

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
April 30, 2013**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 4:12 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2013, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Andrew Martin
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart, Clark County Assembly District No. 22
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21

Minutes ID: 1030



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Karen Pugh, Committee Secretary
Macy Young, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom
Dan Musgrove, representing City of North Las Vegas
Megan N. Salcido, Government Affairs Coordinator, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Dr. John Yacenda, Member, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum
Herbert E. Randall, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum
Peggy Lear Bowen, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Chair Ohrenschall:

[Roll was called.] We will hear Assembly Bill 446 first.

Assembly Bill 446: Revises provisions governing requests for the drafting of legislative measures. (BDR 17-984)

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Clark County Assembly District No. 28:

Assembly Bill 446 adjusts the number of bill draft requests (BDRs) allocated to all authorized entities, such as legislators, standing committees, committee chairs, the Governor's Office, county and local governments, et cetera. This bill is very similar to one proposed by Assemblyman Stewart, Assembly Bill 191. When I asked Mr. Stewart where he got his numbers, he admitted that he just made them up. We found out that previous revisions to the BDR allocations came about in the same way. We decided to look at the number of BDRs that were processed through the system. On the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), you will find two documents that detail the BDR allocations. The first provides background information and historical data covering the past 10 years of actual BDR usage by authorized entity ([Exhibit C](#)). The second is essentially a summary of all of the current and proposed BDR allocations ([Exhibit D](#)).

As you all know, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff works incredibly hard. They begin well before the session starts in February processing a large number of bills, many of which do not make it to the Governor's desk. Our goal was to find a way to make the Legislature more efficient. Using the data we

found on BDRs ([Exhibit C](#)), we set the allocations for each entity as noted on the "Proposed Changes to BDR Allocations" sheet ([Exhibit D](#)).

As an example, for the Legislature, an incumbent Assembly member would see his or her BDRs reduced from 13 to 11. In consultation with the LCB, we also altered the date on which you must have the bill drafting details in to them. For LCB purposes, it is more efficient and less stressful if we get them information earlier as opposed to later. We would have to submit our first allocation of BDRs by August 1, our second allocation between August 2 and December 10, and the last allocation before 5 p.m. on the eighth day of session. I believe Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick today is also going to present a bill that deals with BDRs but only in the sense of the time frame. She is proposing a July 1 deadline as opposed to an August 1 deadline, which is what we have in A.B. 446. I am not opposed to moving the date back a month to July if that is what the Committee thinks is better.

Going down the list ([Exhibit D](#)), you will see that incumbent Senators currently receive 12 BDRs for their first deadline, and this bill would reduce that to 8. They would still receive 10 for the second deadline, but their final allocation of 4 would be reduced to 2. For standing committee chairs it is basically a formula of 1 for every 18 measures referred to their committee in the previous regular session. The busier committees, such as Judiciary, will have more measures to review and, therefore, more BDRs allocated. The Legislative Commission will have an allocation of 10 BDRs, down from 15.

The other major change you will note is to the Executive Branch. They do not have a reduction in bills; however, they do receive an additional time period by which their bills have to be introduced. It is the same concept as that for the Legislature; we do not want the Executive Branch submitting all 100 bills to the LCB at the same time. Fifty of their BDRs will need to be submitted by July 1 and the second 50 by September 1. For constitutional offices we actually increased their allocations. The reason for that is, again, usage. We went back ten years and found that constitutional offices actually used their total allotment of BDRs. They are full-time and for the most part, except for the Lieutenant Governor, deal with ongoing issues and have the opportunity to present proposed legislation only once every two years. Their numbers were already low, and so, based on the historical data, it made sense to increase their allocation. The Lieutenant Governor was increased from 1 to 3, the Secretary of State from 5 to 8, the State Treasurer from 2 to 5, the State Controller from 2 to 5, and the Attorney General from 15 to 20. Again, that is based on historical usage of BDRs.

We tiered the allocation for city governments a bit more than we currently do. There are three categories now: cities of 500,000 or more residents will receive 3 BDRs; cities of 150,000 to 500,000 will receive 2 BDRs; and cities under 150,000 will receive 1 BDR.

Two entities had not used their allotted BDRs for some time and, therefore, we decided to eliminate the allocation entirely for the Mental Health Consortium and the Interagency Committee to Evaluate the Child Welfare System.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Regarding legislator BDRs, did you find that many were not being used or that most legislators were using their full allotment of bill draft requests?

Assemblywoman Flores:

We found that it varied. There were a certain number of legislators who used the maximum possible, but many of those did not end up making it all the way to a bill number; they were requested, drafted, and then not introduced. So there was a substantial fall-off, even from the request phase to the introduction phase.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Assemblywoman Flores?

Assemblyman Thompson:

I have some concerns about the allocations for the Mental Health Consortium and the Child Welfare System. I hope someone is here who can speak on behalf of those two entities.

Assemblywoman Flores:

You must take into account that anything health related can go through the Health and Human Services Committee, which will have an allocation of BDRs. It is not that you are no longer addressing that particular area or subject matter; it just means that this particular entity never used the bills. There are definitely opportunities to address mental health-related bills, or health in general, and more than one avenue in which to do so.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblyman Thompson, agencies often approach a legislator to see if they are willing to carry a bill draft request for them.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I assume in preparing this you had conversations with committee chairs and leadership and they told you that the result of this would probably be fewer but

better bills. It will make individual members prioritize and, more importantly, bring forth bills that they have really worked on and have a chance of making it through to completion.

You mentioned that the Executive Branch had two time periods for submitting their BDRs, but I could not see where they were noted in the bill. Is the September deadline in the year before the session? Is it historically the case that they almost always have their bills ready by then or, with respect to budget, do they typically need a later date to be able to submit?

Assemblywoman Flores:

They do have an unlimited number of budget bills with a time limit of on or before the 19th day of session. That is completely apart from the policy bills that they bring on behalf of various agencies and departments. Currently, they have until September 1 of the year prior, so for example, it would be on or before September 1, 2014, to bring their allotment of 100 policy bills. After that, they have an additional five last-minute bills that they have to introduce on or before the 19th day of session, which is the same deadline for their unlimited number of budget bills. In terms of how many, I would have to ask Ms. Scholley. We did ask LCB how many of those bills came in at the last minute and whether or not that would create a burden for the Executive Branch, and it is my understanding that it should be okay.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I want to help with your question. The Assembly received 26 bills on the last day of the last deadline, which then had to be drafted and put through committee. The Senate received 27. That is a huge burden on our legal staff. I think it is a great idea to move up the timelines because they are going to know if they are consolidating agencies or what have you, and it takes Legal time to put it all together. I wholeheartedly support that because it does make for better legislation.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblywoman Flores, in your discussions with the Governor's Office and the Executive Branch, did you find that the 100 BDRs allotted prior to September 1 was adequate, or was there any concern that they needed more for the agencies and commissions?

Assemblywoman Flores:

In 2009, they were reduced from 125 measures to the 105 that they have now ([Exhibit C](#)). We are not suggesting that we should further reduce their bill allotment; we are simply saying that in order for our staff not to be as burdened

as they currently are, they should submit at least half of those bills by July and the other half in September.

Chair Ohrenschall:

In addition, have they been using up their allotment in the last few years? [Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick nodded yes.] Are there any other questions for Assemblywoman Flores? I do not see any. Is there anyone else in support of Assembly Bill 446 who would like to speak?

Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom:

We have been advocating for this for a long time. I am glad to see it come together. I think it would be a good idea and would give people time to read and research the bills in order to have good discussions on them. I think we will get higher quality bills as well. We are absolutely in support of this bill.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Ms. Chapman? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support? [There was no response.] I will move to opposition. Is there anyone opposed to the measure?

Dan Musgrove, representing City of North Las Vegas:

I want to say candidly that I am in complete support of what you are trying to do. You probably know that I have represented, at one point or another, the largest county in the state, the largest city in the state, and now the City of North Las Vegas. Over the years, we have seen a gradual diminishment of the number of bills that we can bring before you. That can be a good thing in terms of the volume, especially when we look at the number of state agencies and the bills that local governments end up tracking. Back when I was with Clark County, we tracked upwards of 700 bills during a session. The City of North Las Vegas has tracked over 300 this session, with about 180 still being tracked, so any work that can be done to reduce that number is good for us. The issue for us is the reduction from three to two BDRs for cities of 150,000 to 500,000 population, and I think North Las Vegas is a very good example of how we look at this situation.

The City of North Las Vegas did not bring any bills this session, the reason being that we certainly do not want to waste your time with issues that we feel do not merit your consideration. On the other hand, based on the reception that Senate Bill 2 received in front of the Assembly Government Affairs Committee this past week, it does not look like home rule is coming our way anytime soon. That means when we have issues that our constituents are demanding we handle, we need to come in front of this legislative body and ask for your help. When it comes to an issue that only affects the City of North Las Vegas, we

cannot go to the League of Cities and Municipalities to ask that it be one of their bills. And sometimes it cannot be a legislator who is willing to carry that bill on our behalf, so we have to take the issue upon ourselves and bring it before this body and ask for your consideration and help. Again, we do not take that lightly, but we certainly do not want to lose that ability to come before you. Based on A.B. 446, we would drop from three to two BDRs, but there have been times when we needed all three. When I was with the City of Las Vegas, we had five bill draft requests and now it is three. When I started at the county, it was 15 bill drafts.

Some sessions we used all those allotted, while in other sessions we said there was not an issue that we needed to bring before you. All we are doing is answering our constituent needs, so we would ask that you at least exclude the cities of Henderson, North Las Vegas, and Reno from the changes and leave us at our current number. Let me offer something of a compromise. Right now local governments have to have their BDRs in by September 1. All of our bills are prefiled so if you want us to provide them sooner, to give the LCB more time to work on them, we would be willing to do that versus losing some BDRs.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I have a similar bill, Assembly Bill 412, that has to do more with the time frames, which is a larger issue since we are not a part-time Legislature as many people believe. We are a full-time Legislature and must use our staff year-round.

Senator Townsend first brought a bill like this in 2005, and we whittled it down so that local governments received seven BDRs. They could also turn to the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities, as well as the Nevada Association of Counties, plus they had their individual legislators. In 2007 and 2009, similar bills did not get a hearing. We have come to a point where the whole goal is to get everyone to work better together. At the end of the day, we represent the same people. I understand that it is hard to have things taken away. I know that local governments did not utilize their bill draft requests this time, and I think that is great. They know when to utilize them and when not to, but at some point we have to establish a lower number across the board. I can tell you out of 500 bill drafts on the Assembly side, 150 of them died for no apparent reason. Sixty-nine did not even get hearings. We are having duplicate bill drafts from some local governments, so it is a hard argument. It would be different if local governments were actually drafting all the language; they are not. The Legislative Counsel Bureau staff is drafting the language. Mr. Musgrove, you and I agree to disagree many times, but when North Las Vegas needs some type of bill draft or some help, I am happy to be there. The Legislature wants to work more closely with the constituents they

represent. So when you figure those in, there are multiple opportunities to get bill drafts.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any comments you would like to make, Mr. Musgrove?

Dan Musgrove:

I appreciate everything Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said. Again, this was one session where we had extraordinary circumstances, and until we were blessed to get Mr. Thompson on board, we did not have one of our legislators in the building.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

That issue did not come up until after the deadline for submitting bills had passed.

Dan Musgrove:

That is not the direction I am going. I am saying that if one of our bills just happened to be one of his, we would have lost a BDR. Again, it is extraordinary circumstances.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I want to echo what Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick has said. Being in leadership and given term limits, we have, and will continue to have, many freshmen coming in most sessions. Many of them are looking for bills and sometimes get bills just because they think they ought to. The more important point here is if they can begin a relationship with local governments and carry some of your bills, it is better for their early education in this process and I think it brings us all closer together. If that is something that necessitates you having to work more with lawmakers, I think it is a win-win for both sides.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Has your experience been positive when you have approached lawmakers asking for bill drafts, or have you found that they have not had one available when you needed them?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Ohrenschall, I am going to say that is an unfair question.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Musgrove, you do not have to answer if you do not want to. [There was no response.]

**Megan N. Salcido, Government Affairs Coordinator, Office of the City Manager,
City of Reno:**

Our council has adopted a position of opposition for all of the reasons that Mr. Musgrove stated. I can certainly appreciate and understand the comments made by Assemblyman Hickey and Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick. We have a great relationship with our delegation, and I have no doubt that they would be there if we needed them to carry a bill draft request for us. We look forward to working with them more closely in the future if this does pass and our bill draft requests are reduced.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Ms. Salcido?

Assemblyman Thompson:

How many bills did your city utilize this time?

Megan Salcido:

Our city submitted three bill draft requests; we withdrew one just before it was drafted, so we only had two BDRs that became bills.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

The City of Reno also had a committee bill through the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs. To say Reno just had two and withdrew one is not quite the whole story.

Megan Salcido:

I apologize for the lack of clarity. I was responding to the three bill draft requests that we are entitled to as a city. There were only two that became bills. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick is correct that we had a bill picked up by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs that they referred to the Assembly Committee on Transportation. We very much appreciated that. We look forward to working with our delegation in the future if we need them to carry bills for us.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions?

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

We are opposed to section 8 of this bill. In Nevada, local governments may only exercise the powers that are expressly granted to them by the Legislature, and the only tool available for local governments is to ask the Legislature to enact changes to statute either to allow for more efficient operations to adapt to changing situations or to seek new authorities through the use of the bill

draft request. Most local governments are judicious in the use of their BDRs and may not submit their entire quota or even a single BDR in some sessions. However, there are sessions when a local government may need to use all of its available BDRs to address multiple issues. We are opposed to any measure that reduces the number of BDRs that are available to local governments and respectfully ask that you delete section 8 of A.B. 446 should you choose to process the bill.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Ms. Pierczynski? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in opposition? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral on the measure who wants to be heard? [There was no response.] Assemblywoman Flores, do you have any closing comments you would like to make?

Assemblywoman Flores:

I want to mention that the total reduction in BDRs, should everything pass as suggested, is 215 bills. That is significant in terms of the amount of time saved.

I also want to reemphasize that there are other opportunities for entities such as the Mental Health Consortium to request legislation be introduced on their behalf. Aside from the Department of Health and Human Services, there are individual legislators, interim committees, standing committees, and a number of other ways these organizations can still request a BDR. I think that is an important point that we should remember in considering this bill.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblyman Stewart has just joined us, and I believe he is here to testify in support of this measure. I know we have already heard from those in support of the bill, but we will reopen that portion of the hearing in order for Assemblyman Stewart to testify. Mr. Stewart had a very similar measure and agreed not to have a hearing for it because the two measures are so closely related.

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart, Clark County Assembly District No. 22:

When I was teaching, I had a saying for my students: less is more, small is great, round down. I think that is what we are trying to do here.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Mr. Stewart? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 446 and will turn to Assembly Bill 412.

**Assembly Bill 412: Makes various changes relating to the Legislature.
(BDR 17-528)**

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Clark County Assembly District No. 1:

Last session we put in rules to help legislators get the details of their bill draft requests (BDRs) to the Legal Division a bit faster so Legal was not bombarded with a lot of bills all at once. However, that plan did not work out so well. Several legislators waited until the last minute of the last day to submit the details for their BDRs, so the situation did not improve. In fact, it probably complicated things, as the deadline for all of the agency bills and the interim study bills came at once. Legal received close to 550 bill drafts in the same day. No matter how many people we put down there, they could not possibly get to all of them on a timely basis. This bill addresses the time issue. It also addresses some policy issues with the training that we put in place last session.

Legislators need to work more closely with agencies and with local government. It helps with bill drafts and it helps with duplication. In this session, there are over 19 bills that, with the exception of five words, use the exact same language. Why are we not working together? This session, I have worked on bills with Mr. Hickey, Mr. Hansen, and Mrs. Benitez-Thompson. It is okay for us to do things together to reach the same end goal and avoid drafting again and again. Typically, if it is a Government Affairs bill, the same person is drafting my bill as is drafting Mr. Martin's bill, so there is not going to be much difference if we are trying to get to the same place.

Section 1 of this bill requires the discussion of major policy issues likely to arise during the session to be included in the training of newly elected legislators. I devised the process used for the training this session and it was much different than it was the previous session. In the past, freshmen legislators were at a disadvantage because they received an extremely brief overview of all the issues without the time needed to absorb the information. This session we incorporated reviews on topics that were discussed in the interim, such as funding for K-12 and higher education, so the freshmen legislators were coming in with a leg up.

This bill also requires the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to provide training dates to the candidates in writing. In the past, we put that information on the website, but newly elected legislators were most likely not checking out the website the first week after election. Leadership can work together to determine what the dates are and then LCB can communicate that to everyone. Section 1 also allows the Director to provide an alternative means of recording information during session training if the electronic format currently utilized is not available. We realized that we had somewhat limited ourselves

last session, so this would allow us to use CDs, tape recorders, or any other alternative method, depending on what means we have available.

Section 2 prohibits legislators from requesting additional bill drafts after filing for candidacy for the other house. If they are elected to the other house, the prior bill draft requests will count towards their allocation in the new house. What we have seen, and what we will see more often with term limits, is that people from the Assembly are going to the Senate. However, when you are in the Assembly, the first day after session begins you are allowed to submit bill drafts up to your deadline, but with many people transitioning to the other side, several bills were unaccounted for. In 2009, we addressed the term limit issue so that if you were termed out, you could not submit bills, because that would mean that a legislator either had to pick them up or Legal was drafting for no apparent reason. This makes it a little clearer. This session we had two legislators with 26 bills apiece. I find it hard to manage ten and count myself lucky if five of those actually get out.

Assembly Bill 412 changes the first deadline from September 1, when LCB receives all the other agency bills, to July 1, which is consistent with the date noted in A.B. 446. Legislative Counsel Bureau staff will then have two months before they are bombarded by the agency bills. The second deadline for legislators will be changed from December 1 to November 1. With the holidays, that will give LCB staff the additional time needed to move forward.

Committee chair bill draft details will be due by January 1. In the past, they have had until the 15th of the month. If you are a committee chair, and you are trying to work with multiple individuals or organizations to get bills in place, you may not get those details until the very last day at the very last hour, so January 1 is more reasonable. I do understand that January 1 is a holiday, so legislators would need to have information in that night.

Section 3 of the bill moves the interim study bill draft request deadlines to August 1 and November 1.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Right now, the system does not seem to be working well in terms of this large number of bill draft requests. Is your goal to make it more fine-tuned so that there will be more of a selection as to what people do request, in terms of trying to get it heard at the session?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I do not want to say that the system does not work well. Our staff works around the clock. However, I think there are some things we can do to be more

efficient. We all know that there is not one LCB staff member who has ever turned us away if we have 99 percent of the details but need more time to get that other 1 percent. This bill will help them manage more efficiently. One thing that people do not realize is that when submitting a bill draft request, whether you are an agency or a legislator, there are details that need to be gathered and that process can take days. The Executive Branch is in the same boat; there are a lot of moving parts all of the time. I am extra sensitive to staff needs because I believe they work great. This will help them be more efficient and help us to manage our time better.

Assemblyman Hickey:

This bill refers to the training for new legislators. I do not want to ask you for a long answer here, but if you would reflect on the training as it has occurred so far. I did note that it is now mandatory. Do you see any changes that will need to be made to get our legislators as ready as possible to hit the ground running?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

We have a few freshmen here on this Committee and they could probably tell you more about the experience than I could. I believe it was a more pleasant experience than what some of our sophomores went through with 180 topics in 20 minutes. By making training mandatory, no one is able to skip it with the excuse that they have to tie some things up at home. I think a good representative for the effectiveness of our training program is Mr. Thompson. We were able to provide him with the three days of training and you see him here in this Committee and others asking questions. We want legislators being engaged from day one.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who is in favor of Assembly Bill 412? [There was no response.] Is there anyone opposed to the measure? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral who wants to be heard? [There was no response.] I will now close the hearing on A.B. 412. I know the hour is late but we have Senator Manendo, who has been waiting very patiently to present Senate Bill 178.

Senate Bill 178: Authorizes the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum to request the drafting of not more than one legislative measure for each regular session of the Legislature. (BDR 17-924)

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21:

I will ask that Dr. Yacenda join me in presenting Senate Bill 178. I was meeting with our appointee to the Silver Haired Legislative Forum, and as we were sitting there chatting with Mary Shope, who is the coordinator of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum, it dawned on me that our members, who are appointed by us, do not have a bill draft, yet the youth legislators do. I thought, why not the seniors? They have so much to offer us. They have been around a long time and bring a lot of diversity and experience to the process. This bill, in a nutshell, gives them the authority to have one BDR.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Senator Manendo? [There were none.]

Dr. John Yacenda, Member, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum:

We are the "boots on the ground" for all things senior. We have a chance to identify what is important to us and know how to construct legislation for future sessions that would really help the state's seniors. One of the biggest issues now is elder abuse, physical and mental abuse, exploitation, neglect, and isolation. We really need to have an opportunity to present a bill draft request that can deal with these issues in statute and in regulation. [Submitted written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Dr. Yacenda?

Assemblywoman Flores:

It is interesting that you are presenting this bill now after this Committee has heard an hour of testimony why we do not need more bills. Can you provide some detail, including why the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum is different from any of the other committees and organizations that exist, and why you simply could not go through any other committee or entity in order to get a bill draft request?

Dr. John Yacenda:

I represent Senate District No. 16 in Clark County. We all represent different districts, both Assembly and Senate. I think the intention of the forum when it was formed many years ago was to pull together all of the interests in our local districts to find what might be the ecumenical interests that affect so many people in the same light, and not just local issues but also statewide issues. That is part of the reason that the forum seeks a bill draft request, so we can work together and develop specific legislation that comes from the heart of what we have gathered in our "boots on the ground" efforts.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Dr. Yacenda? [There were none.]

Herbert E. Randall, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum:

I am very pleased to testify in favor of S.B. 178, which authorizes the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum to request the drafting of a legislative measure for each regular session of the Legislature. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Ohrenschall:

Has the Silver Haired Forum had any difficulty in finding a bill draft from an individual legislator, or a committee chair, for an issue that they felt was important?

Herbert Randall:

In my opinion, yes. It took us three legislative sessions to find the right legislator, as we did last session with Senator Parks, to finally get a Silver Alert bill passed. That was Senate Bill No. 245 of the 76th Session, which aids in the recovery of missing seniors. If we had a BDR six years ago, we could have had that drafted to our specification and probably passed a lot quicker.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Mr. Randall? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of the measure?

Peggy Lear Bowen, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a lifetime elected member to the National Silver Alert Forum. Senator Parks spent a good deal of time and energy working to get the Silver Alert passed. Now when an elder is lost or endangered, we can get an informational scroll across the local television stations and can place the alert on the Amber Alert systems along the roadways.

We know it can take a long time to get things passed in the Legislature. This is your forum, created by you to be able to bring issues to you for the sake of the elderly. You have recognized their value in the past and they need you to be able to recognize their value in this bill. This is a golden moment in that you can open the door and allow this to happen. I would appreciate your vote in support of this bill. I can tell you that the elders in our state need this bill when it comes to their care. Please vote yes.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Ms. Lear Bowen? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support of the measure? [There was none.] I will now move to

opposition. Is there anyone in opposition to Senate Bill 178? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral? [There was no response.] I will now close the hearing on S.B. 178 and open the meeting to public comment. As I do not see anyone wishing to speak, I will call today's meeting of the Assembly Committee of Legislative Operations and Elections adjourned [at 5:13 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Pugh
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: April 30, 2013

Time of Meeting: 4:12 p.m.

| Bill | Exhibit | Witness / Agency | Description |
|-------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | A | | Agenda |
| | B | | Attendance Roster |
| A.B. 446 | C | Assemblywoman Lucy Flores | Total BDRs by Session Year |
| A.B. 446 | D | Assemblywoman Lucy Flores | Proposed changes to BDR allocations |
| S.B. 178 | E | Dr. John Yacenda, Member, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum | Statement in support |
| S.B. 178 | F | Herbert E. Randall, Pres., Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum | Statement in support |