

NEVADA LEGISLATURE

81st Session, 2021

SENATE DAILY JOURNAL

THE FORTY-FOURTH DAY

CARSON CITY (Tuesday), March 16, 2021

Senate called to order at 11:08 a.m.

President Marshall presiding.

Roll called.

All present except Senator Spearman, who was excused.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Reverend JJ Tuttle.

Gracious God, we thank You for this opportunity to open the day for this Body. We thank You for each and every one who is here today. You have blessed us with supportive people who genuinely seek the welfare of Your people and the State of Nevada.

Loving God, we thank You most of all for being here in our midst. Let Your presence be made known and lead this Senate today. Thank you, God, for we know that You are always here to support Your people.

We give You thanks, and we praise.

AMEN.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

By previous order of the Senate, the reading of the Journal is dispensed with, and the President and Secretary are authorized to make the necessary corrections and additions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Madam President:

Your Committee on Revenue and Economic Development, to which was referred Senate Bill No. 25, has had the same under consideration, and begs leave to report the same back with the recommendation: Do pass.

DINA NEAL, *Chair*

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, Carson City, March 15, 2021

To the Honorable the Senate:

I have the honor to inform your honorable body that the Assembly on this day passed Assembly Bills Nos. 72, 136.

CAROL AIELLO-SALA
Assistant Chief Clerk of the Assembly

WAIVERS AND EXEMPTIONS
NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

March 16, 2021

The Fiscal Analysis Division, pursuant to Joint Standing Rule No. 14.6, has determined the exemption of: Senate Bills Nos. 233, 234.

WAYNE THORLEY
Fiscal Analysis Division

MOTIONS, RESOLUTIONS AND NOTICES

By Senator Dondero Loop and Assemblyman Roberts:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 7—Proposing to amend the Nevada Constitution to remove the constitutional provisions governing the election and duties of the Board of Regents of the State University and to authorize the Legislature to provide by statute for the governance of the State University and for the auditing of public institutions of higher education in this State.

WHEREAS, Article 11 of the Nevada Constitution, commonly known as the Education Article, requires the Legislature to provide for the establishment of a State University that is controlled by a Board of Regents whose duties are prescribed by law (Nev. Const. Art. 11, § 4); and

WHEREAS, The Education Article also requires the Legislature to provide for the election of the members of the Board of Regents and to define their duties by law (Nev. Const. Art. 11, § 7); and

WHEREAS, The Education Article authorizes the Board of Regents to control and manage the affairs of the State University and its funds under such regulations as may be provided by law (Nev. Const. Art. 11, §§ 7, 8); and

WHEREAS, When drafting the Education Article, the Framers of the Nevada Constitution purposefully added constitutional language to ensure that the powers and duties of the Board of Regents and its members “shall be prescribed by the Legislature,” in order to “not leave it to be inferred, perhaps, that they have absolute control” over the State University (*Debates & Proceedings of the Nevada State Constitutional Convention of 1864*, at 586 (Andrew J. Marsh off. rep. 1866) (statement of Delegate George A. Nourse)); and

WHEREAS, The Framers believed that the Board of Regents’ control and management of the affairs of the State University should be governed by laws enacted by the Legislature (*Debates & Proceedings of the Nevada State Constitutional Convention of 1864*, at 585-87 (Andrew J. Marsh off. rep. 1866)); and

WHEREAS, The Framers did not create the Board of Regents as a constitutional body in the Education Article to give the Board of Regents unchecked autonomy from legislative oversight (*Debates & Proceedings of the Nevada State Constitutional Convention of 1864*, at 585-91 (Andrew J. Marsh off. rep. 1866)); and

WHEREAS, As required by the Education Article, the Legislature has provided by law for the establishment of the State University, known as the University of Nevada, and has provided by law for the election of the members of the Board of Regents (NRS 396.020, 396.040); and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has provided by law for the establishment of the Nevada System of Higher Education, which consists of the State University and other educational institutions, programs and operations, and for the Board of Regents to administer the System and to prescribe rules for its governance and management (NRS 396.020, 396.110, 396.230, 396.280, 396.300, 396.420, 396.440, 396.550); and

WHEREAS, In cases before the Nevada Supreme Court, the Board of Regents has asserted that its “unique constitutional status” gives it “virtual autonomy and thus immunity” from particular laws and policies enacted by the Legislature (*Board of Regents v. Oakley*, 97 Nev. 605, 607 (1981)); and

WHEREAS, Although the Nevada Supreme Court has rejected the Board of Regents’ broad assertion of autonomy and immunity from laws and policies enacted by the Legislature, the Nevada Supreme Court has recognized that the Board of Regents’ constitutional status prevents

the Legislature from enacting certain legislation that directly “interferes with the Board’s essential management and control of the University” (*Board of Regents v. Oakley*, 97 Nev. 605, 608 (1981); *King v. Board of Regents*, 65 Nev. 533, 564-69 (1948)); and

WHEREAS, Under our Nation’s fundamental, well-established and long-standing principles of representative government, the traditional role of the people’s elected representatives in the Legislature is to serve as the people’s legislative check of accountability to ensure that public bodies, agencies and officers in the other branches of government are carrying out their governmental functions for the benefit of the people and in a manner consistent with the laws and policies enacted by the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Regents has, at various times, relied on its constitutional status and its authority to control and manage the affairs of the State University as a defensive shield and cloak against the people’s legislative check of accountability, and the Board of Regents has, at various times, taken actions that have hindered, thwarted or undermined the Legislature’s investigation, review and scrutiny of the institutions, programs and operations of the Nevada System of Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Like other public bodies, agencies and officers of the State Government, the Board of Regents should be subject to the people’s legislative check of accountability through legislative oversight, and the Board of Regents’ control and management of the affairs of the State University should be governed by all laws enacted by the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, To secure accountability to the people’s elected representatives in the Legislature, the Nevada Constitution should be amended to remove the Board of Regents’ constitutional status so that the Board of Regents operates only as a statutory public body to ensure that it is subject to the people’s legislative check of accountability through legislative oversight and to ensure that the Board of Regents’ control and management of the affairs of the State University are governed by all laws enacted by the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, Amending the Nevada Constitution to remove the Board of Regents’ constitutional status will allow the Legislature to exercise the full extent of its legislative power to review, reform and improve the programs and operations of the State University and, in doing so, the Legislature will also have more options and greater flexibility to review, reform and improve all other institutions, programs and operations of the Nevada System of Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Amending the Nevada Constitution to remove the Board of Regents’ constitutional status will not repeal, either expressly or by implication, the existing statutory provisions which apply to the Board of Regents, the State University and all other institutions, programs and operations of the Nevada System of Higher Education, including, without limitation, the existing statutory provisions that provide for the voters to elect the members of the Board of Regents; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, JOINTLY, That this resolution may be cited as the Nevada Higher Education Reform, Accountability and Oversight Amendment; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Section 4 of Article 11 of the Nevada Constitution be amended to read as follows:

~~Sec.~~ *Sec. 4. 1. The Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment and governance of a State University which shall embrace departments for Agriculture, Mechanic Arts, and Mining [to be controlled by a Board of Regents whose duties shall be prescribed by Law] and other departments deemed appropriate for the State University.*

2. The Legislature shall provide by law for biennial auditing of the State University and any other public institutions of higher education established by the Legislature in this State.

And be it further,

RESOLVED, That Section 8 of Article 11 of the Nevada Constitution be amended to read as follows:

~~Sec.~~ *Sec. 8. The [Board of Regents shall, from the interest accruing from the first funds which come under their control, immediately organize and maintain the said Mining department in such manner as to make it most effective and useful, Provided, that all the] proceeds of the public lands donated by Act of Congress approved*

July ~~[second AD. Eighteen hundred and sixty Two,]~~ 2, 1862, ch. 130, 12 Stat. 503, and thereafter amended by Act of Congress, for a college for the benefit of Agriculture ~~[the Mechanics]~~ and Mechanic Arts, ~~[and]~~ including Military tactics, shall be invested by the ~~[said Board of Regents]~~ State of Nevada in the manner required by law in a separate fund to be appropriated exclusively for the benefit of the first named departments to the State University as set forth in Section ~~[Four above,]~~ 4 of this Article. And the Legislature shall provide that if through neglect or any other contingency, any portion of the fund so set apart ~~[shall be]~~ is lost or misappropriated, the State of Nevada shall replace said amount so lost or misappropriated in said fund so that the principal of said fund shall remain forever undiminished.

And be it further,

RESOLVED, That Section 7 of Article 11 of the Nevada Constitution be repealed.

And be it further,

RESOLVED, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

TEXT OF REPEALED SECTION

Sec: 7. The Governor, Secretary of State, and Superintendent of Public Instruction, shall for the first four years and until their successors are elected and qualified constitute a Board of Regents to control and manage the affairs of the University and the funds of the same under such regulations as may be provided by law. But the Legislature shall at its regular session next preceding the expiration of the term of office of said Board of Regents provide for the election of a new Board of Regents and define their duties..

Senator Dondero Loop moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Motion carried.

By Senator Ohrenschaal:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Expressing support for expanding the testing capacity for COVID-19 in Nevada through the use of pooled saliva testing.

Senator Ohrenschaal moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Health and Human Services.

Motion carried.

Senator Dondero Loop has approved the addition of Senator Scheible as a sponsor of Senate Bill No. 173.

Senator Scheible moved that Senate Bill No. 103 be taken from the Secretary's desk and placed on the General File for the next legislative day.

Motion carried.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING AND REFERENCE

By Senators Pickard, Buck, Settlemeyer, Goicoechea, Hammond and Hardy:

Senate Bill No. 252—AN ACT relating to contractors; extending the period during which a complaint may be filed with the State Contractors' Board against a licensee who fails or refuses to perform certain work; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce and Labor.

Motion carried.

By Senator Settelmeyer:

Senate Bill No. 253—AN ACT relating to alarm systems; prohibiting, under certain circumstances, the governing body of a county or city from imposing a penalty, fine or fee on an alarm system contractor or monitoring company; revising provisions relating to the information required to be included on advertising by a licensed contractor who installs alarm systems; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Government Affairs.

Motion carried.

By Senator Neal:

Senate Bill No. 254—AN ACT relating to discriminatory practices; revising various provisions relating to discrimination in housing; providing civil penalties and other remedies for certain violations; authorizing the Nevada Equal Rights Commission to enter into certain agreements with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Commission to investigate and enforce laws relating to fair housing as a certified agency under federal law; providing that certain conduct relating to seeking an applicant or tenant's arrest record, conviction record or record of criminal history constitutes an unlawful discriminatory practice in housing; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Government Affairs.

Motion carried.

By Senator Neal:

Senate Bill No. 255—AN ACT relating to economic development; creating the Division of Supplier Diversity in the Office of Economic Development; requiring the Executive Director of the Office of Economic Development to appoint the Administrator of the Division; setting forth the duties of the Division; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Revenue and Economic Development.

Motion carried.

By Senator Kieckhefer:

Senate Bill No. 256—AN ACT relating to elections; requiring the Secretary of State to establish a system for electronically circulating and signing a petition for initiative or referendum; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Motion carried.

By the Committee on Judiciary:

Senate Bill No. 257—AN ACT relating to common-interest communities; revising provisions relating to insurance coverage for certain common-interest communities; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary. Motion carried.

By Senators Scheible, Harris, Neal; Assemblywomen Nguyen and Peters:

Senate Bill No. 258—AN ACT relating to corrections; requiring the Director of the Department of Corrections to adopt regulations prescribing certain standards concerning offenders who are transgender, gender non-conforming, gender non-binary and intersex; requiring a program of facility training for correctional staff to include training in cultural competency for interacting with offenders who are transgender, gender non-conforming, gender non-binary and intersex; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary. Motion carried.

By Senator Denis:

Senate Bill No. 259—AN ACT relating to tow cars; requiring the Nevada Transportation Authority to provide certain annual trainings to a holder of a certificate of public convenience and necessity; requiring a holder of a certificate of public convenience and necessity to attend such training; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Growth and Infrastructure.

Motion carried.

By Senator Cannizzaro:

Senate Bill No. 260—AN ACT relating to Internet privacy; prohibiting a data broker from making any sale of certain information collected about a consumer in this State if so directed by the consumer; revising provisions relating to the sale of certain information collected about a consumer in this State; revising the circumstances under which operators of certain Internet websites or online services are authorized to remedy a failure to comply with certain requirements relating to the collection and sale of certain information about consumers in this State; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce and Labor.

Motion carried.

By Senator Settelmeyer:

Senate Bill No. 261—AN ACT relating to consumer debt; authorizing a prevailing plaintiff in an action to collect a consumer debt to collect a

minimum amount of attorney's fees; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary.
Motion carried.

By Senators Settlemeyer, Pickard, Goicoechea, Hardy, Hansen, Buck, Hammond, Kieckhefer, SeEVERS Gansert; Assemblymen Titus, Wheeler, Dickman, O'Neill, Ellison, Black, Hafen, Kasama, Krasner, Leavitt, Matthews, McArthur, Roberts and Tolles:

Senate Bill No. 262—AN ACT relating to civil actions; requiring a court to award reasonable attorney's fees to a plaintiff who prevails in a civil action for the establishment, protection or enforcement of a right pursuant to a provision of the Nevada Constitution; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary.
Motion carried.

By Senator Settlemeyer:

Senate Bill No. 263—AN ACT relating to elections; eliminating the requirement to cancel a person's voter registration if a person changes his or her party affiliation; revising the deadlines by which military and overseas voters may submit certain applications to register to vote and cast a ballot; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Motion carried.

Assembly Bill No. 72.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Motion carried.

Assembly Bill No. 136.

Senator Ratti moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education.

Motion carried.

SECOND READING AND AMENDMENT

Senate Bill No. 31.

Bill read second time and ordered to third reading.

Senate Bill No. 90.

Bill read second time and ordered to third reading.

GENERAL FILE AND THIRD READING

Senate Bill No. 98.

Bill read third time.

Remarks by Senator Settlemeyer.

Senate Bill No. 98 expands the boundary of the Carson Water Subconservancy District to include the portions of Storey County that are within the Carson River hydrologic basin. The measure expands the membership of the Board of Directors of the Carson Water Subconservancy District from 11 to 13 members by including 2 residents of Storey County appointed by the Board of County Commissioners of Storey County.

The measure excludes the portion of Storey County within the District from the taxable property on which the Board of Directors is authorized to levy a certain tax. Instead, the Board of County Commissioners of Storey County must pay to the District from the County's general fund an amount equal to what would have been generated by such a tax on the portion of Storey County that is within the Carson River hydrologic basin.

Roll call on Senate Bill No. 98:

YEAS—20.

NAYS—None.

EXCUSED—Spearman.

Senate Bill No. 98 having received a constitutional majority, Madam President declared it passed.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Assembly.

Assembly Bill No. 110.

Bill read third time.

Remarks by Senators Ohrenschall, Settlemeyer, Hansen, Pickard, Hardy, Ratti, Hammond and SeEVERS Gansert.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Assembly Bill No. 110 revises the Nevada Lobbying Disclosure and Regulation Act by removing the requirement that to be designated as a lobbyist, a person must appear in person in the Legislative Building or other building where the Legislature or its committees hold meetings. This bill clarifies that a person is not considered to be a lobbyist if he or she communicates with members of the Legislative Branch on an infrequent or irregular basis and does not otherwise engage in lobbying activities. Finally, the measure specifies the registration requirements that are applicable during the 81st Legislative Session to a person who, on or after the effective date of this bill, qualifies as a lobbyist.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

How many people does one need to contact to be considered a lobbyist? This question was asked in the Committee meeting, but the speaker was not able to answer it. If a person decides to talk to the entire Committee, does that make him or her a lobbyist, or do they need to talk to the whole Floor of the Legislative Body?

I am troubled that we are telling lobbyists they will be charged, yet they are not in the building. I have no problem charging people who are coming into the building, but I am perplexed that they are relegated to calling in by phone, and we are going to charge them. How many people, how many Legislators, does one need to contact in order to be considered a lobbyist?

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

This bill was amended in the Assembly to include what is referred to in committee as a "grassroots advocate exception." Section 2.2 (h) of the bill defines this as: "Persons who confine their lobbying activities to communicating directly with one or more members of the Legislative Branch only on an infrequent or irregular basis and who do not otherwise engage in any lobbying activities, unless those persons engage in a pattern of conduct that is substantially similar to engaging in lobbying activities on a recurrent or regular basis."

There is no number of contacts specified in bill, and that is for a reason. Nevada Revised Statute 218H.505 gives the duties of administering and interpreting Chapter 218H to the Director of the

Legislative Counsel Bureau. That is how it has been done in the past, and that is how it would continue under this bill. This bill passed unanimously in the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. It is needed in order for us to get a handle on who is lobbying this Session. I urge its passage.

SENATOR HANSEN:

This bill is obviously because of COVID-19 and the fact we have closed the building. I am concerned that there is no sunset in the bill. I do not think the bill is a big issue one way or another, but I am concerned we are deleting "... appears in person in the Legislative Building ..." as the definition of a lobbyist. The lobby of the Legislature is what gives the position its name. I was hoping there would be a sunset, and once we lift the restrictions on allowing people into the building, this would go back to the law we now have on the books. I do not see a sunset in this bill, and that is one of my issues.

I have been desperate to get people to talk to in person rather than using the communication methods that are inferior to face-to-face conversations. I am going to vote "no" on this bill because of the absence of a sunset and because lobbyists should be allowed into the building.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

There is no sunset in the bill. There are many ways to lobby now even if someone does not physically come to the building. This bill adds the grassroots advocacy exception which had not been in NRS 218H before. It address the concept of trying to protect grassroots activists who infrequently contact their Legislators and who are not demonstrating a pattern of lobbying. I again urge your support of this bill.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I support the idea of expanding our definition to lobbyists who do not necessarily enter the building, particularly given the idea that lobbying will virtually happen now that we have experienced virtual meetings and will continue in the virtual space. My concern is about the grassroots exception we have inserted. As I read that, I can see more than one way to interpret it. It leaves in the hands of one person to pick and choose who fits the definition. The internal inconsistency in subsection (h) gives me concern. It would allow a Director to choose a lobbyist they perhaps did not like in order to exclude them or make them pay the fee. Due to the lack of specificity and the multiple interpretations that could arise, I am not going to be able to support this bill.

SENATOR HARDY:

Do they get a blue badge?

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Yes. Nevada Revised Statue 218H.505 allows the LCB Director to administer the lobbying statute and make interpretations. Nevada Revised Statue 218H.530, also not changed by Assembly Bill No. 110, allows anyone who feels they have been incorrectly labeled a lobbyist when they are a grassroots advocate, to appeal the decision of the Director to the full Legislative Commission. There is an appeal route if someone feels the Director has made an error. That does not change with this bill.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I am aware of the appeal process. The Legislative Commission does not meet frequently during the Session, and this appellate process could be put off for some time. This could cause someone to miss his or her right to appeal without the payment. It is particularly problematic if they cannot afford to pay the fee. I like where this is going and agree with the intent, but the language is broad enough and over inclusive enough that I cannot support this bill as written.

SENATOR RATTI:

I would like to speak in favor of Assembly Bill No. 110. I have a strong difference of opinion with many of the comments that have been made today and would like to lay that out. I, like many of my colleagues, have multiple ways people can get in touch with me. My cellphone number is out there as is my email address and social media contact information. Lobbyists, through all forms

of communication regularly contact me far more so than folks coming into the building during the limited time we are in Session. That was true before the pandemic and will be true following the pandemic.

This bill does something we should have done a long time ago. It strikes a blow for transparency related to who is actually contacting Legislators to lobby on specific issues, regardless of the conversation is in person or electronic. A significantly higher number of my conversations with folks, who are paid by someone to lobby for issues, happen in a virtual format of some kind, not face-to-face or here in this building. I do not believe this bill should have a sunset. Moving forward, with all of us getting used to talking through screens and other mechanisms, many people will be outside this building when they are talking to us.

Prior to the pandemic and the need for this legislation, I was regularly contacted by citizen-lobbyists who were unclear about whether or not they had to register to lobby. This bill goes a long ways in clarifying that. Is there a perfect definition of when one crosses the line between being a lobbyist and regularly contacting the Legislature or being an occasional advocate for an issue in your neighborhood? I do not know if it is possible to write that perfectly.

This bill has significantly more clarity than we had before and includes an appeal process, which we did not have before. Our staff has always done a great job of reaching out to people we see a lot and letting them know it may be time to be registered as they are crossing that line. We have not been punitive. We want people to engage in this process. We are striking a blow for transparency to make sure we and the public know who is contacting us or who is paid to contact us to advocate for an issue. I strongly support this bill and thank those who spent time and energy to figure out how to do this right.

SENATOR HARDY:

I look forward to the day when I can see the blue badge in the lobby. I was told by a former lobbyist that no one is allowed to buy me lunch now, otherwise, they would be a lobbyist. What will the lobby fees be used for? During committee meetings, people see the speaker view but do not see the committee members. We are told to make sure we put ourselves on video. We get texts, emails and phone calls that are not from those who have figured out how to call themselves a lobbyist or a grassroots advocate. I have enough concerns about this bill that I will not be voting in favor of it. I do understand, however, the need to have some clarity.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

When we are here in the building, a badge must be worn to demonstrate who is lobbying. If we meet someone outside the building during the interim or during this Session, is that requirement going to be placed upon them? Will they need to wear the badge so we know who they are and so others can recognize them, or are badges only required in the building?

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Assembly Bill No. 110 does not change the language in NRS 218H.300 regarding identification badges. The only addition is the language making it apply during a regular Session or a Special Session. Current language in this section is that someone who is deemed a lobbyist by the Legislative Counsel Bureau must wear the identification badge whenever they appear in the building. This adds the language "... during a regular or special session" which is not in existing NRS. Otherwise, there are no changes.

SENATOR HANSEN:

While I respect the comments by my colleague from District 13 about transparency regarding our texts, emails and how people can get ahold of us through social media, I am uncomfortable with the fact that to be a professional lobbyist, one must now pay a \$300 fee even though they are not coming into the building, if they want to send me an email or text and not be in violation of this new law. There is a substantial requirement that they would have to pay to be a lobbyist, which is traditionally limited to those coming into the building and following our protocols. We now want to expand this to anyone who wants to send me a communication, even though they are not allowed to come into the building. It is more than transparency. It is now a financial burden if someone wants to send an email to a Legislator. I am still a strong "no" on this bill, but I am in

favor of transparency. We need a sunset in this bill. To force everyone to pay a \$300 fee to send me a text message seems unreasonable.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I will be supporting Senate Bill No. 110. When I looked at this legislation, I thought about the process of how we register lobbyists. It is now contingent upon the person being in the building. It is periodic, and we have not considered the technology we use and have used for a long time. When I have looked at some of my bills, or at hearings coming up, I have had questions about who is representing various interest groups. I do not have that information now because we do not have anyone registered as it has been contingent upon being in the building. Now, and moving forward, we have technology that allows people to communicate on legislation and the process without being registered.

This bill may not be perfect, but we need the transparency. We also need to consider annual registration or registration within a certain timeframe instead of periodically. Everything we have now is periodic. This means some would have to register for this Session and then, if we have a Special Session, they would need register and pay a fee again. If one registers once for a regular Session and there is a Special Session in the same year, I would like to know if they will have to pay again because it is a different Session. The bill is not perfect, but transparency is critically important. While there is a fee associated with it, we need to keep those records so information is available to us and to the public. I will be supporting this legislation.

Roll call on Assembly Bill No. 110:

YEAS—14.

NAYS—Goicoechea, Hammond, Hansen, Hardy, Pickard, Settelmeyer—6.

EXCUSED—Spearman.

Assembly Bill No. 110 having received a constitutional majority, Madam President declared it passed.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Assembly.

REMARKS FROM THE FLOOR

Senator Cannizzaro requested that her remarks be entered in the Journal.

It is my privilege today to recognize 18 of the most outstanding student leaders in our State. I am referring to the current members of the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL).

The NYL was statutorily created in 2007 by a bill sponsored by former Senator Valerie Wiener. Its mission focuses on giving students an active voice in representative state government. Since its creation, more than 210 high school students have been provided with an opportunity to serve as Youth Legislators. We are very proud of this legislative leadership program and greatly appreciate its impact on the youth of Nevada. Through the years, others have also recognized the unique and exemplary impact of the NYL. To date, the NYL program has received more than 50 state, national and international awards.

So, who are these Nevada Youth Legislators? They are high school students who are appointed by their elected Senators to represent the youth of their districts. During their involvement in this two-year program, youth legislators spend their first year in rigorous half-day monthly trainings, covering such skills as: message accountability, listening, presentations, constituent outreach, negotiating and more.

During their second year, Youth Legislators focus on the legislative process, from framing bill ideas to drafting legislation to narrowing down their 18 bill proposals to one bill draft request. Unlike any other program in this Country, the NYL has statutorily allocated one bill on a youth-related issue each Legislative Session.

This afternoon, NYL members will virtually attend and participate as witnesses during a Senate Committee hearing on Senate Bill No. 108. This is the NYL's bill this Session, and it addresses inequities in the juvenile justice system.

Today, as Youth Legislators visit this Floor Session virtually, we would like to honor four Youth Legislators who participated in the NYL at the highest level during their two-year terms.

Each of them attended 100 percent of all required meetings or trainings and engaged 100 percent in all required assignments. These individuals are: Youth Legislator Joanna Bieda, Youth Legislator Melekte Hailemeskel, Youth Legislator Leila Moassessi, and Youth Legislator Kirsten Springer. Each of you will receive a "Certificate of Recognition" in the mail.

In addition, to all of the 2019-2021 Youth Legislators, we would like to present these silver and blue commencement cords to acknowledge their successful completion of their NYL terms. We celebrate them and the importance of their intelligent ideas, their meaningful work and their dedicated service to the youth of their Senate districts and the entire State of Nevada. The remaining Youth Legislators are: Rhythm Kincade; Mahdote Abebe; Jim Atwood; Alexia Carver; Sahi Chundu; Olivia Craig; Romana Dvoran; Adele Espinosa de los Monteros; Tyler Fournier; Kamieko Gointes; Julianna Melendez; Shaunta Palmer; Nicole Valenzuela and Alex Wong.

Please join me in honoring the 2019-2021 Nevada Youth Legislators for who they are, how they have chosen to serve and how they will continue to demonstrate their distinctive leadership in our State and beyond. Thanks to each of them and to former Senator Valerie Wiener, who serves as Chair of the NYL Board.

Senator Cannizzaro moved that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 11:00 a.m.

Motion carried.

Senate adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Approved:

KATE MARSHALL
President of the Senate

Attest: CLAIRE J. CLIFT
Secretary of the Senate