MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Seventy-Eighth Session
February 18, 2015

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Pete Goicoechea at 1:32 p.m. on Wednesday, February 18, 2015, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Pete Goicoechea, Chair
Senator Joe P. Hardy, Vice Chair
Senator Mark Lipparelli
Senator David R. Parks
Senator Kelvin Atkinson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Nate Hauger, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Josh Reid, City of Henderson
Jennifer Lazovich, Focus Property Group; Olympia Companies
Rocky Finseth, Henderson Chamber of Commerce
Josh Hicks, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, Inc.
David Goldwater, KB Home Inspirada LLC
Jim Maniaci, President, Laughlin Economic Development Corporation
Tammi Davis, Treasurer, Washoe County
Yolanda King, Clark County
Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas
Scott Gilles, City of Reno
Cynthea Gregory, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office, Douglas County

Steve Walker, Carson City
Shannon Hogan, NAIOP
John Fudenberg, Clark County

Chair Goicoechea:
Mr. Reid, can you present Senate Bill (S.B.) 47 as amended, please?

SENATE BILL 47: Makes various changes relating to the Consolidated Local Improvements Law. (BDR 22-421)

Josh Reid (City of Henderson):
Senate Bill 47 deals with local improvement districts (LID), and we have made some changes to it in our proposed amendment (Exhibit C).

Local improvement districts are tools that the Legislature has given local governments, and the City of Henderson has used them for several decades. We have had 19 improvement districts created in Henderson. These have been important tools for financing public infrastructure in Henderson. On both of the bills today, we will be talking about a large master planned community in Henderson called Inspirada. The land for Inspirada was purchased from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) a little over a decade ago. The developer, called South Edge, LLC, entered into a development agreement with the City of Henderson. As part of that process, we agreed to create a local improvement district to help finance the costly public improvements at Inspirada.

When a LID is created, the governing body and the developer enter into a development plan. The LID engineer approves the public projects to be funded by the improvement district. Once that list of projects is created, the governing body uses its credit to sell bonds to investors to finance these improvements in that LID. For the LID in Inspirada, the City sold $100 million worth of bonds on the City of Henderson's credit to fund the infrastructure. This creates a lot of liability on the City, but there is a great benefit. Once the LID engineer approves the projects in the LID contract, the developer receives reimbursement from the LID bond proceeds to help finance the expensive public infrastructure projects.

During the 2011 Legislative Session, we asked the Legislature to modify the existing local improvement districts. A major problem occurred when the developer that we worked with ceased to exist during construction. This problem is the main reason we drafted this bill. With Inspirada, the City of

Henderson was at risk for $100 million in bonds sold for the improvement district and was now without a developer. The Legislature took action back in 2011. If you were to go to Inspirada in 2011, you would not have seen much going on there. However today, you will see model homes open and giant parks close to completion. That is all due to changes the Legislature made in 2011, allowing us to modify, reduce the scope of and change the LID projects. Before 2011, there was no process for us to do that. We now ask for other changes in how we modify LIDs.

The first change in Exhibit C, section 22, subsection 1, paragraph (a) authorizes cities and counties to make minor changes to development plans for improvement districts as long as the district engineer determines that they are functionally equivalent as stated in *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 271.641, subsection 2. One example of an issue is the LID in the eastern part of Lake Las Vegas. When the LID was created 10 years ago, a mistake was made in mapping for the road project. The road was mapped in such a way that it went directly into a mountain. To make that change in statute, we have to go through a full LID modification, which is expensive and time-consuming. This bill would allow us to build the road around the mountain if the LID engineer determines that the changes are functionally equivalent and bondholders are not impaired. Another example is that the sewage infrastructure could have changed in the last 10 years, creating a more efficient way to bring in water.

Senator Hardy:
What is a LID?

Mr. Reid:
A LID is a local improvement district created by a government entity pursuant to NRS 271. The LID engineer determines whether the public infrastructure in the plan benefits everybody in the district. If the LID engineer determines that the district will benefit all parties, an assessment placed on the property in that district is typically paid twice a year. Property owners in the LID pay that assessment to fund the infrastructure.

Including the term "functionally equivalent" in S.B. 47 allows us to change the LID contract without returning to the bondholders. This decreases costs, streamlines the process—that would have been helpful in the Inspirada LID modification—and will be a useful tool in future projects.

The second change we propose for NRS 271 is for commercial area vitalization projects. Right now, provisions for older commercial areas to create LIDs provide for beautification and increase property values in the districts. The City of Henderson asks to expand that concept to residential areas. In Henderson, we have had rapid expansion in the past 20 years, but we have a rich, long history that includes older neighborhoods. Neighborhoods come to us seeking tools to help beautify common areas. This would be a tool for neighborhoods to come to the City and petition to create one of these districts. It would work to revitalize commercial and residential areas.

The third change we recommend is a series of technical changes to administrative procedures involving LIDs. Changes to NRS 271.445 would allow Clark County or the City of Henderson to waive certain property owner fees and interests so long as the waivers do not impair bondholders. With the downturn in the economy, people who own land may not want to own that land. Some of these people were creditors who got property through forfeiture, and they often do not pay assessments on their property. As a result, they end up paying interest and penalties on the property. Over a number of years, interest and penalties can exceed the value of the actual land. Henderson has an interest in people paying their assessments so bondholders are not at risk. We are putting infrastructure in place so those people who have paid their assessments for a number of years get the benefit. It can be hard to find out who owns that land we call "zombie properties"—properties owned by people who do not wish to build on the land and have not paid assessments. When somebody wants to purchase that property for development, the City is happy because it means somebody will pay the assessments and help put in the infrastructure. When the penalties exceed the property value, we want to waive some of those penalties.

Language in NRS 271.429 makes it similar for cities and counties when they have to refund all leftover funds in excess of $25,000 to the property owners. The cost of returning that $25,000 is more than $25,000, so we want to increase the refund amount required to $50,000 to avoid spending general fund money.

Under statute, we are required to have a surplus in all of our LID deficiency funds for unforeseen occurrences, and we ask to expand some of the uses for that fund. We have hundreds of thousands of dollars with very limited possibilities for use under NRS 271. We want to use it for modification costs.

If property is sold pursuant to a property tax sale, we want to make sure that LID assessments are collected before a deed is given. We have worked on this issue with Washoe and Clark Counties that will want language changes.

Our amended bill has language dealing with waterfront improvement projects. We got this language from the Office of Economic Development, and we have been working with Clark County and marina owners in Laughlin.

Chair Goicoechea:
Will you clarify the portion regarding waterfronts beyond today's amendment?

Mr. Reid:
Yes.

Jennifer Lazovich (Focus Property Group; Olympia Companies):
I am here on behalf of Focus Property Group as well as Olympia Companies. We support the amended version of S.B. 47.

Rocky Finseth (Henderson Chamber of Commerce):
I am here today on behalf of the Henderson Chamber of Commerce. We support S.B. 47 and the proposed amendment.

Josh Hicks (Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, Inc.):
I am here today on behalf of the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, Inc. We support the bill and amendments. We have been working with the City of Henderson for several months, and the City has addressed many of our concerns in this bill.

David Goldwater (KB Home Inspirada LLC):
I am representing KB Home. We like the provision changes in the 2011 version, and we support S.B. 47.

Jim Maniaci (President, Laughlin Economic Development Corporation):
We support the amended bill. The previous drafts concentrated on the shoreline and up. Laughlin is the only Nevada community on the Colorado River, and this is on a navigable stream. The Laughlin Lagoon used to be part of the river way, and then the federal government channelized the river, digging a connecting channel to the Lagoon. After dredging it once, the federal government said it was no longer its responsibility, so we looked for a way to clean it out and keep

it clean. We came across the local improvement district law, and we worked closely with the Clark County Department of Public Works. When we got to the bond counsels, they said we needed to amend the law. We started working on the local improvement district law. Our focus is from the ordinary high-water mark, which is the shoreline-termed boundary for navigable streams. We want to concentrate on the underwater part so aquatic streets can have the same status as terrestrial streets. The federal government-dug channel connecting to the Colorado River wound up with an unimproved wash into which flowed all of the silt, which blocked the channel. We need a way to clear that out and keep it clean. This bill would help.

Jim Shaw, a former board member candidate for the Washoe County Board of Trustees, wrote:

> Waterfront project means a project undertaken by or on behalf of a contiguous group of property owners fronting on a public river, bay, lagoon, lake, pond or other similar body of water for the purpose of protecting, repairing, restoring and maintaining the shoreline, water access, navigability and the bottom of the adjacent body of water, including without limitation, bulkheads of any kind, retaining walls, dredging, plumbing, landscaping, excavating, filling, graveling, riprapping, drainage structures of all kinds and all the pertinences and incidentals or any combination thereof, including real and other property therefore.

Shaw points out that the property owners end up paying for all of these improvements.

Chair Goicoechea:
The amendment covers most of your concerns.

Tammi Davis (Treasurer, Washoe County):
Washoe County is neutral on the premise of the bill. We have expressed some concerns with the amended language; if they are not addressed, I will oppose the amendment. Our main concern is that this changes NRS 361 which deals with the collection of ad valorem property taxes, and we want to make sure that this in no way risks our collection of those taxes by tax sale. Mr. Reid mentioned that they ask for very large assessments to be added to the amount we collect at tax sale. If that amount exceeds what someone is willing to pay

for a property at auction, we may not be able to sell the property and collect our taxes, which would impact revenue for a multitude of agencies. There needs to be a better definition of some of the terms. Mr. Reid mentioned waiving interest. Given various kinds of interest, we want that tightened up to clearly indicate which type of interest he wants to waive.

A phrase used in Exhibit C in sections 25 and 27 that regards delinquent assessments could have various meanings. We would like to work with the City of Henderson to tighten that language up and ensure it only applies to the intent. The NRS 361.603 says if a government agency requests a property on our tax sale list for a use specified therein, delinquent taxes need not be paid. The proposed amendment includes assessments in that waiver of payment. I have some concern that if a school district requests a parcel for open space and does not pay that assessment, it could negatively affect the city or county that holds the bonds for that assessment.

Chair Goicoechea:
In Exhibit C, section 20, subsection 4 includes the phrase, "as provided by law." That sounds like a protection to both the treasurer and the collection from the county or city. The statute was already settled as far as the county's ability to sell tax delinquent property.

Ms. Davis:
Legally, we are allowed to sell it; I am worried whether we would find somebody willing to pay our asking amount for the property. Imagine that I need to collect on a parcel with a $1 million assessment we added to the delinquent tax amount, and the value of that property is lower than the assessment cost. Not only will we not collect that assessment, we also will not collect property taxes relied on by various agencies.

Chair Goicoechea:
Your concern is by adding the assessment to unpaid property tax …

Ms. Davis:
It may not be sellable.

Senator Hardy:
Do you have "zombie properties" in Washoe County too?

Ms. Davis:
With a loose understanding of that term, we do. I took two properties to tax sale last year with add-on assessments, and they were not sold. That may not have been the only reason they did not sell, but it is a concern.

Senator Hardy:
You need tools to sell the property so you can get revenue from property tax.

Ms. Davis:
That is correct.

Yolanda King (Clark County):
I echo the concerns that Ms. Davis expressed, specifically, the references to NRS 361 and the notification in providing procedure related to that. With language changes that address our concerns, we will support this amendment.

Senator Parks:
We have not heard from Las Vegas, North Las Vegas or Reno on this bill.

Brian McAnallen (City of Las Vegas):
We have reviewed S.B. 47 and with no major concerns, we are generally supportive of what Henderson wants to do.

Scott Gilles (City of Reno):
The City of Reno has no position at this time. We are looking at the bill language and potential changes to which we may be comfortable.

Chair Goicoechea:
We would like to have some changes to this amendment back soon.

Mr. Reid:
We have proposed amendments to S.B. 66 as well.

SENATE BILL 66: Revises provisions governing local governmental agreements for the development of land. (BDR 22-422)

We have worked with the building community and the development community. This bill incorporates the input we have received from other governments and the development community. Development agreements are one of the important

tools we have to outline the development of a city. A lot of the language found with development agreements in NRS 278 is sparse. The language has been there for 20 or 30 years; a lot has changed since then, especially in Henderson. Rapid growth and the recession caused changes to development agreements, so we no longer have anybody to call on the phone to discuss the development agreement we entered into. There is a need to amend NRS 278 provisions to reflect the realities of how jurisdictions across the State use development agreements. Development agreements are for large and small projects. They are bilateral contracts entered into between the governing body of the jurisdiction, in our case the City Council of Henderson, and the developer.

For Inspirada, when the vacant land was purchased from the BLM, the developer came to the City Council to enter into a development agreement pursuant to NRS 278. The benefit of the development agreement is that it gives developers certain entitlements: security in the contract; provisions for the density, the number of homes; public infrastructure; and zoning that they may change as part of the development. They also get what the city has to put in for the development; the schedule that they have to keep; and potential assurances on how quickly permits may be approved. Development is a complex process; you need various maps approved before you can start building. Bilateral agreements give the developer certain assurances recorded on the property. It gives the city certain assurances to know what infrastructure will be built, quality of the construction, time frame for completion and an enforcement tool to make sure everything in the plan ends up in the final development. This is recorded and approved as an ordinance in the jurisdiction, and usually our agreement is with one master developer of the property. Then that master developer sells out parcels to builders, and the development agreement is recorded on those builders' lands.

Normally, landowners are not a party to that agreement, even though it is recorded on their land. Development agreements work for developers. They can be tools to secure financing for a development because they have assurances from the governing body of the jurisdiction that they can build and have these entitlements. Development agreements are stated in law not only for large developments like Inspirada but also for smaller projects.

Say they are building a 5-acre project and because that includes houses, $25,000 of flood protection is now required. This can be secured through a development agreement.

Due to the downturn in the economy, the developer that we entered into an agreement with during the Inspirada, South Edge, declared bankruptcy. That is a bad thing for everybody. Development is halted without a developer, which means jobs are lost and the tax base does not increase as expected. We were successful through a lot of time, money and effort to do an amended development agreement after the Inspirada bankruptcy. Since amending the agreement, we have stuck to the original plan for Inspirada and resumed construction. However, we are not always lucky enough to find a new developer when one disappears. We entered into an agreement with one developer who owned a large plot of land. South Edge sold out some of the land in parcels before going bankrupt. Then instead of having one landowner to deal with, we had dozens of landowners who did not necessarily want to be landowners; they were just given loans and they had to foreclose. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 278, which deals with development agreements, does not provide us with enough guidance in what to do in those situations.

We want to revise statute to reflect how development agreements are used throughout the State. We have looked at other states' authorizing statutes, such as those in Arizona, for ideas to draw from. We want to rewrite the Nevada statute to reflect how agreements are put into practice. We want to give jurisdictions tools to adapt when the developer disappears. We also want to talk and revise the termination process.

The first change I want to discuss is the amended language in the definition of infrastructure. The definition of infrastructure in statute is sparse. We looked at development agreement terms in use across the State and added them to this amended definition.

Second, NRS 278.0201 is the authorizing provision allowing jurisdictions to enter into development agreements. In the comparison chart (Exhibit D), we are asking to remove the text in green. One of the more recent changes to NRS 278 relating to development agreements occurred in the 2009 Session. If you have a master plan and want to convert that commercial project or residential project to a renewable energy project, you could do so by July 1, 2013. This confuses many people about whether it only applies to renewable energy. It appears to only apply to project conversions to renewable energy. We did some research and could not find a project that used this provision to convert. Because nobody has used this, we ask that this provision be removed.

In NRS 278.0201, we want to add what is mandatory in the development agreement. This statute is outdated. Development agreements must contain a description of the subject land; the events of default; and specific cure periods. This is important when we come to determination provisions. All agreements the City of Henderson enters into are heavily negotiated with default provisions and cure periods. It makes sense to require these under law.

Pages 2 and 3 of Exhibit D, in the yellow text, discuss nonrequired provisions that development agreements across the State may contain. These include: permitted uses of the land; reservation and dedication for public purposes or the payment of fees; issues dealing with environmental protection that NRS 278 requires; preservation of historic structures; the phasing and timing of construction or development, which is fairly common as a central portion of the development agreement; and the contingent terms, restrictions and requirements for infrastructure and how that may be financed.

On top of the Inspirada development agreement, we mentioned our $100 million LID when talking about S.B. 47. There are triggers between the two, how the LID functions and how the development agreement functions with regard to public improvements.

These are conditions and terms related to annexation plus schedule fees and charges to which the master developer usually wants assurances to get map approval. The developer may want expedited fees. The developer and governing body negotiate that in a contract between them. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 278 contains a catchall provision. These agreements do not inhibit the city's ability to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens.

The changes in Exhibit D for NRS 278.0201 allow some flexibility for the governing body dealing with specific issues.

Next, I will talk about termination and amendment of development agreements. In effect since 1985 without change, NRS 278.0205, subsection 1 states that:

> The agreement for development of land may be amended or cancelled, in whole or in part, by mutual consent of the parties to the agreement or their successors in interest, except that if the governing body determines, upon a review of the development of the land held at least once every 24 months, that the terms or

> conditions of the agreement are not being complied with, it may cancel or amend the agreement without the consent of the breaching party.

This gives a significant amount of authority to local jurisdictions to unilaterally cancel development agreements. There is a default on the developer party. This has been in effect since 1985.

I have provided proposed amendments to S.B. 66 for discussion (Exhibit E).

Senator Lipparelli:
Does your change in section 7, subsection 1 of Exhibit E give the governing body unilateral authority to determine whether a breach occurred? Are any notice provisions contained in the amended bill wherein the governing body asserts a breach?

Mr. Reid:
Statute has unilateral power determining if the governing body determines a breach, that they are not compliant, what our bill …

Senator Lipparelli:
Stop there. The governing body today, in its own view, determines if there is a breach. Is there any notice to the developer that the governing body has asserted a breach?

Mr. Reid:
Yes. The breach should be conferred in a development agreement. Henderson development agreements have these when somebody breaches the agreement and cure periods. That is why we ask for a requirement to determine a breach by terms of the negotiated agreement.

Senator Lipparelli:
In section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (i) (1), this would come after that notice provision and period of cure. The city can say we have notified the other party that a breach has occurred; now we take this unilateral action so we can move on to other elements of the public hearing.

Mr. Reid:
That is correct. The goal is to balance the interests of the government regarding the unilateral authority already in statute by providing some due process. Normally, development agreements are amended by mutual consent. Since we began working on this bill, two development agreements have been amended in the City of Henderson by mutual consent. The Union Village development agreement and the Inspirada development agreement were amended by mutual consent in the last 6 months. Usually, amendments come from a request by the developer when it runs into schedule or design issues. In my experience, it is rare for a city to request a unilateral amendment to a development agreement.

When the developer went bankrupt, no developers stepped in to replace it. We need a way to deal with this situation in the future. In the 30 years local governing bodies have had unilateral power, I do not know of any circumstance where they abused this power.

Senator Lipparelli:
Why would statute not be effective to the governing body when it no longer has an agreement upon a developer default? I am worried about the expansive nature of the language, giving broad power without the consent of other parties.

Mr. Reid:
I submitted a map of the Inspirada town center (Exhibit F), which is subject to its own development agreement. This is the commercial portion of the Inspirada community. The developer here went bankrupt, and we do not have a developer in its place. Without the developer—and with the old development agreement in place, people cannot do anything with their land because the developer is in breach and no longer exists. Under statute, we can do a review at least once every 24 months to determine if we can cancel the agreement due to noncompliance. When some of these people purchased the property, the development agreement provided entitlements and value. Because we are taking that away and over concern with this issue, we want to add some due process, so people who have an equitable interest in land can have a hearing. This does not exist now. In this specific example, they fall under planned community zoning, meaning they cannot do anything with their land until another development agreement is finalized. We have tried to work with the various landowners to come up with a new land plan and development agreement. We want to amend the development agreement rather than cancel it because it does not help to kill everything and start from scratch.

When parties litigate, it can be hard to work with them together. In section 7, subsections 3 and 4 of Exhibit E, the amended version of S.B. 66, we ask for the ability to work with different landowners in small groups rather than deal with the whole group at once.

If we require that development agreements have default provisions and cure periods, that would fix many issues. Some suggest that we should have a statutory definition of default or a statutory cure period. For those who have to enforce these, the problem with this is that developments of different sizes should have different cure periods. That is why these bilateral agreements are negotiated between parties. The hearing would have everybody with accruable interest in land getting his or her objections on the record; the governing body would consider those and make a decision based on the testimony.

The rest of Exhibit E contains conforming changes for the definitions throughout NRS 278, mainly to change how infrastructure is defined. The amendment we have today is better than the bill because it includes input from local governments and builders across the State.

Chair Goicoechea:
It is unusual that we would put something in statute and have it retroactively apply to agreements for the development of land.

Mr. Reid:
We put that in the bill to make sure that this due process would apply to existing agreements. We are willing to work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau to find something that may work better. As new development agreements come up, we will have a better way to protect ourselves from developers who go bankrupt.

Senator Lipparelli:
In Exhibit E, section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (ii) [(2)], sub-subparagraph b. [(II)], can you give me your sense of what it means when it says, "the governing body shall consider all the testimony presented at the hearing." Is the governing body allowed to make any decision they want regardless of what they hear in testimony?

Mr. Reid:
In the previous bill we submitted, we stated that based on the evidence presented, the governing body had to find substantial evidence in favor of the decision, which is the typical standard the Nevada Supreme Court has put on most land use decisions. We took that provision out because many people we spoke to while drafting this amendment told us that was repetitive. We intend to create a forum for people with an equitable interest in land who are not necessarily parties to the agreement. We want to give them a say because decisions may eventually affect their property. However, it can be difficult to fully accommodate their interests. A case where one parcel was owned by 200 tenants in common made it difficult to get a sign-off from all the owners.

Cynthea Gregory (Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office, Douglas County):
We support the bill as amended to which we have worked closely with the City of Henderson. In regard to Senator Lipparelli's questions, the only notice provided is publication, so this does afford more due process rights.

Steve Walker (Carson City):
We echo Ms. Gregory's testimony on the amended version.

Mr. McAnallen:
I also echo Ms. Gregory's remarks on the amended version of the bill. If there is a working group, the City of Las Vegas would like to be involved.

Mr. Hicks:
We oppose the amended version of S.B. 66. We have been working with the City of Henderson, and the amended version addresses many of the concerns we voiced. We still have some issues and hope to get them addressed by the next hearing. One of our primary concerns revolves around having an opportunity to cure as a baseline in the statute. That is in many agreements, but we want to have some rules regarding the cure in every agreement.

Ms. Lazovich:
Both of my clients have existing development agreements in various jurisdictions in southern Nevada. Like Mr. Hicks, we are just expressing some concern with the amended bill. It will take a little more work between the City of Henderson and my clients for us to give our support.

Shannon Hogan (NAIOP):
The NAIOP, northern Nevada, opposes this bill. We have concerns how the amendments in sections 4 and 9 of Exhibit E would affect the structure of contract law. Nevertheless, we are interested in working with the bill sponsor to find agreeable language.

Mr. Goldwater:
I represent KB Home. I signed in as neutral. The City of Henderson seems willing to address our concerns.

John Fudenberg (Clark County):
I am representing Clark County. We agree with Mr. Goldwater's concerns.

Mr. Reid:
The discussion with some of those who testified has been beneficial, and I am confident that we can come to a resolution. Not all homebuilders are the same, and they make up a large constituency, so we want to address all their concerns. We want the Legislature rather than the courts to define how these agreements are done. We aim to work out the kinks in the next week.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Chair Goicoechea:
The meeting is adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Nate Hauger,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit**		**Witness or Agency**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 47	C	31	City of Henderson	Proposed Amendments to S.B. 47
S.B. 66	D	5	City of Henderson	Comparison of NRS 278
S.B. 66	E	11	City of Henderson	Proposed Amendments to S.B. 66
S.B. 47 S.B. 66	F	1	City of Henderson	Map of Inspirada Town Center