

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
May 11, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Patricia Farley at 3:45 p.m. on Monday, May 11, 2015, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Patricia Farley, Chair
Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Vice Chair
Senator Kelvin Atkinson
Senator Tick Segerblom

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Greg Brower (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart, Assembly District No. 22

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Stewart, Policy Analyst
Kevin C. Powers, Legislative Counsel
Daniel Stewart, Policy Advisor, Assembly Leadership
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Juanita Clark, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation
Sondra Cosgrove, Ph.D., President, League of Women Voters of Las Vegas
Valley
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 11, 2015
Page 2

Lynn Chapman, Eagle Forum
John Wagner, Independent American Party
Jeffrey B. Klein, Chair, Subcommittee Concerning Legislative Issues, Nevada
Commission on Aging; President & CEO, Nevada Senior Services

Chair Farley:

I will open the meeting today with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 252, a bill from the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

ASSEMBLY BILL 252 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections.
(BDR 17-737)

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart (Assembly District No. 22):

Every 10 years, the U.S. Census takes place. After each census, State and local redistricting takes place to keep each voting district in approximately equal numbers.

The purpose of A.B. 252 is to establish the Legislative Advisory Commission on Reapportionment and Redistricting, to begin working on redistricting that will follow the 2020 U.S. Census and be utilized for the 2021 Legislative Session. The Commission would be established by the 2019 Session and consist of four members each from the Assembly and Senate, plus an appointed chair. The Commission would then begin working on the redistricting for 2021.

One purpose of the Commission would be to create maps of three reapportionment plans to be presented to the Legislature, which could then accept one or none of those plans.

Daniel Stewart (Policy Advisor, Assembly Leadership):

Every 10 years, the U.S. Census numbers come out. Unless there has been zero population change in a state, both the federal and the state districts are immediately unconstitutional, which requires redistricting. This bill is meant to help the Legislature get a head start on the process. We know the U.S. Census will occur in 2020, so during the 2019 Legislative Session, the Commission will be appointed and the work will begin July 1, 2019, after Session is finished.

The members of the Commission will be chosen by the majority and minority members of each legislative body. We initially had a fifth Commission member to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court, but there

were concerns about involving the judiciary in something they may have to rule on.

After July 1, 2019, through the 2021 Session, the Commission will be gathering data, strategies and goals to address the changes in redistricting driven by the Census data release, which usually occurs around February or March of the year following the Census.

The three versions of the maps Assemblyman Stewart referenced will include three versions each for State Assembly Districts and State Senate Districts, three versions of Congressional Districts, three versions of the Board of Regents Districts for the Nevada System of Higher Education, and any other category the State Legislature is tasked to delineate. This Commission is an advisory board only, with no power to impel the Legislature to accept any of the maps.

The hope is that this will give the legislative bodies a head start in the redistricting process. The Commission is not exclusive—other parties and caucuses can work on their priorities and maps. This is simply an added tool to help that process to avoid an instance like we had in 2011, when the court's Special Masters stepped in to draw districts.

Senator Segerblom:

Is this language modeled after any other state?

Mr. D. Stewart:

Yes and no. Various parts of the bill have come from other states. There is little similarity between commissions in each state. Arizona's commission will likely be struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the next month or so. It delegates all redistricting duties to a commission not related to their legislature. Iowa has their chief judge involved in the process.

Assemblyman Stewart:

We were careful to keep the power of this commission with the Legislature. This is strictly advisory, unlike Arizona, which completely delegated the power to its commission.

Senator Segerblom:

Since the commission will meet during the interim, it seems like this is an interim committee. Why would it need to be as proposed in the bill instead of making it an interim committee? Is it a time thing?

Assemblyman Stewart:

This is a more direct way. The commission could spend more time on it, organizing computer simulators and hiring people to help them. It would be a head start. If the political parties did not think things were working well, they could chime in. This would prevent the last-minute scramble we experienced after the 2010 Census.

Senator Segerblom:

I understand that, but could we do the same thing with an interim legislative committee instead of creating this commission consisting of people who are basically beholden to us? It may be six of one, a half dozen of the other. I agree with the early start. Until you get the U.S. Census data, you do not know what you can do, and until people are elected, you do not know where they should live, because everybody has to have a district.

Senator Settlemeyer:

What about a possible amendment to require that our bill draft requests (BDR) come in earlier to give our Legal Division a jump on that process?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I am all for planning in advance and reducing BDRs so we can get to the meat of things sooner. In theory, I would look at that, though it might slow down the process if we start amending this bill.

Mr. D. Stewart:

A timing factor that may make it difficult to get a jump-start on redistricting is if U.S. Census data does not come out until midway through the session. Getting BDRs in before the session would be a great amendment.

Senator Settlemeyer:

I am not talking about BDRs; I am talking about a small amendment on your bill dictating that all Legislators would have to prefile half their BDRs before the next session starts. That way, committees would have the opportunity to jump in and get their work done rather than wait for Legislators to finish BDRs.

Senator Segerblom:

Right now, if we do not have half of our BDRs in by November or the first of December, they die.

Kevin C. Powers (Legislative Counsel):

We have two things going on here. Assembly Bill 252 is an act relating to elections. The amendment Senator Settlemeyer is talking about would not be germane to this bill. This bill does not deal with BDRs or the processing of bills through the Legislature. Bills are out there that could address BDR request times and deadline processes, but this bill is not an appropriate vehicle for that.

Senator Settlemeyer:

I appreciate that.

Assemblyman Stewart:

Senator Settlemeyer, I would support that amendment in another bill.

Chair Farley:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 252 and open A.B. 460.

ASSEMBLY BILL 460: Expresses the intent of the Legislature to increase its membership in the next reapportionment and redistricting cycle.
(BDR 17-1126)

Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart (Assembly District No. 22):

This bill is similar to A.B. 252 in that it prepares for the future. To a degree, the makeup of the State Legislature is set by the Nevada Constitution. We cannot have more than 75 members, for example. We did reach that number before in the nineteenth century, but we have not had an increase in the Nevada Legislature since 1983. Only three states have smaller legislatures than ours at 63 Legislators: Alaska has 60, Delaware has 62 and Nebraska has 49.

It has been 32 years since Nevada has increased its number of Legislators. Since that time, the State has grown from more than 800,000 residents to more than 2.7 million residents. Each Assembly member represents around 65,000 people and twice that for each Senator.

This bill would set up a process to begin planning for an increase of one Senator and two Assembly members. It would require the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to study the physical and fiscal needs of expansion, including office space, room on Senate and Assembly floors to accommodate extra Legislators, more staff, etc.

I have included a chart with data on the number of legislators and length of terms in years for all 50 states ([Exhibit C](#)). I also have a handout with the 50 states' legislators, population and population per legislator ([Exhibit D](#)). The chart shows that Nevada has a higher constituent-to-legislator rate than most states.

Mr. D. Stewart:

Assemblyman Stewart mentioned Nebraska, which has a unicameral legislature that includes 49 members for a single house. Looking at the rate of constituents per representative, we are higher than most other states. Since 1983, there have been two redistricting cycles. In each case, because the bulk of the population growth has been in Clark County, districts have moved from north to south and rural to urban, which coincides with the one-person, one-vote rule established by the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have Senate Districts that nearly stretch the entire course of the State. If you represent those districts, you are covering more miles than the average member of the U.S. Congress. It can be difficult to adequately represent your constituents over such a large district. Imagine that in 2021, if this bill is not passed, the disparity will get even greater as the population continues to grow in Nevada, especially in our southern urban areas. You could end up with one Senator representing all the rural counties in the State.

This bill, or any attempt to increase the Legislature, does not change the proportionality but allows more seats for smaller districts in our rural communities.

Senator Settelmeyer:

Looking at [Exhibit D](#), I notice that California has 308,014 residents per legislator, but I believe that that is only for the Assembly. In my discussions with California Senator Ted Gaines, he has told me he represents more than his Congressional counterparts because of the size of the California legislature. During the last redistricting, when Senator Segerblom and I were here, we

discussed increasing the Legislature. But in order to not lose a rural representative, we would have to increase the Legislature by four Senators and eight Assembly members. It did not seem logical to knock out walls to do that. I appreciate the concept within this bill to just add one Senator and two Assembly members, but how about adding the flexibility—if it does not change anything—to decrease rather than increase the number of Legislators?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I understand the building east of us was constructed so floors could be added. Some LCB staff could move there to make room for the additional three Legislators.

Senator Settelmeyer:

My concept was not to limit the bill to only increasing or staying the same. Instead, have the flexibility to do whatever is necessary, rather than thinking only of increasing. It is always good to allow individuals to make decisions without predetermining which direction to go.

Senator Atkinson:

I could understand shrinking a legislature in a state that is stagnant or losing population, but Nevada is growing, so I am not sure why we would even begin to approach the idea of downsizing. Every number I see indicates that we will continue to grow. In the bill, section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (d) says that “According to the 1980 decennial census and the 2010 decennial census, during that 30-year period, the population of the State of Nevada increased exponentially from 800,493 to 2,700,551.”

It is hard to manage districts as they are now. I have 168,000 constituents in my district, and I am sure the rest of the Senators here have a similar number of constituents. When I meet with some of my colleagues from around the Western states—New Mexico, Idaho, etc.—and they tell me they have 15,000 constituents, I am aware we are not like those states.

Juanita Clark (Charleston Neighborhood Preservation):

We are neutral on A.B. 460. We initially opposed this bill, but after listening to wise people discuss the pros and cons, we stand neutral.

Mr. D. Stewart:

To clarify, nothing in this bill binds the 2021 Legislature from either increasing or decreasing the number of Legislators. The flexibility Senator Settlemeyer talks about is already in the law. This bill simply creates a study to gather data to use in case the Legislature decides to increase Legislator numbers in 2021.

Chair Farley:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 460 and open Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 8 of the 77th Session.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8 OF THE 77TH SESSION: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to revise provisions relating to the State Legislature. (BDR C-626)

Senator Tick Segerblom (Senatorial District No. 3):

This is a simple bill about establishing annual sessions for the Nevada Legislature. It passed last session. Under our Constitution, this measure automatically comes up for a second hearing and Committee vote.

After the 2011 Legislative Session, we had an interim study of our Legislature's structure. We studied legislatures across the Country, traveling to Oregon to see their process. We determined it would be advisable to have an interim session.

We meet for 120 days in odd years right now, and we sometimes have special sessions in between. Since I have been in the Legislature, we have had a special session every year, with more than one some years. This bill changes the odd-year sessions from 120 days to 90 days and adds 30-day sessions during the even years.

We changed the schedule from strictly calendar days to legislative days. We would meet 90 days out of the 120 days and 30 days out of 45 days. Since we are here on weekends most of the time, we would only count the days we are actually working in the Legislature. Because of the extra time, we could take a week off after the crossover so the staff could catch up. We could take a week off at the beginning of the session, so staff could catch up and get all the bills ready to go, making us much more efficient in the early stages of the process.

Right now, 120 days every other year is not enough time for this modern State to get the work done. Only three states remain that do not have annual sessions—Nevada, Montana and North Dakota. Texas also does not have annual sessions, but their legislature meets year-round for 2 years. We are a modern State of 3 million people, we are not Montana or North Dakota.

Things move rapidly here—population changes rapidly, the economy moves rapidly—and to meet every year, even for a small period of time, would allow us to stay on top of this rapid movement. That way we would not have to come here every other year and spend the first part of the session figuring out what the heck is going on.

If we vote for this bill to pass, it is only a vote to allow Nevada voters to revisit something that has been in our Constitution since 1864. Another thing the bill does is change our pay structure. Right now, we are paid the first 60 days. This takes that out of the Constitution and authorizes a committee to revisit that pay structure. This would enable us to become a modern institution.

This issue has gone to the voters several times in the last 40 years. We had an annual session with the added 1960 Session that caused such an uproar they took it out of the Constitution. We would not have to serve the full amount of time. There is no reason why we have to wait until the budget committee shows up with the money on May 1, we could have it be April 1 so we have more time. This is one thing we can do to modernize ourselves. I have a presentation to submit ([Exhibit E](#)).

Senator Atkinson:

Are you saying we would meet 90 days in the off year and 30 days during the budget year?

Senator Segerblom:

Yes; you could just have a budget year since there is no limitation in the Constitution for what would be done during the short session.

Senator Atkinson:

So it could go on for a while?

Senator Segerblom:

No. I am saying it does not have to be only the budget in the short session; nothing in the Constitution specifically requires that.

Senator Atkinson:

If we were doing it this year, it would be the 90-day session. Would next year, the even-numbered year, be a 30-day session?

Senator Segerblom:

Yes.

Senator Atkinson:

Are the meetings in Carson City?

Senator Segerblom:

The Constitution states that the Legislature has to meet in Carson City. When the bill was drafted 2 years ago, that part was taken out. The representatives from northern Nevada threw a fit, so we put it back in.

Senator Atkinson:

It sounds like you are not necessarily adding days to a Legislative Session, just breaking it up. Is the 30-day period unpaid?

Senator Segerblom:

No, they are all paid. Right now we are paid for 60 days, then nothing after that. This bill takes the 60-day cap out of the Constitution. We as a Legislature could pay ourselves nothing, but this just gives us the authority to pay ourselves. We visited Oregon, where legislators are paid \$2,000 per month for the whole 2 years. There is also an office allowance of around \$5,000 to \$6,000 to run an office and hire a staff person. These are commonsense ideas. We do so much work without compensation when we are not here.

Senator Atkinson:

I am glad you brought this up. People tell us we should know what we signed up for when we become a Legislator. People like to link us with the national legislators and imagine that we make so much money as a State Legislator, but when you tell them we do not get paid much, they think we are lying because that could not occur in America. What happened to this bill last Session?

Senator Segerblom:

It passed. If it passes this time, it will be on the ballot in 2016. Then it would be up to the voters. Every 150 years, we need to offer the opportunity to voters to choose whether Nevada can become modern or stay in the Dark Ages.

Chair Farley:

Do other studies offer information about this type of measure? Being new, I do not know how good legislation can be produced every 2 years in this time frame. We try very hard to come up with good legislation and get it out the door, but it feels like we do a disservice to people with such a short time span. I do not know the answer, but given the amount of people in this State, something needs to be done to address issues like education and our economy in a more timely and efficient manner. If I had to run a business and hold a management meeting once every 2 years, that business would fail.

Senator Segerblom:

We are only one of a handful of states that meets biennially, and the other two states—Montana and North Dakota—are much smaller with more rural communities than Nevada, where Las Vegas and Reno are major metropolises. How can we protect our State for 2 years? We cannot.

Oregon switched from biennial to annual in 2011. Between their two sessions, they kept the committee structure the same. Those committees met every 3 months in Salem, the state capital, which kept the continuity. Keeping continuity is a problem for us because our interim sessions do not have the same structure as our regular session with different issues and committee makeup.

As a Legislature, we are designed to never go back and look at what we have done. That is the biggest fault I have with our Legislature—we pass a great bill, but we never go back and see if it worked or failed. Oversight ought to be half of what the Legislature does—to bring people in and ask if the legislation we made is working or if we need to make it better.

We are totally beholden to the Governor. It almost seems like we do everything we can possibly do to make ourselves an inferior branch of government. We are the government of the people. We are the ones closest to ordinary people. We should be the ones leading the State instead of being the tail of the dog.

Senator Settelmeyer:

It is always interesting to run across voters who do not know that we are not paid for the last 60 days. It is sad when you tell them that and they still say we are overpaid.

Do you envision the shorter session being focused on fiscal matters only? California has been entertaining the concept of having an overall budget every 2 years but dealing only with financial matters in the other year. They are finding problems with having to rehear the same bill year after year. Do you envision one year for policy matters and the next for budgetary matters?

Senator Segerblom:

I think that is what we would start with, but it could evolve until we figure out how best to proceed. That is what Oregon did—focusing on the budget because it was the first time they had done annual sessions. When factors change so dramatically, especially in a State like Nevada, it is hard to stay current. We just got the State of Nevada Economic Forum numbers a week ago, and those numbers are sometimes out of date by the time we leave here.

We have passed bills where millions of dollars are at stake—like Medicare, for example—and later discovered we made a mistake in the bill. As a result, we could not collect the millions of dollars until we were back in session and could change the flawed bill. It is hard to make a midcourse correction when you are only meeting every other year.

Tesla is an example of an issue we could have corrected quickly had we been meeting every year. Why should we have to show up to vote on a bill within a day of being called by the Governor in September? There are many examples of ways we could be more studious if we had the ability to plan, be organized and complete tasks in a methodical manner rather than just showing up every other year with half the Legislators new, trying to figure out what the heck we are doing for the first few months.

Senator Atkinson:

Since this bill has to pass two consecutive sessions, there cannot be amendments, is that right?

Senator Segerblom:

Right. Not to beat a dead horse, but that is the problem. It is a 5-year process to amend the Constitution, so if we do not pass a joint resolution the second session, it is dead and must be started from scratch the next time around.

Sondra Cosgrove, Ph.D. (President, League of Women Voters of Las Vegas Valley):

We support S.J.R. 8 of the 77th Session. We ask that you allow Nevadans the opportunity to engage in the discussion on whether biennial Legislative Sessions adequately meet our governing needs in the twenty-first century. Under our system of democracy, we have three coequal branches of government to provide different types of representation. These three branches of government engage in checks and balances to ensure the best possible outcomes. We believe a biennial Legislature does not adequately provide Nevadans with sufficient representation, nor do we believe our system of checks and balances is robust enough to ensure the best outcomes.

When Nevada had a very small population with economic and social circumstances moving slowly, having a Legislature meet every other year may have been sufficient. But now that we have a larger population and the world moves at a rapid pace, we need to debate whether our Legislative Branch of government is able to meet our needs under this current system.

Please send this bill to the Nevada voters so they can discuss how our government functions and whether we should have legislative representation during the even years as well as the odd.

Janine Hansen (Nevada Families for Freedom):

We do support Legislators getting paid the whole time they are here working, but we oppose this bill. It is not just 90 days total the Legislature will be meeting, it is 90 legislative days, so it would be an additional 30 days making the odd-year session as long as our current system of 120 days. In even years, you would have 30 legislative days plus 15 days, making the total 45 days. This would hurt citizen Legislators. For people to leave businesses or jobs to legislate, adding those extra days would make it difficult for them.

If, instead, we could get bills in earlier and limit the number of bills, people would have to pick and choose more carefully about which bills they want to push. If we had a more selective process in determining which bills are brought forth, it would improve the quality of the bills and decrease the amount of time spent on bills. It would also save money.

The Utah legislature meets 45 consecutive days every year, which is far less than we do, even though they do meet yearly. It is madness for them to get through a session in that amount of time.

Going to annual sessions would reduce the number of citizen Legislators who can participate. It would also be more difficult for people like me who are unpaid to come and participate as citizens.

Chair Farley:

One of my biggest concerns as a freshman Senator is that when issues come up, I see that to learn all the dynamics and pieces of an issue and then come up with a good solid piece of legislation is sheer magic. Some of these people who do it have a lot of experience under their belt. It is amazing that they pull it off. What scares me is that as our State gets more and more complex, we have gaping issues in this State, and they go almost 2 years without attention. Does that make you think differently?

Ms. Hansen:

That can be a problem, especially when you are new. You might be more experienced by a second year. But I think annual sessions create an opportunity for an expansion of government, which I oppose. I might be in favor of an annual session where you just repeal things.

There is always a long learning curve. I have been here longer than any of the Legislators. I understand the learning curve. Your first session, you may not have the best bills you will ever bring, but you are a quick study and others are too, and they will see the problems in this State. Your main worth as a Legislator is not bringing bills.

Chair Farley:

I agree.

Senator Atkinson:

Explain legislative days as you understand them.

Mr. Powers:

The way the bill is set up, the odd-numbered years will be a 120-day period. During that time, the Legislature is entitled to 90 legislative days. The Legislative Counsel's Digest defines a legislative day as any calendar day on which either House of the Legislature is in session or any legislative committee holds a meeting during a session. It is not limited to weekdays, it is any day the House is in session or a committee meeting is holding a session.

The Legislature could exercise all 90 of its legislative days consecutively, and the session would have to end there—never getting to the 120 days. Otherwise, Legislators could spread those 90 days out through the 120-day period.

In the even-numbered years, the total period allotted is 45 days with 30 legislative days, and the principle would be the same.

Senator Atkinson:

It is not an additional number of legislative days within the 2-year period. We spread them out in both the 30-day year and the 90-day year, still adding up to 120 legislative days.

Ms. Hansen:

I cannot imagine that the Legislature would utilize less than the whole 120 days. Although only 90 would be legislative days, you have that circumstance now—you have weekends when you are not here. Even though you are not meeting each of the 120 days, you are not doing that now. In addition, the next year would be 30 legislative days that can be extended to 45 days. With the delays in getting bills written and doing budgets, I cannot imagine you will not almost always reach the 120 days in the odd years and 45 days in the even years. I have been here too long to imagine things being done in short order.

Senator Atkinson:

I can respect that, but there should be clarification. To be clear, every person here will tell you that when the Legislature is in session, we are working at home or elsewhere—even when we are not here in the building on weekends.

We work very hard during session. Our weekends are grueling and our families will verify that.

Ms. Hansen:
I agree.

Lynn Chapman (Eagle Forum):

We have hearings during the interim, which is the off year. As an unpaid lobbyist, it is hard to get to those meetings. Thomas Jefferson said: "My reading of history convinces me that most bad government results from too much government." Annual sessions lead to larger governments. Political scientists have said that the longer legislatures are in session, the more legislation they produce, which leads to bigger, more expensive and more complex government. States with full-time legislatures generally rank near the top of the list of the biggest per person taxing and spending. Not one person I have talked to about annual sessions has been in favor. It would make a hardship for me to talk my husband into letting me do this day after day. I know it is hard enough for you to do this 120 days every other year, but making it every year would be difficult, for you and for us.

Chair Farley:

I want to weigh that with what we are out to accomplish. When you look at the states around us and how their schools are doing, how their states are evolving and their economic growth, it seems like we are not keeping up. That is why I wondered if there was a study on the models of state government and how they function, and if biennial states fall behind.

I am from Las Vegas and I have kids, so this job is a huge commitment. But it is a job that if one is going to do it, one needs to do it correctly. Even going out of this Session, I realize that as soon as we end it, I will start the next session. I will start meeting with people and trying to understand different issues. It never stops. I agree there are too many BDRs and too many solutions to problems that are not out there. Maybe if given more time and people not feeling compelled to complete everything because of a 2-year gap, we could be more effective.

John Wagner (Independent American Party):

I do not support S.J.R. 8 of the 77th Session. Regarding the legislative days and working on the weekends, we know from experience that we can always

change or suspend the rules. This has been voted on before, and people voted no. I agree with Legislators getting paid for every day they work. I think they should have health insurance, too.

Ms. Clark:

I do not support S.J.R. 8 of the 77th Session. Chair Farley, you are the perfect example of a citizen Legislator. I know this is your first year, and this is a big change. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

Senator Segerblom:

Many constituents have no idea who we are and what we do. We have to think of ourselves as important. We are important. We are the third branch of government, yet we are not a coequal branch. We need to value ourselves as a legislature. As Senator Atkinson said, we are talking about 90 days out of 120 days. This system would give us some time to take breaks. If a committee meets on the weekend, that counts as a legislative day. The finance committees will meet every day from now until the end of this Session.

Chair Farley:

I close the hearing on S.J.R. 8 of the 77th Session and open public comment.

Jeffrey B. Klein (Chair, Subcommittee Concerning Legislative Issues, Nevada Commission on Aging; President & CEO, Nevada Senior Services):

I support S.B. 269 on today's agenda but not yet heard.

SENATE BILL 269: Establishes an interim study committee to research issues regarding the behavioral health and cognitive care of older persons.
(BDR S-1035)

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 11, 2015
Page 18

Chair Farley:

I will adjourn this meeting at 4:54 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Patricia Farley, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
A.B. 460	C	2	Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart	Number of Legislators and Length of Terms in Years
A.B. 460	D	2	Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart	States' Legislators, Population, and Population per Legislator
S.J.R. 8*	E	5	Senator Tick Segerblom	Senate Joint Resolution 8 Presentation
S.J.R. 8*	F	1	Juanita Clark/Charleston Neighborhood Preservation	Written Testimony in Opposition