

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session
March 29, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:04 a.m. on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, in Room 4100 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 www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel

Minutes ID: 625



Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Dylan Small, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Leonardo Benavides, Government Affairs Manager, City of North Las Vegas
Paula Luna, Operations Manager, Battle Born Progress
Jennifer Berthiaume, Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Association of Counties
Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs,
Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson
Charina de Asis, Director, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor

Chair Torres:

Good morning. [Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We are going to begin today with the bill hearing on Assembly Bill 266, and then we will proceed with our work session.

**Assembly Bill 266: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 20-120)**

For this hearing, we are going to have Vice Chair Duran take over. We will have a one minute recess. [The Committee recessed at 9:06 a.m. and reconvened at 9:07 a.m. Assemblywoman Duran assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Duran:

We will now resume with Assembly Bill 266, presented by our own Chair. This is a provision relating to governmental administration.

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

I proudly represent Assembly District 3 in Clark County. Thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 266, which relates to language access plans for local governments. With today being Latino Lobby Day at the Legislature, we are reminded that the fight for a more inclusive and representative government continues, the first step to ensuring all Nevadans, including those who are limited English proficient (LEP), are able to access services offered by local governments and participate more fully in our great community.

Just a couple of pieces of background information on A.B. 266 before we do the bill breakdown. Assembly Bill 266 builds on Senate Bill 318 of the 81st Session, which was enacted in 2021. The 2021 legislation in part required each agency in the Executive Branch of the state government to develop and biennially revise the language access plan that includes information related to existing services available to individuals with LEP and recommendations for meeting the need for such services among those served by that agency.

Assembly Bill 266 is now focusing on local governments, in other words, our cities and our counties.

The percentage of Nevadans who speak another language other than English at home is 29.9 percent. I could tell this Committee story after story of constituents expressing frustration because they did not know that local governments would be making changes to their parks or having large projects in their neighborhood solely because they could not read the information that was sent out to them. To use a specific example, recently in Las Vegas, there has been a lot of construction on Charleston Avenue. I know for those of you who live in Las Vegas, the amount of construction that is going on in downtown Las Vegas off of the Charleston Avenue and Main Street area is familiar to you. Many of those businesses and homeowners were notified and had the opportunity to participate in public meetings regarding those projects. Unfortunately, because many of them lack the ability to understand the information that was being sent to their homes, they were not able to participate in those government meetings and they had no idea such a project was even being considered. They were frustrated they were not able to participate.

In reality, this impacts local governments. This makes constituents frustrated, which means city council members are getting call after call of frustration from constituents who do not know why there is so much construction in front of their business, frustration over not knowing they had the opportunity to participate and were not able to because they did not understand the notice which was sent out to them.

I will apologize to the Committee because obviously the amendment [[Exhibit C](#) and [Exhibit D](#)] came very late yesterday, but I am going to go ahead and walk through the bill using the amendment today. Just to clarify the organization of the document, the amendment is on the left-hand side. The explanation on the right-hand side will cover the entire explanation of that section, including the amendment. That would cover the entire part of that.

[Reading from [Exhibit C](#).] Section 1 of the bill has conforming changes for *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 244, which impacts counties. You will notice that this bill is within two different sections. It is in Chapter 244 and then Chapter 268. Chapter 244 applies to counties, and Chapter 268 applies to cities. It is the exact same thing for counties and cities, except the counties are just in a different chapter of NRS. Section 2 requires that counties with a population of 100,000 or more ensure public notices, which are mailed out for planning commission meetings, be available in every language in which voting materials are provided. Currently this would apply to Clark County and Washoe County. We are looking to really clarify that the public notice will inform them where they can go on the website. We do not want local governments to have to fit four different languages on one public notice. It will say, "To read this in Spanish," and then the link so that individuals can access those documents, so there are not a million words on one single document. Additionally, it requires local governments to make good faith efforts to find translators. We also recognize that there are just not enough translators available. It outlines the requirements for the link as well.

Section 3 of this bill outlines the requirements for language access plans developed by local governments. Language access plans are currently required for state agencies. This expands that so it would now be applicable to local governments, so that they are planning for language. You will note with the amendment that there has been clarification that the board of county commissioners should submit the language access plan to the Governor's Office for New Americans (ONA) annually by August 1 of each even-numbered year—that should be biennially. I apologize, that is my error. It would be every two years, by August 1 of each even-numbered year. That plan would then go to ONA. The Office for New Americans will be responsible for making legislative recommendations.

Section 4 of the bill outlines the responsibilities of ONA in developing language access plans. Additionally, it creates a language access coordinator position. This would add one full-time employee to serve as a language access coordinator within ONA. They would provide oversight, central coordination, consultation, and technical assistance to state agencies, a board of county commissioners, and governing body of a city in their implementation of language access requirements under this chapter. They would provide all covered entities with a manual containing baseline policies and procedures for compliance and maintain a publicly available roster of language interpreters and translators in public contact positions in their languages spoken. They would help with the training of state agencies, the boards of county commissioners, and governing bodies of the city to effectively recruit and retain language interpreters and translators and support the recruitment and retention thereof. They will receive and investigate language access complaints against the agency. They will implement an annual budget and procurement strategy for expenses related to state language access, and they will provide local governments with demographics of constituents with LEP. You will note that the original bill as written required local governments to provide that data on their language access plan. In conversations with local governments, as well as with ONA, it became clear that it makes more sense for ONA to just disperse data that might be relevant to local governments. The local governments have expressed difficulty with accessing some of that data. Any way that ONA and local governments can work together to find that will be helpful.

Section 5 is conforming changes. First, Chapter 268, section 6, does this exact same thing as section 3 but applies it to cities. Section 7 does the exact same thing as section 2, but applies it for cities. Section 8 and section 9 are just conforming changes for Chapter 244. Now, I will go ahead and introduce Leonardo Benavides from the City of North Las Vegas.

Leonardo Benavides, Government Affairs Manager, City of North Las Vegas:

Thank you to Assemblywoman Torres for working with us on some of our concerns in regard to the timeline and making sure we are able to appropriately have everything translated in time as needed, and most importantly, trying to have more of a forward-thinking approach. Working with the state, there are certain data and demographics in the version that were not just easily accessible for us, but it makes sense if we are collaborating with the state to have that information, to have an understanding of who we have in these communities that need the services. What does that look like? Who is it that we did target, especially for our internal city services? What I have been working with her on in this language has

specifically been clarifying that and in regard to working with the local governments and ONA.

Secondly, working on the notice requirements. What we are focusing on is what the Assemblywoman has noticed. We are focusing more on the granular level as certain projects within a city or a neighborhood where people will get a notice and not fully understand what is happening there and may not come to a meeting because they do not understand what is happening a street over. That is the idea here, to be able to make sure that for planning commission meetings, people who are getting these notices have the ability to look up on the website and see in their preferred language what is coming. Then, when they come to the meeting, they will be able to participate and have access to the agenda, which will also be translated.

The City of North Las Vegas has committed to ensuring our multilingual communities have a say in the process. We have already taken steps to ensure that we have more access as we look for ways to support languages such as English and Tagalog at our planning commission meetings, as well as continue our outreach efforts in Spanish. We will soon look to open the Dolores Huerta Resource Center, which will offer community services and information in both English and Spanish as well. For us, A.B. 226 is a natural progression as we look to make sure that more of the community has access and is included in this planning process.

Vice Chair Duran:

Does anyone have questions?

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I received a lot of information that I had questions about prior to your presentation, and I appreciate it. One question I have is about section 6 of your amendment. You show it in red [[Exhibit D](#)]. When I am reading "The Office for New Americans shall collect and maintain demographic data on the residents of the State and provide such information to the cities of the State so that cities may tailor their services to meet the needs of the cities' residents," that statement is kind of confusing for me, because the state has to collect the information and then give it to the cities. I am wondering whether the constituents that you are really concerned about will provide this information to you because a lot of the citizens are undocumented and a lot of them would probably prefer to stay in the shadows, which we do not want, but we know that they do. Those citizens that this is directed towards, how do they really know that this is for their benefit?

Assemblywoman Torres:

There are a couple different things here. A lot of this demographic data is actually collected by the U.S. Census Bureau. There is a census that is done every five years that tracks very specific demographic data, a lot of it that has to do with language that is going to be tracked by that census every five years. Additionally, ONA already has access to certain data that would be relevant to this. Also, school boards and school districts have data because they know the number of students in their area that are coming as English language learners, identifying where we have those needs. I think that there are different areas where they have

that data. This is not adding or requiring the state to collect any more data than what we already have. It is really requesting that ONA help synthesize that data, which is specific to language access, and provide that data to the community.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I know the intention is to get the data from ONA, which will help each community, city, and county know what the prevailing second or perhaps primary languages are outside of English, so that they can target them. Is there a minimum percentage? How far down are you requesting that they go so they can tend to the needs of this citizenry?

Assemblywoman Torres:

That is a great question. Regarding what languages would be required, the language is required by the ballot. Those are already standards that we have in the NRS. Right now, in Clark County, that is going to require English, Spanish, Tagalog, and eventually Chinese. In Washoe County, that is going to be English and Spanish.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

So really, it is looking at what the ballots are based on, because we already have to do that where we should do that. It is just going to be following that pattern, whatever those numbers are.

Assemblywoman Torres:

Yes. As our community changes, as the state changes, then the languages local governments would be required to provide would change. Obviously, I expect that those changes would be over time. I do not think we are going to see a substantial change to 25 languages by next week, and if that is the case, we can have a conversation with this body. That might be a recommendation that would come out of ONA, but it would require a substantial amount of folks to be speaking that language as their native language.

Assemblyman DeLong:

Some of this language is very similar to a hearing we had yesterday in the Legislative Operations and Elections Committee about the Voting Rights Act (VRA) and the five-year census data, and the fact that the counties are tracking that data to determine compliance with the VRA and what language the ballots need to be in. That has got me thinking. The counties are already managing that to make sure that their ballots are in compliance with the Voting Rights Act, so why are we in this bill? Why do we need to use the ONA to do this data work if the counties are already tracking that data to determine which languages?

Assemblywoman Torres:

There is additional data that ONA might have access to that it can just share out, so it would just be very specific. Yes, I agree the counties have access to that data. We are recognizing that ONA specifically will have a coordinator that is responsible for language access. I think this is really just requiring any other information, any data points, any other things that have to do with language access. You will notice that in the original bill, on page 3—I know that it would also apply to section 6 of the bill as well—in section 3 of the bill, you will notice

that we originally required relevant demographics of persons residing in the county, the preferred language and literacy level of residents, the ability of residents to access services in the county, the number and percent of residents of the county who are indigenous, and the number and percent of residents in the county who are refugees. We recognize those data points might not be data points local governments have. Also, we recognize that ONA is in a unique position and, with the funding of a language access coordinator, would have access to data that local governments might not have. We are just requiring that data to be shared. Obviously, it is very broad in the amendments to any demographics or data that apply. That is intentional so that if there is information that ONA might have that local governments might not have or might not be looking at, they would provide that information.

Leonardo Benavides:

What we are looking at here is the intention of the bill. This is for the services that we as local governments are providing, aside from electoral services and for voting purposes. That is why we are working with ONA, getting that constant data and having an understanding of what our communities are looking like and what are the languages that are needed, not just for our planning commission but for our community outreach and other events.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Assemblywoman Torres, I will use your example of construction along Charleston Boulevard. Depending on where you are on Charleston Boulevard, specifically east of the U.S. Route 95, that is the border between the county and the City of Las Vegas. Being that there is construction on that border, who would be responsible in this case for sending out those notices, the city or the county?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I do not know that I necessarily have that information, but I will say that whoever is currently having the planning commission meetings, right? We get notices all the time in our mailboxes at our home. If you own a business, you would get them at your business address as well. They are notifying you of planning commission meetings, any type of changes that they are going to be doing in your community. This would require that those notices are available in whatever languages. It would be whatever is currently statutorily required. This has no impact on who is required to submit those notices. The only thing this is saying is that in those notices, they would be required to have them in other languages.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Mr. Benavides, is there anything currently in statute preventing North Las Vegas from doing this?

Leonardo Benavides:

No, there is nothing in statute, but I think this is something we are already working on striving towards. We are working on having more access and say in our planning commission meetings and our city council meetings. I think something like this is a step in the right direction. This is an aspirational goal. As Assemblywoman Torres mentioned earlier, there is not quite enough staff or certified translators going around yet. I think as we

start to identify what that looks like in each of our separate jurisdictions down south and up in northern Nevada, I think it is important to be able to further tailor those services. I think what is helpful here is, instead of just filing a report every year, we work with the state and ONA to make sure we have a good understanding of what that service is. I think this is a good first step in providing that, but the City of North Las Vegas has definitely been working towards some of that already.

Assemblywoman Torres:

The other thing I think it is important to notice is that there is nothing in statute right now that requires ONA to collaborate with local governments to create language access plans. If a city were to take it upon themselves to create a language access plan, they would not have the guidance of ONA. It is really beyond the resources of what ONA would be able to do right now, so this consolidates this. It also makes sure that it is consistent among municipalities and local governments to ensure that we are looking at the same type of plan. I think even more than that, it is requiring ONA to synthesize the information provided in these plans, present them to the Legislature, specifically to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs, and make legislative recommendations. Session after session, community members have expressed frustration with the lack of services available in their native languages, and frustration in their lack of ability to participate in government work. Nonetheless, we are not having a policy conversation about language access as a community. We have individual legislators who are carrying language access bills, but we do not have conversations about language access as a legislative body. I think this will help motivate and ensure we are having conversations about what that looks like because, regardless of an individual's native language at home, they are Nevadans, and we have a responsibility to represent them and to create policy that is going to positively impact them.

Vice Chair Duran:

Just a comment. Is it like streamlining, so everybody is on the same page, to where everybody is having the same type of language access throughout the cities, municipalities, and so on?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I think it is definitely opening up that dialogue so that we can do that. In some of the presentations that we heard in this Committee earlier this session, we learned about some of the great work that the City of Henderson is doing to make sure individuals have support and access to information in different languages. I have heard about some of the great work that the City of North Las Vegas is doing. I have heard some of the great work the City of Reno is doing to ensure their communities have access to information in their native languages. Nonetheless, I think that we need to be having that one conversation and synthesizing that and saying, This is some of the stuff and this should be the minimum, this should be the bar. This allows for us to have that one conversation and really figure out what our different governments and municipalities are doing well.

Leonardo Benavides:

I think that is why the data part here is so important. We do not know what we do not know. Perhaps many in these communities get these notices or see them posted, and maybe they do not fully understand what is going on or how it impacts them. Or maybe they show up to a council meeting and they are not able to follow clearly what is going on. I think setting this baseline to begin with helps with that process. It helps us understand who is out there and who needs these services. We are making sure that not only are they getting the notice but they are able to come to the council meeting and understand what is happening and how they can participate. As Assemblywoman Torres says, accessibility is important here, and setting this guideline across the state and understanding what the different needs are is what this bill brings forward that is very important.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Question: in section 4, when you say that you are creating a language access coordinator position, I want to know if a requirement will be for that coordinator to be versed in multiple languages.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I have faith that ONA will find somebody suitable to do that. I do not want to put into statute anything that requires any specific language to be spoken. I have faith that ONA will appropriately ensure that we have somebody who understands the needs of the communities they are serving. That could be somebody who possibly has more of an education or academic background or has worked in services providing information in other languages. I do not know that it is appropriate to put that requirement in statute.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I think the reason why I am asking this is because you can have a person who speaks English primarily and does not understand the different nuances as far as different languages. I was just concerned that if we are creating a position like that, maybe one of those requirements should be that they are at least multilingual.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I appreciate the feedback. I am happy to continue to take this conversation offline. I just want to make sure that it is consistent with what we have statutorily done in the past as well. I do have faith that ONA recognizes the need for language access, that probably they would find someone bilingual. That being said, there might be somebody who is a phenomenal candidate who is not. My mom taught English as a second language for many years—now called English language learners—at the community college, and my mom does not speak another language but was able to do the job well. I think it is important to note that somebody who might be very suitable for that position might have some background in diversity, equity, and inclusion. They might have a different type of background that makes them valuable in that position or when working with local governments, or they might speak a language that is not one of the required languages. I would be cautious to put something into statute that requires that of them, but I have faith that ONA would execute this, especially considering the requirements put into place with the amendment.

Vice Chair Duran:

Are they going to be certified translators or interpreters?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I think that is actually a conversation the language access coordinator could have with the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs, and here is why—local governments provide certified translators and there is a translation certificate that you can receive for medical. You can also receive a certified translator license for the courts. All that being said, you cannot be a certified translator in local governments. Those are very different things. We recognize the barriers to that. Something we might consider in the future as well is, where you can be a certified translator for local governments and local government information is a lot more accessible. It is usually more conversational than something that might be translated for the courts. As you all know, reading the bill is very different than a conversation or hearing that you might have. The information that would be translated within local governments is likely not going to be as elevated in language. I think that it is important for us to eventually have a conversation of what that translation process looks like.

Vice Chair Duran:

Next, we will hear testimony in support of A.B. 266. Any of those wishing to support the bill, please step forward.

Paula Luna, Operations Manager, Battle Born Progress:

We are testifying in support of A.B. 266. The 2020 census showed that nationally, Nevada is the third-most diverse state, fourth with the most Asian American Pacific Islander residents, and fifth with the most Latino residents. Language access is an essential step for inclusivity in our community. We all know the incredible diversity of our state, especially in counties with larger populations. Assembly Bill 266 ensures public notices are in languages our communities understand, so they are able to participate in meetings that severely impact their day-to-day lives. Sunshine laws mandate that government agencies must maintain transparency and disclose their activities to their constituents. However, our constituents are not able to participate and become aware of what their elected officials are doing on their behalf. We need to meet them where they are, and in this case, that means supporting A.B. 266.

Vice Chair Duran:

Anyone else? [There was no one.] We will now go to opposition of A.B. 266. [There was none.] Is there anyone in neutral for A.B. 266?

Jennifer Berthiaume, Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Association of Counties:

On behalf of our Nevada Association of Counties members, we are testifying neutral on A.B. 266. We would like to thank Chair Torres for engaging with counties and including us on the amendment.

**Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs,
Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:**

We are also neutral on A.B. 266. We are thankful to the sponsor for working with us and other local governments. With the amended language as presented, we are neutral. Earlier this year Clark County launched our new social media pages entirely dedicated to providing information in Spanish to increase the language access. Our Clark County public information officer leading these efforts has met with ONA, and we look forward to the partnership moving forward.

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson:

We are here today in neutral on the amendment to A.B. 266 as presented. The City of Henderson honors the growing diversity of the residents who call our community home. We recognize the need to provide information in languages other than English. We already have in place programs that provide translation services for those accessing city services and have undertaken efforts in our multiple departments to develop materials in several languages, including meeting all requirements related to voting materials. We thank Assemblywoman Torres for working with local governments to refine her proposal and take into consideration our suggestions on how to make language access requirements workable and effective for everyone.

Charina de Asis, Director, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor:

I am testifying in neutral on A.B. 266. Our immigrant and refugee populations are approximately 20 percent of our population. According to the latest census, almost half—about 46.3 percent—speak English less than very well, or as we call them, limited English proficient. From 2000 to 2021 there was a 59.1 percent increase of those who are LEP in our state. Language access is critical to the population that ONA serves. It enables connection and communication with our LEP Nevadans, whether it is to apply or receive services or relay critical information during emergencies or avoid undesirable impacts on public safety. A robust language access plan by government agencies with efforts to implement it will reduce costs, and staff will not be spending time correcting miscommunication errors. It will increase agency efficiency and improve responses during emergency and disaster preparedness and help LEP Nevadans access government services.

Additionally, a report by the Migration Policy Institute outlined that successful language access programs across the U.S. had a few things in common. One is agency oversight or at advisory councils or technical assistance or all four; accountability mechanisms; data systems and population tracking; community involvement; and financial resources. According to the report, language access programs should have all of these to be successful.

Vice Chair Duran:

Is there anyone else in neutral for A.B. 266. [There was no one.] We will invite Assemblywoman Torres back up for any closing comments.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I would like to just remind the Committee that I took a lot of time to meet with stakeholders, to hear their concerns and to make sure we were able to get them in a place where they felt the bill allowed for them to start with this process of improving language access. It also just made sense for local governments and how local governments work. I really appreciate the stakeholders for coming to the table and presenting amendments and making recommendations. I look forward to continuing this work. I have had conversations up until two minutes before the hearing about this bill about how we can strengthen it and make it most effective for the state of Nevada.

Ultimately, what I think is most important is to recognize that here in the Nevada State Legislature, we are not representatives for just the people who vote for us. We represent every single person who lives in this state. Every Nevadan deserves access to participate in government. Every Nevadan is welcome to come to this table to testify in support of legislation, to voice their concerns. Every Nevadan should be able to speak to the local government about a change that is in their backyard because of the property that they own, because you are not required to be a citizen to own a property in the state. You are not required to speak English in order to own property in the state. I think it is really critical that we are having a conversation about how we make government accessible and how we ensure that every voice, every constituent, is able to participate in the democratic process.

Vice Chair Duran:

One minute recess. [The Committee recessed at 9:44 a.m. The Committee reconvened at 9:44 a.m. Assemblywoman Torres reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Torres:

At this time, we will go ahead and close the hearing on A.B. 266. We do have two bills under consideration for work session today. We will start today with Assembly Bill 143.

Assembly Bill 143: Revises provisions governing counties. (BDR 20-460)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 143 authorizes a board of county commissioners to convey, without consideration and without complying with certain requirements in existing law, real property that the county acquired directly from the federal government for the purpose of clearing title to the property. The real property must be conveyed, as prescribed, to the person or persons, as applicable, who have an interest in the property. The measure exempts such a conveyance from the provisions that generally apply to the sale or lease of property by the board of county commissioners and the real property transfer tax [[Exhibit E](#)].

There are three amendments for consideration. One is attached in the work session document and was from Washoe County, which is to delete section 6 of the bill, thereby defaulting to an effective date of October 1, 2023, for the bill. The second amendment is to add a provision to sunset the bill on June 30, 2025. The third amendment is to add a requirement that the county recorder of any county completing a transfer of real property under the

provisions of A.B. 143 submit a report to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs on or before June 30, 2024, including, without limitation, the number of such transfers initiated and completed.

Assemblyman Gurr:

Not having seen the amendment beforehand, I need an explanation of why we sunset in 2025.

Chair Torres:

I think we had a conversation about sunseting this during the bill hearing. It was because there was something in statute that was very similar that had to do with the transfer of real property that had passed. We were looking at that, and we recognized that there is already a place in statute where that exists. The sunset is so that we can have that conversation and come back and see if we need to extend it; to see whether or not it was effective or if it was not, because when it had passed previously, it was not. I believe it was never used.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I will just add a little bit of detail. There was a provision in statute that was related to some land transfers in Nye County that never occurred. I believe testimony said that was a cumbersome and maybe even unrealistic process. This one seems more streamlined and more able to be implemented. Let us see which one works, and then we can revisit it during the interim.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Are these three amendments friendly amendments to the sponsor? Let the record show the sponsor nodded in the affirmative.

Chair Torres:

At this time, we will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 143.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 143.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman O'Neill. We will go ahead and carry on with Assembly Bill 172.

Assembly Bill 172: Revises provisions governing collective bargaining for local government employees. (BDR 23-700)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 172 requires each local government employer to semiannually provide each employee organization recognized by the local government employer certain information

relating to each employee of the bargaining unit represented by the employee organization. Such information as written and introduced in the bill must include the address, telephone number, work contact information, and work location [\[Exhibit F\]](#). However, there is an attached amendment from the bill sponsor in the work session document that adds the name and email address to section 1 as two pieces of information that need to be provided. Hopefully, the Committee has seen the amendment.

Chair Torres:

I will add I had the opportunity to speak with Clark County. I do not believe Ms. Jacobs was able to make it. I know that they had a conflicting meeting, but Clark County has expressed with the amendment that they are neutral. Members, any questions?

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Since I had an objection on the record, I want to make a clarification that I do agree with the third item on the amendment.

Chair Torres:

Are there any additional questions or remarks? [There were none.] [\[Exhibit G\]](#) and [\[Exhibit H\]](#) were submitted but not discussed.]

I will entertain a motion on Assembly Bill 172.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 172.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DELONG, GURR,
HIBBETTS, KOENIG, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Anderson.

Chair Torres:

At this time, we will go ahead and invite anyone wishing to speak in public comment.
[Public comment was given.] At this time, we will adjourn [at 9:53 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Dylan Small
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 266](#), dated March 29, 2022, submitted by Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 266](#), dated March 29, 2023, submitted by Leonardo Benavides, Government Affairs Manager, City of North Las Vegas.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 143](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 172](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated March 27, 2023, submitted by Justin Norton, President, Washoe County Employees Association, in support of [Assembly Bill 172](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter from Nevada Classified School Employee and Public Workers Association, submitted by Ann Kee, President, and Louie Trio, Vice President, Nevada Classified School Employees Association, in support of [Assembly Bill 172](#).