



**NEVADA LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY
POWERS DELEGATED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

(Senate Bill 264, Chapter 462, *Statutes of Nevada 2009*)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The second meeting of the Legislative Commission's Committee to Study Powers Delegated to Local Governments was held on April 22, 2010, at 9 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/75th2009/committee/>. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator John J. Lee, Chair
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Vice Chair
Senator Terry Care
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Mike McGinness

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division
Heidi A. Chlarson, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Natalee M. Binkholder, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Susan M. Young, Senior Administrative Assistant, Research Division

OPENING REMARKS

- Chair Lee opened the meeting with brief remarks regarding the details of the remaining meetings. He indicated that the Committee would be voting on the recommendations at its third and final meeting and work session scheduled for June 23, 2010.
- Senator Care made remarks concerning the materials distributed to the Committee at its February 18, 2010, meeting. He indicated that it would be difficult to bring "Home Rule" to Nevada and suggested that the focus should be to amend the statutes to allow counties and municipalities to assume additional power with regard to structural and functional duties.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION FROM THE FEBRUARY 18, 2010, MEETING CONCERNING THE SALARIES OF LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS AND POSSIBLE CHANGES TO NEVADA LAW REGARDING SALARIES OF LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS

(As directed by Chair Lee, this agenda item was taken out of order.)

- Alvin P. Kramer, Treasurer, Carson City, made a brief statement on the salaries of locally elected officials. (Please see [Exhibit B](#).)
- Alan Glover, Clerk-Recorder, Carson City, representing the Recorders Association of Nevada (RAN), stated that the RAN has not taken an official position concerning salaries of local government officials; however, it is the Association's opinion that the present process can be improved. Mr. Glover indicated that the RAN would prefer to work with the Legislature on a process that would be fair to everyone concerned.
- Responding to Mr. Glover, Chair Lee noted that he would be speaking with the clerks of the City of Mesquite to request their suggestions for changes to Nevada law regarding salaries of local elected officials. He also noted that the sheriff of Clark County and the District Attorneys Association have expressed similar concerns.

Chair Lee requested that the county representatives come forward to express their opinion regarding the procedure of setting salaries for local elected officials

- Constance Brooks, Senior Management Analyst, Clark County, stated that the Clark County Board of Commissioners has not issued an opinion addressing if it will request greater authority over setting the salaries of local government officials and has not provided any direction or opinion as to the possibility of establishing a salary commission. She noted that the Board has several issues that it is currently investigating for possible bill draft requests (BDRs) to submit to the 2011 Session; however, no solid decision has been made.
- Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), addressed some of the concerns raised by Mr. Kramer and Mr. Glover, which are similar to those that were raised at NACO's board meeting. He stated that:

1. Most counties agree that the current system is not effective; and
2. NACO does not seek the authority to set salaries of local elected officials.

Some of the alternative solutions suggested by Mr. Fontaine included:

1. The possibility of establishing a salary commission, similar to the one established in 2001 under former Governor Kenny C. Guinn that was used by the Legislature to review granting salary increases to local elected officials. The commission could meet approximately every ten years, but during the intervening years, automatic salary adjustments tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) could be granted; and
 2. Salary increases should be equal across the State.
- Allen Veil, Lyon County Sheriff and a member of the Board of Directors, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, provided testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) regarding the Board's opposition to counties setting the salaries of elected government officials.
 - David Humke, Chair, Interim Technical Advisory Committee for Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) and Chair, Board of County Commissioners, Washoe County, stated that the salaries of local elected officials has not been a concern of the Board. He noted that the public has always been critical of local elected officials receiving continuing education and salary increases. Mr. Humke opined that the classes of counties provided in statute for setting salaries is a fair process. Presently, Washoe County is in the second tier and Clark County is in the top tier. He expressed that it would be a fiscal mistake to tie commissioner's salaries to management staff of each individual local government.
 - Knight Allen, a private citizen, said he was not a member of the Governor's Task Force on Salary Compensation, created by former Governor Kenny C. Guinn; however, he did participate in the process and recommended tying salaries of local elected officials to the average private sector wage in Nevada. Mr. Allen made the following suggestions:
 1. Establish a salary commission including private sector citizens as the members; and
 2. Begin by making comparisons to the working people of Nevada and not looking at models of other states. (Please see [Exhibit D](#)).
 - Chair Lee commented that the present system is not working since the budgets and constraints of the local governments are unclear to the Legislature and a method that is effective for each entity needs to be implemented.

- Assemblyman Goicoechea reported that with the passage of Assembly Bill 415 (Chapter 164, *Statutes of Nevada 2009*) the population cap was set at 40,000; therefore, if a local entity is below the 40,000 population, the board of county commissioners, with voter approval, can combine or separate county offices. He also concurred with Mr. Allen that a State salary average should be used to determine the salaries of local elected officials and expressed his concern with tying the law to salaries that are negotiated through collective bargaining.
- Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), recited testimony submitted by Jackie Berg, Clerk and Treasurer, Office of Eureka County Clerk and Treasurer, Eureka County ([Exhibit E](#)), stating that the Eureka County Board of Commissioners recommends that the Legislature continue to set salaries of local elected officials.

Mr. Stewart offered to provide the Committee with a copy of the Governor's Task Force on Salary Compensation Report and Recommendations on Salary Compensation for Certain Elected Public Officers, which was published prior to the 2001 Session.

- Chair Lee suggested creating legislation requiring that the Legislature address the issue of salaries for elected officials every four years.
- Senator Care said that because the *Nevada Constitution* provides that the Legislature set salaries for elected county officials, even if there is a salary commission established, the Legislature would be responsible to set the salaries and could only receive recommendations from the commission.

Discussion ensued among the Committee, local government representatives, and members of the public regarding: (1) how often salaries of local elected officials should be reviewed; (2) the formation of a salary commission and what its duties would be; and (3) how longevity pay would affect the salaries of local elected officials.

Mr. Stewart clarified that *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 245.044 sets forth that "On and after July 1, 1973, if an elected county officer has served in his or her office for more than 4 years, the officer is entitled to an additional salary of 2 percent of his or her base salary for the appropriate fiscal year . . ." Mr. Stewart also explained that the increase must not exceed 20 percent of the base salary for the appropriate fiscal year.

- Heidi A. Chlarson, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB, concurred with Senator Care that because the Legislature is constitutionally required to set the salaries for elected county officers, the Legislature could only receive recommendations from a salary commission regarding the level those salaries should be set. The Legislature would not be bound by those recommendations; it would still be required to set the salaries. Ms. Chlarson further explained that currently, the statute sets the salaries of elected county officers through Fiscal Year 2010-2011.

General discussion ensued among Committee members, local government representatives, and the public, regarding: (1) the effect of term limits on salaries of certain elected officials; (2) establishing a mandate to allow for a review of salaries of elected local officials every four years; and (3) the process that should be used to determine how to set the salaries of local elected officials.

COMPARISON OF GENERAL LAW AND CHARTER FORMS OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN NEVADA

(As directed by Chair Lee, this agenda item was taken out of order.)

- Steve Driscoll, Assistant City Manager, City of Sparks, spoke on the differences and similarities of general law and charter law cities ([Exhibit F](#)). Highlights from his presentation included:
 1. “Dillon’s Rule” and the procedure for granting powers to local governments;
 2. The four primary areas in which “Home Rule” powers are exercised by local governments;
 3. How population affects a general law city; and
 4. The duties and powers of city councils.
- Chair Lee requested that local government representatives provide input regarding why a local entity would choose to become a charter form of municipal government instead of general law.
- Mr. Driscoll responded that the primary reason an entity would shift from general law to a charter form of municipal government would be to go beyond what the general law provides and to grant the jurisdiction specialized or additional approved permissions as provided under “Dillon’s Rule.”
- J. David Fraser, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities (NLCM), added that the cities also had discussions about all cities becoming chartered. He mentioned that both charter and general law cities are overseen by the Legislature under different statutes.
- Jeff Fontaine, previously identified, stated that the counties have also discussed the possibility of requesting a constitutional amendment to become chartered. He explained that if you have a charter, legislative approval is still required to make any changes to the charter. Continuing, Mr. Fontaine said that an advantage to all counties becoming chartered is if NACO or an individual county came before the Legislature to seek some type of change, often those changes could work for all the counties. In closing, Mr. Fontaine said that NACO supports seeking charters for counties even though a constitutional amendment is required, which could be a lengthy process.

- Senator Care suggested that the following items be discussed during the work session of the Committee on June 23, 2010, to provide additional power to local governments:
 1. Amend NRS 266.010, "Home rule granted; limitations;" add language stating "a liberal construction shall be given to the powers of the municipal organizations governed under this chapter"; and
 2. Amend Chapter 268 of NRS ("Powers and Duties Common to Cities and Towns Incorporated Under General or Special Laws") to allow charter cities to have the same powers as other local entities.
- Heidi A. Chlarson, previously identified, opined that it would be possible to add some language to Chapters 266 and 268 of NRS to clarify legislative intent and broaden "Home Rule" for cities. However, she pointed out that the language should be precise as to the exact powers the Legislature is intending to grant to cities.

Responding to Chair Lee about how each local entity interprets the law differently, Ms. Chlarson said that each local entity follows the advice of its legal counsel, and it is difficult for the Legislature to control how each individual entity and its attorney translate the law.

In response to Vice Chair Kirkpatrick's question regarding how the cost of various functions are determined by a county, Mr. Fontaine replied that NACO is in the process of gathering information relating to functional "Home Rule." He explained that prior to the 2009 Session, the counties discussed recommendations to be presented to the Legislature. However, it is difficult for a county to anticipate the resources that will be required for a two-year period, particularly during this economic downturn when budget reductions may be necessary.

Continuing his response, Mr. Fontaine said each county has a district attorney; therefore, when a county decides it wants an active ordinance to govern a certain issue, the district attorney determines whether or not the county has the authority to do so. He further noted that a county would conduct a public hearing prior to adopting a new ordinance.

Replying to Vice Chair Kirkpatrick's query about the possibility of the Legislature providing additional powers to counties by allowing them to enact certain ordinances as opposed to giving them full "Home rule," Mr. Fontaine said that NACO is in the process of identifying those specific areas.

APPROVAL OF THE "SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT" OF THE MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 18, 2010, IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

SENATOR CARE MOVED TO APPROVE THE "SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT" OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2010, MEETING HELD IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR KIRKPATRICK AND PASSED.

REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INTERIM TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (ACIR)

Summary of Recent and Anticipated Activities of the ACIR

- David Humke, previously identified, provided an update of the activities of the ACIR at its second meeting held on April 7, 2010. He noted that:
 1. Robert Morin, J.D., Ph.D., Division Chair, Social Services, Education, Humanities and Public Service, Western Nevada College, spoke about the structure of government in Nevada. Dr. Morin coauthored with Eric Herzik, Ph.D., Department of Political Science, University of Nevada, Reno, the Nevada chapter of the 2001 Congressional Quarterly Press publication titled *Home Rule in America: A Fifty State Handbook*;
 2. Steve Driscoll, Assistant City Manager, City of Sparks, provided a presentation regarding the differences between charter and general law cities;
 3. An overview of charter governments in other states was presented by Wes Henderson, Government Affairs Coordinator, NACO;
 4. The ACIR voted to proceed with an exploration of county charters to develop a BDR to be submitted to this Committee as part of the ACIR report due on June 1, 2010;
 5. Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, NACO, made a presentation of ACIR models in states across the country;
 6. The ACIR voted to further study the membership of ACIRs in other states and work on a BDR for a permanent ACIR in Nevada;
 7. J. David Fraser, Executive Director, NLCM, and Mr. Fontaine, previously identified, presented an overview of the duties and responsibilities provided by different levels of government in the State;
 8. Michael J. Willden, Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), who serves on the ACIR, expressed his desire to see the ACIR continue to examine the provision of services after the June 1, 2010, report is submitted; and
 9. Members of the ACIR discussed the status of local government authority and agree that total "Home Rule" is not anticipated at this time. The ACIR agreed that the current focus should be on identifying areas of governmental operations where efficiency would be increased by granting functional "Home Rule."

In closing, Mr. Humke noted that the ACIR will meet on May 6, 2010, and May 24, 2010, to further examine the issues and finalize the report to submit to the Legislature by June 1, 2010.

- Chair Lee explained that the genesis of the ACIR was to bind a relationship with local governments. He asked Mr. Humke if this has been a valuable tool and whether he wants it to become a permanent committee.
- Mr. Humke responded that in his opinion, the ACIR is an excellent committee and its members are a good combination of local government elected officials and employees from the Executive Branch of State government. The ACIR has been able to gather information from other states to make comparisons with Nevada to determine what may work better for the State. In closing, Mr. Humke said that the ACIR will request a bill draft to make it a permanent committee.
- Jeff Fontaine, previously identified, said that one of the aspects of the ACIR is to review the duties and responsibilities of each level of government. The ACIR members consist of the director of the Department of Taxation, the director of the DHHS, and the deputy director of the Department of Transportation. He noted that Mr. Willden, at the last ACIR meeting, expressed an interest in continuing the ACIR as a permanent committee and continuing discussions relating to shared responsibilities between each level of government.

Discussion ensued among Chair Lee, Mr. Fontaine, and Mr. Humke regarding the ACIRs ability to review property tax caps, and it was determined:

1. The ACIR presently may not have the authority to discuss property tax assessment limitation;
2. If the ACIR was made a permanent committee through legislation, property tax could be listed as one of its duties; and
3. The importance of an adjustment to the ad valorem tax because of the downward trend in properties across the State and whether or not a limitation should be placed on the downward movement of property assessments.

Discussion of Possible ACIR Recommendation to Establish a Permanent ACIR in Nevada and Overview of ACIR Models Used by the Federal Government and Various State Governments

- Jeff Fontaine, previously identified, provided an overview of the ACIR models used by other states and the federal government. He reviewed the: (1) federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and (2) structure and functions of ACIRs in other states. (Please see [Exhibit G.](#))

Mr. Fontaine stated that in 1997, a paper was produced by a fiscal working group of the Regional Planning Governing Board of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, titled “Does Nevada Need an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations,” which resulted in a BDR that was presented to the Legislature. The BDR consisted of an analysis as to whether or not Nevada should follow other states and form an ACIR. It was determined by the fiscal working group that Nevada should form an ACIR: (1) consisting of

a broad-based and nonpartisan membership; (2) including a membership of three elected county officials, three elected city officials, two State Executive Branch officials appointed by the Governor, two State senators, two State representatives, six private citizens, three education representatives from the school boards, one representative from Nevada's Board of Regents, and one representative from a local improvement district; and (3) operating as a nonprofit corporation. Mr. Fontaine stated that the BDR was not approved. In conclusion, he noted the states that have fully functional ACIRs supported by their governor are North Dakota and Texas, and these states also have part-time biennial legislative sessions.

- Senator Lee noted that S.B. 264 (Chapter 462, *Statutes of Nevada 2009*) sets forth that "The Interim Technical Advisory Committee shall: Serve as a forum for the discussion and resolution of intergovernmental problems among the State Government and local governments." He recommended that the ACIR add consolidated tax as a topic for discussion and review by the ACIR during the 2009-2010 Interim.
- Vice Chair Kirkpatrick suggested that local governments should schedule more evening meetings to accommodate the work hours of legislators and private citizens.
- Mr. Fontaine said NACO was a strong supporter of the ACIR and has become familiar with many issues regarding "Dillon's Rule" and "Home Rule." The Committee has discussed many topics such as charter counties and functional "Home Rule," and at its last meeting, the ACIR began discussing more specific functional responsibilities between levels of government. He noted that health and human services is an issue the ACIR is planning to address in the future, and it would be agreeable to discuss property tax caps and revenues and bring recommendations to this Committee.

Discussion of Possible ACIR Recommendation to Propose Legislation Authorizing Counties to Operate Under a Charter

- Wes Henderson, Government Affairs Coordinator, NACO, briefly discussed the various forms of: (1) county governments; (2) ACIRs in other states; and (3) county charters. He pointed out that:
 1. Nationally, 23 states authorize counties to adopt a "Home Rule" charter;
 2. Thirteen states permit or mandate some type of "Home Rule," and 12 states remain without formal grants of "Home Rule" or powers to counties; and
 3. In 1999, the National Association of Counties reported that out of: (a) 3,060 counties in existence at that time, 1,254 or 41 percent of the counties were eligible to adopt a charter; and (b) 1,254 eligible counties, 149 adopted a charter, which relates to 11.9 percent of those eligible or 4.9 percent of all counties.

Continuing, Mr. Henderson noted that at the last meeting of the ACIR, the following questions were open for discussion by the Committee: (1) should counties be allowed to form charters; (2) how to implement or change county charters; and (3) how to enable

counties to adopt charters. In closing, Mr. Henderson said that the agenda for the May 6, 2010, meeting of the ACIR will include an item for discussion on whether or not the Committee will submit a recommendation to allow Nevada counties to operate under charters.

SOLICITATION AND COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING POWERS DELEGATED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ADVANCE OF THE JUNE 23, 2010, COMMITTEE MEETING AND WORK SESSION

(As directed by Chair Lee, this agenda item was taken out of order.)

- Knight Allen, private citizen, Las Vegas, indicated that a sound structure of government already exists in Nevada between the Legislature, counties, and cities. Referring to an organizational chart ([Exhibit H](#)), Mr. Allen indicated if an ACIR is established in Nevada, the Legislature and the local governments would have to remain in a superior position. In Mr. Allen's opinion, the ACIR is not justified.
- In reply, Chair Lee indicated that the purpose of establishing an ACIR is for the local governments to have a forum to discuss issues and bring them before this Committee prior to a legislative session. The ACIR will not have the power to change the law, but only to have a "forum of dialog" and make recommendations to the Legislature.

DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO ADDRESS "FUNCTIONAL" HOME RULE IN NEVADA AND DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE ACIR RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING "FUNCTIONAL" HOME RULE

- J. David Fraser, previously identified, indicated that functional "Home Rule" is the most important to cities. He described functional "Home Rule" as the day-to-day operations of a city; however, he indicated that it is difficult to define exactly what items are considered functional when drafting a BDR. Mr. Fraser explained that planning and zoning are items listed as functional, but they also include some structural issues. He suggested that the Committee review the issues of functional "Home Rule" to recognize that some issues cannot be separated from the functional area. He stated the members of the NLCM were sent a request to submit a list of items provided in statute that they considered to be functional. Mr. Fraser outlined some of the responses received, including: (1) planning; (2) zoning and development; (3) city contracts and public purchasing; (4) public improvements; (5) utilities; (6) capital improvement planning; (7) common-interest communities; and (8) before-and after-school recreation and homework programs.

In closing, Mr. Fraser noted that because the components of "Home Rule" are unclear, the NLCM is willing to do the necessary research to identify specific items and provide a detailed recommendation to this Committee.

General discussion ensued among Committee members and local government representatives regarding identifying the functions that should be handled by local entities internally and what should require Legislative approval.

- Vice Chair Kirkpatrick requested a copy of the statutes provided to the members of the NLCM.

Responding to Chair Lee's request to clarify whether a broad statement in NRS would be sufficient to provide additional functional "Home Rule" to local governments, Ms. Chlarson, previously identified, explained if the Legislature decided to grant local governments additional functional "Home Rule," the Legislature would have to be specific as to the provisions to include. She noted that each state differs in its levels of functional "Home Rule." As noted previously, Ms. Chlarson indicated that if the Legislature wished to address the "Home Rule" question broadly, it could provide a statement of intent or a general statement of how matters not currently addressed in the NRS could be interpreted at the local level.

- Senator Care indicated that prior to the work session scheduled for June 23, 2010, he will follow up with Ms. Chlarson and Mr. Fontaine to assist in researching the statutes to determine the best approach to provide additional "Home Rule" to local governments and if the process can be streamlined.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION FROM THE FEBRUARY 18, 2010, MEETING REGARDING NAMING RIGHTS AND A POSSIBLE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO AUTHORIZE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEVADA TO ADOPT PROCEDURES FOR THE SALE OF NAMING RIGHTS TO PARKS OR CERTAIN RECREATIONAL OR PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Constance J. Brooks, previously identified, stated that Clark County has the provision for naming rights of two facilities: the Clark County Shooting Park and the University Medical Center of Southern Nevada (UMC). In accordance with S.B. 497 (Chapter 444, *Statutes of Nevada 2007*), Clark County's Code of Ordinances, Chapter 19.09, Clark County Shooting Park, was added in 2008. She indicated that the shooting park is built with public funds, but can be maintained with funds generated from the capital naming program. The purpose of a capital naming program is to allow for individuals, corporations, or governmental agencies to purchase the naming rights to buildings, improvements facilities, features, fixtures, sites, activities, events and programs in accordance with NRS 244.307.

Ms. Brooks pointed out that: (1) names must be considered in accordance with appropriate and acceptable community standards; (2) Clark County, through its Board of County Commissioners, reserves the right to reject any name at any time; (3) the naming privileges will not exceed a maximum duration of 20 years, and the duration of naming privileges is subject to fees and charges as approved by the Board; (4) naming privileges for activities and programs will last for the duration of the activities or for a one-year term; and (5) approval of names and all fees are established by the Board.

Continuing, Ms. Brooks said that A.B. 52 (Chapter 469, *Statutes of Nevada 2009*) allows for the sale of naming rights specific to hospitals. Currently, UMC has drafted an ordinance and is waiting for approval by the Clark County District Attorney before adding it to Clark County's Code of Ordinances. The language and regulations are similar to the "Shooting Park"; however, language was added addressing the need to revoke or change a name.

Discussion ensued between Senator Care and Ms. Brooks regarding the definition of "name," and the procedure for a name to be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Knight Allen, previously identified, thanked Chair Lee for allowing him to participate in previous agenda items. He discussed consolidation of services between local governments and expressed his concern about weakening "Dillon's Rule." To Mr. Allen's knowledge, the Legislature has never refused a local government's request because of "Dillon's Rule."

Mr. Allen recommended that no changes be made to the existing laws.

Some Committee members disagreed with Mr. Allen and provided him with information about a number of issues that the Legislature did not agree with local governments.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Peyton
Senior Research Secretary

Michael J. Stewart
Supervising Principal Research Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator John J. Lee, Chair

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda,” provided by Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is a statement provided by Alvin P. Kramer, Treasurer, Carson City.

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter dated April 22, 2010, addressed to Senator John Lee, Chair, Legislative Commission’s Committee to Study Powers Delegated to Local Governments, from Allen Veil, Sheriff, Lyon County.

[Exhibit D](#) is an outline submitted by Knight Allen, private citizen, Las Vegas, titled “The Principle of Taxation in a Free Society.”

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated April 20, 2010, to Michael J. Stewart, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB, from Jackie Berg, Clerk and Treasurer, Office of Eureka County Clerk and Treasurer.

[Exhibit F](#) is the written testimony of Stephen Driscoll, Assistant City Manager, City of Sparks.

[Exhibit G](#) is a packet of information outlining the duties and structure of advisory committees for intergovernmental relations in other states and the composition of the Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, submitted by Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties

[Exhibit H](#) is a memorandum dated April 22, 2010, addressed to The Legislative Commission’s Committee to Study Powers Delegated to Local Governments, regarding “Advisory Committee for Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR),” from Knight Allen, private citizen, Las Vegas.

This set of “Summary Minutes and Action Report” is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits, other materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio record are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.