

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

**Eighty-Second Session  
March 16, 2023**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Michelle Gorelow at 4:04 p.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2023, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Chair  
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Rich DeLong  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None.

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst  
Shuruk Ismail, Committee Manager  
Kristi Howard, Committee Secretary  
Garrett Kingen, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Terry J. Reynolds, Director, Department of Business and Industry

Todd Park, Chief Transportation Inspector, Nevada Transportation Authority,  
Department of Business and Industry

Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada

Kimberly Maxson-Rushton, Executive Director, Livery Operators Association of  
Las Vegas

**Chair Gorelow:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we will hear Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3, Assembly Bill 243, and one bill draft request (BDR). We will hear the BDR first.

**BDR R-387**—Expresses support for the Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan. (Later introduced as [Assembly Concurrent Resolution 5](#).)

I will entertain a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request R-387.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MOVED FOR COMMITTEE  
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST R-387.

ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3.

**Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3: Directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure to conduct a study of the laws administered by the Nevada Transportation Authority and the Taxicab Authority. (BDR R-897)**

**Terry J. Reynolds, Director, Department of Business and Industry:**

With me is Mr. Perry Faigin, Interim Deputy Director, Department of Business and Industry, who will assist me. As an opening statement, I would like to introduce background on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3 to let you know how we got to this place. Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3 is the product of the discussion with the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission reviewing the two agencies of Business and Industry: the Taxicab Authority and the Nevada Transportation Authority. For the past several administrations and legislative sessions, there have been discussions regarding consolidation of these two agencies. The agencies perform some of the same basic administrative functions, but are very different in their approach and the industries they regulate. During the Sunset

Subcommittee testimony, we recommended that the Legislature consider an interim study, A.C.R. 3, to review the laws and regulations that were enacted over 50 years ago under the Motor Carriers statutes to govern these two regulatory agencies.

The basic mission of providing clean, reliable, on-demand public transportation has not changed, but the industry and the methods of delivery have with the advent of new forms of transportation such as transportation network companies (TNCs) and autonomous vehicles now operating in our industry. Our laws and regulations have not kept up with the industry on the public expectations of service. This industry is vital to our tourism, entertainment, and gaming industry and should be modernized to meet the needs of our growing state and traveling public. With that introduction, I would like to go through and give an overview of each agency and discuss some of the issues we face with them.

The first slide [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)] is the jurisdiction and authority of both the Taxicab Authority (TA) and Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA). I am not going to go through each one of these, but I will summarize to leave more time for questions. The TA and the NTA are created and powered by statutes under NRS Chapter 706 of the Motor Carriers section of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The NTA enforces NRS Chapter 706A, Transportation Network Companies, and NRS Chapter 706B, which governs autonomous vehicles. The Motor Carriers section of NRS is approximately 80 pages. It dates back to 1971 and has amendments through it up until 2017. The NTA oversees several license types but most pertinent is, they regulate every Nevada taxicab outside of Clark County and every transportation network company, such as Uber and Lyft, driver in the state [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)].

The Taxi Authority regulates the taxicabs of Clark County and has concurrent jurisdiction over transportation network companies in a limited circumstance under NRS Chapter 706A.280, and I will go into why that is the case. The Nevada Transportation Authority's authority is broader than the Taxi Authority's. It has police power, with additional statutes expressed as outlined under NRS Chapter 289. Neither the TA nor the NTA peace officers are considered law enforcement officers. Under NRS Chapter 179B.070 they are compliance enforcement officers limited to enforcing NRS Chapter 706, NRS Chapter 706A, and NRS Chapter 706B.

The Motor Carriers statutes and regulations were initially added in 1971 and the TNC was authorized under NRS Chapter 706A.280. Its regulations were adopted in 2015. As I indicated, there are 80 pages of statutes under there. Page 3 [[Exhibit C](#)] reflects the various statutes that we go under for both the TA and NTA.

Some differences between the two agencies are shown on page 4 [[Exhibit C](#)]. The Taxicab Authority operates only in Clark County. The Nevada Transportation Authority regulates taxis in all counties except Clark County, and also regulates limousines, shuttles, tow cars, and in-state movers. Page 9 [[Exhibit C](#)] shows a full list of what the NTA regulates. The Taxicab Authority has a dispatch function and conducts patrols in key transportation areas by using a fleet of law enforcement vehicles capable of conducting traffic stops, directing

passenger traffic at large event venues, and establishing a visible presence at transportation hubs. The Taxicab Authority can cite gypsy cabs either administratively or criminally. The Nevada Transportation Authority does not have direct authority to cite off-app gypsy transporters [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)]. I find this surprising, mainly because off-app, unpermitted rides for hire are otherwise unregulated, and many involve persons who cannot qualify to obtain a Taxicab Authority permit or pass transportation network company screening due to criminal backgrounds. This increases the potential for additional crimes against passengers and inadequate insurance protection. Nevada Transportation Authority has an administrative hearing and application process outlined in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC). The Taxicab Authority has a five-member board appointed by the governor. These members are paid by the meeting, and they hold administrative appeals. The Nevada Transportation Authority has three salaried commissioners appointed by the governor. The Taxicab Authority collects revenue through trip revenue, medallion fees, and a technology fee collected on trips. The Nevada Transportation Authority collects revenue through various fees, albeit small, including transportation network company licensing fee assessments paid by the companies, and is allocated State Highway Funds. This dates back to the old Motor Carriers beginnings of the NTA.

Page 5 [[Exhibit C](#)] shows the major functions of both agencies' administrations. They have legal, fiscal, and administrative support, and information technology. They both perform law enforcement, compliance investigations, and vehicle inspections. Nevada Transportation Authority does not perform mechanical inspections but makes sure that inspected vehicles have the basic components they are required to under the law. Licensing and records include both driver and vehicle licensing. Nevada Transportation Authority does not license transportation network company drivers; instead, the company is licensed. Both the Taxi Authority and Nevada Transportation Authority have a hearing process for violations, applications, policy, and regulations.

The Taxicab Authority, established under NRS Chapter 706, was authorized in 1971 under the Motor Carriers statutes and its duties were further codified by the Legislature in 1973 and 1997, as shown on page 6 [[Exhibit C](#)]. Since the initial authorization in 1971 and 1973, changes have been made to the original mission, but the structure has remained basically the same. The Taxi Authority has no specific grant of police powers under NRS Chapter 289 and is specifically enumerated as a category II agency. Its compliance enforcement officers historically perform the following duties commonly associated with category I officers: they have routine patrol, they have criminal investigations, they enforce traffic laws, and investigate motor vehicle accidents. These numbered over 600 last year. These investigations, mostly of minor fender benders, are now conducted by vehicle inspectors. The TA performs routine patrol, has a dispatch function, and dispatches their enforcement investigators as first responders to criminal investigations. The TA has 16 cab companies, 3,530 medallions, over 6,000 drivers, 1,051 lease cabs, which can have up to three drivers and operate multiple shifts, and thoroughly and fully inspects approximately 5,000 taxis [page 7, [Exhibit C](#)]. The standards were loosened because it allowed them to keep more taxis in service due to the intensity of the inspection process. It is a full inspection which covers

the brakes, the inside and outside of the vehicle, the engine, and the structural portion of the frame.

The Nevada Transportation Authority, though having broad police powers under NRS 289.320, only conducts two types of field investigations: performing foot patrol surveillance and conducting sting operations for transportation network company drivers who are off-app or who do not have the proper trade dress visible. The citations for these two violations do not have specific fine amounts authorized under either NRS or NAC. Current practice is to hold the hearing before the commissioners on the citation, or impoundment if it is not a legal vehicle. If a violation is found, the Nevada Transportation Authority must notify the transportation network company so that the TNC can discipline the driver. As previously stated, page 9 [\[Exhibit C\]](#) gives an overview of all active certificates and permits for the Nevada Transportation Authority.

Page 10 [\[Exhibit C\]](#) covers the mandated Nevada Transportation Authority regulatory compliance audits, adopted in 2015, for the operation of a transportation network company. These reviews are performed twice per year. It is important to note that 5 to 10 percent of active TNC drivers are randomly chosen and evaluated, which amounts now to about 3,000 drivers. Citations are issued for any violations found. After a hearing is conducted, fines are assessed. A TNC's obligations to NTA regulations include yearly submission of gross operating revenue resulting in payment of a regulatory assessment fee, and notification of crashes involving their drivers or autonomous vehicle providers. In addition, a transportation network company must provide proof of insurance showing proper coverage limits for each of their vehicles. On pages 11 and 12 [\[Exhibit C\]](#) of the presentation, you will see what the driver requirements are for both TA and rideshares. The purpose of these two slides is to show the Committee the economy between the two providers.

In conclusion, I think that it is time to go through and look at the regulations that govern or have been layered over, requirements governing both the TA and the NTA. The transportation industry has changed considerably in the last 50 years. Whereas many of the companies 50 years ago were family-owned operations, now we have national companies coming in. We are seeing the advent of autonomous vehicles, with Motional and Zoox performing field operations on the Las Vegas Strip right now in preparation to operate their autonomous vehicles. Rideshare Halo is currently operating in urban areas of Las Vegas offering driverless vehicles. They offer parked cars that drivers can take for a period of time. At this point it is hard to envision the many different forms of transportation that may appear over the next five to ten years.

Of a major concern to this agency is that we went from approximately 6 million taxi rides in 2021 to over 13 million in 2022. In 2023, we are on track to expect over 15 million. This ranges from 1.2 million to 1.5 million rides per month. When compared to airport statistics, we are looking at record numbers of deplaning passengers. In January 2023 alone, Las Vegas averaged about 420,000 passengers deplaning per week. In one day in October 2022, we experienced 100,000 people deplaning. We are constantly reviewing airport statistics for both Harry Reid and Reno-Tahoe International Airports to look at what the

passenger levels are. We know from the lines at the airport, along with the complaints we receive about timely intercept, the volume of passengers coming into the airports requires all the public transportation we can get. I think it is important to look at how we can improve the ability of companies to provide safe, clean forms of public transportation for people coming to our communities. I am available to answer any questions.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Committee members, are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Newby:**

With the advent of The Boring Company opening its underground Loop network, will this form of transportation be regulated by either the TA or NTA?

**Terry Reynolds:**

The Boring Company currently does not charge for offering their service; until they begin to charge a regular service charge, they will remain unregulated. Right now, Boring is providing limited transportation for free. When they become a charge service, they will become regulated under NRS Chapter 706. While we can utilize that form of transportation to move people, we need much more than that. Is it serving a good purpose for the community? Yes, it is. Is it needed? Yes, it is. Will it provide all the transportation needs for the gaming and casino core areas? No, it will not.

**Assemblywoman Newby:**

Anticipating that at some point Boring will begin charging, will you then anticipate that you will have to accommodate this type of service in your review of regulations and laws?

**Terry Reynolds:**

Yes, we will.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Where is the one horse-drawn vehicle located?

**Todd Park, Chief Transportation Inspector, Nevada Transportation Authority,  
Department of Business and Industry:**

Luckily, I made sure that they were compliant and have their current insurance. They are here in Las Vegas.

**Assemblyman Miller:**

What do you see as some of the biggest challenges moving forward regarding public transportation? Do you have projections we might need to start thinking about or planning for?

**Terry Reynolds:**

We still have transportation issues in the outlying areas. If you live in Summerlin or Green Valley and need to get to the airport using public transportation, it will be difficult. Most of

Las Vegas's public transportation modes are limited to the core areas within six or seven blocks of the gaming areas. If you room off of the Las Vegas Strip, it is a wait to get a taxi, Lyft, or Uber.

A second issue is making sure that communities can handle modern forms of public transportation. Many of our facilities were built before having to anticipate multiple forms of public transportation. They may have cab stands and room for cab lines, but are not equipped to handle the volume required by queuing and passenger pickup for stadium-style events. Electric vehicles are going to have to have charging areas and the ability to access these areas. We are hoping to be able to focus on the future when it comes to being able to efficiently move passengers.

**Assemblyman Hibbetts:**

What is the study we are doing? You have already identified the problems. Why are we doing a study to study the study? Have the problems been identified?

**Terry Reynolds:**

In addition to what we have studied, it is important to get views from stakeholders, casino properties, and owners of the companies involved in our industry. They have lived with these regulations being stacked on each other for 50 years, so we want to be able to streamline the process for licensing, for getting drivers licensed, and to be able to get cars on the road. We regulate everything from floor mats to the sizes of lettering and numbers on the vehicles. We are involved in every process of their businesses, even telling them how to do their accounting processes. What we are hoping to accomplish with this study is to be able to solicit feedback from the public, stakeholders, industries, and from the properties and areas that they serve within the community. If we do that, we will come up with a much better product for public transportation within our cities.

**Assemblyman Hibbetts:**

How much is this going to cost?

**Terry Reynolds:**

The cost of interim committees will be determined through the Legislative Counsel Bureau. I hope we will be able to save costs for industry by developing a better process for licensing and getting vehicles out on the street, whatever mode of transportation that is out there. Companies are investing hundreds of millions of dollars to be able to get different apps to the passengers, to offer autonomous or electric vehicles, and to get them into the public arena as forms of affordable transportation. I think that they would welcome this process as a way to cut their costs while we are looking at making these outdated processes more efficient. This study will be done to look at how we can better assist them in our regulations.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Would you say that these regulations are old?

**Terry Reynolds:**

They are. They address everything from ashtrays to floor mats. Now we have wrapped numbering and advertising all over the vehicles, which have required another layer of regulations. Buses now wrap their vehicles with advertising and promotions, so we need to come into the new century.

**Chair Gorelow:**

How long do you think is needed to perform the study?

**Terry Reynolds:**

I would estimate four to six months.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Committee, are there any more questions? Seeing none, I will call anyone who would like to offer testimony in support for Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3.

**Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada:**

We want to support A.C.R. 3. I think Mr. Reynolds did a really good job of laying out why it is important to bring about some transparency and openness about laws that have restricted the industry from moving forward. More importantly, this will allow emerging markets to start to put a foothold in Nevada as well. We are growing, and I think we need to diversify our economy, part of which is transportation. We support this bill, and we look forward to following the study and partnering with you to see what regulations we can remove to ensure that small or big businesses can come in and provide great services to our community. We urge you to support this bill.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in support? Seeing no one, is there anyone in Las Vegas testifying in support? Other than Mr. Terry Reynolds's staff members watching the hearing from Las Vegas, there is no one else in support. Are there callers in support? [There were none.]

We will move to testimony in opposition of A.C.R. 3. Is there anybody in Carson City who would like to testify in opposition? Seeing no one, is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition?

**Kimberly Maxson-Rushton, Executive Director, Livery Operators Association of Las Vegas:**

The members of the Livery Operators Association are a combination of limousine operators, scenic tour operators, charter bus operators, and taxi operators that operate in Nevada statewide. They are all commercial transportation companies regulated by either the Nevada Transportation Authority or the Taxicab Authority. In addition to being their counsel, I was previously the chairman of the Nevada Transportation Authority. Between 2003 and 2007 I served on the NTA. From the time that I joined the NTA until the time I left, legislative committees such as yours studied the consolidation of these two agencies. On each of those

occasions they decided, after a lengthy legislative study, not to combine the agencies. The reason is because many of the issues that were previously raised are regulations, not statutes. Those regulations are easily addressed and identified pursuant to a regulatory workshop that can be held by the respective agencies in which the industry has a potential to participate and make the changes that they deemed necessary. Statutorily, there are some antiquated statutes that probably need to be reviewed by a legislative committee because they not only overlap with one another, but overlap with other agencies such as the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of Taxation. There are also some inconsistencies within the statutes that could be cleaned up. Overall, however, the agencies and their autonomy with one another have served the state and industry well and, most importantly, ensure the protection of our traveling public.

I would respectfully submit that the study is not necessary; instead, a cursory and very complete review of all of the regulations would ensure those that are antiquated that were previously noted by Director Reynolds are cleaned up. Then the industry will be able to progress forward into the twenty-first century with new technology and standards that allow them to grow and operate, but without compromising the importance of safety.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Are you in neutral or opposition? Some of your testimony sounded like you wanted changes to this bill. We can reclassify your testimony.

**Kimberly Maxson-Rushton:**

I am specifically addressing the language in A.C.R. 3 which focuses on moving forward and looking at the development of the technology and the industries going forward. I do not have any objection to that and stand in the neutral position. What I do object to is a study that focuses solely on the consolidation of the two respective agencies. I believe that is a separate issue to what is specifically outlined in A.C.R. 3 but will defer to you, Chair, if you believe that my testimony is more towards opposition than neutral.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Thank you very much for that clarification. I will reclassify your testimony as in opposition. Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to testify in neutral? Seeing no one, are there any callers to testify in neutral? [There were none.]

Director Reynolds, do you have closing remarks?

**Terry Reynolds:**

We have had discussions over the years about consolidation. From the perspective of the administrator of Business and Industry, we feel that this is about modernizing our regulations and getting rid of those regulations that have been added on over the last 50 years that really do not apply. This is not a plea for consolidation. We think that the agencies have two separate missions, and we would agree with Ms. Rushton about her comments from that perspective.

We feel there is a need to modernize the statutes and the regulations. There is a lot in *Nevada Revised Statutes* as well as in our regulations that really needs to come into the twenty-first century. There are a lot of things we find and hear about from the industry that are burdensome to them. We are looking at ways that we can streamline our processes and make it more effective for them to be able to operate, to get drivers on the road, or to get their vehicles on the road, in order to be able to meet the needs of the traveling public. Right now, we really need to work on making sure that we have enough public transportation for the people visiting our communities.

**Chair Gorelow:**

We will close the hearing on A.C.R. 3 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 243.

**Assembly Bill 243: Revises provisions relating to legislative affairs. (BDR 17-366)**

**Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5:**

Assembly Bill 243 revises provisions related to legislative affairs, specifically the legislature's interim activities. The Legislature is in session for 120 days every odd-numbered year. However, during the interim period between legislative sessions, interim committees of the Legislature still meet to study certain issues and formulate recommendations for the next legislative session. During the 2021 Session, the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 443 of the 81st Session which significantly changed the interim committee structure of the Legislature. Assembly Bill 443 of the 81st Session repealed several existing statutory interim committees and formed new Joint Interim Standing Committees that parallel those of our standing committees. For example, it is this Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections which voted to draft the bill that I am presenting to you today. Assembly Bill 443 of the 81st Session also imposed new requirements, in particular those regarding membership, quorum, and Legislative Commission oversight for the Joint Interim Standing Committees that differ from those of the interim committees. Primarily we aligned the interim committees with the standing committees that function during the regular session. The previous legislative interim was the first time that the legislature operated under this new structure. We always learn a few lessons the first time we do anything. Assembly Bill 243 seeks to address and fix some of the oversights so that we have a smoother implementation as we go forward. Basically, Assembly Bill 243 is a cleanup bill.

In the bill summary there are six major components that Assembly Bill 243 seeks to address. First, it clarifies the vacancy of a Chair for the Joint Interim Standing Committee. If there is a vacancy, the Vice Chair shall become acting Chair until the Chair is appointed.

Secondly, the bill clarifies that if a regular member of a Joint Interim Standing Committee cannot attend the meeting, the alternate member that attends the meeting must be, to the extent possible, of the same political party. Interestingly enough, sometimes there are different votes depending on party. We want to keep it consistent with the party of the person that is vacant.

Third, the bill proposes transferring the duties that are required to evaluate and review issues relating to governmental purchasing from the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs. That is because *Nevada Revised Statutes* 218E.330 provides that a Joint Interim Standing Committee may evaluate and review issues within the jurisdiction of its corresponding standing committee, and governmental purchasing has typically fallen under Government Affairs in both the Senate and the Assembly. Assembly Bill 443 of the 81st Session, however, had a specific carveout to allow the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections to evaluate and review issues relating to governmental purchasing. This bill basically transfers this task back to Government Affairs, where it is more appropriately settled. It also required a report be submitted to the Joint Interim Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. That report, typically known as the Nevada Public Purchasing Study Commission, also requires that it will be sent to Government Affairs.

Assembly Bill 243 also repeals the requirement that the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services has to review regulations for health care policy. This requirement is outdated and redundant. Before the Legislative Commission had the authority to approve the regulations, the Legislative Committee on Health Care would review regulations relating to health care and that duty was rolled over to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services. However, now that the Legislative Commission can approve regulations again, it is no longer necessary. Currently the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services is the only interim committee responsible for reviewing regulations. For instance, if you are on the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education and a law was passed during the session, if the Department of Education or the State Board of Education comes up with regulations, policies, and procedures to match that legislation, it does not come back to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education to approve it. Again, all of those regulations, policies and procedures would go through the Legislative Commission, so there is no reason to have Health and Human Services carved out on it is own.

Assembly Bill 243 also revises the date a teacher wishing to serve on the Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force must apply by. Currently, teachers who want to be on this task force must submit their application by January 15, with the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education required to appoint members by February 1, within a two-week window. The Department of Education goes through an exhaustive process to make sure that all the teachers who apply are qualified, in order to provide a robust list of candidates. Last year the list included over 100 names, making it obvious that the two-week evaluation period is too small. We are asking to move the enrollment date

back to December 1 in odd-numbered years. Teachers will then be required to submit their applications by December 1, and the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education will have until February 1 to review these teacher applicants.

I also submitted a conceptual amendment [[Exhibit D](#)]. It may not be on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) yet, but it requires that legislators serving their last term, whether based on term limits or not seeking reelection to continue serving in the Legislature, shall not be selected as chair or vice chair of any interim committee. That is simply because the whole intent of interim committees is to prepare for the regular sessions. An interim committee, where members are directing the conversations and studies for upcoming sessions, is not an appropriate spot for someone who is not returning.

Assembly Bill 243 is a cleanup bill. There are a handful of commonsense changes directed toward things we noticed were happening under the new structure. Everything I have presented today was approved by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. We moved it forward and voted to approve it as Bill Draft Request 17-366.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Does anyone have questions?

**Assemblywoman Newby:**

I did notice there was a suggested amendment [[Exhibit E](#)] on NELIS from a Reva Crump. Would you like me to read it into the record?

AB243

Please consider deleting, in lines 16, 17, 18 "if a regular member of a Joint Interim Standing Committee cannot attend a meeting of the Committee, the alternate member who attends the meeting must, to the extent practicable, be of the same political party as the regular member." I submit it should always be of the same political party, period, as one man's practicable is not the same as another man's practicable.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Ms. Crump emailed that to me as well. I do not know if there is the need to ask whether or not that is a friendly amendment because it is covered in the bill. The only reason why we would add "when practicable" is if attendance becomes an issue.

I would like to explain what Joint Interim Standing Committees are to our freshman members. An interim committee structure, which we refer to as a "joint" committee, consists of members from both the Senate and Assembly. We refer to this as "joint" because we are literally working between both houses. During session, leadership from both houses refers names to the Legislative Commission. After processing these names, members are then appointed to certain interim committees. Currently, this new structure includes a list of available members who could be called upon as substitutes, who would become available to

fill in in case somebody was absent from an interim committee. The goal of finding a substitute for an interim committee would be to ask someone of the same party to attend in the absent member's place. The list of available interim committee substitutes includes members of both parties.

**Assemblyman Hibbetts:**

I see in this bill where you discussed the workload shifting from one committee to another, including from Legislative Operations and Elections to Government Affairs. As a member of Legislative Operations and Elections I appreciate that, but as a member of Government Affairs, I am not sure if I appreciate that.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

That is because *Nevada Revised Statutes* 218E.330 provides that a Joint Interim Standing Committee may evaluate and review issues within the jurisdiction of its corresponding standing committee. We are just aligning with the statute.

**Chair Gorelow:**

Committee, are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will open up testimony in support of A.B. 243. Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to come up in support? Seeing no one, we will go to testimony in support in Las Vegas. I do not see anyone, so we will move to callers in support. [There was no one.]

I will open up testimony in opposition of A.B. 243. Seeing no one in Carson City or Las Vegas to testify in opposition, are there callers in opposition? [There were none.]

I will open up testimony in neutral for A.B. 243. There is no one in Carson City or Las Vegas to testify in neutral. Are there callers in neutral? [There were none.]

Assemblywoman Miller, do you have any final comments?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Our experiences are learned as we go. There may often be amendments that come forward as we continue to work, improve, and make sure we have covered everything. These types of hearings do not often bring out massive crowds or a lot of testimony, but I really do want to thank the Nevadan who submitted that amendment. She was engaged and paying attention to what we do up here. I would like to acknowledge and thank her and all Nevadans who are always working hard, paying attention, and staying engaged. We are here for all of you.

**Chair Gorelow:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 243. We will go to our next agenda item which is public comment. [There was none.]

Our next meeting will be Tuesday, March 21, 2023, at 4 p.m. With that, we are adjourned [at 4:56 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Kristi Howard  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "ACR3," dated March 16, 2023, presented by Terry J. Reynolds, Director, Department of Business and Industry.

[Exhibit D](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 243](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 243](#), submitted by Reva Crump, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.