

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
March 28, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 9:04 a.m. on Tuesday, March 28, 2017, 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.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblyman Chris Brooks  
Assemblyman Skip Daly  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner  
Assemblyman Al Kramer  
Assemblyman Jim Marchant  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman William McCurdy II  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst  
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel  
Carol Myers, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Roberta Ross, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Nathan Daniel, Executive Director, Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation  
Lynda Nelson, Natural Resources Specialist, Nevada Land Trust  
Scott Morgan, Director, Community Services/Parks and Recreation, Douglas County  
Karen Mullen-Ehly, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Steve K. Walker, representing Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, Storey County, and Truckee Meadows Water Authority  
Scott F. Gilles, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno  
Maggie Orr, President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts  
Aaron Katz, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada  
Frank Wright, Private Citizen, Crystal Bay, Nevada  
Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County  
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.  
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Corey Solferino, Sergeant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
A.J. Delap, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada  
Daysi Rodriguez, Outreach Coordinator, Tu Casa Latina, Reno, Nevada  
Todd Ingalsbee, Legislative Representative, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada

**Chairman Flores:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have two bills on the agenda today. I will open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 379. Bill sponsors, please come forward.

**Assembly Bill 379: Amends provisions relating to general improvement districts created for the purpose of furnishing recreational facilities. (BDR 25-211)**

**Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24:**

I represent Assembly District No. 24, which is right in the middle of Reno. Thank you for hearing Assembly Bill 379 today. The intent of this bill is to create parks, open spaces, and

trail districts in Nevada. This may sound familiar to some of you who have lived in other states. Many other states have park districts. Park districts are special local government districts created in an area to fund parks, recreational facilities, and open spaces.

This bill is very personal to me. For me, it is a journey that started three years ago. I was looking for an outdoor activity for my daughter's Girl Scouts troop. I approached the staff of one of our local parks for a tour and was informed they did not have staff working on the weekends due to cuts in services. They were very kind and handed me their tour brochures—the same brochure I had received several years earlier when I had taken a tour. I led the tour myself, and of course, the experience was not the same as it would have been with well-informed staff who knew the property well. From that, coupled with other experiences of unavailable park services and learning there was an almost 40 percent cut in parks during the recession in northern Nevada—I hear southern Nevada is similar—I became interested in finding ways to improve funding for our parks.

This bill is especially important for our cities and counties statewide struggling with budget demands to fund parks and recreation. Unfortunately, we have not seen a complete rebound in those budgets since the recession. Last year, I mentioned to a friend that I was planning to sponsor a bill to help fund our parks. She introduced me to a group of citizens who have been working on the same issue since 2011 or longer. Many of them are here with me today. They introduced me to the concept of park districts. They have taken the lead to inform stakeholders and gather support throughout Nevada for this measure, and I am very grateful.

It is very important to realize this bill is only authorizing the creation of park districts. It is another tool in the toolbox to help our cities and counties fund parks and outdoor spaces. In Nevada, we have several types of districts, such as special districts, general improvement districts (GIDs), and conservation districts. None of these alone provide all the mechanisms needed to run a park or recreation area. Such a district needs to authorize the expenditure of funds for a wide variety of needs including the acquisition or creation of facilities; the operation, management and maintenance of facilities; the conservation and restoration of natural vegetation; and personnel for educational activities.

A University of Nevada, Reno study [*A Summary Of Social Issues Pertaining To The 2016 One Truckee River Management Plan*, Technical Report UCED 2015/16-20, University Center for Economic Development, College of Business, University of Nevada, Reno] for the One Truckee River project examined each type of district and determined that Nevada does not have one that will do everything needed for parks and outdoor spaces. The Committee will hear more about that project from some of our presenters.

The types of recreational facilities for which a district may be created are expanded by this bill to include watersheds, trails, open spaces, lakes, ponds, and rivers. This measure allows collaborations with nonprofits to perform some of the functions, and it authorizes that a fund may be created to accept contributions, gifts, grants, and donations. I have not heard of any opposition to this bill. However, there was a concern raised yesterday and also this morning that the Committee will hear later today.

In the drafting of A.B. 379, our intent has always been that any local government entity—meaning any city or county—could initiate the process of starting a district and be involved in its management. The way it was originally drafted, it only authorized counties to create a park district. I wanted to let the Committee know I will be working on a small amendment to ensure the original intent of including cities is addressed. I have spoken with our legal counsel and hope to present this small modification should this bill go to a work session. Other than that, I have not heard of any concerns relating to A.B. 379, and I am looking forward to the discussion today.

The "whereas" clauses in the preamble of A.B. 379 define why we think this bill is so important. The intent of Assembly Bill 379 is to allow for the creation of a park, a trail, or an open space district. Section 1, subsection 4, is an exception to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 318.143 rule about property within seven miles. The reason for this language is to allow for an overlay of any combination of governments and the actual boundaries of the cities and counties. The NRS 318.143 rule is not needed. Instead, the district boundary is created by ordinance and would not have the current restrictions. It was a technicality that we did not specifically request but see the need for it with the overlay concept.

Section 2 contains the main changes. This is where the acquiring, operating, maintaining, managing, and restoring are added to the statutes. These are some of the key things currently missing in our special districts that would enable us to fund parks, recreation, or trails fully. Section 2 contains issues relating to wildfire and native vegetation, the provision for nonprofit collaboration, and allowing the establishment of a fund for contributions. Section 2, subsection 3 contains the addition of "watersheds, trails, open spaces, lakes, ponds and rivers." The reason for including them is to encompass the concept of including all different types of parks and trails. We wanted this to be a wide-open, flexible tool for our open spaces that need additional funding.

We have five key presenters here today: Roberta Ross, Nate Daniel, Lynda Nelson, Scott Morgan, and Karen Mullen. Roberta Ross will be our next presenter.

**Roberta Ross, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a business owner in downtown Reno. The businesses I own or have owned are a half-block from the Truckee River in downtown Reno. I think it is important for the Committee to know, so you understand, why I believe I can speak in front of you in support of A.B. 379. I have had a 162-unit apartment building, a restaurant, recently a barbershop, and I own several condos in the Arlington Towers.

Throughout my life, in order to support my business and help downtown Reno become a better place, I have been very involved civically. I am sure I have been involved in over 30 different committees. Currently, I belong to the One Truckee River project, and I am president and a board member of the Regional Alliance for Downtown. These committees are important for Reno and support A.B. 379. Additionally, I termed out with The Chamber, Reno-Sparks-Northern Nevada; I was president of the Nevada Hotel and Lodging Association; and I sat on the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority Board. I was

a member of the Redevelopment Agency Advisory Board with the City of Reno, which was the first to hear the Truckee River Whitewater Park at Wingfield initiative for downtown Reno. All of these organizations are concerned with the economic development of downtown Reno.

The Truckee River Whitewater Park helped to revitalize downtown Reno. It took a part of downtown and made it an attraction for locals and visitors. Technology businesses came to downtown because of our outdoor environment. That is what we want to add into this bill today: the trails, open spaces, lakes, ponds, and rivers. These recreational areas will help draw more people downtown and to our region. Assembly Bill 379 supports this economic effort.

The biggest concern for our region is to maintain our outdoor recreational quality and get funding for the area. I see this as an opportunity for the parks and recreation commissions of the region to aid in maintaining the beauty, outdoor life, and the quality of life for our jurisdictions as more people move into the area. I support Assembly Bill 379.

**Nathan Daniel, Executive Director, Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation:**

The Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation is a nonprofit organization that supports the parks departments in Washoe County, Reno, and Sparks. We incorporated the Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation in 2012 in order to address some of the problems that developed after the massive funding cuts that our local parks agencies felt and are still prevalent today. I would like to thank Assemblywoman Joiner for introducing A.B. 379.

Today, nine years after the beginning of the recession, the various parks departments in the Truckee Meadows are operating on half of their prerecession budget. This is an untenable situation. The long-term disinvestment in our parks and open spaces has resulted in the deterioration of these vital public areas. It has left managers in a position where they cannot run the parks because of inadequate staffing levels and insufficient maintenance budgets.

The real concern today is the short- to mid-term forecast for parks' budgets are for them to stay flat. This means as we continue to add tens of thousands of people in northern Nevada, our park systems will continue to fall further and further behind the national standards. This enabling legislation is a valuable tool to allow local governments and citizens to make their own choices on how to invest in our public recreation areas and shared natural resources.

If, after thoughtful consideration, local communities decide to create a parks district, not only will this help to ensure our children have access to healthy nearby green spaces, it will also free up municipal and county funds that can be reallocated to other essential services. On behalf of the hundreds of members of the Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation, I strongly support the passage of A.B. 379.

**Lynda Nelson, Natural Resources Specialist, Nevada Land Trust:**

The Nevada Land Trust is a 501(c)(3) organization working to protect the open spaces and special places in Nevada. I am a strong supporter of parks, trails, and open spaces. I retired in 2011 after 22 years with Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space. I am here this morning in support of A.B. 379 to enable park district legislation. My primary focus is to let you know how A.B. 379, if approved, will benefit northern Nevada, all of Nevada, and in particular the Truckee River Watershed.

I have been the project manager for a visionary planning effort for the last two years called the One Truckee River Initiative. The Nevada Land Trust, in partnership with Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful and over 130 stakeholders from local and state governments, local businesses, and private citizens, worked diligently to create the first-ever comprehensive management plan for the Truckee River. We have focused on nine areas specifically along the Truckee River: education, water quality, social issues, recreation, quality of life, ecosystem health, public safety, stewardship, and the main reason I am here today, sustainable funding ([Exhibit C](#)).

Currently, we are working with all our stakeholders to implement the plan. The plan was unanimously adopted by the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County in September 2016. By managing the river as one river, the community, as well as visitors, will benefit greatly from unified and aesthetic experiences along the entire length of the river. We love the Truckee River as well as the parks and amenities along it.

There is only one problem. There is not a sustainable funding source to properly maintain and care for everything that is needed: to keep our water quality the best it can be, to provide for the eradication of invasive species, to maintain the park trails and amenities, and to provide educational opportunities regarding this important natural resource. The Truckee River contributes greatly to our quality of life in northern Nevada.

The approval of A.B. 379 will allow us to begin the much needed due-diligence process of conducting a feasibility study to create a linear park for the length of the river from the state line to Pyramid Lake. Through this large park district, there would be a consistent management agency responsible for operations and maintenance on a daily basis as well as sustainable funding to take care of this most precious resource. It is truly the heart of our community. As a lifelong resident of the Truckee Meadows and an outdoor enthusiast, I ask you to please consider the approval of A.B. 379 for the future of parks, trails, and special places in Nevada.

**Scott Morgan, Director, Community Services/Parks and Recreation, Douglas County:**

I am here speaking in support of this bill. I have served in the parks department of Douglas County for 22 years, and I served 8 years as the general manager of a parks and recreation district in California. I want to speak to the benefits of expanding the language in this bill to allow greater flexibility. There are many challenges facing the parks and recreation industry today, particularly in Nevada. Expanding the duties of districts and allowing for a parks and recreation district is one more tool to meet some of those challenges successfully.

Douglas County supports this because we are very, very rich in special districts. Douglas County has more special districts than any other county in Nevada. We see the benefits of those special districts in allowing the expansion of these duties. I think A.B. 379 creates greater opportunities for us to address some of the needs of the communities. It allows residents and taxpayers greater flexibility to identify and respond to some of the needs in their community. For that reason, we are supporting this bill draft.

**Karen Mullen-Ehly, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a retired parks director. I worked in the field for almost 40 years, and I have a natural resource background. One of the things I wanted to wind up the testimonies with is the statement that this is truly a grassroots effort. The citizens came to a group of retired directors and said, What can we do? What we have is not working. We need to find a different method, and we need to take a look at how we can fund and sustainably fund our essential services of parks, recreation, open spaces, trails, and those sorts of things.

In addition, I was contacted by a number of folks from the community who are interested in fire restoration and fire prevention such as reducing fuel loads in their communities and along the open spaces. There is a gap in our communities where folks do not have a funding source to go after matching federal funding to reduce fuels in the communities' open spaces. If a catastrophe happens, we will be lucky to get seeding done once. In Nevada, we need to be able to seed multiple times to get native vegetation to take. It was with a lot of prompting from citizens who brought a group of us together to begin discussing a sustainable model. Assembly Bill 379 will enable us to take a good look at a cohesive strategy on managing our parks, our open spaces, and our natural resources together with the support of the communities and their local governments. We would appreciate your support of A.B. 379 to allow this grassroots effort to move forward with some sustainable funding.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am looking at the One Truckee River Management Plan Summary (Exhibit C) and the bill. Section 2, subsection 2, states, ". . . within 7 miles from the boundary of an incorporated city . . ." Is that just along the Truckee River? Or is it seven miles around the entire city?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

The handout (Exhibit C) in front of you is one example of a type of project that this bill would authorize. This bill would apply statewide to any entity and any group of citizens interested in initiating a parks district.

Concerning the seven miles, legal counsel may want to help clarify the drafted language, but my understanding of that provision is an exception is being made for these types of districts. They will overlay and possibly cross over different boundary lines. We did not want there to be that seven-mile limitation. Currently, in the statute there are five criteria to meet within the seven miles [NRS 318.055]. This would not be necessary for a parks district because it could possibly overlay cities.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I do not understand how the boundaries can cross over from one city to another.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

The bill provides that in order for that to happen, all of the local government entities involved would have a memorandum of understanding (MOU). They would agree before anything could happen. That is under section 1, subsection 4 where it states, ". . . before a board of county commissioners adopts the initiating ordinance for the proposed district, each board of county commissioners and governing body of an incorporated city, unincorporated town and existing general improvement district with territory included within the boundaries of the proposed district consent to the formation of the district by resolution."

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

This is a follow-up to Assemblyman Ellison's question. Section 1, subsection 4 begins with "The restrictions set forth in paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, of subsection 3 do not apply to a proposed district which will furnish recreational facilities pursuant to NRS 318.143 if before a board of county commissioners adopts the initiating ordinance for the proposed district . . ." Does this allow an overlap or retroactivity of an existing GID? Can you add to an existing GID using that particular section of the language?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I would not use the word "retroactivity." A current GID could be one of the local government entities opting to join in. We wanted it to be a combination of jurisdictions. It might be a combination of a city, county, and a GID in collaboration with a nonprofit that will administer the district. We are not changing any of the current provisions in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* about annexing GID boundaries. Those still apply, but the GID could be part of the MOU group. That is my intent. If it is not drafted that way, we can amend the language. The reason for it is that there might be a GID with a swimming pool or mosquito abatement, and they see the benefit of joining a larger parks and recreation group. It might make sense for them to join a park district for the access to a larger organization.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

The GID must be able to pay for itself, and the MOU must be economically feasible. What do you see happening?

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

Scott, based on your experience with the districts in California, can you offer an explanation on how that works? Our concept is a new park district, and as a part of its formation, the cost would need to be anticipated, like any other GID. I do not foresee that happening, but maybe other testifiers have experience with that.

**Scott Morgan:**

Where most of the districts get their driving force is through that grassroots effort. They come together for a cause to meet a need in their community whether it is roads, sewer, or water. Then, funding sources are figured out. Either they self-tax, or they put in some



type of assessment district. I think the intent of this legislation is to allow the grassroots effort to come up with creative options. Some of those options are addressed in this bill. Formation without funding does not make sense to anyone. Usually, the funding is figured out, and they would use A.B. 379 to capture funding in the form of a foundation, nonprofit, grant, or assessment. Capturing a tax increment starts at the local level. I think this bill contemplates and allows for that flexibility to take place.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

As a mother who also looks for activities for her kids and kids' friends, I appreciate this. There is an article today in a local newspaper about monarch butterflies. Some volunteers went together outside Beatty to create a monarch butterfly rest place. I imagine it might bring a lot of tourism to the area of Beatty via travelers to Death Valley in California. Would this bill allow nonprofits and cities to work with land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior? Do you see that working to leverage some of the funds available?

**Karen Mullen:**

As a former parks director, we often used federal funding sources. I know local GIDs have worked with the federal government on a number of things. If the bill does not allow it, I hope we could work towards that. Washoe County has a number of facilities where a bond issue was passed, and it has been over 20 years. We passed a bond issue to create trails and trailheads on Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture lands for community access to public lands. The county maintains and manages those facilities on federal land. The federal government agreed to do the long-term capital maintenance, and an agreement was worked out between the county and the federal government. I would hope this legislation includes that. We should be able to cross jurisdictional lines, both state and federal, just as we do right now.

**Chairman Flores:**

Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in support of A.B. 379?

**Steve K. Walker, representing Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, Storey County, and Truckee Meadows Water Authority:**

We are all in support of this bill, Truckee Meadows Water Authority in particular because the potential to improve the Truckee River water quality is very important to us. The Truckee River provides the bulk of the water supply for our area.

**Scott F. Gilles, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno:**

The City of Reno supports this concept wholeheartedly. We are glad the sponsors are willing to work on some amendments to revise the way it is currently written. Obviously, we would like authority to create our own districts, and we want to make sure there are options for

sustainable funding. Our opinion is that the GID framework in NRS Chapter 318 may not be the best governance model for us. But we will continue to work with the sponsor on getting to a common place.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I want to ask the same question on section 1, subsection 4. This Committee recently heard testimony from the City of Reno on its redevelopment area which may or may not have an overlay area. How would you be able to plan the economic feasibility around this particular bill with your financial limitations?

**Scott Gilles:**

I do not have an answer for that question right now. Ultimately, we are still digging into how we would fall into this governance model since cities do not create GIDs. Obviously, this bill removes some of the limitations and requires our consent for any GID that would overlay into our borders, but I do not have an answer for you today. That is one of the issues we are looking into with staff, as to how this, as written in NRS Chapter 318, will work for us and provide for sustainable funding options.

**Chairman Flores:**

If you are in support of this measure, please stand so our Committee members can recognize you. [Those in support stood.] Thank you all for being here. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas here wishing to speak in opposition to A.B. 379?

**Maggie Orr, President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts:**

We debated on testifying as neutral or opposed to this bill because we are not opposed to the intent of the bill. We are opposed to measures in section 2 that would duplicate or in some cases conflict with the authorities and powers granted to the conservation districts by the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources decades ago.

I would like to read subsection 1 of NRS 548.105. "It is hereby declared, as a matter of legislative determination, that persons in local communities are best able to provide basic leadership and direction for the planning and accomplishment of the conservation and development of renewable natural resources through organization and operation of conservation districts." We have submitted written testimony that will provide more detail ([Exhibit D](#)).

Conservation districts have a long-term track record of working on private and federal lands. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 548.113 specifically identifies conservation districts as cooperating agencies with the federal agencies. We welcome the opportunity to work with the proponents of this bill to find language that would synergize the efforts of what conservation districts do rather than diluting them.

**Aaron Katz, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:**

Incline Village has a GID which is known as Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID). The proponents do not know about GIDs. I know about GIDs. I am here in

opposition to this bill for that very reason. I have some written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)), and I did not learn of this until last night. I have submitted it to the committee assistant, hoping the Chairman will allow it to be part of the record. This bill is not about preserving parks and trails as you have heard. It is about extending new powers to existing GIDs, who only exist for limited powers. I live in a GID that exercises all sorts of powers that many claim they do not have. This bill will retroactively ratify some of these powers, and it is improper.

*Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 308 talks about not extending new special districts and GIDs but rather consolidating existing ones. This bill will propose creating new GIDs; I do not think they will be created. This means the bill will only apply to existing GIDs like IVGID.

The Incline Village General Improvement District exercises many powers which are evils to our community, and we have very few sources to have them rectified. This session of the legislature is dealing with many issues on GIDs that have been brought forward by our people. I hear from the proponents that this will be a sustainable funding source; it will not. The Incline Village General Improvement District already allegedly spends over \$7 million more on recreational pursuits than available revenues. How does it create this deficiency? They have enacted an invalid special tax against property they disingenuously call a fee. What they do is charge every property owner a fee they call a stand-by service fee for the availability to use recreational facilities, including our parks which are open to the public. This will be the sustainable funding source that the proponents talk about.

As a property owner, I will have to pay a fee for the availability to use parks which charge no fee to the residents of Nevada. Instead of Washoe County using some of the taxes that we pay to support parks and trails, which they do not do, they would rather have the GID do it because it frees up cash that is available for other pursuits. I am not against parks and trails; I am against these new powers to GIDs. If the proponents want a special district to do these pursuits, they should go to NRS Chapter 308 and create a new special district specifically for this purpose and not shackle existing GIDs with this substantial monetary obligation when we already have it.

**Frank Wright, Private Citizen, Crystal Bay, Nevada:**

I am a resident of Crystal Bay, and I share Aaron Katz's thoughts on GIDs. The idea behind [A.B. 379](#) is opening up a Pandora's box of abuse by GIDs which are already being abused where we live. The whole vehicle of choice here is to provide recreation and conservation through a GID. They do not have the ability to tax for it, so they do not have the ability to fund for it, which takes away the economic feasibility of the whole proposal. You are going to count on grants and federal funding, and this whole thing is kind of a visionary thought and does not have fiscal responsibility. General improvement districts would have to start working with the government in order to get grants to fund these projects or these ideas, and you will need lobbyists, you will need lawyers, you will need grant writers—multiple layers of employees. Now you are expanding the concept of a GID and the employment base of a GID, which they have done in our GID.

We have lobbyists. We have lawyers. We have the biggest lawyer bill in the state of Nevada—ten times greater than any other GID in Nevada—and that is what you are heading for when you propose legislation like this. You are asking to expand the powers of a GID beyond the concept and scope of what they are able to do. You are asking the citizens of that GID to fund these ideas, thoughts, and visions which are visions, but they are not fiscally responsible.

I am definitely against this. I think you are creating competing districts from the established conservation districts that we have now. You are going to add another layer, and they will be competing for the funds. You know the funds are not just going to go to one place; they are going to go all over the place, so you are diluting the funds for recreation. This is not the vehicle they should be using to propose these ideas for recreation and conservation and other things.

**Chairman Flores:**

Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in the neutral position on A.B. 379?

**Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:**

We are speaking in neutral. We appreciate the intent the sponsors have brought forward. We have spoken with Assemblywoman Joiner, and we look forward to continuing to work with some of the amendments so we can support this bill.

**Chairman Flores:**

Bill sponsors, please come back up for closing remarks and any response to the opposition.

**Assemblywoman Joiner:**

I am disappointed to hear the conservation districts are in opposition to this. It is not our intention to change the purpose of those districts: they serve a very important purpose in our state. What I want to make very clear is that conservation districts have a very specific purpose, and they do not have the ability to tax in Nevada. They do not have all the abilities that the GIDs have. They are able to produce, and since 2015 have a very limited ability to ask for fees, but it is not the same as a GID. We are looking for A.B. 379 as an additional tool in the local government's toolbox. We do not want to affect the current conservation districts; they can continue to do their work. This is to give another option to find funding.

Regarding the folks from Incline Village, I am very sorry they are unhappy where they are. In regards to the comment that we should not be shackling current GIDs with any new requirements, to be clear, we are not doing that in this bill. Current GIDs with their current purposes will not be changed by this bill. We are creating an enabling ordinance by extending the category options for creating GIDs. That ordinance declares the specific purpose for which a district is created. All we are saying is a district can now include things

like a watershed. All of the blue language in the bill is about managing and acquiring facilities. At no point are we requiring current GIDs to expand their purpose. That is not this bill. They can continue to maintain their current purpose.

The choice is clear for those of us who have seen cuts to our parks and our local governments' issues with tax revenues. We must provide an additional tool for funds or not have our parks at the level we want for our healthy communities. We need healthy outdoor spaces for our kids to play in; we need healthy watersheds and places to recreate like the Truckee River corridor. The current choice for a lot of local governments is to either fund the parks and recreation or other essential services like senior services, foster care, or children's services. When you look at the bucket of money available, it is not big enough to provide all the services our local governments need to provide. Assembly Bill 379 provides one more tool to fund our parks and recreation. I am really hopeful that you can support this measure.

**Chairman Flores:**

If I could ask those who spoke in opposition, I know you just found out about this bill last minute, but if you could please reach out to our bill sponsor so she may give you some more perspective on it. Maybe you will find that you are not in opposition or maybe your position does not change.

[[\(Exhibit F\)](#), [\(Exhibit G\)](#), and [\(Exhibit H\)](#) were submitted but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the meeting.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 379 and open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 297.

**Assembly Bill 297: Requires certain local governments to designate sites for persons to meet in order to complete the sale of personal property that was initiated on the Internet. (BDR 20-765)**

**Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41:**

I represent Assembly District No. 41. Today, I am here to discuss Assembly Bill 297. It covers crimes resulting from an e-commerce transaction. Chairman, with your permission I would like to walk the Committee through the bill and then proceed to a short PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit I](#)).

In 2013, I met a man in an Albertsons store parking lot to buy tickets to a New Year's Eve concert. I paid \$400 for the tickets and later learned I had purchased fraudulent tickets. I had to rebuy them for \$300. That was a \$400 loss that I never reported to the police. In this very building, in February, I heard the testimony of parents whose son was killed during a Craigslist exchange. The intent of this bill is to promote public safety and protect Nevadans by deterring future crime.

The intent of A.B 297 is to have each county, city, and township designate one station as an e-commerce exchange zone. Nevadans can meet here and exchange products purchased online. I firmly believe that if someone is going to commit a crime during a face-to-face transaction, he or she is less likely to do it in a police station parking lot.

Police stations across the country are creating trade stations or exchange zones to protect citizens during meetups for online transactions. These stations or zones allow people to conduct swaps of merchandise and money safely. Here is why it is important for Nevada. In 2015, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Department of Justice's *2015 Internet Crime Report* on crimes relating to online sales, there were over 1,615 victims in Nevada with a total loss of \$3.2 million. Also, it mentioned that only about 15 percent of crimes are reported, and the affected population is our senior citizens. I have created a PowerPoint composed of crimes resulting in exchange zones, states that have exchange zones, reports of crimes resulting from e-commerce sales, and examples of what these zones look like.

A woman was robbed at gunpoint when trying to purchase electronics from an online website; this resulted in the designated parking spots outside a police station in Rancho Penasquitos in San Diego, California [page 2, ([Exhibit I](#))]. There are two at the Oakland County Sheriff's Office in California. Two women were robbed at gunpoint during their Internet exchange resulting in an exchange location inside a Fargo, North Dakota police station. Every single police station in the city of Chicago, Illinois, has an exchange zone.

Here is a list of four more exchange zones [page 3, ([Exhibit I](#))]; many of them resulted from e-commerce exchange crimes. A Craigslist exchange resulted in bloodshed when the buyer and the seller were shot. This resulted in five of the eight regions in Richland County, South Carolina, creating exchange zones.

In reviewing the SafeTrade Stations website [safetradestations.com]—a website that allows consumers to identify places where they can conduct their transactions safely—I found that 42 states have established stations with trade zones, including Nevada. The City of North Las Vegas has designated a police station as an exchange zone. I think it is our duty to be proactive and deter any future crimes from affecting our constituency. I also want to thank Carson City. Carson City has designated one day a month where people can come and actively exchange e-commerce with supervision at the Sheriff's Office.

The next few slides show crimes that resulted from an e-commerce exchange. These three [page 4, ([Exhibit I](#))] were recent crimes, all within the last four to six months. All resulted in e-commerce exchange places being created. The first one concerns a woman in San Diego who was robbed at gunpoint after trying to sell a computer on OfferUp.com. In Richland County, South Carolina, a man was shot several times when he attempted to steal money from an individual trying to purchase a motorcycle on Craigslist. The third one was from the new Facebook Marketplace. A man was robbed at gunpoint trying to sell a cell phone.

These next three are from the FBI's *Internet Crime Report* and Craigslist [page 5, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. A seven-month pregnant woman was stabbed in the stomach, and her fetus was taken from her womb after she answered a Craigslist ad for baby clothes. The suspect took the unborn child to the hospital claiming she had a miscarriage. Here is one closer to home. In South Lake Tahoe, a man was attempting to purchase a car from a Craigslist advertisement. He was beaten and robbed of his \$30,000 when he met the seller. Here is one very close to home: Sparks, Nevada. A woman was almost sexually assaulted when trying to purchase children's clothing from Craigslist. Since then, the Sparks Police has started a campaign to encourage people to use their police station for e-commerce exchanges.

The next two slides [pages 7 and 8, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)] also detail crimes. I will let the Committee review those at your discretion. I have 56 pages of e-commerce crimes committed within one year. Fifty-six pages of crimes that were committed from Craigslist—just Craigslist!

I am requesting a sign designating an area or a parking space as an exchange zone. Here are a few examples of some that currently exist. This one is in Arlington, Texas, designating a safe exchange zone [page 9, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. Here are three different ones from three different areas [page 10, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. The two on the left designate areas as exchange zones, the one on the right also designates that it is monitored by 24-hour surveillance and reminds people to dial 911 for emergencies. This exchange zone is in Paris, Texas [page 11, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. That it is for the exchange of private property is designated, but it does not specify that it is monitored or that anyone will be present. Here are two more [page 12, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. One lists numbers to call for nonemergencies, and that it is monitored by 24-hour surveillance. Another example [page 13, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)], is shown on this page.

The last slide lists a press release sent out by the City of Bellevue Police Department [page 14, [\(Exhibit I\)](#)]. It identifies why they felt the two exchange zones were important. As you can see, it will keep the residents of Bellevue, Ohio, who decide to engage in regular online transactions safe. I think it is our duty to help keep Nevada's residents safe as well.

I was approached very early by a few groups who were in opposition to A.B. 297, and after listening to their concerns, we were able to work together. The proposed amendment [\(Exhibit J\)](#) addresses everyone's concerns and ensures we are introducing the bill in its most effective form. One of the initial concerns was, How do we remove the liability from the agency or officers? Section 1, subsection 2 includes specific language that states, "No action may be brought against the county, sheriff or an officer or employee thereof, based on an incident that occurs when two or more persons meet at a location designated pursuant to subsection 1 or 2."

The second concern involved fire stations, and they have been removed from the bill. The third concern was about surveillance. Some agencies expressed their inability to provide surveillance or a body present. That is why the bill does not place any restrictions or provide details on what the e-commerce exchange zone should look like. The agency can provide a zone based on their maximum capability. Lastly, there was concern about the original effective date of July 1, 2017, and that was pushed out to October 1, 2017.

With these changes, we were able to work with the agencies and move them out of an opposition standpoint. I want to thank the agencies for being open and working with me on A.B. 297. Also, thank you to the Chairman and Committee members for listening to my presentation.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

I like the idea of A.B. 297, and I am interested in how it works procedurally. I was picturing the Bolden Area Command of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro). Its hours of operation are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. Does a person let the police department know that they will be on their site or around their area? If no one knows you are there, no one will come out.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

There are no specific requirements for these zones. It is left up to the discretion of the agency for multiple reasons. For example, the City of Henderson considered an area where people are only present from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. We discussed having their sign post that the e-commerce exchange zone is available Monday through Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Bolden Area Command does not have surveillance but Metro's headquarters does. The headquarters sign might mention the area is monitored by 24-hour, 7-day surveillance. I did not want to impose on the agencies to have someone present because this is only an area where the exchange is done. The e-commerce exchange zone is similar to a custody swap for children. Many people exchange at police stations because they feel safe.

**Assemblywoman Neal:**

That is what I was wondering. In the Bolden Area Command area, there is an FBI building, but activity slacks off around 7 p.m. The street is pretty much vacant, and I could have the potential of getting bopped on the head in front of a police station.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

That is why the bill leaves it up to the discretion of the agency. For instance, Metro might not want to designate the Bolden Area Command; they might want to designate headquarters because it is a busy station. Assembly Bill 297 only requires one e-commerce exchange zone be designated.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

Assemblywoman Neal's question addressed some of what I was going to ask. You provided some examples in your presentation of signage, and some note there are surveillance cameras. What are the minimum requirements? Is signage the minimum? Or must a parking space be designated and set aside—similar to handicapped parking or special employee parking? Please provide some examples of the minimum requirements.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

The examples presented show various options for signage. Some entities designate what is similar to a handicapped parking sign. It is the same size but posts that it is an e-commerce exchange zone. Some parking signs designate an area on the sidewalk near the entrance to



the police station. Some are specified parking spaces that state the space is an e-commerce exchange zone with a 20-minute maximum. Some designated areas are closer to the front door and state they are monitored by 24-hour surveillance. Some are located inside the police station's lobby and are open only during the hours of the station. Some post information on calling the number listed in advance to have someone present. It is completely up to that station. The requirements are vague so every agency can create the e-commerce exchange zone based on their needs and resources. The rural areas have concerns because their sheriff may also be their bailiff. The person may not always be present, so their requirements are different.

**Assemblyman McCurdy:**

I think this is a really good bill. I had a friend who sold sneakers online. There were a lot of instances where people got into sticky situations. Assembly Bill 297 would serve as a deterrent to drive down some of those incidents.

I understand meeting at a police station because 9 times out of 10 somebody would be less likely to harm or take advantage of you. But have you thought about reaching out to malls for e-commerce exchange zones? Or a company such as Zappos.com? We have a pretty diverse industry mix in Nevada, and these companies might like to help.

Also, how will this be marketed to citizens who shop online or use different type of websites to do business? How do we get the message out that there is a safe e-commerce exchange zone?

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

I did think about businesses, but I do not feel like meeting at a public space such as a 7-Eleven store open 24 hours or an Albertsons store is going to be a deterrent. If somebody is going to shoot someone over an iPhone, he or she might do it at an Albertsons parking lot but be less likely to do it in front of a police station. Personally, I am an active online buyer and having one of these e-commerce exchange zones will make me more comfortable conducting my transactions. If I was selling an iPhone and suggested meeting at a police station and the buyer was hesitant, that would be a red flag not to conduct a transaction with that buyer.

As far as awareness, we would use public service announcements (PSAs) and a public awareness campaign. Unfortunately, sites like Craigslist cannot be required to post our PSA because there could be buyers from other areas. For example, there is no way of designating it is in Las Vegas. We can let our community know via PSAs and public awareness campaigns.

**Assemblyman McCurdy:**

Social media walls would be a good place to post the PSA. Maybe once the announcement is final, that can be a channel.

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:**

The presentation included pictures from other states, but you mentioned that North Las Vegas currently has an e-commerce exchange zone at the North Las Vegas Police Department. Do you know how they set up their e-commerce exchange zone?

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

I just learned of North Las Vegas during my research, and I do not have any details. Since they are already doing it, this will be very easy for them to implement. I know they are already suggesting and telling people to use their stations as safe exchange zones. They are listed on the SafeTrade Stations website.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I read this morning about a Tennessee couple who tried selling a baby for \$3,000 before investigators caught them. It seems like Craigslist could provide an educational site. Maybe that is one way to approach this. There has to be someone that is keeping track of all the different frauds. I know a few people who had their deposit stolen when trying to buy a car off Craigslist. I have 48 cameras around my plaza to keep an eye open for the public.

I am wondering if there will be a traffic problem created around the police station. If they set up surveillance, who is going to monitor it? There are a lot of situations that could occur at an e-commerce exchange zone. I may be wrong, and maybe you can address that.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

I do not think it would be possible for Craigslist to monitor. They would only know of a crime after it had occurred; Craigslist is made up of consumers selling or buying products online. But, to that extent, it is not just Craigslist. There are numerous online places where someone can conduct an e-commerce transaction. There is Craigslist.org, OfferUp.com, Poshmark.com, Facebook Marketplace, and Kijiji.ca. The e-classified space is growing fast.

Concerning the traffic issue, the agency is not required to provide surveillance. They are only required to establish an e-commerce exchange zone. If they can only provide a sidewalk space or a designated parking space, then that is all they have to provide. If they can provide 24-hour surveillance, then it is up to them whether or not they want to provide the surveillance. Assembly Bill 297 is not imposing any restrictions such as surveillance or having a body present. The only thing we are requesting is to create a designated area as an e-commerce exchange zone.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I can see that happening in the larger cities, but some small towns may not have a police station. I do not see a size requirement for implementation. If this is mandated, every police station or fire station would have to comply.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

No, it is not every police station or fire station. Assembly Bill 297 does not include fire stations. In the mock-up version of the bill ([Exhibit J](#)), it states that each county, city, or township designates one or more sheriff's offices as an e-commerce exchange zone. If there is only one police station or sheriff's office, then that would be where the area would be designated. It is only an area.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

There are so many small towns in Nevada, and their police force may be voluntary. Surveillance would be impossible. If someone wants to meet at 9 p.m., there will not be anyone available.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

It is not required for anyone to be there. Surveillance is not required for a designated zone. I specifically left out requirements and details because of the concerns our smaller rural areas expressed. They might have a sheriff who is also the bailiff, and there would be no one present. That is why it is only required to designate an area. It is so a resident can have someplace to meet with a seller or a buyer, and they do not have to meet at a 7-Eleven store or at a gas station.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

Anecdotally, I have used the North Las Vegas site. I remember seeing it on FOX 5 KVVU-TV news a couple of years ago. The North Las Vegas Police Department was very excited about it. When I was emailing with the seller and I suggested meeting at the exchange site, they immediately replied that it sounded great. There was a sense of relief for both of us. To Assemblyman Ellison's concern, I think you will find that the police are very accepting of this. They like the idea of preventing crime.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Thank you for sharing your story. That is exactly the intent of A.B. 297. We want to provide a safe place for people to conduct their online exchanges. If a person is hesitant to meet at a police station, it is a red flag. Our goal is to reduce crime. If we can reduce one robbery, one assault, and one death in our state by having these e-commerce exchange zones, it is a win. I think reducing crime is something every public safety agency can get behind.

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

Have you anticipated how much this would cost? Does it come out of the police department budget? Have you spoken to them? Are they pretty willing to set up an e-commerce exchange zone? I think it is a good idea, but I think we need to make sure they are on board.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

The agencies I have worked with have been great. I was approached weeks in advance to develop a resolution that we could all get behind and support. One of the concerns was if there was any fiscal impact. It did go to the Budget Division within the Office of Finance of the Office of the Governor. They stated there would be no fiscal impact to the state. However, that is why the effective date was pushed back to October—to give the agencies the necessary time to erect one sign.

**Chairman Flores:**

To make the record abundantly clear, Assemblywoman Jauregui is giving law enforcement the absolute flexibility to install a camera or not to install a camera. There is nothing being mandated. I appreciate the line of questioning, but we are asking the same thing over and over. If law enforcement would please come up, we can address those questions directly to them. That might make it easier. I will open it up for support, but I will allow the Committee members to ask any questions directly to the testifiers. Is there anyone wishing to speak in support of A.B. 297? Please come forward.

**Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.:**

I am here today representing state law enforcement agencies composed of about 8,000 members. We spoke with Assemblywoman Jauregui regarding A.B. 297. We were concerned the e-commerce exchange zone might give people a false sense of security that if you go to a police station and something was to happen, someone would be there. We are supporting A.B. 297 with the amendments.

**Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:**

We appreciate Assemblywoman Jauregui working with us on this bill. Some of the concerns from the rural agencies were related to setting up surveillance. The amendments have removed those concerns, especially the liability to the agency. We thank her very much and are in support.

**Corey Solferino, Sergeant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:**

We appreciate Assemblywoman Jauregui's ability to address our concerns, and we are now in support of the amended version of this legislation. She hit the nail right on the head with the custody exchange example. People are doing this right now. While there is not a designated area in front of our sheriff's office, people routinely use the roundabouts for their exchanges. The deputies are loading up their cars for their shifts, and unbeknownst to them, people are doing their exchanges. There is no notification process, but the front desk is moments away. We believe with the perception of available law enforcement, people are less likely to do harm.

**A.J. Delap, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We are also in support of the amended version of the bill. We believe it will be an effective tool to ensure safety within our community. We welcome the opportunity to avail our services of that.

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

In the bill, it uses, "shall." That indicates it is required. Would law enforcement prefer "may"?

**A.J. Delap:**

We are comfortable with "shall." We normally have a philosophy of fighting "shall" and loving "may," but under these circumstances we are very pleased with "shall." The Assemblywoman has worked with us and met all our concerns.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I agree the amendments address the concerns mentioned. My fear is that it might give a false sense of security to a person who goes to a police station that does not have surveillance or anybody around. They might be better off going to a police station that does have surveillance even if it is not the designated e-commerce exchange zone. Is that not correct?

**Robert Roshak:**

I received word back from the Eureka County Sheriff's Office and the Lander County Sheriff's Office that they have exchanges. If someone wants to exchange at the police station, he or she always has the ability to call and find out the station hours. If they need that extra sense of security, they can do it when the deputies or police officers are available at work.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

That addresses my concern.

**Chairman Flores:**

Is there any data available on the reduction of crimes within e-commerce exchange zones, maybe in a different state, city, or in North Las Vegas?

**A.J. Delap:**

At this point, it would be difficult because North Las Vegas is the only one following the procedure. Also, it is difficult to say what reduces crime quantifiably or definitively, in any circumstance. We only know what crime occurred, not what was being prevented. Assembly Bill 297 will provide a comfort level and a filter if someone is hesitant to conduct the transaction at the e-commerce exchange zone. I think providing specific numbers would be difficult.

**Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:**

We support A.B. 297 and request the Committee to support it, especially with the amended text. Our association has a lot of rural police stations and sheriff's offices throughout the state. I think the concept is good because in law enforcement we tout our ability to protect and serve. Normally, our service is reactionary. Assembly Bill 297 is a deterrent bill. I would like to thank Assemblywoman Jauregui for allowing us to express our concerns. We appreciate what she did to resolve our concerns.

**Daysi Rodriguez, Outreach Coordinator, Tu Casa Latina, Reno, Nevada:**

Tu Casa Latina is geared to helping immigrant men, women, and children who are victims of crimes, domestic violence, and trafficking in northern Nevada. A case came across my desk of a family whose young son was shot and killed by a stranger he had met on Craigslist. The young man was killed over a belt which the other party did not want to pay for. We did our best to help support them and guide them through the legal process.

When we heard about A.B. 297, we were fully in support. Obviously, the case we just had was really powerful but also because our goal is to help victims of crimes and domestic violence. I am here today testifying in support of the bill.

Earlier, there was a question about marketing and bringing this to the public. I am willing to be an advocate and share with the other advocates who work with victims of crime the information on e-commerce exchange zones. This way we can safely plan with our families and victims, so they will not be revictimized in another way. I will bring this information to our direct client services meetings.

The bill is a great security measure because I have had instances where I would not go and meet someone without being accompanied by my husband. It is just for security measures, and I do believe this will be a great incentive for people to meet and feel safe. I ask that you support this bill and thank you.

**Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:**

We are in support of this bill, and we thank the Assemblywoman for meeting with us regarding our concerns. She was more than willing to work with us. We had concerns from a county position about the fire stations and the liability. I know the sheriff's office spoke with her on some of their issues. Clark County had to leave, but they asked me to let the Committee know they are in support.

**Todd Ingalsbee, Legislative Representative, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:**

I would like to personally thank Assemblywoman Jauregui for working with us on this bill. We support A.B. 297 with the amendments presented.

**Chairman Flores:**

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Bill sponsor, please come back up for closing remarks.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Thank you for letting me present the bill and for allowing people to share their stories. The goal of A.B. 297 is to help promote public safety. If we can save one Nevadan, I think that is a win.

**Chairman Flores:**

The hearing on A.B. 297 is closed. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas here wishing to speak in public comment? [There was no one.] Public comment is closed. This meeting is adjourned [at 10:28 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Carol Myers  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a brochure titled "One Truckee River Management Plan Summary: Phase 1 - West McCarran to Sparks Boulevard," submitted by Lynda Nelson, Natural Resources Specialist, Nevada Land Trust.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated March 25, 2017, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 379](#) to Chairman Flores and members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, authored by Maggie Orr, President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated March 27, 2017, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 379](#) to Chairman Flores and members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, authored by Aaron Katz, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada.

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Bill 379](#) authored and submitted by Tina Nappe, representing the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club.

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony authored by Tina Nappe, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 379](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated March 27, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 379](#) to members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, authored and submitted by Brian Bonnenfant, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit I](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "AB 297" presented by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41.

[Exhibit J](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 297](#) presented by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41.