident could go to the appeals board and work out a payment plan. Sometimes the fees and penalties could be waived. Does that sound right to you? Is that done in all jurisdictions? Does law require it?

MR. HENDERSON:

There are processes where customers can work with the utility on a payment plan. This bill is a tool of last resort. Before any charges can be put on a tax roll, the governing body would have to adopt an ordinance at a public meeting that would list all of the assessor's parcel numbers to be placed on the tax roll. It is always better to work something out before going to this drastic step.

SENATOR RATTI:

This legislation does not trigger or mandate placing that delinquency on the tax roll. Nothing prevents all of those other processes from happening.

MR. HENDERSON:

You are correct.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 8 and open the hearing on A.B. 57.

ASSEMBLY BILL 57 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to coroners.
(BDR 20-375)

BRETT KANDT (Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):
I have submitted written testimony on behalf of Attorney General Adam Paul Laxalt ([Exhibit C](#)).

This bill is being brought on behalf of crime victims. Its purpose is straightforward but important. It will ensure that when a person dies, especially because of a homicide, everything is done that reasonably can be done to notified the decedent's loved ones.

JOHN FUDENBERG (Coroner, Clark County):
I would like to thank Rose Floyd who tragically lost three family members in 2015. Rose initiated this bill because of problems she had in being notified of the death of her daughter. The legal next of kin was the suspect in the murder, so there were some complications. This bill will take care of many of the problems she went through and that other families have gone through in the past.

I support A.B. 57. We worked with the sponsor on the language. We made some friendly amendments in the Assembly, and we are where we need to be with the language. I have been in contact with Laura Knight, M.D., Chief Medical Examiner and Coroner, Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office. She and Robert Roshak, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, support this bill. This bill would be beneficial to all coroners in Nevada for obvious reasons.

MR. KANDT:
We would like to have Ms. Floyd tell her story.

ROSE MARIE FLOYD:
I am Veronica Caldwell's mom. March 4, 2015, I get up early as I normally do, make a cup of coffee and turn on the news. There it is. A triple homicide/suicide in the apartment complex where my family lived. I remember thinking, oh, my God, how tragic for those poor people.

I called my daughter Veronica to talk to her about what happened in her apartment complex, but no answer. I hung up thinking she's probably in the shower. So I called back at 6:00 a.m. We spoke every morning at 6:00 a.m. But, still no answer. At this point, I am

in absolute panic mode. My phone rings and it's a neighbor of Veronica's. She asks me, are you watching the news? I think it is Veronica's apartment. I remember thinking, no, it can't be my girls. I would have been notified.

I immediately called Metro to inform them of the homicide in Veronica's apartment complex and to tell them that I haven't heard from my daughter. They took Veronica's and Yvonne's names and said they would check on it Shortly after, the Coroner's Office calls and verifies that, in fact, Veronica and Yvonne were murdered.

March 3, 2015, my daughter Veronica, my granddaughter Yvonne Rose Reyes and her boyfriend Corey Childers were chased down and shot to death by Veronica's husband, Blake Widmar, in a triple homicide/suicide at approximately 10:15 p.m.

The lone survivor to this brutal murder was my eight-year-old niece, Carly Trujillo, who ran for her little life that night with her murdered family. After Blake shot Veronica, Yvonne and Corey, he cowardly ran back to their apartment and shot himself in the head. He was found suffering from a single self-inflicted gunshot wound but was still alive.

The next thing I can remember, the paramedics were standing over me telling me to breathe. Once I could compose myself, I called the Coroner back and asked if I could come down and identify my daughter. The voice on the other end of the line said, I'm sorry. You're not considered her next of kin. Her next of kin is her husband. What how can that even be possible? I thought he killed her.

Adding insult to injury, I was told that as long as Blake was alive, I would have no rights to her body, and furthermore, should he survive, I will need to petition the court to get the rights to my daughter. I remember hanging up the phone and just screaming. No words would come out.

Later that day, I was told that Blake probably wouldn't survive and that the doctors were keeping him alive to harvest his organs. In the meantime, my Veronica lay in the Coroner's Office alone and unclaimed. It was like she didn't matter. Like she didn't have a mom. I couldn't see my baby and say I'm here, Veronica. You're not alone. You matter to me. I couldn't get to her because I didn't have the rights to her murdered body and there wasn't anything that I could do about it because her next of kin was technically still alive.

If that wasn't devastating enough, I was also told that Veronica survived for an hour after the brutal shooting. She was transported to UMC where she died alone. I should have been there. I should have been with her as she took her last breath. It was my right as her mom. Had I been notified, I could have held her. I was thrown into a state of hysteria that still haunts me every single day.

March 5, 2015, Blake passed. It was only then that I was allowed to identify my only child. Veronica's life was stolen from her by a senseless and brutal act of gun violence. I feel my rights as a mother were stolen from me by a defect in the law.

Respectfully, I ask the members of this Committee to pass Assembly Bill 57 and to consider naming this legislation Veronica's Law after my daughter. This law would ensure that no mother or parent would have to go through the trauma and confusion I faced on March 4, 2015.

Thank you for your time and allowing me to tell Veronica's story.

CHAIR PARKS:

Thank you, Ms. Floyd. Please accept our condolences. I know how difficult this is.

ARLENE RIVERA (Ombudsman, Office of Ombudsman for Victims of Domestic Violence, Office of the Attorney General):

I want to ask you to consider passing this law because there is not another parent who can through what Ms. Floyd has gone through. I want to let you know that here in the south, Rose has the support of the domestic violence

community. She is being supported by Safe Nest, Elynne Greene with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Annette Scott from S.A.F.E. House.

ANNETTE H. SCOTT (Director of Advocacy, S.A.F.E. House):

As domestic violence advocates, we understand the importance of laws for survivors of intimate or domestic homicide. We would like to go on record in support of A.B. 57, also known as Veronica's Law.

The rights of a parent, a mother, a father, a sibling or a child should not be denied because of a minor deficit in the law. This is a terrible tragedy for anyone who is a survivor of an intimate or domestic partner homicide. The additional pain caused by weak laws, which can be avoided, compounds it.

I am reaching out to you to please take the time and make a difference in the lives of people like Ms. Floyd. I hope this law will never have to be used again. That would be amazing, but, unfortunately, the reality is that in this society intimate partner violence is very much a part of our world.

I encourage you all to think of the survivors of victims of crime and make a difference by naming this Veronica's Law, supporting it and passing it, please.

KIMBERLY MULL (Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence):

I have submitted written testimony supporting A.B. 57 ([Exhibit D](#)).

I hope you recognize that Ms. Floyd has worked diligently over the last year to bring this issue forward in memory of her daughter. We would love to see this named after her daughter and called Veronica's Law.

ROBERT ROSHAK (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We support A.B. 57. We appreciate the Attorney General bringing this forward and working with us on the language to make it feasible for the rural sheriffs.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In the case we are talking about, the victim died later in the hospital. The coroner would be on scene to declare the person deceased. However, if the person was transported to the hospital, it becomes the doctor's duty. The reason I am asking is that there are issues in eastern Nevada regarding who signs death certificates.

When the victim is transported by ambulance to a hospital, who makes the call that the person is deceased?

MR. FUDENBERG:

If a person is transported to a hospital and dies at the hospital, the attending physician will pronounce death. Outside of the hospital, it is the coroner or his or her designee who pronounces the death.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Typically, the coroner would not go to the hospital. This would not affect you as the coroner. Whose duty is it to notify the next of kin that the person is deceased?

MR. FUDENBERG:

It does not matter who pronounces the death. In both scenarios, it is the coroner's duty to notify the next of kin.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Would you do that if it were 24 or 48 hours later?

MR. FUDENBERG:

Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR PARKS:

In the 15 rural counties, is it the sheriff's duty to find the next of kin?

MR. ROSHAK:

The sheriff or his or her designee would do that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This is only in cases of homicide or accident. If an individual is transported by ambulance out of a small community like Austin, does the sheriff have to follow up on the fact that the person died in Churchill County? The sheriff in Lander County would be the coroner.

MR. FUDENBERG:

The coroner in the jurisdiction in which the death occurs would follow up. It depends if the coroner takes jurisdiction over the investigation of that death. Those criteria are listed in statute. If the local coroner takes the jurisdiction,

then yes, the coroner is responsible for making the notification. If not, that generally falls on the hospital staff. Most hospitals have social workers who would handle that. At least, that is how it is handled in Clark County.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

If the sheriff in a rural district determines it is something he needs to investigate, then he would assume that role and it would become his duty no matter the time involved.

MR. ROSHAK:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR RATTI:

That was all very helpful. Are we solving the other part of the problem that this family experienced? Before the victim passed, she was alive for a time. Is the hospital allowed to notify next of kin? Could the social worker have notified anyone besides the husband?

MR. FUDENBERG:

I do not think there is a law that governs who the social worker notifies. But generally, at least in Clark County, we have good working relationships with all the hospitals and we coordinate that. The hospitals would rather we make that notification. So in this case, Rose could have been notified. It did not matter that the husband was still alive.

SENATOR RATTI:

I was talking about the time during which the victim was alive.

MR. FUDENBERG:

I cannot speak for the hospitals and what their statutory responsibility is; however, my understanding is that the hospitals would reach out to the family members.

When these types of situations occur, many things are under investigation. We may not know whether the victim is alive or deceased. We may not know the victim's identity for quite some time. That may delay the process also.

SENATOR HARDY:

The HIPAA is involved if the person is living. Who can be notified when you are investigating someone, or suspect someone who is barely living and who is the perpetrator? We have not solved that or the release of the body. I have a problem. What are we doing?

MR. KANDT:

The release of the body was resolved in section 54 of S.B. No. 286 of the 78th Session. The additional issue was not resolved through that legislation. That is the purpose of A.B. 57.

SENATOR HARDY:

So it was not resolved for this wonderful mother because we had not passed it yet in the Seventy-eighth Session.

MR. KANDT:

I do not know when S.B. No. 286 of the 78th Session went into effect. The disposition of the body in a domestic homicide was resolved. The issue of notification still needs to be resolved.

SENATOR HARDY:

How are we resolving the issue of the person who is still living?

MR. KANDT:

That may still need to be addressed. That is not addressed in A.B. 57. Assembly Bill 57 obviously deals with the scope of the coroner's duty and authority. This bill will grant the coroner the authority to make reasonable efforts to notify loved ones under those circumstances. We hope to address this through A.B. 57.

We still need to address the hospital's authority. My office would be happy to follow up on that in future legislation.

SENATOR HARDY:

I agree with what you are doing; however, it seems to me that we have not solved the whole problem.

SENATOR RATTI:

I agree that we are not solving the whole problem. There is still that piece where the victim is alive. I understand that in this case she was alive for a very short time. Maybe she was not even identified. However, if she was alive for longer, is the hospital prohibited from notifying the next of kin? I would like to know the answer to that question.

We have some time. If you are open to an amendment, I would like to work with Counsel to determine if we can solve the whole problem now rather than wait another two years. Maybe that problem does not exist. So let us do some work to find out. Maybe the hospitals have more flexibility. I am not sure, but I would like to work on that. I am assuming that others would as well.

There was a request that the bill be named after Veronica. Is that something we have to amend into the bill? I know that there were other cases in which a law was given a name.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):

If it were the intent to put the name of the law in the bill, then yes, it would require an amendment. You could add a preamble, whereas clauses or something to that affect. Right now, the bill is not designating being named in honor of anyone. If that were the pleasure of the Committee, then that would require an amendment.

SENATOR RATTI:

I would like to ask for that if the sponsor is amenable.

MR. KANDT:

My office would certainly be supportive of naming this Veronica's Law.

CHAIR PARKS:

Is this a common situation in other states? Have they resolved their issues? Nevada is more transient than other states.

MR. FUDENBERG:

I do not know. We have two different Listservs within the medical/legal profession. I have not heard of this situation being an issue in other states through the Listservs and some of the networks with which we communicate. I have not heard of it, but that does not mean it is not an issue.

CHAIR PARKS:

Are there extended periods in the Coroner's Office when you are unable to reach someone who would be an heir or a next of kin?

MR. FUDENBERG:

There are quite a few cases where we cannot reach the next of kin, especially in the Clark County area. As you can imagine, people tend to go there to lose their families. That makes it more difficult. We get many international visitors. That also complicates and delays the notification, not to mention the identification. That is our first step. We have to identify the decedents prior to notifying their next of kin. Therefore, both of those can be delayed by many different circumstances.

CHAIR PARKS:

I had a personal experience where I had known an individual for more than a decade. Unfortunately, he committed suicide. At least two weeks afterwards, I received a call from the coroner's office asking me if I knew this individual and any of his kin. During that period, inquiries had been made to other people who might have known him. The only thing I was able to say was that I knew he had a sister and that she lived in the state of Maine in a very small town. I am presuming with that information the coroner's office was able to make contact. It was surprising that so much time had elapsed.

JOHN T. JONES JR. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

The Nevada District Attorneys Association supports A.B. 57 and supports it being called Veronica's Law.

I want to thank Rose Floyd. I first met her a little over a year ago through an attorney who works in the Clark County District Attorney's Office. When I met Rose, she told me her heartbreaking story and the tragic events involving her daughter. That experience led Rose to reach out to both the Attorney General's Office and the Coroner's Office in Clark County to make the changes presented in A.B. 57.

The Nevada District Attorneys Association is appreciative of the efforts of this Committee to fix the entire situation regarding Rose's heartbreaking experience.

CHAIR PARKS:

We look forward to putting an amendment on this bill and bringing it back for a work session.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 57 and open the hearing on A.B. 79.

ASSEMBLY BILL 79 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to economic development. (BDR S-404)

RYANN JUDEN (City of North Las Vegas):

During the Twenty-ninth Special Session, this Legislature designated the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) as the water service provider in the Garnet Valley, which is the Apex Industrial Park. One of the primary purposes for doing this was to ensure that the water asset being installed at the Apex Industrial Park was being done under the project labor agreement of the SNWA.

Shortly after the Twenty-ninth Special Session, a number of different issues arose. Some of the issues were with our current customers in Garnet Valley who had history with the City of North Las Vegas billing and working with them as the former water service provider. Another issue arose with businesses that were in the process of deciding to develop out there. They had already gone through some of the permitting processes within the City of North Las Vegas. They were concerned that they were going to have to start the permitting process over again.

Another issue occurred after the Twenty-ninth Special Session when the different entities started working on putting together the different infrastructure components for which each was responsible. The City of North Las Vegas was responsible for providing the design, engineering and construction of the wastewater facility at Apex.

During the Seventy-eighth Session, the City of North Las Vegas worked on a bill that allowed it to go into the private sector to seek funds in order to try to get some of the infrastructure built at Apex. Right away, some of those lenders were concerned about what had happened during the Twenty-ninth Special Session of the Legislature regarding moving the provision of water service from the City of North Las Vegas to a different entity. They liked having the water and sewer assets coupled. There are some practical reasons for that. One is that you cannot shut off the sewer if a person does not pay bills, but you can

shut off the water. It is also important because sewer is the least desirable of the two assets but they are usually coupled. The receipts for both sewer and water bills are bonded together.

So the City of North Las Vegas sat down with SNWA and Clark County and discussed some of these issues. They all agreed that there was probably a different structure that needed to put in place for all their customers. The governing bodies of the City of North Las Vegas and SNWA entered into an interlocal agreement. That interlocal agreement preserved the legislative intent to ensure that the water asset was to be constructed by the SNWA. It also returned the water service provision to the City of North Las Vegas. That meant the City of North Las Vegas would continue billing, connecting customers to the water service and the permitting process.

When A.B. 79 was going through the Assembly, there were concerns with some of the language regarding the "look-back" provision that had been deleted in the original draft by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). That was restored in both the Assembly and through a personal amendment by the majority leader in the Assembly to ensure that the "look back" provision in S.B. No. 3 of the 29th Special Session remained. The second friendly amendment that was supported by the City of North Las Vegas was from SNWA which stated that the law would go into effect upon passage.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The water service provider will be the Las Vegas Valley Water District (LVVWD) rather than SNWA going forward.

MR. JUDEN:

The water service provider will be the City of North Las Vegas moving forward.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Where did I miss that in the bill? The language I see says the LVVWD. Does the statute need to say the City of North Las Vegas?

MR. JUDEN:

No, it does not. The Las Vegas Valley Water District Act makes the City of North Las Vegas the water service provider. During the Twenty-ninth Special Session, the Act was amended for Garnet Valley to make the SNWA the water service provider. We are taking that provision from the Twenty-ninth Special

Session of the Legislature out, which then reverts the water service provider to the City of North Las Vegas.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Existing statute makes the City of North Las Vegas the provider in the LVVWD.

MR. JUDEN:

Yes, before December 2015.

CHAIR PARKS:

You have to reflect back to the Twenty-ninth Special Session. A specific action was taken there and this simply reverses that special action.

OMAR SAUCEDO (Southern Nevada Water Authority; Las Vegas Valley Water District):

The SNWA and the LVVWD support A.B. 79. Since the passage of the bill in the Twenty-ninth Special Session, we have had regular meetings with the City of North Las Vegas regarding the water system that is being installed in Garnet Valley for the Apex Industrial Park.

The City of North Las Vegas approached us last year about this bill and we agreed to support the measure during this Session. Part of the agreement was that we wanted to ensure that the conservation measures used in the City of North Las Vegas would reflect the conservation measures used in the LVVWD. The City of North Las Vegas agreed that would be the case. Therefore, we are happy to support this bill as it moves along in the process.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce is also the local chamber of commerce for the City of North Las Vegas businesses. The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce supports the idea that all the billing for building, permitting and bill processing be kept within one entity. This will allow the process to be streamlined through the City of North Las Vegas. The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce supports A.B. 79.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 79 and open the hearing on A.B. 476.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 26, 2017
Page 20

ASSEMBLY BILL 476: Revises provisions relating to notaries public. (BDR 19-1163)

SCOTT ANDERSON (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):
I have submitted a written presentation of A.B. 476 ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR HARDY:

Regarding remote versus electronic notarization, if I go to a notary and I sign the pad with my finger, that is electronic, but if I sign right here and it goes somewhere else, that is remote.

MR. ANDERSON:

It could be that you just type in your signature. As with traditional notarization, with an electronic notary, there would be a person present. The notary would be sitting across from you. You would type your name in on a keypad and the notary would authenticate that you sat before him or her. The notary would attach his or her seal to the electronic document.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is the seal electronic?

MR. ANDERSON:

An electronic attachment can be attached to the electronic version of the document.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 476.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

We have one more bill before us today, A.B. 464. We will open the hearing on A.B. 464.

ASSEMBLY BILL 464: Revises provisions governing certain reports required to be submitted by or to certain governmental entities. (BDR 18-542)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN IRENE BUSTAMANTE ADAMS (Assembly District No. 42):

I am presenting A.B. 464 on behalf of the Legislative Commission. Under NRS 218D.380, the Legislative Commission is directed to review the list of reports submitted to the Legislature that have been in existence for four or more years and to consider whether the reports should be repealed, revised or continued. This bill addresses those duties.

The Commission also considers the costs and benefits of the report and whether the information is available from another source. The genesis of this biennial review goes back to the Seventy-seventh Session when Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson and Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick worked with Senator Debbie Smith to review the hundreds and hundreds of reports required to be submitted to the Legislature each year. The passage of A.B. No. 350 of the 77th Session and S.B. No. 405 of the 77th Session set up the review process and eliminated a number of outdated reports.

Assembly Bill No. 457 of the 78th Session was passed to continue the weeding and pruning of these reports. The bill before you today is literally a housekeeping bill. It will save agencies time and money by eliminating reports that are no longer needed and will benefit the public by converting paper reports to reports posted online. This is a cost-effective way to make information accessible.

RICK COMBS (Director):

Sections 1 and 2 of the bill address reports that are required from the Committee on Domestic Violence and the Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence. The Committee is required to submit a report that summarizes its work during the year and any recommendations it has for domestic violence legislation.

Section 1 would eliminate the report required from the Committee on Domestic Violence but add it to the list of entities from which the Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence should seek comments and recommendations. The Council is then required to include the comments and recommendations in its report. It would eliminate one of the two reports on domestic violence. Both of these entities are staffed in some manner by the Attorney General's Office, so it would assist them by cutting down on the amount of work they do.

Section 3 would convert the report to the Legislature from a regional rapid transit authority regarding its activities, findings and plans of the authority from annual to biennial.

Section 4 is the Housing Division's annual compilation of reports that are submitted by the governing bodies of counties and cities regarding maintenance and development of affordable housing. Section 4 would eliminate the requirement for the Housing Division to submit the compilation report and instead would require the Division to post that compilation report on its Website.

Section 5 addresses the report from the Merit Award Board. It is required to submit an annual report to the Governor's Office of Finance and to the Interim Finance Committee regarding suggestions made by State employees or groups of State employees to eliminate or avoid State expenditures. Section 5 of the bill would convert that reporting requirement from annual to biennial to align with the budget process.

Section 6 is the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) report on investments of money in certain scrutinized companies. This report is provided to the Legislature and generally states—at least over the years that I have been the Director—that PERS does not have any investments in those companies. The PERS Board will be required to include the information on its Website rather than submitting a report.

Sections 7 and 8 deal with local government reports on capital improvement plans and capital improvements that are owned, leased or operated by local governments. Each local government is required to submit annually a copy of its capital improvement plan to the Department of Taxation, the county's debt management commission and the Director of LCB.

Law also requires local governments to submit reports annually to the Department of Taxation and to the Director of LCB regarding the owned, leased and operated capital improvements under that local government's jurisdiction.

Sections 7 and 8 of the bill would eliminate the requirement to submit those plans and reports to the Director of LCB. They would still be required to be submitted to the Department of Taxation. If the Legislature needed those

reports for any reason, the LCB Fiscal Analysis Division would be able to obtain them.

Section 9 addresses a report that is required from the Commissioner of Insurance regarding changes in rates or in the Uniform Plan for Rating Experience, the Uniform Statistical plan or the Uniform System of Classification. That report is required to be submitted to the Director of the LCB when any of those changes occur. I cannot find a recent record of ever having received such a report. It is difficult for us to determine when we should get those reports because we are not notified of when those changes are made. Section 9 would eliminate the requirement for that report.

Section 10 eliminates four different reports. The first one is a quarterly report on transports made by fire departments and ambulance services in Clark County. That report goes to both the Legislative Commission and to the Legislative Committee on Health Care. Neither of those entities has shown any interest in acting on or hearing about those reports in their meetings. Therefore, we are recommending that the reports be eliminated.

Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) is required to submit a report on police activities. This biennial report is being recommended for elimination. In addition, NSHE submits a report on capital improvements that is similar to the report I mentioned earlier that local governments provide. Since NSHE is one of the large entities that receive money through our biennial capital improvement program, the LCB Fiscal Analysis Division should be able to obtain any information that might be needed by Committees.

Finally, the State Fire Marshal's fire-safe cigarette report is recommended for elimination also.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS:

The Legislative Commission is made up of 12 members. I am a member of the Commission. We reviewed this presentation in November 2016, and these are the recommendations for your consideration.

SENATOR RATTI:

Where does the Commission get information on which reports to eliminate?

MR. COMBS:

It gets its information primarily from me. I have tasked the LCB Research Division with assisting me in the process of identifying reports. It is not an easy task. It is difficult to determine which type of report is of interest to someone and which type of report is not of interest to anyone. We do not really have a good way to determine that. Certain items go on the agendas of Interim committees that we take clues from to determine whether those committees actually take an interest in those reports that are appearing in those agendas.

SENATOR RATTI:

Do you poll the Executive Branch to see if agencies are creating reports that no one is using?

MR. COMBS:

Yes, we have gone through the process of asking agencies if they have the same information in multiple reports that they submit, or if they have other reasons for believing that the information reported is not that helpful.

SENATOR RATTI:

We heard a bill in the Committee on Revenue and Economic Development that eliminated four or five reports coming from the Department of Administration. Therefore, I am wondering if we have duplicative processes. Is it appropriate for them to be bringing forward their list and we are bringing forward our list?

MR. COMBS:

I do not want to say that it is inappropriate because it is not. The Department is in the best position to know. We are not polling every single agency, every single biennium. Therefore, it is possible that we did not contact the agency this Interim. It would have to be reports that we stumbled upon and wondered if they could be eliminated. We would have called the agencies and asked them what they thought about it. It is very possible that there was no duplication this biennium.

JOHN FUDENBERG (Clark County):
Clark County supports A.B. 464.

MS. CHLARSON:

Just to point out to the Committee, section 1 of this bill eliminates a report that the Committee voted to change the substance of in another bill, Senate Bill 25,

from the Attorney General's Office. I apologize that I have not had the time to go through and determine if there are conflicts with other bills due to some of these reports being eliminated in this bill. Therefore, if the Committee likes I can look into that and provide the Committee with information to see if we need to resolve any conflicts with other bills at the work session.

SENATE BILL 25: Revises provisions governing the organization and functions of the Office of the Attorney General relating to domestic violence and the fictitious address program. (BDR 18-385)

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
April 26, 2017
Page 26

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 464. Having no further business to come before the Committee on Government Affairs, we are adjourned at 3:03 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	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 57	C	2	Brett Kandt / Office of the Attorney General	Written Testimony
A.B. 57	D	1	Kimberly Mull / Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence	Written Testimony
A.B. 476	E	2	Scott Anderson / Office of the Secretary of State	Written Testimony