

Assembly

0391

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

MARCH 12, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT:

CHAIRMAN DINI  
VICE-CHAIRMAN MURPHY  
ASSEMBLYMAN CRADDOCK  
ASSEMBLYMAN HARMON  
ASSEMBLYMAN MAY  
ASSEMBLYMAN MOODY  
ASSEMBLYMAN SCHOFIELD  
ASSEMBLYMAN FORD  
ASSEMBLYMAN YOUNG

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Laurence Hampton, City of Las Vegas  
Mr. Bill Adams, City of Las Vegas  
Mr. Jack Mitchell, City of North Las Vegas  
Mr. Goodwin, State of Nevada  
Mr. Dante Pistone, State of Nevada  
Mr. Robert A. May, Nevada Society of Professional  
Engineers  
Mr. J. N. Littlefield, State Public Works Board  
Mr. Fred Daniels, Professional Engineers Board  
Mr. Jim Lien, Carson City Centennial  
Mr. James W. Calhoun, Carson City Centennial  
Mr. Robert O. Dimmick, Legislative Counsel Bureau

(The following bills were discussed at this meeting: Request for bill draft to amend industrial revenue bond law; S.B. 219, A.B. 230, A.B. 290, S.B. 210, A.B. 321, A.B. 322, A.J.R. 7, A.B. 199, A.B. 172, A.B. 56.)

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

Mr. Pistone stated that he had a request for a bill draft to amend the Industrial Revenue Bond law. He stated that it was brought to their attention that the revenue bond law does not include warehousing and distribution facilities in the law. Mr. Pistone distributed a handout to the committee members, a copy of which is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof. Mr. Pistone stated that Nevada is lax in industrial financing. He stated that it is permitted but that it has only been used about three times in the state for pollution control devices. Mr. Pistone stated that they feel that with the increasing importance of warehousing and distribution in the state that if they did provide additional enticement it would encourage warehousing and distribution facilities. He stated that the law could be used to much greater effectiveness and could be a great asset to the state.

AB737  
as BDR

Mr. Pistone stated that they were proposing that "warehousing and distribution" be inserted in Section 8 in the fourth line. Mr. Pistone stated that warehousing and distribution have not been eligible before. Mr. Pistone stated that they will only get qualified enterprises coming into the state.

Mr. Dini asked if there would be a new subsection.

Mr. Pistone stated that yes there would be and that it would make sure that only qualified agencies are allowed to use the amendment.

Mr. May moved that the bill be drafted and re-referred back to the committee. Mr. Murphy seconded the motion. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion and it was carried unanimously. Mr. Craddock, Mr. Moody and Mr. Harmon were not present at the vote.

The next bill to be discussed by the committee was S.B. 219, which authorizes counties to budget for art centers. Mr. Jim Lien testified and stated that he was with the Carson City Centennial. He stated that S.B. 219 was permissive legislation which would establish an art center in Carson City. Mr. Lien stated that permissive language allows the city to participate in the funding of such a project. Mr. Lien stated that it was an expansion of the law. He stated that they have not had any opposition from the other entities, and that Clark County was not opposed to this bill.

Mr. Warren stated that he concurred.

Mr. Dini stated that the testimony on S.B. 219 was concluded.

Mr. Young made a motion for a "do pass" on S.B. 219, which was seconded by Mr. May. All of the members were in favor of the motion and it was carried unanimously. Mr. Craddock, Mr. Harmon and Mr. Moody were not present at the vote.

The next bill to be heard by the committee was A.B. 230 which was introduced by Assemblyman Demers. Mr. Demers stated that there were 55 individuals employed by the animal control center in Clark County. Mr. Demers indicated that Mr. Bunker had stated that Clark County would not oppose this bill and that the Humane Societies of Southern and Northern Nevada do support the bill.

Mr. Dini stated that he had received a great deal of correspondence from the small counties and that they would like to be let out from under this bill. He stated that the counties had indicated that they had ordinances and that they did not want to change it. Mr. Dini stated that the committee would go on the assumption that it was for Clark County.

Mr. Demers stated that the problem may be greater in the urban areas.

Mr. Dini stated that the City of North Las Vegas was opposed to the bill.

Mr. Demers stated that that did not surprise him.

Mr. Dini asked if this bill would prevent dogs from running around loose. He stated that it would not and that sterilization would not prevent that.

Mr. Demers stated that North Las Vegas had an increase of a little over 300% and that the big problem is the fact that these dogs are running loose and breeding. He stated that the humane approach is to sterilize them.

Mr. May asked how you would prove possession if people would take dogs and just leave them.

Mr. Demers stated that the animal control people would pick up the dog, and take it to the pound. He stated that the animal would then be executed, someone would claim the dog or someone would adopt the dog. Mr. Demers stated that once an individual comes in, that you would then have an effective control.

Mr. May stated that what we were after was to have them sterilized before they are released from the animal control center.

Mr. Demers stated that he would not be opposed to that. He stated that the dog pound people were responsible for this.

Mr. Dini asked if he thought the wording should be "shall" in Clark County.

Mr. Demers stated that it should be.

Mr. Dini asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Bill Adams next testified on A.B. 230. Mr. Adams stated that he would straddle the fence on this bill. He stated that they recognized the problem. He stated there were two faults. The first one was the price of \$50.00 fine and the difference between "may" and "shall". He stated that the counties have always had permissive legislation.

Mr. Adams stated that in the city the problem is that they do not have enough people to catch the dogs.

Mr. Adams stated that their staff in the animal shelter was 18 people and that they worked 24 hours a day - 7 days a week and that there was one man on each shift. He stated that at the present time most people do not prefer to take this type of a job.

Mr. Adams stated that they are financing their animal shelter which will have a sterilization clinic. They have been getting static because of the possibility of sterilization of the wrong dogs, but that they have facilities available for it. He stated it was their

intention to use veterinarians to do the work. Mr. Adams stated that he felt that the price would go up from the \$35.00 that is currently being charged now for sterilization. He stated that the best thing to do would be to go ahead and give them the authority and to let them see what they can do.

Mr. Young asked if he said that they thought that they could sterilize a dog if this is not enacted.

Mr. Adams stated yes, that they were rewriting the ordinance.

Mrs. Ford asked if his bill will only apply to the city.

Mr. Adams stated that they will have to get the county to do it. He stated that he wanted to do it all the way - county and city.

Mrs. Ford stated that the Blue Diamond area was particularly bad and that they would be an incorporated area.

Mr. Schofield asked if that was where the majority of the problem was.

Mr. Adams stated that that is the one that is receiving the publicity. Most of the areas are on the other side of the city. He mentioned North Curtis park and that area.

Mrs. Ford stated that it looked like we needed to mandate the entities within the Las Vegas Valley and incorporated area to come up with a uniform ordinance. If we ask you to get together and come up with one that would give you flexibility.

Mr. Dini asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Young stated that he did not like to see legislation on something that is unworkable.

Mrs. Ford stated that they had the authority and so did the county and that we had to tell them to get together.

Mr. Dini asked if there was anyone else that would like to testify on A.B. 230.

Mr. Bob Warren next testified. Mr. Warren stated that he had had 14 responses and only one favored the proposal. He stated that this could be a serious problem in some areas and that it should be tried on an area by area basis.

Mr. Warren then listed some of the responses he had received. He stated that Caliente had no vet there and that there would be a problem with sterilization.

He stated that Gabbs feels that it should be handled by local ordinance.

Carson stated that they do have the power to do this. /- 0395

Elko has an ordinance but they feel that it should remain within the local purview.

Henderson and Lovelock oppose it.

He further stated that Sparks would support it if funds were made available for mass sterilization and an educational program were offered.

Mr. Dini asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Bunker next testified. He stated that he had received input from the animal control people and that they felt it was a county problem. He further stated that the initial cost certainly would increase in fulfilling this program. He stated that he felt that after two years the cost would level off and that they bascially supported the bill. One of their concerns was the call back.

Mr. Dini questioned this bill with regard to counties over 200,000 people and that for the rest of the counties it would be permissive.

Mr. Bunker stated that he would defer to the committee.

Mr. May asked Mr. Bunker if he had authority with regard to the \$50.00 on the county level and Mr. Bunker stated that he did not know if that authority is in the county ordinances or not.

Mr. Schofield stated that if the counties had the authority to pass ordinances allowing these law why should we do it. Mr. Bunker stated that he had not initiated the legislation.

The next bills to be discussed were S.B. 210 and A.B. 290. Mr. Adams, director of the Nevada Society of Professional Engineers testified. He stated that these bills were introduced at their request. Mr. Adams stated that they were the major professional organization of engineers in the county and that their membership totaled 60,000. He stated that the state has adopted in addition to the regulations, a code of conduct. In the past a number of engineers have been removed from the society and have had their licenses removed. He stated that they felt it was appropriate that they do this. Mr. Adams stated that for some reason the board was not given the authority to use the code of conduct against the engineers, and that they wanted this in the statutes. Mr. Adams stated that it is aimed at cleaning up the profession.

Mr. Dini asked if he was representing Senator Gibson.

Mr. Adams replied that he more or less was.

Mr. Dini asked if there was any provision in the code of conduct stating that the engineers could wear two hats - one representing a client and the other representing the board.

Mr. Adams stated that once an engineer has stated that he is representing a client, he should remain with the client. Mr. Dini indicated that he had seen one that had represented both and that if it is not specifically in the code of conduct, that he felt it should be amended. Mr. Dini asked if he would have an objection to doing this.

Mr. Adams stated that he felt that the code of conduct would cover this.

Mrs. Ford stated that under the NRS it allows the majority of the membership to amend the code. She asked Mr. Adams if the board could make amendments on its own.

Mr. Adams stated that the board would institute a change in the code and they would send it to each engineer and then the engineers would vote for or against it. Mr. Adams then referred to section 3.7 of the code and read from that section. He stated that in essence this section states that an engineer will not accept compensation from more than one party without the knowledge and consent of both parties.

Mr. Fred Danies of the Professional Engineers registration Board stated that the code was ratified by all people who were registered by their board several years ago. He stated that to make a change they would have to go back through all of the people. He further stated that the board wants this code.

Mr. Dini asked if the board would mind a little amendment.

Mr. Daniels asked if this was a conflict of interest situation that Mr. Dini had referred to.

Mr. Dini said that it was and he further thought that it should be specified in the law.

Mr. Young indicated that in small areas there may not be enough engineers.

Mr. Dini stated that they should not be able to represent both parties.

Mr. Daniels stated that under the code the engineer has the responsibility not to be in that position.

Mr. Dini indicated that the statute could be changed.

Mr. May stated that the initial code is to be ratified by a majority and thereafter it may be promulgated or adopted. He stated that it was vague.

Mr. Dini asked if there were any questions.

The next bill to be discussed was A.B. 290. Mr. Richard Arden spoke on behalf of the bill. Mr. Arden is the president elect of the Nevada society of professional engineers.

Mr. Arden stated that the engineering profession has given considerable consideration to the amendment in order to clarify certain understandings that might exist in the selection of an engineer. There has been a trend in the past to bidding engineering and architectural services. They do not feel that this is in the best interests of the public health, safety and welfare for the following reasons. The public agency will not obtain the best qualified firm to undertake the project. As a matter of fact, the least qualified probably would have the lowest fee because they would not completely understand the scope of work. The public agency would have to obtain additional personnel to check the work and they will not be able to rely on the reputation of the firm and the quality of the work and probably and most importantly would be that the agency would not receive the most economical design because the firm will not have the fee to study the alternatives to determine the most economical design. To protect the firm from the lack of fee, the project will be over-designed which will be reflected in a higher construction cost. From the public standpoint, the careful evaluation of an engineer or architect's services is more important than price alone. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the scope of the work for the engineer to bid. The engineer has to act in an advisory capacity to the client and to help him define the scope of work so that an efficient, safe and economical project can be designed. A relationship must be developed in such a manner to insure one of mutual trust and confidence. This cannot be accomplished through a bidding process. There has been much publicity in the past concerning the selection of engineers in Maryland, which resulted in an editorial in the Washington Post in December of 1974 which clearly points out the opposition to competitive bidding of engineering services. The post said "engineering and architectural services for talent, experience and other intangibles cannot be measured in dollars. The lowest bidding designer in fact is quite apt to give us a prohibitively expensive product, a building that is deficient, a bridge that needs constant repairs or a freeway that causes accidents". The Post also called for the professional societies to police their own ethics and that is what we are trying to do here in S.B. 210. The Post editorial sums up the reason for the passage of this amendment. Several governmental agencies are presently using this method, however, in certain areas where there is a change in administration, they feel that it should be specifically spelled out.

Mr. Craddock asked what control was exercised over out of state engineers.

Mr. Arden stated that the only control is through the State Board of Registration and any engineer that comes into the state has to obtain a license from the Board in order to practice in this state. If they are operating in the state according to the state law they must maintain a residence and a place of business here.

Mr. Craddock asked how long that had been effective.

Mr. Daniels stated between 4 to 6 years. He was not sure of the date. Mr. Daniels further stated that there have been no problems as far as kickbacks. He stated that this bill concerns public works and the selection of an engineer to perform those public works. It is in the best interest of the public in order to get a properly designed job to go through the selection process that is being used by the state public works board.

Mr. Dini stated that the key words are "basis" and demonstration".

Mr. Arden stated that you would be able to review the particular engineer and his firm as to what his capabilities are.

Mr. May then referred to the words demonstrate and shall in the bill.

Mr. Arden stated that under private enterprise we still use the same system and it would be a little different with private enterprise because you can specifically point out to them the advantages of selecting a competent person to save their money. These people are generally dealing in these type of projects all the time and they understand.

Mr. May asked if this would preclude any newly licensed architects?

Mr. Arden stated that if it is a new firm they would have staff with past experience.

Mr. Joe Littlefield, Deputy Manager of the State Public Works Board next testified. He stated that Mr. Hancock is at another hearing and he has asked him to testify in his place and to report to the committee. The Public Works Board does employ this method to secure its architects and engineers. They believe it is the proper method in all public works projects and they would recommend that the committee do it. What we are looking at here is not a question of avoiding an under the table agreement, we are looking at the necessity and a means of assuring that you get the most competent engineer. The reasoning behind this is that if you bid the services at the time when you select the architect and engineer, the project has not yet been defined. If you select the architect or engineer on the basis of bidding you are almost guaranteeing yourself that you will select the outfit that is willing to spend the least amount of time on it. In engineering work, the design is a small part of the total cost. An error on the design could be costly. This always has been the method that the Public Works Board has employed in selecting engineers.

Mr. Craddock asked if he felt that there should be a penalty for an incompetent engineer.

Mr. Littlefield stated that there is liability. There is no necessity in this particular law. This is just the manner of selection.

Mr. Jack Mitchell next testified. Mr. Mitchell stated that he was a registered engineer in the State of Nevada. He stated that he thought it would be a sad situation if a building were designed by the low bidder. The better consultant will almost always save you the entire fee over what you get from the low bidder. Mr. Daniels then referred to Section 2(a) of the code of conduct and stated that they could take disciplinary action for a conflict of interest when they know about it.

Mr. Dini asked if this had ever been done in Western Nevada.



/~0399

Mr. Daniels stated yes. In the one year that he has been on the board, no.

Mr. May, with regard to A.B. 290, questioned Mr. Daniels would consider changing the word shall and striking the word demonstrate. He stated that those two changes would allow them that privilege and would not preclude any new business.

Mr. Daniels stated that the word shall should be there. What they were trying to do was to protect public safety.

The committee then took a five minute recess.

Chairman Dini called the meeting back to order.

Mr. May moved for an indefinite postponement with regard to A.B. 230 which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. Mrs. Ford suggested that we try to do something else on this bill.

Mr. Dini stated that Mrs. Ford and Mr. Schofield were to work on this and to bring back something for committee introduction if possible. All of the committee members were unanimously in favor of the motion and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. Young moved for a "do pass" on S.B. 210, which was seconded by Mr. Moody. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. Moody moved for a "do pass" on A.B. 290 which was seconded by Mrs. Ford. The committee then discussed A.B. 290. A motion for an "amend and do pass" was made by Mr. May and was seconded by Mr. Moody. The proposed amendment was in line 21 of the bill. The word shall will be changed to may and to delete the word "demonstrate" on line 22.

Mrs. Ford stated that she strongly opposes the amendment from "shall" to "may". She suggest removing the word demonstrate.

Mr. Murphy then referred to the verbiage in the statutes and read from the statutes. All of the committee members were in favor of the amend and do pass with regard to A.B. 290 with the exception of Assemblyman Ford. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Dini then referred to A.B. 321 and stated that the State Employees have agreed to take out Section 7. Mr. Dini stated that we would hold on to A.B. 321 and get in touch with Mr. Gagnier on this bill.

Mr. Dini then referred to A.B. 322. He stated that an amendment had been proposed by Mr. Bruce. The amendment to this bill will read "the procedures necessary to accomplish such payroll deductions as specified by the claiming shall be established by the State Controller.

Mr. May moved an amend and do pass with regard to A.B. 322, which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. All of the members were in favor of the amend and do pass and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Dini stated that A.J.R. 7 poses a lot of problems if we were to send it back to Congress. The committee then discussed A.B. 199. Mr. May made a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 199, effective the day that Congress changes veteran's day back. The motion was seconded by Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy stated that A.B. 199 would be tied in to the day that Congress returns Veteran's Day to November 11th. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. May then moved for an indefinite postponement of A.J.R. 7 which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. All of the committee members were in favor of the motion for indefinite postponement with regard to AJR 7 and it was carried unanimously.

Mr. May then stated that the subcommittee had met with Mr. Hancock with regard to A.B. 172. Mr. Hancock suggested that we revise it by amending section 2, line 8 and by saying that the Board shall adopt regulations by establishing procedures acceptable to the state contractor's board. Mr. Dini stated that Mr. May would get the amendment drafted and bring it back to the committee.


Mr. Dini then asked if Mr. Warren had an amendment with regard to A.B. 56. Mr. May stated that he had talked to Mr. Hancock and that Mr. Hancock had discussed it with the fire marshal. Mr. Hancock suggested that Mr. May suggest the following language in 3(b).

"At their own cost conduct factory built inspections to verify compliance with all provisions of NRS 461.170

Mr. May stated that he would get back to the committee with regard to A.B. 56.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Barbara Gomez,  
Committee Secretary

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS  
WEDNESDAY,  
Date MARCH 12, 1975 Time 8:00 A.M. Room 214

/ - 0390

Bills or Resolutions to be considered	Subject	Counsel requested*
A.B. 230	Authorizes counties and requires cities and towns to enact an ordinance to control dogs running at large.  Notify: Mr. Demers Mr. Broadbent Mr. Bunker Mr. Warren  * * * * *	
S.B. 219	Authorizes counties to budget for art centers.  Notify: Senator Gibson Mr. Broadbent Mr. Bunker  * * * * *	
S.B. 210	Provides additional ground for revoking certificate of registration of professional engineer or land surveyor.  Notify: Senator Gibson State Board of Professional Engineers (Director)  * * * * *	
A.B. 290	Provides method for selection of registered professional engineer or licensed architect for public works projects.  Notify: Dr. Robinson Mr. Hancock, Public Works Board	

\*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

0401

GUEST REGISTER

DATE: March 12, 1975

NAME	BILL #	REPRESENTING	TESTIFYING
Laurence Hampton X	<del>290</del> 324	City of Las Vegas	yes
Thomas E Stephens, P.E.	290	Nevada Society of Prof. Engrs	NO
W.E. Adams X	<del>290</del> 210 230	City of Las Vegas	Yes
LACIE MITCHELL	SB 210 AB 270	CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	YES
<i>[Signature]</i> X	AB 197	State of Nevada	YES
Nante Postone X	AB 197	State of Nevada, DED	Yes
Robert A. May X	290	Nevada Society of Prof. Engr	NO
V.N. Littlefield X	290	State Public Works Board	Yes
Fred Daniels X	SB 210 AB 290	Prof. Engrs. Regis. Board	YES
Gray A. Engstrom	SB 210 AB 290	NEV. SOCIETY OF PROF. ENGRS	No.
Jamie Young X	AB 219	Proscenium Playhouse C.C.	NO
Betty Block X	SB 219	Carson City Centennial Bicentennial Commission	NO
Jim Lien X	SB 219		yes
Helena Calhoun X	SB 219	State Council on the Arts	No
James W. Calhoun X	SB 219	Carson City Centennial Bicentennial Commission	
Robert O. Dimmitt X	AB 230	Legislative Council Bureau Audit Division	NO

# Statutes of Nevada, 1967

Senate Bill No. 170--Senator Alleman

## CHAPTER 547

AN ACT relating to public securities and obligations; authorizing counties and cities to issue revenue bonds to finance industrial development projects and to lease such projects; prescribing details in connection therewith; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

*The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

SECTION 1. Chapter 244 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this act.

SEC. 2. Sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the County Economic Development Revenue Bond Law.

SEC. 3. Whenever used in sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this act, unless a different meaning clearly appears from the context, the following words and terms defined in sections 4 to 7, inclusive, of this act have the meanings ascribed to them in sections 4 to 7, inclusive, of this act.

SEC. 4. "Board" means the board of county commissioners.

SEC. 5. "Bonds" or "revenue bonds" means bonds, notes or other securities evidencing an obligation and issued under sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this act.

SEC. 6. "Mortgage" includes a deed of trust and any other security device for both real and personal property.

SEC. 7. "Project" means any land, building or other improvement and all real and personal properties necessary in connection therewith, whether or not in existence, suitable for manufacturing, industrial or research and development enterprises.

SEC. 8. 1. It is the intent of the legislature to authorize counties to acquire, own, lease, improve and dispose of properties to the end that such counties may be able to promote industry and develop trade by inducing manufacturing, industrial and research and development enterprises to locate in or remain in this state, in order to assist in relieving the serious threat of extensive unemployment in parts of this state, in securing and maintaining a balanced and stable economy in all parts of this state and in furthering the use of its agricultural products and natural resources. It is, therefore, the intention of the legislature to vest such counties with all powers that may be necessary to enable them to accomplish such purposes, which powers shall in all respects be exercised for the benefit of the inhabitants of this state for the promotion of their safety, welfare, convenience and prosperity.

2. It is not intended hereby that any county shall itself be authorized to operate any such manufacturing, industrial or research and development enterprise.

3. No county may by virtue of sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this act assist any manufacturing, industrial or research and development enterprise to locate in the county which would offer substantial competition to an existing enterprise within the county whose intrastate markets are substantially the same.

# INDUSTRIAL FINANCING FACTS

State and Political Subdivision Financing										Maximum Amount of Transaction	Maximum Percent of Cost Covered By Transaction	Current Rate of Interest	Total Number of Transactions To Date	Total Amount of Transactions To Date	Aggregate of Funds for Financing	Total Funds Currently Available for Financing
Permitted?	By General Obligation Bonds?	By Revenue Bonds?	Bond Financing To Date	State Financing Agency	Type *	\$ Millions	\$ Millions	%	%							
Alabama	Yes	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes	860.0 <sup>2</sup>	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alaska	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	A,B	.75	90	7	52	9.8	18.0	—	—	—	—
Arizona <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	750.0	No	—	Open	100	10 Max.	336	750	—	—	—	—	—
California	No	No	No	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colorado	Yes	No	Yes	26.7	No <sup>4</sup>	—	.30	100	3 Over	28	2.5	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	9.0	Yes	A,D <sup>5</sup>	Varies	A:100 D:10-100	A:9½-10 D:Varies	337	65.7	67.7 <sup>6</sup>	112 <sup>6</sup>	—	—	—
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	100.0	Yes	D	5.0	100	Varies	30	—	—	10	—	—	—
Florida	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	A	.4	Varies	4 Over Prime	110	14.5	7.2	2	—	—	—
Georgia <sup>7</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	B	.05	10	5.5	158	—	3.6	None	—	—	—
Idaho	No	No	No	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Illinois	Yes	No	Yes <sup>7</sup>	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indiana	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	C,D	C:1.0	C:90	C:½-2	—	—	C:10	—	—	—	—
Iowa	Yes	No	Yes	243	Yes	A	5.0	100	6-9	50	243	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	Yes	No	Yes	281.4	Yes	A	.25	100	Varies	201	13.5	14.1	6	—	—	—
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	677.6	Yes	B	—	—	8	61	6.74	5.3	0.7	—	—	—
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	379.0	Yes	A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maine	Yes	No	Yes	6.3	Yes	C,D	4.0	Varies	2 Over Prime	60	44.7	80	35.3	—	—	—
Maryland <sup>8</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes	20.97	Yes	A,C	4.0	—	6-6.5	3	2.1	12.1	10	—	—	—
Massachusetts <sup>9</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	33.0	Yes	A,B	5.0	100	Varies	12	33	—	—	—	—	—
Michigan	Yes	No	Yes	316.0	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Minnesota	Yes	No	Yes	76.9	Yes	A <sup>10</sup>	5.0	100	—	46	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Yes	412.0	Yes	A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri	Yes	Yes <sup>11</sup>	Yes <sup>12</sup>	267.0	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montana	Yes	No	Yes	16.0	Yes	A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nebraska	Yes	No	Yes	142.4	No	A	Open	100	Varies	97	142.4	—	—	—	—	—
Nevada <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Hampshire	Yes	No	Yes	1.6	Yes	A,B	5.0	100	—	85	8.9	38	31	—	—	—
New Jersey	No	No	No	—	Yes	B <sup>13</sup>	Open	5	—	8	0.9	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	Yes	No	Yes	25.6	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York	Yes	No	Yes	65.3 <sup>14</sup>	Yes	A,B,D <sup>15</sup>	A:0.5 B:1.0 D:No Limit	A:No Limit B:30 D:No Limit	A:2.5 Over Prime B:6.5 D:Varies	A:437 B:528 D:22	A:80.5 B:69.8 D:85.3	A:22.9 B:150	A:14.5 B:100	—	—	—
North Carolina	Yes	No	Yes	25	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	14.1	Yes	A,D <sup>16</sup>	—	A:100 D:Varies	D:Varies	A:3	A:0.8	A:1.1	—	—	—	—
Ohio <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	365	Yes	C	5	90	Varies	3	0.5	5	5	—	—	—
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	334	Yes	B	1	25	7	132	18.5	20	3.7	—	—	—
Oregon <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	A <sup>11</sup> ,C <sup>17</sup>	—	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	A,B,D <sup>18</sup>	A:Varies	100	Varies	B:819 D:1,158	B:931 D:276	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	Yes	No	Yes	6.8	Yes	A,C	5	90	1 Over Prime	106	37.8	40	2.2	—	—	—
South Carolina	Yes	No	Yes	231.5	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Dakota	Yes	No	Yes	14.3	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	Yes	Yes <sup>19</sup>	Yes <sup>20</sup>	425	Yes	B,C	—	50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Texas	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	A,B	Varies	100	Varies	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Utah	Yes	No	Yes	5	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vermont <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	A,B,C	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	173	Yes	A	.05	100	1.5 - 2.0 Over Prime	62	14.6	8.8	2.5	—	—	—
Washington	Yes <sup>20</sup>	Yes	Yes	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	129.7	Yes	B	No Limit	30	5.5 <sup>21</sup>	80	70	6.6	2.1	—	—	—
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	No	—	—	—	—	2	1.0	—	—	—	—	—
Wyoming <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	55.0	Yes	A	No Limit	Varies	Varies	18	3.5	8.0	7.5	—	—	—

ED. NOTE: THE COMPLEX NATURE OF INDUSTRIAL FINANCING IS DIFFICULT TO PRESENT IN TABULAR FORM; RESULTS MAY SERVE ONLY AS AN OVERALL VIEW OF PROGRAMS, WITH DETAILS TO BE FILLED IN BY STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES. SOURCE: STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.

\*TYPES OF FINANCING:  
 A—DEVELOPMENT CREDIT CORPORATION  
 B—DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
 C—BANK INSURANCE

3. DATA NOT AVAILABLE FOR 1972. DATA ARE FOR 1971.  
 4. THE COLORADO BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORP., A PRIVATE GROUP, PROVIDES FINANCING IN COLO. DATA ARE FOR THAT GROUP.  
 5. CONNECTICUT DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ADMINISTERS REVENUE BOND AND MORTGAGE GUARANTY PROGRAMS.  
 6. THE (+) REPRESENTS NO LIMIT UNDER THE REVENUE BOND PROGRAM SELF-SUSTAINING PORTION.  
 7. REVENUE BOND FINANCING AUTHORITY STATE IS AN ACTING COURT TEST OF REBILITATION.

REAL ESTATE AND 75% OF MACHINE-RY AND EQUIPMENT.  
 10. AUTHORIZED BUT INACTIVE.  
 11. EXCLUDES KANSAS CITY AND ST. LOUIS  
 12. INCLUDES KANSAS CITY AND ST. LOUIS  
 13. AREA REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FINANCING PERMITTED IN SOME COUNTIES.  
 14. DI LOCAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.  
 15. DI PARTICIPATION LOANS, BANK OF NORTH DAKOTA.  
 16. PORT DISTRICTS ONLY.  
 17. LIMITED TO 14% OF PORT DIS-

DEVELOPMENT BORDS MAY ISSUE REVENUE AND GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS WITH APPROVAL OF LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES AND A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC NECESSITY FROM THE STATE BUILDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.  
 20. RESPONSIBILITY IS VESTED IN PUBLIC PORT AUTHORITY, RATHER THAN COUNTIES.  
 21. RATE OF EACH TRANSACTION IS DETERMINED BY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BOARD.  
 22. AS NEW YORK BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORP.

"A bond of high enough rating for national banks to purchase with permission of the comptroller of the currency."