

**MINUTES OF THE
NEVADA LEGISLATURE'S
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE'S SUBCOMMITTEE TO
CONDUCT A REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE,
WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW RESPONSES TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

S.C.R. 37, 2009 SESSION

October 7, 2009

A meeting of the Nevada Legislature's Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure, Working Group to Review Responses to the Request for Proposal (S.C.R. 37, 2009 Session) was called to order by Chairman William J. Raggio on October 7, 2009, at 9:06 a.m. in room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada and videoconferenced to room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Street, Las Vegas, Nevada.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator William J. Raggio, Chairman
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson
Assemblyman James Settlemeyer

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Steven Horsford
Senator David R. Parks
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Mike Schneider (excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Russell Guindon, Senior Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Joe Reel, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel
Becky Lowe, Secretary, Fiscal Analysis Division

EXHIBITS:

[Exhibit A:](#) Agenda
[Exhibit B:](#) Attendance Record
[Exhibit C:](#) Request for Proposal for a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure for State and Local Governments, provided by the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

- [Exhibit D](#): Itemized Costs for Each Portion of Scope of Work as Identified in Responses to Request for Proposal, provided by the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.
- [Exhibit E](#): Evaluation of Proposals Submitted for the Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure for State and Local Governments RFP provided by the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.
- [Exhibit F](#): Response to Request for Proposal from Bill Robinson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- [Exhibit G](#): Response to Request for Proposal from Willdan Financial Services
- [Exhibit H](#): Response to Request for Proposal from Moody's Analytics
- [Exhibit I](#): Response to Request for Proposal from Economic Planning and Systems, Inc.
- [Exhibit J](#): Response to Request for Proposal from John P. Johns, CPA
- [Exhibit K](#): Response to Request for Proposal from The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated
- [Exhibit L](#): Response to Request for Proposal from the Center for Tax and Budget Accountability
- [Exhibit M](#): Response to Request for Proposal from the Center for Regional Studies, University of Nevada, Reno

I. ROLL CALL.

The secretary called roll and all members were present except Senator Schneider, who was excused.

II. OPENING REMARKS.

Chairman William Raggio said Senate Concurrent Resolution 37 of the 2009 Legislative Session authorized a study of the revenue system in Nevada, as well as a study of quality-of-life issues that affect the state in the future. The request for proposal (RFP) ([Exhibit C](#)) was the initial step in the Working Group's mission to recommend a consultant to the IFC Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure.

III. BRIEF OVERVIEW BY STAFF OF RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE.

Russell Guindon, Senior Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau said October 30, 2009, 5 p.m. was the deadline for submitting responses to the RFP. The Fiscal Analyst Division received eight bids, and all were received before the due date. Staff prepared a table titled Itemized Costs for Each Portion of Scope of Work ([Exhibit D](#)) as Identified in Responses to Request for Proposal showing the cost of the bids, as well as the amount of itemization that was included in the response for the scope of work as specified in the RFP.

Mr. Guindon directed the members to a form titled, Evaluation of Proposals Submitted for the Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure for State and Local Governments RFP ([Exhibit E](#)). He recalled that the form was discussed at the Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure meeting of September 21, 2009. Legislative Counsel Bureau staff from the Legal Division and Fiscal Analysis Division reviewed each of the eight responses to determine whether the bids met the application requirements in the RFP. Staff completed the top portion of the form to indicate whether the consultant provided the information required by the RFP. Mr. Guindon noted that several bids failed to meet the application requirement of itemizing the costs of the scope of work (page 5, [Exhibit C](#)).

Mr. Guindon said bids were received from the following consultants:

- Bill Robinson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas ([Exhibit F](#))
- Willdan Financial Services ([Exhibit G](#))
- Moody's Analytics ([Exhibit H](#))
- Economic Planning and Systems, Inc. ([Exhibit I](#))
- John P. Johns, CPA ([Exhibit J](#))
- The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated ([Exhibit K](#))
- Center for Tax and Budget Accountability ([Exhibit L](#))
- Center for Regional Studies, University of Nevada, Reno ([Exhibit M](#))

Chairman Raggio asked whether all of the consultants were legally qualified to conduct the study.

Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legislative Counsel Bureau, said all bidders were legally qualified to conduct the study, but some failed to provide a work plan and timeline or an itemization of costs. The Working Group would have to decide whether that would disqualify those bidders. She noted that on page 9 of the RFP ([Exhibit C](#)) the Legislative Counsel Bureau reserved the right to waive any informalities and/or other minor irregularities. Ms. Erdoes said the IFC Subcommittee would decide whether a failure to submit exactly what was requested in the RFP would disqualify the bid. Ms. Erdoes said there was some leeway, but if the Subcommittee deviated too far from the RFP the award of the bid could be subject to challenge.

There being no further comment, the Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

IV. DETERMINATION OF WORKING GROUP PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE.

Chairman Raggio suggested that each proposal be evaluated for its strengths and weaknesses. Each member of the Working Group would have opportunity for input. It would then be determined whether any of the proposals should be considered further. That discussion would lead to the next agenda item, which was the consideration of responses to the RFP. The Working Group members would then recommend either a

single proposal or a prioritized list of proposals. He was open to suggestions from the Working Group members as to other procedures to use to review the RFPs.

Senator Horsford suggested that members review and evaluate the proposals, and discuss the recommendations at a future meeting.

Chairman Raggio deferred to Senator Horsford as the IFC Subcommittee chair to wait until the next meeting for the Working Group to make its recommendation. However, staff indicated the Interim Finance Committee would need to have the recommendation from the Working Group prior to its November 19, 2009, meeting.

Senator Horsford had been working with staff to allow both working groups time to evaluate the responses to the RFP and nominations to the Nevada Vision Stakeholder Group. Those recommendations would be brought to the IFC Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure at the end of October or the first week of November.

Mr. Guindon said if the Working Group chose to defer the recommendation it would be necessary to schedule another meeting of the Working Group. The IFC Subcommittee would meet in early November so that that the vendor that was recommended could be presented to the IFC at its November 19, 2009, meeting, if requested.

Mr. Guindon said the Working Group could opt to narrow down the number to a subset of the eight bids. Then the top-ranked consultants could be asked to make oral presentations to the full IFC Subcommittee. It was also discussed that the consultants make oral presentations to the Working Group before a recommendation is made to the IFC Subcommittee. Alternatively, the Working Group could recommend just one of the vendors be brought forward to present to the IFC Subcommittee. There were other options, but those were discussed between staff and Senator Horsford as chair of the IFC Subcommittee.

Mr. Guindon said the Working Group was also tasked with determining a potential funding amount to submit to the Board of Examiners at its October 13, 2009, meeting. In addition, the Working Group was to discuss its approach to evaluating responses to the RFP and recommending a consultant to the Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure.

Chairman Raggio said he understood from staff that any proposal that requested funding for the project would have to be submitted for consideration by the Board of Examiners, and ultimately for approval by the Interim Finance Committee. There was a limited period of time for the Working Group to review the proposals and report its recommendations to the IFC Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure.

Senator Horsford noted that several of the responses to the RFPs did not provide an itemized breakout of expenses as required under the scope of work. He asked staff to contact those consultants to get that information so that the Working Group had all of the information necessary to complete its evaluation.

In addition, Senator Horsford said staff would be directed to pursue the allocation of funding from the Contingency Fund through the Board of Examiners. The Working Group to Review Responses to the Request for Proposal and the IFC Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure must agree on a potential funding amount. Based on conversations with staff, he thought the request could be phrased as "up to" a certain amount, based on the range of bids received.

Chairman Raggio asked whether it was appropriate for staff to allow some of the bidders to augment their proposals by providing an itemization of cost. He noted that the bids were now public information.

Ms. Erdoes said the Working Group would want to be careful to not allow too many changes to the bids. However, if the Working Group were to find that the cost allocation was a procedural matter, the information could be requested from all of the vendors.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick commented that she had contacted some of the references provided by the bidders. She asked Ms. Erdoes whether the bidders would be able to change the amount of the bid when the itemization of costs was submitted.

Ms. Erdoes said the Working Group would not want to allow any change to the amount of the bids. She said the RFP required the bidder to include an itemization associated with sections 1-3 of the scope of work to include the cost of each component specified in subsections a-f of subsection 1 and subsections a and b of subsection 2 (page 16, Item 5, [Exhibit C](#)). She said that all the bidders provided a "bottom line" amount under subsection 1, and that number could not change.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick noted that most of the bidders' responses assumed there would be between six to ten meetings of the Nevada Vision Stakeholder Group. She stated that the difference in cost between six and ten meetings would be substantial. She assumed travel expenses would increase if there were more meetings to be facilitated.

Ms. Erdoes said the bids needed to be considered as they were written. Most of the bids included the cost-per-meeting. After a bidder was selected, the number of meetings would be negotiated when the contract was discussed. She did not think that question would be asked of the bidders at this stage in the process.

- V. CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE MADE BY WORKING GROUP TO INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE'S SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE.**
- VI. DETERMINATION OF THE CONTINGENCY FUND ALLOCATION REQUEST AMOUNT TO FUND CONTRACT FOR CONSULTANT FOR REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE.**

Agenda items V and VI were taken together.

Chairman Raggio said that the next task of the Working Group would be to determine a potential amount of funding to be requested from the Contingency Fund. However, it would be difficult for the Working Group to determine that amount until the potential finalists were identified.

Senator Horsford said the Working Group had to identify a potential dollar amount to be given to the secretary of the Board of Examiners by 5:00 p.m. on October 7, 2009, for inclusion at its next meeting.

Chairman Raggio asked whether the final amount would be determined by the IFC at its November meeting.

Ms. Erdoes clarified that the IFC, by statute, had the ultimate power to determine the amount of the allocation. The statute clearly specified that the IFC was not bound by the recommendation made by the Board of Examiners. The actual allocation made by IFC could be higher, lower, or the same number recommended by the Board of Examiners.

In response to a question from Chairman Raggio, Ms. Erdoes said Lorne Malkiewich, as Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, would submit the information to the Board of Examiners as soon as the Working Group agreed to a number.

Chairman Raggio asked if the Working Group had the authority to determine the ultimate amount and Ms. Erdoes replied that there had been a delegation by IFC to the Subcommittee and the Working Group to determine that amount.

Chairman Raggio observed that there were eight proposals ranging from \$32,200 to \$909,861. The Working Group would have to determine if it would request an amount that would accommodate all the proposals, or a lesser amount that would preclude consideration of some of the proposals.

Senator Horsford said he understood there was some flexibility. For example, if the Working Group made a request for \$500,000 to the Board of Examiners, and if one of the two bids that was higher than that amount was recommended to be selected, the

IFC could increase the amount at its November meeting. The initial number that was recommended to the Board of Examiners must be reasonable and represent the majority of what would be expected of any consultant.

Ms. Erdoes confirmed that *Nevada Revised Statutes* 353.268 stated the IFC was not bound by the recommendation of the Board of Examiners. It was built into the process for the IFC to consider all of the information and make an independent decision.

Chairman Raggio asked, if the amount requested by the Working Group for approval by the Board of Examiners did not accommodate some of the proposals, would that create an issue of fairness because an amount was not specified in the RFP?

Ms. Erdoes said she could only partially answer the question. As to the legality of setting an amount lower than some of the responses to the RFP, she believed the Working Group could do that, because there was no promise made in the RFP as to the amount that would be allocated to the study. The question of fairness would probably be a policy issue to be decided by the legislators.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said she would like to see the itemization of costs so that the Subcommittee could decide whether to include certain aspects of the study. The Subcommittee members had different wants for the study, and a breakdown of the cost of the elements in the proposals would allow the Subcommittee to determine what should be included.

Chairman Raggio requested that staff contact the potential consultants to request an itemization of costs.

Senator Horsford asked that a time limit be set for the potential consultants to submit the information to staff to allow Working Group members time to review the information.

Mr. Guindon said some of the vendors may be in attendance, or listening to the meeting via the Internet, and may be able to expedite the request. Mr. Guindon said Willdan Financial Services and Moody's Analytics provided a breakdown of expenses in their responses and that information was included in [Exhibit D](#). Legislative Counsel Bureau staff would contact the other bidders to request the information be submitted within three working days.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer asked if the consultants that did not provide a timeline would be allowed to provide that, or would the information only be requested from the consultants that failed to provide an itemization of costs. He said the meeting of the Working Group was called to do a certain job, and he was concerned that the Working Group should narrow down the field.

Chairman Raggio said that Legislative Counsel Bureau staff indicated there was a failure to respond in certain areas of the RFP other than the itemization of costs. The question was whether staff should also contact the consultants that did not furnish information for other parts of the RFP.

Mr. Guindon said it would be up to the members of the Working Group as to what would be asked of the consultants. He asked Ms. Erdoes whether this was a procedural question, or whether the consultants were being asked to augment their responses.

In response to a question from Chairman Raggio, Ms. Erdoes said the questions about the work plan and timeline were more substantive than asking for an itemized cost allocation. It was up to the Working Group to make that determination, but at some point a line should be drawn as to allowing bidders to augment the information submitted. She saw a difference between a breakdown of a number that had already been submitted in the response, and a timeline for the project, which seemed more substantive.

Chairman Raggio understood that there was no problem in contacting the consultants regarding itemization of costs for each portion of the scope of work, but if the consultants had not responded in other areas, a request for additional information could be considered a substantive change. He asked if the Working Group members wanted for staff to ask for information other than the itemized cost for each portion of the scope of work.

Senator Horsford thought that requesting additional information regarding the project timeline would be considered a substantive change to the response to the RFP. Based on that discussion, he asked whether it would be appropriate to no longer consider the bid submitted by Nevada Consultants, Incorporated.

Ms. Erdoes said the determination should be made as to whether the Working Group was going to request that the second irregularity be fixed before that determination was made. If the Working Group agreed that a request for a timeline was more substantive and chose not to ask for that information, then the Working Group could choose to eliminate the bidder from consideration. Ms. Erdoes said the Working Group did not have to eliminate the bidder, but asking them to provide an itemization of costs would be somewhat futile as the bid would no longer be considered. The Working Group needed to decide whether it would allow any further information to be added to the responses other than the cost itemization.

Senator Raggio said Senator Horsford was suggesting that the proposal submitted by The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated ([Exhibit K](#)) did not meet the RFP's requirement of a timeline, so it would be inappropriate to allow augmentation in that area. Senator Raggio asked Senator Horsford if he wanted to make a motion for a vote of the Working Group.

Senator Horsford agreed that was correct and elaborated that the itemization of the costs would not change the total amount of the bid, but would provide detail of the subparagraphs as required by the RFP. However, not providing the project work plan and timeline was a material weakness in the proposal, and because the other responses did include that information, and the bids had already been made public, it would put the other bidders at a disadvantage to allow that change to be made by The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated.

SENATOR HORSFORD MOVED TO REMOVE THE BID FROM THE NEVADA CONSULTANTS, INCORPORATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE A WORK PLAN AND TIMELINE FOR THE PROJECT.

SENATOR HORSFORD WITHDREW THE MOTION IN ORDER TO HEAR PUBLIC COMMENT.

Suzanne Nounna, President, The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated said the timeline was included in the proposal in paragraph form. The proposal did not include a timeline or work plan, but there was an indication that the work would be 80 percent complete by the end of April 2010. In addition, the proposal stated that if the project's expenses were under \$500,000, the remaining funds would be returned to the state. She said the proposal included information about the five people who were a part of the corporation, who had been in Nevada since the 1950s. She stated that her group would perform statistically significant surveys to make sure its recommendations were reasonable politically. Ms. Nounna did not think the lack of a separate timeline or work plan signified a material weakness in The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal. She said the RFP was very clear that all the materials needed might not be available, and that made it difficult to prepare a timeline.

Senator Raggio said that the RFP (page 10, section VI-2-d, [Exhibit C](#)) required that the proposals be evaluated on all factors, including, but not limited to, the project work plan and timeline to complete the specific components of the scope of work. Item VI-3-f required an itemized cost of the services provided by the subcontractor. He asked Ms. Nounna whether she felt The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal complied with those requirements.

Ms. Nounna replied that with respect to the itemization of costs provided by the subcontractor, her group did not intend to use subcontractors. The itemization of costs in her group's bid was in paragraph form. For example, the last paragraph indicated \$123,000 would be net profit for the five members of the corporation. There was no breakdown by line item as to what amount was going to be spent on copying or faxing. She did indicate that the statistically significant survey would cost either \$75,000 or \$50,000.

Ms. Nounna said with respect to the project work plan and timeline, it was reasonable to state that the project would be 80 percent complete by the end of April 2010. She thought economies of scale could be had, and that was why the bid was \$500,000 instead of a higher figure. She said the proposal did include the components of the study, and the costs associated thereby.

Senator Horsford noted that page 2 of The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal ([Exhibit K](#)) indicated that 80 percent of the budget would be expended by the end of April. He asked Ms. Nounna to identify where the actual scope of work was discussed in the proposal, in addition to the work plan and timeline.

Ms. Nounna said her proposal indicated that her group would be bound by the scope of work outlined in the RFP. With respect to 80 percent of the budget being expended by the end of April, it was an error on her part that the bid was not specific in indicating that 80 percent of the work would be done at the end of April as well.

Ms. Nounna said regarding the budget, she anticipated spending \$500,000 or less on the entire project. She said the proposal did breakout how some of the money would be spent, for example, \$50,000 for surveys and \$1,200 for liability insurance.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said her constituents would want details about the study timeline and work plan that were not included in the proposal. She found The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal lacking in those areas. It was important for the Subcommittee to know the parts of the study the consultant thought were important, and how much each part would cost. If one part of the study was very expensive to perform, the Subcommittee might decide not to include that. The Subcommittee wanted to determine which sectors to study based on the expense breakdown. She was interested in studying the consolidated distribution tax, but that would be a long, expensive process. She said Nevadans across the state wanted this information included in the RFP process, and The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal did not provide it. She noted this was a public process, and the Subcommittee wanted the public to be involved.

Ms. Nounna said she appreciated the explanation. She said her perspective on the RFP was a little different than the other consultants in that she did not perceive the study as being a technical event. Rather, the study was to analyze the data and create a regurgitation back to the Subcommittee in a form that might be simpler, and also provide a set of viable solutions, rather than textbook responses. She explained that the reason a specific timeline was not included was that there was lots of information missing in the RFP. If she had understood this when the proposal was written, the amount of the bid would have probably been for \$1.4 million, with an option to remove parts of the study to arrive at the \$500,000 base amount. She figured that a general response would be more reasonable because it could be adjusted. She had no problem with being accountable. She believed that the RFP requested some type of regular reporting, whether it was weekly or monthly. She understood that the Subcommittee may not be able to accept the proposal submitted by The Nevada Consultants,

Incorporated because it did not fit the parameters of the RFP. However, she thought the Subcommittee would be making a mistake by removing the proposal. She said her group was the Subcommittee's best bet because it was made of two CPAs, a great analyst and an excellent tax attorney who had been in Nevada a very long time.

Senator Horsford said based on the explanation by Ms. Nounna, he believed there was a material weakness in the proposal, and the failure to provide a work plan or timeline for the project should disqualify The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated.

SENATOR HORSFORD MOVED TO NO LONGER CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE NEVADA CONSULTANTS, INCORPORATED.

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer said the RFP indicated the timeline and work plan would be looked at, but the Working Group was not limited to looking at only those aspects. He did not think it was appropriate to eliminate the proposal just because they did not provide all the information. The bidder may be eliminated for other reasons, but not specifically because they forgot one document.

Assemblyman Stewart agreed with Assemblyman Settlemeyer that the decision to include the information was subjective, and Ms. Nounna provided the information as she understood the RFP. Eliminating one proposal at this time would not solve anything. He thought The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal should remain in consideration.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK, SENATOR PARKS AND SENATOR HORSFORD IN FAVOR AND ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART, ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER, ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON AND SENATOR RAGGIO OPPOSED.

Chairman Raggio said The Nevada Consultants, Incorporated proposal would remain in consideration.

Assemblyman Anderson was under the impression that the Subcommittee wanted the cost of the study to not exceed \$500,000. He wondered if that would be a criteria to eliminate the proposals with a cost over \$500,000.

Chairman Raggio said there was no limit on the cost of the study in the RFP. The \$500,000 amount was discussed during the 2009 Legislative Session. He did not think exceeding the \$500,000 amount would constitute an inadequate response. He said

Senator Horsford indicated that an amount needed to be suggested by the Working Group for consideration by the Board of Examiners. He asked if Assemblyman Anderson was suggesting that any amount that came in above \$500,000 not be considered.

Assemblyman Anderson agreed that was what he was suggesting.

Chairman Raggio said that Ms. Erdoes told the Working Group that it could submit an amount to the Board of Examiners that could be changed by the IFC in its final determination. Ms. Erdoes said that was correct, and the statute stated that the IFC was not bound by any recommendation of the Board of Examiners. Chairman Raggio said it would not be appropriate to eliminate a proposal because the cost exceeded a certain amount.

Chairman Raggio said there were eight proposals for consideration. He asked if the Working Group wanted further information from the consultants, and to meet again to review the responses and reconsider all of the proposals.

There being no objection, Chairman Raggio asked for the amount that the Working Group would like to recommend to the Board of Examiners for the cost of the potential study.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK MOVED THAT AN AMOUNT UP TO \$500,000 BE RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS AS THE POTENTIAL COST TO CONDUCT A REVIEW OF NEVADA'S REVENUE STRUCTURE.

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART.

Assemblyman Stewart clarified that an amount up to \$500,000 was to be suggested to the Board of Examiners. Chairman Raggio agreed, and reiterated that Ms. Erdoes confirmed that would not be an absolute limit that the IFC would need to adhere to.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. SCHEDULING OF FUTURE MEETINGS.

It was agreed that the Working Group would meet on Thursday, October 15, 2009, at 9 a.m. for the purpose of reviewing the eight proposals, including the additional information to be requested by Legislative Counsel Bureau staff.

Mr. Guindon said the vendors would be given four working days to submit the additional information by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, October 13, 2009. Staff would update the table and provide it to the members electronically in advance of the meeting.

Assemblyman Stewart asked if it would be appropriate to set some kind of structure to what the Working Group members should bring to the next meeting to expedite the process. For example, a ranked list of first, second and third choices.

Chairman Raggio said the additional information from the consultants would be needed before a full analysis could be done. When that information was received by the Working Group, priorities and recommendations could be discussed. He asked Senator Horsford for his opinion as the Chairman of the Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Conduct a Review of Nevada's Revenue Structure.

Senator Horsford agreed and added that after the new information was reviewed, the Working Group would be better prepared to discuss the proposals and make recommendations at its October 15, 2009, meeting.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no public comment

IX. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Lowe, Secretary

APPROVED:

Senator William J. Raggio, Chair

Date: _____

Copies of exhibits mentioned in these minutes are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. The library may be contacted at (775) 684-6827.