

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Sixth Session
April 15, 2011**

The Committee on Education was called to order by Chair David P. Bobzien at 3:29 p.m. on Friday, April 15, 2011, 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/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Chair
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Aizley
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Assemblywoman April Mastroluca
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Washoe County Assembly
District No. 27

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst
Kristin Roberts, Committee Counsel
Taylor Anderson, Committee Manager
Sharon McCallen, Committee Secretary
Gianna Shirk, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government
Relations, Clark County School District
Craig Stevens, Director, Education Policy and Research, Nevada State
Education Association
Keith L. Lee, representing The Children's Cabinet, Inc.
Lesley Pittman, representing United Way of Southern Nevada

Chair Bobzien:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] Welcome to this Friday edition of the Assembly Committee on Education.

We have a work session on several measures as it is our deadline day. We will only be taking questions and answers in case we have any issues with the bills.

We will open up the work session with Assembly Bill 171.

Assembly Bill 171: Revises provisions governing charter schools. (BDR 34-812)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

This particular measure was heard on March 28, 2011 ([Exhibit C](#)). It revises several provisions relating to charter schools. There were several amendments brought up the day of the hearing, so you will have two proposed amendments available. One is a mock-up prepared for Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson and a second amendment submitted by Mr. Ferrari for your consideration.

[Read summary of first amendment ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Page 17 adds a new section, 9.5, and on page 19 you will see the amended language clarifying that the report provided by the Department of Education would include either the salary or the compensation of the licensed person.

Some of the persons who provide services at a charter school do not receive a salary, so by saying "compensation," that includes more of the people for the report.

Also, on page 19, you will find a new section, 9.7. This new section requires a school district—if it was given permission by a licensed employee seeking employment with a charter school—to transmit to the charter school a copy of the employment record, including the employee's evaluation. This section also clarifies that if a charter school closes, it is only the licensed employees of the charter school who must be reassigned to employment in the school district. This section expands the reasons a school district would not be required to reassign a licensed charter school employee to include, ". . . if the employee: (a) was not granted a leave of absence by the school district to accept employment" That is rather than saying "teach." It would be employment in general rather than specifically teaching.

[Continued to read from first amendment and continued with second amendment ([Exhibit C](#)).]

The second amendment was submitted by Mr. Chris Ferrari on behalf of Imagine Schools Nevada. This relates to the very first page of the amendment we just talked about.

If you look at the mock-up amendment, it says it would authorize two educational personnel members to be either active or retired personnel from Nevada. If you look at Mr. Ferrari's amendment, it would provide that one member would be a licensed person from Nevada, but the second person would be a current or retired school administrator who could come from any state. It would be in addition to those in Nevada.

If you chose to do anything with this measure, you have a couple of options. You could approve the mock-up in its entirety, or you could approve the mock-up except those provisions addressed by Mr. Ferrari's amendment; then you could approve his amendment for those two pieces.

Chair Bobzien:

Is there any discussion on A.B. 171?

Assemblyman Kirner:

It looks like there is a difference in the language from the committee that forms versus the committee that governs. They are just minor language changes that appear on the mock-up on page 1, section 1, and lines 1 through 16, and then page 11, section 6, lines 6 through 22. There are only minor differences, but I am thinking they should be consistent.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

It actually says it on the bottom of Mr. Ferrari's page, the second proposed amendment: "We also propose this same amendment to replace, Section 6, Subsections 1 (a) - (b) to provide uniformity on the Committee to Form and Governing Boards of Charter Schools." Is that what you were referring to, to make sure it was also covered in the governance part?

Assemblyman Kirner:

Thank you.

Chair Bobzien:

It is good that we have that clarification for that alignment.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Actually, just before the hearing I talked to Mr. Ferrari and he indicated that there had been an arrangement between the bill's sponsors. Is that accurate on that particular section?

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Washoe County Assembly District No. 27:

This was a process of consolidating multiple amendments. The amendments in the work session document that you have are ones that have universal consensus and support. This amendment, I stand neutral on, but certainly want to see the Committee have a discussion on the merit of the language.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIRNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 171 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 1 AND 2.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Bobzien:

It is an important distinction to include that the second amendment from Mr. Ferrari supersedes the previous one related to the composition of the organization? Alright, we are in alignment.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Bobzien:

We will look to you, Mrs. Benitez-Thompson, to take the floor statement. This was quite a bill to go through and a lot of great work done, and a lot of consensus. It is good to see that one go forward.

Our next bill on the work session document is Assembly Bill 117. This is a bill that has found new life based on some renewed conversations between the parties. There is a consensus amendment and Ms. Martini will give us an overview.

Assembly Bill 117: Revises provisions governing the required minimum number of school days in public schools. (BDR 34-91)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

This measure was heard on March 21, 2011. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).]

An amendment submitted by Clark County School District is attached. As I and the staff understand this particular amendment, the first portion clarifies that any waivers granted pursuant to this measure would be bargained. The language in the second part of the amendment comes directly from the furlough bill, section 4 of Senate Bill No. 433 of the 75th Session. What that provides is that a teacher would not be paid but would still be eligible for retirement. Also, there is a date of expiration of July 1, 2013.

Chair Bobzien:

I have a question for Ms. Haldeman from Clark County School District. As I understand it, the concerns with the original bill with this amendment have been worked out? Ultimately, with this bill, it is giving you flexibility in case you have to go below that number to absorb whatever cuts should take place to the calendar. Is that correct?

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District:

Yes, that is correct. We hope we do not have to use this measure, but as we go through the negotiation process, which we are starting right now, this is a tool that we would like to have in our tool box.

I would like to thank the Chairman for considering this bill on the last day as it is important to us.

Chair Bobzien:

To make it clear, this is a sunset bill. The bill would end July 1, 2013. We are talking about this biennium, and it is basically and essentially the disaster plan.

Craig Stevens, Director, Education Policy and Research, Nevada State Education Association:

Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 117.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Are we talking about both amendments now?

Chair Bobzien:

This is A.B. 117 and there is only one amendment. Excuse me, semantics—one amendment, broken out into two. The intention, Mr. Aizley, is, I am assuming you are taking both amendments constituting the one amendment from Clark County School District.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Yes, if it includes everything we have here.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

I have a question regarding the sunset. Why?

Joyce Haldeman:

The sunset is there because this section relates to making sure the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada contributions for the employees are not disturbed. That cannot go on indefinitely. It has to have a sunset. I am okay with the sunset, because I do not like the idea that we have the ability to reduce instructional days. To me, it is a double winner.

Assemblyman Kirner:

As I am looking at this, I am well aware of the fact that the Governor has asked for concessions from teachers and I assume you are in discussions. How does this interface with that discussion?

Joyce Haldeman:

This is directly connected to that discussion. In Clark County School District, what we are currently looking at, among other things, is a 5.8 percent reduction

in salary. The teachers came to us and indicated that they would prefer to have those in terms of furlough days. Right now, what we are looking at in Clark County is 8 furlough days for teachers, 10 furlough days for anybody who has a 10-month contract, 11 furlough days for an 11-month contract and 12 furlough days for a 12-month contract. If we have 8 furlough days for teachers, it is possible that we will interfere with student instruction, which is why we need that provision.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I guess that is kind of where I was headed. I am thinking of the students and I am trying to think how we have looked at a number of different variations of trying to make sure we get a certain amount of instruction in before we administer tests and things of that nature. If you were to implement this, would that get in the way of the actual instruction in getting a full curriculum for the students?

Joyce Haldeman:

It is our goal not to interrupt the instruction of students. Our primary goal of being here is to make sure that instruction is not interrupted. Currently, in Clark County School District, we use four days throughout the year for professional development. We will likely cut that down to two days, or perhaps even to one. Additionally, teachers have time before school begins and we will look at cutting that down. Then, if we are going to have eight furlough days, we have to go further. One of the reasons we appreciate the Nevada State Education Association coming forth and agreeing with this amendment is because the decision about when those days would be made, would be made in conjunction with the bargaining groups. I can assure you that those teachers do not want to do anything that is harmful to the students either.

It is likely that we would end a semester a day earlier, or do things that would come at the tail end of something rather than right in the middle of testing.

Chair Bobzien:

Seeing no more discussion, all those in favor of amend and do pass say, "Aye."

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Stewart, you will handle the floor assignment.

We will move to Assembly Bill 546.

Assembly Bill 546: Makes various changes to provisions governing early childhood care and education. (BDR 38-739)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 546 was heard on April 6, 2011. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).] There has been one amendment submitted by the United Way of Southern Nevada.

The amendment does several things. [Continued with summary of amendment ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Also, on page 5, the amendment revises the hours from 30 hours of training annually, to 24 hours of training. This coincides with the recommendation of the American Public Health Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics in the *Caring for Our Children* document.

[Continued with summary of amendment ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Bobzien:

This was a bill that certainly had generated some opposition during the testimony, but as I understand it, the United Way of Southern Nevada and The Children's Cabinet, Inc. have gotten together and discussed this amendment. If you could provide us with some brief comments, I would appreciate it.

Keith L. Lee, representing The Children's Cabinet, Inc.:

You are accurate, Mr. Chairman. We have worked out some of the issues that we saw. We think this is really a good piece of legislation now and something we need to go forward with in dealing with early childhood education and development, which is absolutely crucial for our young children to get them prepared to go into the school district.

Lesley Pittman, representing United Way of Southern Nevada:

We addressed some of the concerns that were shared with you during the hearing from both the Children's Cabinet and the child care center representatives that were here before you. Ms. Martini is going to walk through all the changes that were made, but if you need clarification on the rationale or the intent, I would be happy to provide that to you.

Chair Bobzien:

I will open it up for discussion to the Committee.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I am still going to vote no on this simply because the people that testified indicated there was a significant cost to these private businesses which are already struggling. There was no evidence presented that there is a need for

these additional hours. There is no evidence presented that this minimal number of extra hours is actually going to do any good. While it is a feel good thing, it will impact private businesses, which incidentally, we are regulating here. This isn't a public system; this is a private bunch of businesses and they indicated they did not want to have this. So I am still going to vote no.

Chair Bobzien:

Mr. Lee, certainly you do not represent those operators, but some similar concerns were the ones that The Children's Cabinet expressed. Could you share your thoughts about how this amendment mitigates some of those concerns?

Keith Lee:

You are absolutely correct. We also expressed some concerns and we have worked out that 24 hours is a pretty good compromise. Again, part of what we want to accomplish here with the study and developing recommendations is to look toward the future. Twenty-four hours is probably a number that will slide higher in the future as we get a better handle on this. I understand Assemblyman Hansen's concerns as well as the concerns of some of the private companies involved in this. Nonetheless, we are talking about children and their future, whether it is a public or private setting. We need to go forward and develop these standards. Certainly, it is envisioned that the private care providers can and will be invited to be part of this process as we go forward. Again, 24 hours is a good compromise to work with.

Assemblyman Kirner:

For clarification purposes, I seem to recall a conversation, Ms. Pittman, concerning the funding here. Can you elaborate if this is a cost that must be borne by the individual or by the institution or by the federal government? Who has to pay for this extra training?

Lesley Pittman:

We did have a conversation about this. You will note, there is a provision in section 7 of the bill that says, "The Department of Education shall, in consultation . . . develop the training module that must be used in such training. 2. To the extent that money is available to pay for the training, the Department of Education shall arrange to have the training provided at no or reduced cost to the employees of child care facilities."

This was designed to be fairly flexible. Mr. Charlton—who represented the United Way of Southern Nevada during the hearing—indicated that one of the first things he did, as the only private-sector member of the Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council was to ask the question of the other councilmen,

"Where is the money? How much money is coming into the State of Nevada for these types of programs?" No one had an answer. They are in the process of going through what is called fiscal mapping to identify the federal and state grant monies that exist, as well as other workforce reinvestment monies that exist that could be utilized to help subsidize training for the individuals in these early child care facilities.

I went online and did a random check of the 15 hours that are currently required. Most of those are offered for free; not all are fee based. Costs for each class range from free to a maximum of \$10 for two clock hours. We believe there are pools of money that exist for this and the impact on child care providers can be borne by the center directors. My understanding is that it is one of the benefits they provide, in many instances, to their employees—to pay for that training.

Chair Bobzien:

I will entertain a motion at this point.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 546.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN, MCARTHUR,
AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

Mr. Stewart will take the floor statement.

The next bill for consideration is Assembly Bill 551.

Assembly Bill 551: Requires school districts to assess the feasibility of consolidation of services, functions and personnel. (BDR 34-877)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

There are no amendments to consider for this measure ([Exhibit F](#)).

Chair Bobzien:

Do we have any questions or issues?

ASSEMBLYMAN KIRNER MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 551.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I do want to make one comment; I still have a problem with consolidating. The superintendent is still on here. I am not sure why we need to consolidate superintendents of schools if we are not consolidating districts. I am curious.

Chair Bobzien:

As I understand it, the scenario contemplated here is that the governance structures themselves would continue to be autonomous and separate. But, if you have situation, from a staff perspective, in which you really need only a half-time person in two neighboring school districts, the district can share that superintendent if there is that opportunity for staff and administrative savings.

Assemblyman McArthur:

You would still have two separate school boards?

Chair Bobzien:

No. Where in this bill are we contemplating the actual consolidation of governance of school districts? We are merely encouraging the districts to work together and find savings through shared services.

Is there additional discussion on the motion? All of those in favor please say, "Aye."

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. Flores, would you handle the floor statement on this one? Thank you.

We will now go to Assembly Bill 227.

Assembly Bill 227: Requires boards of trustees of school districts to grant the use of certain athletic fields to nonprofit organizations which provide programs for youth sports. (BDR 34-36)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

This measure was heard on April 8, 2011. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).] One amendment has been submitted from the Easter Seals of Southern Nevada. [Read amendment ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Chair Bobzien:

We will open the discussion on A.B. 227. [There was no discussion.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 227.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Bobzien:

The next bill on our work session is Assembly Bill 129.

Assembly Bill 129: Repeals the statewide requirements for class-size reduction and authorizes the boards of trustees of school districts to establish pupil-teacher ratios for elementary schools. (BDR 34-639)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 129 was heard on April 13, 2011. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).] One amendment has been submitted by the sponsor of the bill, Assemblyman Kirner. [Summarized the amendment ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Chair Bobzien:

I will open the discussion on A.B. 129. [There was none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MOVED TO AMEND WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION AND REREFER ASSEMBLY BILL 129 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Bobzien:

Is there any discussion on the motion to amend and rerefer to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means without recommendation? All of those in favor, please say, "Aye."

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Our next bill is Assembly Bill 357.

Assembly Bill 357: Limits the use of certain property or the proceeds of certain property by the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada. (BDR 34-1065)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 357 was heard on April 13, 2011. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).] There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Bobzien:

I will open up the discussion on A.B. 357.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I think the main point of this is that the monies and lands were originally given with the intent and specific obligation to be used for agricultural purposes in Nevada. They are really trying to keep that money in the areas it was originally earmarked for. If we fail to do that, we will end up losing our agricultural departments here in the State of Nevada.

Chair Bobzien:

Mr. Hansen, I will respectfully disagree with you on that. We have heard testimony that the University of Nevada, Reno is actually going forward with expanding some programs, looking at some new bachelor's degrees, and beefing up range science, et cetera. Certainly, the structure of the college is open for discussion—whether or not it continues to be a stand-alone college or becomes a program. I understand we will have concerns about that. My own feeling is that, at a time when we are trying to find ways to grant more autonomy to the schools and to Nevada System of Higher Education institutions, this actually goes in the other direction. In the spirit of moving this discussion along and recognizing that this is an important issue to be discussed, I am going to hold off and not make any additional comments. Do we have any additional comments on this?

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 357.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

I agree with our Chair, but I do think that this has some fiscal pieces to it. I would submit that this is going to need to go to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

Chair Bobzien:

On discussion, I would echo the concerns of Ms. Dondero Loop. I am not ready to vote in favor of this bill at this time. I would be willing to entertain an alternate motion if this one fails, to rerefer with no recommendation to this Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. Is there additional discussion on

this motion? All those in favor of a do pass recommendation on A.B. 357, please say, "Aye."

Assemblyman Stewart:

Was there a second on the motion?

Chair Bobzien:

Yes, there was from Mr. Hansen. All of those opposed? [Roll call vote was taken.]

THE MOTION FAILED. (ASSEMBLYMEN AIZLEY, ANDERSON, BOBZIEN, DIAZ, DONDERO LOOP, FLORES, MASTROLUCA, AND NEAL VOTED NO.)

With that motion having failed, I would be willing to entertain an alternative motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP MOVED, WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION, TO REREFER ASSEMBLY BILL 357 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART VOTED NO.)

Chair Bobzien:

We will move to our final bill, Assembly Bill 290.

Assembly Bill 290: Revises provisions governing pupils enrolled in high school.
(BDR 34-647)

Mindy Martini, Committee Policy Analyst:

This measure was heard on March 21, 2011. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).] There is one amendment submitted by the sponsor of the bill, Ms. Neal. The amendment would remove section 3 of the bill. [Continued to read A.B. 290 amendment ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Chair Bobzien:

Is there discussion on A.B. 290?

Assemblyman McArthur:

For clarification, it looks like, with this amendment, no one has to take this test now in his sophomore year? Does every high school give this test?

Assemblywoman Neal:

No. The practice test was a suggestion so there would be an entry-level pretest for students to figure out where they were in tenth grade. That was taken out because there is no money to do a pretest for all tenth graders. That is what that practice test is; it is not the actual state test.

Assemblyman McArthur:

If it is a practice test, why do we not give it to everyone if it is just practice? You give them a chance to practice and see where they stand.

Assemblywoman Neal:

When I talked to the Department of Education, it was a huge expense and it would take almost four years to even get it developed. We thought about extending it and saying four years from now, but that would not really make a difference. There was no money and I did not like the timeline.

Assemblyman Kirner:

It looks like this is a permissive bill and not a mandate. Have I read that correctly?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Yes.

Assemblyman Anderson:

I was going to make an amend and do pass motion if you are willing to accept it.

Chair Bobzien:

We will hold for just a moment. We have one more hand in the air; then we will come back to you, Mr. Anderson.

Assemblyman Hansen:

As I understand this, it only applies to sophomores, right? [Mr. Hansen received confirmation of that question.]

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 290.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Bobzien:

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] All of those in favor please say, "Aye."

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MCARTHUR VOTED
NO.)

Ms. Neal, congratulations. Please handle the floor statement.

That will conclude our work session for today. Do we have any other matters to come before the Committee when we resume on Monday of next week? [There were none.] Do we have anyone wishing to give public comment at this time? [There was no one.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 4:17 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sharon McCallen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman David P. Bobzien, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Education

Date: April 15, 2011

Time of Meeting: 3:29 p.m.

| Bill | Exhibit | Witness / Agency | Description |
|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| | A | | Agenda |
| | B | | Attendance Roster |
| A.B. 171 | C | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 171 with Two Amendments. |
| A.B. 117 | D | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 117 with One Amendment. |
| A.B. 546 | E | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 546 with One Amendment. |
| A.B. 551 | F | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 551. |
| A.B. 227 | G | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 227 with One Amendment. |
| A.B. 129 | H | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 129 with One Amendment. |
| A.B. 357 | I | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 357. |
| A.B. 290 | J | Mindy Martini | Work Session Document on A.B. 290 with One Amendment. |