

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
May 21, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Debbie Smith at 10:27 a.m. on Tuesday, May 21, 2013, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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 Debbie Smith, Chair  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Vice Chair  
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Ben Kieckhefer  
Senator Michael Roberson

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17  
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3  
Senator Justin C. Jones, Senatorial District 9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mark Krmptic, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Rick Combs, Director  
Cynthia Clampitt, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Rorie Fitzpatrick, Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Dotty Merrill, Ed.D., Nevada Association of School Boards

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 21, 2013  
Page 2

James Westrin, Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of  
Business and Industry  
Charles A. Mohler, Mortgage Advisory Council  
Morgan Baumgartner, Advantage Capital Partners  
Sumiko Maser, Deputy Director, Department of Taxation  
Adam Plain, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of  
Business and Industry  
Alan R. Coyner, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral  
Resources  
Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection,  
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League  
Paul Enos, Noble Energy  
Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division,  
Department of Public Safety  
Terry E. Rubald, Chief, Division of Local Government Services, Department of  
Taxation

**Chair Smith:**

We will now open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 328.

**SENATE BILL 328 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes relating to education.  
(BDR 34-937)

**Senator James A. Settelmeyer (Senatorial District No. 17):**

Senate Bill 328 contains proposals for career and technical education (CTE).  
"Proposed Amendment 8966 to Senate Bill 328, First Reprint" ([Exhibit C](#)) has  
been proposed for this measure. Further minor adjustments are currently being  
prepared by the bill drafters ([Exhibit D](#)). The adjustments would cause the  
fiscal note to be eliminated on this bill.

The primary goals of the bill would still be established. Those include assurance  
for adequate funding of CTE. It would require distribution of those funds to be  
processed through a tracking system. A certain amount of industry sector  
involvement would still be included.

The previous system involved private industry, but that provision gradually  
eroded. This bill seeks to regain industry involvement. Industry representatives  
would review the grant requests and make recommendations. The final

authority would still reside with the Superintendent of Public Instruction as executive officer of the State Board of Education.

The proposed amendment that is under way has been agreed to by all concerned parties. The new "Proposed Amendment 9155 to Senate Bill No. 328, First Reprint" ([Exhibit E](#)) has arrived.

**Chair Smith:**

Please provide an overview of S.B. 328.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

There was a situation in the past where only 5 percent of funds awarded were utilized for leadership training. The federal government has a provision that 10 percent is the maximum that can be utilized for leadership training. This bill will split the difference with a provision that 7.5 percent of funding be directed to leadership activities. The intent is that the organizations will be appropriately funded to ensure that 3 percent of the funding would be directed to student organizations.

In the past, grant awards were set at a specific amount. In the changing economic times, a set amount would be a poor choice. The specified formulas further adjusted that provision. This bill would distribute funds by percentages. Grants would be awarded at 30 percent and the remainder would be distributed on a per-pupil basis. This would help ensure that all industry sectors are adequately addressed. The bulk of the funding would be directed to areas with the most students.

**Chair Smith:**

What prompted the drafting of S.B. 328?

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

A bill was proposed, in a prior legislative session; however, the bill was not passed and the provisions were incorporated into the Executive Budget. Because of that, and the implementation of term limits, much of the institutional knowledge was lost.

Things began to change as more industry involvement was curtailed. That is problematic. When industry is involved, it will occasionally privately fund

a meritorious proposal. It is important that industry be involved in the future for the simple fact that students are needed in the workforce.

**Chair Smith:**

Are the sector councils referred to in S.B. 328 the same sector councils currently in place through the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED)?

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

That is correct. Each sector council would select an unpaid representative allowing them to participate in administering CTE. The sector councils could choose not to send a representative at its own discretion and to its detriment.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

It appears Proposed Amendment 9155 outlines the process and provides guidelines in statute for when to make the grant awards. It is permissive language based upon appropriations for this purpose. Is that what eliminates the fiscal note?

**Senator Settelmeyer:**

That is correct. It also creates guidelines going forward so that individual departments have a sense of certainty. In other words, if an individual is no longer a part of the Executive Branch, or within a bureaucracy or department, rules will not be completely rewritten. This situation occurred in a legislative session several years in the past. It allows more predictability for students and instructors who are in the field. It also ensures federal requirements are met.

For instance, the Future Farmers of America director was not allowed to attend as many events in the past as is allowed by federal guidelines.

**Chair Smith:**

Will the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) discuss the fiscal note?

**Rorie Fitzpatrick (Interim Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):**

Senator Settelmeyer has collaborated with the NDE and has agreed upon significant amendments to the original legislation. Pending our review of Proposed Amendment 9155, we anticipate the ability to remove all fiscal notes to S.B. 328.

**Chair Smith:**

Would it completely eliminate the fiscal notes for S.B. 328?

**Ms. Fitzpatrick:**

That is correct, assuming all expectations are met in the amendment.

**Chair Smith:**

For the record, please review the mock-up amendment and communicate with our Fiscal Analysis Division Staff that after the review, all fiscal notes are removed.

**Ms. Fitzpatrick:**

I will do so.

**Dotty Merrill, Ed.D. (Nevada Association of School Boards):**

The Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) is neutral on S.B. 328 until we review the final amendment in Exhibit E. We would like to see the final mock-up before supporting the bill. There are two ways the current mock-up addresses concerns discussed by the policy committee. Section 3 of Proposed Amendment 8966 would fund student leadership activities. We appreciate that the percentage to be utilized for that purpose has been increased from 5 percent to 7.5 percent for both adult and student leadership.

Section 6 of S.B. 328 originally caused concern because it stated each school district must provide matching funds to be eligible for a grant. Proposed Amendment 8966 to S.B. 328 deletes section 6.

The NASB agrees that having the assistance of representatives from the business community would make an important contribution to considerations of grants.

**Senator Smith:**

We will close the hearing on S.B. 328 and open the hearing on S.B. 354.

**SENATE BILL 354**: Revises provisions relating to mortgage lending. (BDR 54-1058)

**James Westrin (Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of Business and Industry):**

Senator Mark Hutchison had intended to present S.B. 354. However, due to a conflict in scheduling, I will present this bill.

Senate Bill 354 makes two provisions. It requires the Commissioner of the Department of Business and Industry (B&I) Division of Mortgage Lending to promulgate rules to establish a licensing and regulatory program for residential mortgage loan servicers. It also requires the Legislative Commission to create an interim commission to study Nevada's mortgage lending laws.

Currently, the Nevada residential loan servicers are largely unregulated unless their business is located within the State. A servicer located outside the State servicing residential mortgage loans for Nevada property is not regulated. Through news reports and different information provided concerning regulatory cases brought by other agencies, we know that these residential mortgage loan servicers may be engaging in activity that is contrary to public policy or not beneficial to the borrowers.

One of the first items of which I was made aware when I assumed my current position approximately 1.5 years ago, was that there were very confusing and disconnected mortgage laws in Nevada. All mortgage activity was lumped into two separate statutes. One addressed brokers and the other addressed bankers. Those two statutes regulate residential, commercial and private money activity and create considerable confusion within the industry as to what activity could, or could not, be engaged in by a particular segment of the providers.

The interim study is intended to address the resulting confusion to determine whether it is possible to modernize, reorganize, clarify and simplify those laws.

**Chair Smith:**

A sizeable fiscal note of approximately \$415,000 is placed on enacting the provisions of S.B. 354. Please explain.

**Mr. Westrin:**

The Division has submitted the fiscal note. The Division is a totally fee-funded agency that currently does not examine or regulate residential mortgage servicers. The Division would need to promulgate rules to implement the program. It would also be required to license the estimated 170 servicers

currently identified. The servicers are required to register with our office, but no provisions are included for enforcement.

The Division would also be required to employ examiners that would audit those residential mortgage servicers and enforce the provisions.

Based on the anticipated licensing fees, the program would become self-funding, but there would be a period without funding as the program is being implemented.

**Chair Smith:**

There is also a fiscal note attached to the provisions of section 9 of S.B. 354 regarding the proposed interim study.

**Mr. Westrin:**

The fiscal note for section 9 was prepared by another entity.

The interim study is important to the State and its regulation of the mortgage industry to ensure Nevada's laws are clear and address all appropriate concerns. The intent is to ensure Nevada consumers are not harmed by mortgage companies operating outside the provisions of the statutes. It allows the industry to become fully aware of its rights and responsibilities. It would also potentially recommend separation within statute of the residential, commercial and private moneylender provisions.

**Chair Smith:**

I am confused because of the requirement of so many new positions. Why is this measure being considered in the form of a bill rather than going through the normal budget process?

**Mr. Westrin:**

The intent was to enact legislation to regulate the residential mortgage servicers within Nevada. Currently, there are no regulations in place requiring the Division to license and examine those entities. If S.B. 354 were enacted, additional staff would be needed to fully implement the provisions.

**Chair Smith:**

I am not sure why a single legislator is proposing a bill for an agency and that the provisions are not being considered as a part of the budgeting process.

**Charles Mohler (Mortgage Advisory Council):**

The Mortgage Advisory Council works with the Commissioner and we are in support of S.B. 354. We especially support the request for an interim study. The Mortgage Advisory Council conducts surveys to determine whether the industry understands the statutes and what is required. The surveys indicated the industry was confused regarding the statute provisions. We have begun to develop recommendations for how to make the statutes more specific. However, more than our volunteer efforts are required.

**Chair Smith:**

We will continue to work with the sponsors of the bill to determine the proper methods for consideration of the provisions. We will now close the hearing on S.B. 354 and open the hearing on S.B. 357.

**SENATE BILL 357**: Provides for tax credits for certain business entities.  
(BDR 57-478)

**Senator Michael Roberson (Senatorial District No. 20):**

Senate Bill 357 is also known as the Nevada New Markets Job Act. This concept is based on the New Markets Tax Credit Program (NMTC) that was established by the federal government in 2000.

The goal is to spur revitalization efforts of low income and impoverished communities across the United States. I have taken some of the concepts of that Program and tailored it to the needs of Nevada. I will now discuss some of the more significant sections of S.B. 357.

Section 11 provides the definition of a qualified community development entity (CDE). That definition is the same as what is established in the federal NMTC Program. It is defined as any domestic corporation or partnership, if the primary mission of the entity is to serve or provide investment capital for low-income communities or low-income persons; and, if the entity maintains accountability to residents of low-income communities, through their representation on a governing board of the entity with certain limitations.

In terms of S.B. 357, a qualified CDE is limited to an entity that has entered into, for the current or any prior year, an allocation agreement with the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of the Treasury. It is further limited with respect to the federal NMTC Program.

Section 12 defines a qualified equity investment as any investment in, or long-term debt security issued by, a qualified CDE that is acquired after the effective date of S.B. 357, solely in exchange for cash at the original issuance of the equity investment and has at least 85 percent of the cash purchase price of the equity investment used by the issuer. The intent is to make qualified community investments in qualified low-income community businesses by the first anniversary of the initial allowance date.

Section 14, on page 3 of S.B. 357 allows a business entity to earn credits against taxes under the State's insurance premium tax in exchange for investing in a qualified community development program. The credit amount is equal to the applicable percentage for the credit allowance date, multiplied by the purchase price paid to the issuer of the qualified equity investment. The applicable percentage is zero percent for the first 2 years, 12 percent for the next 3 credit allowance dates and 11 percent for the following 2 credit allowance dates.

Section 16 establishes the application process for a qualified CDE that seeks an equity investment, or long-term debt security, designated as a qualified equity investment and is eligible for tax credits.

The GOED must follow certain requirements when determining whether to approve or disapprove such an application. It must also certify \$250 million in qualified equity investments.

Section 17 provides for the recapture of tax credits if three conditions are met:

1. Any amount of the federal tax credit available with respect to a qualified equity investment is recaptured.
2. The issuer redeems or makes repayment with respect to a qualified equity investment before the seventh anniversary of the qualified equity investment.
3. The issuer fails to invest an amount equal to 85 percent of the purchase price of the qualified equity investment in qualified low-income community investments in Nevada within 12 months after the issuance of the qualified equity investment and maintains that equity investment until the last credit allowance date for the qualified equity investment.

An exception for recapture is allowed for an investment that has been sold or repaid, if the issuer reinvests an amount equal to the capital return to, or recovered by the issuer from the original investment, exclusive of any profits in another qualified low-income community investment within 12 months after receipt of such capital.

Section 18 provides that the recapture provisions be subject to a 6-month cure period. Any recapture is prohibited under the qualified CDE that has been given notice of noncompliance and afforded 6 months after the date of notice to cure the noncompliance.

Section 19 sets forth the amount of the refundable performance fee that a qualified CDE must include with its application to the GOED and the procedure for obtaining a refund of the fee.

Section 22 lists the requirements for decertification of a qualified equity investment.

Section 24 authorizes the executive director of the GOED to adopt regulations to administer the provisions of S.B. 357.

This is a tax credit program to encourage investment in businesses in low-income and disadvantaged communities in Nevada. To incentivize their investment, investors will receive a tax credit toward the insurance premium tax it has paid.

This bill was heard before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy. It is before this Committee because of the fiscal note.

**Morgan Baumgartner (Advantage Capital Partners):**

Advantage Capital Partners is a federally qualified CDE. We have been practicing in Nevada since the inception of the federal program in 2000. I will provide a few facts about the federal program and the impacts S.B. 357 will have in Nevada.

The federal program has funded an additional \$3.5 billion that was allocated in each year. Approximately \$33 billion for low-income and disadvantaged areas was allocated in calendar year 2011, for federal fiscal years (FFY) 2012-2013 and FFY 2013-2014. It is important to approve S.B. 357 in Nevada. Up to this

point, Nevada has had a low-to-nonexistent success rate in accessing the federal dollars. For no specific reason, Oregon has seen approximately \$357 per capita of federal investment in its low-income communities. The rate in Nevada is \$2.41 per capita.

Over the years, a number of the states determined they wanted to access the available federal capital for disadvantaged businesses in their states. They piggybacked on the federal program to develop their own NMTC programs. The federal funding has followed those programs. There is no guarantee that the federal funding will come, but historically, once a state has adopted similar programs, federal funding follows.

Florida and Missouri have had similar programs for quite some time. They have reauthorized their programs due to the success they have experienced. Economic projection studies were conducted prior to institution of the programs and they have tracked the success of their programs. The performance exceeded the expectations. They target small or large disadvantaged and low-income businesses.

This is a unique program that is well suited for Nevada. From our client's perspective, the Treasury has identified Nevada as a target state to which it would like to direct some of these funds. Without S.B. 357, that will not happen.

**Chair Smith:**

How was Nevada able to access even \$2.41 per capita?

**Ms. Baumgartner:**

I will research the answer to that question and provide it to the Committee. There is no rhyme or reason as to why the states that did not have programs in the early days were able to access larger funding amounts.

**Chair Smith:**

I do not recall this situation having been brought forward to the Committee in previous legislative sessions.

**Senator Roberson:**

The few dollars Nevada has received were based on the federal program. Other states that have adopted state programs have seen a large increase in

investments to low-income and distressed areas, based on their state's program.

**Ms. Baumgartner:**

The bill is designed to enhance the federal program allocations in Nevada. Therefore, no infrastructure will need to be created. The CDEs are qualified through a rigorous blind, triple-blind scoring application process through the Treasury. The federal agency does all the work. The GOED receives the application and ensures it is complete. The federal guidelines and regulations guide the remaining process. It is a lean program for Nevada. We anticipate a considerable infusion of State General Funds and local funding. The credit is not applicable until the second year of the tax credit allowance date, making this a revenue-positive measure from the onset of the program. The budget impact is spread over the 7 years of the program. Senator Roberson captured the technical aspects.

**Chair Smith:**

This Committee is primarily concerned with the fiscal note attached to S.B. 357. The policy committee vetted the policy.

**Sumiko Maser (Deputy Director, Department of Taxation):**

The Department originally submitted a fiscal note for S.B. 357 at a cost of \$280,000 over fiscal year (FY) 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015 and \$109,000 for the future biennia. The fiscal note was derived from an assumption that numerous businesses would request the credit. Upon clarification, we realized there are fewer businesses than were anticipated. Therefore, the costs would be manageable and the Department could absorb much of the work with current staff. The fiscal note has been revised reducing the cost to \$153,000 for FY 2013-2014 with no future-year costs. These costs would pay for updates to the Unified Tax System. Changes would be necessary to track and manage the tax credits and allow the distributions to occur. The Department has removed the need for an additional tax examiner position and some functions can initially be processed manually.

**Chair Smith:**

The fiscal note indicates it is difficult to analyze the fiscal impacts on the revenue side. Is that still the case?

**Ms. Maser:**

That is correct. It is difficult to know the amount of credits that will be requested. They can range from zero to the specified threshold amounts. The Department could provide some examples for the Committee.

**Chair Smith:**

Please provide that information so we have a clear understanding of the impacts on the insurance premium tax revenue. The revenue is increasing, but we need to know how this legislation might impact the increase in revenue.

**Adam Plain (Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry):**

The Division is neutral regarding S.B. 357 as a matter of policy. We submitted an indeterminate fiscal note on the bill. Our concern is that the provisions of the bill should be placed into *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Title 57. The B&I's Commissioner of Insurance and the Division of Insurance have the duty to regulate all provisions of Title 57 according to NRS 679B.120. We are concerned there may be some vicarious liability for the Division of which we are not aware at this time.

For example, our examination authority is greater than that of the Department of Taxation or GOED. Under A.B. No. 6 of the 26th Special Session, we currently conduct insurance premium tax examinations. We are not aware of the regulatory requirements S.B. 357 would place on the Division.

According to the bill, the premium tax credit can be carried forward. There are other insurance premium tax credits that cannot be carried forward and some that also contain a cap. It might be wise to indicate the order of application of the tax credits because the mathematical order of application can greatly affect the State's revenue. Such a provision would reduce legal hearings in the future.

**Senator Roberson:**

I will work with Mr. Plain regarding his concerns.

**Chair Smith:**

We will now close the hearing on S.B. 357 and open the hearing on S.B. 390.

**SENATE BILL 390 (1st Reprint)**: Requires the development of a hydraulic fracturing program for the State of Nevada. (BDR 46-929)

**Senator Tick Segerblom (Senatorial District No. 3):**

Senate Bill 390 seeks to begin the process of regulating hydraulic fracturing. Inquiries from out-of-state oil companies have indicated that Nevada might be a prime location for this process.

Given the dangers associated with the process and the problems that we have seen in other states, the time is right for Nevada to be ahead of those concerns. This bill is only the beginning of the story on this issue. It is the result of compromise between the industry and environmental organizations. The bill requires the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Commission on Mineral Resources, Division of Minerals to work jointly to develop a program to assess the impact of fracturing on the waters of the State, to provide chemical disclosure and to provide for a public process.

The provisions of the bill only apply to the practice of hydraulic fracturing in the waters of the State. The monitoring of ground and surface water and the regulation of flowback water remain under the jurisdiction of the DEP. Nothing in S.B. 390 should be interpreted to change or remove existing statutory authority of either State entity.

I am unaware of any opposition to the measure. The cost would be borne by the permittees.

**Chair Smith:**

Does the fiscal note remain in effect with the first reprint of S.B. 390?

**Senator Segerblom:**

The fiscal note only applied to the original version of the bill.

**Alan R. Coyner (Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources):**

The Division of Minerals placed a fiscal note on the original version of S.B. 390, which was then amended based on this reprint.

**Chair Smith:**

The Committee currently has the information on the original fiscal note.

**Mr. Coyner:**

The Division of Minerals recognizes that there might be costs associated with further regulation of hydraulic fracturing in the State. Additional regulation may be needed in three areas. First, is the requirement to promulgate regulations that will have minor associated costs.

A second cost identified was associated with the legal costs by the deputy attorney general. This is highly speculative. However, based on our knowledge of how hydraulic fracturing has proceeded in other states, we felt it necessary to include those potential costs.

Because of the focus on the potential impacts from hydraulic fracturing, the Division felt it prudent that field inspection force will need to increase.

The total costs associated with the revised fiscal note are approximately \$61,000 in FY 2013-2014 and, as the program moves forward, approximately \$129,000 is included in FY 2014-2015, with approximately \$238,000 for field inspections over the biennium. These costs can be absorbed by the Division through its fee structure. We are a fee-funded agency receiving fees from the gas and oil industries.

The Division can absorb the costs through fee increases set by the Commission on Mineral Resources and through our reserve funds.

**Chair Smith:**

Would legal costs be anticipated in the initial phases prior to the promulgation of regulations or implementation of the program?

**Mr. Coyner:**

The Office of the Attorney General (AG) provided the Division an estimate of what costs might be incurred for a single lawsuit regarding a permit. Such a lawsuit could occur now, even without the provisions of S.B. 390 being enacted. It is a speculative estimate. However, as we have observed other states' functions, those regulators have incurred fairly significant costs in some cases.

**Chair Smith:**

Do I understand the provision of S.B. 390 can be absorbed through the Division's current fee structure? However, is it possible that the Division would

appear before the 2015 Legislature asking for an increase in the caps to increase the fee revenue?

**Mr. Coyner:**

That is correct. There are statutory caps on both fees the Division collects from the oil and gas industries. The revised fiscal note includes a record of those fees that have been collected over the last several years and the statutes pertaining to them ([Exhibit F](#)).

One of the fees is already at the statutory cap. It is a permit fee that does not generate significant revenue. The other fee is a production fee that has the potential to generate a considerable amount of revenue if additional sources of oil and gas are identified. If that does not happen, there is still room within that fee structure for a fee increase.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

What is the fee for natural gas?

**Mr. Coyner:**

Nevada produces nearly no natural gas, but the statutory cap is 20 cents for each barrel of oil or each 50,000 cubic feet of natural gas. That amount encompasses nearly the total natural gas produced in Nevada at this time. The gas that is produced is used by the oil field located in Railroad Valley to power onsite equipment. The current natural gas fee is set at 10 cents for each 50,000 cubic feet.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

The bottom line is that some of these holes contain millions of cubic feet of natural gas that has already been located. We simply do not have the means to move it.

**Mr. Coyner:**

There is the potential for generating new natural gas through the hydraulic fracturing technique. The process is primarily aimed at oil production. If natural gas is produced, the Division will collect fees associated with it.

We recognize the next time changes might occur will be in 2 years. Because of the way the industry appears to be progressing, it is not likely we will see a sudden flood of hydraulic fracturing in the State.

**Colleen Cripps, Ph.D. (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):**

As Chair Smith indicated, the fiscal note submitted by the Division pertained to the first draft of the bill. With the revisions in the first reprint of the bill, the fiscal note is no longer necessary.

**Kyle Davis (Nevada Conservation League):**

We are in support of the first reprint of S.B. 390. As Senator Segerblom noted, this is the product of negotiations between Mr. Paul Enos representing Noble Energy and me.

The bill represents a good first step in identifying the impacts of hydraulic fracturing to Nevada and taking the appropriate steps to sustain human health and the environment.

It is important to the environmental community that they are adequately covered in the regulations promulgated by the Division of Minerals. It is not intended to remove any existing authority from either State agency.

**Paul Enos (Noble Energy):**

Noble Energy is in the early exploration stages of shell oil clay in Elko County. We support S.B. 390 even though the current exploration may not be economically feasible to produce.

The bill establishes a good regulatory scheme for Nevada because of the collaboration between the two State agencies in promulgating regulations and having them adopted by the Division of Minerals. The Division of Minerals regulates the well bore. The well bore is the first protection for ground water. Therefore, they will have the ability to regulate what happens in the mineral-bearing formation. Mr. Davis is correct; this legislation will not preclude the ability to regulate the flowback, surface water or air quality impacts.

**Senator Segerblom:**

With respect to the costs of potential lawsuits, S.B. 390 would likely prevent more lawsuits than it would encourage. If someone wanted to sue over these issues, that is already allowable.

Water is the most important resource in Nevada and it is important to ensure that whatever we authorize does not destroy our water.

**Chair Smith:**

We will close the hearing on S.B. 390 and proceed with our Work Session.

**Mark Krmptic:**

The first legislation to be considered is S.B. 221.

**SENATE BILL 221 (1st Reprint)**: Makes certain changes relating to public safety.  
(BDR 14-943)

Senate Bill 221 was heard by the Committee on May 6. At that time, a proposed amendment was discussed. Since that time, Senator Justin Jones has brought "Proposed Amendment 8895 to Senate Bill No. 221, First Reprint" ([Exhibit G](#)). Fiscal Staff has received communication via email from the Department of Public Safety (DPS), Records and Technology Division, Records Bureau, also known as the Criminal History Repository, that the proposed amendment would remove the fiscal note to S.B. 221.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Does Proposed Amendment 8895, that was received today, complement the other proposed amendment or complement the first reprint?

**Senator Justin C. Jones (Senatorial District 9):**

In the May 6 hearing, we were working through some of the details in terms of how to implement the proposal allowing gun dealers to go directly to the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), rather than requesting background checks through the DPS. Earlier this year, regulation known as ATF Procedural Order 2013-1 was adopted with additional guidance from the FBI and the ATF. It describes the procedure for how to allow federally licensed firearms dealers to conduct background checks for private-party firearms transfers. The proposed amendment in [Exhibit G](#) implements that additional guidance and language from the FBI and the ATF.

One or two minor technical changes are necessary.

In section 13 of S.B. 221, psychologists had been excluded from the listing of mental health professionals and is now included within the proposed amendment.

Guidance was included in sections 14 and 15 of the bill concerning how to change the contract the State has with the FBI in terms of implantation of the single point of contact provisions.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Should we be referring to both proposed amendments?

**Senator Jones:**

Proposed Amendment 8895 replaces the previously proposed amendment.

If there are other provisions in the first reprint that are not included in [Exhibit G](#), they should be considered as well.

**Senator Roberson:**

I share the concern regarding doing what we can to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and mentally unstable individuals. However, I am concerned about certain portions of [S.B. 221](#). I support the mental health provisions.

Does [Exhibit G](#) make changes to the issue of the fee the federal firearms licensed dealers can charge for background checks? That provision was open ended in the amendment proposed on May 6. Has that been changed?

**Senator Jones:**

Section 8, subsection 6 of [Exhibit G](#) states that a licensed dealer may charge a fee of not more than \$30, for private-party background check transactions. However, the dealer incurs no cost for making the request.

**Senator Roberson:**

Does the proposed amendment in [Exhibit G](#) change the bill to require a two-thirds vote for passage? If not, why not?

**Senator Jones:**

The fee is charged by a dealer, not by the State.

**Senator Roberson:**

With the latest amendment, if a seller in a private transaction who wants to sell his or her firearm to another person, must they turn the gun over to a licensed firearms dealer?

If so, if the buyer fails the background check, is the seller required to submit to a background check to have the gun returned to them?

**Senator Jones:**

In the current format of S.B. 221 and the amendment, the buyer and the seller would go to a federally licensed firearms dealer and the NICS check would be performed within 5 minutes; therefore, the firearm would be transferred to the seller immediately. There are approximately 500 licensed firearms dealers in Nevada so a licensed dealer can be found within 10 miles of any location in the State.

If the NICS check cannot be run within 5 minutes, which occurs in approximately 5 percent of cases, the seller has the choice of whether to leave the gun in the inventory of the federally licensed firearms dealer for continuation of the background check or they can stop the transaction at that point.

If the gun were placed into the dealer's inventory, the gun would be transferred to the buyer if the background check cleared within 3 days. If the purchaser did not pass a background check, the gun would be returned to the seller. In that case, because the gun is placed into the dealer's inventory, by federal law, a background check of the seller would be required. However, the seller could choose to terminate the transaction at the time of the original transaction.

**Senator Roberson:**

Would two fees be charged for both the background check on the buyer and on the seller in those extended cases?

**Senator Jones:**

I am unsure whether the dealer would be required to charge another fee to return the firearm to the seller. If an additional fee is required, it would be \$25, if it was run through the Criminal History Repository or \$30, if a dealer ran it.

**Senator Roberson:**

Can we deviate for a moment in this Work Session to a policy question?

**Chair Smith:**

We can discuss policy because S.B. 221 has been amended. I will remind the Committee that we do not consider the policy on most bills heard before us.

**Senator Roberson:**

Are there any enforcement mechanisms included in the bill? Assuming that the bill becomes law, how are we to enforce a sale between private parties where no background check is completed?

**Senator Jones:**

It would be no different from the current process. If an individual purchased a gun through a licensed firearms dealer such as Walmart and a background check was not completed, it would be a crime and law enforcement could open an investigation.

Under the circumstance of private-party transactions, law enforcement is not aware of every one of those types of sales. Senate Bill 221 will not solve every problem. However, if a system is established it will ensure those who try to follow the law can follow a specified process by keeping guns out of the hands of those who should not be allowed to have firearms.

**Senator Roberson:**

Several different situations were mentioned in your response. You mentioned the purchase of a firearm at a Walmart. Are you referring to a situation in which the clerk at Walmart does not perform the background check and a violation of law will occur?

**Senator Jones:**

That is correct.

**Senator Roberson:**

That is a very different scenario. Under current law, it is not illegal for two private individuals to transact a firearm sale. The bill would make those transactions illegal if a background check were not included. While we want to do what we can to protect the citizens of Nevada, it is also important that we not pass legislation just to say we passed a bill. How do we enforce the law? If it cannot be enforced, is it an effective policy decision?

**Senator Jones:**

All enforcement agencies across the State are in support of this legislation. Not every transaction will be captured. There will still be criminal sales of firearms in the State.

There is a reason why law enforcement across the country is supportive of expanded background checks. To date, more than 2 million prohibited transactions have been identified through background checks. By monitoring of transactions to qualify the buyers, criminals, domestic violence perpetrators and adjudicated mentally imperfect individuals would be prevented from purchasing firearms.

**Senator Roberson:**

In 2010, the FBI ran more than 14.4 million background checks. Of those, 72,659 were denied. Only 62 of the denied cases were prosecuted and of those, only 13 resulted in conviction. What crimes will actually be prevented? There is a need for better enforcement of transactions where individuals fail background checks.

Currently in Nevada, a private individual can voluntarily obtain a background check. I suggest we encourage more voluntary background checks by providing immunity from liability for private party sellers.

I suggest the Criminal History Repository fee be waived to encourage more of those volunteer checks. Would that be more effective than what is proposed in S.B. 221?

**Senator Jones:**

That would not be more effective. Julie Butler, Records Bureau Chief, testified that during the time the voluntary provision has been in place, she could count the number of voluntary checks that had been run on one hand.

Waiving the fee for background checks through the Criminal History Repository would cause a fiscal impact to the State. This Legislature is currently focused on funding education. Funding education costs money.

**Senator Roberson:**

You stated there have only been a handful of voluntary background checks. That is why I am suggesting we encourage more participation in that voluntary background checks provision.

It can be said money could be saved with regard to every bill that comes before the Legislature. If individuals know they will have immunity from prosecution for

a crime they have committed, I would assume more voluntary background checks might be one result.

**Chair Smith:**

We will focus on the changes proposed in the amendment.

**Senator Jones:**

For the record, "I spoke with Senator Roberson several weeks ago and have worked with members of his caucus. Those discussions are what prompted many of the provisions included in the last amendment to the bill."

**Senator Goicoechea:**

What does it cost a gun dealer to run the NICS check on an individual for which he then charges the customer \$30?

**Senator Jones:**

There is no cost to the dealer to request an NICS check.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

That concerns me. If an individual has been convicted of a first-offense misdemeanor, they are precluded from having a gun for a 2-year period. Some individuals may own a large number of firearms and subsequently loan one to another person. If that person then shoots themselves or someone else accidentally with the borrowed weapon, the original owner will be charged with a misdemeanor and will have to transfer a large number of weapons to someone else until after 2 years, when he can own firearms again. That is harsh.

**Senator Jones:**

I sympathize with that concern. We have struggled with that language provision during the last few weeks. I do not want to see a circumstance in which someone did not know about the provision, but is ultimately charged with an offense based on that provision.

The Category E felony was specified for a second offense to ensure those who are trafficking in firearms are punished. I would be happy to discuss this with you further.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

My views are of a somewhat rural perspective and many of my concerns have been addressed in the amendment.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Many individuals have concerns about the development of a registry in any proposed gun control legislation. Section 7.85 of Proposed Amendment 8895 to S.B. 221 is exactly why I am worried. Earlier in the proposed amendment, it acknowledges that a person who has a concealed carry permit is exempted from a background check.

Yet, under section 7.85 of the proposed amendment, that same person must still appear before a licensed firearms dealer and record the transaction. The dealer then maintains the record for 20 years. We create a *de facto* registry by that provision. The federal government is supposed to destroy those records, but the federal government does not always do everything it is supposed to do.

Why would we require someone who has already been authorized for a concealed carry permit to sign paperwork and to have his or her own firearms logged in with a federally licensed dealer?

**Senator Jones:**

I appreciate that concern. It is an area that prompted significant discussion. The purpose of section 7.85 of the proposed amendment is to ensure enforcement in those rare circumstances in which a concealed carry permittee has received a firearm and thereafter committed a crime.

The provision is reasonable, given the fact that there are more than 500 federally licensed firearms dealers across the State.

**Julie Butler (Records Bureau Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety):**

Proposed Amendment 8895 to S.B. 221 eliminates the Bureau's fiscal note on the bill. The amendment directs gun dealer sales to be processed directly by the FBI's NICS office and not through the Criminal History Repository. All private party sales will continue to be processed by the Repository thereby eliminating any of our fiscal concerns.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Is the NICS available 24 hours, 7 days a week (24/7)? Some of the gun dealers have expressed concern that the NICS would not be open on weekends.

**Ms. Butler:**

The NICS is a 24/7 business. The DPS Records Bureau is not.

**Senator Roberson:**

This is the fourth iteration of S.B. 221 and we have not had time to review the proposed amendment. It seems the bill keeps changing. I still have concerns about the enforceability and effectiveness from my perspective. The acknowledged goal is the prevention of guns being in the hands of criminals or individuals with mental health issues.

I suggest we need to provide immunity from liability for individuals who wish to request voluntary background checks. The fee must be removed to encourage those individuals to voluntarily request background checks before they sell their firearms.

Senate Bill 221 does not address "straw" purchases, which is known to be a serious problem. A "straw" purchase is any purchase in which an agent agrees to acquire a firearm for someone else who is unable to purchase a firearm for him or herself. Then the agent transfers the firearm to that person upon completion of the purchase. State law needs to prohibit "straw" purchases.

I share many of Senator Jones' concerns. However, an interim study on criminal access to firearms and improvement of school security is needed. We need to ascertain ways to improve the Nevada reporting system to ensure individuals who are disqualified from ownership of firearms for mental health reasons are reported to the NICS.

Finally, there are concerns regarding the undue burden on the rights of law-abiding citizens of the State.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I am concerned about the position of my constituents. Technically, if an individual wishes to loan a firearm to a friend or relative, my constituents are

concerned the bill would be a *de facto* gun registry bill. They understand the registration of handguns, but the bill reaches beyond those to all weapons.

**Chair Smith:**

I appreciate the members' concerns. I also appreciate the work Senator Jones has done regarding S.B. 221. Guns are part of my world. My father was a licensed gunsmith and dealer. My husband is one of the most avid hunters in the State. We own many firearms. I shoot. I am not considering this legislation as someone who does not know or care about the issue. Senator Jones has researched extensively and tried to assuage some of my concerns.

I am not saying that this bill has all the answers. However, it is time we have these hard discussions and make the difficult decisions. We could require a study in the interim because gun violence is not going away.

We must find a way that guns stay in the hands of good people and not allow guns for individuals with mental health issues. This discussion started after the school incident in December 2012, yet we shy away from addressing this subject.

I support S.B. 221 as addressing decisions that can be made by a reasonable person. If it is implemented, similar to other measures that are sometimes implemented in this building, we can evaluate it in the future. If enforcement is an issue, then we can deliberate the best choices for enforcement.

**Senator Denis:**

These issues are important. We talk about safety all the time. I have spent most of my life advocating on educational issues. At the same time, I have been involved in issues of gun safety. I am not a hunter, but I enjoy range and target shooting. The mental health discussion is important to me. Having a family member who suffers with mental illness, I am aware of those issues. Given the combined issues of mental health and gun safety, Senator Jones has done a good job of dealing with that.

We need to move forward on safety discussions. I am always uncomfortable when studies are suggested, because it usually means we want to put something off. I am tired of putting things off. Studies can be done in a manner that causes us to arrive at the heart of issues. I am willing to move forward with S.B. 221. There will never be a perfect bill and not everyone will be happy.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

I have already been on the record regarding the merits of the background check issue. We are making significant progress during this Legislative Session with addressing mental health concerns. Significant resources are being directed to the mental health community.

One bill currently under consideration addresses involuntary civil commitment. Much that is being done already will get to some of the mental health concerns within S.B. 221.

**Senator Roberson:**

I would like to work with Senator Jones so that this can be a bipartisan piece of legislation. I have expressed my concerns and I hope he will be open to the three changes I have suggested: an interim study, voluntary checks without a cost and prohibiting "straw" purchasing in Nevada.

I have many concerns with the current form of the legislation. I cannot vote affirmatively at this time.

**Chair Smith:**

It is my intention to move S.B. 221 today because we are 2 weeks away from *sine die*. I would also ask Senator Jones to work with the concerns mentioned at this hearing.

**Senator Jones:**

I will be happy to work with all parties. I will reiterate that I have been working with Senator Roberson's caucus since early in this Legislative Session and I met with him personally 3 weeks ago. I have an open door policy, but Senator Roberson has not set foot into my office.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 221 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 8895.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, KIECKHEFER AND ROBERSON VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Smith:**

We will now discuss S.B. 330.

**SENATE BILL 330**: Allows a person who qualifies as both a veteran and the surviving spouse of a veteran to claim both veterans' exemptions from property taxes and governmental services taxes. (BDR 32-690)

**Mr. Krmpotic:**

This bill was heard on May 8. This bill becomes effective upon passage and approval to allow time to perform preparatory administrative tasks. Senate Bill 330 is effective for all other purposes on July 1.

The bill received a do pass recommendation from the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development and was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance based on the fiscal note submitted by the Department of Taxation. The fiscal note identifies loss of property tax revenue with an impact to the State of \$16,500 in FY 2013-2014 and \$16,700 in FY 2014-2015.

The bill allows a person who is eligible to receive a property tax or government services tax exemption as a disabled veteran and a surviving spouse of a disabled veteran to receive both exemptions. Fiscal Staff has received new information from the Department of Taxation that significantly reduces the fiscal impact on the bill.

**Terry E. Rubald (Chief, Division of Local Government Services, Department of Taxation):**

The revision for FY 2013-2014 would total \$2,319 and for FY 2014-2015 would total \$2,350. In future biennia, the fiscal impact would be \$4,669. Of that \$4,669, approximately \$862 affects the State Capital Improvement Program projects and State indebtedness. The remainder would affect the 75 cent per \$100 valuation directed to the school operating account.

The reason for the change is that an error was made in the original calculation. The claim rate was not applied to that calculation. The claim rate currently experienced is approximately 14 percent of the total eligible veterans who apply for exemption.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 330.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Smith:**

We will now discuss S.B. 395.

**SENATE BILL 395 (1st Reprint)**: Requires the Attorney General to prepare and publish certain information. (BDR 14-22)

**Mr. Krmpotic:**

Senate Bill 395 was heard on May 16. This bill requires the AG to prepare and publish on or before January 1, 2014, a collection of the provisions of existing law imposing or authorizing collateral consequences of conviction and any provisions of existing law allowing relief from collateral consequences. The effective date of S.B. 395 is upon passage and approval for preparation and publication of a collection of collateral consequences of conviction. All other provisions are effective January 1, 2014. At the time of the hearing, Senator Segerblom presented Proposed Amendment 8757 to Senate Bill No. 395, First Reprint ([Exhibit H](#)). A fiscal note was submitted by the AG in the amount of \$130,200 in FY 2013-2014 and \$209,400 in FY 2014-2015. The AG provided testimony that if the proposed amendment were included with the bill, the fiscal note would be removed.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

I have spoken with colleagues from the Senate Committee on Judiciary who stated the proposed amendment in [Exhibit H](#) removed their concerns as well.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 395 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 8757.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Smith:**

We will now consider S.B. 446.

**SENATE BILL 446**: Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-1077)

**Alex Haartz (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):**

This bill was heard by the Committee on May 4. It has an effective date of July 1. The bill provides authority for the Nevada Western Interstate Compact for Higher Education (WICHE) Commissioners to enter into a reciprocity agreement, including the State Authority Reciprocity Agreement, for purposes of authorizing a postsecondary education institution that is located in another state or territory. Those institutions could then provide distance education to Nevada residents, if the state licensing requirements and student protections are substantially similar. Participation in state reciprocity agreements would also allow accredited Nevada institutions, both public and private, to serve residents of participating states without having to be separately licensed in those particular states.

At present, there are four regional state reciprocity agreement compacts. The WICHE serves the western states. Senate Bill 446 would authorize Nevada to join the regional WICHE state reciprocity agreement through the Nevada WICHE Commission. Once Nevada joins the agreement, individual public and private institutions can then decide whether their institutions will join the agreement. National reciprocity is intended to occur once the four regional compacts implement a national coordinating council to standardize student protection and complaint resolution processes.

A fiscal note was submitted by the Commission on Postsecondary Education based on a projected loss of fees for new licenses issued to seven institutions each year, at \$1,500 for each license and \$10,000 in fee revenue each year.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 446.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Smith:**

We will now consider S.B. 502.

**SENATE BILL 502 (1st Reprint)**: Makes various changes relating to certain required investigations of the background and personal history of certain persons as a condition of employment, licensure, certification and other privileges. (BDR 40-1137)

**Mr. Krmptic:**

Senate Bill 502 is a Department of Administration bill. It was heard in Committee on May 13. The bill requires investigations of backgrounds and personnel history of certain persons as a condition of employment, licensure and certification and other privileges. It has been coined the Rap Back Program and the program fees and expenditures are billed through the budget of the Records Bureau of the Records and Technology Division in the DPS. The money committees approved that budget during the past week.

Marla McDade Williams presented some necessary technical changes to the bill ([Exhibit I](#)). These minor technical changes include the need, in sections 9 and 11 of S.B. 502, to delete the reference to a facility for long-term care of which the average inpatient length of stay is more than 25 days. The facility reference is a duplicative reference to a hospital described under *United States Code* Title 42, public health and welfare, which accepts payments through Medicare. Two technical changes are necessary in section 14 of S.B. 502. The proposal would retain the old subsection 2 of NRS 449.123 and add a new subsection 3 using newly proposed language for the professional licensees. [Exhibit I](#) also indicates it is not necessary for an employee to ensure that the Records Bureau maintains electronic images of fingerprints. That language is more appropriately located in section 15, subsection 4.

The proposal recommends deletion of paragraph 2(b), lines 43 through 45 on page 9 and lines 1 through 4 on page 10 of the bill.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 21, 2013  
Page 32

The bill implements a budget decision that was approved by the money committees and the fiscal impact of the bill is accounted for in the Criminal History Repository budget, budget account (B/A) 101-4709.

DPS - Criminal History Repository — Budget Page PUBLIC SAFETY-145  
(Volume III)  
Budget Account 101-4709

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 502 WITH THE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS IN EXHIBIT I.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Smith:**

We will now consider Assembly Bill (A.B.) 449.

ASSEMBLY BILL 449 (1st Reprint): Revises the use of certain proceeds received for purposes relating to vital statistics. (BDR 40-1139)

**Mr. Krmpotic:**

Assembly Bill 449 and A.B. 471 are somewhat related.

ASSEMBLY BILL 471 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services for the operation of the vital records and statistics program in Fiscal Year 2012-2013. (BDR S-1191)

Assembly Bill 449 was heard last week in Committee. This bill directs fees collected by the Department of Health and Human Resources, Health Division, Office of Vital Records (OVR) to the Registrar of Vital Records. The bill cleans up a budgetary issue from the 2011 Legislature where those fees were placed in the budget of the Health Division and the General Fund appropriation was removed. The statute was not changed and the fees continued to be directed to

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 21, 2013  
Page 33

the General Fund. Therefore, A.B. 449 corrects the statute and allows the fees to be collected in the Registrar of Vital Records account, B/A 101-3190.

HHS-DPBH - Health Statistics and Planning — Budget Page DHHS-PUBLIC  
HEALTH-25 (Volume II)  
Budget Account 101-3190

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 449.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Senator Smith:**

We will now consider A.B. 471.

**Mr. Krmpotic:**

Assembly Bill 471 makes an appropriation to the Health Division, OVR budget account for FY 2012-2013 in the amount of \$519,243 from the General Fund to address the shortfall in that budget in that fiscal year. The shortfall was created by the difference in the 2011 budget closure and subsequent statutory language. The change is recommended by the Department of Administration, Budget Division and is included in the Executive Budget. The Education First requirement does not apply to this bill.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 471.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 21, 2013  
Page 34

**Chair Smith:**

Seeing no public comment to come before the Committee, this meeting is adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Cynthia Clampitt,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Debbie Smith, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 328	C	6	Senator Settlemeyer	Proposed Amendment No. 8966
S.B. 328	D	5	Senator Settlemeyer	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 328	E	6	Senator Settlemeyer	Proposed Amendment No. 9155
S.B. 390	F	6	Division of Minerals	Memo
S.B. 221	G	8	Senator Jones	Proposed Amendment No. 8895
S.B. 395	H	5	Mark Krmpotic	Proposed Amendment No. 8757
S.B. 502	I	1	Marla McDade-Williams	Technical Amendment