

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session
March 21, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:04 a.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager

Minutes ID: 527



Geigy Stringer, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Geneva Martin, Intern for Assemblyman Steve Yeager
Dylan Keith, Assistant Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson

Chair Torres:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules were explained.] We have four bill draft requests (BDR) that will be introduced in our Committee. We are going to begin with this motion before going to the bills.

BDR 20-848—Revises provisions governing public administrators. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 368](#).)

BDR 18-1056—Revises provisions governing the Keep Nevada Working Task Force. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 366](#).)

BDR 18-979—Revises provisions governing federal grants. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 365](#).)

BDR 28-450—Establishes requirements relating to labor agreements for certain public works projects. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 367](#).)

Chair Torres:

At this time, I will entertain a motion to introduce the four BDRs.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 20-848, BILL DRAFT REQUEST 18-1056, BILL DRAFT REQUEST 18-979, AND BILL DRAFT REQUEST 28-450.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and open the hearing on [Assembly Bill 299](#), which creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction. Speaker Yeager, when you are ready.

[Assembly Bill 299](#): Creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction. (BDR 18-780)

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:

This is my first time appearing in front of this Committee, so let me say thank you for all of the work that you have done so far and all of the work you are going to be doing. You had four bill draft requests this morning and will probably have more coming. Things are going to pick up, and I appreciate the work that you are all doing on behalf of your constituents. Chair, with your permission, I would like to make introductory remarks on Assembly Bill 299, and then I am going to hand it over to my copresenter, whom I will introduce, to take you through most of the bill, and then we will be happy to answer any questions.

What you have in front of you today is Assembly Bill 299. It is not a very long bill, but I think it is an important one. It creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction. I thought one question I might get is, where did I come up with this idea? I have a confession to make. Last legislative session, towards the end of session, one of my constituents emailed me with this idea to have a medal of distinction or something like it in the state. We were too late in the session to do anything about it. For the life of me, I cannot find that email. I was not able to inform this constituent that we are actually going forward with this bill, so if by chance that person happens to be watching today, please reach out. We would love to have your involvement in this process. I think I must have put that somewhere in my email that I was not able to find. That was the genesis—the idea actually came from a constituent.

When I decided to bring this bill this session, I asked some of the folks who work in the leadership office to help me flesh out the concept. I have with me Geneva Martin, who is interning with me for the 2023 Session. I want to tell you a little bit about her, and then I am going to hand it over to her to give her a first taste of being part of the legislative process. She was born and raised in Las Vegas and is a political science major, with a minor in Spanish, in her junior year at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, also known as UNLV. She is currently the legislative intern for the Assembly leadership office. She has been doing an amazing job, and she is really to take credit for how this bill came out. She is beginning to prepare to take the LSAT, which, as many of you know, is the law school admissions test. I have tried to talk her out of going to law school, but I think she really, really wants to do it. That is Ms. Martin's bio. I am going to hand it over to her to take you through the bill, and then hopefully you will have some questions. Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

Geneva Martin, Intern for Assemblyman Yeager:

First, I would like to begin by saying what a privilege it is to be sitting in front of all of you today, especially since I have had the unique opportunity of getting to see this bill all the way from an idea in an email to now being formally presented in front of this Committee. With that being said, I will jump right in and begin with the structure of the bill.

Assembly Bill 299 creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction and the Nevada Awards and Honors Board. The board is to be composed of five members who are residents of the state and appointed by the Governor. The members of the board will serve three-year terms and may be reappointed. The duties of the board, as set forth in section 4, subsection 3, include the following: First, the board will be responsible for establishing a suitable design for the Nevada Medal of Distinction, such as a ribbon, a badge, or other insignia. Second, the board

will be responsible for establishing the requirements for determining whether a person has made a significant and lasting contribution to the state. These requirements will lay the framework for the nominating committee that will be discussed later on. Third, the board will be responsible for procuring the manufacture of the Nevada Medal of Distinction on all of its physical parts, and lastly, taking any other action necessary to carry out the requirements related to the Nevada Medal of Distinction, such as arranging events and different event logistics. Administrative support for the Nevada Awards and Honors Board will be provided by the Office of the Governor. The board may apply for and accept grants, gifts, donations, bequests, or devices on behalf of the board to carry out their listed duties.

On or before January 1 of each year, a selection committee comprised of nine members must be appointed as follows: three members will be appointed by the Governor; two members appointed by the Senate Majority Leader; two members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly; and two members appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nevada. The membership of the selection committee must be posted on the Internet website of the Office of the Governor by the Nevada Award and Honors Board.

On or before the deadline established by the board, each member of the selection committee will submit to the board the nomination of one person who is living and one who is deceased to receive the Nevada Medal of Distinction for that year. The board must post the nominations that are received from each member of the selection committee on the Internet website of the Governor as well. After the awardees have been selected, the board will hold the ceremony to announce the recipients of the Nevada Medal of Distinction for that year.

To guarantee the inclusion of all of Nevada, the ceremony will take place in Carson City during each odd-numbered year when the Legislature is in regular session and in the City of Las Vegas during even-numbered years.

Two days before the ceremony, the selection committee must meet and select the recipients of the Nevada Medal of Distinction for that year, one of whom must be living and one of whom must be deceased. This extended appointment, nomination, and publication process helps to ensure the Nevada Medal of Distinction is upheld as a tool for impartial bipartisan celebration and acknowledgment of Nevadans and the impactful legacies they have to offer. It is for Nevadans by Nevadans.

Lastly, I would like to note that while this is a policy committee, there is a fiscal note which has been submitted for this bill from the Office of the Governor which determines that there is a fiscal impact. Specifics are not yet available, but as soon as they are, they will be shared. In closing, I would like to thank Chair Torres and members of the Committee for hearing this bill today, and I urge your support of Assembly Bill 299. We are happy to take any questions at this time.

Chair Torres:

Thank you for your presentation, Speaker and Ms. Martin. At this time, members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Just a clarifying question: In section 5, subsection 3, the medal is referred to as the Nevada Medal of Honor; it is everywhere else referred to as the Nevada Medal of Distinction. I just wanted to make sure that we are not stealing the U.S. Congress's thunder.

Geneva Martin:

That is definitely an oversight in editing, and that will be corrected.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

My question was what the Assemblyman just finished asking. Thank you for the clarification.

Assemblyman Koenig:

My question is on the makeup of that yearly selection committee. So you have selections from the Governor; you have them from the Speaker of the Assembly; you have them from the Senate Majority Leader. You do not have anyone from the minority party who is involved in that selection committee to make it truly bipartisan. Is there any way you can incorporate a member from the minority party onto that yearly selection committee?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I appreciate the question. Yes, I think there is. I view this as the first draft of the bill, so I think we will incorporate those suggestions. The only thing I worry about sometimes is when we create these committees, we have to make sure they do not get too large to carry out their function. But yes, we will take that under consideration. That is probably a good suggestion.

Assemblyman Koenig:

Right now, with a Governor of the minority party, that would be fine, but when this goes in, there could be years when the governor is in the same party, and the majority is on all three, then the minority party would have no say in that.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Right—just thinking out loud, maybe there is a way to put a safeguard in there. For instance, this year, it would be bipartisan. Truthfully, it should not be a partisan issue, right? We are talking about people who have done great things, but these are people who are going to be making nominations, and sometimes Republicans run in more Republican circles and Democrats in more Democratic circles. But I think we could probably put a provision in that if we are not in a situation where there is divided government, maybe we change the appointing authority; that would be a good way to make sure. And of course, as we know, our Supreme Court justices are nonpartisan, so we will maybe get some nonpartisan members there. I appreciate the suggestion.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I have a question about section 6, subsection 2. It says two days before the date of the ceremony, the committee will meet and decide who is going to get the award. Can there not be more lead time? Someone gets an award, and then two days later; they may have family they want to attend.

Geneva Martin:

I appreciate the question. We did consider that when creating the first draft. The initial idea was that no one will be notified beforehand, and the final selection of the recipient will be announced the day of. That way, everybody would be present at the awards ceremony. Even if the nine individuals who were nominated were not selected, they are still gaining recognition. There is still a spotlight on Nevadans who are doing excellent work even if they are not the recipients of the award. We thought that by giving such a small leeway into that, we are ensuring that everyone will be at the ceremony. They are still getting the recognition even if they are not the recipient of the award.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Two days before, the winner will be notified. Is that so?

Geneva Martin:

The recipient will be notified the day of. The actual selection will be made two days prior to the event.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Okay. For all of the recipients. I understand. Thank you very much. It is very clear.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I have a follow-up on Assemblywoman Taylor's comments on section 6, subsection 2. Most of the bill reads as if the board is making the selection of the two recipients, but the text in section 6, subsection 2, implies that the selection committee is making the selection. So there seems to be an inconsistency in that sense.

Geneva Martin:

Yes. That is probably one of the most difficult parts of this relatively simple bill. How we have it structured is, the Honors and Awards Board is responsible for the public announcement of what is being decided by the committee. We can definitely clarify that language.

Assemblyman DeLong:

So the concept is the committee will identify nine individuals and then they will meet internally and decide on two?

Geneva Martin:

Yes, that is correct.

Chair Torres:

Thank you, members. Are there any additional questions? [There were none.]

I have a question that follows up on Assemblyman DeLong's question. Would it make more sense to just appoint the nine members, then, instead of appointing the selection committee for those members? Should we not just say there are nine members who are appointed, one appointed by the Speaker, one appointed by this . . . instead of creating the committee that is then going to appoint nine additional members, and then have the selection committee do that? Or is the intent maybe because the event would be overseen by the Honors Board? I am just trying to understand the role of each one.

Geneva Martin:

It already is relatively separated that way. I do not think the language provided is clear enough on that. The Awards and Honors Board is going to be appointed by the Governor. They have nothing to do with the actual selection or nomination process other than the publication on the website of what the committee is deciding, and they are just to handle the logistics of the oversight of the entire process. Only those on the committee itself are involved in the nomination process.

Assemblyman Yeager:

If I could just add, because we are housing this in the Governor's Office, I would view the board as more of an administrative support-type board. The Governor is going to have those appointments. You will see that on page 2 of the bill, line 19; it talks about the Governor appointing those five members who have three-year terms. They are the administrative support because that is where the program would be housed—in the Governor's Office.

But then the committee itself is appointed, as noted, some by the Governor, some by the Speaker, some by the Majority Leader, some by the Chief Justice. That committee is the one that makes nominations and selects the award winner, and that committee is reappointed every year. I think someone can serve multiple terms. But the idea is the administrative board will be a little bit more long-lasting. It certainly does not say this in the bill, but my vision of how this would look in an ideal world is, the administrative board would hopefully create a website and the people who are nominated would have their profiles up there. Much like we do for the Grammy Awards or the Oscars: Here are your five nominees and then you have a winner selected. It would serve as a way to look back at some of the achievements.

The reason we picked one living person and one person who is deceased is because we have not had this program in the state. There is a way to look back and recognize some of the contributions of those who are no longer with us, but then to look forward so that they would be—I do not want to say a Hall of Fame—but a website of people in Nevada who have done really amazing things. That is the administrative support that the board itself would be tasked with, whereas the committee is going to be a volunteer committee that is going to go out in the community and try to find nominees and then decide on an award winner. I am sorry for the long answer, but I am an attorney and it is hard for me to be concise sometimes.

Chair Torres:

Thank you. I do appreciate that. I know for others coming into the most efficient Committee on Government Affairs, it sometimes is a challenge.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I had a question in regard to the biennium. Is the intent to not bestow the honor of this medal during an ongoing session, or is that something that is in flux?

Geneva Martin:

We have not solidified an exact timeline because of how it will differentiate between years and locations when the nomination and the selections all take place. After the first two years, I think there will be a better-solidified schedule and time frame. As of right now, everything would begin in October and then hopefully take place by January. Then going forth, it would be as it gets done. That is definitely something that we are wanting to clarify.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Interesting, because if you were to pass this bill and it were to pass the Senate and it were to be signed by the Governor—by the way, I have had productive conversations with the Governor's Office; I did not want to put something in his office without asking him—this would go into effect in October of this year. That means the first award winner would be next year, which would be off session so it would happen in Las Vegas. That probably gives the committee a little bit more time to figure out how this is going to work. But we did intend, and you see it in section 6, that during a session year, the award ceremony would be in Carson City on a date in which the Legislature is in regular session. I think that would be a great opportunity for us.

These things do not always come to pass the way you would like them to, but my vision would be having a ceremony at the room that is adjacent to the Governor's Mansion, where the Governor could present the medal, and hopefully we would all be invited to celebrate those Nevadans. Ideally, we will have a year to work some of the kinks out, and then hopefully have it ready to go so that those of us who are back in this building next year would be able to participate in the awards ceremony here in Carson City.

Chair Torres:

Ms. Martin, you are learning very quickly that just because it is a short bill does not mean it is a short hearing.

Assemblywoman González:

Is there any requirement of the board and/or the nominees to be residents? Could a person get this award who maybe no longer lives here?

Geneva Martin:

That is an excellent question. They would need to be current residents of Nevada or at least have a residence in Nevada, to still be considered for the award. One of the stipulations can definitely be clarified by the Award and Honors Board because they are the ones who will be

listing the designated specifics of each requirement that the nominee will have to fulfill to be able to even be in the running. That can be determined later on.

Chair Torres:

It would be helpful in the future amendment to clarify that, maybe specifying the length of residency in Nevada so somebody who has lived here two weeks—maybe not—but somebody who has lived here for five years, ten years I do not know what that requirement might look like, but I definitely think a length of residency requirement would be helpful.

Assemblyman DeLong:

Since we are now talking about residency requirements for receiving, you have individuals who I would think would not have a residence since they are deceased. Do they need to be buried in Nevada?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I will note that the board itself—the one that is created at line 19 of page 2—those administrative board members have to be residents of the state. You raise a good question and Assemblywoman González raised a good question. It does not really say necessarily of the person being awarded, although the board itself is going to come up with some regulations around this. We try not to be too prescriptive, but what is a significant and lasting contribution? What does that mean? I think some of that will be fleshed out by the board. I certainly could foresee a scenario where the board would determine, Look, maybe you do not currently have to live in Nevada, but you have to have lived here at some point and done something for those who are living.

But to your question, which I do not know if it was a serious one or not, but I do not think it would be a requirement that you have to be buried in the state of Nevada. Ideally, you would have some family here because it is a good opportunity to bring family members in to honor their loved ones who have passed on.

Assemblyman DeLong:

It was actually somewhat serious. A couple of good examples would be Mark Twain or John Mackay, both of whom did not die in Nevada, but certainly made contributions.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Now we have those two in the minutes. So when that first selection committee comes together, there are a couple of suggestions right there. Thank you, Assemblyman.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any additional questions or any other names you want to get on the record?

Assemblywoman González:

When you were talking about the board discussing what the requirements would be, would those change, or once this initial board makes those determinations, is that the requirement for receiving the award?

Geneva Martin:

They can definitely be subject to change, but the first set of requirements will probably set the precedent for what is done going forward. There may be some changes, perhaps about posthumous locations, that could be made going forward or potentially about the length of time someone has lived in Nevada. Those things could all be subject to change. But the primary requirements of defining what is a significant and lasting contribution and things as such that will be definitions will remain the same.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? You have been awfully quiet today. It does not look like there are any additional questions. Thank you for not throwing away your shot, Ms. Martin. You did a phenomenal job with your first presentation, answering all of our questions. At this time, we will go ahead and move into support for Assembly Bill 299.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

We would like to thank the sponsor and Ms. Martin for bringing this bill forward. We regularly put on our own customer service excellence awards. We recognize that there are so many Nevadans who go unrecognized for going above and beyond what they have to do, and being able to tell their stories is incredibly important. For that reason, we are in support of this bill and we urge your support as well.

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson:

We are also honored to support the Speaker's bill this morning. I would not be surprised if one of the members of this Committee might be in the running at one time for one of these awards.

Chair Torres:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of A.B. 299 here in Carson City or in Las Vegas? Seeing no one, is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in support of A.B. 299? [There was no one.] I will invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 299; seeing no one in Carson City or in Las Vegas, is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 299? [There was no one.] Now I will invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 299. [There was no one.] I will go ahead and invite the bill sponsor for any closing remarks. Maybe a requirement of this Committee should be to ask the question whether they grew up to be a hero or a scholar.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I want to thank the Committee for allowing me the opportunity to present and thank you for welcoming Ms. Martin to the Committee. It is a real pleasure to be able to have her present

the bill, given that she did all the work on the bill. Thank you for the consideration. I will hand it over to Ms. Martin for any other concluding remarks.

Geneva Martin:

I would also like to say thank you for not traumatizing me my first time sitting before you. I appreciate all of the questions; we will definitely find a way to make sure they are all thoroughly addressed and answered. Thank you for the opportunity, and I definitely urge your support for A.B. 299.

[Also submitted but not discussed was Exhibit C, which is included as an exhibit for the hearing.]

Chair Torres:

At this time, I will close the hearing on A.B. 299. Rest assured, Ms. Martin, all the traumatization would happen in Judiciary but never Government Affairs.

Today we will be conducting a work session to take action on measures the Committee has heard in previous meetings. It is not customary for the Committee to take testimony or otherwise rehear the bills during the work session. However, I may invite a witness to come forward for clarification or questions during consideration of the measure or perhaps during one of the amendments. We will go ahead and start today with Assembly Bill 13, and I will turn it over to Ms. Ruedy.

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

Thank you, Madam Chair. As nonpartisan Legislative Counsel Bureau staff, I do not advocate for or against legislation. I am merely walking you through the work session document.

**Assembly Bill 13: Revises provisions related to governmental administration.
(BDR 23-418)**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit D.] Assembly Bill 13 relates to whistleblower protections for State officers and employees. The measure imposes a time limit of not later than ten working days after the date on which the alleged violation or reprisal or retaliatory action occurred for a State officer or employee to file a written appeal with a hearing officer of the Personnel Commission of the Division of Human Resource Management of the Department of Administration. There is one amendment by the Office of the Attorney General that changes that from 10 working days to 60 working days—that is the amendment that is in the work session document [page 2, Exhibit D]. The measure eliminates the authority of a hearing officer to order the termination of employment of the proper person.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 13.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN THOMAS MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 13.

ASSEMBLYMAN GURR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will go ahead and take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblyman D'Silva.

Assembly Bill 18: Revises provisions relating to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services of the Department of Administration. (BDR 19-218)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from [Exhibit E](#).] Assembly Bill 18 revises the composition of the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services of the Department of Administration and modernizes certain statutory language to better define the work of the Division. The measure further authorizes the Division to provide service for certain agencies to facilitate the economical processing of information throughout the state government. There were no amendments.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion on Assembly Bill 18.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARTER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 18.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblyman DeLong. We will go ahead and move on to Assembly Bill 28.

Assembly Bill 28: Establishes the Nevada Baby Bonds Program. (BDR 18-356)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from [Exhibit F](#).] Assembly Bill 28 is a bill from the State Treasurer to establish the Nevada Baby Bonds Program and the Nevada Baby Bonds Trust Fund. The measure authorizes the State Treasurer to adopt regulations relating to the program and to administer

the program and trust fund. The measure appropriates \$80 million from the State General Fund to the trust fund to establish the program.

Specifically related to the program, the measure requires the Department of Health and Human Services to notify the State Treasurer of the birth of a designated beneficiary. Upon such notification, the State Treasurer shall, within the limits of money made available for this purpose, credit \$3,200 from the trust fund to the designated beneficiary. A designated beneficiary is defined as a natural person born in Nevada on or after January 1, 2024, whose birth was subject to medical coverage provided under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program.

When submitting a claim to the State Treasurer to receive money in the trust fund credited to the designated beneficiary, the designated beneficiary must be at least 18 years old but less than 30; have been a resident of Nevada for at least the 12 months immediately preceding the submission of the claim; and attest that the money will be used for certain purposes related to postsecondary education, to purchase a home, to start or purchase a business, or for certain investments.

Related to some concerns expressed by the Committee, the State Treasurer did submit an amendment subsequent to the hearing. That is in your work session document [page 2, [Exhibit F](#)]; those amendments are in section 9 and section 14 of the bill. It requires a designated beneficiary to successfully complete a course in financial literacy prior to being able to claim funds credited them in the Nevada Baby Bonds Trust Fund. It requires any regulations adopted by the State Treasurer pursuant to this act to include provisions to ensure designated beneficiaries complete financial literacy course work that includes training on the rights and protections available to consumers when using their baby bonds funds to take out student loans, purchase a home, start a small business, or invest in financial assets or personal capital that provide long-term gains to the designated beneficiaries' wages or wealth. That was the only amendment presented.

Chair Torres:

At this time, I will ask members for any questions. Seeing none, I will go ahead and entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 28.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARTER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 28.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion, members? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DELONG, GURR,
HIBBETTS, KOENIG, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Taylor. We will go ahead and go forward with Assembly Bill 92.

Assembly Bill 92: Authorizes a board of county commissioners to create the office of county counsel. (BDR 20-619)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit G.] Assembly Bill 92 authorizes a board of county commissioners to create the office of county counsel to perform many of the noncriminal duties otherwise assigned to the district attorney. Any such county counsel is authorized to appoint deputies and other clerical, investigational, and operational staff. County counsel is prohibited from conducting criminal prosecutions or bringing certain civil actions relating to an obligation for child support. There were no amendments.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass on Assembly Bill 92.

ASSEMBLYMAN HIBBETTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 92.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Gurr:

Madam Chair, I am going to vote yes to get this out of Committee, but I reserve my right to vote no on the floor.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

To keep it simple, ditto.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I would like to reserve my right to change.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I would also like to reserve my right to change my mind.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Ditto to what Assemblywoman Taylor and the rest of my colleagues just said.

Chair Torres:

At this time, I will go ahead and move on to the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG VOTED NO.)

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Koenig. We will go ahead and move forward with Assembly Bill 177.

Assembly Bill 177: Revises provisions governing parcel datasets. (BDR 20-715)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit H.] Assembly Bill 177 adds an association for operators to the list of entities that the State Demographer of the Department of Taxation must, upon request, provide the fiscal year-end parcel dataset of a county. The measure adds, without limitation, Underground Service Alert of Northern California and Nevada, or its successor organization, to the definition of an association for operators related to this provision. The attached amendment is from the Nevada Association of Counties [page 2, Exhibit H]. It is to clarify that employees and agents of these companies cannot disseminate parcel dataset information.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 177.

ASSEMBLYMAN D'SILVA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 177.

ASSEMBLYMAN GURR SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Gurr; congratulations to the freshman on getting your first BDR out of Committee. We will go ahead and continue with Assembly Bill 189.

Assembly Bill 189: Revises provisions governing construction start times in certain counties and cities. (BDR 20-232)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit I.] Assembly Bill 189 provides that if the board of county commissioners in a county whose population is 700,000 or more—currently only Clark County—or the governing body of a city which is located in such a county adopts an ordinance restricting the hours in which construction work may begin in a common-interest community, the hours for construction work in a common-interest community must not begin later than 5 a.m. during the period beginning on April 1 and ending on September 30. The governing body of a county or city to which these provisions apply must amend any ordinance not in compliance with these provisions as of July 1, 2023. Any existing ordinance regulating excessive noise is also subject to these provisions.

However, following the bill hearing, the bill sponsor did submit an amendment [[Exhibit J](#)] that I omitted from the work session document; I apologize. That was provided to all of you this morning as a free-floating document that you should have found on your workspace, and it is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System also. The amendment has ever-so-slightly different wording.

The amendment to [A.B. 189](#) is: "If the board of county commissioners in a county whose population is 700,000 or more adopts an ordinance restricting the hours in which construction work in a declarant controlled common-interest community may begin, the hours for construction work in a common-interest community must be allowed to begin at . . ."—and this is where it is just slightly different wording, in just these few words—. . . but no earlier than 5 a.m. during the period beginning on April 1 and ending on September 30."

Then there was a second proposed amendment [[Exhibit I](#)] suggested by the Committee to amend section 7 of the bill to change the effective date from July 1, 2023, to "upon passage and approval."

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions on the amendment? I know we have Ms. Capurro here who is happy to answer anything. Assemblyman McArthur, did you have a question?

Assemblyman McArthur:

No question, but I am going to say yes and reserve my right.

Chair Torres:

All right, no questions on the amendment. I will go ahead and entertain a motion to amend and do pass [Assembly Bill 189](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND
DO PASS [ASSEMBLY BILL 189](#).

ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion other than Assemblyman McArthur who has already commented—he is speaking a lot in Committee today. Seeing none, we will go ahead and take a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will go ahead and assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Jauregui.

We will go ahead and close the work session and move on to public comment. [Rules for public comment were reviewed.] Is there anyone wishing to give public comment? [There was no one.] [Meeting reminders were given.]

Are there any questions or any comments from members before we adjourn? Assemblyman McArthur, go ahead with a "McArthur Minute"? He said he is fine today. He will save it for tomorrow since he will be up a little earlier. Seeing no further business before this Committee, the Committee is adjourned [at 9:49 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Geigy Stringer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a document titled "Medal of Distinction Work Timeline," dated March 21, 2023, submitted by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 13](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 18](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 28](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 92](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 177](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 189](#), presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is an amendment to [Assembly Bill 189](#), dated March 21, 2023, submitted by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41.