

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eightieth Session
March 22, 2019**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Vice Chair William McCurdy II at 8:50 a.m. on Friday, March 22, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair
Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Alex Assefa
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblywoman Connie Munk

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Chris Edwards, Assembly District No. 19
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles, Assembly District No. 25

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Geigy Stringer, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 620



OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott W. Anderson, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Tony Yarbrough, State Senior Vice Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and
Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Council
Katherine Miller, U.S. Army Colonel (Ret.), Director, Department of Veterans
Services

Vice Chair McCurdy:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 245. Presenters, please come forward.

Assembly Bill 245: Requires the waiver of certain fees for certain veteran-owned businesses. (BDR 7-124)

Assemblyman Chris Edwards, Assembly District No. 19:

Today, I am delighted to present Assembly Bill 245. With your indulgence, I would like to provide an overview of the bill's intent and then have Mr. Scott Anderson from the Office of the Secretary of State go through the bill itself.

Just a quick background: Like all of you, I contemplated what bill draft resolutions I wanted to submit for this session. One of them was going to be focused on helping small businesses. Of course, at first, I did not know exactly how, but I knew I wanted to do that. I discussed the concept with the Secretary of State's Office and, shortly after our meeting, the Secretary of State came to me and proposed the bill that you see before you today.

The intent is quite simple. It helps veterans who want to start their own businesses with business fee relief. The initial savings to the veterans could be as high as \$750 to over \$1,200 throughout the course of the fee-waiver period. Some may say that this is not a lot of help. I submit to you that it is not just a matter of money. It is also a matter of showing our veteran entrepreneurs that we want them here, we want them to succeed, and we will provide them help where we can. It is fair to say that as their business grows, our constituents will benefit by having more products and services available to them. In time, this investment in our veteran entrepreneurs will provide a much greater return on investment (ROI) than if we do not do it.

You may wonder, of course, how much will this cost? That is a great question. There have been four other states that have started a program similar to this. The average cost was about \$1,000 per limited liability company (LLC) or corporation, and there have been as many as 500 businesses started this way in the largest of those states. Frankly, given our size as a state, we do not expect quite that many. We do not have information regarding what the longer-term ROI was and how many jobs were created. That is simply because the programs are so new throughout the country. However, logically, the benefits of more jobs, more services, and more products will lead to more revenues for the state well into the future. This bill also furthers our state's goal of being the most veteran-friendly state in the Union. This is

one more way that we can make this true. I thank you and now, with your permission, Mr. Vice Chair, I would like to hand the presentation over to Mr. Anderson.

Scott W. Anderson, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

This bill would allow for certain veterans coming out of the military to get a leg up through some relief from the initial filing fees and for a period of three years after the annual fees. This would require the business or entity to be at least 51 percent veteran-owned. It is considered to be a one-time, one-business type of relief so that we can make sure that these provisions are not abused from multiple businesses getting this type of waiver.

What this bill would do is allow a sole proprietorship or general partnership, corporation, or LLC to be formed with the initial filing fee being waived and for the annual fee to be waived for three years thereafter. The bill offers a period of relief of approximately four years. Currently the formation costs in Nevada for a corporation include not only the initial filing fee but also the state business license and fees for the initial and annual lists. For a corporation it amounts to \$725; for LLCs, \$425; and for sole proprietors and general partnerships, \$200. Thereafter, annually, for corporations it is \$650; for LLCs, \$350; and for general partnerships and sole proprietorships, \$200.

This legislation comes from West Virginia's Boots to Business initiative that was started approximately six years ago. At this point in time, they have had a little over 500 entities that have taken advantage of the program. We do not expect the number to be that high in Nevada. We expect the number in the initial years to be in the tens. Perhaps later on, if this is a successful program, the number could potentially go up in the area of 250 businesses that will come on board and maintain the program even a year thereafter.

This bill would require the Secretary of State to develop some regulations to come up with the qualifications for the exemption. Right now it has been discussed that we would look at the U.S. Small Business Administration's Boots to Business registration as being one of the requirements. The submission to the Secretary of State of a U.S. Department of Defense Form DD214 would show how the veteran left service. We are looking to allow veterans who have been discharged for something other than dishonorable to be allowed to have this exemption. This is to give a leg up to these veterans.

We have been asked to put a fiscal note on this bill. It really cannot be determined right now, because this is kind of an opportunity cost. Save for this exemption, most veterans would not be taking advantage of the opportunity. Therefore, that veteran-owned business would not be started. I am able to tell you the amount of fees that would be waived, based upon some of our analyses. On the low end, assuming perhaps 20 entities per year, the waivers would amount to anywhere from \$9,295 to \$35,305 in years one through four. That is the low end. On the high end, assuming 250 entities, the waivers would total anywhere from \$116,000 to \$418,000. The lowest to the highest depends on the success of the program. We expect that a program of this type would take a while to ramp up as we get the information out there. We have in the past worked with the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA), the Department of Business and Industry, and the Department of Veterans Services to make

available resources to veterans to ensure that they are successful in business. We know that a lot of small businesses do not succeed in the first five years of starting. This bill will, however, allow them some relief that hopefully helps them become successful.

That is simply what this bill is about. As you can see, it is 15 pages long, but most of the provisions are repeated throughout different chapters of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), Chapter 76, Chapter 78, and Chapter 86. The bill is intended, again, only for sole proprietors and general partnerships, which only have to get state business licenses, as well as for-profit corporations and LLCs on the entity side. I do not have too much to add. Assemblyman Edwards has given the purpose of this bill and the Secretary of State's Office is ready and able to implement this. I am happy to work with the sponsors and any other interested parties over any concerns relating to this bill.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thank you for bringing this bill. Our Committee enjoys having issues that deal with veterans come before it. How did you land on the three years? You mentioned that most small businesses do not succeed in the first five years. I was just wondering where the three years came from.

Scott Anderson:

This legislation is based on the West Virginia model. They had a four-year relief period, which they felt to be a reasonable time frame. That time period would allow these businesses to really get off the ground. Granted, the relief is not a tremendous amount when you look at it on a per-business basis, but it is some relief from those fees that are required to be paid to our office.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am assuming that it will help us capture some of the veterans who are at least self-identifying. Has West Virginia seen an uptick in veterans going for veterans' benefits and the like? Things that we have been worried about our veterans availing? Moreover, will there be continued interaction with the veterans to let them know of other services and programs that might be available to them by virtue of being veterans?

Scott Anderson:

We have not spoken with West Virginia about those types of things. However, we will be providing additional resource information to the veterans to ensure that they have the resources or access to the necessary resources. We do have some of those resources available through SilverFlume Nevada's Business Portal (SilverFlume). We have a link to the Department of Business and Industry web page and other veterans' services. We most definitely will be working with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other veterans' organizations over any concerns they may have and toward gathering any metrics that may come from these fee-exempted filings.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I would really like to see some numbers from West Virginia. I would like to see anecdotal evidence indicating that because of this program, they are seeing better than average results for veteran-owned businesses. Perhaps some people reporting increased awareness. I would really like to see those numbers so we can see that this actually works in the best possible way for our veterans.

Scott Anderson:

As of last report, over 500 businesses in West Virginia had taken advantage of this. My understanding is that approximately 480 of those were still in business and still on record. We will reach out to West Virginia to get more information on that. More research needs to be done in regard to the program at large. We do not have an indication whether West Virginia feels that it is successful. I would feel that having 500 veteran-owned businesses is successful, and having most of those still in business would lead me to believe that the program is successful.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are you saying that this is for honorably discharged veterans only, or could this be for anybody who has been discharged?

Assemblyman Edwards:

We are looking to benefit those who are discharged honorably or under a general status, not dishonorable discharges.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (c) of the bill says "except as otherwise provided in subsection 3" It says the fee to accompany is \$200—is that for an LLC or a corporation? LLCs are \$200 for each LLC, unless you are under an umbrella. Section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (b) says a business license is required of an individual who is not an entity required to file an initial or annual list by the Secretary of State, but they have to have that fee? I am confused. I am 100 percent for this. Whatever we can do to get the veterans up and get them working and get them into business, I am for 100 percent. I am somewhat confused—I have 11 LLCs under my series. If a business starts, they have to have documents for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). So how can the state waive the fee? Does it just put it on hold? I am confused.

Scott Anderson:

The language would capture sole proprietorships and general partnerships under the state business license law, and LLCs and corporations under the business license and corporate registration law. For LLCs and corporations, the waiver would include the registration fees and the business license. For sole proprietorships and general partnerships, the waiver would include just the state business license, because that is all they are required to get. Now this is just a waiver of the fees and not a waiver on having to file the formation documents. The entities would still have to file their formation documents, only there would be no fee required to go to the state. The entities would still be a matter of record, so they could go to

the IRS or any other agency with their formation documents endorsed as filed with the Secretary of State's Office. There just would not be a fee.

Assemblyman Ellison:

That addresses my whole concern. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Munk:

I understand this is for new businesses just starting. However, I notice the licensing fees for existing businesses are hefty. Have you thought about including some of the existing businesses that are veteran-owned?

Scott Anderson:

The bill is structured to be prospective. Going back and identifying existing businesses could be problematic. Though difficult, I think it could be done, but the intent of this is to be a new program moving forward with new businesses.

Assemblywoman Munk:

Do you have any idea at this point how many new businesses are being started by veterans who are coming home, or how many are going to be starting them?

Assemblyman Edwards:

We are hoping to capture a few hundred over the course of the next four years. We just do not know how many that will be. However, I think this program will play very well with the veterans programs we have at our community colleges and universities that have been extremely successful. This will give those folks the next step of support as they get back into civilian life.

Assemblyman Assefa:

Along the lines of what Assemblywoman Munk just asked you, have you seen a trend of veterans applying for business licenses in the past five years or so? How many veterans are coming forward with the application to form small businesses? You gave us figures earlier as to how much money we may not be generating if this bill became effective, but is that accounting for the eligibility requirements that are in written in the language?

Scott Anderson:

Unfortunately, Nevada's current laws do not collect that information when we register a business. There is voluntary reporting through SilverFlume on electronic filings, but I cannot say that data would necessarily be an accurate depiction of all veteran-owned businesses that are currently on file with us. I really cannot give you a good answer on that. What I can say is, when we previously discussed the program with West Virginia, they said their numbers at the beginning of their program were in the tens. Several years after the program was in place, their numbers moved up into the hundreds, and they are maintaining at approximately 500 veteran-owned businesses moving forward, with a few more being added every year.

Assemblyman Edwards:

This is one of the best ways to capture that kind of information. As we go forward, we can actually see how many veterans are opening up businesses and what types they are. That can show us how we can help them even more in the future. Unfortunately, we do not always collect that kind of information. Then we have a brilliant idea like this and we say, How much do we have? And the only answer is, We will have to find out. This is a way to find out.

Assemblyman Assefa:

Logistically, how would this work? How would SilverFlume understand someone is applying under this category? Is it by self-declaring? Would they have to show up to your office to authenticate that they are 51 percent veteran-owned or that they fall into these categories?

Scott Anderson:

More than likely, at least initially, this would not be an electronic filing. Although we could have it as an electronic filing, there would be some documentation that would be required. It is yet to be determined exactly how the qualifications will work, but it would most likely include the requirement that they file their Form DD214, which shows how they left the service, and potentially submit certification by the SBA or other certifying authority that they are indeed a veteran-owned business. There are agencies that do that; we are still working to figure out which those would be.

Assemblyman Assefa:

If this bill became law, is it your intention to let veterans know this is available for them if they show up at your office to apply for it? Is that how it works?

Scott Anderson:

Initially, that would probably be the case. We would definitely make it known that this program was available to our veterans. It may not be that they would have to show up to our office, but they would have to provide the documents necessary to show that they are a veteran-owned business that would qualify for such a waiver. Whether that be by uploading an electronic document or providing it through the mail or showing up at our office, we would look at those documents and the other requirements they provide to us to make the determination whether they qualify for the waiver.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Thank you for bringing this bill forward, Mr. Edwards. If you were a vet already established in one type of business and you are changing over to another type, changing the formation of your company, would this go into effect? Would you be allowed this fee waiver?

Also, let us say a vet has multiple companies of various names, or goes out of business and starts another. Is this fee waiver always going to be granted every time they decide to go into business for the first time, the third time, the sixth time, no matter how many times they go into business?

Scott Anderson:

The intent is for one time, one business; not for multiple businesses. We could see this being abused. For example, a qualified person could become a registered agent and set up multiple companies for others and apply for waivers going forward, and then sell those entities to other people. The eligibility requirements would be necessary for the entirety of the waiver period. So on an annual basis, the requirements need to be shown to continue to receive the exemption.

Regarding your first question about changing the type of entity, there are times when an entity may be a corporation and changes to an LLC or a sole proprietorship that changes to become a corporation. At first glance, we would go ahead and consider that to be an ongoing concern and the fees would still be waived for the four-year period.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

So as long as it is in that five-year period, is that what you are saying? You did not touch on the other question.

Scott Anderson:

Yes, within that four-year period, the waiver would apply. I am not sure what question I missed.

[Assemblyman Flores assumed the Chair.]

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Until the question comes back to me, Chair, please go ahead to the next person.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

You have answered most of my questions, but one just came up with the statement you just made. If a veteran currently owns a business before January 1, 2020, and he or she would like to start an additional business, is he or she eligible as he or she has not currently taken advantage of this?

Assemblyman Edwards:

Yes.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional questions? I do not see any. I would like to invite you both to sit back, and I invite forward all those wishing to speak in support of the bill, either in Clark County or Carson City.

**Tony Yarbrough, State Senior Vice Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and
Chairman, United Veterans Legislative Council:**

I represent nearly 9,000 members statewide of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the department of Nevada. I also represent close to 250,000 members of the United Veterans Legislative Council (UVLC) as chairman. The UVLC is a nonpartisan organization of all

veterans organizations throughout the state of Nevada. That includes all veterans, active duty military, National Guard, families, advocates, and those seated here behind me. I am sure that many of you have veterans in your family history and have direct experience with active military service as well. As we move forward, please remember them and the family sacrifices and the commitments to serve our country and how proudly you support them. Naturally, all we want to do is the best for them.

The UVLC supports A.B. 245 for the following reasons: From history's standpoint, this will be the third session that we have tried to find an opportunity to be able to bring relief, encourage, and provide incentives for veteran-owned businesses. We have tried so many different directions, and this is probably the best approach that I have seen so far. To me, it is extremely important that we find a way not only to do the outreach to find those veteran businesses which have been very, very elusive, both through the Secretary of State and the Department of Veterans Services because, obviously, you cannot force somebody to come forward. That means they have to self-identify. This is a major incentive to bring those people forward and for us to be able to help them find success in their businesses. This is the biggest reason of all, naturally, that the UVLC supports this, and I stand by for questions.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any questions? I do not believe we have any. Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to speak in support of A.B. 245? I do not believe we have anyone here. Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition to A.B. 245? Seeing no one, is there anyone wishing to speak in the neutral position on A.B. 245?

Katherine Miller, U.S. Army Colonel (Ret.), Director, Department of Veterans Services:

I want to share a little bit of information. First, I want to tell you that state and national studies reveal that the No. 1 need for transitioning veterans is employment. Many of our veterans wish to become business owners. However, the number of veteran-owned businesses is declining. Today, only 4.5 percent of businesses are veteran-owned as opposed to 49.7 percent after World War II (WWII). There are many reasons for that. After WWII there were a number of national loans that helped veteran business owners. Our veterans today lack strong business or personal networks. Before, during the large mobilizations they came from communities and returned to those communities. Many of our veterans today are going to different communities than the ones they were raised in. Veterans tend to ask for smaller loans these days. Larger banks are less likely to approve these loans that are under \$100,000.

Additionally, just last year, SilverFlume did add a field requesting veteran owners to self-identify as a business. This is going to help us collect data in the future, but right now we just do not have enough of the information to provide the Secretary of State or others help in identifying that demographic.

Lastly, if this bill is passed, we will send a letter to all veterans who indicate they are transitioning to Nevada. When we get such data from the Department of Defense, we currently send them a letter with information on housing and employment. We can easily

update that packet to add information regarding this benefit, so veterans who are interested in entrepreneurship and opening a business would understand what Nevada offers them.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any questions? I do not believe we have any. Is there anybody else wishing to speak in the neutral position? Seeing no one, I invite you to give any closing remarks you may have.

Assemblyman Edwards:

I want to thank you all for your consideration of this bill. We look at it as a way to give some of our veterans who are returning and transitioning back into civilian life something to look forward to, something to strive for. One of the problems that the veteran community has been having is that they have difficulties moving into the civilian sector and they often do not know where to turn for even a little bit of help. This is one way for them to turn to us for that help and for us to provide that help to them. As far as getting the word out to the veterans, we have a great network of folks to help. Mr. Yarbrough, in particular, has a fantastic organization. I have let the word out down in the south and I know that we do get the word out amongst ourselves. Once we do get the word out, we will have a very successful program, and I appreciate your support.

Chair Flores:

Thank you. We are going to go ahead and close the hearing on Assembly Bill 245. Next, members, we will go into the work session documents.

I want to bring this to everyone's attention. We work hard to try to get all the stakeholders at the same table. There was an item in the work session today that was pulled at the last minute. Sometimes, when we can, we shall postpone things in the interest of getting all the stakeholders at the table before we do anything with it. I did not pull the item intentionally for any other reason besides trying to get all the stakeholders on the same page. We are going to table Assembly Bill 86 for today, as there are some questions that need to be addressed before we do anything else with it. We are instead going to start with Assembly Bill 206 (Exhibit C), which revises provisions relating to emergency management. Mr. McDonald, please proceed.

**Assembly Bill 86: Revises provisions relating to governmental purchasing.
(BDR 27-182)**

[This bill was not heard.]

**Assembly Bill 206: Revises provisions relating to emergency management.
(BDR 36-864)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

This bill revises provisions relating to emergency management. It was sponsored by Assemblyman McCurdy and heard in this Committee on March 15, 2019. The bill requires

the chief of the Division of Emergency Management of the Department of Public Safety—as part of the emergency management planning process—to develop written plans for the mitigation of, preparation for, response to, and recovery from emergencies or disasters. Further, the bill prescribes the contents of each of these plans and requires the chief to annually review each plan and revise as necessary. This measure also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to develop a written plan, as described in the bill, to address behavioral health needs in an emergency or disaster. Finally, the bill abolishes the Committee on Training in Search and Rescue and transfers its duties to the Board of Search and Rescue. We have no amendments on this measure.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 206.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 206.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR
THE VOTE.)

The floor statement is assigned to Vice Chair McCurdy.

Next, we have Assembly Bill 216 ([Exhibit D](#)).

Assembly Bill 216: Requires the establishment of a database of information relating to funding opportunities for higher education and career advancement. (BDR 18-858)

Jered McDonald:

This bill requires the establishment of a database of information relating to funding opportunities for higher education and career advancement. This was sponsored by Assemblywoman Tolles and others and heard in this Committee on March 18, 2019. The bill requires the Office of the State Treasurer to establish a statewide database containing information relating to sources of funding for higher education and career advancement opportunities. The bill requires the database to include certain information about each source of funding listed in the database. The bill further requires the State Treasurer to make the database publicly available on its Internet website and establish means of communication to disseminate and explain the information. The bill also requires the Office of the Attorney General to establish a program to connect victims of domestic violence and human trafficking with the information in the database. Finally, this bill authorizes both the State Treasurer and the Attorney General to accept any gift, donation, bequest, grant, or other source of money to establish and maintain the database. We received an amendment from the State Treasurer's Office and that is on page 2 of [Exhibit D](#). That amendment would add the term “vocational training” to the information contained in the database. We also received

requests to add some cosponsors and the list that I have includes Assembly members Assefa, Gorelow, Hafen, and Hardy.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 216.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I apologize, Chair. Could I add myself as a cosponsor? Is now the time? I apologize.

Chair Flores:

I retract my request for a motion. At this time, we would like to add Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod and Assemblyman Carrillo as cosponsors to Assembly Bill 216, along with the additional members who have been added.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

According to the bill, Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod is already a sponsor.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I am not on there.

Chair Flores:

For clarification of the record, we will make the amendment that Mr. McDonald indicated, and in addition to adding the sponsors whom Mr. McDonald mentioned, add an additional amendment to also add Assemblyman Carrillo and Assemblywoman Duran to the list of cosponsors.

At this time, I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 216.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 216.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR
THE VOTE.)

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod asked to do the floor statement. However, our bill sponsor is here. Assemblywoman Tolles, please have that floor statement—it just makes sense. Thank you. Everybody loves your bill and they all wanted to be on it, apparently.

Next on the work session document, we have Assembly Bill 220 ([Exhibit E](#)).

Assembly Bill 220: Requires the issuance of bonds for environmental improvement projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR S-435)

Jered McDonald:

Assembly Bill 220 requires the issuance of bonds for environmental improvement projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. This bill was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means (On Behalf of the Interim Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System) and heard in this Committee on March 12, 2019. Assembly Bill 220 requires the issuance of not more than \$8 million of the \$100 million in general obligation bonds authorized in 2009 to provide money to carry out certain environmental improvement projects included in the second phase of the Environmental Improvement Program. We have no amendments on this measure.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 220.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 220.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR
THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Leavitt, if I may ask you to take that floor statement.

Next on the work session document, we have Assembly Bill 230 ([Exhibit F](#)).

Assembly Bill 230: Revises provisions governing historic preservation. (BDR 22-298)

Jered McDonald:

Assembly Bill 230 revises provisions governing historic preservation. This bill was sponsored by Assemblywoman Swank and heard in this Committee on March 19, 2019. The bill provides a procedure for a governing body of any county or city to designate a historic neighborhood, including a requirement that the governing body hold a public hearing before designating an area as a historic neighborhood. The bill also clarifies that a landmark is a site, building, structure, or object that is eligible for inclusion in the State Register. Assemblywoman Swank did provide an amendment. The amendment would replace the provisions of subsection 2 of Section 1 with a requirement to provide a notice that, at a minimum, satisfies the requirements of subsection 3 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* 241.020. This would make the noticing requirements the same or similar to what Clark County is already doing.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 230.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 230.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Are we able to amend this to add my name as cosponsor?

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod has withdrawn her motion. Now we are open for discussion and we would like to amend A.B. 230 per Mr. McDonald's acknowledgment of the friendly amendment that was put in the record. In addition, we would like to amend A.B. 230 to add Assemblymen Leavitt, Bilbray-Axelrod, and Carrillo to the bill. For the sake of clarity: Assembly Bill 230 would be amended with the friendly amendment that was indicated and put on the record by Mr. McDonald. In addition to that, Assemblymen Leavitt, Carrillo, and Bilbray-Axelrod would be added to the bill. At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 230.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 230.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Chair, I have a very small question that I want to ask the sponsor of the bill. I will vote to get the bill out of the Committee, but I am going to reserve my rights. I need a clarification whether the cities and the counties will be the ones that will implement the program, or whether it will be a private party. I want to get clarification on that.

Chair Flores:

Understood. Members, are there any additional comments?

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR
THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Swank. She wants to do it, as it is her bill.

Members, we are done with the work session. As to Assembly Bill 86 that was pulled at the last minute, please understand that we are just trying to get clarity and/or get last-minute amendments added. If there is anything in particular that you favor, please let me know so that we can ensure that you are made a part of that work group. The fact that we pulled

anything does not mean that we are not going to entertain it, it is just that we want to get clarity and get everybody on the same page first.

We also had two Committee bill draft requests (BDRs) dropped today. The way this process works is, we need to introduce them and we have to take a motion as a Committee to do so. Your agreeing to a BDR being introduced does not mean that you have any support for and/or opposition to it. Your vote is a procedural measure that is necessary for the bill to be introduced as a Committee BDR.

We have BDR 19-890. At this time I would like to entertain a motion to introduce BDR 19-890.

BDR 19-890—Revises provisions governing notaries public. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 412](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 19-890.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Next, we have BDR 19-893. Again, your agreeing to have this introduced as a Committee BDR does not mean that you support the bill. It only allows for it to be procedurally introduced by the Committee. At this time I would like to entertain a motion to introduce BDR 19-893.

BDR 19-893—Revises provisions governing local governments. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 413](#).)

ASSEMBLMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 19-893.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Next, I would like to invite anybody wishing to speak in public comment to please come forward. I do not believe we have anybody here for public comment.

I want to do a special shout-out to Cheryl Williams, who has worked in this Committee for many years. She is not officially part of this Committee for this session, but she has been a friend to this Committee for many years. I want to acknowledge her, as it is her birthday today. If you see Cheryl Williams around, please wish her a happy birthday. Cheryl, I know you are watching—happy birthday.

This meeting is adjourned [at 9:40 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Geigy Stringer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 206](#), dated March 22, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 216](#), dated March 22, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 220](#), dated March 22, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 230](#), dated March 22, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.