

Assembly

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

MARCH 21, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAIRMAN DINI  
VICE-CHAIRMAN MURPHY  
ASSEMBLYMAN CRADDOCK  
ASSEMBLYMAN HARMON  
ASSEMBLYMAN MAY  
ASSEMBLYMAN MOODY  
ASSEMBLYMAN FORD  
ASSEMBLYMAN YOUNG

MEMBERS ABSENT: ASSEMBLYMAN SCHOFIELD

ALSO PRESENT: George Flint, Nevada Wedding Association  
Vernon Bennett, Retirement System  
Frank Holzhauser, Department of Human Resources

(The following bills were discussed at this meeting: A.B. 397, A.B. 376, A.B. 212, A.B. 354, A.B. 400, S.B. 272.A.B. 342).

Mr. Dini called the meeting to order at 8:00 A.M.

The first bill on the agenda to be discussed was A.B. 397. Mr. George Flint of the Nevada Wedding Association testified. He passed a handout to the committee which was entitled Note Concerning Financial Impact of A.B. 397 to Washoe and Clark Counties, a copy of which is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof.

Mr. Flint stated that A.B. 397 is most important to them for several reasons. He stated that there was some confusion as to who is concerned with this bill. Prior to 1970 all marriages were performed 100% by Justice of the Peace. There was criticism at times that Justices of the Peace were receiving exhorbitant incomes in excess of \$100,000. There had been attempts to create a public office that would take the Justice of the Peace out of the marriage business, and taking the money that was going into books of the Justice of the Peace and putting it into county funds. Only two townships were included. After the 1980 census there will be several other townships thst will have to have a marriage commissioner. The only two to be effected are those in Las Vegas and Reno. He stated that this law went into effect on January 1, 1970. Mr. Flint then referred to the handout and explained it to the committee.

Mr. Flint informed the committee that Nevada had 20 times

2- 0513

as high a marriage rate as any other state. 95% of the marriages are non-Nevada weddings. A good part of the other 5% are not married by marriage commissioners. He stated that they feel if this bill is adopted it would be an ideal source of income. Mr. Flint informed the committee that Austin Bowler, Mr. McKissick and Mel Close were the three people that worked on this in 1969. That is why the original legislation was set up on the basis that it is now.

Mr. Flint informed that Washoe County's property taxes have almost doubled. They cannot afford to do a wedding for \$10.00 and \$15.00.

Mr. Flint stated that when this particular statute was put into effect, the Washoe County Clerk estimated that they would lose thousands of dollars. The first year it made \$100,000 in profit. Apparently the counties are happy with the profit. If A.B. 397 becomes law since the combined number of licenses were 184,150 and there has been a steady growth, they can expect that the counties will issue the same amount or more in 1975.

Mr. Flint stated that the only people discouraging them were the counties. Mr. Flint stated that to be completely fair that he has thought of some negative aspects. He again referred to the handout. He stated that this would raise a once in a lifetime fee from \$15.00 to \$30.00. The next question would be would it discourage some couples from getting married. It would still be cheaper than getting married any where else in the United States. He stated that they come here for many reasons.

One-third of the California marriages now come to the State of Nevada. It has been estimated that every wedding that comes to the State of Nevada represents \$1,000. He stated that if the average couple that flies into Las Vegas from Chicago gets married in a chapel they will spend \$1,000 in Clark County and that they would not be discouraged by raising the fee to \$30.00 from \$15.00.

Mr. May stated that it appears that it is not actually a county bill.

Mr. Flint stated that it was not introduced at the request of the counties but by people such as himself.

Mr. Dini asked if there was anyone else who would like to testify on A.B. 397. Mr. Alex Coon, Washoe County Clerk next testified. Mr. Coon stated that he spoke to Mr. Gaunt and he agrees that the fees in this section should be set by county ordinance and regulated by county ordinance.

Mr. Dini asked if they were set now.

Mr. Coon stated no. As the law states now it says no more than \$20.00. If it is regulated by ordinance they can change it in 30 days. They feel that the state law should not make a limitation here.

2-0514

Mrs. Ford stated to Mr. Coon that he was then asking that we leave it to the county.

Mr. Coon said to the county commissioners.

Mrs. Ford asked if it would have to be established by ordinance if they wanted to go above that.

Mr. Coon stated that it should be at the local level where they can meet with county commissioners and wedding people. He stated that he had spoken to Mr. McKissick and the whole purpose of this law in 1969 was to create some revenue for the county. The revenue generated by marriages in Washoe County has been averaging annually around \$200,000. Of course there are operating expenses. The County Commissioners are counting on this kind of revenue. He is asking the committee to let the county on the local level to settle this matter.

Mr. May asked Mr. Coon if the committee used a figure but left it not more than. He asked Mr. Coon if they were presently in line with the limitation imposed by state law.

Mr. Coon stated that they have an ordinance going along with the state law.

Mr. May stated that this says not more than \$15.00 and \$20.00. Mr. May asked Mr. Coon if they were at \$15.00 and \$20.00 now.

Mr. Coon replied yes.

Mr. May asked if we changed it to say not more than \$25.00.

Mr. Coon stated that this would be more in line, but they would like not to have any ceilings.

Mr. Coon stated that Clark County was different.

Mr. Dini asked if he did not think it would bring in more revenue if we established this.

Mr. Coon stated that he did not think so. Two years ago they had over \$200,000 in income from marriages. This year it was down to \$195,000. He stated that the economy is going down.

Mr. Dini asked if there was a down trend and they raised the fee if Mr. Coon thought they would break even or come out ahead. Mr. Coon stated that if you make it not more than \$25.00 and not more than \$30.00 it would be a lot better than saying not less than. Mr. Coon stated that he felt that Miss Bowman would concur.

Mr. Richard Bunker testified next. He stated that he had spoken to Miss Bowman and she asked him to say that she is not in favor of A.B. 397. He stated that they could also raise money by raising the room tax. Mr. Bunker stated that the questions become how far can we go in raising money and still not destroy the goose that lays the golden egg. He stated that there was

a great deal of advertising by wedding chapels. Mr. Bunker stated that if the tourist wants to be married in the courthouse it can be done. They are well advised by chapels. They feel that it is another tourist oriented situation. It is a convenience that they have provided for them. He stated that they are very happy with the amount of money that they are making under the circumstances and it is the opinion of the county of Clark that they are able to do it with the prices that are already set by statute.

Mr. May asked if they have been that way consistently.

Mr. Bunker stated that he presumed so.

Mr. Flint stated that Clark is not changing the maximum allowed by law. They are changing the minimum. Mr. Coon is charging \$15.00 and \$20.00. He stated that Mr. Coon has pointed out that Washoe County is down \$10,000 in revenue for the past year and he states that it is because of the economy. He informed the committee that the County of Douglas is up 1,600 licenses. He stated that Washoe County is not off because of the economy. He further stated that Mr. May's suggestion would not work.

Mr. May asked suppose we use a range.

Mr. Flint then referred to A.B. 376 which asks to raise Justice of the Peace Fees. He then explained that bill to the committee and informed the committee that that bill had been instituted in 1865. He stated that he would like to see some alteration where private enterprise did not have to compete with a \$10.00 figure which is the law. He stated that the fee of \$25.00 and \$30.00 is a sizeable step. It represents about 1/2 of what a wedding chapel is receiving.

Mr. Don Mello testified next. He stated that Mr. Flint had called him. He stated that he finds it very difficult to believe some things he has heard, particularly as to why it was created. He stated that he had been listening to the problems of the counties. He stated that they had come to the governor and the money committees. He further stated that this bill will give them more money. He stated that this was about all he had to say and he suggested that the counties do something to start taking care of themselves. There were very little facts from the counties.

The next bill to be heard was A.B. 212. Mr. Wahrenbrock of the Department of Human Resources testified with regard to this bill which includes director of department of human resources on data processing commission if department is furnished services by the state. He stated that the bill was important and that they would like to participate in activities of the computer center.

Mr. Bennett testified next. He passed out a letter to the committee, a copy of which is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof. He stated that the retirement board entered into the computer area in 1974. They understand

2-0516

that several major agencies are represented on the computer commission and they respectfully request that the committee to place the executive officer of the retirement commission on the board as well.

Mr. May stated that there was a supervisory board that concerns itself with the computer. He asked if this was discussed with them. Mr. Barrett stated that he had discussed it with Mr. Glover, Mr. Harding and Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Young asked what the advantage was of being on the board.

Mr. Bennett stated that they would like to be in the decision making process in the future.

Mr. Glover stated that the reason that this bill was introduced was that it was requested from Mr. Holzhauser. It would allow the head of their department to sit on the computer board. The bill was drafted improperly and there is an amendment. He stated that he has no feeling one way or the other as to who sits on the board.

Mr. Gordon Harding testified next. He stated that he was in a unique position. He stated that the board consisted of six capable department heads. All of them are reputable and knowledgeable people. He stated that this agency was originally developed from agencies which had data processing equipment. When they became members of the computer facility they simply moved from an owner to a member of a board. He stated that in the Department of Human Resources there is some merit. They represent a user which consumes 14% of the total resource in the computer facility. The Public Employees Retirement Board consumes 2% of the computer resource. He stated that if we had 75 users we could find ourselves in an unreasonable situation. He stated that there is no reason for either of these organizations to be on this board. He stated that the computer is a technical piece of equipment. You couldn't vote properly without background and experience in computers. There should be some consideration to the basis for membership.

Mr. Dini asked what the primary function of the commission was.

Mr. Harding stated that the computer facility is the state organization which effectively operates the state centralized computer. The commission sets the policy for the facility. It approves all new equipment to the facility.

Mr. Young asked if the commission set up the priorities.

Mr. Harding answered no. It is set by the manager.

Mr. Craddock asked what the percentage of the capabilities of the computer are being used now.

Mr. Harding - for the prime shift - 8 to 5 Monday through Friday we use 93%. If we take Monday through Friday from 5:00 P.M. to 8:00 A.M. we are using 51% of capacity. Weekends about 70% of capacity.

Mr. Craddock stated that it seemed that priority could be a

problem.

Mr. Harding stated that as it becomes a problem designs will have to be made as to what additional systems would be owned by the state. He stated that 85% would be the saturation point. We will have to look at long-term growth. This is something that requires a fair amount of background and experience.

The next bill to be discussed was A.B. 354, which increases fees allowed to constables. Mr. Chaney testified on this bill. He stated that it was given by Constable Talbot. He referred to a schedule. He stated that the fees were changed in 1973. He stated that they wanted a little more justification in the price that they can charge for their service.

Mr. Craddock asked what Mr. Talbot had suggested.

Mr. Chaney stated that he said whatever we could get.

The next bill on the agenda to be discussed was A.B. 400, which shortens the name of Nevada commission on equal rights of citizens.

Mr. George Cotton of the Equal Rights commission testified next. He stated that this was a housekeeping bill, changing the name of the Equal Rights commission.

Mrs. Ford asked if these were the only places in the statutes where the name is.

Mr. Cotton stated that he believed it was Chapter 233.

Mr. Murphy asked if there was any particular reason.

Mr. Cotton stated that most of the state commissions are like that.

The next bill to be discussed was S.B. 272, which further defines persons exempt from provisions concerning professional engineers.

Mr. Adams, a Professional engineer testified. He stated that it was a clean up package. Mr. Murphy suggested that this bill be sent to Health and Welfare.

Mr. Young moved that it be returned to the introducers which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. All of the committee members were in favor and the motion was unanimously carried. Mr. Schofield was not present at the time of the vote.

Mr. Murphy stated that the City of Reno had asked him to introduce an amendment to the charter for Reno.

The committee then discussed A.B. 354 and Mr. Dini asked if we should give them \$3.00.

Mr. May moved for an amend and do pass with regard to A.B.



2-0528

354, which was seconded by Mrs. Ford. This amendment would amend the fee to \$3.00 on the summons portion. All of the members were in favor of the amend and do pass and it carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield was not here for the vote on A.B. 354.

Mr. Schofield then stated that he was holding A.B. 342 and he stated that he recommends after discussion with officials in Clark to putting the population clause back so that it will affect counties "up to 200,000 or less". This would leave Clark County out.

Mr. Schofield made an amend and do pass motion with regard to A.B. 342, which was seconded by Mr. May. All of the committee members were in favor of the amend and do pass motion and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Craddock brought up the subject of mobile homes. He stated that he would like the committee to authorize him to research the statutes. Mr. Craddock then made a formal motion for the committee to authorize him to research the statutes, which was seconded by Mr. Harmon. All of the members were in favor of the subcommittee to research and draft a bill in that area, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Craddock and Mr. Harmon were appointed to the subcommittee.

Mr. Young moved for indefinite postponement with regard to A.B. 212, which was seconded by Mr. Moody. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. Young moved for a do pass on A.B. 397, which was seconded by Mrs. Ford. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion and it was unanimously carried. Mr. Schofield was not present at the time of the vote.

Mr. Murphy moved for a do pass motion on A.B. 400, which was seconded by Mr. Moody. All of the committee members were unanimously in favor of the motion and it carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield was not present at the time of the vote.

Mr. Craddock moved for a Do Pass on S.B. 272, which was seconded by Mr. Young. All of the members were in favor of the motion and it carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield was not present at the time of the vote.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara Gomez  
Committee Secretary

ASSEMBLY

2-0511

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS  
 FRIDAY,  
 Date March 21, 1975 Time 8:00 A.M. Room 214

Bills or Resolutions to be considered	Subject	Counsel requested*
A.B. 397	Adjusts fees charged by commissioner of civil marriages.	
	NOTIFY: County Commissioner's Association	
A.B. 212	Includes director of department of human resources on data procession commission if department is furnished services by state computer facility.	
	NOTIFY: Mr. Glover, Mr. Frank Holzhauer, Mr. Wahrenbrock	
A.B. 400	Shortens name of Nevada commission on equal rights of citizens.	
	NOTIFY: Mr. Barengo, Mr. Bremner, Nevada Commission on Equal Rights	
S.B. 272	Further defines persons exempt from provisions concerning professional engineers.	
	NOTIFY: Senator Gibson, Board of Professional Engineers.	

\*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.



VERNON BENNETT  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WILL KEATING  
ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER

STATE OF NEVADA



2-0519

AB212

RETIREMENT BOARD  
ELBERT B. EDWARDS  
CHAIRMAN  
ROBERT C. WEEMS  
VICE CHAIRMAN  
MEMBERS  
CHARLES H. COLLINS  
L. ROSS CULBERTSON  
BOYD MANNING  
DONALD L. REAM  
GLENDON F. WALTHER

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

P.O. Box 1569  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701  
TELEPHONE (702) 885-4200

March 19, 1975

The Honorable Joseph E. Dini  
Assemblyman, State of Nevada  
c/o Nevada State Legislature  
Legislative Building  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Re: AB 212

Dear Sir:

This will confirm your discussion yesterday with Mr. Ross Culbertson, member of the Retirement Board, regarding AB 212. This Bill in its present form adds the Department of Human Resources as a using agency under NRS 242.170 and as a member of the data processing commission under NRS 242.190. The Retirement Board respectfully requests that your committee consider an amendment to AB 212 to add the Executive Officer of the Public Employees Retirement System as a member of the data processing commission if the Public Employees Retirement System has services furnished by the computer facility. The Retirement Board began using the computer facilities on a regular basis January 1, 1974. Our needs have been expanding in this area for the past two years. The Retirement Board understands that the major agencies using the computer facilities have their Chief Executive listed as a member of the data processing commission. The Retirement Board respectfully requests that we be provided the same privilege. We will attend the meeting of the Government Affairs Committee scheduled on March 21, 1975, and will be prepared to discuss the proposed amendment.

We appreciate any assistance which you and the Government Affairs Committee may provide regarding this matter.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Vernon Bennett".

VERNON BENNETT  
Executive Officer

c.c.: Retirement Board Members  
Alan H. Glover  
Howard E. Barrett

VB:bh

Friday, March 21, 1975

Appearing before the Assembly Government Affairs Committee in support of

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 397

My name is George Flint and I live in Reno. I am appearing today to encourage your committee to give a "Do Pass" to this bill. I represent the Nevada Wedding Association of Las Vegas and also am the operator of two wedding chapels in Reno. Thank you for taking time to hear me and for your consideration on this piece of legislation.

In order to simply state our position on this bill I have listed the following:

REASONS FOR THE ADOPTION OF THIS BILL:

1. Private enterprise cannot compete with the extreme lowness of present rates.
2. No increase in cost to counties whatsoever in adopting this legislation.
3. Will bring in an estimated additional \$350,000.00 profit to counties.
4. Would be an altogether more realistic figure to other charges now being made by wedding chapels, Justices of the Peace, and churches both in Nevada and within the states most of the weddings now originate.
5. All of the increase would be paid for from 95 per cent OUT OF STATE FUNDS.
6. IDEAL SOURCE OF MUCH NEEDED ADDITIONAL INCOME TO COUNTIES WITH ALMOST ZERO COST TO NEVADA CITIZENS. (Represents NO "TAX INCREASE")

HISTORY OF PRESENT FEE STRUCTURE: Office was established by the Nevada State Legislature during the 1969 session and became law on January 1, 1970. Fees were established in line with current amounts being charged by Justices of the Peace and minimum fees charged by wedding chapels.

PRESENT AND PROJECTED FINANCIAL IMPORTANCE FROM MARRIAGE COMMISSIONER OFFICE:

See attached schedule

ARE THERE ANY NEGATIVE ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN ADOPTING THIS BILL?

1. It would raise a once or twice in a life-time cost by a few dollars. However, in the overall cost of getting married this is negligible.
2. Would it discourage some couples from coming to Nevada to be married? Still would be less expensive than getting married anywhere else.
3. It has been estimated that every wedding in Nevada brings \$1,000<sup>00</sup> into our economy. This fee raise would not interfere with that spending ability.

NOTE CONCERNING FINANCIAL IMPACT OF A. B. 397 TO WASHOE AND CLARK COUNTIES

Under present rate schedule:

Clark County issued during 1974 exactly 50,200 Marriage Licenses

Clark County Marriage Commissioner handled 21,432 marriages or 42.7 per cent of those licenses issued for an average of \$13.00 per ceremony.

Clark-County-Marriage Commissioner's office thus received \$278, 616.00.

Average of \$13.00 is arrived at approximately by this procedure:

40 per cent of marriages are during regular hours and charged \$10.00 each  
60 per cent of marriages are during after hours, week-ends, and holidays and are charged \$15.00 each.

Washoe County issued during 1974 approximately 33,950 Marriage Licenses

Washoe County Marriage Commissioner handles 32 per cent of these licenses for approximately 10,864 ceremonies at an average rate of \$18.00 each.

Washoe County Marriage Commissioner's office thus received \$195,552.00.

COMBINED REVENUE FROM BOTH OFFICES BEFORE EXPENSES \$474,168.00.

IF A. B. 397 BECOMES LAW THE FOLLOWING REVENUE INCREASE CAN BE EXPECTED WITH NO ADDITIONAL COSTS WHATSOEVER TO THE INDIVIDUAL COUNTY:

Combined number of licenses issued both counties for 1974	84,150
Combined ceremonies handled by both Marriage Commissioners	32,296
Maximum possible decrease due to competitive and other factors such as recession , etc.: 10 per cent	- 3,230
Net number of weddings that will be handled by commissioner:	29,066

This would mean that 60 percent or 17,440 weddings would bring \$30.00 each in revenue for \$523,200.00 and that 40 per cent or 11,626 weddings would bring \$25.00 each in revenue for \$290,650.00.

≡ THESE TWO COMBINED AMOUNTS TOTAL:	\$813,850.00	≡
COMBINED TOTALS FOR 1974	\$474,168.00	

POTENTIAL INCREASE TO COUNTY GENERAL FUNDS WITH NO ADDED COST OF OPERATION:  
\$339,682.00

