

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Dini
Vice Chairman Schofield
Mr. Craddock
Mr. DuBois
Mr. Jeffrey
Mr. May
Mr. Mello
Mr. Nicholas
Mr. Polish
Mr. Prengaman
Mr. Redelsperger

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

Chairman Dini called the meeting to order at 9:40 A.M. The first bill to be discussed is AB-505 - Creates board of fire safety and applies certain fire safety requirements to certain buildings.

Mr. Dini: Jack, why don't we mention the amendments that are missing?

Mr. Jeffrey: The only thing I see is on Page 4, Lines 4 and 5. I don't remember discussing the proposition that no member other than the Fire Marshal shall serve more than two consecutive terms. I think that should be removed; especially with the makeup of the board, it seems to me that we will probably have fire officials from the large counties and we do require building officials from each of the large counties. I think those people should stay on the board. The board sunsets, anyway, so that's not really that big of a thing. Then, in Section 12, subsection 2, starting on Line 34, we talked about the fire safety board having a hearing within thirty days and the subsequent to the hearing, making a decision within thirty days. The thirty days to make the decision was left out. That's all I see that was left out of it.

Mr. Dini: There was some discussion about amending this into SB-214.

Mr. Jeffrey: Well, let me get together with Bill and see what he wants to do. It really doesn't matter to me, but I'll find out what he wants.

Mr. Dini: Why don't we stand in recess and send Jack down to talk to him. The committee recessed at 9:40 A.M.

Mr. Dini reconvened the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

Fire Chief Roy Parrish, Clark County: The way AB-505 it is structured now where a local entity would have the flexibility of appearing before the Legislative Commission to get their ordinance approved and reviewed is not a problem for me. My

question is: what is the Legislative Commission? Is it a group of legislators that meet after the session?

Mr. Dini: They meet during and after the session. They are twelve legislators, six from the Senate and six from the Assembly. It is a housekeeping commission for the Legislature.

Fire Chief Parrish: The way it is structured, it is very closely related to our ordinance in Clark County. I believe that it is functional and with that provision where you do have the right to speak in front of the Legislative Commission, we don't really have a problem.

Mr. Dini: What we need is a motion to amend it. We have to amend that thirty days and delete on Page 4, that provision where you can only serve two consecutive terms. We will have to amend it into SB-214. Mr. Jeffrey moved to AMEND AB-505 INTO SB-214 WITH TWO ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS. Seconded by Mr. Mello. Motion carried.

Mr. May: On SB-568, I would like to move a DO PASS. Seconded by Mr. Jeffrey.

Mr. Prengaman: I would like to have some discussion on this.

Mr. Dini: Yes.

Mr. Prengaman: As you recall, you appointed a subcommittee - Assemblyman DuBois and myself, to meet with interested parties. We met this morning and had members of the contractors and local governments and other interested parties there. We met for about an hour and discussed a variety of things. We tried to get some resolution as to the mechanical problems that might be there that local governments might experience; school boards said bond monies are put in an account; local governments said they pool their monies. We did not get any specific amendments. There seemed to be a polarization, but we did ask the members of local governments to come back with some ideas as to how their finance people could accomplish this if in fact it became law. Each side seemed very strong about their own position.

Mr. Jeffrey: It seems to me the bill calls out that the interest to be paid will be the interest earned by the local government. I don't see where that is all complicated.

Mr. Prengaman: There was some discussion about how the rate should be determined, whether they were going to put this money in a separate account and whether it should be at the prevailing rate. These were discussed but no conclusions arrived at.

Mr. May: I talked to the City Manager of North Las Vegas and he indicated that North Las Vegas doesn't have that much going in construction in the next two years. They do oppose it but not as strongly as in the past. I am sure it will probably need some cleanup in a couple of years. And in the interest of time we should proceed with deliberations and get it on the floor. Maybe, pass it this year and if it needs attention in two years, we can look at it then.

Mr. G. P. Etcheverry, Nevada League of Cities: We are not that much in opposition to the bill as such. We are concerned about the mechanics. I have to throw out one other concern and despite with what happens to the bill, but if MX becomes a reality in our state, those small entities who would not be able to comply with the restrictions on thirty days or quarterly reports really need some flexibility in dealing with their contractors. This has been brought out in the hearings. That may cause a problem for small local entities. I am somewhat concerned that Clark County, as well as the City of Las Vegas, with administering a lot of these funds, or at least assisting some of the smaller local governments. We do have to have that flexibility. In some of the smaller local government areas where they don't have the capability of on a minutes figuring out interest rates and that type of thing. We have no objections but we do want to point out those things.

Mr. Jeffrey: I agree, but I think that as far as public entities, there is going to be considerable public works projects and they will have to take on additional staff. I agree that the small local governments are going to have some problems if MX comes.

Mr. May: This is not an everyday occurrence. It is not that every contract will get into a situation where there will be a problem. It will probably be an exception rather than the rule.

Mr. May moved a DO PASS on SB-568, seconded by Mr. Jeffrey. Motion carried.

Mr. Redelsperger: I have some amendments for AB-604. The major is in subsection 1 of Section 2 where we have the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1981 and ending June 30, 1982, the first \$9.5 million received from the federal government shall go to the state distributive school fund. Any amount received in excess of that figure shall be distributed 50% to the Department of Energy and 50% to the county of origin. The \$9.5 million is the budgeted amount for the state distributive school fund. The following year, in subsection 2, the amount increases to \$10.5 million. Anything in excess of that, it would be distributed on the same basis. The discretion would be left up to

2289

the Interim Finance Committee. If the funds were not used, they would revert back to the distributive school funds, through the Interim Finance Committee.

Mr. Dini: Do you want to make a motion to amend and do pass and refer to Ways and Means?

Mr. Redelsperger: Does it need to go to Ways and Means under this formula, even though there is no fiscal impact? There would be none, as any monies that the Department of Energy, say, did not use would go back to the distributive school fund.

Mr. Redelsperger: I make a motion that we AMEND AND DO PASS AB-604, seconded by Mr. Prengaman. Motion carried.

Mr. Dini: We have some BDR's for introduction. BDR-20-2084* dealing with a public parking garage in Las Vegas. BDR-34-2056** deals with the University of Nevada Regents. It is a cleanup bill. BDRS-1995† deals with the Virginia City Water District. It provides for an appeals board. The other one is for the Comstock Historical group and this provides for fees and provides an appeals procedure for people when the Comstock makes a decision they are unhappy with. This is BDR-33-1933†. It was moved and seconded to introduce. Motion carried.

Mr. Dini adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucille Hill
Lucille Hill
Assembly Attache

*AB 660
**AB 662
+ AB 661
†+ AB 663