

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

**Eighty-Second Session
May 4, 2023**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Michelle Gorelow at 4:06 p.m. on Thursday, May 4, 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
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama, Assembly District No. 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst
Bryan Fernley, Committee Counsel
Shuruk Ismail, Committee Manager

Minutes ID: 1070



Kristi Howard, Committee Secretary
Bet Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nick Schneider, Policy Analyst, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Dale A. R. Erquiaga, Acting Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Chair Gorelow:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will begin today with Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session, which proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to remove the constitutional provision 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.

With that, we welcome Senator Dondero Loop and Assemblywoman Kasama.

Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session: Proposes 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. (BDR C-944)

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8:

I will be joined today by Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama, who represents Assembly District No. 2. We are jointly presenting Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session, the Nevada Higher Education Reform, Accountability and Oversight Amendment. I am sure many of you are aware of the general contents of this bill. Nonetheless, I will start with some introductory comments. Assemblywoman Kasama will provide additional comments after me.

As you know, the *Nevada Constitution* requires the Legislature to provide for the establishment of a State University that is controlled by an elected Board of Regents whose duties are prescribed by law. Additionally, the *Nevada Constitution* provides for the Board of Regents to control and manage the affairs and funds of the State University under regulations established by law. Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session proposes to remove the constitutional provisions that govern the election and duties of the Board of Regents and its control and management of the affairs and funds of the State University. Instead, S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session would require the Legislature to provide by law for the governance of a State University. I want to stress that S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session does not

repeal any existing statutory provisions governing the Board of Regents, including those that provide for the election of the Board of Regents. That is an important piece because a lot of people have confused that we are asking for the Board of Regents not to be elected, and they are.

However, it would make the Board a statutory body whose structure, membership powers, and duties are governed by those existing statutory provisions subject to any statutory changes made through the legislative process. This is no different than any other board set forth in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). In the lead-up to previous sessions, the Nevada System of Higher Education has sometimes tried to alter control or misrepresent information provided to lawmakers, including the Nevada Legislature. Obviously, for us, this would be unacceptable. Assemblywoman Kasama and I are encouraged by steps taken in recent years to correct many of these issues. Even so, as policymakers, we must be focused on building long-standing and stable systems of governance, not on individual personalities. We owe the citizens of Nevada a culture of accountability in all levels of government. This higher education system belongs to all Nevadans. It is our collective investment in the future of our state. As you recall, Assembly Joint Resolution 5 of the 79th Session, which proposed some of the same amendments as S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session, passed overwhelmingly in two legislative sessions, and recently the Senate passed S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session with 20 yes votes and 1 no vote. We are grateful for the support of all of our colleagues.

Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session removes the Board of Regents from the *Nevada Constitution* but does not substantially change any higher education policy or procedure. It simply puts the Board of Regents and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) on par with every other governing board and state agency created pursuant to statute. Chapter 396 of NRS would continue to exist and would still comprehensively govern the Board of Regents, and it still includes the requirement that the board be elected. The purpose of S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session is twofold. One, it allows the Legislature to exercise informed and measured governance of NSHE; and two, it allows more flexibility in considering reform proposals.

Constitutional governance serves as an antiquated way to oversee higher education. The reason the Board of Regents was placed in the *Nevada Constitution* in the first place was to access land grant funding under the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, without requiring action by the Legislature. Ever since, we have included all the state's higher education governance and administration under this provision despite a laundry list of studies and analysis recommending the reorganization of the state's higher education structure. It is our belief with the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session, we will see a resurgence of strong support for NSHE and the Board of Regents. Assemblywoman Kasama and I pledge our support to work with NSHE administration and the Board on behalf of the students, their families, and our communities to have the best system in the nation.

Chair Gorelow and Committee members, this concludes my testimony, and I would like to turn the microphone over to Assemblywoman Kasama, who will provide some further information.

Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama, Assembly District No. 2:

I am pleased to join Senator Dondero Loop in my support of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session. I would like to point out, and as set forth in the ballot question arguments for A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session, that although some other states have elected boards with constitutional status that control and manage particular institutions and programs of higher education, Nevada is the only state in which a single elected board with constitutional status controls and manages the affairs and funds of the state's entire system of public higher education. In past cases before the Nevada Supreme Court, the Board of Regents have even asserted that its unique constitutional status gives it virtual autonomy and thus immunity from certain laws and policies enacted by the Legislature. Based on legislative testimony, these assertions have given some people the impression that the Board conducts itself as a "fourth branch" of government and that the Board too often invokes its constitutional status as a shield against additional legislative oversight and accountability.

Again, as Senator Dondero Loop noted, things have improved in recent years. Nonetheless, this general governance structure needs to change. A good example of this is how the university's budget is administered. While the *Nevada Constitution* requires the Legislature to provide financial support for the operation of the State University, it also directs the Board to control and manage the funds of the State University. There is a clear divide between the Legislature's constitutional power to fund higher education and the Board's constitutional power to direct how those funds are actually spent. It gives the Board virtually unparalleled power within state government to control and manage higher education spending, without the same level of legislative oversight typically applied to other Executive Branch agencies.

Another component of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session relates to the administration of federal land grant proceeds that are dedicated for the benefit of the State University. As a bit of background, the *Nevada Constitution* provides that funding derived by the State of Nevada under the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 must be invested in a separate fund and dedicated for the benefit of certain departments of the State University. If any amount of the separate fund is lost or misappropriated to neglect or any other reason, the State of Nevada must replace the lost or misappropriated amount so that the principal of the fund remains undiminished. Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session clarifies and modernizes existing provisions of the *Nevada Constitution* relating to the administration of these federal land grant proceeds. However, because the State of Nevada must administer those proceeds in the manner required by federal law, S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session will not change the purpose or use of those proceeds.

In closing, Senator Dondero Loop and I know that S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session represents a second bite at the apple, if you will. This time, however, the language in S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session is softened from A.J.R. 5 of the 79th Session and now calls for governance rather than control and management of the State University. Moreover, a biennial legislative audit of the State University, and any other public institutions of higher

education established by the Legislature, is also included in S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session. This new, gentler language and the audit provision will bring an enhanced level of transparency and trust that our system of higher education so desperately needs.

We urge your support of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session. This is just the beginning of a long process to bring this forward to the voters, and we hope you agree that all Nevadans should have an opportunity to consider S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session in 2024. That concludes our presentation. We stand ready to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee members, are there questions?

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller:

This subject always fascinates me, not just obviously as an elected, but also as a teacher. I have spent years teaching fifth and sixth graders about government and loving to create and spread that love and appreciation for our government. What kids are usually intrigued by is our three-branch system and being able to quiz with them and go back and forth of which branch has the most power. Kids want to believe that one person or one branch has ultimate power. When they see the cyclicalness that goes between the three branches so that no one has ultimate control, they really get fascinated and intrigued by that separation of powers.

Our three branches are something that is fundamental to our entire U.S. government and our state, so in your testimony, when you mentioned something as being referred to as a "fourth branch," it literally is counter and different. I am being very diplomatic in my words right now, but it is definitely against this three-branch system and the separation of powers that we have. You alluded to some other states that have situations where there are things that are within their constitutions. For this specifically, is there any other state in the United States that has their regents set up like this where it is separate outside of any type of governance?

Senator Dondero Loop:

I actually do not know the answer to that. There might be somebody here from NSHE that would know that answer. I can tell you that, like I said in our testimony, it was originally done because of the land grant in 1862. To my knowledge, most people do not have their university branches within their constitution.

I would add one little piece that is just kind of for our teacher up there. You can tell your students that when it was voted on in 2020, it was Ballot Question No. 1, and it literally lost by a difference of less than 4,000 votes. With over 1.2 million total votes cast, it only lost by 4,000 votes.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

Since it was brought up in testimony, can we get Legal Counsel on the record as to whether or not the university system is a "fourth branch" of government? I already know the answer, but I would like to have it on the record if I may.

Bryan Fernley, Committee Counsel:

In response to the question, Article 3, Section 1, of the *Nevada Constitution* specifically says, "The powers of the Government of the State of Nevada shall be divided into three separate departments, the Legislative, the Executive and the Judicial." There are three branches of government in Nevada, and those are the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.

In response to the question on other states, I do not know the number of other states that have constitutional provisions or have board of regents in their constitutions, but I could look into that.

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller:

With that being said by Legal, then my question is this: We know as legislators where our authority stops or where there is authority over us. Again, we have an Executive Branch. We also have a Supreme Court that can deem any law that we make unconstitutional. We know there are stopgaps for the Executive Branch and for the lawmaking body. I guess my question then is, who actually has authority over, or where is the separation of powers, or where that ends?

Bryan Fernley:

It is our view that the Nevada System of Higher Education is part of the Executive Branch because they execute laws that are enacted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor. They implement laws; they are part of the Executive Branch. That being said, they are part of the Executive Branch, but they do have a slice of constitutional authority that is independent. The extent of that authority has been discussed in case law, but they are part of the Executive Branch of state government.

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller:

Is this legislative body enabled to enact laws that NSHE and the Regents must follow?

Bryan Fernley:

Yes. I think the example that comes to mind is there was a Nevada Supreme Court case that dealt with employment issues within the Nevada System of Higher Education. Because that case involved generally applicable laws that apply to all state employees, those also applied to NSHE employees. The Legislature does have the authority to impose requirements on NSHE; there are just certain defined areas that the Legislature would not have that authority because of that constitutional status of the Board of Regents.

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller:

Because of the constitutional status, there are areas where the Legislature does not have authority.

Bryan Fernley:

Correct.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee, are there any other questions? Seeing none, we will open up testimony in support of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session.

Nick Schneider, Policy Analyst, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Vegas Chamber is in support of Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session. As many of you know, the Chamber has a long history of engaging in higher education matters. We are advocates for reform because workforce development alignment continues to be a top issue for our members, many of whom are the job creators of our state. The Chamber believes that the passage of S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session is an essential component to reforming the state's higher education governance structure, and a better governance structure is important to aligning the needs of today's students and employers. We all recognize that the demands on our workforce are quickly changing, and we need a governance model that will adapt to meet those challenges and opportunities. We need to ensure that our higher education structure is responding to those changes in the workforce. To do nothing would be a great disservice to the approximately 100,000 students that are currently enrolled in NSHE institutions across the state. We believe that S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session would provide much needed clarity between the role between the Board of Regents and the State Legislature.

We do want to recognize that there have been some recent efforts by NSHE to align education, as well as improve operations and community engagement, and we do appreciate that. However, for the long-term benefit of both students and employers, we need to reform our higher education governance structure. We urge your support of the passage of S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session a second time so it can go to the voters in 2024.

Chair Gorelow:

Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to come to the table in support of S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session? Seeing no one, we will go to Las Vegas. [There was no one.]

We will move to callers who would like to testify in support. I have to note that the phone lines are still not working. If you are listening, please submit your testimony to the committee secretary and we will get you on the record. We apologize for the inconvenience.

We will close testimony in support and move to testimony in opposition in Carson City.

Dale A. R. Erquiaga, Acting Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education:

I am here today on behalf of the Board of Regents. Historically, the Board of Regents has opposed this resolution and the one that preceded it in the other house when this bill was heard in committee. Neither my chair nor vice chair was available to testify in opposition. They were not available today, and I send their apologies. Unfortunately, we are stuck with me.

In February of this year, the Board gave direction to me as Chancellor to take positions on certain bills. This is a measure that the Board of Regents discussed, and by consensus, directed me that if I were to testify that I would testify in opposition of this bill. I believe

that what the vice chair said in the previous house, and what I heard from my Board members then, is the Board's opposition is less about the constitutional authority. I have been in this building a long time and have seen the tug of war over constitutional authority between the Legislature and previous Boards of Regents. The comment that I have heard the most from my Board in this iteration is about the language that is repealed from the *Nevada Constitution* on page 5, lines 43 and 44.

I appreciate Senator Dondero Loop's comments about this resolution: what the voters would do would not change the election status of the Board. However, with that provision removed from the *Nevada Constitution*, future legislatures could change the elected status and could make this an appointed board, or a "hybrid board," as we call a board that has both elected. That is the concern: yes, you are the elected representatives of the state today for the Board of Regents; that might change if this constitutional amendment were to pass.

Chair Gorelow:

Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to come to the table in opposition? Seeing no one, we will go to Las Vegas. I do not see anyone there. Again, the telephones are not working, so if you would like to submit testimony in opposition, please submit that to the committee secretary. We will close testimony in opposition and open up testimony in neutral. Is there anybody here in Carson City who would like to testify in neutral on S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session?

Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

The Nevada Faculty Alliance is neutral on S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session. We have members on both sides, although recent history has swayed more of our members towards support. I would like to provide some background. The Nevada Faculty Alliance is affiliated with the American Association of University Professors, which advocates for academic freedom in higher education. We are generally concerned about the potential for political and partisan interference in curriculum and academic standards.

In the past two years, academic freedom has been under unprecedented attack by state legislators and governors around the country; fortunately, not in Nevada. Ballot Question No. 1 in 2020 had a clause regarding academic freedom, but as written, it would actually have endangered academic freedom in our view. Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session is silent on academic freedom. Last session, we offered an amendment to protect academic freedom, but it gained no traction. Having a constitutionally established governing board, as in 24 of the states, provides some protection for academic freedom, but today we see both elected and appointed boards becoming highly politicized, and they do not necessarily protect the principles that we value.

We all have a strong interest in having a fully functioning Board of Regents serving students in Nevada. The Nevada System of Higher Education has more often asserted its constitutional authority over personnel issues and its own power structure than in defense of academic freedom or educational policy. Our hope is that we can protect the principles

of academic freedom in the future through collective bargaining. That would help if Assembly Bill 224 is enacted. We remain willing to work with legislators to add true protection of academic freedom to the *Nevada Constitution* or in state law.

Regarding the numbers of constitutional versus nonconstitutional boards of trustees, it is 20 for constitutional. About five of those are elected either by the people or the Legislature.

Chair Gorelow:

Would anyone else like to come to the table in neutral? Seeing no one else in Carson City, we will go to Las Vegas. [There was no one.] The telephones are still not working, so again, if you have testimony in neutral for S.J.R. 7 of the 81st Session, please submit that in writing to our committee secretary. We will close testimony in neutral, and we will invite our sponsors to come up to the table for any final comments. [There were none.] We will close the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 81st Session.

We will now go on to our work session. I will turn it over to Ms. Proehl to walk us through the work session. We will begin with Assembly Concurrent Resolution 4.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 4: Directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs to conduct a study of the use of polygraphic examinations on certain employees. (BDR R-1008)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit C.] Assembly Concurrent Resolution 4 is the first measure on the work session today. It was heard in Committee on April 20, 2023. The measure directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs to conduct a study during the 2023-2024 Interim of the use of polygraphic examinations on prospective government employees and to report the findings and any recommendations to the 83rd Session of the Legislature. There are no amendments.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee, do we have any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to adopt.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT
ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Committee, are there any comments or questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong. We will now hear Assembly Concurrent Resolution 6.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 6: Directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study relating to battery which constitutes domestic violence. (BDR R-840)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit D.](#)] [Assembly Concurrent Resolution 6](#) was heard in Committee on April 20, 2023. The measure directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study during the 2023-2024 Interim relating to battery which constitutes domestic violence and is committed by strangulation. The Committee must also report the findings and any recommendations to the 83rd Session of the Legislature. There are no amendments.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee, do we have any questions or comments? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adopt.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT [ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEWBY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Committee, are there any comments or questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gorelow:

I will also give that floor statement to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong. We will move to [Senate Joint Resolution 3](#).

Senate Joint Resolution 3: Urges the United States Bureau of Reclamation to consider certain actions, alternatives and measures for the protection and management of the Colorado River. (BDR R-349)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit E.](#)] [Senate Joint Resolution 3](#) was heard in Committee on April 27, 2023. The measure urges the United States Bureau of Reclamation to consider certain actions, alternatives, and measures for the protection and management of the Colorado River including:

- The pursuit of a collaboration-based framework to address the structural deficit in the Colorado River;
- The inclusion of mechanisms to account for evaporation and system losses;

- The amendment of existing federal regulations to prohibit the inefficient delivery, application, or use of water to limit unnecessary losses in the Colorado River; and
- Consideration of the Consensus-Based Modeling Alternative submitted by Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming in the supplemental environmental impact statement process.

There is one proposed amendment by the Southern Nevada Water Authority that proposes to remove the consideration of the Consensus-Based Modeling Alternative by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Chair Gorelow:

Thank you very much, Ms. Proehl. Committee, do you have any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Committee, are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gorelow:

I will give the floor statement to Assemblywoman González. The final measure on today's work session is Senate Joint Resolution 7 (1st Reprint).

Senate Joint Resolution 7 (1st Reprint): Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to establish certain rights relating to reproductive health. (BDR C-864)

Hayley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit F](#).] Senate Joint Resolution 7 (1st Reprint) was heard in Committee on March 23, 2023, at a joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. The measure proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to: (1) establish a fundamental right to reproductive freedom; (2) authorize the State to regulate abortion care after fetal viability; and (3) prevent the state from penalizing, prosecuting, or taking any other adverse action against an individual based on the outcome of a pregnancy, a provider of health care under certain circumstances related to reproductive freedom, or an individual or entity for aiding or assisting another individual in exercising the individual's right to reproductive freedom. There are no amendments.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee, do we have any questions or comments?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I just wanted to make a quick comment. I do not remember when we heard this. It was a while ago. It was a long hearing, and I want to recognize Senate Majority Leader Cannizzaro for bringing this. Bringing a measure like this is always tough in terms of actually presenting it and running a hearing. I am supportive of the measure because I think in a time when the federal government and the federal courts are going through a lot of changes, what this measure does is gives the question to the Nevada voters. Much like when we talked about other constitutional measures such as the lottery here, I trust our voters to decide whether this is something significant enough that needs to be in our *Nevada Constitution*. Obviously, this would have to pass through the next legislative session as well, so this really is step one of three of potentially getting this into our *Nevada Constitution*. But I do think, even with the protections we have in state statute, that is not the same as the *Nevada Constitution*, and I think we owe it to our voters to give them a chance to weigh in on this really important issue. I will be supportive for that reason.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I want to echo Assemblyman Yeager's comment about trusting the voters. However, I believe what we are asking them is too broad, too far reaching, all at once. If we want to trust the voters, I think a more narrow, more focused question would be more appropriate.

Chair Gorelow:

Are there any other comments or questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER MADE A MOTION TO DO
PASS SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Committee, are there any comments or questions about the motion? [There were none.]

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

Chair Gorelow:

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui. With that, we will close our work session and open up for public comment. [Public comment was heard.] Committee, are there any other comments before we adjourn? [There were none.] We will see you next Tuesday, May 9, 2023. The meeting is adjourned [at 4:41 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 Concurrent Resolution 4, submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Concurrent Resolution 6, submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Joint Resolution 3, submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Joint Resolution 7 (1st Reprint), submitted and presented by Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.