QUESTION NO. 4

Amendment to the Nevada Constitution

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 of the 74th Session

CONDENSATION (Ballot Question)

Shall Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution* be repealed and shall Article 1, Section 8 of the *Nevada Constitution* be amended to revise provisions relating to eminent domain proceedings?

Yes □ No □

EXPLANATION

Approval of this question would repeal Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution*, known as the People's Initiative to Stop the Taking of Our Land (PISTOL), and amend Article 1, Section 8 of the *Nevada Constitution* in order to: (1) provide that the transfer of private property from one private party to another is not considered a public use except under certain circumstances; (2) require an entity that takes private property to provide the property owner with all appraisals it has obtained; (3) grant a property owner the right to a separate determination of whether a taking constitutes a public use and place the burden of proof on the entity taking the property; (4) define "fair market value" and "just compensation"; (5) provide that neither party to an eminent domain action is liable for the other party's attorney's fees except under certain circumstances; and (6) make certain other changes related to eminent domain proceedings.

The proposed amendment provides five exceptions to the prohibition against exercising eminent domain in order to transfer property from one private party to another. Under the following conditions, such a transfer would be considered a "public use" if: (1) the private party obtaining the property uses the property primarily to benefit a public service such as a utility, railroad, public transportation project, pipeline, road, bridge, airport, or facility that is owned by a public entity; (2) the property is leased to a private party that takes up a portion of an airport or facility that is owned by a public entity so long as the public entity notifies the original owner of its intention and allows the owner the opportunity to bid or propose on such a lease; (3) the property taken has been abandoned by the owner, is a threat to public safety, or contains hazardous waste that must be remediated, and the original owner is granted first right of refusal to reacquire the property on the same terms and conditions as anyone else; (4) the entity that obtains the property exchanges it for other property in order to relocate public or private structures or avoid excessive compensation or damages; or (5) the person from whom the property is taken consents to the taking.

Additionally, the proposed amendment defines the terms "fair market value" and "just compensation" and provides for the manner of computing these amounts. It also stipulates that neither party may be held liable for the other party's attorney's fees in eminent domain proceedings except in the circumstance of an inverse condemnation, wherein a property owner makes a request for attorney's fees in a legal action. The proposed amendment revises from 5 years to 15 years the amount of time within which the entity that took the property must put it to use before the property must be offered to, and will revert to, the original owner upon payment of the original purchase price.

Finally, the repeal of Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution* would rescind a property owner's right to disqualify one judge at the district court level and one judge at each appellate level in any eminent domain action.

A "Yes" vote would repeal Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution* and amend Article 1, Section 8 of the *Nevada Constitution* relating to eminent domain proceedings.

A "No" vote would retain Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution* and keep intact the current provisions of Article 1, Section 8 of the *Nevada Constitution* relating to eminent domain proceedings.

ARGUMENTS FOR PASSAGE

Although the People's Initiative to Stop the Taking of Our Land (PISTOL) remains a well-intentioned, popular initiative that provided much needed protection for Nevada's private property owners, it also contains several flaws that have the potential to cost taxpayers money and hamper efforts to maintain and upgrade infrastructure, including schools, roads, water supply and sewage systems, and public transportation.

Recognizing these problems, representatives of local governments, state agencies, private businesses, the public, and even the original sponsors of PISTOL worked together over the course of two legislative sessions to craft a workable constitutional amendment relating to eminent domain that allows Nevada to move forward with public projects while protecting private property rights, saving taxpayers money, and avoiding unnecessary lawsuits. The provisions of this question clearly define the limited instances in which private property can be transferred or leased to a private party through eminent domain, which do not include increasing tax revenue or generating profit for private businesses. This question builds on the successes of PISTOL while correcting its deficiencies.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PASSAGE

The People's Initiative to Stop the Taking of Our Land (PISTOL) was a response to eminent domain practices upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *Kelo v. the City of New London* and by the Nevada Supreme Court in *Pappas v. the City of Las Vegas*. In those cases, the courts expanded the definition of "public use" to allow local governments to increase their tax bases by turning over private property to private persons in order to support private business interests. This question seeks to weaken the protections contained in PISTOL by expanding the circumstances under which a government can use eminent domain to transfer property from one private party to another.

The PISTOL initiative sought, in clear and concise language, to put a stop to these transfers once and for all, and to give property owners legal tools to use in the event that their property was targeted for taking by the government. The initiative passed with over 60 percent of the vote in both 2006 and 2008. Voters understood the issues at hand and chose to pass the initiative in two successive elections. There is no reason to change the provisions of PISTOL.

FISCAL NOTE

Financial Impact – Cannot be Determined

This question would amend the *Nevada Constitution* to include new provisions relating to eminent domain proceedings within the State of Nevada, including:

- Allowing the direct or indirect transfer of any interest in private property to another private person or entity as a public use in certain circumstances, as specified in the proposed constitutional amendment;
- Removing the right for property owners to preempt one judge at the district court level and one judge at each appellate level in any eminent domain action; and

• Requiring that property taken by eminent domain must be offered to, and reverts to, the person from whom the property was taken, upon repayment of the purchase price, if the entity who took the property fails to use the property within 15 years after obtaining possession of the property.

These proposed changes relating to eminent domain proceedings may affect the number of eminent domain proceedings that are undertaken by the State and local governments. However, because the number of eminent domain actions that may be undertaken cannot be estimated, the financial effect upon the State and local governments cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty.

Subsections 4 through 8, inclusive, and subsection 12 of Article 1, Section 22 of the *Nevada Constitution* contain various provisions relating to the rights of property owners in eminent domain proceedings, the calculation of fair market value for the property, and the determination of just compensation to the property owner. If this question is approved by the voters, these provisions of the *Nevada Constitution* would be repealed and replaced with similar language contained in this proposed constitutional amendment. These provisions of this question are not anticipated to have a financial effect upon the State or local governments, if approved by the voters.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 of the 74th Session–Assemblymen Hardy, Buckley, Ohrenschall, Horne, Gansert, Allen, Anderson, Arberry, Atkinson, Beers, Bobzien, Carpenter, Christensen, Claborn, Cobb, Conklin, Denis, Goedhart, Goicoechea, Grady, Hogan, Kihuen, Kirkpatrick, Koivisto, Mabey, Manendo, Marvel, McClain, Mortenson, Munford, Oceguera, Parks, Parnell, Pierce, Segerblom, Settelmeyer, Smith, Stewart, Weber and Womack

Joint Sponsors: Senators Care, Heck, Cegavske, Hardy, Raggio, Beers, Coffin, Horsford, Lee, Mathews, McGinness, Nolan, Schneider, Townsend, Washington, Wiener and Woodhouse

FILE NUMBER 51

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION—Proposing to amend the Nevada Constitution to revise provisions relating to the taking of private property by eminent domain.

Legislative Counsel's Digest:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution and the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provide that private property cannot be taken for a public use without just compensation. In *Kelo v. City of New London*, 125 S.Ct. 2655 (2005), the United States Supreme Court ruled that the use of eminent domain to acquire property and transfer it to another private party for the purpose of economic development does not violate the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

This resolution proposes an amendment to the Nevada Constitution to prohibit, except in certain circumstances, the taking of private property if the purpose of the taking is to transfer an interest in that property to another private party.

In addition, the amendment proposed by this resolution requires an entity which is taking property by the exercise of eminent domain to provide the owner of the property with all appraisals of the property obtained by the entity before the entity is allowed to occupy the property. Furthermore, in all eminent domain actions, the owner of the property that is being taken is entitled to a determination of whether the taking is for a public use and the entity that is taking the property has the burden of proving that the taking is for a public use.

The amendment proposed by this resolution provides for the manner of computing the just compensation owed to a person whose property is taken by the exercise of eminent domain. Also, the amendment provides that neither a property owner nor an entity which is taking property by the exercise of eminent domain is liable for the attorney's fees of the other party, except in a certain circumstance. Under the amendment, the owner of property taken by the exercise of eminent domain, or his successor in interest, has the right to reacquire the property for the price paid by the entity which took the property under certain circumstances.

This resolution also proposes to repeal the "People's Initiative to Stop the Taking of Our Land" if that initiative is approved by the voters at the 2008 General Election.

RESOLVED BY THE ASSEMBLY AND SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, JOINTLY, That Section 8 of Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution be amended to read as follows:

- Sec. 8. 1. No person shall be tried for a capital or other infamous crime (except in cases of impeachment, and in cases of the militia when in actual service and the land and naval forces in time of war, or which this State may keep, with the consent of Congress, in time of peace, and in cases of petit larceny, under the regulation of the Legislature) except on presentment or indictment of the grand jury, or upon information duly filed by a district attorney, or Attorney General of the State, and in any trial, in any court whatever, the party accused shall be allowed to appear and defend in person, and with counsel, as in civil actions. No person shall be subject to be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense; nor shall he be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself.
- 2. The Legislature shall provide by law for the rights of victims of crime, personally or through a representative, to be:
- (a) Informed, upon written request, of the status or disposition of a criminal proceeding at any stage of the proceeding;
 - (b) Present at all public hearings involving the critical stages of a criminal proceeding; and
 - (c) Heard at all proceedings for the sentencing or release of a convicted person after trial.

- 3. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 4, no person may maintain an action against the State or any public officer or employee for damages or injunctive, declaratory or other legal or equitable relief on behalf of a victim of a crime as a result of a violation of any statute enacted by the Legislature pursuant to subsection 2. No such violation authorizes setting aside a conviction or sentence or continuing or postponing a criminal proceeding.
- 4. A person may maintain an action to compel a public officer or employee to carry out any duty required by the Legislature pursuant to subsection 2.
 - 5. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.
- 6. Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been first made, or secured, except in cases of war, riot, fire, or great public peril, in which case compensation shall be afterward made.
- 7. Except as otherwise provided in paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, the public uses for which private property may be taken do not include the direct or indirect transfer of any interest in the property to another private person or entity. A transfer of property taken by the exercise of eminent domain to another private person or entity is a public use in the following circumstances:
- (a) The entity that took the property transfers the property to a private person or entity and the private person or entity uses the property primarily to benefit a public service, including, without limitation, a utility, railroad, public transportation project, pipeline, road, bridge, airport or facility that is owned by a governmental entity.
- (b) The entity that took the property leases the property to a private person or entity that occupies an incidental part of an airport or a facility that is owned by a governmental entity and, before leasing the property:
- (1) Uses its best efforts to notify the person from whom the property was taken that the property will be leased to a private person or entity that will occupy an incidental part of an airport or a facility that is owned by a governmental entity; and
- (2) Provides the person from whom the property was taken with an opportunity to bid or propose on any such lease.
 - (c) The entity:
- (1) Took the property in order to acquire property that was abandoned by the owner, abate an immediate threat to the safety of the public or remediate hazardous waste; and
- (2) Grants a right of first refusal to the person from whom the property was taken that allows that person to reacquire the property on the same terms and conditions that are offered to the other private person or entity.
- (d) The entity that took the property exchanges it for other property acquired or being acquired by eminent domain or under the threat of eminent domain for roadway or highway purposes, to relocate public or private structures or to avoid payment of excessive compensation or damages.
 - (e) The person from whom the property is taken consents to the taking.
 - 8. In all actions in eminent domain:
- (a) Before the entity that is taking property obtains possession of the property, the entity shall give to the owner of the property a copy of all appraisals of the property obtained by the entity.
- (b) At the occupancy hearing, the owner of the property that is the subject of the action is entitled, at the property owner's election, to a separate and distinct determination as to whether the property is being taken for a public use.
 - (c) The entity that is taking property has the burden of proving that the taking is for a public use.
- (d) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, neither the entity that is taking property nor the owner of the property is liable for the attorney's fees of the other party. This paragraph does not apply in an inverse condemnation action if the owner of the property that is the subject of the action makes a request for attorney's fees from the other party to the action.
- 9. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, if a court determines that a taking of property is for public use, the taken or damaged property must be valued at its highest and best use without considering any future dedication requirements imposed by the entity that is taking the property. If property is taken primarily for a profit-making purpose, the property must be valued at the use to which the entity that is taking the property intends to put the property, if such use results in a higher value for the property.
- 10. In all actions in eminent domain, fair market value is the highest price, on the date of valuation, that would be agreed to by a seller, who is willing to sell on the open market and has reasonable time to find a purchaser, and a buyer, who is ready, willing and able to buy, if both the seller and the buyer had full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available.
- 11. In all actions in eminent domain, just compensation is that sum of money necessary to place the property owner in the same position monetarily as if the property had never been taken, excluding any governmental offsets except special benefits. Special benefits may only offset severance damages and may not offset the value for the property. Just compensation for the property taken by the exercise of eminent domain must include, without limitation, interest and reasonable costs and expenses, except attorney's fees, incurred by the owner of the property that is the subject of the action. The district court shall determine, in a posttrial hearing, the award of interest and award as interest the amount of money which will put the person from whom the property is taken in as good a position monetarily as if the property had not been taken. The district court shall enter an order concerning:
 - (a) The date on which the computation of interest will commence;
- (b) The rate of interest to be used to compute the award of interest, which must not be less than the prime rate of interest plus 2 percent; and

(c) Whether the interest will be compounded annually.

12. Property taken by the exercise of eminent domain must be offered to and reverts to the person from whom the property was taken upon repayment of the original purchase price if, within 15 years after obtaining possession of the property, the entity that took the property:

(a) Fails to use the property for the public use for which the property was taken or for any public use

reasonably related to the public use for which the property was taken; or

(b) Seeks to convey any right, title or interest in all or part of the property to any other person and the conveyance is not occurring pursuant to subsection 7.

The entity that has taken the property does not fail to use the property under paragraph (a) if the entity has begun active planning for or design of the public use, the assembling of land in furtherance of planning for or

design of the public use or construction related to the public use.

- 13. If any provision of subsections 7 to 12, inclusive, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the provisions or application of subsections 7 to 12, inclusive, which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of subsections 7 to 12, inclusive, are declared to be severable.
- 14. The provisions of subsections 7 to 12, inclusive, apply to an action in eminent domain that is filed on or after January 1, 2011.

And be it further

RESOLVED, That Section 22 of Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution, commonly known as the "People's Initiative to Stop the Taking of Our Land," if that section is approved and ratified by the voters at the 2008 General Election, is hereby repealed.