

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

**Eighty-First Session
May 11, 2021**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 4:08 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, Online and in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman Andy Matthews
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11
Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst
Kathleen M. Norris, Committee Counsel
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager
Jordan Green, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

Chair Miller:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We were planning to start with a work session, but that will be moved until we have all our members present. We have two bills on the agenda. Today we will be hearing Senate Bill 268 and Senate Joint Resolution 6. Do we have our bill sponsors here? [There was no one.]

We will go into a five-minute recess [at 4:10 p.m.].

I will call the meeting back to order [at 4:15 p.m.].

Again, we have two bill hearings this evening. The first one is Senate Bill 268, presented by Senator Harris. It revises provisions relating to state financial administration. I will open the hearing on S.B. 268.

**Senate Bill 268: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration.
(BDR 17-545)**

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11:

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to present Senate Bill 268, a bill relating to state financial administration, which will allow us to test the strength of the state budget against a series of economic conditions.

Before going over the specifics of S.B. 268, I would like to explain briefly why I believe it is important for us to pass this bill. Following the 2008 financial crisis and during the ensuing Great Recession, the U.S. Congress imposed regulations addressing the viability of the nation's financial industry [Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Public Law 111-203, July 21, 2010, 124 Stat. 1376]. This included what are known as "stress tests" on the banking industry. Private financial firms, such as Moody's Analytics, have since been conducting budget stress tests in various states.

Starting in 2015, Utah began financial stress testing for its own state budgets, and by 2017, included this practice in state law [*Utah Code Annotated*, subsection 36-12-13(2)(e)]. The state of Minnesota was also an early adopter of budget stress testing [*Minnesota Statutes*, section 16A.152, subdivision 8], and in 2019, the states of Montana and Nebraska passed laws requiring their fiscal analysis offices to stress test the annual budget [House Bill 715 of the 66th Montana Legislature; *Nebraska Revised Statutes*, section 50-419.02]. Several other states and numerous local jurisdictions across the country have also conducted budget stress testing for various components of their budgets.

What is the purpose of a budget stress test? According to The Pew Charitable Trusts ["Budget Stress Testing Helps States Prepare for Fiscal Distress," April 9, 2020]:

Budget stress tests help states estimate the potential financial shortfalls that could result from adverse events—a dramatic economic downturn, for example, or an outbreak of illness, such as the one caused by the novel coronavirus. Policymakers can use this data to plan ahead, helping to avert or limit a fiscal emergency and keep long-term priorities on track.

Essentially, fiscal experts apply various financial scenarios against existing and predicted revenues and expenditures that could replicate a recession, for example, or other events that could impact state finances. This practice can inform our actions as legislators and help us set targets for how much money our state may have to cover unanticipated revenue shortfalls or predict more favorable outcomes. A budget stress test can help us evaluate various tax and spending decisions, set reserve goals, consider our dependence on particularly volatile revenue streams, and ensure our critical state programs are funded adequately. With this background, you can see how important S.B. 268 can be for the state of Nevada.

The bill is very simple and straightforward. In short, the measure requires the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), Fiscal Analysis Division, to the extent resources are available, to perform a budget stress test in each even-numbered year comparing the estimated future revenue to, and the estimated future expenditure from, the major funds in the State Treasury under various potential economic conditions. A report regarding the results of the test must be posted on the Legislature's website and submitted to the Governor and the Legislature. The bill language is intentionally broad so our Fiscal staff can conduct this test using various methodologies and scenarios. From this budget stress test, legislators should be more informed when making critical policy and funding decisions that impact our many state programs.

Thank you very much for hearing S.B. 268. Also present today is Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB. As LCB staff, he is unable to advocate for or against the passage of legislation, but he is here to say a few words and can help answer questions you may have concerning the budget stress test process. Of course, I am happy to answer any questions you may have as well. Mr. Thorley will just be answering questions if appropriate. I submit myself to the Committee for any questions.

Chair Miller:

We will address questions to you directly, and you can let us know when you would like to defer that question to Mr. Thorley.

Senator Harris:

I would like to defer all the questions to Mr. Thorley.

Chair Miller:

Fair enough. Committee members, do we have any questions?

Assemblyman Matthews:

I know this is not a money committee, and I know the Chair

Chair Miller:

The Chair is going to stop you right now. Will you please redirect your question in the form of a policy focus?

Assemblyman Matthews:

I was going to preemptively say that I will try to phrase this in a way that does not get to the money aspect of it. I am trying to get a sense of what kind of a lift this will be in the workload that this would put on the Fiscal Analysis Division, with an eye toward making sure we have the personnel to do this.

Senator Harris:

I drafted this legislation in concert with the Fiscal Analysis Division. As I mentioned in my opening testimony, we kept it very broad in order to give our staff some time to figure out what the best tool is and if they need to possibly purchase something, to work with other fiscal staff in some of the states that I mentioned are already doing this, and to develop what would be a best practice.

I also took into consideration time constraints. As we know, our Fiscal staff turns right around; right after we are done here, they are working on the next biennium. I want to make sure that they have time to do this and to give them the legs they need to figure out the best way to do it with the resources available.

Assemblyman Matthews:

Just to be clear, this concept makes a lot of sense to me. It certainly seems like something the state ought to be doing. My last question would be: Is there anything that is currently being done that approaches the intent of this? Is there anything somewhat comparable that this would be replacing or supplementing, or are we starting from square one on this?

Senator Harris:

I will let Mr. Thorley correct me if I am wrong, but I will take a shot at it. We have the Economic Forum, and a lot of our budgeting and forecasting is done through the Economic Forum. It is not my understanding that they conduct what is considered a stress test; that is

not currently in their function. This would not be supplanting anything that is currently done. It would be a new analysis done by our Fiscal Analysis Division, and I would imagine, in conjunction with the Office of the Governor, Office of Finance, as well.

Assemblywoman González:

It says, "To the extent of available resources" [section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (f)]. Are we mandating that they do this, or are we saying they do whatever they can do? What does that mean?

Senator Harris:

We are mandating that they do it if they can.

Chair Miller:

Is that the legal terminology?

Senator Harris:

Yes.

Chair Miller:

Are there additional questions?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Is there such a thing as an abbreviated budget stress test they could do if they did not have the resources to do an in-depth test? Would they do a little bit less involved one that would be helpful?

Senator Harris:

It is my intention that the Fiscal Analysis Division staff take a look at what the best practices are, take a look at what their current capabilities are, and put their best foot forward at doing something new.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

We do have the Economic Forum that meets in December and May, and its reports are brought back to this legislative body. What would happen if the stress test came up with an opposing conclusion than the Economic Forum? Where would we be then?

Senator Harris:

I will take my best shot at this and, again, Mr. Thorley, please save me if I mess it up. It is my understanding that the stress test will not necessarily predict our revenues and expenditures. That will still be done during the Economic Forum. You will not see competing numbers coming from the stress test. What it is designed to do is be an additional piece of information for our Fiscal staff, for the finance committees, and possibly for the Interim Finance Committee, to take into consideration as they look at budgeting decisions moving forward.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

As a follow-up, I know this is not a money committee; however, if this bill were to pass, we know that our Fiscal staff is, as you said in your presentation, stretched thin. We may have to add personnel to accommodate this.

Chair Miller:

This is not a money committee, so I am glad you appreciate that.

Senator Harris:

I am sure the Fiscal staff would welcome additional staff with or without the passage of this bill, but we will set that for another day.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for your advocacy, Senator. I have a few questions. In the bill, you have the budget stress test each even-numbered year. You mentioned earlier that other states do this. Do other states do this with the same frequency?

Senator Harris:

I am going to take a guess that they do not only because not all states budget in the biennium like we do. That is where the frequency comes from in this bill. I do not want to speak out of turn, but I believe the Utah Legislature does it as often as its budgeting cycle occurs.

Chair Miller:

That is what I was implying; we know that 46 states are annual. Do they actually do it with the frequency of whenever they are doing their budget, whether it is annual or biennial?

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

The Utah Legislature Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst does the budget stress test every three years. It is not an exercise that you gain a lot by doing it annually, for example. It is intended for long-term planning purposes and policy discussions related to that.

Chair Miller:

Mr. Thorley, in your opinion and professional expertise, would you say then that because it is something meant for long-term planning, it would not necessarily have to occur every biennium but maybe, like all long-term strategic plans, at five- or ten-year increments?

Wayne Thorley:

I would prefer the Senator answer that. I can tell you in working with Senator Harris on the language of the bill, our recommendation coming out of the Fiscal Analysis Division was every other year simply because we are not in session every other year. Obviously, in session years, Fiscal staff is very busy doing other things. The idea behind the every-other-year language in the even-numbered years was to sync it up in non-session years.

Chair Miller:

My next question may be for the Senator or possibly legal counsel. When I am looking at lists of recommendations and duplication of efforts and such, I would imagine that some of the recommendations could include eliminating certain departments, combining certain departments and agencies, and certain efforts like that. That is what my assumption is.

Senator Harris:

I envision seeing recommendations such as, "Maybe we need to increase our reserve percentage because something could be coming down the line. We stress tested it, and we would not be sufficiently capitalized under that particular scenario, which has a certain percentage chance of happening." They would not be making recommendations that I would consider policy recommendations.

Chair Miller:

When we are talking about programming and the structure of government, there is often a fiscal impact. If there is a duplication of services and that is something they are looking at fiscally, I am just wondering if—but you are saying that you are focused on just fiscally. I am also trying to distinguish between what we just mentioned that already occurs every time with the Economic Forum. I am trying to see the separation.

Senator Harris:

Just like the Economic Forum does not necessarily make recommendations about which programs to cut, it just tells us what dollars we have; I would imagine this would be something similar. Our Fiscal staff is really great at leaving those types of policy decisions to us at the Legislature. I do not see them changing and encroaching on that. Although they may offer suggestions about what services we may see an increase in, it would be up to us as to how to address that on that granular level.

Chair Miller:

In the states that do this, are the stress tests done internally? If we are asking legislative staff to do this, would it be for the entire scope of all three branches, just one particular branch, or within our own branch? Then, of course, is there any conflict with that? Maybe legal counsel can address this if necessary.

Senator Harris:

I can state that in Utah the legislative fiscal staff handles the stress test. Of course, if we need Committee Counsel to respond, I am sure she is more versed than I am, but I do not think that we necessarily have a separation of powers issue given that it is the Legislature's job to pass the budget every other year.

Chair Miller:

I have one final question. I am not a fiscal person, but when you say "stress tests," I know there are accreditations, programs, and processes. Would there be a nationally recognized process or a set of good practices or something that would be followed? Or would it be, "OK, Fiscal, just go at it and tell us what you think"?

Senator Harris:

What I imagine is actually going to happen in practice is that our Fiscal staff is going to put some feelers out to their colleagues in other states. I know that Mr. Thorley has already had some discussions with his counterparts in Utah, for example. Maybe they will go to the National Conference of State Legislatures and look at the best practices and bring that back to our state. The bill is not so prescriptive as to require any one methodology. Again, that is done to allow our staff to figure out what works best for us here in Nevada. I am fairly confident in their abilities to find something that will do us proud.

Chair Miller:

Are there any additional questions?

Assemblyman Frierson:

I had to step out briefly; I apologize if you addressed this. I ask this question online or offline with almost every policy: Is there something that we are fixing, or is there some need that we have not had that is exemplified that this would correct?

Senator Harris:

I can be honest. The answer is absolutely no. Nevada is one of the best fiscal states when it comes to practices out there. This would just make us a bit better.

Chair Miller:

That concludes our questions. I will open testimony for S.B. 268. It does not look like there is anyone in the room to testify in support. Is there anyone on the line who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] I will open testimony in opposition. There is no one in the room. Is there anyone on the line who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the room who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Do we have anyone on the line who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close testimony for S.B. 268. Senator Harris, would you like to make any final remarks?

Senator Harris:

I just want to thank you for taking the time to hear this bill and reiterate how great our Fiscal staff is here. I think this will be another tool in the toolbox to make sure that we are prepared for whatever may come in the future.

Chair Miller:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 286. I will open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 6, which is being presented by Senator Spearman and expresses support for the creation of a retirement plan for spouses of members of the military.

Senate Joint Resolution 6: Expresses support for the creation of a retirement plan for spouses of members of the military. (BDR R-384)

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1:

The measure before you today, Senate Joint Resolution 6, calls on the federal government to address the issue of military spouses' loss of retirement benefits due to frequent relocations. This resolution is simple and yet incredibly important. The men and women of the United States military and their families give selflessly of themselves in the service to this nation. It is therefore incumbent upon the federal government to do all that it can to support those individuals.

This past summer, the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults With Special Needs heard testimony from two military spouses of service members in Nevada. These spouses are professionals in their own industries and shared their stories, their experiences, and the employment challenges of the spouses of service members. According to data from the U.S. Department of Defense, there are more than 630,000 military spouses in the United States and 5,415 active duty spouses in Nevada. Compared to civilians, military spouses—who are 93 percent female—are ten times more likely than other workers to have moved to a new state in the last year due to military relocation. As a result of these frequent moves associated with military life, military spouses earn significantly less when they work compared to their civilian counterparts. However, they are often more formally educated than their civilian colleagues. The barrier is the ability to get a job and leverage the expertise they have developed through training and education. According to data from a survey by Blue Star Families, 35 percent of military spouses work in a licensed occupation; 30 percent are unemployed; and 56 percent are underemployed.

Unfortunately, our military spouses face two choices: one, family separation if they choose to remain in their current employment; or two, keep the family intact by moving but possibly incurring job loss. The issues of military spouse unemployment and underemployment affect household incomes, long-term financial stability, and personal fulfillment and wellness. While two-thirds of American families have two incomes, less than half of the military couples do; however, depending on the service member's rank, many military families require a dual income. Currently, a private first class, and that is an E-3 in the military with less than two years of service, makes \$2,104 a month—let that set in—while the average rent in North Las Vegas is \$1,212 a month. The employment situation of military spouses has been a priority for the U.S. Department of Defense for several years. The Department of Defense understands that a spouse's employment situation severely impacts military readiness since many service members leave the military because of their spouse's inability to work.

As someone who has served, I believe families are the ones who make the greatest sacrifices. I often say, "When we serve, our families serve." They sacrifice their time by placing their lives on hold, they sacrifice their careers, and most importantly, they sacrifice their loved ones for the safety of our country. When we deploy overseas, our minds are consumed with completing the mission at hand, but for those who stay behind, their minds are consumed

with the unknown. For those reasons and others, S.J.R. 6 urges the federal government to create and implement a retirement plan that addresses the loss of retirement benefits for spouses of military service members due to frequent relocations that is funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

The anxiety that military families experience is also exacerbated by those who have seen their spouse through multiple deployments in and out of Iraq, in and out of Afghanistan, and—even if they were not going directly to a combat zone—many people have deployed in support of other operations around the world that support these war efforts. I believe it is time for us to stop saying, "I appreciate your service," if we are not willing to stand up and tangibly express that gratitude.

This is an important bill that can positively impact the lives of our military families. Thank you for your consideration and support of Senate Joint Resolution 6. This concludes my testimony. I will stand for any questions at this time.

Chair Miller:

Thank you, Senator. Our first question will come from Vice Chair Jauregui.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Are spouses not entitled to their spouses' retirement right now if they are married to an active military member or veteran?

Senator Spearman:

I am really glad you asked that question because it gives me an opportunity to highlight some of the things that happen. This bill is not "instead of" the spouse's employment. For example, if someone is a social worker and were to stay in one location, he or she can probably buy into or accrue enough years so that when he or she retires after 20 years, 15 years, or whatever it is, the person has his or her separate retirement. Military spouses, because they are always on the move, never have a chance to do that. If that spouse is a teacher, the same thing happens. They are moving so much that they never have the opportunity to get vested.

One of the very unfortunate things that happens—all too often in my opinion—is when military spouses will serve with the military member and either just before the member retires or right at the time the member is going to retire, there is a divorce. As a pastor, I have counselled with women—I am sure there might be some men but mostly women—who have had to try to figure out what in the world they were going to do now because the military member had divorced them and remarried, and the former spouse is not entitled to any of the military member's retirement benefits.

What this really does is say to those who are professionals, who move around with their spouse, that they will have an opportunity to work in their profession, and they will also have an opportunity to get vested in a retirement plan of their own, independent of their spouse's military employment, or not for lack thereof. That is why this bill is urging the federal

government to set up this plan; I do not believe that it would work state by state. I know we have had several conversations in this body, particularly as it relates to teachers and other public service employees. This is the way that I believe we can make sure that those military spouses have their own retirement. Besides that, I talked about self-fulfillment. It is not instead of the retirement that they would get from the military service members, but it is in addition to.

Chair Miller:

Committee members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] Senator, I have a few questions. Following what Vice Chair Jauregui was saying, we know that when it comes to IRAs, spouses are able to contribute \$6,000 a year on behalf of their nonworking spouse, \$7,000 if you are over a certain age. Is this something that you would envision happening? Because that mechanism is already in place, would it be a contribution like that or an actual military retirement in their name?

Senator Spearman:

It would actually be a military retirement in their name. I can put it as succinctly as this: for couples who are not in the military—if they are in professions, one is a doctor and the other is a nurse—they have an opportunity to do just what you asked me. In addition to whatever retirement they are getting in their professions, they have an opportunity to do that. If you are a military spouse, you do not have that opportunity because you are bouncing around the world supporting your spouse who is deployed to several different places and at several different times. I do not think an IRA or using what is already available solves the problem. I do not think that you should give up the opportunity to get vested and have your own retirement to work in your profession just because you are trying to support the military member.

If I might add this: for 28 percent of the service members who are asked about reenlistment, it is important to them and their reenlistment hinges on whether or not their spouse can work in their chosen profession. Imagine you are a teacher, and you are married to someone in the military. The service member is getting ready to be reassigned to Frankfurt, Germany. Your choice, if you are not vested as a teacher here in Clark County, is to pick up and leave, go to Frankfurt, and maybe you can find a job over there with one of the Department of Defense schools, maybe not. Or, you are here in Clark County, and your spouse is reassigned to MacDill Air Force Base in Florida. You go to Florida, and there is no way you are going to be able to start at the same tenure that you had in Clark County. I just think that is patently unfair. These are the people who are supporting us when we are deployed. To deny them an opportunity to have a retirement of their own, in their own profession—denying them that when those who are in civilian households have that is unfair. There is never a question of that in a civilian household because, most of the time, both parties will decide if one goes somewhere for a promotion, what will that do to the other's profession? In the military, that is not an option.

Chair Miller:

My next question is going in another direction. I am trying to get a global picture of this when it comes to resolutions that we are sending to Congress. I see there is a study in the recommendations. Are there any bills right now that have been introduced in Congress that are somewhere in the U.S. House of Representatives or U.S. Senate that have not moved or have been introduced, or is this preemptive to encourage bills? Also, do you have any idea how many other states—if there are other states—have also sent similar resolutions?

Senator Spearman:

I am not aware of other states that have sent a resolution. This particular resolution comes at the behest of the military spouses who testified before us in the 2019-2020 Interim in our Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults With Special Needs. This is something that they suggested. They said that right now, "We do not have an opportunity to do that." I have talked with each member of our congressional delegation, though, and let them know that S.J.R. 6 is making its way through this body. Indeed, I sent a copy of the bill to their assistants to say, once it passes, I really would appreciate introducing a bill, whether it is in the U.S. House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate, but we have to get started with this.

As I said before, I know that every time I left the states—there were a couple of times that I left, and I could not even tell my family where I was going. That is a horrible position to be put in, but family members do it because they support us. For those who have been deployed multiple times and during the last 20 years, even if you were not deployed overseas—many times you might have moved from Fort Hood in Texas to Fort Lewis or Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington—there are a number of different places. As the spouses pick up and move, they lose whatever tenure they have.

As I said before, whenever people find out that I am a veteran, they always say, "Thank you for your service." I say thank you, and I say to other veterans, "Thank you for your service." It is a lot easier to say that than it is for us to do something that tangibly represents our gratitude. This is one of the ways that I think we can do that. The spouses support us when we are deployed, and I believe putting this in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act shows the spouses that we appreciate their service too.

Chair Miller:

Are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I will open testimony for S.J.R. 6. Is there anyone in the room who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the lines who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in the room who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the lines who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] There is no one in the room who would like to testify in neutral. Is there anyone on the line who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close testimony on S.J.R. 6. Senator Spearman, would you like to make any final remarks?

Senator Spearman:

I would urge you all to support this resolution. Military spouses are the wind beneath our wings. We could not do what we do were it not for their support. This is a tangible way that we can say to them, "Thank you for your service." Thank you so much.

Chair Miller:

Thank you, Senator. I will close the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 6. The next item on our agenda, and now that we have all members present, is our work session. I know that we have three bills to work session today. The first one will be Assembly Bill 441.

Assembly Bill 441: Revises provisions governing legislators. (BDR 17-922)

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

As an employee of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, I cannot advocate for or against any legislation. I am just here to walk the Committee through the Work Session Document [[Exhibit C](#)].

Assembly Bill 441 was introduced by Assemblyman Frierson. We heard the bill on April 22, 2021. The measure provides that when a legislative vacancy occurs after the general election, but before the regular session is convened, the caucus leader of the house and party of which that legislator was a member may allocate all, some, or none of the former legislator's allocated requests for bill draft requests (BDRs). The measure establishes deadlines for submitting the BDRs and for providing the details needed to draft the legislation. Requests allocated to other legislators are not counted against that legislator's existing BDR limits. Any such requests sent to committees must be approved by a majority of the members of the committee prior to submittal for drafting. Further, a legislator appointed to fill a vacancy is authorized to solicit or accept contributions from other legislators or from an organization whose primary purpose is to support legislators of a particular party or house. The contribution amount that may be accepted must not exceed \$10,000 for a regular session or \$1,200 for a special session. Limits are placed on how that money may be spent, and conditions are specified for the disposal of unspent contributions.

There were no amendments submitted for the bill.

Chair Miller:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 441.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 441.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN, LEAVITT,
MATTHEWS AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

I would like to assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno. We will move on to Senate Bill 84.

Senate Bill 84: Increases the maximum number of voters in an election precinct. (BDR 24-532)

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Mr. Sturm read from the Work Session Document, [Exhibit D](#).] Senate Bill 84 increases the maximum numbers of voters in an election precinct. The measure was submitted to the Legislature on behalf of the Committee to Conduct an Interim Study of the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting in the State of Nevada. This Committee heard the bill on April 27, 2021.

Senate Bill 84 increases the maximum size of an election precinct from 3,000 registered voters to 5,000. There were no amendments proposed for the bill.

Chair Miller:

Committee members, do we have any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 84.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 84.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any comments or questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman González. Next, we will move on to Senate Joint Resolution 7.

Senate Joint Resolution 7: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to remove the constitutional provisions governing the election and duties of the Board of Regents of the State University and to authorize the Legislature to provide by statute for the governance of the State University and for the auditing of public institutions of higher education in this State. (BDR C-944)

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Mr. Sturm read from the Work Session Document, [Exhibit E](#).] Senate Joint Resolution 7 proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to remove the constitutional provisions governing the election and duties of the Board of Regents of the State University and

to authorize the Legislature to provide by statute for the governance of the State University and for the auditing of public institutions of higher education in this state. The measure was heard on April 29, 2021, and it was sponsored by Senator Dondero Loop and Assemblyman Roberts.

Again, Senate Joint Resolution 7 proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to remove the constitutional provisions governing the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada. The Legislature shall provide by law for the governance of the State University and the establishment of its various departments. In addition, the resolution stipulates that proceeds of public lands donated for the support of the institution shall be invested by the state of Nevada as required by law.

There are no amendments for consideration at this time.

As a special note, if this resolution is passed by the 2021 Legislature, it must also be passed in identical form by the next Legislature and then be approved and ratified by the voters in an election before the proposed amendments to the *Nevada Constitution* become effective.

Chair Miller:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Joint Resolution 7.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN, MATTHEWS
AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Vice Chair Jauregui. We are rolling the other item to our next work session on Thursday.

**Assembly Bill 443: Revises the interim committee structure of the Legislature.
(BDR 17-1045)**

[Assembly Bill 443 was not considered. Exhibit F was submitted relating to A.B. 443 but was not discussed and is included as part of the record.]

With that, we are finished with our work session items. The last item on our agenda today is public comment. [There was no one.] We will give people a few moments because we know that depending on how they are viewing, they may be a minute behind. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] I will close public comment. We have finished our agenda items for the day. We will meet again this Thursday at 4 o'clock on May 13. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:04 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Green
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 441, submitted and presented by Pepper Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Committee and Policy Research Services, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 84, submitted and presented by Pepper Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Committee and Policy Research Services, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Joint Resolution 7, submitted and presented by Pepper Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Committee and Policy Research Services, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 443, submitted by Pepper Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst, Committee and Policy Research Services, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.