

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 15, 1977

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 A. M.
Senator Floyd R. Lamb was in the chair.

PRESENT: Senator Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman
Senator James I. Gibson, Vice-Chairman
Senator Eugene V. Echols
Senator Norman D. Glaser
Senator Norman Ty Hilbrecht
Senator Thomas R. C. Wilson
Senator C. Clifton Young

OTHERS: Ronald W. Sparks, Chief deputy, Fiscal Analysis
Howard Barrett, Budget Director
Cy Ryan, UPI
Daisy J. Talvitie, President, League of Women Voters of Nevada
Vernon Bennett, Executive Officer, Public Employees Retirement System
Senator Richard H. Bryan
James Lien, Dept. Exec. Director, Department of Taxation

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Bennett to speak on S. B. 463. He asked Senator Hilbrecht to take the chair during this presentation.

S. B. 463: Increases percentage of salary used to determine pensions of district judges. Mr. Bennett said that the Retirement System was opposed to the provisions of this bill which basically provides that the retirement benefit for a district court judge will go from 4.1666 percent for each year of service to 8.332 percent for each year of service or, in effect, double the service credits. The Legislative Interim Retirement Committee that will be formed in S. B. 173 indicated on some similar legislation last week that the Committee would like to defer those actions so that the committee could make a two year study. The concern the Board has is that presently in PERS their members pay 8% of compensation to receive a benefit equivalent to 2 1/2%. The District Court Judges and Supreme Court Justices receive a retirement benefit without contribution and the Board feels that to double the percentage from 4% to 8% is going to have a detrimental effect on the other retirement systems that have to contribute because their members are going to start demanding the same thing. There are already members who ask why they can't have the same benefits the district court judges have and there are members who ask why they have to pay when District Court Judges and Supreme Court Justices do not. The Board feels that any person in a retirement system should have to pay contributions and the Board hopes to meet with the Committee during the next two years on the principle that retirement contributions should be made to obtain the retirement benefits, but the Board feels it would be very detrimental at this time to double the benefits for District Court Judges when no study has been made. Senator Hilbrecht asked if it was his testimony that whatever the Committee does with the judges retirement fund ought to await the study which is hoped will occur during the next two years. Mr. Bennett said they felt that the doubling of benefits should wait until a study could be made. There were no questions and Senator Hilbrecht asked Senator Bryan to speak on S. B. 367.

S. B. 367: Revises Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Act. Senator Bryan said this bill represents a compromise which was effected during the course of hearings on the Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Act. There were two initially divergent positions. The Department of Taxation's bill was S. B. 113 which proposed that the administration of the act be conducted exclusively by the Department of Taxation and the conflicting position, at least expressed by some

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 15, 1977
PAGE TWO

assessors and particularly the assessor in Clark County, who wanted to retain the administration at the local level. The compromise that was worked out was to provide for optional provisions. Those assessors that wished to conduct the administration may do so under the provisions of the bill in its first reprinted form and those who wish the Department of Taxation to do so have that option with them. The basic provisions deal with:

1. A definition of mobile home lot, which is contained in Section I of the bill; this sets out some administrative clarification provisions as to residence and domicile;

2. A statutory determination found on page 2, line 1, 17 as opposed to 15 percent senior citizens approximates their contribution towards residential property taxes. The bill as amended would limit the income eligibility to \$10,000 which is the present law and which again represented a compromise from the assessor's bill which would have established the figure at \$12,000.

There are, in addition to the 17% provision, an additional liberalizing provision which is found on page 4, and that is the income range category. There were originally 8 different categories. For administrative purposes those categories have been reduced in number as indicated in lines 23 through 26, so that now there are only four categories. The rest of the changes are just clarification in terms of the administration of the act. He said he believed that the fiscal impact is projected to be about \$1.2 million. There was an additional fiscal impact as a result of allowing the assessors to, at their option, participate in the administration of the program. That feeling was rather strongly expressed by the Clark County Assessor. This will be about \$43,000 in addition. He said he believed that for the present biennium they were projecting a cost of about \$800,000 for the program in its present form.

Mr. Lien explained some of the changes in the bill, in answer to questions from the Committee. He said that the fiscal impact for the second year was \$1.34 million; he said these figures for the two years include the refunds, the county administration and the additional costs etc. of the department to administer the program, which were not built into the original department's budget.

Senator Lamb asked Mrs. Talvitie to speak on S. B. 388.

S. B. 388: Establishes multipurpose service programs for certain homemakers in later life. Mrs. Talvitie prefaced her remarks by giving some statistics on the retirement system of the U. S. Military System policies for widows of retired military men. Also the entitlement under Social Security of divorced mothers. She read from a prepared statement, copy attached. She answered some questions from the Committee; Senator Lamb said the Committee had heard her testimony, but he reminded them that the bill had already been acted on and the Committee would have to revive the bill so he asked the Committee to keep their questions to her relative to the testimony she had given. Mrs. Talvitie thanked the Committee for giving her the opportunity to appear before them.

Senator Lamb asked the Committee to consider S. B 463.

S. B. 463: Increases percentage of salary used to determine pensions of District Judges.

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 15, 1977
PAGE THREE

Senator Echols moved that the Committee indefinitely postpone; Senator Wilson seconded and the motion carried.

S. B. 367: Revises Senior Citizen's Property Tax Assistance Act. Mr. Barrett said that this bill would result in \$29,000 over the budgeted figure in the first year and \$144,000 beyond the budget in the second year. Senator Hilbrecht said that a good deal of the increase results from the material on page 4, particularly raising the threshold to \$12,000 plus providing counties the ability to receive up to \$10 on each claim they process, which is not now being done. At the present time the Department of Taxation processes them all and they receive a \$2.00 charge for receiving it. In Clark County, they would handle it all, and the state would pay them to handle it. In effect the bill relieves the Taxation Department of that responsibility and the assessor is taking it up and is being paid for it. Mr. Barrett said they did recommend a change in the present law. He said the present law only spends about \$800,000. Senator Wilson asked what part of the fiscal note is caused by this bill and what part of the impact on the fiscal note is caused by the executive budget. Mr. Barrett said the changes on page 4 are the changes that cause the increase from the \$800,000 to \$1.2 million. The reason it goes beyond the \$1.2 is that they made a later estimate.

Senator Gibson said he understood that there was a bill on the other side that has a bit more expense attached. Senator Hilbrecht said this bill was the more conservative of the two. Senator Gibson said that so far in this program the applicants have been fewer than projected; what would happen if there were more, a supplemental?

Mr. Barrett said if it happened in the first year they would use money from the second year and in the second year they would have to come to the Legislature for a supplemental. Senator Glaser moved the Committee do pass; Senator Hilbrecht seconded and the motion carried.

Senator Young asked how the Legislature stood as regards the Governor's budget. How much has it been exceeded; have there been any estimates made with regard to what revenue projections are to be in the surplus. Mr. Sparks said they were about \$1.4 million over the first year and a little over \$1 million in the second year. The action taken since he last made the projection has not affected the figures materially. In the C.I.P. about \$12. million in total was cut but not all general fund. He said he was expecting the sales and use tax figures later in the day. He said the Governor had recommended that they leave \$22. million surplus and he said the surplus would be at least \$22. million and probably a little higher.

Senator Lamb referred the Committee to S.C.R. 26.

S.C.R. 26: Authorizes expenditure from legislative fund for travel, subsistence and honorarium to Mr. Hardin Jones. Senator Lamb said they had a conference and he would like some direction. Senator Young moved that the Senate Finance Committee hold on this; Senator Hilbrecht seconded and the motion carried.

Mr. Sparks said the only budgets he was aware of that had not been acted on are the Counsel Bureau budgets and there are salary adjustments to be made on those.

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 15, 1977
PAGE FOUR

S. B. 312: Extends time for termination of Nevada American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The assembly has amended this bill on line 21. They are changing the date to conform with the rest of the bill.

Senator Hilbrecht moved the Senate Committee concur; Senator Wilson seconded and the motion carried.

S. B. 388: Establishes multipurpose service programs for certain homemakers in later life. Senator Lamb said they had heard testimony on this bill earlier. Senator Wilson moved for reconsideration; Senator Hilbrecht seconded and Senator Lamb asked for a vote. Senator Wilson said he might be able to persuade them in a discussion. The Committee voted against reconsideration. Senator Echols, Wilson and Hilbrecht voted for reconsideration and Senators Young, Lamb, Glaser and Gibson voted against.

S. B. 424: Increases annual salaries for elected state officers. Mr. Sparks gave each member a copy of the Salaries of Top Administrative Official By State. The comparative salaries were discussed. Mr. Barrett said the salaries in the bill were the result of a study made by Personnel and the Supreme Court. Senator Lamb gave them a list in increases since 1963:

Governor:	150%
Supreme Court Justices:	160%
Attorney General:	135%
District Judges:	150%
Secretary of State:	178%
Controller:	150%
Treasurer:	150%
Lieutenant Governor:	122%

and if they went with the pay raise from \$60 to \$80, the Legislature would increase 100%. Senator Lamb said these would be the increases if the Committee adopted S. B. 424. Mr. Barrett said there were some discrepancies in the list they were looking at. He said he had more accurate figures in his office.

A. B. 483: Makes appropriation to division of travel and tourism of department of economic development to continue advertising campaign to attract tourists to Nevada. Senator Lamb read amendments which had been added: Amend Section I, page 1, delete lines 2,3,4 and insert: "to the Department of Economic Development the sum of \$200,000 to be used as follows: for industrial development in Clark and Washoe Counties \$100,000 pro rated between the counties on the basis of their populations and determined by the last National Census of the Bureau of Census of the United States, Department of Commerce; for the development of tourism and industry in the remainder of the state, \$100,000. No amounts may be allocated for local projects under this section unless it is matched with an equivalent amount from local sources." Amend the title of the bill to read "An act making appropriation to the Department of Economic Development to assist in developing industry and tourism throughout the state and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Gibson moved the Committee amend and do pass; Senator Echols seconded. Senator Young asked if the money in the rural counties was to be apportioned according to population. This will be used in any amounts for which they can provide matching money, Senator Gibson said. Senator Young said he had some reservations about that, but he was not enthusiastic about the whole thing anyway, so it did not make much difference. Senator Gibson said this had been working all right as it

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 15, 1977
PAGE FIVE

was handled with the appropriation made two years ago. In this bill the small counties are not governed by population figures, they just have to match the money.

Senator Lamb asked for a vote and it passed with one dissenting vote by Senator Young.

The Committee went back to consideration of S. B. 424. Senator Gibson said they should talk about the Attorney General's salary as compared with the District Judges. He said the District Attorney and Sheriff in Clark County are going to receive \$40,000 under the local government increases. The District Judges will get \$40,000 in this bill and the Attorney General will only get \$37,000. He felt there should be some relativity. Senator Gibson referred to his papers and said that the District Attorney in Clark County was presently making more money than the Attorney General, so he felt the figures would be all right. Senator Lamb read the proposed salaries:

Governor:	\$47,000
Lieutenant Governor:	\$ 8,000
Supreme Court Justices:	\$43,000
Attorney General:	\$37,000
District Judges:	\$40,000
Secretary of State:	\$30,333
Controller:	\$27,000
Treasurer:	\$27,000

The salaries were discussed in relation to salaries received in other states. Mr. Barrett said his office had made a study in August, 1977 and they compared the proposed salaries to his most recent ones.

Senator Glaser moved the amendments be adopted and the bill passed; Senator Echols seconded and the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 A. M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:



MURIEL P. MOONEY, SECRETARY

APPROVED:



FLOYD R. LAMB, CHAIRMAN

by

Daisy J. Talvitie, President

The League of women Voters considers S. B. 388 as one of the most important bills before this Legislature, as it seeks to solve one of the most critical problems facing women today. To me it is a bill to which I can give a great deal of personal committment. I have been asked by the League to present to you as much information, as it relates to the bill, that comes from personal experience.

My own mother was a widow at age 49. I became a widow in my fifties. And out of six men in my husband's family, of his generation, only one is still alive today. Of those who died at an early age, one death occurred at about 35, another at about 45, another became totally disabled in his late forties, with his wife assuming the responsibility of the family support. My own husband died at age 56.

All of these women in my family would be classified as displaced homemakers. They had chosen the role of homemaker and had not worked outside the home (since the date of their marriage or the birth of their first child) except in volunteer activities.

Believe me, I know the problem well. In my mother's case-- although this was a number of years ago--the same identical problem would be present today. The laws have not changed as related to the problem, and my mother found herself suddenly with absolutely no source of income. Since my father died while still working-- in fact on the job--she had no eligibility for assistance under his retirement pension. His death was from a heart attack, which

was, undoubtedly, brought on by the stress from his job at the particular time. ^{Settlement from the company was payment of funeral expenses and the cost of moving her out of the company house.} NIC benefits are still questionable.

She was too young for Social Security benefits. Even today she would have been ineligible for Federal welfare assistance because of physical disability and her children were past 18 years of age. There was then, and still would be, no unemployment benefits because she had been engaged in unpaid labor at home.

She was not eligible for health plan benefits and, even today, it is extremely difficult to find a health insurance policy for an unemployed person. I just went through that process in the case of my daughter, and finally did find two available policies. In my mother's case, we were able to get insurance coverage for her through my sister's policy with Blue Cross-Blue Shield, which is not operative in Nevada.

In other words, the displaced homemaker falls within the cracks of all existing Federal income assistance programs. My mother had only a high school education, no job experience, no recognizable job skills except those she had performed as supportive services in my father's work. No employer was willing to give her credit for that as experience. One literature source--the report from the National Commission on the ^{I. W. Y.} ~~Status of Women~~, 1976--quotes from a bill before Congress at that time, proposing to direct a study of feasibility and appropriate procedures for allowing displaced homemakers to participate in the CETA program. So apparently there is a problem there.

I was more fortunate than my mother. As a result of my husband's death, ^{from service incurred causes,} I do receive benefits ~~from service incurred causes.~~

However, I came very close to being left with an income of between \$300 and \$400. My husband was still on active duty when his cerebral hemorrhage occurred. In spite of his having 30 years service, with retirement eligibility, had the Retirement Board not taken emergency action and retired him during those three days when death was expected at any moment, I would have been ineligible for any portion of his retirement pay. Since then, the Federal law has been changed and that emergency action now would not be ^{possible} in ~~effect~~. Today the officer must have been retired for at least one year in order to make the widow eligible for retirement pay.

In seeking employment, I found that even though I had a college degree, former paid work experience, my training was too long ago and my certification had expired. However, the V. A., ruled they could not give me assistance to update the certification as they still considered me as trained for the profession. They could only give me assistance to train for a new profession.

I had been away from work for 28 years. I had no idea how to go about finding a job, or what type of job I should seek. I needed, as my mother had, counselling--job capability analysis. When I sought work, I faced the same identical problem my mother had faced. Even though I was widely known in the community, had handled many responsibilities in volunteer organizations--none of them counted with the prospective employers. I did not go to the State Employment Office because I called them on the phone and discussed my situation with them, and they very frankly told me they would not be able to help me--nothing available.

I still had a daughter in high school and two sons in college. After a number of months, some very good legal help from

lawyer friends, good financial advice from a friend who was a C.P.A., personal assistance from Senator Bible in dealing with the Veterans Administration, my affairs were settled and I had sufficient income and was able to cope.

Those were months of great personal emotional trauma, absolute terror for the future, a feeling of being totally lost. I did not want to sit and knit for the rest of my life--I wanted to be a useful, contributing member of society, capable of supporting myself and family without being dependent upon charity. I managed to solve it, but in order to I had to make one irrevocable decision. Within 48 hours after my husband's death, I was told that I would have my income only so long as I did not remarry. So I will continue to live as a displaced homemaker--one of the more fortunate ones--and hopefully able to continue in volunteer work.

To sum this up, the displaced homemaker is in desperate need of financial and legal counselling at a time when she may be the least able to pay for such services. She desperately needs employment counselling and employment training--a job skill--and help with job placement.

I have had less experience with the problems of divorcees. I do know that she faces the same problems, insofar as the Federal assistance programs are concerned. She is too young for Social Security, in most cases, and even if she were old enough for Social Security, she is ineligible under her former husband's account if she had been married to him for less than twenty years. She rarely gets alimony and, if she does, it is likely to be insufficient support for her. The child support awards are usually inadequate and both the child support awards and the alimony are

often not paid. The collection problem is well known. She also needs counselling and, in addition to the problem of the divorce, she goes through an emotional trauma based upon a feeling of rejection.

Senate Bill 388's main thrust, and I agree with that, is on the job placement and retraining service. However, I also stress the need for counselling as proposed in the bill.

We say we want the woman to be free to remain in the home--that we want to strengthen the family life. It is the firm belief of the League of Women Voters that unless there is legislation, such as SB-388, fewer and fewer women will choose that role.

Insofar as my daughter is concerned, I would like to see her able to choose to be a homemaker--but I must advise her to prepare for a profession--to continue work after marriage, if the situation remains as it is today.

SALARIES OF TOP ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS BY STATE

Functional Area	Governor	Lieutenant Governor	Secretary of State	Treasurer	Controller	Attorney General
Nevada Title	Governor	Lieutenant Governor	Secretary of State	Treasurer	Controller	Attorney General
<u>Western States</u>						
Nevada	\$40,000	\$ 6,000PT ^{cc}	\$25,000	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$30,000
Alaska	50,000	44,000	44,000	39,372 - 47,304	22,668 - 27,252	48,576
Arizona	43,200	none	25,920	24,300	a	37,800
Colorado	40,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	26,220	32,500
Idaho	33,000	8,000PT ^s	21,500	21,500	21,500	25,000
Montana	30,000	20,500	18,000	18,000	z	25,000
New Mexico	35,000	g	24,000	24,000	a	30,000
Oregon	42,350	none	35,090	35,090	See Secretary of State	35,090
Utah	35,000	22,000	k	21,000	a	25,000
Washington	42,150	17,800	21,400	24,150	a	31,500
Wyoming	45,000	None	28,000	28,000	28,000	31,296 - 41,928
<u>Other States</u>						
Alabama	29,475	PT ^l	22,959	22,959	23,249	33,500
Arkansas	23,438 ⁱ	12,175PT ^l	14,675 ⁱ	14,675 ⁱ	14,675 ⁱ	15,675 ⁱ
Connecticut	42,000	18,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000
Delaware	35,000	12,000	18,720	18,000	20,000	30,000
Georgia	50,000	25,000	35,000	See Finance/ Administration	35,000	40,000
Indiana	36,010	23,504	23,504	23,504	a	27,014
Iowa	40,000	12,000PT ^w	22,500	22,500	32,750	29,000
Kansas	35,000	10,400PT	20,000	20,000	24,828 - 31,548	32,500
Kentucky	39,500	27,900	27,900	27,900	a	27,900
Louisiana	50,000	40,000	35,000	35,000	30,000	35,000
Maryland	25,000	44,856	24,000	44,856	44,856	44,856
Minnesota ^m	41,000 -	30,000 -	25,000 -	25,000 -	a	36,500 -
	51,250	37,500	31,250	31,250		45,625
Mississippi	43,000	a	28,000	26,000	a	30,000
Missouri	37,500	16,000	25,000	20,000	See Finance/ Administration	25,000
New Hampshire	33,744	a	25,101	25,456	28,644	28,846
New Jersey	65,000	None	43,000	43,000	See Budget	43,000
New York	85,000	60,000	47,800	35,020	60,000	60,000
North Carolina	40,332	31,500	32,532	32,532	32,532	36,708
North Dakota ^p	40,000	6,500PT	27,000	27,000	See Finance/ Administration	32,000
Ohio	50,000	30,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Oklahoma	42,500 ^j	24,000	18,500	22,000	18,780 - 28,880	27,500
Pennsylvania	60,000	45,000	35,000	42,500	a	40,000
South Carolina	39,000	17,500	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000
Tennessee	60,550 ^o	7,373PT ^o	41,292 ^o	41,292 ^o	a	47,269 ^o
Texas	66,800	7,200PT	39,900	42,300	42,300	42,300
Vermont	36,100	15,500PT	19,600	19,600	a	23,959
Virginia	50,000	10,525PT	20,000	36,150	35,650	37,500
West Virginia	50,000	None	30,000	35,000	32,000	35,000
Wisconsin	44,292	28,668	22,140	22,140	a	36,450

(REPRINTED WITH ADOPTED AMENDMENTS)

SECOND REPRINT

S. C. R. 26

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 26—
COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

MARCH 25, 1977

Referred to Committee on Finance

SUMMARY—Authorizes expenditure from legislative fund for travel, subsistence and honorarium to Mr. Hardin Jones. (BDR 1854)



EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Authorizing expenditure from the legislative fund for travel, subsistence and honorarium to Mr. Hardin Jones for appearance before senate judiciary committee.

1 *Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly concur-*
2 *ring.* That expenditure of money from the legislative fund is hereby
3 authorized to pay travel expenses and a subsistence allowance as provided
4 by law for state employees and a \$100 honorarium to Mr. Hardin Jones
5 for appearing before the senate judiciary committee to discuss the subject
6 of marihuana.

20

Original bill is on file at
the Research Library.

SENATE BILL NO. 463—SENATOR SCHOFIELD
(by request)

APRIL 11, 1977

Referred to Committee on Finance

SUMMARY—Increases percentage of salary used to determine pensions of district judges. (BDR 1-1498)

FISCAL NOTE: Local Government Impact: No.
State of Industrial Insurance Impact: Yes.

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to district judges; increasing the percentage of salary used to determine their pensions; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. NRS 3.090 is hereby amended to read as follows:
2 3.090 1. Any judge of the district court who has served as a justice of
3 the supreme court or judge of a district court in any one or more of those
4 courts for a period or periods aggregating 20 years and has ended such
5 service shall, after such service of 20 years and after reaching the age of
6 60 years, be entitled to and shall receive annually from the State of
7 Nevada, as a pension during the remainder of his life, a sum of money
8 equal in amount to two-thirds the sum received as salary for his judicial
9 services during the last year thereof, payable every 2 weeks from [funds]
10 money to be provided by direct legislative appropriation.
11 2. Any judge of the district court who has served as a justice of the
12 supreme court or judge of a district court in any one of more of those
13 courts for a period or periods aggregating 12 years and has ended such
14 service shall, after such service of 12 years and after reaching the age of
15 60 years, be entitled to and shall receive annually from the State of
16 Nevada, as a pension during the remainder of his life, a sum of money
17 equal in amount to one-third the sum received as salary for his judicial
18 services during the last year thereof, payable every 2 weeks from [funds]
19 money to be provided by direct legislative appropriation.
20 3. Any judge of the district court who qualifies for a pension under
21 the provisions of subsection 2 is entitled to receive, for each year served
22 beyond 12 years up to a maximum of 20 years, an additional [4.1666]
23 8.3332 percent of the sum received as salary for his judicial services
24 during the last year thereof, payable as provided in subsection 2.

Original bill is 2 pages long.
Contact the Research Library for
a copy of the complete bill.

1977

(REPRINTED WITH ADOPTED AMENDMENTS)

FIRST REPRINT

A. B. 483

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 483—ASSEMBLYMEN HOWARD, BENNETT, CHANEY, JACOBSEN, MELLO, DINI, HICKEY, BROOKMAN, BARENGO, RHOADS, SERPA, MOODY AND POLISH

MARCH 17, 1977

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means

SUMMARY—Makes appropriation to division of travel and tourism of department of economic development to continue advertising campaign to attract tourists to Nevada. (BDR S-1448)

FISCAL NOTE: Local Government Impact: No.
State or Industrial Insurance Impact: Contains Appropriation.

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT making an appropriation to the department of economic development to assist in developing industry and tourism throughout the state; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated from the state general fund
2 to the department of economic development the sum of \$200,000 to be
3 used as follows:
4 1. For industrial development within Clark and Washoe counties,
5 \$100,000, prorated between the counties on the basis of their populations
6 as determined by the last preceding national census of the Bureau of the
7 Census of the United States Department of Commerce.
8 2. For the development of tourism and industry in the remainder of
9 the state, \$100,000.
10 3. No amount may be allocated for a local project under this section
11 unless it is matched with an equivalent amount from local sources.
12 SEC. 2. After June 30, 1979, the unencumbered balance of the
13 appropriation made in section 1 shall not be encumbered and shall revert
14 to the state general fund.
15 SEC. 3. This act shall become effective upon passage and approval.

Original bill is on file at
the Research Library.

(REPRINTED WITH ADOPTED AMENDMENTS)

FIRST REPRINT

S. B. 312

SENATE BILL NO. 312—SENATOR RAGGIO

MARCH 7, 1977

Referred to Committee on Finance

SUMMARY—Extends time for termination of Nevada American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. (BDR 18-1175)

FISCAL NOTE: Local Government Impact: No.
State or Industrial Insurance Impact: Yes.

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to the Nevada American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; extending the time for termination of the commission; providing for disposition of its money on deposit and accounts receivable; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. NRS 233E.130 is hereby amended to read as follows:
2 233E.130 The commission shall submit an annual report to the gov-
3 ernor not later than December 31 of each year and a final report on or
4 before [June 30, 1977.] *July 31, 1977.* Each annual report shall include
5 the specific plans for activities in the next calendar year and the estimated
6 costs thereof.
- 7 SEC. 2. NRS 233E.140 is hereby amended to read as follows:
8 233E.140 The commission shall be terminated [on June 30, 1977.]
9 *no later than July 31, 1977.* All historical records of the commis-
10 sion shall then be transferred to the division of state, county and munic-
11 ipal archives in the office of the secretary of state.
- 12 SEC. 3. Upon termination of the Nevada American Revolution Bicen-
13 tennial Commission, all of the commission's money on deposit shall be
14 transferred to the state general fund, and thereafter any accounts receiv-
15 able of the commission shall be collected by the department of general
16 services and deposited in the state treasury for credit to the state general
17 fund.
- 18 SEC. 4. NRS 233E.010 to 233E.140, inclusive, are hereby repealed.
- 19 SEC. 5. This section and sections 1 to 3, inclusive, of this act shall
20 become effective upon passage and approval. Section 4 of this act shall
21 become effective on August 1, 1978.

Original bill is on file at
the Research Library.