

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Mr. Craddock
Mr. Jeffrey

GUESTS PRESENT: Please refer to the Guest List attached
to the minutes of this meeting.

Chairman Dini called the meeting to order at 8:05 A.M.

Mr. Dini stated that the first thing that they would do would be to withdraw A.B. 620 because A.B. 520 did the same thing and it has been processed.

Mr. Dini indicated that the first bill on the agenda would be S.B. 559.

Mr. Noel Clark and Mr. Duane Sudweeks of the Colorado River Division of Nevada Department of Energy, testified first. Mr. Clark stated that they were here in support of S.B. 559. The primary reason for introducing this piece of legislation at this time is that ultimately the Southern Nevada water project would be transferred to Las Vegas Valley Water District. However the division is in the process of construction on the project which will not be completed in all probability for at least a year and maybe a little more, because of many reasons, part of which are technical. All this bill does is to extend the time for the transfer to July 1, 1983 or whichever comes later. We support the bill. The district, we understand, supports the bill also. We ask your favorable consideration.

Mr. Sudweeks stated that he would add that we have communicated with at least three of the other water users who have indicated they also support the bill, mainly North Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Boulder City, Nellis Air Force Base the other recipient as usual, takes no position on the bill one way or the other.

Testimony on S.B. 559 was concluded.

Mr. May moved for a Do Pass on S.B. 559 which was seconded by Mr. DuBois. The motion carried unanimously.

The next bill before the committee was A.B. 628.

Mr. Bjorn P. Selinder, Churchill County Manager and John Serpa, County Commissioner and member of the Churchill County Hospital Board and also K. Lee Smith who is a member of the Churchill County Hospital Board testified next.

Mr. Selinder stated that they were here this morning for the purpose of giving our views on A.B. 628, which would allow the sale or lease of a county hospital to a corporation for profit. That might be a misnomer perhaps. It seems to be a harsh way of looking at things. However, perhaps I should give you some background as to why we are seeking these changes to the law. As you are probably well aware most small communities in the State of Nevada are experiencing some tremendous problems with their hospitals. As a result we simply can't afford any longer at the county level to keep maintaining these operations. We don't have the finances for operations, let alone capital improvements. Over the past year we have been researching the possibility of conveying the hospital to either a proprietary company or to a non-profit corporation and of course there is a problem with the State law inasmuch as it only allows the conveyance to a non-profit operation as opposed to proprietary.

We began researching this and it was obvious that there were many, many qualified proprietary operations out there that could take over a small community hospital and make a going concern of it and that is why we are here before you. I might call your attention to what we see as just perhaps a slight oversight in the drafting of the bill. On page 2, it would be starting on lines 10 and 11 where it discusses the hospital and it says if the hospital is conveyed for payment to the county of its actual capital investment and so on, we would propose to you a slight change in that wording wherein we would remove the words "actual capital investment" and somehow insert in their "appraised value" and that would be in conformity then with the first page which begins talking about appraised value. It is just a technical problem which we feel ought to be ironed out. With that, I would defer to John Serpa.

Mr. Serpa stated that he put together some rough figures on the appraised value of the hospital and they really are rough, because I just took a \$25.00 a square foot figure for the building and I took the land value - we own a full block - and I just took the land value of 16 lots by \$14,000 a lot which for that area that is the low area of what lots are selling for. and under the present law where we would have to sell for book value based on an audit, and these figures I worked them back. Our last formal audit was as of June 30, 1980, we would come up approximately \$200,000 short, if we sold it under the old law. Book value at that time was \$680,000. We had very little land value in there because of book values and we can't show a depreciation on the land and when the hospital was started those lots were probably worth a couple hundred dollars apiece and I would like to stress what Mr. Selinder

said, we don't know - we wanted to just have another way to go - another option. We do have plans to convey our hospital into some sort of private or non-profit ownership and get it out from under the county. We are having a heck of a time keeping it afloat so to speak. We have several proposals and we are going to entertain formal proposals on May 20th and several of the companies have indicated that they would be interested in this type of legislation so that it would be a management type deal, an outright sale or a non-profit corporation.

Mr. Redelsperger asked what kind of deficit they had been running.

Mr. Serpa stated that this year for example they budgeted for \$150,000 from the county directly into the hospital. For this coming fiscal year - 1981/1982, but we feel that might be a little low right now - On Thursday night we had four people in our hospital and we didn't anticipate the drop off and apparently it is traditional that in the spring of the year everyone feels good or else they put off operations and such. You get a normal drop off but we did not anticipate that great a drop off so we might be short of the \$150,000. With the \$150,000 that the hospital board budgeted, we, as county commissioners don't know where it is going to come from especially with being \$400,000 short of our initial budget, so it really puts us in a spot.

Mr. Redelsperger asked if they were looking towards a sale or a long term lease.

Mr. Serpa stated that they have several companies that are interested and we have one dollar amount right now where they would come in and they would buy the hospital with "X" number of up front dollars pay the balance in a 12 month period and this was under a non-profit corporation structure and they would give as soon as law would allow as far as hearing dates, time of hearings, etc. they would take over. They are the firm that just opened Raleigh Hills in Reno. I think that is a drug and alcohol treatment center.

Mr. Serpa stated that they are also in Tonopah right now. I think in Tonapah they are just a management -

Mr. Redelsperger stated that they were also losing about \$200,000 a year prior to leasing it and now they are making a profit off of the hospital and that has really bailed the county out.

Mr. Dini stated that Lyon Health Center is running at a deficit in Yerington. It was self supporting.

Mr. Dini stated that they did not have the doctors.

Mr. Serpa stated that they wanted to provide health care for Churchill County and the way it is looking now and with what we have to pump into there, we feel that our only alternative is eventually just to get it down to the emergency room and that is it and that is not fair to the community because we want to provide

a real good comprehensive health care and we feel that this is the answer and we have been in contact with the people of the Tonapah Hospital - there was some controversy about the room rates. I don't think people realize how much the county is pumping in there.

Mr. Serpa stated that they feel they have enough control with Reno being only sixty miles from Fallon that if they got their charges too high that people just wouldn't go. They would go to Reno like they are doing now, but we feel if we offer some good competitive comprehensive care there that you darn sure would like to be in your local hospital rather than in Reno.

Mr. DuBois stated on page 1, line 7, you are talking about a 50 year period and on page 2, line 13, you are talking about a 30 year period. Why the difference there?

Mr. Serpa stated that one is a lease - a 50 year lease - and the other would be a sale and that is the installment period, we didn't feel that we should drag out the installment sale any longer than that.

Mr. Dini stated that the hospital association has proposed an amendment. A copy of the amendment is attached to the minutes of this meeting as EXHIBIT A.

Mr. Dini stated that what you are doing in that paragraph there you are just putting the existing hospital board back on - it just gives them more latitude.

Mr. Serpa stated that they had contact with Mr. Hillerby and we find that a good change because we realized that when we drafted this up that we precluded any local representation and many of the firms that we have been talking to have no problem with the advisory board. Mr. Serpa asked Mr. Dini if it spelled out in there how that would be selected?

Mr. Dini stated no it does not.

Mr. Nicholas asked if Mr. Serpa could describe to him for the record, what he believed the intent is of "appraised value".

Mr. Serpa stated that it would be real hard because as far as a hospital goes, it would be hard to find a comparative sale if you change it from that use for a sale so to speak you would have a functional obsolescence so what I did on just coming off the wall with the figures I used, I just took the structure at a square foot figure of \$25.00. Now to appraise it as a hospital we would have to probably go in and get some appraisers or an appraiser with that expertise and set the value as a hospital, less the depreciation. What we have is we have some functional obsolescence as a hospital because the hospital was built in the late 1940s so if someone were going to build a new hospital, there is no way they wouldn't build it that way, so we would have to get someone with some real expertise in the field to give an appraised value.

2294

Mr. Nicholas stated with the particular understanding, I would certainly realize the problems that you suggest. It should also be noted that even though you may be talking in terms of \$25.00 as far as a square foot is concerned at this time for replacement value you might have to go as high as \$250.00 - it might be as high as ten times what you are talking about. So acquiring outside assistance would really be necessary here.

Mr. Serpa stated yes.

Mr. Dini asked if anyone wished to testify on this bill.

Mr. Lee Smith, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Churchill Public Hospital, testified next. He stated that he was merely here to ask you to support this concept. We need this alternative in solving our problems in Fallon.

Mr. Bryce Wilson of the Nevada Association of Counties testified next. This would appear to have beneficial possibilities for other counties, although I have no direct input to that effect. I just wanted to say that the Counties would support the bill.

Ms. Carol Inforte from the Office of Health Planning and Resources for the State of Nevada testified next. I am not speaking either in favor or against this bill. I think it is a good concept, but I would like to add a word of caution that there are eighteen facilities within the State of Nevada, Churchill County Hospital included, that are Hillburton Facilities, and under Federal regulation, it cannot sell to a for profit organization and that should be part of their consideration when looking at possibly transferring ownership of the facility. It is not a violation of the regulation to transfer ownership, but they must look at it in terms of whether it is for profit or non-profit. Does everyone understand what a Hillburton Facility is?

She stated that that is one which applied for and received Federal funding to either build a facility, convert the facility or modernize the facility. They have 20 years to pay back the loan in terms of uncompensated services, in other words they have to provide medical services at a certain level for free to the public and the public would have to qualify in terms of certain financial restrictions. But for 20 years they provide a certain amount of services and there are certain rules and regulations that the Federal government does impose upon the facilities during that 20 year period of time. One of them is sale or transfer of the facility to a for profit organization, so I would just caution that there are eighteen facilities out of the acute care facilities that are under Hillburton requirements within a 20 year span.

Mr. Dini stated that they could do it but that they would still have to go non-profit.

Ms. Inforte stated that she is not saying that they can or they can't, but I think that they should really be in contact with the

region in terms of what they can do and if they do want to sell for a profit is it possible to pay out their Hillburton loan in terms of dollars. I don't know that one way or the other. I am just saying that under the regulations as they stand, you cannot sell for profit or transfer for profit.

Mr. Polish asked how many more years did Churchill County have.

Ms. Inforte stated that she could not say and that she would have to look it up on the record. Most all of the facilities end some time in the 1990s.

Mr. Serpa stated that they had about 14 to 15 years left and the one firm that has made a very concrete proposal indicates that if that loan can't be assumed they would just pay off Hillburton. It would be just like clearing a title on any piece of property in a since Hillburton has a lien against the property. We have been in contact with Ms. Nigland's office and I am sure we are not going to do anything on this without her knowing about it.

Ms. Inforte stated that she was just adding that as a word of caution that there are 18 facilities within the State that would fall under that and that this should not impinge on anybody if they want to sell their property, but that they should be aware if they are under Hillburton requirements that they do need to look at that.

Mr. DuBois inquired as to whether or not they could tear the hospital down and build a shopping center.

Ms. Inforte stated that in essence she guessed they could if they cleared out their Hillburton requirement if the hospital did have a Hillburton requirement if they were able to pay back the loan and make some kind of satisfactory arrangement with the Federal government, they could probably do whatever they wanted.

Mr. DuBois asked what would happen if a K-Mart came in and they bought it.

Ms. Inforte stated that if they did that and they did not contact the region and they did not take care of their Hillburton requirement I am sure the Federal government would have something to say or something to do about it. I would hesitate to say what they would do, but I am sure that they would do something.

Mr. Serpa stated that in their contract to whomever they sell to we are making those provisions that insure continuous health care in Churchill County. That would be part of the contract and we would have a whole team of attorneys to get an iron clad health care continuance. In most of the proposals that we have had have indicated that what they want to do is take over the hospital and run it for "X" number of years depending on the economy and then build a new facility there anyway. This would be in our sales contract that they would provide health care. That is why I am sure we can work out something with Hillburton and if they

do insist it being paid off, then we will pay it off.

Ms. Inforte stated that she would say that it would be up to the individual facility to negotiate with the region on how they want to clear out their debt. That would be entirely an individual matter and like I say, I think that would be entirely an individual matter and like I said I think the bill just allows for a profit organization to be able to buy and sell which should be their option because not every facility within the State is under that obligation, so they should have that freedom.

Mr. Fred Hillerby testified next. He stated that he had had the opportunity to discuss the amendment. On the second page lines 22 through lines 28 where we deleted that whole section 3 and I think that is some of the concern you were just expressing was that I understand part of the purpose would be to take out the non-profit because of the fact that we are allowing a proprietary corporation to buy a hospital and my only concern would be and I would feel comfortable in the case of Churchill that they would build into their contract the fact that there has to be a hospital there because the county is obligated to provide medical services, I am just concerned though in ten years from now that if we take that totally out of there, the possibility as Mr. DuBois mentioned, of somebody buying the hospital and saying it is mine and it is not making the bottom line we anticipated and therefore we are going to change its purpose. I think most people and one of the services we plan to offer as an association is to try to be able to talk to County Commissioners and Hospital Boards and try to help them develop some guidelines to look at when considering selling their hospital to some other corporation, but I am wondering if we strike just the words "community non-profit" if it would leave the clear intent that if you sell the hospital that you intend it to stay as a hospital and not that its purpose be changed.

I was talking briefly with the County Manager and I had hoped to see him before we started, but I got caught in another hearing, but that would not be a problem. Maybe if we just deleted "community non-profit" words out of that paragraph 3.

Mr. Serpa stated that that would help their sales contract too. That would give it more strength.

Mr. Hillerby stated maybe that in addition to the other changes that we had proposed would be of some benefit here. The Hillburton is one issue that I don't know how it is going to be resolved. That money was only available for non-profit and I don't know at this point whether or not there is going to be a big push on the part of the feds to make them pay that off or not, but I think that would be a very good reason when we revised lines 10 through 12 on page 2, to leave in the indebtedness because that makes it part of the package if somebody is interested in buying one of these. If we have to pay off the Hillburton that is your nut, not ours.

2297

Mr. Dini asked if anyone else wished to testify on A.B. 628.

Testimony was concluded on this bill.

Mr. Nicholas moved for an Amend and Do Pass on A.B. 628, which was seconded by Mr. Mello. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Dini asked if there was anybody present to testify on S.B. 560.

Mr. Dini stated that the committee would next hear testimony on S.B. 488.

Mr. Don Thompson, representing Clark County Department of Public Works, testified first.

Our particular interest in this bill has to do with the special assessment districts. Because these districts seems to be one of the ways of the future that we are going to be able to provide many improvements in the community. The limitations on local government are probably going to increase and require citizens in specific areas wanting specific types of improvements to assess themselves for such things as streets, parking lanes, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, streetlights and so on. To give you an idea of what we are doing with the special improvement district area, we have 27 of these SIDs in various stages right now. Four of them are already built but we can't presently sell the bonds because of the present interest rate limitation. Two of these districts are in the final stages of design and will soon be ready for bid. One is already being advertised in anticipation of approval of this bill and in order to obligate currently budgeted funds. Urgency is required on this particular project because it includes some flood control work as part of a larger project and the county is presently being sued by a number of property owners for flood control damages, so if this bill does not pass, the project obviously does not go forward and the flood problems remain. We also have ten projects that are coincident with the regional transportation projects which are not yet funded and we have ten districts for which the scope is presently unknown. Another critical factor in the process is that all the work up to the point of construction has to be completed up front before the bonds can be sold. The people within the assessment district also have the opportunity to decide on the fate of the district until design and final costs estimates are known. Right up until that point they can say yes or no.

What we don't have now is an assurance that once we get to that point we can actually sell the bonds. The problem with that circumstance is first that the people are anticipating the project and it does not happen. Secondly the project is very often included as part of a larger improvement project, like the RTC projects. To try and take advantage of economies of scale, doing all the work at one time and so on. If the SID portion gets held up, the entire design may have to be redone and with the resultant delays and additional costs. Third, a significant delay in the project with

an uncertainty in bonding means that once you get to the point where you have your design and you are ready to go, you can't sell - you know you have no assurance of being able to sell the bonds, the project sits in limbo. At some point in time, your design and your cost estimates begin to become obsolete and in that event even if the project is not redesigned, the cost to the assessment district itself is frozen and any additional cost due to inflation, the county itself would have to pick up the difference.

In summary, I would like to state that the funding process for SIDs is difficult enough without having the bonding problem with the current interest rate limitation, this difficult process is almost impossible. So we badly need to remove that uncertainty. I also discussed with Mr. Cathcart of the City of North Las Vegas, and he asked me to express their support for the bill as well.

Mr. Nicholas asked if Mr. Thompson could take a moment to describe to him in your words what the discount situation would be. I understand that the interest rate is simply eliminated. It is not stipulated in this bill at all and it could be literally any interest rate. As far as the discount situation is concerned, would you tell me what that would be under this bill.

Mr. Thompson stated he was not sure. I think - I wouldn't want to say because I am not sure.

Mr. Nicholas asked if there was someone else who could address this.

Mr. Thompson stated that he thought that was looked at as well, but that he was not sure.

Mr. Nicholas stated that in other words either.

Mr. Thompson stated that it is on the first page of the bill. The discount would be as the State Board of Examiners would determine.

Mr. Nicholas stated that that was okay as it also rides free.

Mr. Bob Kendrow, representing the Airport Authority of Washoe County testified next. We have an interest in this bill in that it would provide for the continued and orderly development of the airport facility in Reno. The way we do business with the air carriers that serve the facility is that they express a desire to have certain capital improvements completed and in order to do that we have to develop money - develop capital to do it. We had plans to go to the bond market of November of 1980 and were unable to do so because of the interest rate limitation. Particularly, we have commitments to acquire certain properties contiguous to the airport and these people are kind of hanging out at this time because we are not able to develop the funds to do that although we do have by contract with the carriers that serve the facility, the authority with them to proceed, but the present law with the 90% limitation has prevented

us from doing that and so we are eager to have a bill enacted that would enable us to go to the market and develop capital money.

Mr. Ken Patridge, Vice Chansellor of Finance of the University of Nevada System, testified next. The Board of Regents of the University of Nevada System would like to support the passage of S.B. 488. With the present bonding situation, it is impossible for us to sell student revenue bonds for a 9% interest rate or less. As such we presently have two buildings that were authorized by the last session of the legislature that we are not able to go forward with. The one building is the business and hotel administration building to be built on the campus of the University of Nevada Las Vegas. The total construction budget is \$11,786,000 and we are authorized to sell \$2,000,000 of revenue bonds to support that project. The other facility is the learning resource center at Clark County Community College which has a construction budget of \$3,786,000 of which 2.2 million dollars is to be funded by the sale of student revenue bonds. So we would ask your consideration for passage of S.B. 488 so that we may go forward with these two projects by selling the bond issues.

Mr. Kermit Mellon, General Manager of the Incline Village Improvement District testified next. With me is Mr. John Ross, a trustee of the District. We are here to support S.B. 488 in its concept and I am wondering even though Assemblyman Nicholas asked the question a little bit ago whether or not that discount in interest limit has been actually eliminated in Chapter 318 under which general improvement districts exist. The problem that I have, on page 26 of the bill, on line 19 through line 25, relates to general obligation and revenue bonds of general improvement districts and it does take out the section dealing with 9% discount rate and 9% interest rate but it only puts back in the discount and I am wondering if it should not read on that line 24, such an interest rate and discount rate as the board may determine. It seems to me that that would at least clarify whether that is the intent. On page 27, where it speaks of special assessment bonds, it only relates on line 26 and 27 to interest rate and not to discount rate, so it seems to me that it speaks of discounts in one area and interest rates in another area, but it doesn't really include both in either space so I would ask that you consider an amendment that would relate both to interest and discount rates in both of those areas. Otherwise, we certainly support the bill because we presently have a \$2,000,000 interim debenture that we are waiting for an interest rate to be established or left at 9% so that we can market the bonds to take out that interim debenture.

Mr. Bob Sullivan of the Carson River Basin of Governments testified next. Two evenings ago we had our county's staff together to look over the tax package and we were discussing financing and financing problems and I thought we would have somebody here to speak to it. This particular bill, some 70 sections of it, speak to all governmental units presumably from irrigation districts all the way on up and I would like to say that even the rural perspective where we haven't got such large projects as you just previous heard with an airport and with a university, we have some difficulties at our

level. In fact, in terms of the shorter term loans we only get the through the good graces of the bank and usually at the last minute. 9% is not very much attractiveness for them to help us help ourselves.

Testimony on S.B. 488 was concluded.

Mr. Nicholas asked if the chair would entertain a motion on this bill. Mr. Dini stated that he would like the motion at a later time as there was a conflict on it.

The committee discussed bonding and interest rates.

Mr. Mello stated that when you really think about this you are leaving this in the hands of a lot of people that may bend to the whims of some bonding firms and that is what concerns me.

Mr. Nicholas stated that he knew that Sparks had a pretty good rating and some of the people who have talked to us today may not have ratings that are quite that high and might not be able to command those interest rates, but I understand Mr. Mello's concern and I do think that one thing we could do is to get some ideas from some of the entities who have spoken to us about if there were to be a top level, what a reasonable top level would be. They perhaps have a better idea.

Mr. Dini thought that perhaps a percentage point below the prime rate or something in that area.

Mr. Dini stated that each district has a different credit rating.

Mr. Dini stated that the committee should study the bill for a few days.

Mr. Nicholas commented that if any of the people here at today's meeting who have spoken to this issue have any ideas on this that they perhaps could get the information to the committee, that would be very much appreciated.

Mr. Dini stated that the committee had already taken action on two bills this morning and inquired if any one was here to testify on 560 yet.

Mr. Marvin Levitt stated that with regard to 488, he thought they were in agreement with the concept of the bill as to whether - as it relates to trying to set a rate that works for everyone - that is probably the problem that relates to the various entities and districts throughout the State because we go all the way from those that are in pretty good financial condition to those that are on margin so the interest rate varies quite a bit. Now there might be what you suggested a possible tie to the prime or to a bond buyers index or something like that. There is an index published on a regular basis as to the average interest rates of all issues say in the week or ten days and you can always relate

it somehow to that index of all the various bonds which might be better that way. Clearly 9% is not going to work in today's market. Something needs to be done to find some leverage there whether - I would imagine that most local governments would be trying to find the lowest rate they could possibly find. What Mr. Mello mentioned might be a possibility if you had the right kind of situation with -

Mr. Mello stated that his concern mainly was with the Airport Authority.

Mr. Dini questioned Mr. Levitt on what the City of Las Vegas had done.

Mr. Levitt stated that they had not sold any bonds since 1970. We are in a strange situation. Given another two years we will have no outstanding debt.

Mr. Dini stated that he had BDR 23-742 which came from Assemblyman Robinson. Mr. Dini stated that it was quite late in the session for this bill.

Mr. Dini stated that he had BDR 20-919^{*} which came from Mr. Hickey. Mr. Jeffrey asked if that bill had any elected officials.

Mr. Dini stated no.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he did not think we should consider it. He stated that the balance is so close now that it would be very easy for the elected officials to lose control of that board and the elected officials have to have control of that board. There are just too many things that depend on local government that come before that board and if we put somebody on from the chamber, we are going to need two more elected officials.

Mr. Nicholas moved for committee introduction which was seconded by Mr. Schofield. The motion carried unanimously.

The committee then discussed the bonding question.

There was discussion by the committee with regard to the Airport Authority being mentioned in the bonding bill.

Mr. Dini stated that he would appoint Mr. Mello and himself on the subcommittee to study the bonding bill.

Mr. G. P. Etcheverry, Nevada League of Cities, testified on S.B. 560, and stated that in their original packet for legislative proposals on item 22, requested that some language be drafted in trying to clear up some areas in 278.480. S.B. 560 does that plus others. I am not sure where the rest of it came from and I expected some of my planning people to be here today, however in looking at this bill it does pretty well concur with what we are asking for in legislation with our item 22, specifically on line 9, where we say

certified mail rather than registered mail. It needs some clean up legislation, because now you don't register mail any more. It is all certified and I think we had to clean up that aspect of 278.240 and also on line 14, I should say 13 and 14, the notification dates and the amount of time. Presently it just says that we have to make notification. It does not give us a time element and people take advantage of it and I think we want to make a note there that we want to at least have a specific time frame set and I am not sure where this particular bill came from as it is not a League bill but it does address those two areas and other than that I see no problem with this bill. I have not had a chance to run it by anybody this morning, however they have had copies of this bill and I have received no information from anyone so apparently they must concur with it.

Testimony on S.B. 560 was completed.

There being no further testimony or business to come before the meeting, the meeting adjourned at 9:12 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara Gomez
Assembly Attache

ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

Date 5/14/81

PLEASE PRINT

| <u>PLEASE PRINT YOUR NAME</u> | <u>PLEASE PRINT REPRESENTING:</u> | <u>I WISH TO SPEAK</u> | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | | <u>FOR</u> | <u>AGAINST</u> | <u>BILL NO.</u> |
| KERNIT McMILLIN | LLAGE | X | | SB 488 |
| BJORN SELINDER | CHURCHILL COUNTY | X | X | AB 628 |
| K. Lee Smith | churchill Public Hospital - TRUSTEE | X | X | AB 628 |
| J. Crossley | LCB Audit | X | Amendment | AB 620 |
| La. Cook | Energy | X | X | SB 559 |
| Dr. R. Co | Public Health | X | X | SB 559 |
| Joe Cochran | City of North Las Vegas | X | X | SB 559 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO A.B. 628

Amend A.B. 628 as follows:

Page 1 delete lines 9 thru 20 and add the following new language
"(a) The corporation must make provision in its articles of incorporation for an advisory board. The advisory board must be broadly representative of the public served by the hospital."

Page 2 lines 10 thru 12, delete [of its actual capital investment in the hospital, after deducting depreciation] and add the following new language: "of an amount not less than its appraised value,"