

Assembly

3-1048

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

April 18, 1975

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: ASSEMBLYMAN SCHOFIELD
ASSEMBLYMAN FORD

ALSO PRESENT: Assemblyman Heaney
Bob Warren, Nevada Bell
Mr. Lambert, N.H.P.
John A. Riggs, Chriss Mumm, Sparks Jaycees
Carrol Nevin, Crime Commission
Assemblyman Polish

(The following bills were discussed at this meeting: A.B. 571, A.B. 532, S.B. 107, A.B. 616, S.B. 421, A.B. 565, A.B. 509)

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

The first bill on the agenda to be discussed was A.B. 571, which increases compensation and maximum traveling allowances of members of state board of registered professional engineers, redesignates one of its officers and requires appointment of executive secretary.

Mr. Fred Daniels testified. Mr. Daniels stated that there are two points in this bill. The first one would allow them a salary and travel expenses up to \$60.00 a day. Assembly Bill 571 will limit that to \$40.00 per day. The wish to have an executive secretary that works for the board, but is not a member of the board. There have been some problems with persons working on the board and acting as executive secretary at the same time. It causes internal problems.

The next bill to be discussed was A.B. 565, which increases county hospital trustee compensation in certain counties.

3-

Mr. Polish testified. This bill refers to small counties. Mr. Polish stated that it would be limited not to exceed \$80. The other trustees would get from \$35.00 not to exceed \$70.00.

Mr. Polish stated that this bill came out of White Pine County.

Mr. Dini asked if all small counties were paying trustees.

Mr. Polish stated no. He indicated that White Pine had on this basis. It was changed at the last session.

The next bill to be discussed was S.B. 107, which authorizes governor to enter into interstate law enforcement mutual aid agreements.

Mr. Lambert of the Nevada Highway Patrol testified. He stated that the basis for requesting this bill was the need for exchange of mutual police aid with states such as California and Utah. During the governor's conference in 1973. He indicated that for both state, California and Nevada, members have crossed over to handle emergencies. There is a problem of legality of being in another state.

This bill enables us to get into mutual aid agreements where the units will be able to respond legally.

Mr. Carrol Nevin of the Crime Commission testified. He stated that he felt sure that the governor is aware of the necessity of such agreements and of the necessity for specificity concerning limitations and responsibilities which must be place on out of state or federal police agencies. Mr. Nevin indicated that we should be sure that when we make these agreements that there is a definite limitation on the time that they will be in force and also on the responsibilities and limitations that are placed on them. We do not want to enter into agreements that would allow authorities from California to make investigations concerning Nevada matters that are not of real interest to them but they could use this as an excuse to make investigations. They should be limited as to time and what they will be doing here in Nevada.

Mr. May indicated that he did not see any limitation on the length of the compact or agreement. He indicated that any governor might extend it which would be binding on the state.

Mr. Nevin stated that he felt that those items should be included in the agreement that the governor enters into.

Mr. Warren testified next. He stated that this bill provides the governor with the capability of ordering cooperation of county, city and state. He indicated that this was amended in the Senate. Mr. Warren indicated that the League of Cities supports this legislation.

The next bill to be discussed was A.B. 532, which authorizes cities to establish tax increments areas within prescribed limitations.

Mayor Lillard testified and submitted a written copy of his testimony to the committee which is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof.

Mr. Alex Fittinghoff of the City of Sparks testified. He stated that he was the Community Development Coordinator for the City of Sparks.

Mr. Fittinghoff presented a chart to the committee, which he then explained. Mr. Fittinghoff stated that the thrust of the program is to attempt to entice private capital into an area that has been declining. He stated that they want to have an image of going forward. He stated that taxes through public investment would rise. It is their contention that at no time will they capture any more than 2-1/2% of the tax base. They will limit the geographical area and tax base to 5%. No more than 2-1/2% will go back into the fund and into public works. Mr. Fittinghoff stated that there were several errors in the bill. Page 3, line 37, the word "not" should be stricken.

Mr. Dini indicated that on line 38, if you take out not he thought it should be does not exceed. Mr. Fittinghoff stated that he had no argument with that.

Mr. Fittinghoff stated that on page 6, line 45, the next to the last word should be "by" and not "be".

Mr. Fittinghoff stated that Section 20 deals with cooperative agreements with the federal government. This is unnecessary and the entire section can be taken out. He indicated that these would not happen. This is redundant and not necessary. This is a local job with local money.

Mr. Fittinghoff stated that Subsection 2 of Section 18 was not entirely necessary and that if it was taken out it would not affect the bill.

Mr. Dini asked if on line 49 pages 7 and 8 if they were going outside of the debt limit. Mr. Fittinghoff stated that if it was a problem that it could be taken out. He indicated that this was a district by district activity.

Mayor Lillard testified next. He indicated that they realize that Reno put in a bill. They met with the Washoe County Delegation with some ideas. Their delegation suggested that rather than try to amend it to propose their own bill. This is simply a self-help program. They would be happy to keep it simple and workable.

Mr. Soderblum of the Nevada Railroad Association testified next. He indicated that their objection to this bill is that it diverts taxes for another purpose. It would complicate the system as it now exists. He indicated that a tax increment area would be formed to select a few taxpayers to shoulder this. Only the property owners in this area would share the burden. They could be saddled for 50 years. He stated that Mr. Latimore suggested that there should be an amendment to the bill to exclude property of a public utility under

the jurisdiction of the ICC from any tax increment area. Mayor Lillard agrees that this amendment would be justified under those circumstances. This bill does not involve any area involving a rail-road right-of-way.

He proposed the following amendment:

"Property of a public utility subject to the jurisdiction of the ICC may not be included in any tax increment area created under the provisions of this act."

Mr. Bob Warren of the League of Cities feels that this is a useful and proper tool. He stated that this creates new revenues that do not exist now.

Mr. Fittinghoff stated that they do not want to alter the tax system. All they want is a definite process of allocation to districts.

The next bill on the agenda to be discussed was A.B. 616, which provides for statewide emergency telephone number.

Assemblyman Murphy testified. He indicated that this came about through various sources and various interested people. The Jaycees have been interested in it. In 1974 he discussed it with Bob Galli. Mr. Murphy indicated that this provides for a five year period to create the 911 number. Mr. Murphy stated that the people find the idea palatable. Mr. Murphy indicated that 5 years was a reasonable time period for planning for the telephone companies and for the law enforcement agencies. Mr. Murphy stated that this was a very popular idea. Mr. Murphy then deferred to Mr. Heaney.

Assemblyman Heaney testified next. He stated that he was an endorser with Mr. Murphy and Mr. Mello and 36 co-sponsors. He indicated that he would like to give some background with respect to the development of the bill in terms of his involvement. He stated that this number was entirely new to him. He contacted Mr. Warren of Nevada Bell. Mr. Heaney stated that he also made contact with Neol Clark of the Public Service Commission. He also contacted Mr. John Riggs with the Nevada Jaycees. He stated that they had an interest in this concept.

Mr. Heaney referred to A.B. 333, which provides for free access to the operator without the insertion of a coin. He stated that any type of emergency service can be obtained. You may go as far as you wish. He indicated that some of the areas that can be covered are law enforcement, fire, poison control, civil defense and disaster. It can be used as a "hot line". Mr. Heaney stated that this developed 30 years ago in England. Their number in England is "999". The interest in the United States was developed in 1960s. Mr. Heaney stated that there have been a number of cities that have adopted the number. New York has been using this number. Mr. Heaney stated that at this point there are only two states that have recognized the 911 number. Massachusetts in 1972. California

was the pioneer in 1972. Mr. Heaney stated that this was patterned after the California bill. Mr. Heaney stated that this bill was drafted to fit the particular needs of Nevada. They have tried to involve local governments. He stated that if Nevada does pass this act, we would be the first state to make available on a statewide basis a 911 emergency number. He believes that we would be first to provide on a coin free basis for pay telephones.

He then discussed the bill itself with the committee. Mr. Heaney stated that the one major problem was financing. It could be funded by either the state or by local governments. Mr. Heaney stated that it should be with local governments, in terms of the financing burden. Mr. Heaney stated that the system and concept are valid. The primary concern in an emergency situation is getting help. The critical factor is response time. Anything we can do to cut down response time is important. 911 attempts to do that. He stated that it is convenient and easy to remember. Mr. Heaney stated that by one telephone call you can get all of the kinds of emergency answers that you need. 911 is a useful concept.

Mr. Warren of Nevada Bell testified next. They are not against the bill. In January of 1968 the number was made available. All of the telephone companies had to agreed on what the number was going to be. All agencies using it agreed that they would share in it.

Mr. Warren stated that they would have the responsibility to make the conditions of the number known. He stated that it was not a marketing type of service. The public safety agencies have to agree on it. Mr. Warren stated that all agencies must use it. Mr. Warren stated that all agencies have to agree as to where it is located. The anticipated cost would be \$641,000. To do it sooner would bring about conditions that would be difficult for them to meet. Space would be a problem.

Mr. Warren indicated that he would like some changes made in the bill. Section 18, subsection G. He feels that as to the committee these people should be from the telephone company.

Mr. Warren next discussed cost. He stated that they do not endorse pass along tax. They would also like to have section 26 redone. The 1980 time frame is okay on the basic service arrangement. The time frame may be too short for a sophisticated arrangement. The sophisticated arrangement would bring many lines into a switchboard.

Mr. Norris of the Central Telephone Company of Las Vegas testified next. He stated that Central Telephone has made several proposals. They stand ready to provide service. Depending upon the sophistication of the system, they would like to have a bit more flexibility in the five year time period for providing for this service. Many of the services will have to be developed from scratch. They do not feel that there should be a pass along tax. They do feel that there should be specific representatives on the committee from the telephone industry. The dial tone first will cost their company over the next five years about \$1,000,000. He indicated that they are contemplating a much better type of pay phone. They have given

telephone service in Las Vegas considerable study.

Mr. Denton of Continental Telephone testified next. He stated that he agrees with the two other companies. The expense in providing this service will be very high. He would hope that the funding would not be placed only on the customers but on all citizens of the state. Also, the funding should not appear on a customer's bill.

He referred to paragraph G of Section 18 which states that two persons with expertise in telephone communications be placed on the board. He stated that that should be more specific. The words "from the telephone industry" should be added. Other than that the bill is good. He stated that there were presently two communities utilizing it.

Mr. John A. Riggs, President of the Sparks Jaycees testified... They have been pushing for this for several years. The Nevada Jaycees support this 100%. They will provide as much public relations help as they can. The basic reason for their involvement is public safety. He stated that any child would be able to dial 911 if it were put on the telephone. Anyone can dial it.

He stated that each Jaycee President will assign a chairman to help law enforcement agencies and public safety agencies. A copy of a statement submitted by Mr. Riggs is attached hereto and incorporated in these minutes.

Bob Galli testified next. He stated that he was very much in favor of the general concept of 911. He does, however, have some very strong reservations about the mandate by 1980. This is not a practical date. He does have extreme concern about the cost factors. He stated that this could be a complex system.

Mr. Jacka of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department testified next. He supports the concept of 911. They have been involved in this in several states. He stated that if you have a basic system such as Henderson does, it would be a low cost item. They feel that they need a sophisticated system. There are space problems and equipment problems. They have been unable to get firm prices in the past. You have to define the system before you can get the amount that it will cost. He stated that Clark County has to have a sophisticated system. He suggested that the advisory board go to work immediately to determine which jurisdictions need this.

The board should get the total cost breakdown, to obtain federal fund commitments on a firm basis and to report back to the legislature on the progress and to fix a firm implementation date on that point.

He feels that the highway patrol should be represented on the board.

He also feels that the \$25.00 should be raised to what was for other boards. They should be given more authority other than the review situation.

Mr. Lambert of the Highway Patrol testified next. He would like to have a representative from the Highway Patrol on the board. He would recommend amending Section 18 to include them. They do support the emergency statewide system. They will have to coordinate with all local 911 call boards. There would be a lack of adequate telephones, more so in the rural areas. If this system is going to be instituted, it should be more closely looked at. He supports Mr. Jacka and Mr. Galli in their position about the 1980 deadline.

Mr. Bob Edmondson testified next. He stated that their counsel supports the legislation. They see certain problems with it.

With regard to section 18, medical care is referred to throughout the bill. There is no representative of medical care on the board. He stated that with regard to page 2, section 10, the referral method is worse than what we have now. He recommends the deletion of Section 10.

Ms. Chappel of the Emergency Medical Services testified next. He stated that this has been discussed for four years. They strongly support the concept of this bill.

She strongly supports the bill but does see some problems but that these problems can be worked out. She does not feel that it is necessary to study it for two years. Their office will assist in every possible.

Mr. Noel Clark stated that he would not testify but would be willing to answer questions.

Mr. Chris Mumm of the Sparks Jaycees testified next. He stated that at least a basic system should be in operation by 1980.

Mr. David Haneline of the Reno Police Department testified next. They support this project. They do find some problems with the funding. You must have a central dispatch system. There is a jurisdictional problem.

Mr. Carrol Nevin of the Crime Commission testified next. There is no question about the need for this program. He does agree with Mr. Galli and Mr. Jacka.

Mr. Heaney suggested that the burden be on local government. He mentioned that the subscribers should bear some expense.

Mr. John Kimball stated that it would be very meaningful for senior citizens to have this 911 number.

Mr. Stan Warren stated that everyone should have a basic system by 1980. There would be some duplication of costs if it were done that way.

Mr. Barry Towne of the Sparks Police Department stated that they support Bob Galli's position.

Mr. Heaney stated that he is concerned about stopping with just a study. He proposed that he and Assemblyman Murphy and the telephone companies and law enforcement agencies get together as an ad hoc subcommittee to work out the amendments and to come back to the committee within one week with a uniform batch of amendments for the committee's consideration.

Mr. May stated that Mr. Heaney be given a week to develop amendments and proposed changes and to report back to the committee and Mr. Harmon seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield and Mrs. Ford were not present at the time of the vote.

The committee took the following action:

S.B. 421. Mr. Young moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield and Mrs. Ford were not present at the time of the vote.

A.B. 571. Mr. May for an amend and do pass which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Schofield and Mrs. Ford were not present at the time of the vote.

A.B. 532. Mr. Dini appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Young and Mr. Murphy with regard to this bill. Mr. Young stated that they will speak to Mr. Gray about this bill.

S.B. 107. Mr. May stated that he would like to work up some amendments. The committee will hold this bill.

A.B. 565. Mr. Craddock moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. Mr. Dini questioned the filing fee in this bill.

Mr. May indicated that the committee should let Mr. Polish check it out when he goes home.

Mr. Craddock withdrew his motion for a do pass. The committee will hold this bill.

A.B. 509. Mr. Dini referred to the amendments on this bill which Mr. Cathcart had presented to the committee a copy of which is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof.

Mr. Young moved for indefinite postponement which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. All of the members were in favor of the motion and it carried unanimously. Mr. May did not vote. Mr. Schofield and Mrs. Ford were not present at the time of the meeting.

Mr. Young moved for indefinite postponement of A.B. 565, which was seconded by Mr. May. All of the members were in favor of the motion and it carried unanimously. Mr. Craddock and Mr. Moody did not vote. Mr. Schofield and Mrs. Ford were not present at the time of the vote.

There being no further business to come before the meeting,

April 18, 1975

1056
3'

the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara Gomez
Committee Secretary

ASSEMBLY

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON.....
 Friday,
 Date April 18, 1975.....Time 8:00 A.M. Room 214.....

3- 1047

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

THIS AGENDA SUPERSEDES AGENDA FOR FRIDAY,
 APRIL 18, 1975

- A.B. 532 Authorizes cities to establish tax increments areas within prescribed limitations.
 Notify: Mr. Mello
- A.B. 565 Increases county hospital trustee compensation in certain counties.
 NOTIFY: Mr. Polish
- A.B. 571 Increases compensation and maximum traveling allowances of members of state board of registered professional engineers, redesignates one of its officers and requires appointment of executive secretary.
 NOTIFY: Board of Engineers
- S.B. 107 Authorizes governor to enter into interstate law enforcement mutual aid agreements.
 NOTIFY: Carrol Nevin, Crime Commission
 Governor's Office.
- A.B. 616 Provides for statewide emergency telephone number.
 NOTIFY: PAT MURPHY
- S.B. 421 Validates securities, voted and nonvoted, securities issued in anticipation of the issuance of such securities and proceedings pertaining to such securities.
 NOTIFY:

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

3-1057

GUEST REGISTER

DATE: April 18, 1975

NAME	BILL #	REPRESENTING	TESTIFYING
Jim Lillard	532	Mayor - Sparks	yes
Alfred Fitzhugh	532	City of Sparks	yes
Wayne K. Davis ✓	616	Central Telephone Co.	yes.
Carl A. Anderson	532	Trav. RR. Assoc.	yes
Richard Denton ✓	616	Continental Telephone	yes
Fred Daniels	571	Prof. Engr. Regs. Bd	yes
GINO DEL CARLO	616	MYSELF	NO
STAN WARREN ✓	616	NEVADA BELL	YES
David Noroline ✓	616	Reno Police Dept	YES
Rita Chappell ✓	616	State EMS	yes
JOHN Carroll	548	DMU	no
BILL FITZPATRICK			
Bob Halli ✓			
John Riggs ✓			
Not clark.			
Bob Edmondson ✓			

Statement of Mayor James C. Lillard, Mayor of Sparks, Nevada

3 1058

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, as the Mayor of Sparks I am here before you to testify in support of Assembly Bill 532, which if passed, will enable the cities of Nevada, through their respective city councils, to establish local self help programs in areas and neighborhoods which require public investment, in the form of public works, to create an attractive climate for private investment. The tax increment financing technique proposed in this bill is neither a new concept nor new to Nevada. Communities in other states have used this technique to a great extent over a period of many years. Section 279.676 of the Nevada Revised Statutes provides for use of this technique to raise the local matching share in urban renewal projects.

For some time the leadership of Sparks has been concerned about the deteriorating condition of our Town Center. Early in 1973 Sparks held a 3-day "Growth for Sparks" Conference, with some 150 concerned citizens, businessmen, professional and lay persons in attendance. The conferees agreed that the revitalization of the Town's Center should be the number 1 priority, and that the effort should be spearheaded by the city. In response to this problem, a Town Center Committee, comprised of residents, business

leaders, and property owners has been organized and has been studying the problems and potentials of our Town's Center for some 14 months.

While their work is not yet complete and the final plan and rehabilitation programs are not scheduled for final City Council action until September of this year, work is progressing well. Preliminary conclusions lead us to believe that given a few financial tools, and a lot of hard work by all persons affected, the Town Center can be rehabilitated to once again play its important role as the center of economic and social activity of our community. While we have concluded from our work to date that drastic surgery, like urban renewal is not necessary nor desirable in our situation, the rehabilitation of our Town Center and other areas of our city can be accomplished through the judicious application of public funds in order to attract private investment. The tax increment financing technique which this bill will establish will permit a City Council, after appropriate public hearings, to concentrate public

investment in capital improvements with the taxes generated by new

3-1060

private investment itself. In a nutshell, it is a neighborhood self help program.

The bill does not, and I repeat, does not propose to increase the tax rate for any individual or group of property owners; rather it proposes to reallocate a small percentage of tax revenues generated by new construction into a fund which would be used to construct public works such as parking facilities, streets, sidewalks, and public plazas which are necessary to stimulate private investment.

Mr. Chairman, we are not here before you today advocating a concept which does not have a broad base of support. Besides enthusiastic support from our Town Center Committee members we have spent a considerable amount of time discussing this concept with members of the legislature and various state officials. I have personally discussed this matter with the Governor who has indicated his support for the

concept. Additionally, I have sought and received the advice and ^{3- 1061}

support of the chief administrative officer of the Nevada Tax Commission,

Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Bruce Arkell, the State Planning Coordinator.

In conclusion, let me reiterate what Assembly Bill 532 will do and will

not do.

1. The bill will permit the City Council of any city in the state to initiate self help programs in areas which require them by constructing or reconstructing necessary public improvements.

2. The bill will not increase property taxes or tax rates but will make it possible to reallocate tax revenues in a very limited way.

3. The bill does not expand the powers of the City Council beyond those existing in the city charters and general laws in any way other than the manner in which taxes are allocated for a very small segment of a city and in a very controlled manner.

Mr. Alex Fittinghoff, the Community Development Coordinator

3-1062


for our city is here with me today and is prepared to explain how the
tax increment financing program would work and to answer your
technical questions.

Thank You,

AB616

3-1063

"U.S. JAYCEES CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM"



Chuck Ivery
Program Manager
U. S. Jaycees

U. S. JAYCEES
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM
P. O. Box 7, TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74102
PHONE: (918) 584-2481

TO: MEMBERS OF THE NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
FROM: JOHN A. RIGGS, CHAIRMAN, CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM, NEVADA JAYCEES
SUBJECT: 911 HOTLINE

I am writing you this note to seek your help and support for a Nevada Jaycee Program: 911 Emergency Hotline.

This idea has been discussed with certain members of the Legislature and appropriate legislation has been requested by Assemblymen Heaney and Murphy. Several members of the Senate and Assembly already know about this program and are willing to support a proposed bill to make this invaluable public program into law.

This is an outstanding program in that it will save lives, property, and time in getting the corresponding official and/or service to the scene of need in the shortest amount of time after the placed call is received.

The theme of system being, you dial 911 and are connected to a public service emergency switchboard. Immediately, you are then connected to the proper official or agency handling your needed service, whether, police, fire, ambulance, etc.

This program has proven itself in New York and other large cities. Also, it has been tried in several communities here in Nevada. For instance, it is working well in Fallon for fire and ambulance. It is in effect in Humboldt County, Boulder County and Henderson, though, exact results are not known.

Success of the 911 Hotline depends on public relations work in educating the public in general and personnel connected with operating the switchboard and handling the services.

American Telephone Company (Bell of Nevada) has indicated its willingness to assist with installation of this system, if adopted state-wide. Preliminary research indicates that there is a good possibility that LEEA and or other federal agencies will supply necessary funding. Completed data regarding funding will be assembled shortly, and presented at time of hearings on this proposed bill.

Your consideration and support will be appreciated.

Reply address: John A. Riggs
610 Mill Street
Reno, Nevada 89502

Sincerely,
John A. Riggs
John A. Riggs

Recommended Amendments to A. B. 509
as presented to Government Affairs Committee

Page 1 - Section 3, Paragraph 1, line 8--delete [without limitation]; insert after "includes",
such as but not limited to.

Page 1 - Section 4, Paragraph 1, line 20--delete [and]; insert or.

Page 2 - Section 4, Paragraph 2--delete paragraph in its entirety; insert "Chief administrative officer" means the person directly responsible to the governing body for the proper administration of that particular entity.

Page 3 - Section 9, Paragraph 2, line 9--insert after "officer", or the governing body.

Page 3 - Section 9, Paragraph 2, line 13 and 14--delete [submitted at the next regular or special meeting of the governing body for ratification]; insert reported to the governing body at its next regular meeting.

Page 3 - Section 10, line 19--insert after "bidders qualifications", including past performance.

Page 4 - Section 18, Paragraph 2, line 44--delete [presented at]; insert reported to.

Page 4 - Section 18, Paragraph 2, line 45--delete [or special] and [for ratification by a majority].

Page 4 - Section 19, Paragraph 1, line 48--insert after "no", authorized representative or.

Page 5 - Section 19, Paragraph 1, line 1--delete [such]; insert after "a member", of such governing body.

Page 6 - Section 25, Paragraph 2, line 22--delete [local].

Page 6 - Section 28, Paragraph 1 and 2, lines 32 through 40--delete total section 28.

Page 7 - Section 30, Paragraph 1 through 5, lines 18 through 48--NOTE: The present NRS 334.030 is ok. All deletions should be put back. All insertions should be taken out.

Submitted by,
Joseph Cathcart
Purchasing Director, City of Las Vegas
April 7, 1975