

MINUTES

ASSEMBLY COMMERCE COMMITTEE

APRIL 26, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Harmon
Vice Chairman Mello
Mr. Demers
Mr. Sena
Mr. Weise

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Mr. Barengo
Mr. Price

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mrs. Hayes
Mr. Moody

GUESTS

Les Kofoed, Gaming Industry Association
Lorraine Arms, Reno Chamber of Commerce
Russell McDonald, Reno-Sparks Convention Authority
Dave Byington

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Harmon at 3:00 p.m.

Senate Joint Resolution 25

Les Kofoed, Gaming Industry Association, stated that the resolution speaks for itself and the reason for the resolution is that they are not getting anywhere with IRS. The last offer of the IRS is \$1200 across the board on keno, bingo and slots for reporting gaming payouts. The gaming industry has tried to explain that this \$1200 threshold on keno and slots will only accumulate "a mountain of papers" for the IRS and it is not a realistic figure. Senate Bill No. 1118, as introduced by Senators Cannon and Laxault, calls for a threshold of \$1200 on bingo, \$2500 on keno and \$5000 on slots. S.J.R. 25 is to show the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington that all of the people in Nevada are interested and concerned.

COMMITTEE ACTION

S.J.R. 25: Mr. Demers moved Do Pass, seconded by Mr. Weise. Motion carried.

Senate Bill 230

Lorraine Arms, Vice President of the Greater Reno Chamber of Commerce, presented the Chamber's official testimony in support of S.B. 230. A copy of Ms. Arms' testimony is attached as Exhibit I.

Mr. Russell McDonald stated that with the agreement of the Washoe County Commissioners he was representing the Reno-Sparks Convention Authority. Mr. McDonald said that this bill was introduced by Senators Raggio, Wilson, Young and Gojack although he had been commissioned to draft the bill for introduction independently. The bill was introduced before Mr. McDonald had negotiated introduction of his bill which the Authority had sponsored. There were some small differences with respect to the manner in which the 4 additional members would be appointed. However, in testifying before the Senate committee, a compromise was worked out, according to Mr. McDonald.

Mr. McDonald explained that the way S.B. 230 now stands, the Convention Authority of Reno-Sparks as heretofore created by their own action, with an advisory committee of the 4 representatives having the qualifications listed on lines 18 to 21, page 1, the four members will be blanketed in. This is patterned in part after the Clark County Authority but Washoe County District Attorney has ruled that because these people are gathered in as County Commissioners and City Councilmen as the original members, they cannot vote on a contract that would extend beyond their term of office for which they were elected as an elected official. Mr. McDonald therefore added on Page 2, Section 3 as it now reads. Mr. McDonald also explained other portions of the bill.

Mr. Weise stated he was interested in putting together what he had in A.B. 186 which was to create a mini-board at North Lake Tahoe wherein all revenue from the room tax collected there would go to Reno; it would take out the administrative cost; it would take out the current bond indebtedness and the balance would go back up to North Lake Tahoe. Mr. Weise said people up there feel they are in direct competition with Reno and they are competing for these tourists the same way Reno is. Mr. McDonald said that obviously since he represents the Convention Authority he would be opposed to Mr. Weise's amendments to A.B. 186 and also A.B. 186. Mr. McDonald would rather talk to the people on the Convention Authority and try to recognize any overage beyond service and operating expenses could be spread around.

Assembly Commerce Committee Minutes
April 26, 1977

Mr. McDonald further told Mr. Weise that if it was his intention to amend S.B. 230 that personally Mr. McDonald would oppose it.

Senate Bill 366

Dave Byington, Nevada State Life Underwriters Association, appeared in favor of S.B. 366 which has to do with licensing of fraternal agents. They feel that the consumers who buy life insurance from the fraternalists should be afforded the same protection and expertise of an insurance agent as any other life insurance agent in the State of Nevada. Mr. Mello asked where the grandfather clause was in the bill and it was pointed out to him.

COMMITTEE ACTION

S.B. 366: Mr. Demers moved Do Pass, seconded by Mr. Mello. Motion carried.

Mr. Weise stated he would like to offer amendment #991 to Senate Bill 230 and explained that the North Lake Tahoe area contributes a goodly amount of money to the fair and recreation department and they have received nothing back. They have purchased two golf courses, their own ski resort and their own bowling alley because none of these funds have come back. They really need an indoor pool. They will also pay their own share of current bond indebtedness. Mr. Weise stated the amendments he was submitting covered all of these questions.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. Weise moved that S.B. 230 be amended to include Amendment #911, seconded by Mr. Mello. Motion carried.

Mr. Weise moved Do Pass S.B. 230 as amended, seconded by Mr. Mello. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Jane Dunne
Assembly Attache

My name is Lorraine Arms and I am here as a Vice President of the Greater Reno Chamber of Commerce to present their official testimony in support of Senate Bill 230.

Four years ago we supported this legislation; however, opponents of the Bill, at that time, contended the Chamber was self serving because it was under contract to the Convention Authority for promotional funding. During the last Session, our Board did not take a stand for the same reason.

Now, however, the Greater Reno Chamber of Commerce has no funding from the Convention Authority. This history is intended only to give you background.

Today we continue to believe, as we did four years ago, that SB 230 has merit because it will place four voting members with experience in tourism, finance and directly related fields among the five members who are appointed by the three governmental bodies elected from Reno, Sparks and Washoe County.

Since the Convention Authority determines which four of twelve nominees will serve they have control over both qualifications and performance of these four lay members.

By the same token, the lay members can contribute a wealth of practical experience in tourism, hotel, resort and finance fields since it is assumed the Convention Authority members will accept only willing and knowledgeable candidates as nominees.

As for those selecting the candidates to present to the Convention Authority, it is to their best interests to find the highest caliber of individuals to submit as nominees.

Exhibit 1

more.....

This bill indicated the Chamber of Commerce will select the twelve nominees from four different categories. I can assure you and the members of the Convention Authority that we would consider this not only an honor, but a trust. While there is little doubt some highly qualified candidates could be found who are non-members, we would contend that Chamber members are involved in community activity because of their desire to create a better community and to also give something back of their time and effort.

As stated in my opening remarks, the Chamber no longer receives funding from the Convention Authority, nor does it intend to in the future. Therefore, there is no area where our participation could be considered self serving. We currently have an advisory member on the Authority and at no time has he been instructed by the Chamber Board nor the staff as to what recommendations to make. He is there because he is capable of representing the best interest of the total community.

A similar Bill has been successfully in effect in Clark County for a number of years. The only fundamental difference between Clark County and Washoe County is that our Chamber does not receive funding which should make our situation even less objectionable.

Thank you.

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

COMMERCE COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE April 26, 1977

SUBJECT S.J.R. 25

MOTION: _____

Do Pass Amend _____ Indefinitely Postpone _____ Reconsider _____

Moved by Mr. Demers Seconded by Mr. Weise

AMENDMENT _____

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

AMENDMENT _____

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

VOTE:	<u>MOTION</u>		<u>AMEND</u>		<u>AMEND</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Harmon	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mello	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Barengo	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Demers	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hayes	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Moody	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sena	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Weise	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

TALLY:

Original Motion: Passed Defeated _____ Withdrawn _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Attach to Minutes April 26, 1977
Date

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

COMMERCE COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE April 26, 1977

SUBJECT S.B. 230

MOTION: Amend & Do Pass

Do Pass Amend Indefinitely Postpone Reconsider

Moved by Mr. Weise Seconded by Mr. Mello

AMENDMENT

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

AMENDMENT

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

VOTE:	<u>MOTION</u>		<u>AMEND</u>		<u>AMEND</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Harmon	<u>x</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Mello	<u>x</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Barengo	<u>Not present</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Demers	<u>x</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Hayes	<u>Not present</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Moody	<u>Not present</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Price	<u>Not present</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Sena	<u>x</u>	___	___	___	___	___
Weise	<u>x</u>	___	___	___	___	___

TALLY:

Original Motion: Passed x Defeated Withdrawn

Amended & Passed Amended & Defeated

Amended & Passed Amended & Defeated

Attach to Minutes April 26, 1977
Date

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

COMMERCE COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE April 26, 1977

SUBJECT S.B. 366

MOTION: _____

Do Pass Amend _____ Indefinitely Postpone _____ Reconsider _____

Moved by Mr. Demers Seconded by Mr. Mello

AMENDMENT _____

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

AMENDMENT _____

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Harmon	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mello	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Barengo	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Demers	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hayes	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Moody	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	<u>Not present</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sena	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Weise	<u>x</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

TALLY:

Original Motion: Passed Defeated _____ Withdrawn _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Attach to Minutes April 26, 1977
Date