

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

**Eighty-third Session  
May 2, 2025**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 10:47 a.m. on Friday, May 2, 2025, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair  
Senator Skip Daly, Vice Chair  
Senator Lisa Krasner  
Senator John C. Steinbeck

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblymember Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5  
Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1  
Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No.9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst  
Connie Summers, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Joshua Skaggs, Nevada Republican Party  
Catherine Ingham

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
May 2, 2025  
Page 2

Nancy Carlson  
Janine Hansen, State President, Independent American Party of Nevada  
Kimberly Fergus  
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Bruce Parks, Chairman, Washoe County Republican Party  
Katrine Ivanoff  
Ellen Gifford  
Iris Stone  
Alexis Motarex, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors  
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County  
Jennifer Berthiaume, Nevada Association of Counties  
Ashley Kennedy, Clark County  
Nic Ciccone, City of Reno  
Terri Laird, Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We are going to open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 14.

**ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 14 (1st Reprint)**: Condemns the January 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol and denounces the use of presidential pardons and commutations to absolve the rioters. (BDR R-991)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

Assembly Joint Resolution 14 deals with the January 6, 2021, insurrection where a mob violently attacked [United States] Capitol Police and breached the United States Capitol, all in an attempt to prevent or disrupt the peaceful transfer of power, a hallmark of United States democracy.

There really isn't much I can say that isn't already in the language of the resolution, but I want to highlight a few key facts. The January 6, 2021, insurrection was an attack on the rule of law. The [United States] Capitol Police and other law enforcement agencies were the heroes of the day, protecting members of Congress and the United States Capitol. At least 140 police officers were injured in the line of duty that day. I will note I was originally going to present this yesterday. It was coincidental, I believe, that yesterday was Law Enforcement Memorial Day, so I think it is appropriate to mention that we know at least 140 police officers were injured. We do believe not all of them reported their injuries.

Many of the insurrectionists were, at least for a time, held accountable having been prosecuted, convicted and sentenced for their crimes. So that brings us to the pardons and commutations of roughly 1,500 insurrectionists issued by President Trump on January 20, 2025. Let there be no doubt, the President has unqualified pardon and commutation power. But what President Trump did on January 20 was reckless. Instead of an individualized analysis, he granted blanket pardons and commutations. That action was a slap to the face to law enforcement and to the principles of law and order. You don't need to take my word for it. The International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police jointly condemned the pardons and commutations, noting they undermine the rule of law and perhaps embolden others to commit similar acts of violence against police officers and others.

I was not in Washington, D.C., on January 6, 2021. I was in my living room in Las Vegas watching the television in horror as these events unfolded. But when I presented this resolution in the Assembly not too long ago, I had someone with me at the table who was there that day, and that someone was not an insurrectionist but one of those heroic [United States] Capitol Police officers I referenced earlier. His name is Harry Dunn, and he was able to give a firsthand account of what his experience was like that day. Unfortunately, he was not able to join us here this morning, but I would like to play his comments from that hearing. I have them here on video ([Exhibit C](#) electronic copy is not available. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.), and I think it would be worthwhile for the committee to hear them.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Hearing Mr. Dunn speak, for me personally, brings back a lot of feelings, shock and numbness I felt that day seeing what was happening in our Capitol.

JOSHUA SKAGGS (Nevada Republican Party):

I am here in strong opposition to [A.J.R. 14](#). Before I begin, I would ask for a brief moment of silence to honor the memory of Ashli Babbitt who was tragically killed at the [United States] Capitol Building on January 6, 2021, and Corey Comperatore who was murdered by an assassin who made an attempt to end President Trump's life on July 13, 2024, in Butler, Pennsylvania. We believe [A.J.R. 14](#) further polarizes our politics and puts Americans who support President Trump in physical danger by presenting a one-sided, demonizing narrative of the events of January 6, 2021. While we condemn the minority of those present that day who assaulted others or damaged property, [A.J.R. 14](#)

wrongfully condemns the actions of everyone at the [United States] Capitol that day without acknowledging the broader context or deeply held beliefs of many Americans who peacefully made their voices heard.

For example, video footage from that day shows that many of these individuals were allowed into the [United States] Capitol by law enforcement through doors which could have never been breached by unarmed protesters. For many, January 6 was simply an attempt to seek redress of grievances by Americans who felt disenfranchised due to irregularities in the 2020 election that were never fully investigated, at least here in Nevada. While it is unfortunate that a small minority of those protesters crossed the line into inappropriate violence and property damage, labeling all of those present that day as insurrectionists ignores the diversity of motivations and experiences of those present in Washington, D.C., on January 6.

Assembly Joint Resolution 14 deepens divisions and fosters resentment rather than promoting understanding or healing. Furthermore, denunciation by A.J.R. 14 of presidential pardons and commutations for those involved sets a dangerous precedent. It suggests that certain groups or individuals are beyond redemption because of partisanship and misplaced feelings. Instead of fostering unity, A.J.R. 14 risks entrenching divisions and further alienating those who feel their voices are already marginalized. The bill passed the Assembly on a purely partisan vote, highlighting it as a political attack by Democrats rather than an effort to heal and move forward. Please vote no on A.J.R. 14.

CATHERINE INGHAM:

I strongly condemn the violence that happened on January 6, and I never want anyone to get hurt, but Nevada's A.J.R. 14 oversimplifies the January 6 [United States] Capitol riot, undermining the constitutional validity of presidential pardons and distracts from the State's urgent priorities such as drought and infrastructure that depend on a collaborative governance. By rejecting this measure, Nevada lawmakers can demonstrate a commitment to nuanced discourse, respect for federal authority and a focus on issues that directly impact their constituents. The events of January 6 were undeniably serious, but the bill's approach condemning without context and vilifying without balance does more to divide than to heal. Many people were just there to peacefully protest. Furthermore, rejecting A.J.R. 14 would signal a commitment to practical, forward-looking leadership rather than divisive retrospection.

NANCY CARLSON:

I strongly oppose A.J.R. 14, which condemns the insurrection of January 6, 2021. In contradiction to what is included in this bill, President Trump did not organize this event. He did not select the date. He was invited and accepted an invitation to speak on December 19, 2020. Violence was condemned, but it was never incited by President Trump at any time during his speech at the Ellipse field. I know this because I was there. I am not an insurrectionist.

There were known antifa members in the crowd wearing Trump gear, encouraging movement into the [United States] Capitol, and some [United States] Capitol Police did, in fact, remove barriers, invite attendees into the [United States] Capitol building and escort them through the building. The President requested the support of the National Guard three times due to his awareness that there was a potential for violence. His requests were ignored. The full videos of the events on January 6 were not provided during the defense of those charged. They were not given fair trials. Months after January 6, the FBI admitted there was no evidence for a plan to invade the [United States] Capitol.

There was no fake set of electors. Article II, section 1 of the Constitution allows for the rejection of the electors and verification of the counts. A number of congressional representatives were ready to verify the elector votes, matched by the will of the people from their states. There was sufficient concern about the election results and concern over the legality of the indictments of the attendees charged on January 6, such that most, not all, of the indicted were granted clemency by President Trump. This is the right of the President, and this right has been enacted by many presidents, including very recently by President Biden.

Let us acknowledge that there are differences between the parties in the way many events have been viewed over the last several decades. Let's move on and stop with the divisiveness. Our country was founded on a two-party system for a reason, to ensure checks and balances. Our constitutional republic has been a success because of our two-party checks and balances. Please oppose A.J.R. 14.

JANINE HANSEN (State President, Independent American Party of Nevada):

I am not a Republican. I did not testify in the Assembly, and I am very thankful for those that oppose this bill today and fully support their testimony. I think it

is very sad that this has been brought forward because it only encourages divisiveness between us. This is five years ago. I think we need to move on. I think we need to heal. I think we need to extend the hand to one another from the different parties. I do not think this accomplishes anything but encouraging people, once again, in negative feelings toward one another from Republicans and Democrats. I think it is very unfortunate that we would spend our time on such a negative bill.

KIMBERLY FERGUS:

I strongly oppose A.J.R. 14. I echo a lot what others have said. However, in my view, this resolution is nothing more than a partisan stunt. Let me break it down. Wasting time on a symbolic, nonbinding resolution has zero legal effect. It is political virtue-signaling, not governing. It attacks the constitutional power of the presidency. The U.S. Constitution gives the President absolute pardon power. You don't get to pick and choose when you respect it. Selective outrage is hypocritical. No resolutions [surfaced] condemning the 2020 riots where federal buildings were burned and police were attacked. So violence is only bad when it is politically inconvenient. It politicizes law enforcement. Don't use injured officers as a shield while ignoring violence against them in every other context. That's exploitation, not support. It does not represent Nevadans. This is D.C.-style theater. Most Nevadans want their Legislature focused on real issues, not preheated partisan drama from four years ago. The resolution is a disgrace, misuse of legislative time and embarrassment to the Body. I urge you to vote no.

LYNN CHAPMAN (State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom):

I too am not a Democrat or a Republican. I am a member of the Independent American Party. I was not there that day, but I do have a friend who was there. She is former military, former police. She took video of everything that was happening, and I did see the video a number of times. There were people dressed in black encouraging people to enter the building. There were a number of people that were dressed in black, and they were all running around trying to get people to enter the building. We now know, looking back and more testimony and this and that, that there were federal agents who were also encouraging people to walk into the [United States] Capitol building. It is interesting that people who did not do anything but walk in and walk out ended up having to serve time. This bill is really a slap in the face to anybody who had friends who know what happened or who were there or ended up in prison serving time because they walked into our [United States] Capitol building. Also,

there were no Republicans that signed on to this resolution. It is not showing everybody in the State cohesive and together. It is just Democrats that are doing this, and that is not really what we should be doing. It is dividing people and not bringing people together. So for that reason, I think it is very important that we deep-six this bill. It is not something to be proud of or to bring people together. It will divide us further. Please vote no.

BRUCE PARKS (Chairman, Washoe County Republican Party):

I cannot adequately express my disappointment that this partisan bill would even be considered. You do not have all the facts surrounding that day. In fact, I don't believe the American people will ever know the entire story behind what occurred that day. Going forward with this bill will achieve nothing positive for anybody. It will only serve to further divide us, not only as a state but as a country. If that is your purpose with this piece of political theater, then I am quite sure that you will achieve success. It never ceases to amaze me the shortsightedness of the Democrats who sponsored or support this bill. Not one single Republican is in favor of this. I would caution you to consider what the implications of passing this are going to be. I don't believe they have been considered. This will do no good for anybody.

KATRINE IVANOFF:

Once again, this is another bill that Nevada Legislators are not spending time helping Nevadans but thinking of everything else but Nevada residents. On another hand, I am glad that you are wasting your time on such a meaningless resolution. At least that time is not spent trying to tax us more or take more of our rights away. I urge you, even though it is kind of meaningless, please vote no. Nevadans need to know you have our back, and that bill is not showing us that. It is not a bill that includes the problems that Nevadans need solving.

ELLEN GIFFORD:

Assembly Joint Resolution 14 is an opinion of a small group of Nevada Legislators who want their voices to be heard. It is proclaimed, should this resolution make it through the legislative process, the Chief Clerk of the Assembly will prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and various other elected officials. Concurrent with this resolution, there is the truth. An extremely large population of Nevadans know what that truth is, and they will want their voices to be heard also. Perhaps A.J.R. 14 will make it through the legislative process and find its way to the President of the United States. If it does, it will be completely overshadowed by

the communications that will also go out to the President from that huge population of Nevadans, assuring him that A.J.R. 14 does not represent all of Nevada, assuring him that Nevada's got his back and encouraging him to forge ahead in serving our country and saving our country.

IRIS STONE:

It is puzzling to me why the Nevada Democrats are sponsoring this resolution after numerous facts have shed light on many inaccuracies of the original narrative. Over 751,000 Nevadans voted for President Donald Trump on November 5, 2024. He won Nevada by more than 46,000 votes. The nationwide Democrat campaign in 2024 made sure that January 6 was front and center on all messaging to the voters. For four long years, we heard nothing but claims about this so-called insurrection while attacking President Trump and Republicans along the way. Remember, it was President Trump who ordered 10,000 National Guard to be at the [United States] Capitol on January 6, 2021, and it was U.S. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi who declined the proposal. Nevadans know that, and Americans know that. Obviously, [for] the Democratic Party, [the] January 6 has lost its negative effect. [Some] 751,000 Nevadans will view this resolution as selective outrage from the Nevada Democratic Legislators. I should also point out the fact that this matter is still in discovery in the U.S. House of Representatives and has an open investigation on what happened on January 6, 2021. I hope you see reason and do not go any further with this proposal.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will now close the hearing on A.J.R. 14 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 249.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 249 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to fiscal notes.  
(BDR 17-932)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DANIELE MONROE-MORENO (Assembly District No. 1):

I serve in the Legislature as the chair of the [Assembly] Ways and Means Committee. Going into the legislative session and looking at the budget, knowing we would not have a lot of money to do some amazing work we would love to do when we are sitting here, gave us an opportunity to do some cleanup to make all of our jobs, especially those that are in the fiscal part of our jobs, a little easier. The bills we are presenting today are some cleanup bills to make

our jobs more efficient. I have with me Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, and Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst.

The first bill we will be presenting to you is A.B. 249 which requires the summary of all bills or joint resolutions to include certain statements relating to the measure's fiscal effect on the State's Highway Fund. The bill also changes the summary statement relating to the measure's fiscal effect on the State from "Effect on the State: Yes," to "Effect on the State: May Have Fiscal Impact." Additionally, the bill revises the deadline for posting the fiscal note for an initiative or referendum petition on the Secretary of State's website and authorizes the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau to extend the period of local governments to return fiscal notes if a matter requires extended research.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Regarding the portion of the bill about initiative and referendum, do you see that changing the process at all for folks who are trying to get something on the ballot or with anything at all?

MICHAEL NAKAMOTO (Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):

No, to answer your question. Basically, in extending that period of time, that is allowing us additional time to do the research. Right now, the time is ten working days. For a lot of the initiative petitions that are filed, that simply does not give us enough time to do the due diligence, to do the fiscal note that we feel is important and necessary for the initiatives and referenda.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

So we don't see it affecting the people who are trying to get it on the ballot or anything like that?

MR. NAKAMOTO:

No, because we are tying it to the filing or the filing of any challenges. I think the greatest challenge is going to be the obstacle in getting it available for submission rather than the fiscal note itself, which I think is still what it is under the current law.

ALEXIS MOTAREX (Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors):

We are in support of A.B. 249, specifically, the inclusion of fiscal notes indicating an impact on the Highway Fund. Money from the Highway Fund is

used to augment the budgets of other agencies in addition to its intended purpose of building and maintaining Nevada's highway system. In 2023, that amounted to over \$44 million. The Highway Fund is an increasing deficit as vehicle miles traveled in the State continue to increase while funding decreases due to an antiquated funding mechanism that has not been adjusted since 1992. At the same time, we continue to see requests for funding from other agencies that directly impact [Nevada] Department [of Transportation's] ability to perform its core function of planning, constructing, operating and maintaining over 5,000 miles of highway in the State, which provides for thousands of prevailing wage jobs for Nevadans every year.

We believe including the fiscal impact proposed in this legislation on the Highway Fund will provide for better transparency, education and awareness about the funding of nonhighway-related expenditures.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):

We are in support of this bill, particularly section 1.5, the provision that allows local governments to have the same opportunity that exists today for state agencies that when there is a fiscal note that's been requested of us that requires additional research, we may request an extension of time beyond the deadline for submission. For context for the committee, in this session so far, Washoe County has received 227 fiscal note requests. So nearly a full quarter of all the bills introduced have been requested for a fiscal note analysis by Washoe County. And in some cases, we do need to confer with our actuarials or third-party administrators to be sure we are giving the best information. And Senator Daly, perhaps to your earlier comment about fictitious or exaggerated fiscal notes, in all honesty, we sometimes feel the need to protect ourselves; we give a higher number than we might have otherwise been able to get to if we had time to sharpen the pencil. So while this may seem like a small thing, it really is important for local governments, and we ask for your support.

JENNIFER BERTHIAUME (Nevada Association of Counties):

Local governments value the opportunity to weigh in on the fiscal impacts of proposed legislation and appreciate the option this bill provides that allows a request for an extension on matters that may require extended research. For this reason, NACO [Nevada Association of Counties] is in support of A.B. 249.

ASHLEY KENNEDY (Clark County):

I ditto the comments made by my colleagues.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
May 2, 2025  
Page 11

NIC CICCONE (City of Reno):

I just want to echo the comments of my other local government colleagues.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 249 and open the hearing on A.B. 348.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 348**: Revises provisions relating to the Legislature.  
(BDR 17-931)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DANIELE MONROE-MORENO (Assembly District No. 1):

Joining me here at the table is Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, and Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst. We are here to present A.B. 348 which revises provisions relating to the Interim Retirement and Benefits Committee (IRBC) and the Legislative Counsel Bureau's (LCB) Fiscal Analysis Division.

Assembly Bill 348 requires the IRBC to review the operation of and make recommendations regarding the Legislator's retirement system and provides for the terms of members, appointment of alternates and filing of vacancies for the Committee. The bill also eliminates the requirement for the Fiscal Analysis Division of LCB to perform and report the results of budget stress tests in even-numbered years and to the extent of available resources. Finally, A.B. 348 abolishes the Legislative Bureau of Educational Accountability and Program Evaluation (LBEAPE) within the Fiscal Analysis Division.

As I stated earlier in my presentation on the last bill, as chair of the Ways and Means Committee, I serve on this Committee. Unfortunately, I could not make a meeting; and we learned that according to statute, there was no provision to make an alternate appointment for that one meeting as you can do on the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) and other interim committees. So A.B. 348 is another cleanup bill and the reason for the abolishment of the LBEAPE. We have not utilized that in years, and we now have a different mechanism to use for that. This is just antiquated policy that we'd like to remove from statute.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

Thank you for the explanation on the education thing [LBEAPE]. Too bad the Sunset Subcommittee did not get to it first, but [I'm] always in favor of getting rid of a board that is old and antiquated, and we don't use it anymore. And then [I'm] all for the alternates as well. If that creates a problem, it just seems to me

it would have been easier to anticipate that and say that you appoint three members and two alternates. So you have them, you know who they are, they would be the ones you call, similar to what we do with the Legislative Commission when you appoint that. I don't know if it's worth changing it now, but it seems more efficient to me. You could change it easily in section 1, subsection 2 and just say appoint three members and two alternates for efficiency.

SARAH COFFMAN (Assembly Fiscal Analyst):

To answer your question Senator Daly, the language that was included in the alternate section was basically the same as the alternate language we used for the IFC. We were just trying to keep it consistent with the money committees.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

Understood. Like I said, it is not that big of a deal. We do it for the Legislative Commission, and it works pretty well. We name who the alternates are.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 348 and open the hearing on A.B. 506.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 506**: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 18-934)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DANIELE MONROE-MORENO (Assembly District No. 1):

Assembly Bill 506 is another cleanup bill on how we are becoming more efficient in how we do our jobs in the Fiscal Division. I have at the table with me Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, and Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst.

Assembly Bill 506 eliminates 19 reporting requirements that currently mandate various state agencies, departments and entities to submit reports to the IFC when the Legislature is not in session. The bill would eliminate the following requirements to the IFC:

- The Attorney General to submit annual statements on the Registry Account.
- The Executive Director of the Office of Economic Development to report on certain economic development programs related to the Catalyst Account.
- The Director of the Department of Corrections to report on accounts receivable for Prison Industries.

- The Legislative Bureau of Educational Accountability and Program Evaluation to submit reports to certain legislative bodies on odd-numbered years. If you remember, I just mentioned this elimination in A.B. 348.
- The Merit Award Board to report on employee suggestions and for local governments to submit performance contract reports to the IFC.
- The Purchasing Division [to submit reports] on contracts with veteran-owned businesses.
- The state boards or commissions that hire consultants [to report] pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 333.705, subsection 7.
- The Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada [to submit an] annual report regarding the Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Trust Fund.
- The State Board of Education to submit a quarterly report on variances from the pupil-teacher ratio that are requested by a school district.
- The Department of Health and Human Services [to report] on childcare grants.
- The local air pollution control agencies to report annually on the use of money received from the Pollution Control Account.
- To report special distributions from the Contingency Account related to water rights.
- The State Contractors' Board [to report] regarding the Recovery Fund.
- The University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine, [to report] on cannabis research.
- DETR [Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation] and the Housing Division of B&I [Business and Industry] to report on contractual relationships with nonprofit collaboratives in creating jobs in the fields of energy efficiency and renewable energy.
- The State Public Works Board, school districts and the Board of Regents [of the University of Nevada] to report on certain projects for weatherization and retrofitting.
- The Public Utilities Commission, otherwise known as the PUCN, to submit reorganization plans to the IFC.
- Reporting on certain sales and use tax-related proceeds. Specifically, section 13.3 of the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005 contained a provision requiring certain information to be reported to the IFC. [Though] these reports related to the expenditures made using those revenues between July 1, 2013, to June 30, 2016—and we are a little past 2016—that supplant other revenue sources during that period, [they] continue to be submitted to the IFC even after the June 30, 2016, expiration date by Clark

County. However, they were not required. As such, this provision can be eliminated.

- Finally, reporting on school district consultants pursuant to NRS 391.155.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

As a clarification, there were several of these reports that are just being sunsetted, the cannabis one at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR)—they've never done those studies—the bureau you mentioned. But many of them, as I understood it when reading the bill—for instance the one on GOED [Governor's Office of Economic Development] and some of the others, the Contractors' Board, etc.—are still going to be produced. They're just not going to be redundantly sent to the IFC as I understand it.

SARAH COFFMAN (Assembly Fiscal Analyst):

When the Chair was going through this request with us, what staff did was evaluate when the last time was the IFC actually discussed these various reports; most of them had not been discussed in several years to a decade in some instances. So that was one of the criteria we were looking at when going through to determine whether these should be included in the IFC. That's not to say these committees won't have these reports. They just won't be submitted on the continual basis to the IFC.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

Understood. I know when I looked at the one on GOED, the report is still produced, has to be sent to the Governor, has to be sent to the Legislature, just not redundantly to the IFC. We all get a ton of reports, and I am sure we read every word, right? I just wanted to clarify that these reports are not going to the IFC. Many of them will still exist and be available. Some of them are actually being sunsetted.

Ms. IVANOFF:

I am testifying in neutral as I am not very familiar with the bill. However, in listening to the presentation, I could not help but be surprised that many of those reports that you are now trying to delete you never even received within ten years, which is mind-boggling to me. If you were supposed to get those reports, why would you wait ten years? Why were you not requesting those reports? I would think that is part of your job. I am just a regular citizen, but that is what jumped out at me. I just want to put it on the record that if

someone is supposed to give you a report in a certain time, you should not be waiting ten years to acknowledge them not giving you that report.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO:

In response to the individual who called in neutral and anyone else listening, I want to assure them that a number of the reports that were mentioned to be deleted, that information does come to the legislative body. It just wouldn't go to the IFC. Oftentimes, information that was contained in those reports is discussed during various interim committee meetings. There have been so many changes in the last ten years in how we do our interim committees where we combined committee meetings. We do receive the information. We utilize that information when we come back to this body on a biennial basis when we make policies. So we are doing our job, we are utilizing the information; it is not that we waited ten years, it's just been used in other ways.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Thank you for your work in streamlining the process and your work on the [Assembly] Ways and Means Committee, the joint committees and on the IFC in trying to keep our State functioning with all the vital services we need to provide to our constituents. I will now close the hearing on A.B. 506 and open the hearing on A.J.R. 6.

**ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6**: Urges Congress to extend the Social Security Fairness Act. (BDR R-32)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BRITTNEY MILLER (Assembly District No. 5):

Assembly Joint Resolution 6 urges Congress to extend the Social Security Fairness Act (SSFA). I would like to briefly explain the government pension offset and windfall reduction provision. Both reduced or eliminated social security benefits for people who had earned both a pension and social security.

First, we need to keep in mind that social security is not an entitlement or an assistance program. It is literally money that's been withheld or taken directly from our paychecks that should be returned to us based on multiple factors but heavily focused on individual earnings and withholdings. Secondly, this primarily impacts public employees who have worked in both scenarios throughout their life, meaning they've paid into social security and also received a pension. So unless you have done both of those, this would not capture you in this scenario.

Using myself as an example as a second-career teacher, I have already paid into social security and earned all 40 credits before I became a teacher. According to the windfall elimination provision, what that meant was that now that I am in PERS [Public Employees' Retirement System] and no longer paying social security, and this was enacted back in 1983, upon my retirement, they would reduce my earned social security benefits up to half. Again, this is money I've worked for, money I've paid, and they are now saying, well now that you are getting a pension, you are only going to get half of your social security. Obviously, I have a long ways to go before I could retire; but according to my December 2024 social security statement, they were already saying that at this point, even though I still have a few decades [to work], they would reduce my social security by \$700 a month.

This primarily impacts teachers, firefighters, police officers and, of course, federal, state and local government employees, as well as their spouses and surviving spouses. The good news is that after multiple decades of fighting, including our own public service unions that lobbied Congress, on January 5, [2025], H.R. [House of Representatives Resolution] 82, the SSFA, a bill that [Senator] Lisa Murkowski cosponsored for over 20 years trying to overturn this law, finally became law. The act repeals the Government Pension [Offset] Act which reduced or completely eliminated spousal support for public employees regardless of whether their spouse paid social security taxes. It is estimated that the repeal of the Government Pension Offset restored social security benefits for nine out of ten employees who lost their entire spousal social security benefit under the formula. Those previously affected by the offset will now see an increase of anywhere between \$700 to \$1,200 a month in their social security benefits. That amount alone, given where we are with our economy and the cost of living—housing, groceries and medication, especially for retired individuals—can definitely be life-changing. It is like a whole other check for some people.

The SSFA also repealed the Windfall Elimination Provision. About 11.8 percent of Nevadans are entitled to both a pension and social security benefits, and they will now see their social security benefits increase by as much as \$558 a month. More than 2 million government employees and retirees in the United States now benefit from the repeal. If this holds, I will benefit eventually, meaning when I retire. I have paid into social security. This is money that's been withheld from my paycheck, and then I will go on to earn a pension. So again, imagine how surprising it was to find out that the money that's been taken—

and I know many people have problems with paying taxes as it is, but again, we have paid a tax—that's supposed to be directly returned to us, and they were planning on not returning it. Thankfully, in the future, those of us moving forward shouldn't be affected by this. This is for those who were affected by this because this has been a law since 1983. Generations of teachers, firefighters, police officers and other local, state and federal government employees who have retired since 1983 have been penalized by being stripped of the benefits through this reduction. This is money they've rightfully earned.

What happened with the SSFA is they retroactively applied it to anyone who retired from December 2023 moving forward. They will receive back payments for all of 2024, what they should have received, which on average equates to about \$4,320 a person. That's great, and most people are not going to deny a check for over \$4,000. I know that can be very helpful for people.

If you know the history of social security, this is not the first time the government has messed up on large groups or generations of social security. I grew up always hearing about how my grandmother was a gap baby. During a period of time, her entire generation was cheated out of money that was rightfully theirs. Assembly Joint Resolution 6 is simple. It urges Congress to enact legislation to extend the SSFA to retroactively apply from December 2013 forward. Technically, I believe it should go from 1983 when this first happened. Certainly, we still have people who are alive [during this time frame]. Back in the 1980s, people retired much younger. I remember as a kid when people would say their parents were retiring at 50. So there are still people alive that have been impacted, but I think ten years is still at least a significant return for many people. Going back to 2013 would entitle about \$47,000 in return payments to each person from 2013 to 2023. Again, \$47,000 to retirees can be life-changing.

The measure also urges the President to sign such legislation if passed by Congress and requires that this Assembly joint resolution would be submitted to both Houses, the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to our Nevada Congressional Delegation. I urge your support on this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

At this time, I need to present a bill on the Assembly floor and will turn the gavel over to Vice Chair Daly.

SENATOR STEINBECK:

Just a statement that I have received a lot of letters of support on this particular bill [from] people who worked for many, many years and felt that they've been left out on this benefit. So I thank you for bringing the bill forward.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:

[Due to technical issues, a portion of this meeting's recording has been lost and is unable to be transcribed.] ... if I go on and continue in other careers with or without a pension. The idea is that was still my money taken out of my paycheck. It doesn't impact me as much because I am far from retirement and the laws have changed, but I really grieve for the people that worked, that paid, that did what they were supposed to do and are cheated out of money that was directly taken out of their pay.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

I support the measure. I've heard from people, public employees, over the years who have been impacted by this. It's a federal rule, nothing we could really do at the state level.

TERRI LAIRD (Executive Director, Retired Public Employees of Nevada):

We are a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization founded almost 50 years ago with the primary mission to protect the pension and benefits earned by all public employees. We are in full support of A.J.R. 6, urging Congress to extend the SSFA from one to ten years. This may be a lofty goal, but we appreciate the effort from the bill's sponsor, Assemblymember Brittney Miller. Retired Public Employees of Nevada (RPEN) has long fought to repeal this federal measure that penalized public employees earning a pension from PERS but also qualifying for social security benefits as Assemblymember Miller mentioned. There were many RPEN members in the north, southeast and west who submitted petitions to our Nevada Delegation in Washington; and as an organization, we have brought forth many proclamations calling for a repeal of the Windfall Elimination Provision and Government Pension Offset. As Assemblymember Miller mentioned, this effort passed in Washington in late December and was signed by President Biden in January. We are elated with the success of the public employees in Nevada, and 13 states did their part too. It was a joint venture. Each and every time, we were happy to see it passed. We hope you will support this bill.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER:

I just wanted to add something else for understanding how important this was. This has also allowed for the retention of some of our employees. Had the SSFA not been passed, I found the loophole which was as long as you had—now, I've earned 40 credits in social security but that's because my generation started working very young so I have it—but the other loophole was if you had worked 30 years paying into social security, then they could not touch your social security at all. In my situation, I still have 15 more years easily to work. So it was one of those things. A lot of teachers were leaving because of that too because when they found that out, they thought they could still leave, go pay back into social security, and they won't be able to touch either one. That loophole alone, if that was a way for me to make sure that I got all the money rightly coming to me, was going to be an option I was going to take just like many other educators already had done. I just wanted to add that it is significant.

VICE CHAIR DALY:

We will now close the hearing on A.J.R. 6 and move to the last item on our agenda, public comment.

Ms. IVANOFF:

I was calling to make the record straight. Yesterday when I was trying to correct the record, I was saying that I testified in support on A.J.R. 10, but I changed my opinion to opposition. The Chair misunderstood and indicated they were going to move my testimony on A.J.R. 11 from support to opposition, so I am just clarifying for the record I want my testimony on A.J.R. 10 in support to be changed to opposition testimony. Regarding A.J.R. 11, I am in opposition, but I need that changed to support.

**ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10 (1st Reprint)**: Urges the Federal Government to release federally managed land in Nevada for housing. (BDR R-1097)

**ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11 (1st Reprint)**: Urges Congress to enact the Protecting the Right to Organize Act. (BDR R-1012)

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
May 2, 2025  
Page 20

VICE CHAIR DALY:

On A.J.R. 6, we have a letter in support ([Exhibit D](#)) from the Nevada State Education Association. On A.J.R. 14, we have a letter in support ([Exhibit E](#)) from Chelsey Cavion and a letter in opposition ([Exhibit F](#)) from Nancy Carlson.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Connie Summers,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Introduced on Minute Report Page No.</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.J.R. 14	C	3	Assemblymember Steve Yeager	Harry Dunn Video Testimony
A.J.R. 6	D	20	Senator Skip Daly	Letter in Support: Nevada State Education Association
A.J.R. 14	E	20	Senator Skip Daly	Letter in Support: Chelsey Cavion
A.J.R. 14	F	20	Senator Skip Daly	Letter in Opposition: Nancy Carlson