

Submitter: D Torres

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Rules

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2006

I am writing to the proposed bill that would limit the number of legislative measures each member of the Legislative Assembly may request the Legislative Counsel to prepare—capping it at 25 for individual legislators and 15 for committees during regular sessions beginning in odd-numbered years.

Perhaps the intent behind this proposal may be to streamline legislative operations or manage workloads, I am concerned that the bill would have unintended and detrimental consequences for democratic representation, responsiveness to constituents, and the diversity of issues brought before the legislature.

o Constrains Democratic Representation

Elected officials are sent to the legislature to be the voice of their constituents. Artificially limiting the number of measures they can introduce restricts their ability to advocate on a full range of issues that matter to the people they represent. For legislators representing diverse or underserved communities, the cap could disproportionately hinder their ability to bring forward critical but less mainstream legislative ideas.

o Reduces Responsiveness to Emerging Issues

The political, economic, and social landscape can shift rapidly. New crises, legal developments, or public demands often emerge between sessions. This cap could force legislators to choose between honoring constituent-driven needs and addressing emergent statewide challenges—an unfair and unnecessary trade-off.

o Limits Legislative Innovation and Collaboration

A healthy legislature fosters a diversity of ideas. This proposal discourages experimentation, iterative policymaking, and collaborative problem-solving by forcing legislators and committees to triage potential solutions based on an arbitrary number. The quality of lawmaking could suffer as a result, favoring only the most politically expedient or headline-grabbing measures.

o Creates Inequities in Legislative Influence

In practice, those with greater institutional power or staff support may be better equipped to navigate these restrictions, further marginalizing freshman legislators or members without established influence. It also risks centralizing legislative influence among leadership or majority factions, stifling robust debate and minority perspectives.

#### o Exceptions Are Not a Sufficient Safeguard

Though the bill provides for exceptions, it does not clearly define the process or criteria for granting them. This lack of transparency could open the door to inconsistent application, political gatekeeping, or bureaucratic delay—further eroding public trust in the fairness of the legislative process.

Legislative efficiency should never come at the expense of democratic access, transparency, and representation. Rather than imposing arbitrary caps, I urge the legislature to invest in better procedural supports, increased staff resources, or improved calendaring tools to manage workload without compromising lawmakers' ability to serve the public interest.

Please DO NOT pass this bill.