



NEVADA LEGISLATURE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.150)

MINUTES

July 7, 2025

The first meeting of the Legislative Commission for Calendar Year 2025 was held on Monday, July 7, 2025, at 11 a.m. in Room 165, Nevada Legislature Office Building, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4100, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Commission's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Chair
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen
Senator Melanie Scheible
Assemblymember Shea M. Backus
Assemblymember Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui
Assemblymember Howard Watts
Assemblymember Steve Yeager

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Skip Daly
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Robin L. Titus
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Roger Wilkerson, Deputy Director, Director's Office, and Chief, Administrative Division
Dan Rushin, Chief Financial Officer, Administrative Division
Tarron L. Collins, Office Services Coordinator, Director's Office

Daniel L. Crossman, Legislative Auditor, Audit Division
Asher A. Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Kevin C. Powers, General Counsel, Legal Division
Christina Harper, Manager of Research Policy Assistants, Research Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Remarks in brackets provided for clarification.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND OPENING REMARKS

Chair Cannizzaro:

Good morning, and welcome to the first meeting of the Legislative Commission of the 2025–2026 Interim. Thank you all for joining us. We are going to begin our meeting with our roll call. Madam Secretary, will you please call the roll?

[Roll call was taken.]

Chair Cannizzaro:

We have four members attending in the Legislative Building in Carson City and eight members in the Legislative Office Building in Las Vegas. We have a quorum present.

Before we begin, I want to go over just a few housekeeping items. For any of you who wish to testify, please make sure that you state and spell your name for the record before testifying. If anyone would like to receive a copy of the Commission's agenda, minutes, or reports, you may be added to our mailing list by following the links on the Legislature's website or by providing information to our staff; contact information for staff is also listed on the Legislature's website. In addition, we accept written comments, which may be emailed or mailed before, during, or after the meeting. The information regarding where to send written comments is also on the website and listed on the agenda for this meeting.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

That will bring us to Item II on our agenda, which is our first period of public comment. We will begin here in Las Vegas, then go to Carson City, then move over to our phone lines. For those of you who are here to give public comment, please make sure that you state and spell your name for the record. We will limit public comment to two minutes per person, and any additional comments you have can always be submitted in writing during or after the meeting. And we will have a second period of public comment for those of you who wish to testify. If you are going to give testimony, please make sure that in whatever location you are, you sign in on the clipboard by the door before you leave or when you come in.

[Chair Cannizzaro called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.]

We will move on to Item III, which is our election of Chair and Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission.

AGENDA ITEM III—ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

Chair Cannizzaro:

Members, I would like to note that you have a copy of Joint Rule 11 at your desk today. Subsection 6 of Joint Rule 11 provides that the Chair shall be selected at the first meeting of each newly formed Legislative Commission and shall serve until his or her successor is appointed following the formation of the next Legislative Commission. At this point in time, I will entertain a motion.

Senator Titus:

Madam Chair, Senator Titus here.

Chair Cannizzaro:

Senator Titus, please.

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like just a moment to make a comment and statement before we open up any nominations or move forward with this process.

Chair Cannizzaro:

I will go ahead and give you the leeway to make that comment. It might be more appropriate on the discussion of the motion.

Senator Titus:

Thank you. Just a comment before we formally start the Legislative Commission. I appreciate the tolerance and opportunity to address my fellow Commission members and fellow Nevadans.

As we convene our first meeting in the 2025–2027 [2026] Interim, I have to address the troubling events that transpired in the final moments of the 83rd Legislative Session. What should have been a collaborative close to a productive and cordial session was marred by the majority party's eleventh-hour actions, which undermined, in my opinion, the integrity of our legislative process. In the final 30 minutes before the constitutional midnight deadline, the majority party introduced [Senate Concurrent Resolution 8](#) to shift the Legislative Commission membership from a balance 3-3 split in each house to a 4-2 majority in their favor. The resolution was read in the Assembly before the Senate vote was even finalized at 11:51 [p.m.]—a procedural irregularity that denied minority members adequate review and deliberation. In fact, according to the Assembly, they never received a copy of the resolution before the vote. This lack of transparency is unacceptable in a body committed to fairness that legislates for an even partisan State.

[Senate Resolution 9](#)'s vote occurred at 12:18 a.m. on June 3, 18 minutes after the deadline set by Article 4, Section 2 of the *Nevada Constitution*. Legal precedents suggest that actions taken after midnight are void unless enrolled prior to midnight, which SR 9 was not. Consequently, the existing 3-3 membership balance should remain.

Most alarmingly, it is our opinion, that the Lieutenant Governor was locked out of Senate chambers preventing him from fulfilling his constitutional duty. This action raises serious questions on the legality of the Senate's actions during that period. Under *Mason's* rules [*Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure*], which govern our proceedings, such actions violate the principle of perfect equality among members and undermine the democratic process. Last minute amendments left no time for the Legislative Counsel Bureau to process the bill and print it, resulting in its failure to not making it to the Senate chambers prior to midnight. Safe neighborhoods are nonnegotiable, and the majority party's actions prioritize political gains over public safety.

Chair Cannizzaro:

Senator, I am going to ask you to wrap up your comments, as this is inappropriate for the item we are on.

Senator Titus:

I am going to close. This is prior to the actual motions. While we believe there is legal standing to challenge SR 9 in court and win, the judiciary is unlikely to intervene in internal legislative processes and procedures. Therefore, we will prosecute our case in the public opinion. However, it is my opinion that we, the four of us that are Republicans on this body, are honored to serve on this Commission. We will cooperate with the majority party and are looking forward to participating in the future motions and future leadership. Thank you all for your tolerance.

Chair Cannizzaro:

I will remind members of this body that while we are on items on our agenda, it is appropriate for us to have discussions about those particular items. This particular item, Item III on our agenda, is the election of Chair and Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission. It is inappropriate for us to have what I would characterize as some sort of legal debate in the Legislative Commission regarding the formation of the Legislative Commission. That is more appropriate for any sort of legal challenge that may or may not exist.

As for the number of allegations, I will recognize and remind this body that we have rules of decorum and rules against infringing upon or calling out other members of this Commission. And I will remind this body that those exist for the members who serve on this Commission at all times. To the extent that there are allegations made today regarding the passage of Senate resolutions at the end of the legislative session or allegations, which frankly, I am going to take a moment to address, that somehow the Lieutenant Governor was locked out of the Senate—that is 100 percent untrue. And I do not appreciate those allegations being brought to a Legislative Commission meeting.

I am going back to Item III, which properly allows us to talk about the election of Chair and Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission. I am open to a motion to nominate a Chair for the Legislative Commission. I am going to Assemblymember Watts.

Assemblymember Watts:

Thank you, Chair, and thank you for your service as Chair during this past interim. It is my intention to make two motions, one for each position. I would like to make a motion to elect Assemblymember Jauregui as Chair of the Legislative Commission.

Assemblymember Backus:

I move to second.

Chair Cannizzaro:

I have a motion from Assemblymember Watts to nominate Assemblymember Jauregui for Chair of the Legislative Commission. I have a second from Assemblymember Backus. Any discussion on this motion?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS MOVED TO ELECT ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI AS CHAIR OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senator Cannizzaro:

Congratulations, Madam Chair, on your election. I will now accept a motion to nominate a Vice Chair for the Legislative Commission. I will again go to Assemblymember Watts.

Assemblymember Watts:

I move to elect Speaker Yeager as Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission.

Assemblymember Backus:

Madam Chair, I second that.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I have a motion to nominate Speaker Yeager as Vice Chair of the Legislative Commission from Assemblymember Watts, and I have a second from Assemblymember Backus. Any discussion on this motion?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS MOVED TO ELECT ASSEMBLYMEMBER YEAGER AS VICE CHAIR OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senator Cannizzaro:

Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Vice Chair. Now that we have a new Chair and Vice Chair for our Legislative Commission, I am going to turn the duties over to Chair Jauregui to take over the rest of the meeting.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senate Majority Leader, Speaker, and members of the Commission. I am looking forward to working alongside everyone during this next interim as Chair of the Legislative Commission.

I would like to move to Item IV, which is approval of our draft minute minutes for the Legislative Commission meeting held on December 19, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM IV—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON DECEMBER 19, 2024

Chair Jauregui:

These draft minutes ([Agenda Item IV](#)) are also available on the Legislature's website. I will first ask if there is any discussion on these minutes. Not seeing any in Las Vegas and no hands raised in Carson City, I will look for a motion to approve the minutes of the Legislative Commission's December 19 meeting.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON DECEMBER 19, 2024.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

That takes us to Item V on our agenda, which is our review of the administrative regulations.

AGENDA ITEM V—ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS (NRS 233B.067 AND NRS 233B.0675)

The list of regulations to be considered can be accessed electronically at: https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Register/IndexesRegsReviewed/LCMtg_List_2025_Jul7.pdf. (Please contact the Legal Division of the LCB at 775-684-6830 for a hard copy of the text of the regulations.)

Chair Jauregui:

Our Legislative Counsel, Asher Killian, is here with us today in Las Vegas to assist us with this item. There are 18 regulations that were submitted for approval pursuant to NRS 233B.067 ([Agenda Item V](#)). These regulations are all contained in the notebook provided to the members and posted on the Legislature's website under the tab for this meeting, which you will find by hitting the View Events button in the upper right corner of the Legislature's website homepage. There is also a public copy of the notebook on the sign-in table at each end of the videoconference.

At this time, I will ask Commission members if there are any regulations to be held for further discussion. I have received a list from the members, so I will go through the list that I have first, and then members, if there are any other regulations that you would like to pull in addition, please speak up. The first regulation I have is R139-23. The second regulation is R057-24. The third regulation is R068-24 followed by R077-24, R109-24, and finally R130-24. Commission members, are there any additional regulations that you would like held for discussion? I do not see any additional regulations to be pulled at this point. I would be looking for a motion to approve the remaining regulations under this item that were not pulled.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING REGULATIONS: R138-23, R063-24, R073-24, R104-24, R108-24, R112-24, R119-24, R126-24, R156-24, R157-24, R172-24, AND R176-24.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Now, let us get back to the regulations that have been pulled for further discussion. I will take those in order. The first regulation is R139-23, and this regulation was requested by Senator Skip Daly.

Senator Daly:

Is there someone coming forward down there?

Chair Jauregui:

Senator Daly, I was just going to ask you if there was anyone in Carson City.

Senator Daly:

Nope.

Rebecca Lindelow, Social Services Manager, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS), Department of Health and Human Services:

This is Rebecca Lindelow with DWSS. I have Angelise Washington on the line as well to answer any questions. She is our Program Specialist.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you. Senator Daly, did you want to proceed with your questions?

Senator Daly:

Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. This is not something I am 100 percent familiar with, but I do have a couple of questions. When I was reading through it, the new language in Section 1 and then also in Section 3, sub[section] 3(b), seems to indicate that there is a formula, a relatively prescriptive formula, on how you make a determination on what the support level needs to be. Is it significantly different from what we had? How much flexibility is there? What are we changing with this new language as far as making those determinations?

Ms. Lindelow:

Angelise? Are you on the line?

AVH:

Angelise has not joined Zoom yet.

Ms. Lindelow:

Let me answer that the best I can. This is specific to when we are looking at both parties' obligations; how we determine that obligation has not changed. This is in regards to the difference between the obligee's obligation and the obligor's obligation and whether the amount for the obligation would be a full or a half. How they determine the obligation has not changed.

Senator Daly:

So, this is just to figure the difference between the two parties, if you will, on who has to pay which amount?

Ms. Lindelow:

Correct.

Senator Daly:

My unfamiliarity with some of this is perhaps prompting the question because it seemed pretty prescriptive on how this was done. I understand the difference between the two obligees, the people that have to pay, and then making that split, but the formula, or the way they do that, is based on income and a variety of other issues. None of that has changed?

Ms. Lindelow:

Correct.

Senator Daly:

Ok. In Section 4, sub[section] 1(d), can you give me an explanation or a little bit of insight as to why we are making that change? It seems to add a little more flexibility, but I was just looking for some confirmation on what it is we are trying to get done there.

Ms. Lindelow:

I am sorry. Can you give me that section again?

Senator Daly:

Section 4, sub[section] 1(d).

Ms. Lindelow:

Bear with me please.

Senator Daly:

Were you able to find that section? You are muted. We cannot hear you.

Chair Jauregui:

Ms. Lindelow, I believe you have your computer on mute. We are still having trouble hearing you.

AVH:

This is Stephanie with Broadcast. If you click that caret next to your audio, you can switch the audio. It looks like it is switched to a phone, and I do not know if the phone has been muted.

Chair, it looks like she has been disconnected; I am sure she will reconnect in a moment.

Chair Jauregui:

Senator Daly, since we are waiting for another presenter from the agency to get on, do you mind if we come back to this regulation just in hopes of getting all agency representatives on the line and giving Ms. Lindelow time to reconnect?

Senator Daly:

I have no objection, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Members, we will come back to R139-23, and we will move to R057-24.

Do we have the Nevada Interscholastic Activities Association (NIAA) here? I believe we have questions for you from Senator Daly and Assemblymember Backus.

Paul J. Anderson Esq., Legal Counsel, NIAA:

Yes, Madam Chair. Paul Anderson with the Maupin, Cox & Legoy law firm in Reno. I am legal counsel for the NIAA.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Anderson. We have questions for you from Senator Daly and Assemblymember Backus. We can start with Senator Daly.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. "Verbal abuse" is defined in Section 8, sub[section] 12(d). I do not know how you get around it, but it seems fairly subjective. It sounds like it is the referee or whatever official is at the location or overseeing the event that makes that determination. Can you give an explanation on what types of things might or might not be verbal abuse? Obviously, we want people to behave, but when is it going to cross that line? And what kind of training are the people going to get on how they determine what verbal abuse is? Different personalities, different people, different refs, different interpretations, different events.

Mr. Anderson:

Senator Daly, thank you for the question. Which section are you looking at exactly?

Senator Daly:

The definition for verbal abuse in Section 8, subsection 12(d).

Mr. Anderson:

Well, [Section 8, subsection 12](b) defines “assault.” Is that what you are discussing?

Senator Daly:

[Section 8, subsection] 12(d) where it says, “‘Verbal abuse’ means aggressive, offensive or profane language that is directed at a person.” And if I read the first part of that, it is the referee or the official at whatever event that is going to make that determination.

Mr. Anderson:

Correct. It would be either an actual game or contest official that would make that determination and/or a school administrator at most likely the school where the event is taking place who would make that determination. It is not going to be a determination that is made off the whim for any particular comment. You need to understand, as you may already, that high school sports are education-based, yet they have turned recently into events where very aggressive language or profane language is being used, and that is what we are trying to prevent here. As far as training, our officials receive extensive training through their associations, and the NIAA, as an association, provides training to administrators, athletic directors, and school principals on an annual basis. It is not going to be something where some slight comment that may not necessarily fall within the definition would spur that sort of action. And there is appeal ability for the individual to pursue, also.

Senator Daly:

I understand. I was just trying to get some clarity on that. I do not think you could make a definition that would cover everything that people are going to understand. And then you do subjectivity on the interpretation—on who it is, what the particular words were, what type of event it was, how close they were—in a wrestling match you are fairly close to the activity. There are a lot of different things that would go into this. We do not want to get into the situation where obscenity is, “We will know it when we see it,” but that is kind of where we are at, sounds like to me.

Mr. Anderson:

You are correct in a lot of ways. I think we do know it when we see it at the high school level. And you are accurate, also, with respect to the nature of the event, the closeness of fans. For instance, a football game is much different than, as you mentioned, a wrestling match. There is an appeal process, and if somebody was ejected for comments, they can be brought to the attention of the Executive Director and appeal rights pursued from there. That is also in the regulation.

Senator Daly:

My second question is in Section 10. I understand a coach, an official administrator, faculty member who is involved, or a pupil who is involved. Those people are there, they have responsibilities, there are things that come along with them, participating in the rules. But when you add a “spectator” who participates in or attends the sanctioned sports shall not make defamatory statements. I understand if you are in attendance—and that was the section we were just talking about on offensive, abusive language—but if somebody makes a post, a private person on a social media site says that the ref was no good, et cetera, how is it that you are then going to try to prohibit that spectator from attending an otherwise public event based on their free speech? I just do not see how Section 10 is ever going to

get to a spectator in relation to the social media or activity outside the event. We are not there, we are not watching, no one is there. You are making a post; you are doing whatever you might do and [inaudible] say that guy was a no-good so-and-so. The way I read Section 10, you would be able to prohibit that person from participating based on his speech. How do you see that working? I do not see it working, but how do you see it?

Mr. Anderson:

Senator Daly, the idea of this entire regulation is to attempt to bring back civility, as best we can, into the high school athletic arena. Not that it is not there, but there are times when it is not. In this situation, the spectator typically would be a fan, or a parent, or somebody involved with a particular school. We have always prohibited coaches and players from commenting in the media about officials. That is a fairly standard rule that you would see, not only at the high school level across the country but also with colleges. I understand your concern and how we would enforce it. If it is on social media and it is well-known, I think it could be enforced against a spectator depending on the nature of the post and the criticism.

Senator Daly:

I understand how you can put it on a coach; you have an employment relationship with them, an official, an administrator. Even a pupil—you can say this is part of what comes with you being a student at the school or participating in the event. But when you get to be a spectator, I do not know how you would be able to enforce or prohibit me from coming to your event later. Are you going to have somebody checking everybody's post, or are you going to have this parent ratting out another parent? How are you actually going to do this? I understand you want civility; we want civility across the board, but people still have free speech rights. We can disagree with what they are saying or how they go about it and the civility of it all. We can disagree with all of that, but they still have those rights. I am just not seeing how Section 10 works.

Mr. Anderson:

The idea of the regulation is to bring that civility back to the high school athletic arena. If there is something posted that goes wild on the Internet, then I think it can be enforced because if a particular spectator is attending games at a certain school, the administration there is going to know who that person is. With respect to the free speech rights, I certainly understand what you are saying, but we see no place, as the NIAA, for somebody to verbally abuse—whether it is an official, or a player, or a coach, or whoever is participating in one of these events—publicly or at the particular event. We have included this here because things have gotten much worse in the last few years. And one of the problems we do have as an association, which could at some point really affect high school sports, is an inability to recruit, obtain, and keep officials for our events because of the abuse they have been taking from spectators. So that is the purpose behind it.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. That was my last question. I know other people have questions. What I am getting out of this, and whether I am right or not, is that we are okay trying to take away a person's First Amendment rights because we think we have a greater good. I just disagree with that concept. People have that First Amendment, freedom of speech. If they were doing it "at the event," I think that is different, but they are outside the event and then you are going to say we are going to preclude you from coming to this otherwise

public event based on speech you made online. I just do not see how that stands legally, but I will let other people ask questions. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Daly. We are going to Assemblymember Backus and then Assemblymember Hansen.

Assemblymember Backus:

Thank you so much, Madam Chair. I, too, like Senator Daly, had some concerns over the regulation. Thank you, Mr. Anderson, for being with us today to go over this.

Mine is going to go in a different direction than the verbal abuse. I am looking at what is set forth in Section 3 and how that would apply. For example, in Section 8, subsection 1, you have basically a penalty that would apply. It says, "If a team ...," but basically, the focus is going to be on the spectator. So, "If a ... spectator violates any provision of NAC [*Nevada Administrative Code*] 385B.802 to 385B.812, inclusive, or Section 3 of this regulation, the principal of the school or a designee thereof shall, within 24 hours after becoming aware of the violation, prepare and submit to the Executive Director a written report concerning the violation." And then each of the following paragraphs addresses Section 3. I understand where the NIAA is looking at having more civility, but when you look at Section 3 and the mandates for each spectator, the one, for example, that could stand out, to me, would be subsection 3 [of Section 3] that requires each spectator to, "Behave in a manner that reflects favorably on the participating pupils, teams and school community." And when I look at that, what if it is not reflected favorably? That you have a parent or a spectator at the event cheering against the other team? There is a lot of vague language here that is a little overbroad. I do not understand the thoughts behind this code of civility. For example, one section of the code would require the principal to write up a report within 24 hours when this occurs. I am trying to understand this a little more, especially with Section 3. I thought I understood the verbal abuse, but I agree with my colleague how that could ply out to social media. But looking at Section 3 and this code of civil conduct and if someone is violating it, all of the penalties that could resonate from that.

Mr. Anderson:

Your question, as I understand it, is with respect to subsection 3 in Section 3 and how that would apply. Is that correct?

Assemblymember Backus:

It is. It looks like each of these requirements under Section 3 for a spectator ... I think subsection 3 stood out to be the easiest because it could be objective from a pupil on the opposite team to the spectator who is there cheering as not being favorable. And then we have all of these escalating events that would happen, including a report required by the principal or designee within 24 hours.

Mr. Anderson:

To try to answer your question with respect to Section 3, which says that the spectator shall "Behave in a manner that reflects favorably on the participating pupils, teams and school community," that goes just to the general conduct of spectators at a game. I think it enhances some of the other items. The use of profane language and that sort of thing falls within this or threats of assault or battery, for instance, with respect to the spectator

against an official, player, or another coach. It kind of falls within all those things. I do not think it is anything different than those, is what I am trying to say.

Assemblymember Backus:

I appreciate that, Mr. Anderson, and I appreciate that Section 3 is more like a code of conduct, like something you would see hanging in the school that says, "Be kind to each other." But when you are looking at Section 3 and the escalating penalties, I agree with you when you are looking at verbal abuse or assault battery where you have escalating penalties. That makes sense, and they, in my mind, need to be separated.

I do not want to keep going through this because Senator Daly and I both have similar concerns with the language in this bill where I think it could be made better. I will stop my line of questioning unless the Chair needs me to make a motion.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you. At this time, we will go to Assemblymember Hansen.

Assemblymember Hansen:

Thank you, Chair. If we want to go for the motion, that is fine. I appreciate my colleagues bringing up these concerns. I share those concerns, a little too ambiguous. My questions were answered.

Chair Jauregui:

At this time, Mr. Anderson, I think we will refrain from bringing this regulation up for a vote. We will defer this until our next Legislative Commission meeting and encourage you to work with the members on the sections in which they have concerns. Thank you for being here, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson:

Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Members, that takes us to our next regulation, which is R068-24. I believe we have Ms. Souza-Llamas here from the Department of Public Safety.

I have one quick question under this regulation. It comes on page 3 of the repealed section. I want to make sure I am reading this regulation correctly. We are repealing the sections on page 3 because we are combining both the application and the renewal application into one application, and because this text is duplicated between both, we are repealing it on page 3. If you could confirm for me on the record that this language will still be included on the application of places where you cannot have a firearm and that we are just repealing it because it is duplicated.

Erica Souza-Llamas, Administrator, Records, Communications and Compliance Division, Department of Public Safety:

Yes, we are repealing it because it is duplicative between the initial application and the renewal. The location where firearms can be carried is also outlined in statute under

NRS [Chapter] 202 ("Crimes Against Public Health and Safety"), so we felt it was duplicative to also have it in the NAC.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Ms. Souza-Llamas. I appreciate you being here just to confirm that on the record. That was the only question I have. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. Members, are there any other questions?

Senator Titus:

Madam Chair, I have a number of questions if I might.

On a personal note, I am a CCW [concealed carry weapon] holder, so I have been through this process, and I need some clarity on these new regulations. First, to renew the CCW that I have had now for decades, the original course is an eight-hour course, and the renewal course is a four-hour course. I looked through all this; I could not see where that has changed at all. Are you using the same forms? Can you give me some clarity on what the difference would be now on the renewal process?

Ms. Souza-Llamas:

I have Undersheriff Lee Orozco from the Churchill County Sheriff's Office on Zoom to help me answer questions. I do not believe that this will change the requirements for the renewal versus the initial training. I believe those are going to remain the same for the hours of training.

Senator Titus:

Is he there to clarify that? Do you know if the forms are the same? Is it just four hours, Sheriff, if you are on the line?

Lee Orozco, Undersheriff, Churchill County Sheriff's Office:

Yes, this does not change anything in regards to that; it is just clarifying the language. The form will remain the same.

Senator Titus:

Great. Thank you. And if I might ask another question, Madam Chair.

Sheriff, as you probably know, my husband is a retired sheriff and was Chair of [Nevada] Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association], and it is the Sheriffs' and Chiefs' organization that still writes these regulations. Is that not correct?

Undersheriff Orozco:

We do the standards for training and instructor certification.

Senator Titus:

Correct.

Undersheriff Orozco:

The regs are by statute.

Senator Titus:

Thank you. And the new regulations on page 11 mention that the applicant "Demonstrates continued competence with a firearm through successful completion of a course prescribed by the sheriff." So potentially there could be 17 different trainings that the sheriffs choose?

Undersheriff Orozco:

Each sheriff has these lesson plans submitted to them and the instructor's bio, and they are responsible for making sure it adheres to the standards and that each one is approved by a standard by sheriff. And once it is approved by a sheriff, it is considered to be approved by all sheriffs.

Senator Titus:

Correct. We know that our concealed carry is recognized in multiple states but not all states. I just want to make sure that our concealed carry issued in one county is recognized in all 17 counties.

Undersheriff Orozco:

It is. Yes.

Senator Titus:

Thank you. Can I ask just a couple more, Madam Chair?

Chair Jauregui:

Yes, please continue, Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

On the question process, when the applicant is filing, it has been a huge issue with our legalization of cannabis and owning firearms. And in my mind, not only as a physician, but as a CCW holder, it has always been brought forward that if you are on medical marijuana, if you are consuming marijuana, you cannot carry. You are changing the question to have they ever used marijuana. Then what would be the result of that? It is question 15 on the application, and it is on page 9: "During the year immediately preceding the date of this application, have you consumed cannabis?" I wonder what the pathway is if there is a yes. What will that determine? The license is now good for five years. In my mind, you could say no, I have not consumed in the last year, but then there are five years where potentially they could consume. Can you clarify that for me?

Undersheriff Orozco:

Yes. They have to be qualified to carry a firearm or to possess a firearm by federal standards. With marijuana still being illegal federally, if they say yes or if they have a marijuana card, then they would not be eligible for a CCW. Obviously, if they do it within those four years, we do not know about it. Unless something comes to light, then that will not affect it.

Senator Titus:

Thank you. This is my last question and thank you for your tolerance, Madam Chair.

There is some concern that this cannabis language does not mirror the federal application language. Are you aware of that? Is there any clarity that you could offer me on that one?

Undersheriff Orozco:

I am not aware of the specifics.

Senator Titus:

Maybe you might be able to clarify that it does not mirror the federal regulations.

Ms. Souza-Llamas:

We added this question to ensure that we were also following the federal guidelines. The federal guidelines are why we added question 15 to the Nevada application.

Senator Titus:

So, it does follow the federal guidelines?

Ms. Souza-Llamas:

It does.

Senator Titus:

Thank you for being here, and Sheriff, thank you for being on Zoom. Madam Chair, thank you for your tolerance.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Titus. Senator Daly, did you have any additional questions?

Senator Daly:

No, Madam Chair. I am good. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

At this time, I would be looking for a motion to approve regulation R068-24.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO APPROVE R068-24.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you for being here, Ms. Souza-Llamas.

Our next regulation is R077-24, and we have someone from the State Environmental Commission here. Is Miss Schumacher available? Senate Majority Leader Cannizzaro, I believe this agenda item is yours.

Senator Cannizzaro:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for being here with us. I have a few questions about this regulation as it pertains to the odor pieces that are being removed. The information that we received was that NDEP [Nevada's Division of Environmental Protection] believes that the odor provisions are unenforceable and thus are asking for them to be removed. I think that was an answer to one of the individuals who attended one of the public workshops and asked about why those provisions were being removed. Can you talk to us about why you believe those provisions are unenforceable?

Jeffrey Kinder, P.E., Deputy Administrator, NDEP, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (SDCNR):

Thank you for the question. A little bit of history on the odor part of the regs. Back in the 1980s, EPA [United States Environmental Protection Agency] conducted a yearlong study on odor regs and their enforceability under the [Clean Air Act](#) [H.R. 6518 of the 88th Congress]. And after about a year of researching it, they decided not to include odor regulations under the Clean Air Act as an enforceable mechanism. Instead, they decided to defer it because it is subjective to local enforcement. So, many states at that time removed them from their regulations. Nevada did not, but over the past two decades, we have found this regulation to be ineffective. It requires a lot of work on our part. It also requires a lot of work on the facility's part and the community's part to establish some sort of standard that would be enforceable.

We feel that under the Clean Air Act, if an odor results from a regulated air pollutant, we have plenty of authority under the Clean Air Act and those compliance tools to work with the facility to address an odor concern. If that does not work, we have also been successful working with the county local code enforcement to come up with a solution. This intermediate step that is currently in our regulations we found to be ineffective, and that is why we are proposing to remove it, but we still have tools available to work with a facility and a community to address an odor concern.

Senator Cannizzaro:

That is helpful as an explanation. How many violations of odor complaints have you processed?

Jennifer Schumacher, Chief, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, NDEP, SDCNR:

In the past 15 years, we have processed no odor violations because it has been unenforceable as Jeff Kinder mentioned.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I think part of your answer to that was you believe it would be enforceable under the Clean Air Act and then also through regulation or oversight or working with—I guess you could

clarify that piece of it—the local governments. Have you spoken with local governments throughout the State to know what their capacity is to be able to enforce those? Do you have some sort of idea or a plan of how that would happen, or is that just the intention moving forward and the hope that you will be able to work that out?

Mr. Kinder:

Thank you for the question. To clarify, we have not been able to bring forward any violations under the current odor regs. We have been able to bring violations forward when odor was a symptom of a regulated air pollutant. For example, we had an asphalt processing facility that the local community had concerns with. They were able to put a control on that addressed their concerns as well as addressing any Clean Air Act concerns.

We have been successful working with several counties on odor regs. We are always available to show up at various public meetings, provide tools, do inspections. Generally, when we have an odor concern at a local level, the county or the planning commissioner of that entity can look at maybe having the facility located somewhere else or not approving say homes in certain areas. That is how we have been able to work with the local jurisdictions. We reached out to each of the local entities. We did about a year and a half worth of stakeholder outreach just to make sure we are on page with local jurisdictions to make sure that what we are proposing today makes sense for everybody. But I can let Jennifer answer that question.

Ms. Schumacher:

Yes, we reached out to the counties, and twice previously the last couple years, we reached out with our Small Business Environmental Program. Also, we reached out right before our public workshop to each county individually. We did not receive any opposition to this. We received some support in removal of this regulation, and the counties would continue to work with us. And as Jeff mentioned, we would investigate these odor complaints if we receive any.

Senator Cannizzaro:

Thank you. That is helpful. The way that I am understanding it is these are being repealed because they are unenforceable as they exist in current regulatory form, but you still have the ability to enforce that as part of the Clean Air Act and then would work with local governments, and they seem to be relatively on board or at least have no objections to that as a mechanism to address any complaints that you may have. I see you nod your head yes, which is great. I wanted to make sure I understood what the process would look like so that it does not feel as though we are abandoning entirely the ability to regulate some of those odor issues that might come in our communities throughout the State. That gives me more comfortability.

I have one final question with respect to the mercury pieces. I noted some of the answers to the questions during the public comment period. We are moving them from one tier to another. Can you generally describe what the difference is between tier-1 and tier-2?

Danilo Dragoni, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator, NDEP, SDCNR:

Thank you for the question. When the mercury program was developed and implemented initially in Nevada, the tiers were created to basically accommodate the existing facility and units. What was planned was that the units already existing were going to be subject to the first tier, and eventually all of them would move to tier-2 by 2006, 2008. In addition to that,

the new facility and new units coming into the mercury program will be automatically accommodated into tier-2. All the regulations that we are removing right now are related to tier-1, for which no facility and no emission units exist anymore. And the new facility and units coming into the program will be tier-2.

Senator Cannizzaro:

That is helpful and I appreciate that. Madam Chair, that completes my questions on this. Unless there are other questions, I would be happy to make a motion to approve.

Chair Jauregui:

Committee members, any other questions? Seeing none, then I will take that as a first from Senate Majority Leader Cannizzaro.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO APPROVE R077-24.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you for being here. Next, we have R109-24. I believe I have Ms. Medina with the Board of Wildlife Commissioners here. Senator Daly, when our agency representative gets here, please feel free to ask your questions.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a couple of questions. You still get the paper tag, and you can still fill it out, and do it the way you normally do it now. Is the electronic validation voluntary? You do not have to do it?

Matt Maples, Administrator of Data and Technology Services, Department of Wildlife:

That is correct, Senator Daly. We will have two options going forward with this regulation. Customers can select to continue using a paper tag, which is currently in place, or use an electronic tag, which would be provided through a smartphone application.

Senator Daly:

You would have an app that they would download to use it. There is no fee, I am assuming for that. Does it track the person and their location? How does it work? I am technologically challenged, so I would never do it anyway; I would just turn it off if I was out somewhere. How do you do the connectivity stuff? It seems to me you are going to be out in a lot of places. I have GPS go out on me when I am driving around town.

Mr. Maples:

All great questions and all were points of discussion during various Commission meetings and during public input. I will try to address those. Please forgive me if I forget to address a point and just remind me.

To the first point, yes, the smartphone application would be downloaded by the customer if they choose to. It is not required and is provided free of charge. There is a development process that we would go through with our licensed vendor to develop the application. It is totally voluntary if you want to use the E-tag option or continue to use paper tags.

The point of discussion on the location services ... One of the requirements in the application development is that the customer could select a "turn off location sharing" as part of the smartphone application, so that we can satisfy that concern, both through the Commission and through members of the public, that the application could be tracking your whereabouts and where you choose to validate your tag based on the harvest of an animal. Customers would have the opportunity to turn that off and then location data would not be stored for that individual.

Senator Daly:

Ok. There is no way to address some of the connectivity issues. It seems to me if you are out in the middle of nowhere and you do not have service, you have to use the paper tag anyway.

Mr. Maples:

Right. I apologize for missing that last question. That was also discussed thoroughly during the Commission meetings. A number of other states have created E-tags through smartphones. One of the development criteria that other states have been successful with that we will also use is it will be required to work in the absence of cell phone service. Most of Nevada, especially where we are hunting, does not have cell phone connectivity, so the app would be downloaded prior. The validation code would be stored but not revealed to the client until the tag was punched, so to speak, or validated. That is a requirement as part of the application development that it would work outside of cell service.

Senator Daly:

Last question. Is there an advantage to the Department of Wildlife on the data collection side of it? Is it quicker? Is there an advantage to doing it this way versus the paper method you have been using for a long time?

Mr. Maples:

Yes. There are a number of advantages that we have identified as part of the tag validation process. The customers would also be delivered their harvest questions at that point. Our biologists would receive harvest data sooner than they typically would. It will also reduce staff processing time. We have processes where customers can return tags and then those tags can be issued through a first come, first serve program awarded to an alternate. Customers would receive alternate tags or first come, first serve tags more rapidly. So, it is a benefit to the customer and also a benefit to the Department, and it would reduce the amount of staff time needed to process those tag returns.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Those were all my questions. When you are ready for a motion, I will be happy. I know there are other questions.

Chair Jauregui:

Senator Titus, it sounds like you have a question. Did you want to jump in?

Senator Titus:

Madam Chair, if I might ask a couple of questions before a motion?

Chair Jauregui:

Yes, please proceed.

Senator Titus:

I do not have a tag this year, so it is not a concern of mine, but if I had one, I have some concerns regarding a couple of things. I want to make sure, and you answered this question already, that if you download the application and we are out there and we do not have cell service, as you already mentioned, that we would be able to fill out that tag right away even without cell service and then that would be saved, be uploaded when we did indeed have cell service. So, you answered that question that I had.

The other question I had is about the taxidermy and the meat processing and making sure that that transition, whatever this process is with these electronic tags, would then be easy. It does mention in the regs that there is going to be some component to that. But what if I and my cell world process—I have Starlink, so I am pretty much up everywhere—but we butcher our own and those kinds of things. But the taxidermy is a different thing; they do not have it. So, I went ahead and did an electronic process. They do not do the electronic process. Is it something that I would download to be able to give the taxidermist that information? I mean, two separate potentials here where they need a paper copy.

Mr. Maples:

Yes. Thank you for the question, Senator Titus. For the meat processing, I will try to address some of those concerns first and then the taxidermy secondly. Similar to when you would leave a copy of your tag with the meat processor, you would leave the validation code.

Senator Titus:

The validation number? That is all they need?

Mr. Maples:

Yes, and the same process would occur for the taxidermy process. You would provide that validation code to your taxidermist and then that would be recorded as part of the receipt that the taxidermist provides back to you along with information on the species and sex of the animal, client ID, describing characteristics, things of that nature.

Senator Titus:

Thank you. I am very excited about that. Hopefully you can use salvage permits in the future on this application. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Titus. Are there any other questions from any members in the north? Seeing none, are there any questions from members in Las Vegas? Seeing none, Senator Daly, I will go ahead and accept a motion.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO APPROVE R109-24.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you for being here to answer Senator Daly's questions.

We will now head to R130-24. I believe our representatives from the State Environmental Commission are still here. If they would join us back at the witness table, and Senator Daily, when they are ready, please proceed with your questions.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a couple of questions. When I read the statement for the need of the regulation, it seems to me there is inconsistency in the statement. It says, "The proposed language to existing regulations adds clarity and consistency to current practice, and allows for soil and groundwater action levels to be updated concurrently with federal standards, without further revisions to state regulations." But then when I read Section 1, it says that you are adopting the levels as they exist when you turn this in. If the federal regulations change after that, I am not seeing the consistency there on the current concurrency. Not that that is a problem. The federal government may do something foolish that we do not like and would be below the standards we would want to keep in our State, et cetera. And I know a lot of times when those changes are made, you review them to see if they are appropriate for the State of Nevada and various things, especially when we adopt updated regulations from the "feds," et cetera. Will it automatically match what the feds do, or is it going to be locked in when this regulation is approved and submitted?

Mr. Kinder:

Thank you, Senator, for the question. You are correct. We do not perspective adopt anything by reference. When we do adoption, it is at that point in time. If things change in the future, we would go back through a regulatory process. We would review the changes and go back through the regulatory process to again be current.

Senator Daly:

Understood. And we can be out of compliance, we just cannot be lower than what the feds say. We can have a higher standard. If the feds change the lead level to three times what it

is now, we can say, "No, we do not think that is appropriate for the State of Nevada," and still have the higher standard. We just cannot have it be five times if the feds say it can only be three. Is that correct?

Mr. Kinder:

Yes, that is correct. We can be no less stringent than the federal law. When the federal law becomes more stringent than State law, it creates a regulatory gap for whatever time period it takes us to review and adopt that standard.

Senator Daly:

Are we satisfied currently with the levels that we are going to be adopting through their reference? You have reviewed them and nothing ... Things are changing fast at the federal level; we used to be able to count on vaccines and stuff, but we cannot anymore from the feds.

Mr. Kinder:

Yes, we are comfortable with the current standards and the cleanup work that we are doing. But we will, of course, review any new changes at the federal level as they come down.

Senator Daly:

I just wanted to get clarity on what seemed to be an inconsistent statement in the need for the regulation. Those are my only questions, Madam Chair. I just wanted to make sure that the federal levels are aligned with what we believe is appropriate for the State of Nevada, and that regardless of what the feds do, we would only have to update if they improved the standard to catch up. That is the only question I have. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Daly. Are there any questions from other members in Carson City? Members, any questions down here? Seeing none, Senator Daly, would you like to make a motion?

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO APPROVE R130-24.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Now we will come back to our first regulation. I believe we have both representatives now from the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. We will come back to R139-23. Ms. Lindelow, I believe we have you back on the line as well as your colleague.

Senator Daly, when you see them on the screen, please go ahead and proceed with your questions.

Senator Daly:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Ms. Lindelow? Do we have you?

Ms. Lindelow:

Senator Daly, Madam Chair, I am so sorry about the technical difficulties, or perhaps user error. My apologies for the delay.

Senator Daly:

No worries. I think we were on the question on Section 4, sub[section] 1(d) regarding the public assistance that says, "Contain a certification by the obligee that he or she is not currently receiving," and you are striking out "public assistance and has not applied for public assistance" and you are changing that to "is not currently receiving cash assistance through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families." To me, the language that you are deleting was broader, and the language that you are replacing it with is more narrow, so they could have some public assistance and still meet this. I just want to be clear that that is the case, and then, if you think it will be helpful to people.

Ms. Lindelow:

The reason that it was changed from a broader public assistance to TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, is due to the fact that the child support program only pursues child support, would [inaudible] the TANF program. We do not pursue child support when it is just the food stamp, [inaudible], or the Medicaid program. It is specific to TANF.

Senator Daly:

So, they would be eligible to receive those other benefits and not have any impact on this?

Ms. Lindelow:

Correct.

Senator Daly:

I know you said this is just when you are reconciling between the two. Thank you for that clarification for me; I was not picking up on that part of it. In Section 9, it seems to me that there are two calculations. There is how much the obligee owes based on income and all the formulas you use, but then there is also a basic needs calculation. How do those differ? And what happens if the income level says the obligation is lower than the basic needs? What happens then, or does that ever happen? Maybe it never happens.

Ms. Lindelow:

Angelise, are you on the line?

Angelise Washington, Social Service Specialist III, DWSS, DHHS:

It establishes a base, which we see in Section 1, which tells us what the base is. The obligation has to meet the minimum requirements per the federal regulation. We would not establish a child support obligation that does not meet the minimum qualifications. That answers your question.

Senator Daly:

So, there are two calculations. You have a basic needs calculation that you say is the minimum federal obligation for child support, but then you have an income calculation that is done on what the obligee would owe based on what he makes. What if his obligation based on that formula would be less than the basic needs? In other words, there is only so much you can afford. You cannot get blood out of a turnip. If they are not making enough to meet the basic needs, and there are two different calculations, which one trumps the other and what happens when there is not enough for the basic needs?

Ms. Washington:

If we have an obligor in a situation where he cannot meet the basic needs, it is his income and then it is also childcare. We added childcare, the needs for medical expenses, and then any other adjustments that seem fit. If he is unable to meet all the categories, then the judge, the court has the ability to deviate from the guidelines if the obligor does not have the means to meet all of the [inaudible] obligations.

Senator Daly:

Ok. So, it is basically going to go to a family court judge, and whichever judge you go to, he is going to decide.

The last question, if I can, Madam Chair, is in Section 11, sub[section] 1 regarding existing language. If a person is still in high school, how do you interpret that? I have heard conflicting stories on how that is interpreted. I have heard people say it does not matter that they dropped out of high school when they were 16, and they have not been attending, and they are not enrolled, but they still have to pay till they are 19 because they could graduate from high school. How is that interpreted and enforced? Is it 18 or is it 19?

Ms. Washington:

The emancipation is when the child reaches 18 years of age or if the child is still in high school. So, if the child is 18 and they are still enrolled in high school, that child support obligation is still there until the child graduates from high school.

Senator Daly:

Understood, and that is where you said if they are enrolled. And I have heard anecdotal stories that we owe the obligation until they are 18. They turned 18, they were not in high school, they dropped out when they were 16, and they still have to pay till they are 19 because they have not graduated from high school yet. How do you interpret that? Do they have to actually be in high school—enrolled, have classes, been attending? Is it 18, or until they graduate from high school, or 19? How do you interpret that?

Ms. Washington:

Eighteen is the emancipation. We go past 18 if we can verify that the child is still enrolled in school past their eighteenth birthday. We do verify.

Senator Daly:

They do have to be enrolled, and do you make some effort to verify that?

Ms. Washington:

Correct. Yes, we do verify.

Senator Daly:

Very good. Those are my only questions, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Daly.

Ms. Washington, thank you so much for being here and answering the questions.

Are there any other questions from members in Carson City? Are there any other questions for members in Las Vegas? Seeing none, Senator Daly, would you like to make a motion?

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO APPROVE R139-23.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

That completes our consideration of all regulations under [Agenda Item V](#). We will now move forward with [Agenda Item VI](#), which is legislative audits.

AGENDA ITEM VI—LEGISLATIVE AUDITS

SUMMARY OF AUDIT REPORTS PRESENTED TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S AUDIT SUBCOMMITTEE (NRS 218G.240)

Chair Jauregui:

We have our Legislative Auditor, Mr. Dan Crossman, in Carson City to present the audits. Mr. Crossman, would you like to proceed with the summary of the audit reports?

Daniel L. Crossman, Legislative Auditor, Audit Division, LCB:

Good afternoon, Chair Jauregui, Vice Chair Yeager, and members of the Legislative Commission. Under [Agenda Item VI](#), you will see a letter ([Agenda Item VI](#)) from Senator Dondero Loop, Chair of the Audit Subcommittee, indicating that on January 16, 2025, a meeting of the Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission was

held in which five reports were presented and accepted by the Audit Subcommittee. Following the January meeting, all Legislators were notified of the release of these reports via email with links to the reports on our website. During that Audit Subcommittee meeting, we presented a summary of the key findings in the audits to the Subcommittee, answered questions of the Subcommittee members, and engaged in some robust discussions. Representatives from the agencies also provided remarks and answered various questions.

Today, I will just briefly summarize the key findings from those reports. Please note that full reports are available on our website where many more details can be obtained regarding our findings and the specific recommendations that we made to the agencies. Additionally, if any of the members of the Commission are interested in discussing any of these reports in more detail, I would be happy to find time to do that with you. We are also available during the interim to present to any of the committees as desired.

Turning to the next page in the packet under Agenda Item VI is a summary of the audit of the Department of Administration's State Public Works Division, project identification, cost estimation, and reporting. Our audit's objective was to determine whether the Division had adequate controls to identify, complete, and report on construction projects. We identified that certain opportunities could be pursued to reallocate unused funds from completed projects to others more timely. Furthermore, the Division can expand its use of an alternative budgeting method to more agencies to improve more timely completion of maintenance projects.

The Division can also enhance its use of its facility condition assessment (FCA) report to benefit the CIP, or capital improvement program, development. Specifically, project managers often did not coordinate with the facilities group or use the FCA reports to assist with identifying CIP needs. We also noted certain information reported biannually to the Legislature by the Division on the costs of recommended maintenance for State buildings had some inaccuracies. Specifically, the report included tens of millions of dollars in costs for projects already completed and included outdated cost information.

Finally, we found the Division does have an effective process for estimating project costs but needs to improve its processes for retaining documentation used in the development of cost estimates for projects included in the CIP.

We made five recommendations in this report, which the Division accepted.

On the next page is the summary for the audit of the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) stockroom purchases, material stockpile management, and mechanic productivity. The purpose of this audit was to determine whether NDOT has effective controls over stockroom purchases, equipment repair, workshop work, and material stockpiles. We also evaluated the appropriateness of the use of State resources in certain areas. We found that NDOT continues to experience problems developing and implementing controls to safeguard assets and deter or detect fraud. Specifically, we observed purchasing controls designed to ensure the proper approval and accounting for vehicle and equipment parts were often circumvented and not effective. In many cases, appropriate purchasing approvals and proper segregation of duties were not documented. Purchasing documentation signatures were often illegible and contained fictitious names, and some purchases were made before proper authorization had occurred.

In addition, NDOT has weak controls over material stockpiles and related data, and the recording and tracking of equipment and car parts can improve. Although we did not identify fraud during our audit work, given NDOT's history of some fraudulent incidents,

strong controls are needed in these areas as millions of dollars in parts and materials are purchased every year.

Low productivity rates at some equipment repair shops highlighted procedural inefficiencies. Specifically, we observed significant variations in productivity between equipment repair shops, with low productivity reported for several. For example, an analysis showed mechanics at one location recorded only an average of two hours per day working on NDOT vehicles. Furthermore, we observed the inappropriate use of State resources as unnecessary modifications were made to a vehicle, and another vehicle was driven almost exclusively for personal use. Low productivity and improper use of State resources resulted in waste and increased costs to the State. In addition, fleet costs will increase if vehicle repairs or routine maintenance are not performed timely.

We made ten recommendations to NDOT in this report, and all these recommendations were accepted.

On the next page is a summary for the audit of the Department of Administration, Mail Services Division. The purpose of this audit was to determine whether the Division's controls protect against improper transactions, including fraud, and ensure accurate billing of agencies for mail services.

In the report, we noted a common theme in our testing areas that the Division frequently did not maintain adequate documentation, which limited some of the conclusions we could draw. We found the Division's lack of controls for certain mail processes increase the risk that fraud and waste have occurred or will occur in the future. Although we did not specifically identify instances of fraud, we were unable to conclude that it did not occur because of limitations to available information and documentation. A lack of controls led to suspicious metering transactions, unsecured metered envelopes, uncontrolled and inaccurate refunds, and unknown parties accessing Division funds.

In addition, the Division did not perform background checks for individuals with access to sensitive information. With some metered transactions worth tens of thousands of dollars, and with the Division paying millions of dollars in metered postage every year, the opportunity to defraud the State is significant.

We also found that the Division did not have a sufficient process to ensure it accurately billed customer agencies. System errors caused the Division to over and underbill customer agencies for the services they provided them. Unusually large and suspicious transactions and remote meters also created additional billing inaccuracies. Furthermore, insufficient review of billings led to the Division underbilling for certain production work they did. This also created waste because the Division had to absorb some of those costs as a loss. Inadequately trained staff and a lack of formalized policies and procedures contributed to these billing issues. Ensuring billings are accurate and adequately supported is essential to safeguarding State resources.

We made 15 recommendations to reduce the risk of improper transactions and improve the process of billing for this Division's services. The Division accepted all 15 recommendations.

Turning to the next page is a summary for the audit of the [State] Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF), forest fire suppression budget account. The purpose of this audit was to evaluate the impact of the Division's billing, collection, and payment practices related to the forest fire suppression

budget account. This audit was required by [Senate Bill 480](#) from the 2023 Legislative Session.

We found that a lack of proper oversight resulted in the Division of Forestry requesting more supplemental funding that was necessary, as more than \$32 million in fully reimbursable out-of-state costs for fire incidents had not been billed for reimbursement. When NDF fails to seek reimbursement from other states and the federal government, money due to the State is not collected, and supplemental funding then must be requested from the Legislature. Additionally, accounts receivable amounts were not adequately recorded, which impacts the State's financial statements. Increased oversight of the fire suppression accounting functions will help ensure appropriate funding and help improve State budgeting decisions. Improvements are also needed over accounting and budgeting for NDF's emergency fire expenditures. Budgeting processes resulted in the comingling of Nevada's in-state costs with costs incurred associated with Nevada resources assisting with out-of-state fires. Furthermore, the budgeting formula also comingled these costs.

Lastly, NDF did not sufficiently review Wildland Fire Protection Program cooperator and other State agency invoices to detect billing errors. Additionally, NDF'S data on fire incidents was inaccurate and frequently incomplete. Error-free invoicing and data are necessary to ensure the accurate accounting of fire costs to help ensure Nevada is fully reimbursed for its costs to fight fires in out-of-state jurisdictions and making sure that it only pays its share of cost-share fire expenditures.

We made 13 recommendations to ensure forest fire suppression expenditures are tracked, reimbursed timely, budgeting practices improve, and cooperator payments are accurate. All recommendations were accepted by the agency. The Legislature also took certain steps during session to enhance accountability of NDF's fire suppression costs through revisions to the budgeting process.

On the next page is the summary of our review of governmental and private facilities for children inspections, dated December 2024. This year's report included the results of 36 children's facilities that we inspected. We had notable findings at seven of these facilities. In each of these we identified certain health, safety, and/or welfare issues and contacted the respective licensing agencies to share our concerns. We also identified some additional concerns related to fire safety, denial of rights reporting, reporting requirements, and fingerprint submission requirements at many of the reviewed facilities that warranted additional attention as well. As a result of our reviews, and based on the licensing agency's actions, various forms of corrective action were taken for the facilities and homes to ensure standards of care are being met. Through our continued work in this area, we will monitor and follow up with facilities and their licensing agencies where we have had concerns.

There are many more details in this report, which I will not go into today, that identify deficiencies we noted at the various facilities, and that report is available on our website. This report also included a few recommendations for legislative consideration to formalize complaint reporting requirements, enhance training requirements, and to require certain child abuse and neglect staff screening checks at certain facility types in statutes. During this session, Assemblymember [Natha] Anderson championed a bill, [Assembly Bill 521](#), which was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services, that enhances the statutory requirements associated with investigations of the history of abuse and neglect associated with certain medical facilities and organizations to protect children. This was in response to our report and identification of a need for enhanced statutory requirements to protect children. This bill passed unanimously in both houses and was signed by the Governor.

As I previously mentioned, we are available any time to dig into these reports in additional detail. These agency reports, the first four, are required to submit a 60-day plan of corrective action, which was due on April 14, 2025, and all those reports have been received. The six-month report on the implementation status of recommendations is due on October 14 of this year. These six-month reports, which are prepared by the Governor's Finance Office, Division of Internal Audits, as well as our assessment of the implementation status after we receive that six-month report, will be presented at a later date to the Audit Subcommittee and then to the Legislative Commission.

This concludes my summary of the audit reports that were accepted by the Audit Subcommittee on January 16, 2025. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Crossman, for the report. Commission members, any questions for Mr. Crossman? I do not see any here in Las Vegas. Let us go ahead and move up north. Assemblymember Hansen.

Assemblymember Hansen:

Thank you, Mr. Crossman. I have some concerns regarding the governmental and private facilities for children's inspections. I did not see it noted, but I think on the other audits they have that 60-day plan for corrective action, would be one question. And in particular, under your general concern, six facilities related to fingerprint submission documentation. Does that mean they did not have fingerprints on people that are working there? Would that fall within, if it is a 60-day corrective recommendation, that we would hope to have that by then?

Mr. Crossman:

Thank you, Assemblymember Hansen. In regard to your first question about the 60-day plan, this report is not considered a full-blown audit, if you will. The inspections of these facilities are not subject to the same statutory requirement to have a 60-day plan of corrective action. Our role in the review of children's facilities is to come in after the licensing agencies have done their work. Then we report back to the licensing agencies and request that they follow up on these. While we do not have a formal follow-up process, we do continue to have contact with these entities. And each year we do a risk assessment to identify which facilities we will go into that year. And often, it may be a repeat facility that we were just in the prior year or maybe the year before to follow up on that status. Additionally, behind the scenes, there are a lot of conversations that go on between my staff that specialize in this area. They are child welfare specialists that work on a routine and regular basis with the State and Clark County and Washoe County to follow up on the status of these agencies and the improvements that they are making. But to your original question, I do not have a formal process for that follow-up.

And then to your second question regarding the background checks. I do not know the exact answer to the ones that we have highlighted here. In some cases, it may be a lack of a background check. In other cases, it may be a lack of documentation that they performed those background checks. I will go back and look at the details and get that information to you.

Assemblymember Hansen:

Thank you. Chair, a quick follow-up if I could?

Chair Jauregui:

Yes, Assemblymember.

Assemblymember Hansen:

Thank you. Mr. Crossman, I am going to be "Pollyanna" here. I am saying there is not a statutory requirement for a 60-day. So maybe that is because you address it sooner because you are having conversations or the licensing agencies have been alerted to it and maybe can get to it quicker?

Mr. Crossman:

It very well may be earlier than 60 days. It just really depends on the next opportunity we have to contact them. It depends on the severity of the issues we noted there. Often it depends on the licensing agencies and their attention to it as well. There is not a defined timeline for that.

Assemblymember Hansen:

Just for the record, thank you for that and thank you for these audits. They are always very instructive and certainly major concerns if the fingerprints have not been done. I can understand maybe they do not have the documentation available, but if they have not been done, that we have people not being screened properly that are working with children, and then also, one of the facilities incorrectly administering medications. So hopefully our agencies are listening and know that my hair is on fire and that it is going to be taken care of soon. Thank you, Mr. Crossman, for your oversight.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, members. Any other questions from Carson City?

Senator Titus:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to acknowledge the hard work that Mr. Crossman and his team have done. When I sat on that Subcommittee and heard these particular four reports, I was actually appalled at what we heard. And to hear that the particular agencies listened and improved, I just want to acknowledge the importance of these audits. Thank you for the good work that you do. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Any other questions from members? Seeing none, I will echo the sentiments of Senator Titus. Thank you so much for the work of you and your Division, Mr. Crossman.

Members, this is not an action item, but I am happy to accept the report on behalf of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee on Audits. And thank you, Mr. Crossman, again, for being here and presenting the audits and for the work that you do.

Members, we will now move on to Item VII, which is the appointment of members to committees and similar entities.

AGENDA ITEM VII—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES AND SIMILAR ENTITIES

Chair Jauregui:

We have Deputy Director, Mr. Roger Wilkerson, here to assist us with the appointment of the members to the various committees. Mr. Wilkerson, when you are ready, please proceed.

Roger Wilkerson, Deputy Director, Director's Office, and Chief, Administrative Division, LCB:

Thank you, Madam Chair. In your packet you will see recommended appointments for two bodies this afternoon: the Commission on Minority Affairs and the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum ([Agenda Item VII](#)). I am happy to provide further information if you wish, but in the interest of time, I will leave that to your discretion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Wilkerson. Members, you have a copy of the appointments for both the Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs and the members to the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum. Do you have any questions for Mr. Wilkerson? We can start here in Las Vegas. Seeing none, are there any questions in Carson City for Mr. Wilkerson? Seeing none, we will go ahead and take a motion on them one at a time. Do I have a motion to appoint the members, as listed, to the Commission on Minority Affairs?

VICE CHAIR YEAGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REAPPOINTMENT OF NINA GALLAGHER, GINA JACKSON, AND JUANNY ROMERO TO THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON MINORITY AFFAIRS FOR A TERM COMMENCING JULY 1, 2025, AND THE INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF ELIZABETH LOPEZ FOR A TERM COMMENCING JULY 1, 2025.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Next, we will move on to accept the appointment to the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum.

VICE CHAIR YEAGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF LISA COFFRON TO THE NEVADA SILVER HAired LEGISLATIVE FORUM FOR SENATE DISTRICT 17.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Wilkerson, for being here and walking us through [Agenda Item VII](#).

AGENDA ITEM VIII—AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES AND POLICIES OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

Chair Jauregui:

Members, I would like to note that I will be rolling Agenda Item VIII until our next Legislative Commission meeting. I had one member reach out to me requesting more time to review the amendments to the rules and policies ([Agenda Item VIII](#)). So that will be rolled to our next meeting, which is scheduled to be held in August. Please take that time to read through those changes and amendments. We will move to Agenda Item IX.

AGENDA ITEM IX—LITIGATION

REPORT REGARDING LITIGATION

Chair Jauregui:

We have our General Counsel, Mr. Kevin Powers, here to provide us with a report regarding litigation. Mr. Powers, when you are ready, please begin.

Kevin C. Powers, General Counsel, Legal Division, LCB:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I have three cases to report on today. I will move quickly through them.

The first case is *Lombardo v. Nevada Commission on Ethics*, which is currently pending in the Nevada Supreme Court. In the underlying action, the Ethics Commission entered an opinion concluding that Governor Lombardo, while serving as a local public officer, violated certain provisions of the ethics law in NRS Chapter 281A ("Ethics in Government"). Governor Lombardo then petitioned for judicial review in the First Judicial District Court in Carson City. As part of the petition for judicial review, the Lombardo attorneys argued that certain provisions of the ethics law were unconstitutional. In particular, arguing that the statutory provision allowing the Legislative Commission to appoint four members of the Ethics Commission violated separation of powers. Because the petition in the District Court was challenging the constitutionality of the legislative enactments and appointments, the LCB intervened in the case in order to protect the constitutionality of the Legislature's actions.

During the original District Court proceedings, there was a jurisdictional issue as to whether the Lombardo attorneys had properly served the Attorney General with notice of the complaint. The District Court agreed that there was improper service and dismissed the action. The Lombardo attorneys appealed to the Nevada Supreme Court on June 18, 2025. The Nevada Supreme Court entered an order agreeing with the Lombardo attorneys that there was good cause to "not" serve the Attorney General in this matter. And therefore, that service was not necessary to invoke the jurisdiction of the District Court. As a result, the Nevada Supreme Court remanded the case to the District Court. And now with the parties back in the District Court, the parties will address the merits of the constitutional and statutory issues.

I want to emphasize the Legislative Counsel Bureau is involved in this case “only” to defend the constitutionality of the legislative enactments and appointments under the ethics law. The Legislative Counsel Bureau will not be arguing with regard to the merits of the actual ethics violations found against Governor Lombardo when he was a local public officer. Again, we will be focusing only on defending the constitutionality of the Legislature's actions.

The next case to report on is the Elko County case that I have reported on in several prior meetings. It is *Elko County v. State of Nevada*. It was in the First Judicial District Court and has now moved to the Nevada Supreme Court. In this case, Elko County is challenging the constitutionality of Section 2 and Section 8 of [AB 519](#) of the 2023 Legislative Session that required the Board of County Commissioners of Elko County to impose a local property tax of a rate not less than 1 cent and not more than 25 cents to fund capital projects for county school districts within Elko County, including capital projects for schools located on qualified tribal land.

In February, the District Court entered an order and found that Sections 2 and 8 of AB 519 were unconstitutional, that they violated Article 4, Sections 21 and 25 of the *Nevada Constitution* as invalid local and special laws. The Court severed those provisions, Sections 2 and 8, from the legislation and the rest of the legislation remains constitutional. Keep in mind, the rest of the legislation includes the appropriation from the 2023 Legislative Session of \$65 million to the Elko County School District in order to perform construction on a new school in the Duck Valley Indian Reservation to replace the existing deteriorating Owyhee school. So that appropriation was not struck down; it remains in place, but Sections 2 and 8 were declared invalid.

As authorized by the Chair of the Legislative Commission, the LCB filed a notice of appeal on behalf of the Legislature. That appeal is now pending in the Nevada Supreme Court, and we will argue that Sections 2 and 8 are not invalid, special, and local laws and that the Legislature properly enacted those laws as proper legislation.

The last case to report on is the new case. It is *Ribar v. State of Nevada and the Legislative Counsel Bureau*. This case involves a challenge to the Nevada Lobbying Disclosure and Regulation Act in NRS Chapter 218H (“Lobbying”) and Joint Standing Rule 25 that deals with media credentialing during the legislative session. Under those provisions, the Lobbying Act and Joint Standing Rule 25, a person who is a registered lobbyist, whether paid or unpaid, cannot also be granted media credentials by the Senate and Assembly to be granted media access to the floor of each house. The purpose of the rule is to ensure that lobbyists are not on the floor of each house with the media. This rule was modeled after rules in the U.S. Congress and most other state legislatures, and no rules like this have ever been struck down.

However, Mr. Ribar is the plaintiff. He has challenged the constitutionality of those provisions of the Lobbying Act and Joint Standing Rule 25. He filed that case in February in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. In March, the Legislative Counsel Bureau filed a motion to dismiss the original complaint. In response, Mr. Ribar filed a motion to amend his complaint. The District Court, under the Liberal Amendment Standards, granted him his motion. Mr. Ribar filed a first amended complaint on June 26, 2025. The LCB filed a motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. That motion is currently pending for the U.S. District Court.

Those are the three pending cases, Madam Chair. I am certainly open to any questions. Thank you.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Mr. Powers. Members, this is not an action item, but if you have questions for Mr. Powers, now is the time. Do we have any questions in Las Vegas? Seeing none, are there any questions for Mr. Powers in Carson City? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Powers, for being here and for your update on the three cases.

Members that takes us to our last agenda item, [Agenda Item X](#), public comment.

AGENDA ITEM X—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Jauregui:

This is our second period of public comment. We will accept public comment at this time from people here in the Las Vegas Office Building, and then we will move to Carson City, and then last to our phone lines. Please remember that comments will be limited to not more than two minutes per person. If there are any people in our Las Vegas audience who would like to give public comment, please approach the witness table. Seeing none, are there any people in the audience wishing to give public comment in Carson City?

Senator Hansen:

Madam Chair? I would like to comment under public comment as a member of the public when it is the appropriate time. It is not generic to anything specific on the agenda, however.

Chair Jauregui:

Senator Hansen, if it is ok with you, I would like to go to members of the public first and then we will come back to you last to end public comment.

Senator Hansen:

That would be fine. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Seeing no one in Carson City, AVH, can we please check the telephone line for anyone wishing to give public comment?

AVH:

Chair, the line is open and working. We have no callers at this time.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you. Senator Hansen, I believe you said you wanted to give public comment in your public capacity as a Nevadan. Please go ahead.

Senator Hansen:

Thank you, Madam Chair. First, congratulations on being selected as the Chair of the Commission.

This is a little bit of a follow-up on what Senator Titus mentioned. The last 30 minutes of the session is something I wanted to address. This is my first opportunity with fellow members of the Legislature. What happened in the Senate unfortunately tainted an otherwise, I thought, a very excellent session, when the President pro Tem[pore] during the last minutes took the stand, and the Lieutenant Governor—he may not have been locked out, but I stood there and witnessed him trying to get into the chamber and saw the Sergeant at Arms blocking him from entering the chamber. That is when I moved for a point of order. And the Parliamentarian asked the President pro Tem to step down and brought in the Lieutenant Governor. The problem with that is the Lieutenant Governor never brought us out of recess. The rules are very clear in *Mason's*: “An unqualified motion to recess,” which was what we were in, “when adopted and announced, places the house at recess until called to order by the presiding officer.” We never came out of recess. We never had the presiding officer, the Lieutenant Governor, do that. That is issue one.

Next, [Senate Concurrent Resolution 8](#) was brought up immediately; rather than giving all of us an opportunity to debate, they called for the question. The right to debate, though, is something that cannot be denied to us. It is a fundamental rule of parliamentary procedure governing all legislative bodies that the opportunity to debate, and if possible, to convince their fellow members is the right of the minority of which they cannot be deprived by the will of the majority. Clearly, that was an absolute abuse of calling for the question. It should never have been allowed. So that is another disgraceful ending to an otherwise pretty good session.

Next, after the vote without any debate, I called for a motion for reconsideration. What happens when you call for a motion for reconsideration? Again, the rules: The effect of making a motion to reconsider is to suspend all action on the subject of the motion until the reconsideration is acted upon. Instead, that was passed to the Assembly without even an opportunity for any of us to have a discussion on it, and it was a violation of our own rules.

And last, I have heard ...

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Senator Hansen. I appreciate you giving public comment, but because I want to make sure that I am equitable throughout this interim, I will be keeping public comment to two minutes just like I would for any other member of the public. Thank you so much for your testimony. Senator Hansen, I would encourage you to send anything else in writing like I would to any other member of the public. Anyone else who would like to give public comment?

Senator Hansen:

Madam Chair, one brief comment on LCB?

I understand that you guys have been telling, asking ... Then this is not public comment, this is Senator to fellow members of the Legislative Commission. My understanding is that there has been pressure put on the Legislative Counsel Bureau to try to make midnight Pacific Standard Time not mean the current one because we had daylight savings time. In fact, the *Nevada Constitution* is perfectly clear. It says very clearly, Article 4, Section 2, “For the purposes of this section, ‘midnight Pacific time’ must be determined based on the actual measure of time that, on the final calendar day of the session, is being used and observed by the general population as the uniform time for the portion of Nevada which lies within the Pacific time zone, or any legal successor to the Pacific time zone, and which includes the

seat of government of this State as designated by Section 1 of Article 15 of this *Constitution*. The Legislature and its members, officers and employees shall not employ any device, pretense or fiction that adjusts, evades or ignores this measure of time for the purpose of extending the duration of the session.”

So, I am a little bit embarrassed that you in the majority party are putting pressure on the Legislative Counsel Bureau to now pretend that 1 a.m., instead of 12 p.m., is the correct time to have *sine die*. We are violating, once again, the *Constitution*, and I hope that Mr. Powers, being here, and the rest of the legal staff of LCB does not succumb to this pressure, but in fact, follows the clear, unmistakable verbiage in the *Nevada Constitution*. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you for your comments, Senator Hansen. As a member of the majority party, I can tell you with confidence that that has not been the case of the majority party pressuring our legal counsel. Thank you for your comments.

Members of the Commission, any other comments? Seeing none, thank you so much, everyone for being here.

Duncan Rand Mackie, President, Nevada Firearms Coalition PAC (Political Action Committee), submitted a letter opposing R068-24 ([Agenda Item X](#)).

Chair Jauregui:

I appreciate being elected Chair of the Legislative Commission. I look forward to working with you all. Please be on the lookout for a poll coming to select an August date for our next meeting. Seeing no other business before us, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM XI—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Coons
Research Policy Assistant,
Research Division, LCB

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item IV	Draft Minutes for the Meeting Held on December 19, 2024	Tarron L. Collins, Office Services Coordinator, Director's Office, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)
Agenda Item V	Administrative Regulations	Asher A. Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB
Agenda Item VI	Summary of Audit Reports Presented to the Legislative Commission's Audit Subcommittee	Daniel L. Crossman, Legislative Auditor, Audit Division, LCB
Agenda Item VII	Appointment of Members to Committees and Similar Entities	Roger Wilkerson, Deputy Director, Director's Office, and Chief, Administrative Division, LCB
Agenda Item VIII	Amendments to the Rules and Policies of the LCB	Kevin C. Powers, General Counsel, Legal Division, LCB
Agenda Item X	Letter Opposing R068-24	Duncan Rand Mackie, President, Nevada Firearms Coalition Political Action Committee

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.