

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

**Eightieth Session
February 6, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:33 p.m. on Wednesday, February 6, 2019, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E 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 Melanie Scheible, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel
Becky Archer, Committee Secretary
Lona Domenici, Committee Manager
Julie Newman, Legislative Assistant
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Katherine Miller, Director, Department of Veterans Services
John Fudenberg, D-ABMDI, Clark County
Lisa Kremer, Director, Department of Real Property Management, Clark County
Mary Walker, Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County
Sheri Russell, CPA, CGMA, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Finance,
Carson City
Jeff Page, County Manager, Lyon County
Vinson Guthereau, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Jamie Rodriguez, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 6, 2019
Page 2

Michael Pelham, MBA, Nevada Taxpayers Association
David Cherry, City of Henderson
Sherry Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission, Department of
Tourism and Cultural Affairs
Marla McDade Williams, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
Joe Bryan
Aletha Tom
Meg McDonald

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing with the adoption of the Committee on Government Affairs Standing Rules ([Exhibit C](#)). There have been a few recommended small changes but nothing of any significance. I will accept a motion to adopt the Standing Rules.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO ADOPT THE STANDING RULES OF
THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

We will have a presentation of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs Committee Brief ([Exhibit D](#)) from Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst.

JENNIFER RUEDY (Policy Analyst):

The Committee Brief, [Exhibit D](#), is prepared each session by the committee policy analyst and presented as a quick overview of what happened in the Committee during the Seventy-ninth Legislative Session and to some degree what will be coming before you this Session.

CHAIR PARKS:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 16.

SENATE BILL 16: Revises provisions relating to the Gift Account for Veterans.
(BDR 37-196)

KATHERINE MILLER (Director, Department of Veterans Services):
I will present Senate Bill 16 from my written statement ([Exhibit E](#)).

This bill would authorize the Director of the Department of Veterans Services (NDVS) to apply for and accept federal grants and other sources of money and to deposit the money into the Gift Account for Veterans. We are also pursuing a modification to the bill which would allow us to deposit grants and other monies into the gift accounts for our veterans homes.

The NDVS has six gift accounts: the Gift Account for Veterans, sometimes called the License Plate Gift Account; the Account to Assist Veterans Who Have Suffered Military Sexual Trauma; the Gift Accounts for the Veterans Homes in Southern and Northern Nevada; and the Gift Account for Veterans Cemeteries. This account covers both of our cemeteries. There is also a gift account called Nevada Will Always Remember Veterans. This account allows us to accept money when buildings, highways or roads are renamed after veterans. This money is used to help offset the cost for signage.

The statutory language governing the Gift Account for Veterans does not clearly outline the NDVS's authority to accept gifts and grants into the account. The Governor's Office of Finance and the NDVS financial officer has recommended that language in the statute governing the acceptance of federal grants and other sources of money be changed to the language in the statute that governs cemeteries. We want to make the language consistent across the statutes that allow the NDVS to accept gifts and grants.

Some programs are funded in part by the Gift Fund and in part by grants and other gifts. This creates extra work for the financial staff, increases the opportunity for accounting errors and lessens transparency because accounts must be compared to understand revenue and expense impacts. If the NDVS could accept gifts and grants into the appropriate program, staff reviewing the program in the Data Warehouse of Nevada would understand the complete financial impact and status at a single glance.

We can keep things the way they are and we could still accept gifts and grants. The problem is that it creates more work for staff and more opportunity for error. The intent of this bill is to standardize language governing the acceptance of grants and gifts.

In the past week, we discovered that the accounts for veterans homes does not have the language authorizing the NDVS to accept gifts and grants. This has occurred a few times in the past year. An AmeriCorps grant caused much angst about how and where to deposit that grant. There are also other examples of that occurring. There are ways to work around this. We could still accept this money, but it is not an efficient way to do business.

When we discovered that we should have included the gift accounts for veterans homes in our bill draft request (BDR), we had discussions with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and the Governor's Office. Based on those discussions, we will be submitting a proposed amendment to S.B. 16 which would add the veterans homes gift accounts. If approved, the language will be consistent across all six gift accounts.

CHAIR PARKS:

You will be submitting an amendment that will add further details.

MS. MILLER:

The proposed language is going to the Governor's Office today or tomorrow and then it will go to the LCB. I apologize for not catching that initially.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 16 and open the hearing on S.B. 36.

SENATE BILL 36: Revises provisions governing the purchase, sale or lease of real property by a board of county commissioners. (BDR 20-489)

JOHN FUDENBERG, D-ABMDI (Clark County):

Statute states that when counties are selling or leasing real property, they must obtain two appraisals. Counties are prohibited from selling or leasing property for less than the highest appraised value. With the passage of S.B. 36, counties would not be required to use the higher of the two appraisals. This change would allow counties to use the average of two appraisals to sell or lease real property.

We are having a difficult time moving property. We may get appraisals that come back at \$2.7 million and at \$2.1 million. We have to start the sale at auction at \$2.7 million. That is not a good position to be when trying to sell property.

That is the intent of this bill.

On page 2, section 1, subsection 2, a few lines there are cleanup language to reflect our current practice.

A significant change is in section 1, subsection 3. Mary Walker, who represents the counties of Douglas, Lyon, Storey and Carson City, is offering an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) to remove subsection 3. As the bill's sponsors, we support that amendment.

Subsection 3 would have allowed a board of county commissioners to purchase real property above the appraised value. We had a situation where a property was being listed at approximately \$8.9 million; the appraisal came back at \$8 million. We could not buy the property. The seller was holding tight to the \$8.9 million. We wanted the property but could not buy it for more than the \$8 million appraisal. That is why section 1, subsection 3 is in the bill. However, that is not the primary purpose of this bill. We are happy to take that out and consider it a friendly amendment.

Page 5, lines 31-37, addresses the primary issue we are trying to solve with this bill. It would allow a board of county commissioners to use the average of two appraisals when selling or leasing real property.

Page 6, lines 39-43, outlines the process for counties to move forward and when to get additional appraisals when the property does not sell at the first auction.

If the property does not sell after the second attempt, page 7, line 3, describes how to list the property with a broker. Only one appraisal is needed for the purposes of listing the property with a broker.

Page 7, starting on line 37, and for the remainder of the bill, outlines how counties would be able to hold auctions online or in some electronic format, and the requirements to hold online auctions.

We would have more success in selling properties if we could extend the period during which bids will be accepted. Rather than doing it at the Clark County Government Center in a one-hour process, we could extend it to a few weeks

which would allow more exposure of the property, and potentially, more people would bid on the property.

Some members of the Committee had asked if this bill would apply to tax lien properties. That is not our intent.

SENATOR RATTI:

What is the underlying philosophy of having only one appraisal when going through a broker?

MR. FUDENBERG:

I am not sure about that. It is more an issue of efficiency.

LISA KREMER (Director, Department of Real Property Management, Clark County):
Getting one appraisal when property is to be listed with a broker is for efficiency purposes, assuming that we went through two rounds of auctions with two appraisals. Once we are unsuccessful with those two rounds of auctions, getting one appraisal and listing it with a broker is purely for efficiency purposes. However, this would still require the approval of a board of county commissioners to do so.

SENATOR RATTI:

You can only use a broker if you fail doing it the other way first. Is it correct that at this point there is an additional appraisal, but there have already been prior appraisals?

MS. KREMER:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR RATTI:

Why does this only include counties? Do cities have the same rules? I am sure that they are addressed in a different chapter of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). Are those rules the same and should they be aligned? If it is a problem for counties, is it also a problem for cities?

MR. FUDENBERG:

The City of Henderson contacted us regarding an amendment to the bill. I am not sure about the details because it is conceptual at this point. It is my understanding that cities are allowed to purchase property. The chapter of NRS

that applies to cities gives them the authority to purchase property as we are describing in this bill. However, Henderson officials intend to offer an amendment soon that would allow cities to perform online or electronic auctions. They do not want this bill to affect the city section of statute with the exception of the ability to conduct online or electronic auctions.

SENATOR RATTI:

Would it be possible for the Legal Division to verify that cities have the ability to use the average of the two appraisals?

HEIDI CHLARSON (Committee Counsel):

Yes, I will do that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I want to clarify that tax lien property is not determined to be real property until it has been offered for sale and title has been established.

MS. KREMER:

Tax lien properties are not part of this statute. That follows a separate statute and a separate process. My department does not handle that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am trying to determine the point at which tax lien property that has been offered for sale and has not been purchased becomes county real property. Maybe we can determine that later.

I am assuming the resolution for an internet auction would establish the parameters for bidder qualification. I could see someone at a computer running a bid up and not having coffee money.

MR. FUDENBERG:

In order to determine who is bidding and if the bidder is qualified to bid, the resolution will contain the description of how bidders will be prequalified. That should avoid that issue.

CHAIR PARKS:

I am presuming that none of this affects a condemnation. You mentioned a property that someone was interested in selling. The price was \$8.9 million and

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 6, 2019
Page 8

the appraisal was \$8 million. Would the language in this bill impact the possibility of condemnation?

MR. FUDENBERG:

I do not know the answer to that question.

MS. KREMER:

I do not know the answer to that question either. I do not think it would affect the condemnation laws, but I cannot answer that for sure.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will make sure we verify that. We have many willing sellers who are not quite eager to sell at appraisal but want far above the appraisal.

MARY WALKER (Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County):

We support S.B. 36 with the amendment, [Exhibit F](#), which I submitted to the Committee. This is good, commonsense legislation. The amendment deletes section 1, subsection 3, lines 18-22 on page 2 of the bill. The amendment eliminates the ability for a county commission to purchase real property at an amount exceeding appraised value.

Rural counties are different than urban counties. This language would have increased the cost to purchase real property in rural counties.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Are rural counties able to pay 10 percent more or accept 10 percent or 15 percent less on some of these appraised bids? Is there some flexibility?

MS. WALKER:

I am not familiar with that.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will research that.

SHERI RUSSELL, CPA, CGMA (Chief Financial Officer, Department of Finance, Carson City):

I support S.B. 36 with the amendment submitted on our behalf by Ms. Walker. We initially had concerns about this bill because the root of the problem seems to be that we were paying more for property and receiving less at the sale. The

appraised value for property on which a city makes a purchase should be the fair market value price point. Allowing a city to go over that amount opens the door to abuse of taxpayer dollars.

JEFF PAGE (County Manager, Lyon County):

We concur with Ms. Walker and Carson City. We have had a number of situations in the last three or four years in which we were either purchasing or selling property and had challenges because of the market. We were concerned, but we are glad that Clark County is working with us and helping move the amendment forward. The bill would be detrimental to rural Nevada when purchasing or selling real estate without the amendment.

In answer to Senator Goicoechea's question, paying 10 percent more or accepting 10 percent or 15 percent less on some of these appraised bids might have been something done in the past. In the last eight years, that has not occurred.

VINSON GUTHEREAU (Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties):

The membership of the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) is comprised of all 17 Nevada counties, and NACO supports S.B. 36 and the proposed amendments. This will help all counties.

JAMIE RODRIGUEZ (Office of the County Manager, Washoe County):

We too support S.B. 36 brought forward by Clark County. We appreciate the concerns of the other counties and agree that the amendment is also friendly for Washoe County.

MICHAEL PELHAM, MBA (Nevada Taxpayers Association):

We would like to support S.B. 36 pending a minor amendment ([Exhibit G](#)). We would like to see the auction notice posted in boldface print. It will be easier to see and bring more people to the auction.

CHAIR PARKS:

We have standard boiler plate language regarding the size of the font and the layout for public notices. We will take a second look at that.

DAVID CHERRY (City of Henderson):

Thank you for allowing us to come forward with a conceptual amendment as discussed with you earlier today. Thank you, Senator Ratti, for asking the

important question regarding how cities are treated and whether cities want to have some parallel language. In fact, that is what our conceptual amendment would do.

Nevada Revised Statutes 268 covers cities. We would like to add language to NRS 268 to mirror sections 2, 3 and 4 of the bill that Clark County has brought forward. We have been in discussions with the bill's sponsors, and they would support that amendment. We would also like the ability to average the appraisal process when selling property. It is our understanding that in NRS 268 we do not have the ability to use the average the way the county bill contemplates. We would like to have that ability. We are also interested in using internet sales for some of the same reasons articulated by Mr. Fudenberg.

We will work with members of other city governments to assess their support, and we will bring language forward for your consideration at a later date.

CHAIR PARKS:

We like bringing things into the Twenty-first century, using the internet wherever possible and doing things through electronic medium.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 36 and wait for the conceptual amendments to be drafted and presented back to us. When everything is ready, we will call for a second hearing on the bill.

I will now open the hearing on S.B. 59 on behalf of the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

SENATE BILL 59: Requires proceeds from fees collected for the use of Stewart Indian School land be credited to the Nevada Indian Commission's Gift Fund. (BDR 18-187)

SHERRY RUPERT (Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs):

I have a presentation on the Stewart Indian School Living Legacy ([Exhibit H](#)). I want to share some photos, especially for those of you who have not visited the Stewart Indian School, in order to give a context of what I will be talking about today.

The Nevada Indian Commission (NIC) was established in 1965 to be the liaison for the Governor to the 27 tribes, bands and colonies in Nevada. The NIC's mission is to enhance the government-to-government relationship with the tribes and to educate the public about the State's first citizens. The NIC has five full-time employees. The executive director is appointed by the Governor and is a member of the cabinet. The NIC consists of five members appointed by the Governor. Three are American Indians and two are from the general public. We have statewide responsibility.

One of the priorities of the NIC has been the preservation of the Stewart Indian School. It was the only off-reservation Indian boarding school in Nevada. It was created by an act of the State Legislature in 1888. It operated from 1890 to 1980. It was an initiative by the federal government to remove Indian children from their families and homelands and put them into these boarding schools to assimilate them into the dominant culture.

The School is on the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district. It is one of the most intact of the Indian boarding schools in the Nation and one of the most distinct for its architecture of stonemasonry buildings. Not only were these buildings made of native stone from Nevada, but they were built by Hopi stonemasons from Arizona. Eventually, the students themselves built the buildings at the School. The site has national significance which is why we have drafted a nomination application to the National Park Service to have it designated as a National Historic Landmark.

We have the opportunity to tell a unique story which is not taught in our schools and has been swept under the rug for far too long. Native American People have sacrificed so much. Not only were their homelands across this Nation given up, but something even greater than that was forced to be given up—our families. They had to give up their children, tearing apart the family unit, forcing our children to take on new identities, shaming them into denying their culture and their languages—the one thing that sets us apart from everyone else.

We also see this as an opportunity for healing for many of our people, especially for the students who attended the School. Providing them a platform on which to tell their stories will relieve that burden and maybe some healing will come from that.

In the Seventy-eighth Legislative Session, the NIC was designated as the coordinating agency for future uses and activities at the Stewart Indian School. The Seventy-eighth Legislative Session supported the NIC's efforts to preserve the School and prepare for the establishment of a welcome center, a cultural center and a museum to finally tell the story of the Stewart Indian School. The Seventy-eighth Legislative Session also provided an operating budget and two new positions, a museum director and a curator, to begin preparations for the cultural center and museum. We continue to provide campus tours and educational presentations on the complex history of the School bringing awareness and support to our efforts.

Going to the presentation, page 5 of [Exhibit H](#), is a map that is included in the master plan for the Stewart Indian School. The master plan was completed through a capital improvement plan (CIP) that was awarded in 2015. The master plan includes an interpretive plan, a marketing plan, a business plan and a strategic plan. It was important to include all of the stakeholders in the planning process: Stewart Indian School alumni, tribal leaders, state leaders, tourism industry leaders and local leaders.

The master plan presents a restored and reimagined historic campus that can be shared with alumni, local residents and visitors in a way that recognizes the history of the institution's inception, educates visitors about the lives of the students and reestablishes itself as a community asset. The master plan provides a roadmap for restoration and creates a cultural destination for future generations to ensure that this important part of Native American history and experience in Nevada is preserved.

In the Seventy-ninth Legislative Session, \$1.2 million was approved as a CIP for the old gym at the School. That beautiful building is in the photo on the bottom left-hand corner of page 6 of [Exhibit H](#). It was the heart of the campus when the school was open. The two top photos, page 6 of [Exhibit H](#), are of the exhibit space for the cultural center and museum. Through a CIP, \$4.5 million was appropriated for construction and exhibits for the School.

Construction started in August 2018 and it looks on track to complete construction at the end of June 2019. When there is construction, sometimes there are setbacks, but we are fairly confident that we will have a grand opening in the fall of 2019.

Most recently, we were awarded \$83,994 by the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation, Office of Historic Preservation, to begin planning for the renovation of the School's auditorium. This is another big, beautiful building which seats about 300 people. As you can see on page 7 of [Exhibit H](#), the stage and the seating is still intact. In that photo, some of our School alumni are enjoying being back in their auditorium during one of our tours of the School.

The master plan also talks about repurposing many of the areas and buildings on campus. We are looking at this as a way to make the School sustainable. The State has invested millions of dollars in just these few buildings at the School. They are historic. They require additional care. They have to meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards for preservation. The buildings have to be seismic retrofitted which is very costly.

We are looking at different areas, both indoors and outdoors, as places to generate revenue for the School. We conduct tours to educate the public, but when the cultural center and museum opens we will have the opportunity to have guided tours conducted by alumni. People will pay for those tours, and we hope to have additional events at the School. We have the Stewart Fathers' Day Powwow and are looking at other events. We could rent those different areas. We get inquiries often about having events or weddings at the School. There are those opportunities for the School to generate revenue. We would like those revenues generated by the use of the School to stay with the School.

We schedule the School's gym for events. There are two gyms. I mentioned the old gym, the one that got the roof, and there is a newer gym. That is the one depicted in the bottom left photo on page 8 of [Exhibit H](#). It shows that we were having an event in the newer gym. This gym could also be rented out for events. The NIC schedules the use of that gym. The ability to do that was worked out with the Department of Administration, State Public Works Division, Buildings and Grounds Section. They have been good partners for us, and they understand the vision and the intent we have to further develop the School. These are some pictures from the master plan, page 9 of [Exhibit H](#).

When enacted, S.B. 59 will allow the NIC to rent the use of the open spaces and meeting, lodging and conference spaces on the School's campus as described in the master plan. The proceeds from these temporary rentals would be deposited into the Nevada Indian Commission Gift Fund to be used to further

preserve the over 65 historic buildings on the 110-acre campus. Minimal dollars are allocated by the State for maintenance and preservation of the historic site.

There is no program at the School that is able to accept revenue for the use of these indoor and outdoor spaces for temporary use. The NIC would request to have these available spaces assigned to the NIC to schedule and accept these revenues.

Our core message is that Stewart Indian School changed the course of generations of American Indians. For more than 90 years, American Indian children were removed from their homelands, family and culture with profound impacts on their lives. The Stewart Indian School Living Legacy preserves their stories and cultural legacy—never to be forgotten.

CHAIR PARKS:

This is the first bill we are hearing today with a fiscal note requested. We have not yet received the official fiscal note. Pursuant to NRS 218D.475, a State agency has five working days, unless that five-day period is extended, to prepare and return a fiscal note once it has been requested. While this is a policy committee, NRS 218D.435 requires that a fiscal note, if requested, must be available for consideration before a vote may be taken by a committee, but the bill may be heard as presented by you today. Typically, if there is a fiscal note, we would probably refer the bill to the Senate Committee on Finance for its consideration.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Reno-Sparks Indian Colony):
The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony supports this bill.

JOE BRYAN:

I am a Washoe Elder. I am Hopi and Washoe. Some of my relatives helped build the Stewart Indian School. They were stonemasons. Many of us disagreed when the State closed the School. The State said it was not earthquake-proof. But if you go out and look at the buildings, there is little damage to the stone. The stonemasons did something that no other contractors did. They dug a sand base, compacted it and then put the foundation on it so it is acting like a rubber base when an earthquake occurs. They have been told that they were 100 years before their time in their technology.

I moved to Nevada in 1952 when I was 6 years old. I am 72 now. I grew up at the Stewart Indian School. We lived in some Quonset huts at the southeast side of the School where there was a ranch and a barn and a farm. We eventually moved up by the gym and the shop into some stone duplex buildings.

My mother and father were Amy and Sullivan Bryan. My mother was one of the nurses at the School and my father was the maintenance man. I actually helped repair some of the glass that was broken in the doors and the dorms.

I lived at Stewart until 1960 when we moved to the Carson Colony where I have lived ever since. I support everything that Sherry Rupert has done at the School. She has done a fabulous job, and I applaud her dedication.

I am a storyteller but I have also done sports programs. I had one of the biggest programs in northern Nevada. I combined with Fallon and several other reservations and we all came together as a group.

I have in-laws who are in Arizona. They are Navajos. Toney Begay is one of my in-laws. He is the grandfather to my grandkids who were all born here. Toney played basketball at the School when it took the championships from 1962 to 1964. He is here whenever there is a program at the School. One of the things alumni say is that they wish they would open up the dorms so they could stay there. That is where they lived.

Some of the Navajos who were brought to Stewart never went home. They never had the money to go back home. They were brought here when they were probably nine or ten years old but they never returned to their families. That was a sad situation. On the other hand, though, it was a good trade school which gave them a working experience. Many of them appreciated that.

I went to Haskell Indian Junior College, which was a boarding school. It was good and bad. But I took it as a good experience because I later ended up working for IBM for 15 years and retired from that company. I went in as a technician because of the trade schools. I came out as an engineer. I was also in line management. I managed 34 people in 4 departments. So IBM was good to me. I learned a trade and became sufficient in what I do. So whatever the direction Sherry Rupert is trying to take us to revive the School and save some of the buildings is supported by those who went to the School. They want to

return. They love coming back to Nevada. They love coming to School as much as they can.

ALETHA TOM:

I am from Moapa, from a Paiute Tribe. I graduated from Stewart Indian School over 50 years ago, in 1965. I went there when I was 12 years old. The presentation given by Sherry Rupert has much to do with the support that we have in order to proceed with this bill.

I have many memories of the Stewart campus as a young girl growing up. It was place we lived in, survived in and woke up at in the morning. We had our breakfast, lunches and school there, and we walked the campus. This land has much meaning to many Native American Indians who went to school there from the 1890s to the 1980s. The preservation of the School is important to all of us. It was either good or bad, and there are many memories. There are some sad and good stories. Many people chose to go there, but then there were those who did not.

I have good memories and some sad memories. Loneliness is a hard thing when you are away from your parents. I hope you can understand how important this is to all of us and really consider the importance of this bill. We are here to support that bill for our people.

MEG McDONALD:

I am a member of the Washoe Tribe, and I live here in Carson City. I am a member of the Stewart Advisory Committee. I would like to see this bill passed because I have many relatives who went to Stewart Indian School.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 59, and we will await the fiscal note that may require the bill to be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

That concludes our bills for this meeting. These three bills will be brought forward for either consideration or to be placed on a future work session.

We have two bill draft requests (BDR) for Committee introduction. Pursuant to Joint Standing Rule 14, Committee members must vote to request the drafting of legislative measures requested by the Senate Committee on Government

Affairs. A vote in favor does not indicate support for the bill but rather allows these bills to be drafted and presented to us as drafted.

I would like to request two committee BDRs. The first one is BDR 22-736.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 22-736: Revises provisions relating to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 136](#).)

CHAIR PARKS:

It includes some elements that deal with transportation plans and transportation improvements.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 22-736.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Parks:

The second one is BDR 23-650.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 23-650: Provides for collective bargaining by state employees. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 135](#).)

CHAIR PARKS:

This bill is similar to bills that have been considered in previous sessions.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 23-650.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMIOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 6, 2019
Page 18

CHAIR PARKS:

That concludes our hearing for today; therefore, the Senate Committee on Government Affairs is adjourned at 2:53 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 | 5 | | Attendance Roster |
| | C | 2 | Jennifer Ruedy | Committee Standing Rules |
| | D | 10 | Jennifer Ruedy | Committee Brief |
| S.B. 16 | E | 2 | Katherine Miller / Department of Veterans Services | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 36 | F | 1 | Mary Walker / Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, Storey County | Proposed Amendment |
| S.B. 36 | G | 1 | Michael Pelham / Nevada Taxpayers Association | Proposed Amendment |
| S.B. 59 | H | 11 | Sherry Rupert / Nevada Indian Commission | Presentation |