

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
February 25, 2015**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Vice Chairman John Moore at 8:33 a.m. on Wednesday, February 25, 2015, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website: www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John Ellison, Chairman
Assemblyman John Moore, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblywoman Shelly M. Shelton
Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblyman Glenn E. Trowbridge
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Assembly District No. 26

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Eileen O'Grady, Committee Counsel
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

John J. Lee, Mayor, City of North Las Vegas
Ryann Juden, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor/City Council, City of
North Las Vegas
Sumiko Maser, Deputy Director, Administrative Services, Department of
Taxation

Vice Chairman Moore:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We are going to start today with a presentation from the City of North Las Vegas.

John J. Lee, Mayor, City of North Las Vegas:

Before I get into my presentation, it is exciting to see a new Assembly. I served 14 years at the Legislature, and I was always a big proponent of term limits. I like fresh ideas and new people. I have heard and read a lot about a few of you on this Committee. I know you will do a great job for Nevada.

After serving in the Legislature, I thought my political career was over. I was very excited about working on some other projects within my businesses. I recognized that North Las Vegas was going down a maelstrom. Three or four people talked to me about becoming mayor. After a couple of months, I wondered what happened to all those people who were interested in being mayor. I grew up in North Las Vegas, and it is very important to the state of Nevada that nothing detrimental happens to North Las Vegas. If we could do something about it, we had the responsibility. I threw my name in the hat and once again jumped in the ring chasing dollars, just as you do to support your communities. I won the mayor race in the primary.

It was not an easy transition. I was not able to get into the building until the day of the swearing in. I was then able to see the office, just as you did when you first came to the Legislature and saw your first parking stall and your

first office, all the fun things about being a legislator. I wanted to take as much information as I had available to find out where North Las Vegas was at that point. After sitting in the Legislature for many years, I realized we did not have a bankruptcy option. I realized it had already been decided between the county and the city regarding the new boundary lines. Due to the situation, there was a chance North Las Vegas could lose its charter.

Understanding that I love my small community, I decided I had to give it 100 percent before I threw in the towel. Recognizing other cities in the country were having problems, I decided to call Detroit. Detroit was going through the same bankruptcy issues. If there is a Detroit, I thought there might be a North Detroit. I asked how the issue of the bankruptcy was affecting the town next door. If North Las Vegas was a problem, I wanted to know how it was affecting Henderson, Las Vegas, and Boulder City. The individual I spoke to said I was asking the wrong question. I should be asking how Detroit's problems affected the three states surrounding them and southern Canada. Detroit's issues had made a huge impact on commerce and other things in the area.

I realized if North Las Vegas did go under, it could be horrible. I called some of my friends in the Senate in California and asked how the 16th and 19th largest cities in California were affected by the issues in Detroit. I was told it completely shut down the bond markets in the state of California. There was no new money coming into California for infrastructure needs, such as water, sewer, and the other things local governments need. I realized what was happening in North Las Vegas could affect what happens in Las Vegas, which would then affect the rest of the state. The only option in North Las Vegas was to dig in and fight.

I called in the state government and explained the situation. We looked at how the State of Nevada helped White Pine County recover from its financial difficulties a few years ago. There was nothing in statute providing a direction on how we could make North Las Vegas whole. The state's only option would have been to replace our city manager and the finance director, which we had already done. I got in touch with Marvin Leavitt of the Committee on Local Government Finance. We tried to figure out how to save the city without affecting the entire state of Nevada. I called Governor Sandoval on a couple of issues, and we have been working very closely with the Executive Branch.

I am happy to tell you, we have brought peace back into the labor groups. We all sit at the same table, we talk to each other, and we all have a plan to repair North Las Vegas. We are doing things in North Las Vegas that are different from what other communities are doing. We have reached out

regionally, and we worked with our local governments for their best advice and best practices. We have had great success. We took a \$156 million deficit down to \$78 million.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick recognized that the City of North Las Vegas was overcharging for water and sewer. They were taking the money from the sewer department and putting it into the general fund. It was almost a shell game of how we were keeping the city afloat. At that time, I was the chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick and I set up a plan to get North Las Vegas out of raiding the sewer fund to keep it afloat. I believe we have until 2021 to work on our budget to allow the city sewer fund to be an enterprise district again. We are working very quickly at solving that problem in North Las Vegas. As Mayor of North Las Vegas, with the experience I had in the Legislature and how fast things move here, my goal is to stop using the sewer fund by 2019.

The first order of any business is to stay in business. That is what we are doing now. We are fixing ourselves, taking chaos and turning it into order, and we are looking at every department. We do not ask the state for money. We may need some help with bond ratings. At one point North Las Vegas, in the best of times, had a high bond rating, but it dropped 15 levels. I do not care what my bond rating is. If you already have a house that is paid for and your FICO score is in the 400s, what do you care? You are not looking for a new house because you have a house you enjoy. I do not need to borrow money for North Las Vegas.

There are great things happening in North Las Vegas. I want you to recognize there is a challenge and an opportunity to help, but I do not want you to feel sorry for us. In the county, we have the Nellis Air Force Base with 40,000 people. We have the brightest diamond of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) with the North Las Vegas VA Medical Center. We are getting ready to open between 10,000 and 12,000 homes in the northern alluvial skirt of the Sheep Range.

Senator Reid and I were very fortunate to build a relationship years ago. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Department of the Interior was going to transfer some land to North Las Vegas. I called Senator Reid and said if he wanted to help North Las Vegas, he needed to let me rearrange the public lands that we are trying to get transferred into North Las Vegas. I was able to rearrange the land and put 150 acres next to the VA Hospital for a health care zone.

We have a lot of great things happening. The first year we replaced all the directors, the city manager, and the city attorney. It was not that they were bad people; we are just moving in another direction now. We have a new group of administrators and we are a team. I do not make a decision without talking to the staff. If I pay people money, I am going to listen to their advice. I am not going to hire them and tell them what to do. I have brilliant people around me who make me smarter. I can tell you, the next time North Las Vegas appears before this Committee, we will be able to tell you a great story. We have an exciting opportunity, and we are looking forward to the challenges and growing once again.

I will now turn it over to Ryann Juden for the PowerPoint presentation. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Ryann Juden, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor/City Council, City of North Las Vegas:

I will go over the slide presentation ([Exhibit C](#)) we provided to the Committee. It has some basic facts, similar to what you have been provided by other municipalities. I will also discuss some of what we have been up to this past year.

The city was founded in 1946. The city has an area of 104 square miles. Of that, a little over half is undeveloped, which is something we have seized upon because it provides tremendous opportunity for a struggling city. As an analogy, if a business owner is struggling to pay the bills for his restaurant, and he sees only 10 of his 20 tables are constantly full, he must find a way to fill those other 10 tables. That is similar to what we inherited. As we look out, we see there are 10 other tables, and we are looking at the opportunities to leverage those tables and bring patrons in to help cure some of the financial struggles we are having in North Las Vegas. The 2013 population was a little over 227,000 people. From 2000 to 2009, North Las Vegas was the third-fastest-growing large city in America.

There is \$126 million in the general fund for 2015 and \$492 million in all funds combined. Regarding employees, we have 979 full-time equivalents at this time.

The governing body of North Las Vegas is made up of four council members and one mayor. The mayor is elected at-large. Each of the four council members is elected in their respective wards. They collectively make the determination to elect the mayor pro tempore.

This map [page 4, ([Exhibit C](#))] shows the wards and how they are divided. These are new ward realignments based on a redistricting we did last year. The redistricting in North Las Vegas did not take place appropriately after the census, so that was one of our first items of business. There were some dramatic population shifts in Ward 4. This map also demonstrates how much open space there is in the northern area. There is an opportunity for growth, not just in residential areas in the northern portions of Wards 3 and 4, but also along the industrial corridor in Ward 1, which we will discuss shortly.

The government's structure is a council-manager structure, and the system of government is a charter system of government. The council appoints a professional city manager and city attorneys who report directly to the council. The city manager hires per council-approved budget and staffing plans. The council provides policy direction for the city, and the city manager makes recommendations and implements policy decisions. This is very similar to many of the other cities that have presented to this Committee.

This slide [page 5, ([Exhibit C](#))] shows the structure of government in North Las Vegas. We have citizens at the top who give input directly to our elected officials. It moves down through the city manager and then through the various departments.

As the Mayor outlined, there are serious challenges facing North Las Vegas. Some of these are the same challenges as other municipalities and counties. The property taxes are no longer a stable source of revenue. One acute challenge North Las Vegas has is about a 57 percent decrease in staffing levels from the high in 2008. This has created a tremendous burden on our ability to deliver services that are commensurate with services delivered in the past. Additionally, if you can imagine inheriting a city with these kinds of challenges, there are some cultural issues we have had to deal with, as many of our staff members have been uncertain in the past about their jobs and how secure those jobs are. Their ability to be public servants was affected by this. As we move forward, we are trying to alleviate some of the strain the cuts and riffs have placed on our employees.

Those of you who have been in the Legislature in the past are probably glad North Las Vegas is not in front of you this year, as they have been in the past, to discuss the consolidated tax formula and how we need changes to the formula. This fell from a fundamental misunderstanding North Las Vegas had regarding the consolidated tax formula. As many of you know, the formula is what it is. What you put into it is what you get out of it. It is a formula. It is like baking cookies. There is a recipe, and if you try to improvise and put other ingredients in, your cookies probably are not going to turn out very well.

North Las Vegas chose not to take advantage of growth modeling that would have been rewarded through the consolidated tax formula. This, in turn, caused a deficiency in consolidated tax funds compared to other cities in the area. While this historic misunderstanding was easy to identify, it does require some time to remedy, as we shift and transition to build North Las Vegas so it is rewarded through the consolidated tax formula. You cannot be just a bedroom community in the state of Nevada and expect to succeed based on how revenues are distributed in the state.

One of the things the Mayor mentioned is the plan to leverage and seek out the natural opportunities that exist in North Las Vegas, as well as creating new opportunities. Some of the things that were identified right away were significant underutilized assets in North Las Vegas. As the Mayor mentioned, we have an air force base. Some would say that belongs to Clark County, but it is also surrounded by North Las Vegas. Many of the people on that base live in our community, and they are an asset that has never been leveraged by the city. By recognizing the people who work there, we are looking for opportunities for industries that would traditionally be found near air force bases of the magnitude of Nellis Air Force Base. We want to welcome them into our community and help them understand we are a community that could provide an opportunity for them to grow their business.

Another opportunity we noticed was the VA hospital. Those of you who have seen the VA Medical Center in North Las Vegas know it is surrounded by nothing. It was not lost on policymakers that there was a jewel sitting in the middle of nowhere, a tremendous federal asset that we had not yet found a way to build around. We keyed in on that right away. As the Mayor said, we went directly to our Nevada delegation in the U.S. Congress and started talking to them about ways we could better leverage this asset. In discussions with them, we identified some land directly adjacent to the VA Medical Center. We were able to get 150 undesignated acres to use as a health services job creation zone. The regulations are currently being developed by BLM and city staff, and allow North Las Vegas the opportunity to take this asset and truly leverage it. One of the things we discovered as we were working with the VA is they consider this hospital to be the jewel of their system.

One of the interesting commentaries the Under Secretary of Defense made to the Mayor was that their most successful VA hospitals are directly connected to a medical school. You also see this same phenomenon happening within the top medical programs in the nation. Some of the top medical schools in the country are also directly connected to a VA hospital. There is a symbiotic relationship that exists between these two assets that has historically proven to be a successful model for both the VA and the medical school. We saw this as

a wonderful opportunity. I know there is currently a discussion in front of this body concerning a medical school for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and we believe a wonderful home for a portion of the medical school or the medical school entirely would be across from the VA hospital. On this acreage, we would be able to have a medical school that could expand and grow, as it would not be able to do if it were put on 11 acres downtown. We have been able to make some inroads into leveraging that wonderful asset.

Another asset we have taken particular interest in is the industrial park at Apex [pages 8 and 9, [Exhibit C](#)]. One of the keys we know southern Nevada lacks is a large-scale industrial park ready for immediate occupancy. If you talk with any economic development professionals, of which we have several at the state, local, and county levels, they will tell you we need to have available land for the businesses we are trying to attract and for the businesses looking to expand. This is something southern Nevada has traditionally had, which has helped its growth. Basic Management, Inc. was an industrial park that was connected to water and utilities, and because of that, it provided the catalyst for large Fortune 500 companies to grow and expand in our region. We currently lack that today, but Apex provides an opportunity.

Apex is an 18,000-acre industrial area in the northern part of North Las Vegas [page 9, [Exhibit C](#)]. Apex is the light green area with the target. When you look at the town in total, which is in brown, it shows that Apex is a very large industrial park relative to the size of North Las Vegas and provides tremendous opportunity for the region.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

My first question is about the 150 acres adjacent to the VA Medical Center and the health services job creation zone. I was wondering if that is all going to be directly tied to the VA Medical Center and veterans services, or if it is something that will be competing with Henderson's Union Village.

Ryann Juden:

We have spoken with Henderson's Councilwoman Marsh about this. To answer the first part of your question, no, it is not part of the VA. It is actually land that belongs to North Las Vegas. According to the regulations, we have to dispose of it in that way. It does provide us an opportunity to look at VA hospitals across the nation to determine the ancillary services that traditionally surround VA hospitals and are lacking with our VA hospital. A portion of their business model is generally connected to the VA hospitals, but a larger portion of their business model is also connected to other health services and medical needs. As you know, about 40 percent of

southern Nevada's medicine goes to Phoenix and Los Angeles. We have a difficult issue with capturing all of our medical services within the state.

With regard to competing directly with Union Village in Henderson, my understanding of Union Village is it is not looking strongly at a research or medical school component. In that regard, we view these 150 acres as providing an opportunity and space for a research component. For a medical school, it can be looked at as having both a clinical component and a research component. Clinical components traditionally locate closer to where patients live. Having a vibrant, healthy medical school is the research component that chases the dollars and allows these medical programs to grow nationally.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

You said Apex remains largely undeveloped because it lacks the utility infrastructure. In other cities, I thought they require the developers to bring the utilities out to the area. Is that something you are looking at, or are you just saying it is the challenge you face because you do not have the money? Do you not think you can get developers to pay to bring the utilities out even though you have the land and the favorable business plan?

Ryann Juden:

What we know about Apex is when we inherited it, it had sat undeveloped for a decade and a half. I believe most of the parcels have probably been owned by multiple individuals. Some of the owners were larger groups now located outside the valley. One of the things we noticed is there is a special improvement district (SID) that requires developers to participate in the utilities. The reality is, with these developers, especially those who have had this land for longer periods of time, there has not been a desire for them to participate. We have gotten creative by looking at what we call a reverse SID. Whenever there is acquisition of property by new owners, there are ways we can capture these funds. That is something we have been looking at structurally to help us.

I will also explain how the Mayor has looked at Senate Bill No. 1 of the 28th Special Session that passed in September for opportunities for us to induce private dollars to be used the same as they have been in other areas. In other areas, public dollars have provided the main waterline, but not the hook-ups to businesses. The real problem was businesses would not locate to Apex unless they had utilities. If you are a business looking to move, you do not want to wait two years for a waterline to be built. At the same time, utilities would not build the infrastructure until there were businesses there. Somehow, we had to deal with this problem. While there could be some past examples of how it has worked, it was clear it was not working at Apex.

There was clearly a power problem at Apex. After this body passed the medical marijuana provisions, and once medical marijuana hit southern Nevada, this was a big deal. There were a lot of companies and people involved, and there was a lot of excitement in this area. We quickly learned that marijuana does not require a lot of water. Marijuana growth facilities use more power consumption. The policymakers in North Las Vegas created a green zone at Apex. The green zone incentivized businesses, specifically the marijuana businesses, to move out to Apex. We created a zone in Apex that decreased the cost by roughly half of what it would cost anywhere else in the valley. This policy was very successful, with 32 different businesses currently moving or building in different areas of Apex. At that point, NV Energy came to the table and told us they would get to work, and by August 15 they would have all of the step-down that was necessary, so the power issue at Apex is largely being solved. We still have the water problems.

[Assemblyman Ellison assumed the Chair.]

Assemblyman Stewart:

I would like to welcome the Mayor back to the Legislature. I remember in 1946 when North Las Vegas was first incorporated. I think you have made some great progress since then. I have a three-part question. First, there has been some talk of southern Nevada becoming an inland port. I think Apex would be an excellent place for that with Interstate 15 and the Union Pacific Railroad running right through it. Have you given any thought to that? Secondly, can you give us an update on the economic impact of the Clark County Shooting Complex and the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument? Thirdly, can you give us an update on the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR) and their impact?

John Lee:

The inland port is a very interesting current event being discussed nationwide. As you know, goods are shipped from other places, mostly from the Long Beach, California, area. There is a lottery to get those ships in, and sometimes the ships can sit for three or four days. Once the ships are unloaded, they have to get out as soon as possible. The canisters from the ships are stacked everywhere. Getting that product moved to other locations would have a huge impact on the western United States. We have land available in Apex, but the situation is that the land available needs BLM access. Congressman Hardy has looked into this issue and made a statement that he wants to work on it in Washington, D.C. in order to alleviate that pressure in California. The goal would be that the ships are immediately unloaded, the canisters are put on trains, and everything is moved to southern Nevada, meaning anywhere in southern Nevada where it would work best for the region.

From there, they would distribute the product to California, Denver, Salt Lake City, or Phoenix. This could be the hub that moves that product through the spine of the transportation system of our nation.

Congressman Hardy and I had a meeting the other day. He is going to see what he can do in Washington, D.C. to help get access through the BLM property. I have a meeting this Friday with the BLM. I have been appointed as the elected official for the state of Nevada on a BLM committee. I am not relying just on our delegation team but also working with our state organizations. I will defer the next two questions to Mr. Juden.

Ryann Juden:

Clark County Commissioner Tom Collins has worked on legislation for the shooting range. There have been some events at the shooting range in the last month that were very successful. As with any asset, it does take time to establish and become a premier location for events. Although I am not as familiar with the shooting range, because it is located in the county, it is clear it is becoming a premier venue for events.

Once Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument passed Congress, one of the things the bill required is the formation of a committee. All Congress did was turn the land over to the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The National Park Service has two years to create a business plan for that federal asset. During that process, they are determining where the entryways to the park will be and where any assets within the parks, such as walking trails, visitor centers, and parking lots, will be located. That is currently being done. We do see Tule Springs as a tremendous asset for North Las Vegas.

Tule Springs is an urban core national monument, so the National Park Service is looking for opportunities to attract different groups of individuals who are not traditional park users. Having a park located so close to an urban core provides a tremendous opportunity for students in Clark County to go on day trips and learn about the park system and the opportunities it provides. Even though we have some wonderful parks and monuments close to North Las Vegas, nothing will be as close as Tule Springs. We see that as a tremendous opportunity for our community as well as visitors to the region. We also see it as an opportunity to encourage them to stay a little longer and get out into the communities to see these kinds of resources. It is currently in the planning stages, and I think there will be much more to report to this body during the next session.

As far as NASCAR and the Las Vegas Motor Speedway venue, we see this as another wonderful asset located near North Las Vegas that provides opportunity for events. The Mayor, the council, and the staff are looking for ways to make North Las Vegas more of a festival city.

Craig Ranch Regional Park is a 150-acre park that provides tremendous opportunity. Commissioner Collins worked through the county commission to provide approximately \$7 million for an amphitheater that houses about 4,000 people. It is a true regional park that has the potential to build community, not just in the City of North Las Vegas, but also in the region.

One of the other issues we had with Apex was water. As we looked for an opportunity to solve the water problem, this body provided us a wonderful opportunity. The 2014 Special Session was convened in September for the Tesla economic package [page 10, [Exhibit C](#)]. As this Committee knows, bills that are passed have to be uniform in application and general in nature. As we looked at Senate Bill No. 1 of the 28th Special Session, we saw tremendous opportunity, and we are very thankful to this body and the Governor for approving this historic bill. We saw opportunities for the south to create these economic diversification districts outlined in the bill. This bill had all the hallmarks of opportunity in reality. Twenty-one hours after the first language of the bill was seen, it was signed by the Governor. About seven days later, it was announced that there would be a special session. It is one of the largest tax abatements in the history of the country, and it is the largest tax abatement in the history of Nevada. This is an important, landmark bill that is only 25 pages long.

We found the bill provides the opportunity for a governing body to create an economic diversification district. The bill requires a \$3.5 billion capital investment over a ten-year period. A key part that provides opportunity for North Las Vegas is that the participants must be engaged in a common purpose or business endeavor. How the bill is currently being used in the north is that these participants are engaged in a business endeavor. We looked to find how "common purpose" would be defined because it is not defined in the bill. This is a bill that was basically the creation of earlier efforts within the state, specifically Assembly Bill No. 449 of the 76th Session, to create an economic development plan.

One of the things the bill did was to commission the study that the Brookings Institution developed, which was to identify specific sectors within the state of Nevada that provided long-term and near-term opportunities for investment by the state. We looked at the common purpose in the bill as businesses that were collectively engaged in diversifying the state's economy

by targeting and strengthening deficiencies in specific sectors that are outlined in Nevada's economic development plan [page 12, ([Exhibit C](#))]. Some of the sectors that we are specifically looking at that provide opportunities in that plan are business information technology ecosystems, logistics and operations, manufacturing, aerospace, and defense.

This chart [page 13, ([Exhibit C](#))] demonstrates how the health of a region is determined. The data provided by Brookings comes from Moody's Analytics. Brookings looks at a region and all the industries in the region and tries to determine where they are deficient. If you look at leisure and hospitality, the median coefficient is 1 percent and Las Vegas is 3.01 percent. This means we are about 300 percent of where we need to be in the area of hospitality and leisure. If you look at manufacturing, Las Vegas is at 0.28 percent, but a healthy economy of our size should be at a coefficient of 1 percent.

We looked at defining "common purpose" as businesses that are collectively engaged in curing one of the industry deficiencies. We saw a tremendous opportunity in S.B. No. 1 of the 28th Special Session to attract businesses that would be able to cure some of these industry deficiencies. As long as they were actively engaged, we could attract them to build at Apex through the abatements and the incentive package that were provided in the bill.

Apex is an 18,000-acre park with 7,000 acres that are leveled and could be developed if they had the infrastructure. We suggested creating a 700-acre economic diversification district in the northern area of the park. We would attract businesses to this area by providing them the same tax incentives that were provided in S.B. No. 1 of the 28th Special Session. For them to build in this 700-acre area, one of the conditions was they had to help us privately finance the waterline. That is important because the waterline allows the entire park to open.

We had an economic impact analysis done by Brookings. They determined that those 7,000 acres in Apex, based on the connectivity Apex provides, could sustain and support over 116,000 jobs and create an economic impact to the state of Nevada of \$193 billion over a 20-year period. These were serious numbers, and we felt we had to find a way to build the waterline and open those 7,000 acres. We think this is a very good use of the policy this body created and put into law.

Assemblyman Munford:

I want to welcome the Mayor back to the Legislature. I know you served with honor and humility in this body because you really care about helping people.

It was an honor for me to serve with you because you were very kind and thoughtful toward me.

Mayor Lee, I have been in your office many times, and I have brought potential developers and people who had projects who wanted to locate in North Las Vegas. I am in contact with people now who want to locate in Apex. I will be in contact with you in the future to help with these economic problems and to bring something that I feel will have some impact on the future of North Las Vegas. About 25 percent of my constituency is in North Las Vegas, so I have a close connection. I want you to be successful and have a great future.

John Lee:

I know you are very supportive of our efforts at Apex. We recognize the historic West Side is a value to our community. We understand the culture, and we understand the opportunity at the same time. Do you know the difference between land and real estate? The difference is that real estate is what you buy, sell, and develop to produce jobs and offer tax base. Land is what is between here and Reno, between Las Vegas and Salt Lake City, between Phoenix and Las Vegas. Land just holds the planet together. The property in your area, Assemblyman Munford, is very valuable property in North Las Vegas and will not be left alone. We will work very closely with you, and we are working with the community right now, to start thinking of things that are going to happen there.

Assemblywoman Neal, you were here when Senator Horsford worked on a special bill to give abatements in that area. I do not know if those abatements are still available, but I would like to resurrect them in order to take advantage of that legislation. I will be working with you on that. I do want you to know I appreciate what your community has to offer to the success of our whole region.

Assemblyman Flores:

I hear the enthusiasm on the new development in Apex. I think we all have a responsibility to make sure that goes through. In terms of the area that is undeveloped, have any environmental studies been done? I know the BLM published a study on naturally occurring asbestos and how they were linking that to cancer. This was in the surrounding areas of Apex. I am curious if there have been any studies done in the areas that pertain to North Las Vegas to ensure that is not a concern?

John Lee:

You are talking about the Interstate 11 issue and the naturally occurring product out there. None of that has ever been found in North Las Vegas. We do have some plant species that we are aware of and need to protect based on federal law. I will tell you that land is virgin with no problems. We do the turtle studies that are required by state law. We comply with all of the requirements before we prepare the land for development. There is nothing on the lands in North Las Vegas that would not permit it to be developed.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I know there are great things happening in North Las Vegas. My question is regarding the industrial strengths and deficits [page 13, [Exhibit C](#)]. I have been researching some of the sectors in North Las Vegas. What are the strong industry sectors in North Las Vegas?

Ryann Juden:

This particular slide is information from Moody's that was prepared by Brookings Institution, and it deals with the entire Las Vegas area. There is sufficiently more deficiency within North Las Vegas regarding sectors such as light manufacturing, logistics, and information technology ecosystems.

Assemblywoman Neal:

What effect will the aviation bill, [Assembly Bill 161](#), have on North Las Vegas? There are two things that are going to happen. We want to grow our economy and we want to diversify, and we need to as a city. At the same time, there is going to be a positive impact on one side for the aviation, and there is going to be immediate impact that comes to us positively. However, there is also revenue walking out the door. The acquisition or use of [S.B. No. 1 of the 28th Special Session](#) also allows additional revenue to walk out the door. I understand this in terms of calculated risk. However, I want to make sure we have revenue coming in one side and developing on the other side, and in the middle, we are still reaching our goal of trying to have a balanced sheet. Talk to me about the aviation impact and when the City of North Las Vegas can expect to see some positive revenue hit their economy.

Ryann Juden:

We completely support the aviation bill. That language went through our council, and the council passed a resolution in support. The aviation bill is an attempt to put us on a level playing field with other states that are competing for this industry. When you specifically look at some of the residents in North Las Vegas who currently own homes and work in the aviation industry, either at Nellis Air Force Base or at Creech Air Force Base, when these individuals retire from the military, they tend to leave. We actually saw an

instance where we had three different individuals in North Las Vegas who retired from Nellis and then moved to Colorado. They had security clearances and knowledge of the industry. They moved to Colorado because it had vibrant areas in the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) or drone industry where they were able to market their talents. We were not able to keep them in North Las Vegas. We lost valuable residents who were paying taxes and who owned homes because we were unable to compete. Once we level the playing field and are able to attract some of these businesses in this area, some of our residents who are already well-trained, have their children in our schools, and are a part of our community, will be able to stay, and their tax dollars will be able to stay.

I completely understand your question about the two sides of the ledger. We are giving abatements to these businesses that would not otherwise be located in Nevada, and for some period of time, we do not capture revenue from that business. However, we do capture all the other things that business brings to the state. They are employers, they have driver licenses, they register their vehicles here, and they own homes in our cities. There is a snowball effect to all the revenues they generate. There is significant information and literature that demonstrates when these abatements are provided to businesses, they will hire more people. Once again, there is a greater opportunity for employment in our area. Aviation is a great example because what it does is captures one of the natural assets we have in southern Nevada, and it relocates something we have been losing as our airmen have been retiring.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I wanted to get clarification on that and get it on the record. I know what is happening in North Las Vegas. I have seen the shift in the quality of life. I have seen the "happy" grow within the residents. I want to make sure that ten years from now, we are not having the same battles and fights. That was not a good history for us in North Las Vegas. Things are shifting and people are starting to believe we can be a good place to live.

John Lee:

There were six sites set aside for drone testing to take place. The testing had to take place five miles from a residential area, and they could not be higher than 400 feet. We were so excited we got that determination. It was exciting for Nevada. However, the medical marijuana issue wiped out all the discussions of the drone industry and manufacturing for a period of time.

When people elected me to be Mayor of North Las Vegas, they did not ask me to fix their streetlights or spend my time solving barking dog issues. They asked me to make their lives better, make their property values go up, help

them get a job, and help them do the things that would give them a better quality of life. This may sound odd to you, but I am not paid to worry about the day-to-day operations of the small issues. What is this city going to be like in ten years? That is my job. That is how I assume my responsibilities. I have a half-billion-dollar business that I have to turn around.

If you look at the drone industry, there is a potential of 116,000 jobs, which is equal to mining, if we can capture this industry in Nevada. A UAV pilot receives \$110,000 per year. An engineer could make \$80,000 per year. Those are the jobs we are bringing to southern Nevada with the help of the Legislature.

We have one challenge. In any new industry, you will recognize everyone has a good idea and a portion of that industry becomes their specialty. There are 10 to 15 people who all have different specialties. They all think they are going to be lucky enough to attract everyone else to them, but they do not. Creative egos do not do that. Only through financial necessity does that happen. My job is to somehow, for the state of Nevada, find an astronaut or a general who will say Nevada is the place this is going to happen. We could then bring major aircraft companies into this area. We will be in the drone industry in a very small way until we get a luminary to stand up next to the Governor and say Nevada is where this industry takes place. That is what we are trying to accomplish right now. My job is to see that we suck up every bit of labor in our valley and put it to work, not just in North Las Vegas, so everyone has a job again and everyone has the quality of life we had in the past. The drone industry is a component of that.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

The Assembly Committee on Government Affairs is a new Committee for me. Looking at the history and what has happened to North Las Vegas, there seems to be a lot of things in play. This was a great presentation, but I hate to see so much on the plate for North Las Vegas. I seem to do a lot more homework in this Committee than I have had to do in previous committees. North Las Vegas is not even close to my district. However, there are Nevadans in that district and that is a concern of mine. The presentation provided great information. My only concern is the timeline. I just do not see that a lot of this will take off in a timely fashion to make it all happen. The way I see it now, it looks great on paper. I am not one to burst anyone's bubble, and I am not trying to throw anyone under the bus. However, we have to have reasonable goals. We have to dig ourselves out of the ditch before we can even think about building the road. I am not trying to put you on the spot. This was not really a question, and I apologize for that. The presentation is very much appreciated, but at the

end of the day, we need to make sure we take care of Nevadans. I know that is a priority for you, as well.

John Lee:

That is more a statement of fact. For years, North Las Vegas has done very little to work with the assets it has. I do not have the toughest job in Nevada by any means. I think Pat Skorkowsky, the Clark County School District Superintendent, has the toughest job. When I wake up in the morning, I am glad I have my job. I can solve my problems. In my experience, if you start a traditional business, you want to quit three times. If you fight through and get past the third time you want to quit, you go from no pay to slow pay to over pay, if you give your efforts time to compound. We are laying the groundwork today, but we are at warp speed as far as a local government goes, and as a business goes. I ask you to have a little faith and trust in me and the potential of North Las Vegas. I do not need the state to make my payroll or my bond payments. Keeping an eye on me makes me accountable to you. I will be back at the next legislative session giving you a more positive report.

Ryann Juden:

I agree with Assemblyman Carrillo as far as how this looks on paper. We have already started to see the vision on paper convert to reality. For example, we have a multinational company that has invested over \$150,000 in doing a preliminary engineering and design study on the waterline to Apex. This was a private company that saw what was on paper and thought it looked good. We expect to get the preliminary engineering and design study from them in the next few weeks. Their intent is to take the study back to their corporate board to seek private financing for the waterline. We are starting to see results today.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

As things come into play and the more information we have, we will be able to keep moving forward.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 64.

Assembly Bill 64: Authorizes the governing bodies of certain cities to take actions otherwise reserved to the board of county commissioners. (BDR 21-429)

Ryann Juden, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor/City Council, City of North Las Vegas:

I want to thank the Committee for hearing this bill and giving us the opportunity to answer any questions. During this session, we have already seen discussion regarding home rule. Assembly Bill 64 actually highlights some of the legal and institutional deficiencies that handle home rule. During the last few sessions, we have seen a tendency for this body to move decisions to the local level. We are seeing that more with some of the political-hot-potato issues. In the 120 days the Legislature has, there is not an opportunity to get through some of those issues, so there is a tendency to move them to the local level. This is actually something to be expected, and is one of the natural consequences of term limits.

One of the primary arguments for term limits is it breaks up consolidated power and diffuses it somewhat. In other states where they have implemented term limits, they have seen a power shift that moves to the Executive Branch. However, in Nevada, you could argue the Executive Branch already has sufficient power. What term limits would do is increase the propensity of this body to move more decision making down to the local level, which we are already starting to see.

Senate Bill No. 1 of the 28th Special Session is a landmark bill in Nevada, not just from the economic development standpoint, but because it provides a tremendous amount of home rule. One of the issues we have seen is that in Nevada, which has a tradition as a strong Dillon Rule state, we lack the institutional framework to properly capture and disseminate this power once it is passed to the local level.

A great example of that was the bill known as "More Cops." At the end of the last regular session, there was a special session to deal specifically with "More Cops" with Senate Bill No. 1 of the 27th Special Session. The power and authority was passed to Clark County to make a determination on "More Cops." The result was a tremendous amount of pressure on Clark County, both politically and financially. One of the realities we have in the state of Nevada is that Clark County is both a county and a city. Whenever power is transferred to them, sometimes they make decisions based on whether they are wearing their city hat or their county hat. "More Cops" is a great example of that. Every municipality in Clark County asked the county for more cops. Clark County had an issue with their police department and their

sheriff. They were looking at their budget and the issues they had, which impacted their decision. They were looking at the unincorporated residents within Clark County.

We refer to this bill around the office as the "share the pain bill." Had this change existed in law before the 2013 Legislative Session, there would have been some understanding by this body that when these decisions are passed to Clark County, and Clark County fails to act, it would continue to matriculate and cascade down to the local level.

We have spoken to Clark County about A.B. 64, and one of their concerns was the three-month provision. We are completely amicable to changing that provision. Clark County does not believe three months gives them proper opportunity and time to act. I want to make sure this is on the record. We believe "acting" in this bill is either voting for or against it. Once they have acted, it is a moot point, but if they do not act because of political pressures, it then moves to the local level. We would like to continue working with Clark County and come to an agreement on a more appropriate time limit.

This bill is designed to start creating some of the institutional framework within existing *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) that properly captures and disseminates home rule as this body sees fit to start delivering it. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

Could you give me a couple of examples of where the county commission has failed to act in a timely manner so we can understand the significance of this request? How does it harm the city?

Ryann Juden:

A wonderful answer to that question is specifically "More Cops." "More Cops" was something that dramatically impacted not only North Las Vegas but all the other cities. Once this decision came down to Clark County, there was a tremendous amount of pressure. During the discussion of "More Cops," there was some discussion of whether it should go to the cities who could unanimously decide. Ultimately, it was determined it should go to Clark County. However, Clark County acted specifically as a city in that discussion. They were very concerned with their own police department and with their own budget. Despite the fact that all the other cities may have had issues in their police departments, what was very clear was all the other cities wanted that authority.

While there might be limited examples now of how this specifically impacts us, we saw one example last session, and we see a tradition of home rule being discussed now. We believe there are some institutional deficiencies within the NRS that prevent the proper cascading of home rule.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I was here for the "More Cops" legislation. At the end of the day, it was not necessarily wise. We make these political decisions to pass things to the local level, but that does not make it right. We made decisions because we did not want the political heat, so we passed it to someone else who did not want it, and then they did not take it. Is this an effective fix for what naturally should have stayed in this house and should have been dealt with? If we give power without recognizing that the power should have maintained itself in that one body, is this the way to solve that issue?

Ryann Juden:

I am not going to opine on whether this body made a mistake or not when it came to "More Cops." I think this body does an outstanding job. I understand the underpinning premise of the question, which is responsibility. Regardless of the responsibility of this body, one of the things that is very apparent is there is an inclination, right or wrong, to start moving hot political issues to the local level. We want to make sure it is clear there are other levels besides just the county. In particular, with the unique nature of Clark County, which does provide municipal services and does act as a city, there could be conflicts. If "More Cops" was the tip of this iceberg of passing power down, we would like to relieve Clark County of some of that pain. Who knows if the mayors who testified actually wanted this power and were willing to put their necks on the line, but I do know our mayor, our council, and our police department desperately needed it. We were willing to receive the power that was passed down and act on it.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

Anytime we have legislation that refers to only certain counties by population, my question is always why? We do not usually pass special legislation to help solve disputes in one or two jurisdictions. Why not Washoe County? Why not the rural counties? This is not one of the issues where it appears to me the capacity in the rural counties would be any different. Why specifically Clark County and not the other counties and cities?

Ryann Juden:

I believe Washoe County dealt with this issue in the last session with school funding or bonding. I think for our interest, we put language in the bill for North Las Vegas and Clark County. The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)

constructed the bill. If there is some desire by this body to increase this to other counties, I believe that would be entirely appropriate. They are facing a similar problem. In a Dillon Rule state without the tradition of home rule, we lack the institutional framework to capture and disseminate the power.

Assemblyman Moore:

I would agree with Assemblywoman Joiner. I believe home rule as a whole is probably good for the state. To give certain counties or cities their own special privilege, I have a hard time with that, especially given the past track record of North Las Vegas being on the brink of bankruptcy and it being insolvent. It would seem to me that giving you additional power is not in the best interests of this body or your own city. Help me understand this.

Ryann Juden:

I do not disagree with the premise that this should not be solely for Clark County. In the construction of the bill with LCB, clearly, Clark County was the issue we were dealing with and how that power matriculated down. As far as whether North Las Vegas can be trusted with power and authority, I think is a good question. As this body is given power by the residents of Nevada by putting people in place to exert that power, I think the residents of North Las Vegas realize there was mismanagement and bad policy-making happening. Elections not only have consequences on governing, but they are also based on the decisions you have made. In that regard, the institution of democracy properly worked. That is, leaders who had made bad decisions in North Las Vegas were removed from office and replaced with new leadership. We have given testimony today regarding the visions of that leadership turning into action. I think the system, in that regard, works. If North Las Vegas should not have been trusted in the past, it is currently a new day, and we are demonstrating it is to be trusted and we are changing the fortunes of that city.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

It is not necessarily the 80-page bills that scare me as much as the 2-page bills. This looks to me like home rule within home rule. What are you seeking to achieve with this bill? What is the ultimate goal?

Ryann Juden:

The reason this did not need to be an 80-page bill is because an 80-page bill already exists. This bill provides a change to that framework of the NRS that recognizes where it might be silent as this body decides to exercise more home rule. The county is not the only local government that power should be cascaded down to. Other bodies below the county are also willing and capable of accepting the authority and power that this body delegates to them.

That is the interesting thing about home rule in Nevada. Everything is already spoken for. When you look at these all-encompassing home rule bills, such as Senate Bill 11, the reality is they may not do much of anything. This body, over a period of decades, has done a very good job of outlining specific powers in the state of Nevada. This body has reserved a tremendous amount of power to itself, but it has also delegated power to the local level. Power has already been shuffled around, and it has been decided where that power goes.

This bill suggests that as there is a propensity to increase the amount of home rule with the leftover power, there is a recognition that there are other government levels below the county that are capable, willing, and able to make decisions.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I am a big fan of local control. Having said that, I understand your willingness to work with the county on revamping some of the time requirements. I do want to make it clear that I would not be supportive of anything that would be construed in any way to be punitive in nature for past actions.

I will go on record as congratulating the City of North Las Vegas for the corrective actions it has taken, its successes, and its vision for things it wants to do in the future. I think your successes in those areas might well serve as a model for some of our other agencies that exist within the state of Nevada.

This Committee received a letter from Aaron L. Katz from Incline Village ([Exhibit D](#)), that addresses an issue that I would like you to be aware of when you work with Clark County. Perhaps the bill can be corrected with changing just a word or two. You may have to have your legal staff look at it, also. The letter we received from Mr. Katz is a fairly well-worded document that addresses an issue in Incline Village. Mr. Katz is worried that the population cap could easily be changed and somehow negatively impact him.

Ryann Juden:

If you could share that letter with us, it would be very helpful in our discussions.

Chairman Ellison:

The letter is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

Assemblywoman Dooling:

I share Assemblyman Trowbridge's feelings regarding local government. We have this balance of pull back and let go. I am a strong believer in the right people being on a bus and the right driver behind the wheel. I am very

impressed and I feel your confidence. I feel we must give this confidence to the right people. I am curious about the three-month provision and what you were thinking.

Ryann Juden:

I appreciate your confidence. We will not let you down. The three-month provision was used because we were looking at an appropriate time for a decision to be made. In discussions with Clark County, there was a further understanding that it may take them a little longer, as it has taken some time for us to turn our battleship around because of the intricacies of a large organization. Clark County is dramatically larger. They were concerned whether there would be sufficient time for them to act. That being brought to light, we agree. Three months would probably have been enough time for North Las Vegas to act. However, we understand it may not be enough time for Clark County.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any other questions from the members of the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in favor of the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wishes to testify on the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify who is neutral?

Sumiko Maser, Deputy Director, Administrative Services, Department of Taxation:

The Department of Taxation is neutral on this bill. However, this bill may have some impact on our Department. If a local government, specifically a city, were to approve an optional sales tax rate, this would essentially create a new tax jurisdiction within the state of Nevada.

Currently, we ask our taxpayers to report and remit taxes based on the 17 counties in Nevada. If a city were to implement an optional tax rate, that would create a new tax jurisdiction. This would create changes to our tax forms, as well as some changes to our unified tax system and the distribution process.

We were not asked to do a fiscal note on this bill, so we are not sure what the fiscal impact would be at this time, or if there would be any if an optional tax were to be approved by a city government. We did want to bring this to your attention. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Ellison:

Our Policy Analyst, Mr. McDonald, will speak to the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau regarding that issue. Is there any further testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Are there any final comments from the bill's sponsor? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 64. We will take a short recess before the work session.

[The Committee recessed at 10:02 a.m. and reconvened at 10:11 a.m.]

Chairman Ellison:

We will begin the work session with Assembly Bill 3.

Assembly Bill 3: Revises provisions governing the Public Employees' Retirement Board. (BDR 23-185)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 3 revises provisions governing the Public Employees' Retirement Board. This bill is sponsored by Assemblyman Kirner and was heard in this Committee on February 16, 2015. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Assemblyman Flores:

Assemblyman Kirner, I am curious about the intent behind the amendment. The two big issues that were raised during the hearing of the bill was why try to fix something that is not broken and the concern of having individuals on the board who do not have a stake in the system. Is the amendment you submitted somehow trying to find a middle ground for those issues and, if so, how do you think it accomplishes that?

Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Assembly District No. 26:

I am trying to find a middle ground. I strongly believe the public has an interest. Some people feel we are trying to fix something that is not broken. That has never been my contention. My contention is there is an interest and two people on a nine-member board is a minority representation. There was some testimony that it would change the plan and that Wall Street people would become involved. If that happens, the other seven people should be ashamed of themselves. I have seen this operate successfully across the state in many other boards.

I have personal experience with the Board of the Public Employees' Benefits Program. The members from the private sector, of which I was one, and I testify from my heart, all have fiduciary responsibility to the members. During

my 11 years on the board, the private sector members all contributed and participated in a valuable way.

I know you do not know the history of the Public Employees' Benefits Program, but when I arrived, they were not paying benefits and were in trouble. They had to ask the Legislature for additional money twice. The contribution that the general public members made was invaluable. Behind me are some members who may remember the key decisions, which frankly I drove, that helped their benefit structure by comingling them. I do not see it as a negative at all; I see it as a positive. The Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) is statewide, for all public employees, whether they are firemen, policemen, or people in counties and cities who administer our local governances. I think those are all good. I think the public has an interest in that. I am trying to find the middle ground. I was surprised at the outpouring because I do not see this as that big of a decision. I hope I have answered your question.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I am not sure whether this ever made it in writing, but at one point the proposal was to have the additional members be nonvoting. It has now been amended to where they are voting members. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Kirner:

There may have been some discussions, but I do not know if I was a party to that.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I believe you were.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I may have been, but I do not know that I had an in-depth conversation. At the end of the day, if they are not voting members, then they may as well not be there.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

That is exactly the point.

Assemblyman Kirner:

That is why I want voting members.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHELTON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 3.

Chairman Ellison:

I am waiting for a second to the motion. [There was no second.] For the record, I will second the motion so we can get a count of the votes.

CHAIRMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION FAILED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CARRILLO, DOOLING, FLORES, JOINER, MOORE, MUNFORD, NEAL, SILBERKRAUS, SPIEGEL, STEWART, TROWBRIDGE, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

We will now move to Senate Bill 82.

Senate Bill 82: Removes certain obsolete provisions relating to security services provided by the Capitol Police Division of the Department of Public Safety. (BDR 27-358)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 82 removes certain obsolete provisions relating to security services provided by the Capitol Police Division of the Department of Public Safety. The bill was sponsored by the Department of Public Safety and was heard in this Committee on February 23, 2015. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).] We have no amendments for this bill.

Chairman Ellison:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 82.

ASSEMBLYMAN TROWBRIDGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will ask Assemblywoman Joiner to take the floor statement. We will move to Senate Bill 90.

Senate Bill 90: Confers upon a person who is subject to the Nevada Code of Military Justice the right to demand a court-martial in lieu of accepting nonjudicial punishment. (BDR 36-338)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 90 confers upon a person who is subject to the Nevada Code of Military Justice the right to demand a court-martial in lieu of accepting nonjudicial punishment. This bill was sponsored on behalf of the Office of the Military and was heard in the Committee on February 23, 2015. [Continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).] We have no amendments for this bill.

Chairman Ellison:

Is there any discussion from the Committee? [There was none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SILBERKRAUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 90.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHELTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will ask Assemblyman Moore to take the floor statement. Is there any public comment? [There was none.] The meeting is adjourned [at 10:25 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lori McCleary
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman John Ellison, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: February 25, 2015

Time of Meeting: 8:33 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness/Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Ryann Juden, City of North Las Vegas	PowerPoint presentation
A.B. 64	D	Aaron L. Katz, Private Citizen	Letter in opposition
A.B. 3	E	Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
S.B. 82	F	Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
S.B. 90	G	Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document