



NEVADA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE TO CONSULT WITH THE DIRECTOR

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.225)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The first meeting of the Nevada Legislature's Committee to Consult with the Director was held on Monday, June 14, 2010, at 1:40 p.m. in Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda," is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/75th2009/committee>. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775.684.6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblyman John Ocegueda, Chair
Senator Steven Horsford
Senator John J. Lee
Senator Joyce Woodhouse
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator William J. Raggio
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea (in Carson City)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU (LCB) STAFF PRESENT:

Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director
Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel
Donald O. Williams, Research Director
H. Pepper Sturm, Chief Deputy Research Director
Susan Furlong Reil, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Sylvia A. Wiese, Executive Assistant

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Oceguera called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m. [Exhibit A](#) is the agenda. Certain items may have been taken out of order but were placed in agenda order in the minutes for purposes of continuity.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2008, MEETING

The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2008, MEETING HELD IN CARSON CITY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW OF REVISIONS TO INTERIM COMMITTEE PROCESS APPROVED BY THE 2009 LEGISLATURE

- Lorne Malkiewich, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained briefly what the committee does: 1) Reviews the structure, functioning and organization of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB); and 2) Reviews preparations for the upcoming session. Statutorily the Committee should meet once before July 1st, once before September 1st and once before January 1st.
- Mr. Malkiewich said in the last interim there was a meeting with discussion about major reforms to the manner in which interim committees are structured and possible changes to it. Item II (see [Exhibit B](#)) in the packet is the bill that was passed as a result of recommendations of this Committee for drafting. In the bill four changes were made:
 - 1) The bill provided that the Legislative Commission shall review and approve the budget work program for the Committee and any changes to the budget for work program, in the past it was understood but was not spelled out in the statute;
 - 2) The bill also provided that unless otherwise ordered by the Legislative Commission, statutory Committees could not meet earlier than November 1st of each odd-numbered year and not later than August 31 of the following even-numbered year, this was a way to get a handle on the interim committee process by putting some limitations on the beginning and ending for statutory committees and also, in part, a reflection of the budget cuts, and a way to phase into the interim since there are a number of duties that need to be performed after session;
 - 3) The bill also prohibited the staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau from serving as primary administrative or professional staff for a committee unless the chairman of the committee is required by statute or resolution to be a Legislator, unless otherwise provided by specific statute. An example of such a statute is the Economic Forum which requires that the LCB provide the staffing though it is not chaired by a Legislator. The concern here is similar to the last one which is to get a handle on the staff workload in the interim in dealing with these committees. There is a lot to do in the interim particularly when you are holding 30-35 positions vacant.

- It is understood “whatever needs to be done needs to be done,” however the concern was we did not want a great deal of those resources to be taken away for a committee not chaired by a Legislator;
 - o 4) Finally, interim studies could not meet earlier than January 1st of the even-numbered year and not later than June 30 of that year, the most notable exception allowed by the Legislative Commission is the Reapportionment Committee as a great deal of its work will be done after July 1st.
 - o Please note in all of these changes there is the phrase “except as otherwise ordered by the Legislative Commission” giving the Commission the ability not just to have some control over the committees but also to help out with the staff.
- Mr. Malkiewich said another change reviewed in the past was having a different method of creating the committees and making the recommendation for interim studies to be suggestions made to the Legislative Commission. Resolutions would say “here are some things the Legislative Commission should consider studying” and have the Legislative Commission determine which studies would be done; this is something we could take a look at in the future. Also, we looked at the idea of changing the interim committee structure. Presently we have a number of statutory committees that are created; some are sunset, but generally they continue for quite a while and do not necessary reflect the Legislature’s workload. The difficulty is if you want to change the focus, such as getting rid of a committee, you would need to change or eliminate the statute. One of the things to take a look at is whether we can align interim studies with the statutory committees and to have them parallel the session standing committees.

PRESENTATION ON INTERIM COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

- Don Williams, Research Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau, who also introduced H. Pepper Sturm, Chief Deputy Research Director, said they prepared a proposal for the Committee’s consideration. This Committee and some of the previous legislative leaders have indicated a need for a better way to organize the interim study process and structure With input they have gotten they have developed a proposal of an alternative to the existing interim study process and structure.
 - o One of the issues over the years has been the number of legislators appointed to interim studies without knowledge of the topics being studied.
 - o Another issue has been the number of bill draft requests submitted by interim studies and then heard by session standing committees without members who served on those interim studies.
 - o The proposal assumes the creation of the same number of session standing committees in each house with of the statutory jurisdiction of each standing committee more closely aligned with its counterpart in the other house.
 - o In Part III, Attachment A (see [Exhibit B](#)) is a possible model in which we took a minimum number of nine committees in each house and that the interim committees be structured based on those session standing committees. The model would be a joint interim committee in those areas, one interim committee for Commerce and Labor, Government Affairs, Health and Education, Judiciary, Legislative Affairs and Elections, Natural Resources, Taxation, and Transportation.

- There could be variations of this, for example the one area that would be a challenge is Health and Education because the existing statutory committees on Health and Education are two of our busiest interim bodies. One possible option would be for those committees to go ahead and create joint interim committees, one on Health and one on Education or create standing subcommittees for each of those under a joint committee Health and Education Committee.
 - To make this work it would require the repeal of most of the existing statutory committees and then the current jurisdiction of those committees be assigned out to the new joint interim committees.
 - As an example, we listed most of the major existing statutory committees that would be repealed under this proposal but note the entire list is more extensive than this. Note that certain bodies like the Legislative Commission, Interim Finance Committee and Economic Forum would remain.
- Chair Ocegüera asked, if limiting and getting rid of a number of committees would save money? And, would the number of meetings of the nine standing committees increase?
 - In response, Mr. Williams said the number of members appointed to each committee would determine the fiscal impact. If it would be less than the full membership, closer to the current membership of existing interim studies with the same current number of meetings, it would save money. Beyond that, adding the number of meetings and members would increase the cost.
 - Senator Lee asked about the proposed interim committee structures since the Senate does not mirror the Assembly how would this actually work?
 - Mr. Williams responded it would require that the standing committees during session to be organized on a parallel basis which could be done without too much difficulty so that committees in each House would have the same jurisdiction over the same chapters of NRS but would have to be done before session. As far as the jurisdiction, some current statutory committees do not necessarily fall easily into one category of our existing standing committees.
 - Mr. Sturm continued the presentation with the following:
 - Unless otherwise specified by the Legislative Commission, when it meets to approve the interim work programs and budgets for each of the joint interim committees, the Commission would select the chair and vice chair of each joint committee from members serving on the corresponding session standing committee.
 - Members of all joint committees and their approved subcommittees meeting during the interim period would be appointed by the Legislative Commission from the membership of the corresponding session standing committees. The Commission could also consider appointing members serving on topic-related subcommittees of the two budget committees, in addition to those mentioned that are aligned to the session standing committees members.
 - The Legislative Commission will decide upon any needed subcommittees of the joint interim committees and will appoint the chair and vice chair for any subcommittee formed from the joint interim committee. Again, the Legislative Commission would have the authority to make those choices as

opposed to the chair and vice-chair of the joint standing committees. Any subcommittees would have to be subject to budget considerations and work programs that the Commission has approved.

- The Commission continues to review and approve work plans and budgets for all joint interim committees and their subcommittees and will decide whether to include any of the topics designated by the previous legislative session for study. The joint interim committees must structure meeting schedules for the full committee or any approved subcommittees in accordance with that approved budget and work plan.
 - The Legislative Counsel would revise the drafting rules for legislation that call for the study on a topic during the interim period to reflect this new coordinating role of the Legislative Commission in this process. For example, legislation calling for a study of a particular topic would contain the language: "...the Legislative Commission shall consider a study of ..."
 - Provide the Legislative Commission with the authority to adjust membership numbers and the number of approved meetings for all studies recommended from the previous session if the volume of approved study topics as specified in the work programs exceeds available resources. Specifically, authorize the Legislative Commission to redirect a new study, reassign to another committee, direct a staff study if necessary to save money, or elect not to conduct a study; that is why legislation would include the language about the "...the Legislative Commission shall consider a study...": they could elect not to do that because we do not have the budget or the staff for that or for any newly created statutory committee for that matter.
 - Require by rule that all legislation – including budget and omnibus bills – which add to or create a study or a statutory committee, must be processed by the session standing committee in each house assigned to review legislative studies.
 - Align bill referrals to session standing committees to ensure committee members will be hearing bills they worked on during the interim.
- Senator Raggio indicated concern about the issue of parity between the two Houses of the Legislature with the proposed joint committees and that is something that needs to be considered with any restructuring.
 - Mr. Malkiewich said he wants to make it clear what we are trying to do is to present some options as a starting point. There are a variety of options on how to set up the committees and appointments.

DISCUSSION OF ADOPTING ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING DETAILS FOR BILL DRAFT REQUESTS

- Referring to Item IV (see [Exhibit B](#)), an outline of the proposal, Mr. Malkiewich said since having gone to 120-day sessions, limiting the number of bills gives the Legislature a better chance of getting done on time. In addition to all the other issues created by term limits, the huge turnover means people who are leaving request bills and people who are newly elected request bills which means by November, after the election, we will probably be running ahead of last session on bill draft requests and the Legislative Counsel would appreciate help with getting the bills in early. This agenda item was suggested at a Legislative Commission meeting for this Committee's review. There are deadlines for

requests: you have requests for certain numbers of bills by September 1st, by December 15th, and by the 8th day of session. The statutes and rules say that you have to include sufficient information to allow drafting. The fact is, call this the "practical problem," you are not, when you submit the bill, going to have all the details you need. One concern is that "how is a legislator supposed to know everything when they submit a bill?" Either the legislator is going to have a general idea and will be submitting the more specific detail later, or in the course of drafting some questions are going to come up. Though these bills are requested on time, and the idea is the September BDRs will be done in the fall, the December submissions will be drafted by the start of session and the ones submitted the first few days will be drafted next, what happens instead is that many of these bills will sit around until very close to the deadlines for introduction. That is when suddenly the details start materializing and the dual problem is, first the Legal Division gets overwhelmed by the number of bills for which they are getting details very late in the process, and, secondly, the benefit of getting bills in early in session is lost. We end up getting a large number of bills introduced between days 35 and 50. The suggestion is to consider some sort of a system of secondary deadlines, whether they be advisory or mandatory, such as, if you are submitting a bill on September 1st then perhaps you get can get all the details in by December 1st, for those bills requested December 15th get all the details in by January 15th and for those requested by day 8, have all the details in by day 22. There are concerns about making this policy decision for the Legislature. First, do you want to do it at all? The second issue is the strength of the penalty for not getting it done. It can be treated something like our targets for closing the budget: we put a date on the calendar saying this is when you need to do it, but it would be advisory. If you make it mandatory, is the only significant sanction would be that a bill is going to be deemed withdrawn if the details have not been submitted. If it is just going to be advisory, a target, then it is not as important to have exceptions or be able to accommodate unusual situations. If you are going to have some stringent sanctions, you do need to allow exceptions for cases where a legislator cannot have the details because, for example, it is as a matter federal law that has not yet passed. Since the idea is to help the Legislative Counsel, Mr. Malkiewich suggested that a decision be made in consultation with the Legislative Counsel so it will help her to get the information and not create more administrative problems in terms of getting the details.

- Chair Ocegüera said it seems pretty black and white to him but why not have the exception be that a request must be taken to the leadership of each House. The person would have to go to leadership and say, "look, it is a federal requirement and I couldn't get the information for four more days can you give me the waiver?" It would reduce that number considerably, and so if there is one more step for people that they have to go through that process to get a waiver, it would be helping the process.
- Mr. Malkiewich responded that would be one way that you could provide for exceptions. Depending on the date, perhaps the two weeks before the deadline the Legislative Counsel would send out a notice to legislator that these bills are about to die because we of missing details and if they do not have a waiver from leadership the bill would die.

- Mr. Conklin said he likes where the Chair is headed with this and we have a tremendous Legal staff but he thinks there needs to be some insulation for the Legal staff. He said this needs to be addressed but there needs to be a buffer between legislators and the staff. Somebody who can take the heat for saying “no, the rules are clear, you don’t have a legitimate reason, we’re not letting this go on.” He thinks that’s a huge burden for the LCB to bear. Mr. Malkiewich responded that is a problem and any sort of limitations of this type where you are putting staff in a position of enforcing a rule needs some kind of process whereby the decision about exceptions is not being determined by the Legislative Counsel.
- In reference to legislators who are termed out or moving to the other House submitting BDRs, Senator Lee questioned whether that is and should be permitted.
- Mr. Malkiewich answered the statutes say you are still a legislator until November 2nd, and the statute also says that a legislator is entitled to request bills. We do have limitations on drafting those in place. What the Legislative Counsel does is those bills will not be drafted until someone who is actually coming in next session has claimed them. If a term-limited legislator says I really think we need this bill and puts the bill draft request in, that bill draft request will sit there until someone picks it up. As an example, assume Ms. Gansert requested a bill she is entitled by statute to request six bills before September 1st and another five between September 1st and December 15th – Mr. Goicoechea decides to introduce them, we would then draft them. A person who is not elected to office yet cannot request a bill. A person who is moving from one House to the other is permitted to submit the number of bills draft requests of their present House, however, if elected to the other House, the person will be permitted the statutory number for that House.
- Senator Horsford said he wanted to go about this a different way, whether or not members are entitled to bill drafts. He was visiting with a colleague in another state that has a process whereby a conceptual bill request is made that doesn’t have every detail of the actual bill drafted, it just is a concept, and they have to take that to the committee by a certain date and get a majority vote to actually have the bill drafted. He thinks particularly from the committee level that is something we could do to make sure there is a level of support before we have our staff drafting a bunch of bills that never go anywhere. He would like staff to investigate other states and their processes and what they do to limit the number of actual drafts that staff are required to develop. Chair Ocegüera said he thinks Senator Horsford is referring to a kind of Rules Committee model and would have to work in the interim to make determinations on bills. It is an interesting concept we can discuss but shifts the power radically.
- Mr. Goicoechea said just for clarification, so technically if Ms. Gansert requests her eleven bills and she is not coming back and another legislator picks those up, then they do not count as out of their BDR requests and someone could end up with twenty-two bills?
- Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, replied that the former legislators BDRs would not be included in the total BDRs allowed the present legislator. Mr. Goicoechea said maybe that is something we need to look at because technically

all of sudden you have members who have the ability to do twenty-two and if you happen to be in leadership it could be up to thirty-two.

- Ms. Smith said she really would like us to work toward having some kind of a mandatory date for submitting details and language unless there is some kind of a waiver or exception.
- Chair Ocegüera said that these issues will come up again in future meetings. He suggested the Committee members discuss, reflect and put together their thoughts on these issues and get together individually or in groups and figure where we are going to be on some of these issues when they are brought up again in a Committee to Consult with the Director meeting.

PREPARATION FOR THE 2011 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

· **Expanded Training for New Legislators**

Mr. Malkiewich said we know that we will have at least twenty-eight new members next session, 28 out of 53 who are up for election will be turning over and a large number of those, particularly on the Assembly side, will be freshmen. Almost all of the Assembly candidates have no prior legislative experience. The four changes we will be looking at, although we'll be working out specifics between now and when we actually do the training, are as follows:

- More training. In the past when we had a smaller number of legislators you could do more mentoring and more work within your caucus. When you have possibly twenty-one freshmen in the Assembly not everybody can be mentored. When we have small number of legislators we can assign a Research Analyst to spend all kinds of time with that legislator getting them up to speed, answering all their questions. Instead of meeting one on one, the size of pre-session orientation is going to be more like a classroom setting with a room full of people. With that many to train, we are going to have to provide more of the training to the legislators and assume less that they will be getting this training elsewhere and the program will be expanded. We will spend a few more hours if not days to take a look at some concepts, set some additional training and look at some of the things caused by turnover from term limits, such as loss of institutional memory when you not only lose a large number of legislators but lose your most senior members.
- Chair and Vice Chair training. People who become chairs generally have been serving here for several sessions and have moved up. That is changing and out of necessity we are going to have new people at least, as Vice Chairs if not Chairs. We focus on the Chairs, but you want to make sure the Vice Chair is very comfortable stepping right in and taking over the committee meeting so the staff has been asked to look into including Vice Chairs in the training.
- New money committee member training. Similarly, the money committees usually having a very small turnover who can be trained by the returning members, but this session are going to have new members, whether they are freshmen or just legislators who are returning and who are moving over to the money committees, who have no experience in the process required for reviewing the budget, so we will be working on developing training programs for the new money committee members.

- Continuing training during session. In the past, we have been encouraged to have continuing training during session and had comments from freshmen legislators about needing follow up training once getting into session. We are taking a look at scheduling training in advance, perhaps a third of the way through session. If we schedule the dates in advance and put them on the calendar then people would know to schedule that time and be prepared for the training.

Chair Ocegüera said the reason this is on the agenda is because both in the private and public sector the first thing we end up doing is cutting our training. He thinks that is the wrong direction to go and that is why he is proposing we do much more training. He is going to go as far as putting it on the schedule and taking a Legislative Day to have training for these new members because with the amount of turnover we are going to have we are going to need training and it is worth our time to give these people a day's worth of "here's what's going to happen next." He thinks it is well worth our time and well worth the money so he wanted to reiterate how strongly he supports these four concepts.

Senator Horsford said he wanted to reinforce that, however, he thinks for purposes of planning, he would not be as specific as "money committee training" or "reapportionment training." It needs to be left broad and generic to allow us to determine, as we get closer, whether it needs to be all that, some of that, or something else than that. He agrees we need to leave some dates specifically for training and have it be part of the overall schedule but internally we need to leave it more flexible.

Ms. Smith said she really likes this idea and that it is going to be critical in our success. She wants to suggest that looking at the dates on the regular new member training, it seems to her that we could push both of those a little later so that the first one gets a little closer to First House Passage when we really are spending all that time on the floor and so that when we talk about what happens on the floor and all of the things that go on and even including where they spend their time that it be a little closer. The same for the second training that we are closer to Second House Passage, budget closing, and more importantly conference committees. She thinks the conference committee thing gets really confusing for people at first and by pushing that training a little later it would be fresh and more helpful.

Preparation for Reapportionment and Redistricting

The interim study Committee on this subject has had a couple of meetings and so far have been talking about hardware and software and generalities, Redistricting 101. The next meeting is July 21st, and they will be hearing from the clerks and the registrars on their needs, getting a presentation on census geography, looking at the legal requirements and taking a look not at adopting rules for redistricting but just the sort of things that you would put in rules so that we will be prepared for that later in the interim. That is a large part of our preparation for next session to make sure we are ready for redistricting.

Review of 120-day Calendar and Items for Consideration in Revising or Adding to the Calendar.

Mr. Malkiewich said if you look at the calendar Part V of the packet (see [Exhibit B](#)), many of the issues already raised concern this. We talked about putting some of the items on the calendar so people would have the time scheduled. The Chair suggested creating training days, not legislative days, and since the Committee is familiar with 120-day calendar he is not going to talk about the different deadlines. Things to look at are the potential changes. March 14th (day 36) and March 21st (day 43) are the legislators bill drafting and committees' bill drafting deadlines. These relate to the issue we discussed before, what happens if we do not get some kind of system of secondary deadlines is we get within a couple weeks of March 14th and suddenly all those individual legislators' bills get details; obviously the Legal Division cannot draft a bill by March 14th and get it to you if they do not have the details until March 15th. The idea is to get you your bill drafts a week before the deadlines so that if any changes need to be made you can get them back. With regard to the March 15th entry, he has no idea when the reapportionment data is coming but we are anticipating it a few weeks before April 1st so he is suggesting putting that on the calendar. March 17th (day 39) and 18th (day 40), this is the first set of suggestions to which Assemblywoman Smith was referring, rather than having these day 39 and 40 perhaps move the new member training a little closer to the deadline for bill introductions, closer to day 50 than day 40. The reason these dates have question marks after them is so the Committee could see how they look on the calendar and move them around to see how they work in connection with the other deadlines. Senator Horsford made the suggestion that March 23rd through 25th be aside as "Training" rather than being specific about the kind of training. If we have the date set aside people have it on their calendar, and we determine this is what we need to do. One of the reasons we put the Money Committee Training here is that the money committees will start to closing budgets on April 5th; up until that date the money committees are just hearing budgets, and on April 5th the workload changes substantially. Reapportionment Training would be for all legislators to have a session when the final details are in and we are starting to work on reapportionment. The second set of new member training is days 81 and 82; it would be nice to have this training close to conference committees but I do not think there will be time around day 109 or 110 on Conference Committee Training so perhaps moving this closer to the end and covering Conference Committees.

Days 89 and 92, are a minor technical change: we moved the date for resolving budget differences from day 89 to 92 last session because the Economic Forum report was due on day 89 last session, now that it is due a little bit earlier we might want to move the "Start Resolving Budget Differences" back to day 89. The most significant change on here is a substantive issue that you may want to consider which is whether you want to put deadlines for finishing reapportionment. By way of example, May 6th would be for finishing the maps and May 13th for passing the bills. The idea here is to try to spread your workload a little bit instead of spending days 100 through 120 trying both to close the budget and to do reapportionment. This deadline would mean that we are going to try and get reapportionment by this date and then can spend between day 96 and 120 finishing up the budget. One of things we found last session was, even with an extremely accelerated schedule for closing the budget, having a deadline helped us to get it done. The final point is conference reports to drafting on day 118, which has been a very confusing deadline. It is a

suggestion: if you have a conference committee that is appointed in the ordinary course of things try to make sure that your report is to drafting at least by then. We have conference committees appointed on day 119 and day 120, they obviously cannot make this deadline. Mr. Malkiewich indicated that he heard the other day that someone thought that this was a limit, that you could not turn it in before then; we certainly do not want to be doing that. The benefit of this target is minimal so the Committee might want to consider eliminating it.

Mr. Conklin said he has been a member of the Elections Procedures Ethics Committee for a long time and has not always seen eye-to-eye with Senator Townsend but thinks he had some real points a couple sessions ago. They worked on a bill to limit the bill draft requests for the Executive Agencies and he knows that Mr. Malkiewich has worked on that with them, and at some point he would like to have some legislative history about how we managed to give out so many bill draft requests to cities, counties, the Governor's office, the Attorney General's office, and so on. One of the reasons he is asking is this is our process, the Constitution allows bill drafts to no one. We allow bill drafts, the Constitution provides that exclusively to us, and when you look at other legislative bodies like Congress, the President of the United States has no bill draft requests. He said if we owned this process a little bit more it might be easier to get some of these deadlines in place and we might foster better relationships with other branches of government by forcing sponsorships. We lose a lot of bills because no legislator is a champion of those bills.

Mr. Malkiewich said, with respect to the history the bill draft limitations first started when he was Legislative Counsel a number of years ago. This was the general direction of the changes Senator Townsend suggested, and they resulted in a cut of about 160 bills out of non-legislative requestors and expanded legislative bills by 80. We have taken a step in that direction and will report back on where we are on that. Over the years we have improved this quite a bit, we have now tied the bills more to need. The Governor gets to submit 100 bills to carry out the needs of the agencies by September 1st. Those bills need to be finished by December 15th and prefiled. We then allow an unlimited number of bills from the Department of Administration to carry out the budget because if the budget says there is an appropriation of \$15,000 for this function we do not want to be using a legislators bills on it. That is exempted because it is just for that purpose. What started to happen was that some of the Governor's agenda was being mixed into that exemption, so we said "no" this is just for budget bills during session and gave the Governor a separate allocation for the Governor's agenda.

Mr. Conklin said from his perspective there is no problem with the budget, but there are 100 bills that are policy bills, and the only policy branch of government that he is aware of is this branch so why would we. It is a fundamental question of why would we give up that agenda setting ability without some agreement or some sponsorship amongst our own body.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sylvia A. Wiese
Executive Assistant

APPROVED BY:

John Ocegüera, Chair

Date: _____

This set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report" is supplied as an informational service. Copies of the complete exhibits and materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio recording are on file in the Director's Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the committee secretary by Email at: admin@lcb.state.nv.us or telephone: 775/684-6800.

EXHIBITS
Committee to Consult with the Director

Exhibit A	Agenda
Exhibit B	June 14, 2010 Meeting Packet