

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON REVENUE**

**Eighty-Second Session
March 7, 2023**

The Committee on Revenue was called to order by Chair Shea Backus at 4:05 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Chair
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant
Assemblyman Ken Gray
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Nick Christie, Committee Manager
Gina Hall, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

William Brewer, Executive Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority
Stephen Aichroth, Administrator, Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry
Jess Molasky, Principal and Project Manager, Ovation Development Corporation
Dylan Keith, Assistant Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Jennifer Lazovich, representing City of Sparks
Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno
Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition
Arielle Edwards, Director of Government Relations, Nevada HAND
David Goldwater, representing Nevada Home Builders Association
John Sande, IV, representing Nevada State Apartment Association
Randy Robinson, Director, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Nicole Rourke, representing City of Henderson

Chair Backus:

[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will be hearing one bill today, [Assembly Bill 62](#), which revises provisions governing property tax exemptions for low-income housing. I will open the hearing on [A.B. 62](#) and ask the presenters to feel free to start when you are ready.

[Assembly Bill 62](#): Revises provisions governing property tax exemptions for low-income housing. (BDR 32-362)

William Brewer, Executive Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority:

Along with being the executive director of the Nevada Rural Housing Authority, I am also a member of the Advisory Committee on Housing to the Nevada Housing Division. A couple of sessions ago, the Advisory Committee on Housing was created by the 80th Session of the Legislature and charged to assist the Nevada Housing Division with information and input about community needs and so forth, and to advise them on the qualified allocation plan, which distributes tax credits in the state [page 1, [Exhibit C](#)]. For the regular session the Advisory Committee on Housing is permitted to have one bill draft, which relates to matters

within the scope of the Committee, so A.B. 62 is our bill draft for this session. I would like to introduce Mr. Steve Aichroth, who is the administrator of the Nevada Housing Division, and he will explain the specifics of the request.

Stephen Aichroth, Administrator, Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry:

I come before you today to present A.B. 62. I will walk you through the what, why, and how portions of the bill [page 2]. What A.B. 62 does is it revises the existing statute. The existing statute allows for a property tax exemption on qualified low-income housing projects. This is done solely through one source—the money appropriated under the Federal HOME Investment Partnerships Act [HOME funds]. Assembly Bill 62 will streamline this by allowing four other sources of funding to grant the property tax exemption. I want to emphasize this is not to expand the property tax exemption. It is to expand the sources for that property tax exemption. The four sources proposed in the legislation are if the project receives low-income housing tax credits, if it receives state Account for Affordable Housing Trust Funds, if it receives federal Housing Trust Funds, and if it receives Section 811 federal funding. These are all programs that the Housing Division currently has purview over.

In order to talk you through this and have a better understanding of exactly what this is and why it is important to modify this [page 3, [Exhibit C](#)], I want to go through a very quick discussion of how we build affordable housing. That is what the next few slides will do. There are some limiting things to what we can do at the Housing Division in the development of affordable housing, and 95 percent of what we do is related to the availability of private activity bonds and 9 percent credits. Those two programs are federal programs which support the development of affordable housing. In the private activity bonds, the state receives about \$345 million annually. It is based on per capita. Fifty percent of that goes to the Director's Office of Business and Industry and fifty percent is divided amongst the local jurisdictions. The local jurisdictions can use them for affordable housing projects if they choose to, as can the Director's Office of Business and Industry. In September, if the local jurisdiction has not created a resolution to support the development of affordable housing, that private activity bond authority comes back to the Department of Business and Industry. For the last few years, the Department of Business and Industry, aside from one small project for economic development in the past three to four years, it has gone to housing. What you are going to see on the next few slides is what we were able to do with that funding through private activity bonds and 9 percent tax credits which are allocated by the U.S. Treasury to the State. The Nevada Housing Division is the allocating authority, and we receive roughly \$9 million annually in the tax credit authority to provide to developers.

What we end up doing with that authority is through both the 4 percent program [page 4] and the 9 percent program [page 5]. When you develop affordable housing, you need to take a layered approach. It has been described as lasagna financing. I am not going to go through all of this capital stack. I would be happy to engage with members of the Committee if you want to learn more about this.

I want to point out one small portion of this. At the very bottom of this slide [page 4] you will see for this particular project that \$1.5 million was allocated with HOME funds. It is not a significant portion of the capital stack for the construction, but it is significant in that it trips the property tax exemption. When you are collecting rents that are not market rate for a property that cost just as much to build as market-rate properties, it is very important to have that property tax exemption. In this particular instance you see it is very little. Here it is 4 percent and in most cases it is actually lower—HOME funds put into the project to get the development to pencil over the 30 years of affordability.

We also use it in the 9 percent program [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)]. Here it is identified in green at \$1.4 million. This was more of a percentage in this particular project, but a smaller amount of dollars. You see six different layers of financing here. HOME loans or HOME grants, however they are put into the project, need to be a part of the capital stack. Through the use of these funds in the 4 percent program [page 6] we have created over 5,000 units in the past four years using \$675 million of bond cap authority, and we are still working through that. In the 9 percent program [page 7] we have created almost 1,200 units of affordability. All the projects you see on those two pages had HOME funds attached to them in some way, shape, or form to get that property tax exemption. That is basically how we build affordable housing and that is the significance of the HOME funds in the project.

The actual allocation of HOME funds comes to the state in five different manners [page 8]. It is a funding method through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that goes to Clark County, Henderson, Las Vegas, Reno, and the state of Nevada. From the state of Nevada, the Nevada Housing Division does the balance of the state. If it is not listed there, for instance North Las Vegas does not get an allocation, they will either come to Clark County or to the State for Affordable Housing Trust Funds. We get about \$12 million annually in HOME funds. These were the 2022 HOME fund allocations. The 2023 HOME fund allocations have already been preliminarily announced to us. Those are going to increase to \$12.8 million. I wanted to point out to this Committee that it does not vary too much, other than HOME funds are subject to congressional approval annually. If, for some reason, hypothetically there is an argument over the debt ceiling and they have to cut some funding somewhere to negotiate things, HOME funds could potentially be on the chopping block. That would stop new construction development in the state.

It is a small bit of funding when you compare it to other matters [page 9], but it is incredibly important. The last thing I will mention before I turn it over to Mr. Brewer for final comments, in Nevada we are about the only state in the country where it is required to get the property tax exemption. I do not know of another state where that exists. Our HOME funds, what I just showed you, are primarily used for the development of affordable housing, but it has other uses: rental assistance, security deposits, and any other manner we could potentially use that. Because we have a limited amount of funding and because it primarily goes to affordable housing, strictly development, the passage of [A.B. 62](#) could potentially free-up those HOME funds for other uses that we are not using to the fullest extent in the state of Nevada. With that, I will turn it over to Mr. Brewer for some final comments, and then I think we will be ready for questions.

Bill Brewer:

I want to finish up with just a couple of things to emphasize what Mr. Aichroth has said. Why do we need this exemption in the first place? Once the project is built and leased up using the "lasagna" Mr. Aichroth talked about, the rents that are collected have to be enough to help the property operate effectively. Those operating costs for multifamily property could run as much as \$1,000 per unit per month. It takes a fair chunk of money to run a project for wages on the management, insurance—everything. Property taxes are a significant line item in the cost for operating an affordable housing project. The abatement of those taxes can be a substantial help in assisting the project's cash flow and allowing it to meet its foremost mission of serving very low-income households. HOME funds, as Mr. Aichroth mentioned, have traditionally been the trigger to those tax abatements.

The changes proposed in this legislation would simply allow other sources of financing to trigger the tax abatement. Because there are several other ways a community can support the development of affordable housing and meet the match requirements for HOME funds, including donated land or other fee abatements, this would ensure the HOME funds could be utilized most strategically by the Housing Division to help some projects over the finish line and into construction.

To summarize what we have heard, common sources of funding for an affordable housing project include HOME funds, low-income housing tax credits (LIHTC), state housing trust funds, and Section 811 federal funding. The proposed legislation simply recognizes those four sources, common in any affordable housing financing stack, as appropriate triggers for the exemption. Thank you for your time. We would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Backus:

Thank you for your presentation, especially the background. This is definitely a niche of development in our community. Do we have any questions from our Committee members?

Assemblywoman Considine:

I know we are talking about developing, rehabbing, and working on existing buildings. Just so I have it straight in my head, can any of this money be used to purchase an existing building that is not already affordable housing to change it into affordable housing?

Bill Brewer:

I assume you are speaking of those funding sources, such as the LIHTC and so forth. Yes, those can be used to build new units. They can be used to purchase existing units, rehabilitate units, and to preserve affordable units.

Assemblywoman Considine:

Section 1, subsection 2—the existing language—is talking about low-income units. It is using the words "low-income" repeatedly. Then in the new section [section 1, subsection 3] it just says, "the units." Can you explain the difference? Are we looking at a different

income level? Is it low, very low, or area median income (AMI)? What is the difference between listing for the existing portions of the funding sources and the other sources for low-income units?

Steve Aichroth:

Thank you for pointing that out. Section 1, subsection 3 specifically transfers back to the housing trust funds. National Housing Trust Funds are defined by being 30 percent of AMI and lower. That is what that particular funding source is. Section 1, subsection 3, because it flags 12 U.S.C. § 4568, specifically references that source of funding.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for bringing forward this language. It sounds like there are a large number of people who were involved in the discussion of it. My first question has to do with slide 8 [page 8, [Exhibit C](#)], where you explain where the money is divided out. It is very specific with Clark County, Henderson, Las Vegas, and then Reno. I know it is also referenced in a letter we received from the Housing and Neighborhood Development manager for the City of Reno [[Exhibit D](#)]. If I am understanding this correctly, the money is only given to the City of Reno for all of Washoe County. In the Sparks area, which I represent, does that come under the jurisdiction of the state of Nevada? I am looking for some equal representation, or some understanding of how that is exactly divided up.

Steve Aichroth:

What is done in both Clark County and in Washoe County are HOME consortiums [Washoe County HOME Consortium and Clark County HOME Consortium]. The funding does come into the City of Reno, but then they have engaged with the county and the City of Sparks, and they all have representatives. There might be someone in the audience who can speak better to the makeup of the consortium, but that is also done in Las Vegas. That is one of the things that has to happen, as we talked about streamlining this process, is the money has to be allocated by that consortium first. One of the things we are always telling affordable housing developers who are actively pursuing projects in Washoe and Clark Counties, before you even come to the Housing Division, get your HOME funds, and that slows that process down. Again, talking about streamlining, because we are potentially ready to issue them the tax credits, and we are ready to potentially issue them the ability to go before the Board of Finance to get bond cap approval for their projects, we do not make that move until they have some commitment of HOME dollars to their project.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for that clarification. Is this written down anywhere that this is the policy, to always have that discussion first, or is that just the practice because of the current leadership under Nevada HAND?

Steve Aichroth:

It is not under Nevada HAND. This emphasizes how important HOME funding is and how limited the source is. If you do not have that, we know you cannot build it. You have heard "if you build it, they will come." Here we need you to come before the HOME consortium and then we can build. It is flipped.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

This is just the current practice. There is nothing written down or set in stone that that is the expectation. Am I understanding this correctly?

Steve Aichroth:

From the Housing Division's perspective, yes. There might be some other procedural things that the HOME consortiums in those two areas do, but from the Housing Division's perspective, we need to ensure you have that level of funding, otherwise we are just spinning our wheels.

Assemblywoman Mosca:

I was on the Community Development Advisory Committee so that is my background knowledge when it comes to the experience of approving the HOME funds. If I am understanding this correctly, you do not have any builders who did not get HOME funds who did not get this exemption because it is the front end. That is the issue. Do we have any examples, like if they built it but they did not get it because they did not get the HOME funds?

Steve Aichroth:

That is correct. We are going to want to see that as part of their capital stack when we evaluate the financial feasibility of their project.

Chair Backus:

I want to confirm something. In section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (3), I am not as familiar with respect to the money from the Account for Affordable Housing created by NRS 319.500. I pulled it up because I wanted to see if there were some sort of conditions on that money. I am more familiar with Section 42 [Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 42] tax credits that are basically only issued when it is for affordable housing. It seems like under NRS 319.510 there is a variety of how that money could be used. I was overthinking how broad this provision could expand because it pertains to real property that could be used for housing and related facilities for persons with low incomes. Could it be used by a business that is helping persons with low-income housing? The whole purpose for this would be those persons would actually have to reside at the facility, live there, and get the benefit of low-income housing. Is that accurate?

Steve Aichroth:

I will take a stab at your question and see where we land. The Account for Affordable Housing is basically the required state match for the HOME funds. That is about \$10 to \$12 million annually, collected by the Department of Taxation and provided to the

Housing Division to support that. It does a couple of different things, but it can be used for development. It can also be used, to your point, we can provide it to a nonprofit to provide services, housing stability, rental assistance, security deposits, all of those types of things. What we are talking about here is specifically the construction, preservation, or rehabilitation of a project.

Chair Backus:

Is this a project where someone would be able to live, in a low-income housing development? It is not like the commercial use of another facility. This is purely just for those places where individuals would be able to live in affordable housing situations.

Steve Aichroth:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

I was excited to see this bill. I am in real estate and do property management. Where I am looking at this, in terms of the differences, that original bill was saying "funded," meaning it had to be funded in a certain way, but now you are adding "financing" to that and naming these particular programs. Am I correct?

Steve Aichroth:

As I read it, that is correct.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

That is the distinct difference between the old and new. New programs pop up all the time and financing pops up all the time. I would hate for you to not be getting these property tax exemptions if you had some new funding that would fall under some of these similar criteria. It just seems like it is very specific. I do not know if there is a good way of wording it, but I would just hate to have you have your hands tied behind your back.

Steve Aichroth:

I will tell you probably 95 percent of the affordable housing that is built in the state, through what I would call true affordable housing, not naturally occurring but subsidized affordable housing, is actually built through what is indicated in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (1)—the tax credit programs. Unfortunately, we do not see a whole lot of new federal dollars coming through. Typically, if they are, they are probably going to come through the housing trust funds or Section 42. Effectively, we are covering just about everything that can be developed through the Housing Division anyway, with affordable housing with those two sources.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

I was looking at section 2, subsection 3, paragraph (a) on page 4 of the bill, describing an elderly person. In terms of the U.S. Code [12 U.S.C. § 1701q] it sets the age at 62 or older. I remember my time as a planning commissioner back in Clark County; we were having

projects coming up to us that set the age at 55-plus. That is actually a little bit more frequent. Does that mean that the age of 55-plus would not qualify because an elderly person is described in the U.S. Code as age 62-plus?

Steve Aichroth:

That is a great question and one that I do not have an answer to. I did see that 62-plus, and I can tell you the bulk of what we do as defined as senior housing is 55-plus. I do not know if that needs to be amended or if it works. It would be something we have to work with Legislative Counsel Bureau to ensure that is coming through correctly.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

I would suggest we do that. Once we get to the local level, my successor would have some sort of clarity that needs to be explained. We want to make sure the projects that come to our district are not excluded because we are going with this definition versus being very clear in our NRS. I would appreciate follow-up on that.

Chair Backus:

Do any other members of the Committee have further questions? [There were none.] Thank you for your presentation. We will go to testimony in support of A.B. 62. We will start in Las Vegas.

Jess Molasky, Principal and Project Manager, Ovation Development Corporation:

Ovation Development is a company my dad, Alan, started back in 1984. By way of brief background, Ovation is one of Nevada's largest and leading developers of affordable housing for low-income seniors and working families. Our affordable housing communities total more than 1,900 units at 13 different communities, with more under development. It is a privilege to be testifying before you in support of A.B. 62.

Assembly Bill 62 expands and modernizes existing tax exemption opportunities, to encourage more low-income housing and affordable housing developments. These technical fixes to the property tax exemption will pave the way for more developers to join Ovation in affordable housing development. The finance structuring that makes affordable housing possible is complex, and in order to ensure rents remain affordable over decades to come, several federal and state programs must be layered into the financing structure. A key ingredient to this complicated formula is the property tax exemption.

Assembly Bill 62 creates more eligibility opportunities beyond the HOME funds that will increase efficiencies and speed up affordable housing projects, ensuring more Nevadans are housed quicker. Ovation believes all residents, regardless of socioeconomic status, deserve a quality home that helps to strengthen individual lives, families, and community. Assembly Bill 62 furthers that goal, and we urge your support.

Chair Backus:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to give testimony in support of A.B. 62? [There was no one.] We will move to those here in Carson City who wish to give testimony in support of A.B. 62.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

We are in strong support of this bill. We believe it is a strong step forward. We appreciate the sponsors for bringing this good piece of legislation forward. It promotes, in a very commonsense way, more affordable housing. It allows builders to do their jobs, and it is the right move forward. We kindly ask your support.

Jennifer Lazovich, representing City of Sparks:

We are here in support of the bill. On a personal note, in my capacity in the off session representing projects like this in southern Nevada, I can tell you that this is a great step forward, and it will bring many more of these projects to the community. Thank you for your support of this bill today.

Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno:

I wanted to thank our partners at Washoe County and Sparks for being members of the Washoe County HOME Consortium. They have been a vital part of this. Ultimately this will remove the barrier that requires these folks to get HOME funds in order to get that property tax exemption, which is the most important part to make sure these projects pencil. I urge your support for A.B. 62.

Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition:

The Nevada Housing Coalition is a statewide nonprofit to promote and advance affordable housing solutions. Our organization includes 300 members across the state, from the urban and rural communities, public and private sectors, developers, builders, finance, community service providers, and advocates. Thank you, Mr. Brewer and Administrator Aichroth for the presentation, and of course thank you to Assemblywoman Jauregui for her leadership in housing as chair of the Advisory Committee on Housing.

I am here to express the Coalition's strong support for A.B. 62, that will bring more affordable housing and allow it to happen more timely and less costly, without a cost to our state and communities that is not already there. The original intent of using HOME funds to trigger the property tax exemption was that the HOME program required a local financial match and the exemption served as that match. Since the original law was enacted, our communities can meet the HOME match requirements in other ways. However, the property tax exemption is absolutely critical for the financial feasibility of developing and preserving affordable housing projects. To our knowledge, there is no other state in the nation that utilizes the HOME program to trigger the property tax exemption. It is burdensome, and to grant token amounts of HOME funds to a project just for the exemption is incompatible with the program.

The additional compliance components and the lack of coordinated timing of applications for HOME funds, with our tax credit program for example, cause significant project delays and add costs. More affordable homes, more quickly. No additional costs in today's reality. Assembly Bill 62 is one of the Nevada Housing Coalition's top priorities this session, and we strongly support this bill.

Arielle Edwards, Director of Government Relations, Nevada HAND:

As the state's largest affordable housing developer and builder, we are in strong support of A.B. 62. This bill will remove barriers to developing affordable housing and streamline the financial process. We have also submitted a letter in support from our president and CEO, Audra Hamernik, for your consideration [[Exhibit E](#)]. We urge your support of A.B. 62 and thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

David Goldwater, representing Nevada Home Builders Association:

At the urgency of some of the members, including Member Armstrong [Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong], last session we worked with the Nevada Housing Coalition over the interim on a number of legislative proposals, this being one of them. I often pithily say that if it is cheaper, politically easy, it has already been done around here. I was wrong. This happens to be one of the instances where we can do something very good for a lot of people by expanding the eligibility for this tax exemption. I urge your support.

John Sande, IV, representing Nevada State Apartment Association:

I believe we have officially hit the "me too" portion of support testimony, so I will say "me too." Our executive director has also submitted a letter in support [[Exhibit F](#)]. Thank you for hearing this important legislation, and we urge your support.

Randy Robinson, Director, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas:

On behalf of the City of Las Vegas, we support A.B. 62.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:

We know that housing is the No. 1 issue facing our clients, from adult guardianship to our kids in foster care, that their kinship caregivers are struggling with housing. We strongly support this bill and will just give a "ditto" for everything that has been said here today.

Nicole Rourke, representing City of Henderson:

We also support A.B. 62 for the aforementioned reasons.

Chair Backus:

Next, we will go to the phone lines. Do we have anyone on the phone lines wishing to give testimony in support of A.B. 62? [There was no one.] We will move to those in opposition of A.B. 62. Is there anyone on the phone lines wishing to give testimony in opposition of A.B. 62? [There was no one.] We will move to Las Vegas. Is there anyone wishing to give testimony in opposition of A.B. 62? [There was no one.] We will invite people here in Carson City to give testimony in opposition of A.B. 62. [There was no one.] Is there anyone

on the phone lines wishing to give testimony neutral to A.B. 62? [There was no one.] In Las Vegas, is there anyone who wishes to give testimony neutral to A.B. 62? [There was no one.] In Carson City, is there anyone who wishes to give testimony neutral to A.B. 62? [There was no one.] Would the presenters like to come back up and give closing remarks?

Bill Brewer:

We appreciate the time that has been given in consideration of this bill today, and for the counsel we have received. We will be looking at that potential change to the bill and will get back to you as soon as we can. We look forward to working with the Legislature on this great legislation. We appreciate all the support it has received today.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 62. That brings us to the end of today's agenda. Last but not least we have public comment. Is there anyone on the phone lines who wishes to give public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wishes to give public comment this evening? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City who wishes to give public comment? [There was no one.] Do the members of the Committee wish to make any remarks this evening? [There were none.] We do not have a Committee hearing this Thursday. Our next Committee hearing is next Tuesday at 4 p.m. in Room 4100. We are adjourned [at 4:46 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gina Hall
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Department of Business & Industry, Advisory Committee on Housing," submitted by Stephen Aichroth, Administrator, Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated March 6, 2022, submitted by Monica Cochran, Housing & Neighborhood Development Manager, City of Reno, in support of [Assembly Bill 62](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated February 28, 2023, submitted by Audra Hamernik, President and CEO, Nevada HAND, in support of [Assembly Bill 62](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter dated March 7, 2023, submitted by Robin Lee, Executive Director, Nevada State Apartment Association, in support of [Assembly Bill 62](#).