

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Eightieth Session
April 30, 2019**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Sandra Jauregui at 4:02 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2019, in Room 3142 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 at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman John Hambrick (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5
Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
Brenda J. Erdoes, Committee Counsel
Catherine Bodenstein, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Rick Carter, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Kathleen Nash, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Denell Hahn, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Jim Hartman, Private Citizen, Genoa, Nevada
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson
Alanna Bondy, representing EHB Companies, LLC
Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber
of Commerce
Warren B. Hardy II, representing Council for a Better Nevada
Elliot Anderson, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education
Joannah Schumacher, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Juanita Cox, Chair, Citizens in Action
Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Chair Jauregui:

[Roll was called and Committee protocols were explained.] Welcome, everybody, to the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. I will open the hearing today starting with Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint): Requires an interim study concerning the development of certain golf courses. (BDR S-60)

I will invite our bill sponsors up to the table. Thank you.

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5:

I am here today to present Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint). A few months ago, an article in *The Wall Street Journal* entitled “Golf-Home Owners Find Themselves in a Hole” noted that prices for homes near a golf course typically decrease 25 percent when the golf course closes, but the price decrease can be even more devastating, by 40 to 50 percent, if a contentious legal battle over the closure ensues. The article noted, “Golf participation peaked in 2001, when nearly 30 million people played more than 500 million rounds; in 2017, that figure dropped to nearly 24 million people playing about 450 million rounds.”

A constituent in my district, Rick Carter, brought this issue to my attention when a developer purchased the golf course adjacent to his home and made moves to add high-density housing in place of the golf course.

My intent with Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint), as I introduced it, was to provide some reasonable protection to homeowners who purchase homes near golf courses, specifically

because those homes are near golf courses. At the beginning of this session, however, it became clear to me and to the other cosponsors on this bill that the provisions of the bill as introduced might not be the best approach to address this issue. Candidly, I do not know what the best approach is, and after considerable discussion with numerous interested parties on both sides of the issue, I decided that the issue merits further study during the interim.

To this end, I offered an amendment in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs to delete and replace the original bill with provisions that would direct the Legislative Commission to appoint a committee to conduct an interim study concerning the development of residential golf courses and subsequent conversion of such golf courses to other uses.

With your permission, I would like to walk the Committee through Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint) proposes the following for this interim study:

1. The interim committee must be composed of six legislators, three from each house, who will be appointed by majority and minority leadership.
2. In the course of the study, the committee must:
 - a. "Examine, research and identify the procedures available in this State and other states for the conversion of land used as a residential golf course to any other use;"
 - b. Consider how such procedures should involve affected local governing bodies, the owners of the residential golf course, and the residents of affected communities; and
 - c. Submit a report of the results of the study and any recommendations for legislation to the director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 2021 Nevada Legislature.
3. The committee should consult with and solicit participation from:
 - a. Representatives of local governmental bodies and agencies that regulate planning, zoning, and land development;
 - b. Representatives of businesses that develop residential golf courses;
 - c. Representatives of residents who live in the communities that include residential golf courses;

- d. Representatives of the Real Property Law Section of the State Bar of Nevada; and
- e. Any other persons the committee determines would be appropriate.

Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint) defines a “residential golf course” to exclude a commercial driving range that is not operated in conjunction with a golf course; any clubhouse or business associated with a golf course; or a lot or parcel owned by a person who holds a gaming license for a resort hotel.

The Legislature has a long history of working to provide solutions to keep Nevadans in their homes. When countless homeowners were facing foreclosures during the recession and now when the economy is turning around and affordable housing is still scarce, we work to find solutions for them.

The Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau has advised me that there is no appropriate legislative statutory committee to assume responsibility for the study. Therefore, the proposed amendment was drafted to require the Legislative Commission to appoint a committee to conduct the study.

I am going to go off my script at this moment. Yesterday, I heard about an amendment to Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint), and this afternoon I received a copy of that amendment (Exhibit C). It does three things. I believe the proponent of this amendment will come forward and discuss it. I am not in opposition to this amendment; it is just that I do not think it is necessary because one issue is the definition of a residential golf course. I would assume that is also something the study committee would determine. We put in a definition for a residential golf course in this measure in order for us to have something in transitory language that would help the Committee know where we wanted this to go.

Concerning the other two issues, one deals with a moratorium on development and the other one deals with any pending litigation on other golf courses. I am going to have that person discuss this amendment, but should the Committee want us to pursue an amendment to Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint), of course, I am more than happy to continue conversations, but we also know that we are under a time crunch, so I would not want to extend that time very long.

I have with me Senator Parks, who will be making some comments as well, and also, once Senator Parks has made his remarks, we would like to go the Grant Sawyer State Office Building where my constituent, Rick Carter, is, and we would love to hear from him. Madam Chair, if it is okay with you, I would like to have the Committee hear from Senator Parks and then Mr. Carter. Thank you very much.

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7:

As a cosponsor of this bill, I came to the table with Senator Woodhouse, but I think she has covered everything pretty well. Unless there are questions, I think I will keep my remarks brief and conclude with that. Thank you.

Rick Carter, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I know that Senator Parks is there with you and then, of course, Senator Woodhouse has been the chief author. I would like to thank her and say hello to her and Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo who is, of course, on your Committee. For the record, we do not have this amendment here in front of us. I am going to have some difficulty addressing that, although perhaps before this is over we can get that amendment so I can take a look at it.

On July 3, 2017, many of the approximately 5,000 residents residing in more than 1,500 homes composing the Grand Legacy community learned from TV news that the Legacy Golf Club course had been sold. The Legacy community spans over approximately two square miles north to south from Windmill Parkway to Wigwam Parkway, and east to west from North Pecos Road to North Valle Verde Drive in Henderson.

The next day, July 4, 2017, the Legacy Golf Club was summarily closed. All staff, including the maintenance staff, were fired, the water was turned off, and the property was chained off and immediately began to deteriorate. We now have the amendment. Ten days later, the Grand Legacy Community Association hired a team of attorneys to uphold the tenets of the community deed restrictions, reinstate the maintenance of the golf course, and preserve the community's way of life. In an emergency court session, the judge required the developers to maintain the golf course as a golf course until final determination of the court could be rendered regarding the litigation.

This initial step was critical in keeping the golf course viable for the future, and this is the core of our concerns in regard to similar situations throughout Nevada. We have learned that once a course is closed and not maintained, it becomes almost impossible to retrieve it from deterioration due to the huge expense involved. I could cite numerous golf courses in numerous communities that are facing a situation of a closure and the old golf course turning into desert.

During the next eight months, the Grand Legacy Community Association was galvanized to fight the impact of the developers' plans to kill the golf course and build housing in its place. The Grand Legacy Community Association was joined in its lawsuit by my homeowners' association, the Master Series homeowners' association (HOA), and the Green Valley Village Community Association. Several other Legacy HOAs provided financial support to the three named plaintiffs in the lawsuit since they, too, recognized the importance of the litigation to their way of life.

The community impact we determined at the time was quite severe:

1. The negative environmental effects on air quality, soil content, wildlife indigenous to the community due to poisonous chemicals, dust, and pollution that would be unearthed during the process of development.
2. Increased overcrowding of schools as Clark County School District confirmed that all school levels in Green Valley were overcrowded and remain so today.
3. A potential increase in crime as verified by the Henderson Police Department.
4. Immediate devaluation of home and property values of up to almost 40 percent. Additionally, many people in this community throughout the golf course paid lot premiums on their lots if they were, in fact, on the golf course or facing the golf course. This, in and of itself, would lead to a decrease in the tax base for the City of Henderson, Clark County, and all other entities relying on property taxes.
5. There would be an increase in traffic and other issues.
6. Lastly, a state of limbo was caused by not knowing the outcome of the fight over the development which led to months and months of angst on our part, stress, doom and gloom, et cetera.

Just a side note here: The day our golf course litigation was resolved, 17 real estate agents entered our HOA on one single day, realizing that the community had bounced back in terms of value.

In our quest to find a solution to our plight, members of the Legacy community met with Henderson Mayor Debra March and some of her executive cabinet; Commissioner Jim Gibson; Henderson City Councilman, Dan Stewart; Senators Joyce Woodhouse and David Parks; Assemblymen Fumo and Cohen; and other elected and community leaders.

The outcome of the lawsuit is that the suit settled. However, our community made a pledge to the four legislators who held our hands through this terrible ordeal that we would help the citizens of the entire state of Nevada come to terms with what is becoming a scourge on many, many communities, a scourge in many of your legislative districts. Frankly, it is not over yet.

Senator Woodhouse described briefly the original bill that she and the three other members of the Legislature introduced. She was quite clear about it. We were very excited about that bill because it laid out a process we felt would be fair and equitable to all concerned and provide us some stability throughout the entire state of Nevada. She described why she has reverted to a study. We support that. We think that her reasoning and the reasoning behind moving to a study that the other legislators decided on makes sense. So we want to be supportive of the bill as it was amended. Again, I am going to take a second and look at this amendment that Senator Woodhouse talked about because I am not familiar with that yet.

We think that a study would do some very important things for all of you as legislators. It would keep this issue in front of us for the next two years. It would potentially involve all stakeholders if members of the Legislature would invite everybody to come and sit at the table and discuss the various issues involved. It would allow us to seek solutions that we may not have thought of or understand the problems a little bit better than what we understand at this point in time. It will allow the members of the Legislature to come to the next session of the Legislature with, hopefully, a solution that we can all join hands and support. We hope that will be the case. We do not want this issue to die today or between now and the end of the session, and we hope that if it does pass—we hope it does—that the study will be funded and will actually go forward. I understand there are a limited number of studies. I am not really sure about how that works, but only a limited number of studies can be pursued during the interim.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, if you might indulge me for a moment, I would like to read the amendment, and I think there are some other people here who might like to speak if members do not have any questions for me at this time.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Carter. We are going to open to questions from the Committee and then we will move forward with testimony in support. Members, do you have any questions?

For everyone in the audience, the amendment to which Senator Woodhouse was referring ([Exhibit C](#)) is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

Committee, does anybody have any questions for Senator Woodhouse or Senator Parks?

Assemblyman Daly:

I am looking at the study as proposed, and I know the original bill talked about not being able to use this for an alternative use. I think when you list out the people who the committee would be required to talk to, it seems all to the one side about golf courses. It seems to me that there is no specific reference to somebody who might want to develop it for an alternative development, whether it be apartments, low-income housing, whatever it might be. It just says any other person the committee deems appropriate, so you have a representative of local government, a representative of businesses that develop golf courses, a representative of people who live in the community, a representative of the Real Property Section from the State Bar, but you do not have anybody on the other side who might want to develop the land in the highest, best use, which developers always want to do. If they own it and they are not making money as a golf course and they want to convert it to something else, I think those people have to be represented. They are not there. I think it should be specifically put in there that those people have to be consulted the same as the other side.

Senator Woodhouse:

I understand your point. That has not been brought up yet before. If this Committee does entertain this bill, I would be more than happy to talk about proper language in order to add that. I looked at the last one, which is very broad, as any other persons the committee

determines to be appropriate. But if the Committee would like to have something more specific, we certainly can entertain that. Thank you.

Assemblyman Daly:

I know this study is not necessarily about a specific location or various things, but I understand, as you said, there was an issue, apparently, and I am not familiar with it as much as some others from southern Nevada might be. But was the community golf course—whatever it was—owned by the HOA? Was it privately owned and run by somebody else and this developer decided he wanted to develop his land into something with a higher, better use, in his opinion? As long as it met the zoning requirements, I think he could do that. I am just curious. Who owned it when the change was proposed to be made?

Senator Woodhouse:

I believe Rick Carter could answer that question from the Legacy group, and there will be some other individuals, I am sure, in the audience regarding other golf courses and the situations that they have experienced. Mr. Carter could answer the question regarding Legacy. Thank you.

Rick Carter:

The answer to the question is that the golf course had been owned by an insurance company for many, many years. This was a course that was originally developed when Hank Greenspun deeded some property—lots and lots of different properties—in the city of Henderson in an effort to attract homeowners, et cetera, into the city. He—Hank Greenspun—placed deed restrictions on the property—the golf course property itself—because he did not want somebody to own that property and then do something else with it the next day. So there were actual deed restrictions on that property running for 50 years. Did that answer your question?

Chair Jauregui:

Yes, Mr. Carter. Thank you so much. Committee, does anyone else have any questions for the bill sponsors? Seeing no one, we will open it up to testimony in support.

Kathleen Nash, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I also live in the Master Series at Legacy. I think Mr. Carter has laid out what happened to our neighborhood. Even though we won—using the term loosely—in court, we had to hire lawyers, and we had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars—all paid for by all of the homeowners who were in the Legacy. We had to spend hundreds of hours of our time even though we had this deed restriction. In the end we proved that they did not have the right to develop it. We won, but I want you to know that when we have to fight the golf course because there are no laws and rules about it, it costs thousands of dollars and a lot of people's time. In the end they upheld us, but we still paid the price for it. We were lucky. Not all the other golf courses are as lucky as we are. Thank you.

Denell Hahn, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I am representing the Black Mountain Neighborhood Association. I want to thank all of you for shining a light on this issue. I think it is something that has affected some of the golf courses in southern Nevada, but it is affecting every golf course in the state of Nevada. Anyone who lives by a golf course, anyone who drives by a golf course, whose children play golf, pay attention to what is happening. Now that our land is increasing in value, developers are looking for open spaces, and they are trying to find ways to less expensively acquire some open spaces.

We support Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint) in its amended form. We would have much preferred the original bill because for the Black Mountain golf course, quite frankly, two years is probably too long for us, but we are still in the game. I think that the study would be an excellent opportunity for other golf courses and even Black Mountain to be included in the study. We appreciate the positive steps that must and should be taken with an interim study.

In February 2018, the Henderson city leaders adopted a closure and maintenance ordinance to deal with the problems of a closed golf course property during the time it was considered for redevelopment. We were delighted. We are delighted with the leadership in Henderson, but now that the Black Mountain golf course has been closed for six months, it is clear that the language and the requirements need adjustment. We are finding that many areas of that golf course and maintenance agreement are being interpreted incorrectly by the potential developer. We have seen that there has been no irrigation to our golf course for over six months. It is presenting quite a hazard to us as we speak.

We have several amendments that we are going to offer to the Henderson City Council next week that will incorporate elements of the original Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint). It will better accommodate the issues that we are facing such as open spaces, buffers between existing structures, and of utmost importance is the environmental study. Our research reveals that we have fungicides, arsenic, pesticides, and other turf applications significantly on golf courses. This is something that happens, and you know if you have been on a golf course or play golf, to have that lush turf, they dump chemicals and have for a long, long time. Our golf course is 60 years old. We have 60 years' worth of contaminants in our soil. We are immediately concerned because with no watering, that soil does not stay on the ground. It is in our dust. It is in our air right now. We are worried about the contamination of the soil for current and future use, but we are concerned about the dust and contamination in our homes and in our lungs right now. I have to tell you this is an extremely important situation.

Requiring a study will be important to all areas of the state. If Henderson will agree to our amendments, this study committee will have the additional benefits of the real-time application of golf course conversion requirements. We encourage the passage of the interim study and, especially with the stated health consequences, we think the study is essential and continued attention to this problem is really necessary. I thank you.

Jim Hartman, Private Citizen, Genoa, Nevada:

I want to indicate that this issue of golf course closures is not really limited to southern Nevada, but also includes northern Nevada, Washoe County, Sparks—Assemblyman Daly's district, I believe, has had a golf course closure—Carson City, and I come from Genoa.

Twelve miles from here is the Genoa Lakes golf course, rated one of the ten best golf courses in Nevada. Last year, the owner group of that golf course indicated they were threatening to close Genoa Lakes unless their—what I would describe—demands were met by neighbors, our homeowners' association. That is only 12 miles from here. The owners bought that golf course—two golf courses, actually—in 2014: the Ranch Course and the Lakes Course. They paid \$3.25 million for two golf courses, water rights, and buildings. They bought golf courses. Instead of thinking they have golf courses, they have decided that they see the opportunity to residentially develop those golf courses even though that would conflict with the covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs), the PUD [planned unit development filing with the county], and a court decision that limits the development at Genoa Lakes to 220 home sites. There is a public threat of intimidation that we will close our golf course unless you do what we demand.

We have mobilized within our homeowners' association. We were inspired by what Henderson has done with its ordinance. We have support from 174 of our homeowners, and they have signed up in support of a Henderson-type ordinance being adopted in Douglas County. We are working within the county to see if Douglas County would adopt a closure ordinance. We see this as a statewide problem and want to support the notion of an interim study and would indicate our support today for going forward with an interim study of this whole issue. Thank you.

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson:

First off, we want to thank the bill sponsors for bringing forward this important piece of legislation and also for working with the City of Henderson to refine the definition of residential golf course that is found in the bill jacket before you today. As you have heard quite a bit of testimony, the City of Henderson has a pretty extensive amount of experience in dealing with this issue. We passed the ordinance that has been spoken about that we believe is designed to protect against nuisance, blight, and deterioration when you have an instance when a golf course is closed. It also requires things like a neighborhood meeting to discuss the plan that has to be put in place once a closure is announced by an operator. We think all of these elements of the city's ordinance are designed to ensure proper development if it is to take place and also to maintain the quality of life found in neighborhoods where the closures are taking place.

One thing to keep in mind as we look at the study is how unique each of these circumstances can be. You may have several golf courses contained within a single community, as you heard about with the situation where we have Legacy and Black Mountain, but they are very different in some ways as well. So we would hope that the study would take into account that just because one area of the community may be experiencing this, the situation behind

the closures may be very different, as was also spoken to by the gentleman next to me [Jim Hartman].

We would look forward to being a part of this if the bill moves forward and the study takes place. The City of Henderson stands prepared and ready to offer any expertise that we would have available to offer staff or any knowledge that we may have that could be helpful in shedding some light on what may be the best practices in our community and around the country that we looked to. Thank you for your time.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in support?

Rick Carter:

Madam Chair, I am wondering if we will have an opportunity to address the amendment ([Exhibit C](#))?

Chair Jauregui:

Mr. Carter, you can take a couple of minutes now during support testimony. We do have other bills to hear. If you want to take a couple of minutes to address the amendment, you may.

Rick Carter:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the opportunity. I had not seen it until just a few minutes ago. I have read it ([Exhibit C](#)). I do not have a problem with sections 8 and 9 that are proposed to be added to the bill as amended. The fourth item under the definition of "residential golf course," however, would severely limit the study in cases throughout the state of Nevada. It would, therefore, in effect, require the study committee to only study those matters where there is a recorded covenant in favor of maintaining that land as a golf course. As we have explained many times, not every golf course has a specific covenant, but oftentimes promises have been made to homeowners or purchasers of land or housing when such properties are developed. They may not have a covenant or a deed restriction, so you are severely limiting the study. As David Cherry just testified, having a broad range of study issues is probably better than limiting the study. I thank you very much for listening, and I hope that part of the amendment will not be placed on the bill. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in support? Seeing no one, we will open the testimony to those in opposition.

Alanna Bondy, representing EHB Companies LLC:

I was the one who submitted the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). Just to clarify, it is not on behalf of myself, personally, it is on behalf of EHB Companies. I want to thank the sponsors for meeting with me and discussing the bill, and I would like to thank them for working throughout the session on this bill, especially amending it to a study. I think that is important. We definitely understand the intent of the bill and understand that a lot of

homeowners are put in a tough position when they purchase homes with a certain expectation that there will be a golf course and then that ends up not happening. We sympathize with that, and we sympathize with those homeowners; however, we did propose an amendment to address some specific issues.

In section 8 of the bill, I proposed to clarify that this bill will in no way be construed to create a moratorium on development. I know in the previous meeting on the other side, somebody had mentioned they hoped that this would create a moratorium on development. I wanted to clarify that this study would not be doing that. I do not think that was the intent of the bill at any point.

I included section 9 because there is always ongoing litigation involving these properties. I wanted to clarify that this study will in no way hinder or delay that litigation or be used as an excuse to hinder or delay the litigation that is ongoing. I think those are simple amendments to clarify the intent of the bill, and I hope those will gain support.

With regard to the definition, we had wanted to revise the definition to exclude land where the owners of the parcels of land have obtained things like CC&Rs, provided homeowners with notice, and where the homeowners do not really have any reasonable expectation that this land that is being defined as a residential golf course currently would continue to be a residential golf course into the future. That is why I proposed that revision to the definition, just to exclude any property owners where they have provided that notice to people and there are not restrictive covenants on the land, such as it is privately owned land and things like that. We are willing to work on that definition to ensure that it does not severely limit the study, but we did want a definition that clarifies the differences between properties where the residents do have a true expectation that this land will continue to be a residential golf course and land where there is no reasonable expectation of that continuing.

As Assemblyman Daly mentioned as well, I think it is important that developers' voices are heard. I had originally read the bill to include developers of this land, but if that is not currently in the bill, I would appreciate that being included as well.

As David Cherry previously mentioned, each of these situations is unique. I think that is why it is important to understand what the study is targeting which, I believe, is golf courses in which homeowners have this continuing expectation that that land would have been a golf course. I think as the definition stands now, it is a bit broad and encapsulates land that is not necessarily meant to be included in the study. With that, I can answer any questions.

Chair Jauregui:

Committee, do you have any questions? Seeing none, thank you. I would encourage you to continue working with the bill sponsors. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition? Seeing no one, we are going to open to testimony in neutral. Seeing no one, Senator Woodhouse, would you like to give any final remarks? [Invitation was declined.] With that, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint). Thank you.

The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 354. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 354.

**Senate Bill 354: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada System of Higher Education.
(BDR 34-59)**

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5:

I am pleased today to present Senate Bill 354 for your consideration. This bill proposes to revise the membership of the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

Senate Bill 354 is linked to Assembly Joint Resolution 5 of the 79th Session from 2017. As you know, this session, A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session has passed both houses of the Legislature and will be placed on the general election ballot in 2020. If the voters approve the proposed constitutional revisions, the Board of Regents will be removed from the *Nevada Constitution*. The Legislature will be authorized by statute to provide for the governance, control, and management of the state universities. The provisions of S.B. 354 will become effective only if the proposed constitutional change in A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is approved and ratified by the voters in 2020.

I am bringing S.B. 354 forward because I have concerns about the current composition of the Board. I would like to explain that position to you. If A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is approved by the voters, then the Board of Regents will be put on par—and I think this is really important—with every other governing or regulatory board that has been created by the Legislature.

Senate Bill 354 proposes to do the following:

First, the bill reduces the number of Regents from 13 to 9. Historically, the Legislature has revised the number of Regents several times over the years, starting with just three members back in 1864. In 1905, the Legislature increased the membership to five where it remained for years. In 1957, the membership was increased to nine members from five. Over the next 44 years, the Legislature increased and decreased the membership of the Board four times. In 2001, the Board membership was set at the present 13 members.

This is not a new exercise of authority by the Legislature. I believe it is time to reduce the size of the Board once more. A 13-member board is unwieldy. A smaller board, in my estimation, will be more efficient and responsive. A smaller number of members will go far to reduce the formation of factions that result in turf battles and inertia—something that Nevada can no longer permit and can no longer afford.

Second, S.B. 354 requires the Board of Regents to be composed of five members elected from districts established by the Legislature and four members to be appointed by the Governor. This hybrid board is not a new concept. The State Board of Education currently consists of voting members elected from the congressional districts and the remaining voting members appointed by the Governor.

The membership plan proposed in S.B. 354 is appealing because it ensures geographic representation by the elected members. This is important so that Nevadans in every part of the state feel they have a voice on the Board. Nevadans can go to their elected member with their concerns about higher education opportunities for themselves, their children, and their communities.

Senate Bill 354 permits the appointment of members who will bring expertise to the Board. That is my No. 2 reason why I am pushing so hard for this bill to be adopted by this Legislature. The Governor is authorized to find and select individuals who are knowledgeable in education and business, the foundation for modern economic development in any state. This is important in creating a board that is forward-thinking as we grow Nevada's economy and make this state a wonderful place to live. I should also point out that the Governor must ensure that appointees represent the diversity of Nevada, including geographic regions, gender, and ethnicity. Together this combination of board members supports a new role for the Board, one that provides policy leadership in the public interest.

Finally, if A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is approved by the voters, S.B. 354 provides that the terms of the Regents serving at that time will expire on January 2, 2023. After the reduction in the size of the membership, initial terms are staggered with some terms expiring at two years and others at four years. When completely effective, about half of the terms will expire every two years. This will guarantee continuity. One of the most important factors in the success of a system of higher education is governance. We in the Legislature, as well as many concerned Nevadans, worry about the current governance of the Nevada System of Higher Education. We need to seek a balance between geographic representation and subject matter expertise. I propose S.B. 354 as a means to strike that balance.

If A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is ratified by the voters in 2020, we must be prepared to revitalize the Board's membership. Senate Bill 354 offers a way forward. The other point I would like to make is that if this bill passes and A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is approved by the voters, then in the 2021 Session, when we are working on redistricting, those nine new districts can be drawn up. That is very, very important that we get into that process. I thank you for your consideration, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Jauregui:

Committee, do you have any questions for our bill sponsor, Senator Woodhouse?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I do have a few concerns over this piece of legislation because we met about A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session—I think it was about a month ago—and we had agreed that we were passing that so we could put it in the hands of the voters. My concern with this piece of legislation is that it will not be clear to the voters that, immediately upon passing that piece of legislation, we were simultaneously passing this bill and putting this bill into effect. I do not think there is anything in this that would require it to be a part of the language in the ballot box. I am just wondering if we have done anything to address those concerns or if we have taken that into consideration.

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. Yes. I have heard that concern. However, I do not believe that S.B. 354 and A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session are in conflict with each other. This bill does not go into effect until A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is approved. We are always open to amendments, and I think some individuals in this room know that we tried a number of amendments on the Assembly side. None of them were workable. So I felt this was the best way to address the issues that I felt needed to be addressed in revitalizing and restructuring the Board of Regents.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I guess my concern is that this is almost a different process for us to amend a piece of legislation that we have already passed because this is the second time this has come into the Assembly. If we wanted this to be a part of the legislation, to be a part of that joint resolution, I feel that we should have included that in the discussion two years ago, quite frankly.

Assemblyman Roberts:

To follow up on Assemblywoman Torres' comments, I had some of the same concerns. I think it might actually jeopardize the vote on A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session because, for me—and this is probably bad on my part; I should have looked to see if this bill was out there when we considered it—I probably would not have supported the first bill had I known this was going to be at the same time or contingent or connected to it. I think the voters may do the same thing. It may actually jeopardize what we tried to do with A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session. I do not know if you have thought about that or considered that moving forward. I would like to get a feeling for your thoughts on that.

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. Yes. I have considered it. I have had many conversations with my friend and colleague, former Assemblyman Elliot Anderson, because the two of us have been working for four years now on A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session, and I was here before you with him a month ago. I believe that these two pieces of legislation, A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session and this bill, are in concert with each other. I do not see them as being competitive with each other.

Assemblywoman Miller:

Senator, I suppose I can understand the reduction in the number of Regents, but can you explain the reason for appointing the Regents? I really support the people electing their elected officials. Could you give me some clarity on why the need for appointments when they are already elected and we know that A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session would reduce some things and modify some parameters around these positions? I am wondering why the need now to go to appointed.

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. Yes. When I looked at the size of the board, I felt it was important that we reduce it from 13 to 9, but the reason for the appointed—I have to go back

in time. I served on the study committee that developed the hybrid board for the Nevada State Board of Education. I think that was back in 2010. I used that as the model for this one. First of all, of the nine, five are elected because I agree with you. We want the people's voice to be there.

The No. 1 reason for having appointees is so that after the election, we have five people who are serving on the board who are elected by the people, and then the Governor can look at what they are bringing to the table. Then over time, he or she would have the other four positions to appoint and could look at the geographical regions' diversity. I want him or her to look at the gender and ethnicity, and then the other really important piece is looking at educational backgrounds and looking at business backgrounds because I think all of those components need to have a place on the Board of Regents and they do not exist there now. That is what I am trying to address.

Assemblywoman Miller:

I understand the desire to have diversity in experience and background and in gender and race and everything else. I look around Nevada and it seems that in many areas, when we have had elected positions, Nevada is being naturally represented with some great diversity in the state right now. My question is, when you talk about regions, how would it be determined, if there are nine positions and four will be appointed and five will be elected, which five regions get to vote and which five do not? I know personally, and I will speak for my district and my constituents, we want to elect our representatives. Could you speak to that please?

Senator Woodhouse:

Yes. Thank you for the question. The five districts would be redrawn from the present 13 when we do the redistricting in 2021 if this bill passes. There will be five districts within the state of Nevada just as now there are 13. It would be reduced to five. That creates a larger area in which candidates would have to run, but I think that is balanced by the fact that the Governor would be appointing individuals based upon the diversity and all of the other things I have been addressing. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

What kind of model do other states have? Have you looked at what other states are doing? Is this hybrid model a very common model, or do other states just have elected boards of regents?

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. Actually, there are all different kinds of combinations. I would assume that Mr. Elliot Anderson will probably share with you California's makeup. There are some similar to ours. There are a number of different kinds. I know that a couple of years ago I attended a conference on higher education with the National Conference of State Legislatures and at that point, we were talking about two different things, one of which we did not pursue, which was this one. The other one was states that were removing their community college systems out of their higher education system and having a separate one

for community colleges. That was one of the reasons why I went to that conference, because we were undergoing that. But the other half of the conference was about this, and all I can say is, there are a lot of different configurations on how states set up their higher education institutions, and we can certainly provide that information to you. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Torres:

Senator, I really do appreciate the intent of this legislation because I think that it is quite obvious that we need to reform higher education in a large way. I think that is what we are starting to do with A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session and I think it is what we continue to do. To my knowledge, I do not know that we as a state have had any discussion about what we can do after A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session; has it been assigned that there is going to be some type of committee that looks into what the best governance structure for Nevada is? I truly want whatever it is that we put into place to be the strongest governance structure that we can. Have we done any research into that already? Or is this the start of that discussion?

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. Yes, in fact, that was one of the things that we discussed when we were trying to come up with other ways to move this legislation. We talked about an interim study, just as we talked about in the previous bill. The concern is that if we do not move forward this legislative session, then we will be out of the rotation of redistricting. So that was one of the reasons why I was pursuing this in its current form in order to get this ball rolling and make something happen.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

With the makeup of the nine-member board, with five being elected and four being appointed, are the four appointees ex officio nonvoting members of that board, or are they also voting in regard to the issues the same way the ones who are elected do?

Senator Woodhouse:

Thank you for the question. All nine members, the five elected and the four appointed, are voting members of the Board of Regents.

Chair Jauregui:

Committee, do you have any further questions? Seeing none, we are going to open to testimony in support.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce:

First of all, the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce would like to thank Senator Woodhouse for bringing this bill forward. The Chamber did support this bill in the Senate. As you know, the Chamber, for years, has advocated for additional higher education reform in the state of Nevada. We do recognize, of course, in the last several years there have been improvements with the Board of Regents, but our organization does believe that reducing the number of Regents from 13 to 9 would help improve the operations of the Board and better

the governance structure. So the Chamber is in support of the bill. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I am happy to answer any questions.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Council for a Better Nevada:

Some of you may be familiar with the Council for a Better Nevada, but it is an organization made up of concerned citizens from the public sector, from the private sector, from the nonprofit sector, whose main objective and only objective is to create a better Nevada in all walks of life. One of the main objectives that organization is looking at is what we do with our higher education system in the state of Nevada. We are in support of this legislation specifically because we think it is time to do something with our Board of Regents, and specifically to the point that Senator Woodhouse brought up about finding a way to balance the input of the election of Regents with a guarantee that we have some expertise in place. As was testified to in response to a question, states vary significantly in terms of how they handle their boards of regents and their governance structures. That part is true. What is also true is that Nevada has, in our opinion, a very outdated process for governing its, similar to, as far as I know, three other states—four, but I think North Dakota is changing its governance structure. So our governance structure is becoming outmoded, outdated, and needs to be upgraded. Putting some control over the governance structure for the system into the hands of the Legislature and the Governor is a huge step in that direction, as is better defining how our Board of Regents' responsibilities are divided up and what they do. It varies greatly, as has been testified to. But again, I want to impress upon you that the one thing that does apply to the state of Nevada is that it is very rarely used. There are examples, but it is a 150-year-old model that is beginning to show its age. The Council for a Better Nevada is in support of this legislation doing something with the Board of Regents. I thank you for your time, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in support? Seeing no one, we will open it up to testimony in opposition.

Elliot Anderson, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I am here to testify against S.B. 354 in its current form. First, I would like to say that I really take no joy in being here. I am a bit dumbfounded about the whole situation and wish that this did not have to happen. I had resolved at the beginning of the legislative session to leave my opinions at home and to not interject myself here after deciding not to run for reelection.

To those ends, I have tried very hard to resolve my concerns with S.B. 354 off the record but have not met with any success. It obviously goes without saying, but I am going to say anyway that I have worked hand in hand with Senator Woodhouse for the past two sessions to advance constitutional higher education reform. I do not wish to be on opposite sides of the table from her today. My hand has been forced. I need to be here to protect important constitutional change from being disrupted before the ink dries on it. I need to be here to encourage this institution to look more broadly and not get mired in the debate of this session and look back toward the founding of this state to remember the stakes. Senate Bill 354 will trip Nevada up from changing the course of 150 years of history.

As this Committee is well aware, the Legislature sent A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session to the ballot after passing the resolution for the second time this session nearly unanimously, and I thank you again for your support. Assembly Joint Resolution 5 of the 79th Session corrects decades' worth of bad constitutional case law that restricted the ability of the Legislature to effectively exercise oversight over the Board of Regents. The history of the need for this reform goes back to a misinterpretation of the original intent of the framers of the *Nevada Constitution*. I am not going to repeat all of this history here today, but in sum, A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is about a century of history and correcting it, but of course, it still must pass the ballot.

Most of S.B. 354, if not all of it, can only be effective for three months before the next legislative session. It cannot take effect unless A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session passes in November of 2020, three months before the next legislative session. If the Legislature passes S.B. 354 with the appointment provisions intact, it will be consigning A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session to defeat on the ballot and risking changing 150 years of Nevada history for these three months of effectiveness. In these three months, the change will not have any meaningful impact on higher education outcomes.

Through A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session, two sessions of the Legislature have applied to the people of the state for more power to oversee the state's higher education system. Senate Bill 354, as written, would inextricably link the appointed-Regents ballot question to the question of constitutional reform. Before using this power that has not even taken effect yet, the Legislature needs to diligently and thoughtfully study the options available for higher education reform. It should not tinker with the Board of Regents until the ink on A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session dries and the voters affirm the Legislature's application for this power.

Recent Nevada history bears out a proposition, a proposition that I did not think needed to be stated out loud: The people will not vote to get rid of their ability to select their own representatives. The proposition of appointed Regents died on the ballot in 2006, and the proposition of appointed judges died even more overwhelmingly in 2010. And I forgot to mention that the proposition of appointed Regents died in the Legislature in 2009 when Senator Raggio tried to pass it for a second time. I believe he got it through 2007, but then it died on the ballot. I believe the Senate voted it down in 2009, if I recall my history correctly.

I would note that since 2010, the electorate has grown more hostile, both on the left and the right, to this sort of a proposal. It is a very populist electorate. A vote for S.B. 354, at best, is like putting on a 50-pound pack before running a marathon. It is probably not going to be successful. Even if it is not certain, you might be able to complete that marathon, but that is going to be really tough. It will make A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session difficult, if not impossible, to pass. Moreover, having spoken to 61 legislators personally about A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session last session, I do not think A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session would have passed last session if appointed Regents were in the mix.

I am asking you to rise out of this moment, and out of this session, and to think about the Legislatures that have come before you that have tried to reform the Board of Regents for

years—only to be stopped by constitutional law. Senate Bill 354 is an impediment to changing history and charting a new course for higher education. It is time to look forward and not send mixed messages to the voters. The Legislature needs to focus on the power of the institution to reform higher education and not too narrowly on those details at this point. Senate Bill 354 risks all that we have achieved the last two sessions, and the Legislature needs to spend a great deal more time considering 49 other models that are out there before making these changes. Thank you.

Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education:

First, I would like to thank the sponsor for meeting with us around these concerns about the bill. We have two Regents who submitted statements of opposition ([Exhibit D](#) and [Exhibit E](#)), and their concerns with not being able to finish their terms. I want to be able to put that on the record because they were not able to be here today.

Joannah Schumacher, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am a natural woman as defined by your rules. I want you to know that I accept your oath of office and I remind you of our contract. The idea of limiting the representation of men and women of this state over something so fundamentally important to all of us as the education system seems dictatorial. Putting such a large number of appointees in the hands of one person is ill-advised. Everyone thinks these types of ideas sound like no big deal when somebody with the same mind-set as ours is the one making those appointments, but we discover—usually too late—what might happen when it is in the hands of someone who we disagree with.

Please oppose S.B. 354 and ensure this system is decentralized and in the hands of the 99 percent. Keep 13 board members and have all of them elected. The idea of 13 being too unwieldy seems silly. Follow *Robert's Rules of Order* regarding open meetings and things will run smoothly. Experts always are consulted by boards, but the hardworking taxpayers want to be able to redress their grievances by the clearest manner of an election. Thank you.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

It is a pleasure to be here. Two years ago when Assemblyman Elliot Anderson brought A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session to this Committee, I had the opportunity to meet with him because originally, it did contain information that part of it would be appointing Regents. I significantly opposed that. We talked it over and came to an agreement because I understood his concerns about governance of the Board of Regents and agreed with him that we needed a better structure. He took out the portion on appointing the Board of Regents, so we came to a good agreement, and that is why I did not end up opposing A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session last session.

Then when I read this bill, I was astonished to see that if we supported A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session, what would happen is that we were inadvertently opposing our own position of supporting elected officials. So during the Senate hearing on this bill, I said that if it passed, then we would then oppose A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session because our right to vote for the Board of Regents would be taken away from us. During that hearing, the sponsor did say

that there was going to be an amendment submitted that would take out the portion about appointing members of the Board of Regents. Apparently, that did not happen.

I want to tell you that I am very thankful that former Assemblyman Anderson came and provided that background and information. I did meet with him last session, and we came to an agreement that we would support A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session as long as we continued to be able to elect our public officials. You know, we have trust in you; we elect you. We think that even though sometimes there may be people in the electorate who are not as smart as some of the others, this is the system we have which holds our public officials accountable. This is what we have in a representative government. We believe that the people have the ability to make good decisions. All of you should believe that too, since you are elected. We oppose this bill. We appreciate what former Assemblyman Anderson has said today and we support him in this. Thank you.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

I wanted to start off by saying you all look pretty diverse, so to me, everybody looks different, everybody is tall, short—I am not going to say fat, thin. We are all pretty diverse, and I think people are pretty smart. They vote for people they like, this or that. We the people are part of the community, and we all have a dog in this fight because we also pay money and taxes to our university system. You know, people have always voted down taking away our rights to vote for people who we are putting into positions of leadership or authority. What we are asking is that, please do not take away our voice to be a part of our governmental process. Thank you.

Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:

I want to say that the appointment of four members of the Board of Regents by the Governor, in my opinion, is in direct opposition of our representative republic. I also believe this factor could potentially give preference to political ideology or special interests at the expense of experience and education when choosing people on the Board. These positions should be elected by the people. It is for this very reason that I am against this bill. I urge you to stand with the voting voice of Nevada citizens and oppose this bill. Thank you very much.

Juanita Cox, Chair, Citizens in Action:

We oppose S.B. 354. We believe that we will lose representation, and we presume rurals will lose once again. We will have less and less representation in the rurals by going from 13 to 9. We, the people, will lose again by not electing all Regents but by having the Governor appoint four members. We, the people, are virtually cut out of our oversight and our knowledge, or lack thereof, for the education of our offspring, and it becomes a political body of special favors and elites, not necessarily diversified. This is not acceptable. Please oppose S.B. 354. Thank you.

Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

Nevada Faculty Alliance is an independent statewide association of faculty at all eight Nevada System of Higher Education institutions. We work to empower faculty to be fully engaged in our mission to promote student success.

We are almost neutral, but we have some opposition to certain key segments here. Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA) is neutral on the number, the length of terms, and the method of selections of Regents. There are pros and cons, and our members have varying opinions on that. There is no single right answer, and states do it in various different ways. We testified in the neutral position in the Senate for those reasons and because the amendment was being proposed to eliminate the appointed positions.

We are opposed here today only regarding the implementation of the appointments in the current language. First, we believe the qualifications for appointed members, which says "knowledge and experience in higher education or business," is too narrow. It should be expanded to include, for example, higher education or without limitation business, technology, natural and social sciences, humanities, arts, and other scholarly fields—the whole breadth of the academy.

Second, we ask for clarification on the language in section 1, subsection 2 that states, "After the initial terms, each member of the Board of Regents serves for a term of 4 years, which commences on the first Monday in January and until his or her successor is elected or appointed, as applicable." I understand that under *Robert's Rules of Order*, this phrasing with the "and" would mean that an appointee can only be removed before the end of his or her term for cause, but I am not a lawyer so I do not know what it means here.

Also, if Senate Bill 14 is enacted and if it applies to these appointments—S.B. 14 applies to the removal of gubernatorial appointees in general—then the reasons a governor could remove the appointed members for cause would be for misconduct, incompetence, or neglected duty, but those terms are not defined in S.B. 14, and there is no due process for a board member to refute an accusation of misconduct other than through the courts. This language could potentially allow a future governor to remove board members on a pretext, so we would ask for clarifying language for a more robust mechanism for removal with at least minimal due process of notice of the charges and an opportunity of replying. That said, we believe it should be possible to remove board members for malfeasance.

More generally, and this is getting back to the neutral part of our testimony, if this bill and A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session are enacted, it is clear that larger changes in the structure of higher education in Nevada are being contemplated. We respectfully request that faculty representatives at every level be actively involved in those discussions and decisions. This is an essential part of our shared governance model for academic institutions. A top-down approach would not only violate the principles of shared governance that we uphold, but also would likely yield counterproductive results. The Nevada Faculty Alliance is ready to be part of a collaborative discussion, improving the outcomes in public higher education. As November 2020 approaches, we recommend that an appropriate forum for that purpose be established because if A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session is enacted, it does take the election of the Regents out of the *Constitution*. That is what it does. Thank you very much.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in opposition? Seeing no one, is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? Seeing no one, I will invite the bill sponsor to give any closing remarks.

Senator Woodhouse:

I really appreciate your taking the time to hear Senate Bill 354. It has been difficult working on this bill and being here at odds over Senate Bill 354 with my colleague and very personal friend, former Assemblyman Elliot Anderson. I think this is the only time we have ever disagreed with each other, but I do respectfully disagree with him in that I do not see Senate Bill 354 and A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session to be in conflict with each other. I think they are both great steps forward for us to be able to go down the road of reforming our higher education system in the state of Nevada. I ask for your support of Senate Bill 354. If you do have any further questions, please contact me. Again, thank you so very much.

[A letter in opposition to Senate Bill 354 was submitted but not discussed ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Jauregui:

With that, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 354. Our last item on the agenda is public comment. If there is anyone who wishes to give public comment, please approach the table. Thank you.

Joannah Schumacher, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I wanted to thank Assemblywoman Torres, Assemblywoman Miller, and Assemblyman Roberts for your thoughtful comments. I did not include it in my testimony, and I was afraid you all would run off before I could thank you. What happens sometimes is bills come before the public and they are not very clear. It is of grave concern to me that we are going to have a bill coming forward that is going to go to the vote of the people and they are not going to understand what is going on if this bill passes. I appreciated what you were asking.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else wishing to give public comment? Seeing no one, I will see you on Thursday at 4 p.m., and we will adjourn our meeting [at 5:22 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Catherine Bodenstein
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 251 (1st Reprint), submitted by Alanna Bondy, representing EHB Companies LLC.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter in opposition to Senate Bill 354, dated April 30, 2019, submitted by Patrick R. Carter, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter in opposition to Senate Bill 354, dated April 30, 2019, submitted by Carol Del Carlo, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada.

[Exhibit F](#) is a statement in opposition to Senate Bill 354, submitted by Patti Jesinoski, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada.