

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

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

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Michelle Gorelow at 4:08 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, in Room 3142 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.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Chair
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst
Shuruk Ismail, Committee Manager
Kristi Howard, Committee Secretary
Garrett Kingen, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 568



OTHERS PRESENT:

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Dana Englekirk, Vice President, Skyland General Improvement District
Lynn Chapman, State Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Alida Benson, Executive Director, Nevada Republican Party
Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Randy Case, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Chair Gorelow:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will introduce Bill Draft Request 24-776, complete work sessions for Assembly Bill 192 and Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session and will hear Assembly Bill 200. We are pulling Assembly Bill 104 from the work session.

Assembly Bill 104: Revises provisions governing the submission of legislative measures for city charters. (BDR 17-141)

[This bill was not considered.]

Let us get started with the bill draft request introduction.

BDR 24-776—Revises provisions governing elections. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 394.)

We have a Committee bill draft introduction for Bill Draft Request 24-776. This measure is an act relating to elections requiring the Secretary of State to adopt regulations that prescribe the procedure to be used if the abstract or certification of results for any election is not timely prepared or transmitted; prohibiting with certain exceptions, the counting of ballots more than once; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

I will entertain a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request 24-776.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 24-776.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will open the work session on Assembly Bill 192.

Assembly Bill 192: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-836)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit C](#).] Assembly Bill 192 is sponsored by Assemblywoman Cecelia González. It was heard in this Committee on March 9, 2023. The measure requires the Secretary of State to prescribe the form of all mail ballot envelopes, including the envelopes the mail ballots are sent in and the return envelopes, so they are uniform throughout the state. An exception is made for the color of the return envelopes, which must be a unique color as determined by city and county clerks and approved by the Secretary of State.

The measure also establishes standards for the size and placement of signs marking the area within which electioneering is prohibited at polling places.

There were a few amendments proposed to the measure. Washoe County proposed an amendment to change the size of the signs posted to mark the area within which electioneering is prohibited from at least 18 inches by 12 inches, as originally written in the bill, to at least 17 inches by 11 inches.

In addition, the Office of the Secretary of State proposed the following amendments to the bill:

1. Adjust language around the color of envelopes and paper to provide that the Office of the Secretary of State will determine a method of distinguishing ballots of neighboring counties to be displayed prominently on the outside of the return envelope;
2. Clarify that in addition to setting the design for the ballot and envelope, the Office of the Secretary of State will also purchase the ballots and envelopes for the counties in a single statewide contract and be the main point of contact for the vendor; and
3. Provide for a county to request from the Secretary of State an exemption from the purchasing contract, but not the design, for the Presidential Preference Primary, primary, and general elections in 2024 only. The Office of the Secretary of State would not be required to grant this exemption.

Chair Gorelow:

Are there any questions before I continue with a motion? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 192.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEWBY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 192.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAMERON (C.H.) MILLER SECONDED THE
MOTION.

Are there any questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Gorelow:

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman González. We will move on to the work session for Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session.

Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session: Proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to add and revise terms relating to persons with certain conditions for whose benefit certain public entities are supported by the State. (BDR C-477)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit D](#).] Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session was sponsored by Assemblywomen Benitez-Thompson, Titus, and Krasner, and Senators Hardy, Harris, and Seevers Gansert, et al. It was heard by this Committee on February 23, 2023. The measure proposes to amend Article 13, section 1 of the *Nevada Constitution* by:

1. Replacing the term "institutions" with "entities";
2. Revising the description of persons who benefit from entities fostered and supported by the State from "insane" to "persons with significant mental illness"; "blind" to "persons who are blind or visually impaired"; and "deaf and dumb" to "persons who are deaf or hard of hearing"; and
3. Adding entities for the benefit of persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities to the types of entities that shall be fostered and supported by the State.

There are no amendments for this measure. There is a special note for the Committee. If this resolution is passed by the 2023 Legislature, it must also be approved by voters at the 2024 General Election before the measure becomes effective.

Chair Gorelow:

Members, are there any questions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session.

ASSEMBLYMAN HIBBETTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 1 OF THE 81ST SESSION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any discussions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Dickman. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 200.

Assembly Bill 200: Revises provisions governing legislative measures that may be requested for a regular legislative session. (BDR 17-103)

Assemblyman Richard McArthur, Assembly District No. 4:

Assembly Bill 200 is pretty straightforward and basically just reduces the number of bill drafts that can be requested. Under existing law, legislators, legislative committees, and other entities such as certain elected officials and local governments may request legislation to be drafted for potential consideration by the Legislature during the regular session. These entities have different limits on the number of bill draft requests that they can submit. Assembly Bill 200 proposes to cut most bill draft requests (BDRs) in half with some exceptions.

These entities that only have one or two BDRs available to them are, for the most part, left alone. Those that have an unlimited number of requests available, like the Chief Clerk of the Assembly, the Secretary of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and the Governor's Office of Finance, were given specific numbers instead of leaving them as unlimited. I know there are some who want to have as many BDRs as they can get hold of. However, having fewer bills to consider will lead to more thoughtful legislation so that more bills may not be necessary. You can only do so many bills in our 120-day session, and 120 days is stipulated in the *Nevada Constitution*. We cannot change that fact.

Right now, our Nevada State Legislature processes a lot of bills in the 120-day time frame. This makes the legislative process more difficult for both the legislators and the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). The LCB processes, on average, 1,250 BDRs per session, but only about half of those bills get passed. A lot of unnecessary bills are being processed. With a little bit of careful consideration and with fewer bills, some of those bills that normally do not make it can be eliminated. With fewer bills to consider, legislators will have more time to read, deliberate, and make changes on each bill. This should result in more thoughtful legislation and negate the need for more bills. Even with A.B. 200 resulting in a reduction in BDRs, there will still be plenty of bills to satisfy our legislative responsibilities.

I am not going to go over this bill section by section. The bill spells out the new numbers I have proposed for BDRs. These numbers can be more easily reviewed in the handout titled "Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) Allowed By Entity" [[Exhibit E](#)], which everyone received a copy of. I do want to leave you with just a couple of quick thoughts. First, fewer bills will help to streamline the legislative process and reduce the drafting backlog. Second, the Legislature will probably pass about the same number of bills that it normally does every session, but with fewer bills to consider. This will make it easier and less of a burden on both the legislators and the LCB staff. This bill should prove to be beneficial for everyone

concerned. If A.B. 200 does pass, it will make the legislative process better and more productive.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee members, do you have questions? Is there anything that prohibits a legislator from using all these BDRs?

Assemblyman McArthur:

No, there is not. A legislator does not have to use all of the BDRs that are assigned to him.

Chair Gorelow:

I am confused about why we need to limit them if we have the opportunity not to use all of them.

Assemblyman McArthur:

A lot of people use all the bills that they can, and when that happens, it really jams up the system.

Assemblywoman Newby:

Some of the bills we have heard are very simple, single-subject sorts of things, and some of them are really complex and include a lot of things. As I was thinking about this bill, I was thinking about whether this would encourage people to cram all the same subjects into a larger bill and not necessarily reduce the complexity of what is being decided. Instead of single-subject bills, like all my education policies, I could just decide to put them all into one bill. Have you thought of that, and if so, what is your response?

Assemblyman McArthur:

I think most people would like to put out a bill that is going to get passed. I do not think a lot of people will try to do something like that because it is not going to help their bill if they cram that much stuff into it. Most people want specific things, so that is what they put into a bill. If it is done properly, they will probably get it passed. If you try to do too many other things, it may not pass. It has to be a single subject. I really doubt that anyone is going to build up a bill just so they could get a bunch more things passed.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

My question is on the intent of this. The intent of this is to reduce the workload on not only us as legislators, but also the LCB staff. Is that correct?

Assemblyman McArthur:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Would one of the intended or unintended consequences of that allow us to have our Legal Division staff in Committee where they are supposed to be instead of actually drafting bills?

Assemblyman McArthur:

It absolutely would. That is what our problem is right now. Things are being jammed up right now, and that is why we have the problem we do. A lot fewer bills would help that problem.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

A legislator is supposed to run for office to be the voice of their community. That is my understanding. Often, legislation that we see presented for bills has come from members of the community, whether it is a business owner, mom, teacher, or what have you. Limiting the number of bills also limits the voice of the community that that legislator is supposed to represent and be their voice in the Legislature. How would you address that? It is not just limiting the bills, but also limiting the voices of those whom we are supposed to represent.

Assemblyman McArthur:

You put in the bills that you think are necessary or that you want to put in. When your constituents want you to put a bill in, you can still put that bill in. Assembly Bill 200 just means that you cannot put in another 20 or 30 bills. One of the results of this is you put in fewer bills, but they are really good bills that you thought about and talked to people about. These are the bills that you really think are going to help the state of Nevada. I do not think it is going to stop anyone from getting a bill.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

With A.B. 200 as drafted, how many bills would legislators have moving forward if this were to pass?

Assemblyman McArthur:

Under Assembly Bill 200, the Assembly retains 6 bills, and the Senate has 12 bills. That is one of the reasons for this. Instead of the LCB staff getting 1,250 bills, and only half of them are passing because no one is voting on them, fewer bills will mean that people could spend more time going over them. You would get the good bills in, and we would not have to keep putting in bills that no one is going to vote for but that the LCB would have to write up every time.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Legislators run every two years and can start putting in bills right after we get out of session. If we are not reelected, the bill may never be processed, but still contributes to the high number. Just because you limit the number of bills does not mean it is going to necessarily improve the quality of the bill. I do not think the two correlate. Currently, if you are a sitting legislator, you have ten bills you can put in for. If you are a new legislator, you can put in five or six. That does not mean that the lesser number of bills submitted are going to be of better quality, just of a lower number. This limits the voice of the community that we are supposed to represent. If you are worried about 120 days, then maybe what we should be looking at is having a Legislature that meets on an annual basis to do the work of the people, not cramming our work into 120 days.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Right now, we only have a 120-day session. Until we do change the number of days we meet, this is a bill that I think will help us out. I do not think anyone wants to put in bills that are not going to make it or are not any good. Why would you want to put in ten bills when you only know three or four are really good and responsive to what the people want? Why put in any more than that?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I put in ten good bills that reflect what my constituents want to see.

Chair Gorelow:

I was not planning on taking all of my bills because I knew I would be chairing and that was going to be extra work. Not only did I take all of mine, but I also grabbed a couple of Committee bills and a special bill. I think all of my bills are good, and I hope that they all pass. I know that they all will not because that is just the nature of what we do, but I am still hoping that they all pass. I cannot imagine trying to cut them in half or looking at someone's bills and asking which ones they think are not any good or whose voice they want to silence.

You have changed some of these without limitation. In section 2, subsection 5 of the bill, the Legislative Counsel, General Counsel, Secretary of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Assembly cannot do more than ten legislative measures. How many bills do they typically do?

Assemblyman McArthur:

I do not have that number. I checked to get an average that they put in and that is the number I used, but I do not have those details with me.

Chair Gorelow:

I would be concerned that if that is an average because that means one year they went over ten and there was a reason that they needed to go over ten. I would be concerned that we might be tying the hands on how this process actually works and not being able to get some of the legislation we vote on at the beginning. We vote on having our rules in place, whether people are getting paid, and so forth. That would be another concern of mine by limiting some of these bills.

Assemblywoman González:

Do you know the number of bills that legislators did not use?

Assemblyman McArthur:

I have no idea about the average. I know a lot of people have a lot of the bills that they did not use. I do not know what that number is for sure, but the fact that we only passed half of all the bills that we turned in means to me that we could do better legislation. There is no reason to jam up LCB. We are backlogged right now. I really do think we could put better bills in. For some of those who say, I really need to put in ten, there are others who may only

put in a couple. They could take those five or six that you did not use. I think we could get the legislation done with the fewer number.

Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller:

You mentioned better bills several times. I understand that there are a multitude of reasons why a bill dies or does not get passed. What would be considered a better bill? For example, if a bill gets pulled to Ways and Means, the policy may be good, but money is not available to carry out the policy at this particular time. Does lack of available funding not make it a good bill? What is a better bill and how do we determine what would be a better bill to bring forward, knowing that many of them are not going to get passed? It is not because they are necessarily bad bills but because there are a multitude of other things at play.

Assemblyman McArthur:

What the term "bad bills" means to me is bills that are being processed and we are spending a lot of time on that are just not going to pass. You do not have to use my term for such bills. Half the bills that are turned in are not going to make it. If we had more time to look at these bills, figure out what bills were really good, what bills people really want, then those are the bills we ought to put in. That way, it does not jam up the LCB.

Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller:

The way our process works, like having the bills drafted and going through Committee, all of that is to determine what bills are necessary to move forward. We have to sort through a lot of ideas for bills, then put them in a form that we understand. Until all the pieces are pulled together, we may not know until the bill is drafted that it is not going to work. We then may realize that it has to go into another statute altogether to accomplish what we were trying to do. I understand the frustration that we probably all have as we are getting our bills out, but I do not know that limiting the number of bills will improve the process of vetting bills. If we reduced the number to half of the bills going in that we have now, we still would probably have half of those bills getting passed. We will still have to go through this process to determine whether they are bills that are going to make it all the way.

Assemblyman McArthur:

If we have fewer bills, we will have more time to talk to people to find out what they want in these bills. I did not necessarily mean it is a better bill, but it probably will be because you have plenty of time to go over it. Right now, you do not. In addition, you will have time to make necessary changes and to put in amendments. You need the extra time, but you do not need the extra bills.

Assemblyman DeLong:

As a freshman, I only submitted two-thirds of my bills. Again, as a freshman, I have a relatively limited perspective on this, but what I am seeing is that LCB is not able to handle the workload. That may be only for a portion of the session, but we are currently going through part of the process right now where the system is not functioning the way it is designed. It has nothing to do with whether it is a good bill or a bad bill. That is where we are with our process, so something in our process is not working. Ideally, this is a solution to

try to deal with that. Is it the right one? I do not know, but it is the only one I have heard. I would love to hear if there are other ones.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Right now, that is the problem. We are backed up and, hopefully, this will help solve that problem. We cannot extend past 120 days right now, so this is what we have to live with. Now, until something else changes, this is a solution.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I do have a suggestion for a solution. One would be to change the deadline date so that legislators have to submit their bill draft ideas to LCB in a timelier fashion. Additionally, when you look at every department in the state of Nevada, LCB is no different with having vacancy rates. As we look at what our pay rate is for state employees, maybe if we raise the pay and benefits package, we will get more people wanting to apply for the jobs and fill those vacancies. If we can do those two things, I think that would be a better solution than limiting the people's voice for bills.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Even if you think it is a better solution, we do not have it right now and this is the only solution we have. I think it is better to try to solve the problem right now than saying maybe we can find a better solution later. This could be our solution right now.

Chair Gorelow:

Has it always been a problem, or are we just trying to solve something that might be happening this session due to the vacancies? Do you see that as always being a problem in the future?

Assemblyman McArthur:

There probably will be more problems. It used to be that you could not bring bills up until the session started. Now we are bringing bills up earlier. This was the solution to solve the problem then. Now it is getting worse, so we have to find another solution. What really jammed LCB up before was you did not present bills until you got up here to the Legislature. They solved that by putting bills in before session started. We fixed an old problem, but now it looks like things are getting tight again. We need another solution.

Chair Gorelow:

I still have lots of questions about Assembly Bill 200 but will take them offline. I will move to support for Assembly Bill 200 from Carson City.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

I love this bill. I have been a citizen lobbyist here every session since I was 19 and have been here full-time since 1991. There are always problems with too many bills. I confirm that to you, we fully support the bill. It would be a great blessing to all members of the Legislature, the staff, and the public if it were to pass. In life, we have limited resources, so we are forced to prioritize. That way, the very best and most important things get our

attention, our time, and our resources. Limiting the number of legislative measures would bring focus to the most important issues. There would be cooperation on bills that might be duplicative. There would be more time for consideration of those bills which are critical to our state. The LCB would breathe a sigh of relief as would the public. There is no reason to have 1,096 bills this session. There is a proposed constitutional amendment to have annual sessions. There is no need for annual sessions and the public does not want it. Assembly Bill 200 resolves the time problem facing our Legislature. This session, there has been very little notice on many hearings for bills. This makes it very difficult for the public to be able to engage in the process. Assembly Bill 200, by reducing the number of bills and providing advanced deadlines for them to be in to the LCB, would help provide for more advanced notice for hearings. It has been very difficult this session to try to be engaged as a citizen lobbyist when the notice of so many bills being posted is so short. People are asking me why we are not getting more timely notice. Assembly Bill 200 is a very reasonable approach to limiting bills. It would make the Legislature more efficient, more productive, and less exhausting. We support A.B. 200.

Dana Englekirk, Vice President, Skyland General Improvement District:

I strongly support this bill also, and I would like to ditto Ms. Janine Hansen's comments. I will yield the rest of my time.

Chair Gorelow:

Seeing no more supporters of A.B. 200 in Carson City or Las Vegas, we will go to the phone lines for callers in support of A.B. 200.

Lynn Chapman, State Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

As an unpaid citizen lobbyist, I have been going to every session of our state Legislature since 1987. I thank Assemblyman McArthur for bringing this bill to limit the number of legislative bills back this session. I have given testimony every time on this issue when it comes before the Legislature. There are just too many bills every session. No one has time to read all the bills, do the research that is needed to make a good decision, and give testimony for or against these bills. One year we had six or seven bills that had almost the same information in every one of them. We had six or seven hearings with almost the same testimony in each hearing, which was a waste of time. Those bills could have been consolidated into one or two bills with one or two hearings instead of the six or seven that we had. How many bills are very similar and can be brought together to form one bill to be heard? It seems that every governmental entity has many bills available and tries to use them all. We need to cut back. Do we really need over 1,000 bills every session? I remember a few times we had up over 1,800 bills and that was ridiculous. That was before we had the 120-day limit to our Legislature, which people voted for. I believe that A.B. 200 is a great starting point to help the Legislature to use their time and our time wisely. Please vote yes on A.B. 200. Start using our time more efficiently.

Alida Benson, Executive Director, Nevada Republican Party:

I am testifying in support of A.B. 200 on behalf of the Nevada Republican Party. We have heard in recent hearings that it is necessary for the Legislature to transition to annual sessions

in order to have time to properly consider bills. That is not true. More legislative time will simply increase the number of bills heard but will not allow time to properly consider any of them. What is needed is a way to ensure that only bills important to Nevadans are heard and that they are properly considered. In Nevada we have over 3 million residents and 1.8 million registered voters. In our most recent election, a little over 1 million people cast their votes. Of those 1 million, perhaps 5,000 will call in to the Legislature who are not paid lobbyists. Part of the hurdles citizens participating in the legislative process have is the challenge of reading so many bills as well as reading bills of such great lengths. Take Assembly Bill 231, which weighs in at 120 single-spaced pages. Does the average busy voter have time to read this, much less schedule time with their legislator to support or oppose it? Judging by the current participation levels, the answer is no. Improving the process to focus on bills that address the truly necessary functions of government creates a streamlined and transparent Legislature that invites citizen participation. The Republican Party advocates for the purpose of this body to engage in necessary governance of our state, not pass as many bills as possible. Assembly Bill 200 is a step in the right direction for advocates of a transparent government that works for the people of Nevada. On behalf of voters in the great state of Nevada, we strongly support Assembly Bill 200 and urge the Committee to support the commonsense bill to support government rightsizing and transparency.

Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:

I fully and strongly support Assembly Bill 200, which would reduce and limit the number of bills presented during a legislative session. There are currently too many bills. This makes it difficult for members of the public to participate in the legislative process. I suspect that it makes it very challenging for members of the Legislature to keep up with their important details and facts. Reducing the number of bills presented during a legislative session would help correct these issues. Going to annual sessions is not the answer, as some have suggested. It would put a considerable amount of strain on everyone, especially members of the Legislature. I believe it would be costly to the State and reduce public participation in the legislative process, not increase it due to an increase in the number of bills and in the amount of time required for them to participate. Less bills will create more focused understanding on the bills that move forward. I urge you to please support Assembly Bill 200.

Randy Case, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am calling in support of the bill. I have a lot to say, but I will try and keep it brief. If you do not see a correlation between quantity and quality, I invite you to walk into any tract home and compare it to something that was handcrafted. There is always a correlation between quality and quantity. Limiting our bills will enable the public to participate, and it will also enable our legislators to better represent all of us. I have watched and viewed hundreds of committees and hearings and you can always tell which legislators have and have not read the bill. There are many reasons that bills do not get passed. If I hear that the bill is going to the top of the Chief Clerk's filing desk one more time, I might scream. This may not be the end-all solution, but it is definitely a wonderful first step in getting a good bill.

[\[Exhibit F\]](#) was submitted but not discussed.]

Chair Gorelow:

Let me please remind people that we are courteous to everyone. Is there anyone else on the telephone? Seeing no other callers, we will now move to opposition to Assembly Bill 200. Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to come to the table in opposition to A.B. 200? [There was no one.] There does not look to be anybody in Las Vegas, so we will move to callers in opposition to A.B. 200. [There were no callers.]

We will then move on to neutral. Is there anybody in Carson City who would like to come to the table to testify in neutral on A.B. 200? Seeing no one, we also see no one in Las Vegas. Are there callers who will testify in neutral on A.B. 200? [There were no callers.]

Assemblyman McArthur, would you like to come to the table for final comments?

Assemblyman McArthur:

No matter how many people look at this bill or how it is perceived, we still need to remember that we only have 120 days to get our work done. We need to limit our workload to fit into that time frame. Right now, that time frame is pretty crowded, so I think this is our best solution.

Chair Gorelow:

We appreciate the conversation. I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 200. We will now move on to the last agenda item, public comment. [There was no public comment.]

Committee members, are there any further comments before we adjourn? [There were none.] With that, we are adjourned [at 4:58 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kristi Howard
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 192](#), submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 81st Session](#), submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is a document titled "Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) Allowed By Entity," submitted and presented by Assemblyman Richard McArthur, Assembly District No. 4.

[Exhibit F](#) is a packet of letters in support of [Assembly Bill 200](#).