

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

**Eighty-Second Session
March 2, 2023**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Michelle Gorelow at 4:01 p.m. on Thursday, March 2, 2023, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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 Bryan Hibbetts
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

Minutes ID: 371



OTHERS PRESENT:

Stephen Wood, Government Affairs Liaison, Consolidated Municipality of Carson City; and representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno
Michael Hillerby, representing City of Sparks

Chair Gorelow:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] I would like to call this meeting to order. I will now open the hearing for Assembly Bill 104.

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

Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District No. 31:

Today I am presenting Assembly Bill 104 for your consideration. This bill aims to offer more flexibility for Nevada's incorporated cities to submit legislation to amend their charters. Currently, if a city wishes to amend its charter, they must either use one of their allotted bill draft requests (BDR) or look for a sponsor to submit the bill on their behalf. This can create several challenges for cities, especially those that are only allowed one BDR per session. Those cities include my own hometown, Sparks, as well as Boulder City, Caliente, Carlin, Carson City, Elko, Mesquite, Wells, and Yerington.

Cities may also struggle to find a sponsor at times due to the required charter review process prescribed by the Legislature within the city charters. Although this process allows cities to thoroughly vet proposed changes to their charter, it also creates certain time constraints. As you know, ideas for individual legislative bills, or BDRs, come from many different constituents, and those spots fill up pretty quickly. If cities have any other legislative priority other than their charter, they may be put in a situation where they must choose and possibly wait another two years for one or the other. This is probably the simplest bill any of us will hear this session.

Assembly Bill 104, section 1, subsection 6, simply allows cities to have an additional BDR solely for the purpose of amending their charters. They would only be able to use this additional BDR if the change has gone through the regular review and approval process. As always, they will have to submit proof to the Legislative Counsel Bureau regarding that approval from the governing body in order to submit the BDR. I believe that if cities were given this option to amend their charters, it would allow them to have a more thorough and serious discussion about legislative priorities that aim to help the people they serve. As we all know, their constituents are our constituents, and I believe it is our duty to make sure our constituents' voices are being heard. Thank you for your time, and I would be happy to try and answer any questions you might have at this point.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman D'Silva:

I have just one quick question. Have you heard any feedback from any of the municipalities and the cities as to what their thoughts are on this measure?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

My city is certainly very supportive of this. I would like to ask Mr. Stephen Wood, who represents Carson City, to come up here.

Stephen Wood, Government Affairs Liaison, Consolidated Municipality of Carson City; and representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

I am planning to testify in support of this bill. We are supportive of this measure.

Chair Gorelow:

Are there questions from any other Committee members? I have one. How many cities would be considered a special charter?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I believe there are nine incorporated cities and Carson City. I would like to add North Las Vegas to the list of cities I mentioned above. I am sorry but I forgot to add that one.

Chair Gorelow:

How often do you think something like this would be utilized?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

It is hard to say. There has been some discussion about an amendment, such as maybe restricting this to every other session possibly, or maybe limiting the number of times that it could be used over a ten-year period. At this point, the stakeholders who want this bill are open to that. I would leave that to the discretion of this Committee. Otherwise, the municipalities could use it every session if we do not do that. I do not see this being used a lot, but it would certainly be a good option for cities that have things come up. In reviewing the BDR submission form from the Legislative Counsel Bureau that the cities have to use, they would have had to submit a bill draft by November 16, 2022, for it to be considered by this session. If they were in the midst of charter change discussions but they had another issue they had to deal with, they would have to make both decisions in a rushed manner.

Chair Gorelow:

Committee members, are there any other questions?

Assemblywoman Newby:

Along those lines, when I was lobbying for a municipality and discovered the number of bills that were restricted, we were very unhappy. In point, A.B. 104, section 1, subsection 7 requires them to be prefiled like the rest of the bills. This charter bill would have to be

submitted around the same time as all of the rest of their bills. Does that leave enough time for the charter committees to do their work, in your estimation?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I believe that it does because they would know their issues during their charter committee hearings. Rather than have to decide between the charter issue and the other issue, they would probably be prepared. If this was in place, they could maybe do two things that they want to do and not have to choose one over the other.

Chair Gorelow:

Can you talk a little about what kind of charter changes one of these municipalities might have a BDR for?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

From a few sessions ago, there is an example that I could cite. The Sparks city attorney is elected, and a group requested that the City of Sparks change the charter to make this position an appointed position. Sparks obviously had to come to the Legislature to ask for this change. From my point of view, it was good that bill was defeated because most of my constituents think they should be able to elect their city attorney. That is the only example I can think of since Sparks has not done a charter change in quite a while. I would like to ask Mr. Wood to give some additional examples.

Stephen Wood:

The charter serves as, essentially, the constitution for a city. Carson City, for instance, has a charter bill, Senate Bill 16, on the Senate side. Senate Bill 16 deals with several different chapters of our charter, including the realignment of ward boundaries after a census. It includes the mayor pro tempore assuming the role of mayor in the event of a vacancy. There are many, many different facets of city government that a charter governs, from ordinance process, to duties of specific offices, to sometimes hours that offices are open. They are very broad documents that govern a lot of the intricacies that go into governing a city. I think that this bill will allow us some flexibility when we have to make changes. As we know, things change. The Carson City Charter was adopted in the 1960s and things have changed since then. We need to come to you to request those changes and have those discussions, and as the Assemblywoman pointed out, sometimes it is hard to choose those priorities. We appreciate this bill.

Chair Gorelow:

We will move on to testimony in support.

Stephen Wood:

I am representing the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities and Carson City. The Nevada League of Cities and the Carson City Board of Supervisors took official action today to support Assembly Bill 104. As the bill sponsor noted, there are nine incorporated cities in Nevada that are only allocated one BDR per regular legislative session. When these cities need to come before the Legislature to amend their charters, this limitation can put them in

somewhat of a tight spot, especially if they have other needs that require the Legislature's attention. Speaking on behalf of Carson City, the Carson City Charter Review Committee and the Board of Supervisors approved what is now Senate Bill 16, which revises various sections of the Carson City Charter. This bill was submitted as the one BDR the city is allowed for this legislative session. Although the city chose to prioritize those charter amendments this session, the limitation that was discussed during the presentation today prevented the city from having a more thorough discussion around other potential changes to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* that would benefit the residents of Carson City. Again, on behalf of both the Nevada League of Cities and Carson City, I would like to thank the Committee for hearing the bill and the sponsor for carrying it. We support A.B. 104.

Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno:

We just wanted to thank the sponsor for this bill and this measure. Every two years our charter committee does have to convene to look at what kind of changes we would like to see to our charter. I think that this bill, in addition to the two BDRs the City of Reno is allocated based on population size, will empower our citizens and our charter committee

Michael Hillerby, representing City of Sparks:

We want to add our voice of support and thank the sponsor for bringing the bill forward. I will provide a little information to the Committee regarding an earlier question. The City of Sparks actually used a bill last session to amend the city charter. It was to bring the city charter into compliance with recent election law changes at the State of Nevada. Because the charter is separate, we needed to do that to make that consistent. Those changes involved how many candidates may appear on the primary or the general election ballot. The other was to clarify that a candidate-elect does not take office at the next meeting but takes office at the meeting next following when the vote was canvassed. These are a high-level overview of the changes we made in the city charter as a result of legislation last time. Again, we would certainly appreciate the opportunity, if there were other items that the city needed to pursue, that we would also help the hardworking citizens on the charter committee by being able to bring their bill draft request forward as well.

Chair Gorelow:

Would anyone else like to provide testimony in support? [There was no one.] In opposition? [There was no one.] In neutral? [There was no one.]

Assemblywoman Dickman, would you like to make any final comments?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I am most grateful to the Committee for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 104. I thank you on behalf of the cities who do their best to serve our constituents. I hope for your

positive consideration, and I have one final comment. I want to humbly apologize to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller. I did not mean to slight the City of North Las Vegas. You guys have to take me to Vegas and give me a tour.

Chair Gorelow:

I think you have several hosts to make sure that happens. Thank you very much, Assemblywoman, and with that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 104.

Next, we have two Committee bill draft request (BDR) introductions. As a reminder to members, to vote in favor of introducing a BDR does not imply a commitment to support the measure later. All this action does is allow the BDR to become a bill and enter the legislative hearing process.

We will start with Bill Draft Request 24-365. This measure was requested by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and revises provisions relating to elections.

BDR 24-365—Revises provisions relating to elections. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 242.)

I will entertain a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request 24-365.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 24-365.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] Was there a nay? If there was a nay, can you please raise your hand so we can record it? [There was none.]

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

We will move to Bill Draft Request 17-366. This measure was requested by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and revises provisions relating to elections.

BDR 17-366—Revises provisions relating to elections. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 243.)

I will entertain a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request 17-366.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 17-366.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Gorelow:

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] Was there a nay? If there was a nay, can you please raise your hand so we can record it? [There was none.]

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

We will now move on to public comment. [There were none.]

Are there any comments from the members? [There was none.] Our next meeting will be Tuesday, March 7, 2023, at 4 p.m. Seeing no further business, the meeting is adjourned [at 4:21 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.