

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS, PAROLE, AND PROBATION**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
June 3, 2017**

The Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation was called to order by Chairman James Ohrenschall at 10:10 a.m. on Saturday, June 3, 2017, in Room 3138 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/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner (excused)
Assemblyman Keith Pickard (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Linda Whimple, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ben Graham, Government Relations Advisor, Administrative Office of the Courts
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County
District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys
Association
Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Chairman Ohrenschall:

[Roll was called and protocol was explained.] We have one bill on our agenda today. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 451 (2nd Reprint).

**Senate Bill 451 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to criminal justice.
(BDR 14-1007)**

Ben Graham, Government Relations Advisor, Administrative Office of the Courts:

I might ask the Chairman's indulgence for a minute and go with Mr. Peabody and Sherman as they step into the Wayback Machine and we go back to 1995, which is not too much different from today about trying to understand criminal sentencing and procedures and truth in sentencing. Senator Mark James, who was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, directed me, along with Allison Combs of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), and [Senator] Maurice Washington, to go into the little room on the second floor without any windows and for some reason we completely revamped—or made an effort to revamp—the sentencing structure in this state, creating the A, B, C, D, and E categories in an effort to try to make some sense of our process. Before that, there were no classifications. What was anticipated in 1995 was that over the next 22 years, we would get a review and some of these sentencings might be adjusted, probably more down than up. People have been concerned about sentencing and here we have another 5-, 10-, or 20-year penalty, and in reality, we are not sure that is the most and best efficient use of our corrections resources.

Senate Bill 451 (2nd Reprint) attempts—it came out of the Advisory Commission chaired by Justice Hardesty, and I am actually here on his behalf today—to create a commission to try to do what we have not done for the past 22 years. The hope is that we will take a look at the prior sentencing structure and penalties that we put in the last year or two. One of the

problems is that we are all very emotionally involved; sometimes we are victims of crime or we have family members who are victims of crime, and quite frankly, there are a lot of people for a lot of things. I say it with a little bit of jest, but they want the death penalty for this because they have been hurt or harmed. Hopefully, this commission will take a nonjaundiced look at the sentencing structure.

If you look at the obligations and the mandate to what the commission is to do, it is kind of phenomenal what it is commissioned to do. I really think the membership is quite diverse. It goes from the typical judges, prosecutors, public defenders, Department of Corrections, private practitioners in the criminal bar, victims of crime, parole and probation people, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, behavioral sciences, and an advocate on the behalf of inmates. I do not think we have really ever had that before, but I think it is time that we step forward and do a comprehensive review. You have heard the presentations of \$22,000 per year that we spend to keep someone in prison. Maybe they need to be in prison for a year or two, but not 10 or 15 years, and we need to understand that. If we could save some money on this long-term incarceration, maybe we could put some money on the front end. Those of us who have been involved in it need to do it and need to do it early before they even get involved in serious crimes. Hopefully, this would lead to a reduction of some sentences and the lessening of the number of prisoners in our jails and prisons.

There are members appointed by the Assembly and appointed by the Senate. There will be assistance from the LCB. They will meet at least three or four times, and they will have a bill draft request (BDR) that you can look at in 2019 to adjust these sentences more appropriately. There is a modest degree of funding already put in from the other side. The only thing Justice Hardesty did when he testified was he thought they would need more money, but he says that we are getting started here. With Mr. Peabody and Sherman, we will come back in 2019. I fully anticipate that you are going to want to do this and look forward to working over the next interim to try to get the sentencing straightened out that we did not do after 1995.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.] We have had a lot of testimony this session; in fact, I think yesterday in the Senate Committee on Judiciary hearing on Assembly Bill 414 (1st Reprint), there was a gentleman who had served about 14 years in prison who had given a confession but was not guilty of sexual assault and burglary, and he had been exonerated. We also heard testimony about the Cathy Woods case in Reno and some other cases. In the case of Frederick Lee Steese, which has recently been highlighted in *Vanity Fair*, people were innocent but served long periods of time—decades or longer—in prison and then were exonerated. Would there be a benefit to try to have someone like that on the sentencing commission, someone who was actually found innocent and exonerated who did time and could have that perspective if someone is available and interested on serving on the sentencing commission?

Ben Graham:

I think you have a good diversity in here. Quite frankly, some poor soul who has been wrongfully convicted—I am not sure if it would give a broad enough view that would help the diversity, but I certainly would encourage testimony from someone like that. The most horrendous thing I can think of is the poor soul who goes to prison who should not be there, but that means the person who should be there is out preying on us.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

It is like the *Steese* case. I do not think they ever found the actual criminal.

Ben Graham:

Yes. It is very difficult. I am not suggesting that you would want to, but you could be appointed to the committee, or Assemblyman Fumo, or Assemblyman Wheeler.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I like that order. You went from liberal, to more liberal, to the most liberal member of the Committee.

Ben Graham:

This is a nonpartisan address. Frankly, I think we have too many people in prison for too long a time for penalties that did not involve injury to you or me or our homes. I think that is going to be a big emphasis with this study to try to balance that out.

Assemblyman Yeager:

It looks like what this sentencing commission seeks to do is take some duties away from the Advisory Commission that meets now and put those in the sentencing commission. They also have a BDR, which I think is something new, because the Advisory Commission typically does not. In terms of that BDR, do you contemplate that after the new sentencing commission is done meeting, they would simply take a vote like anything else, and as long as a majority of the quorum that is present on that day agrees that they would go forward with the BDR? What do you envision would be the purpose of the Advisory Commission going forward if the sentencing commission is established and those particular duties are taken away from the Advisory Commission?

Ben Graham:

As you are probably aware, there is some question as to whether the Advisory Commission is going to continue. There were other areas that they dealt with, but I think this creation here was to make it more specialized and more focused because the Advisory Commission had a broad expansive study—I do not think you got into the marijuana thing too much, but there were many other areas. There had been a previous sentencing commission of sorts, but it just never got off the ground. Hopefully, this will take care of that. As far as the recommendations, I know we are not going to get unanimity and you might end up with a bill draft with a majority and possibly a minority report of some kind. But that would certainly be up to the chairman and members of the committee once that gets going. I hope that illustrates what we are thinking about a little bit.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Yes, I did have to Google Peabody and Sherman. I appreciate that reference. Being somewhat of a layperson serving on this Committee for the past four months, I have constantly been intrigued by how we sentence some things that are being put forward as felonies and other things that are misdemeanors, and wondering what the rhyme or reason is on some of these different categories. I see this first sentence under section 3, "Sentencing and corrections policies should embody fairness, consistency, proportionality and opportunity." I want to say, Hear, hear. I appreciate the work this commission is going to do and if any of us have the privilege of coming back and serving next session, I cannot wait to see those reports and what comes out of them. I am envisioning this enormous spreadsheet of how we sentence and what the effectiveness and fairness of it is. I commend this effort.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

My experience is that there are an overwhelming number of issues to deal with in the criminal justice arena. One of the things we had sought to do was to look at a number of category B felonies, basically because there were so many of them. When we got into it, the task was overwhelming and it became readily apparent that it needs to be a focused endeavor just on this topic because it is that overwhelming. I agree with Assemblywoman Tolles that my experience in the Legislature has been that there is no rhyme or reason. They are done in isolation, and that is an issue with a part-time legislature. Bills come up and then they get put in and no one really thinks about how they fit in with the rest of what the Legislature has done.

One of the most important things that a criminal justice system needs to have is a sense of fairness. I think it is basic to American jurisprudence. I think what the sentencing commission can help us do is to get a renewed emphasis on making sure that things make sense logically together. Certainly, logic helps that. I cannot give this any more of a stronger recommendation, because I think it is an important endeavor for us to start to engage in. I am glad to see that this got out with some strong bipartisan support in the Senate because this is not at all a partisan issue. Across the country, many people from all sides need to take a look at some of these things. I am glad to see that. Mr. Graham, thank you for getting it through and my compliments to Justice Hardesty on your success on this bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Thank you for your service on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. I know you are not presenting the bill, but I wonder if you remember the genesis of this composition and whether any discussions you participated in led to this composition of the sentencing commission.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I do not recall any specific conversations on the composition, although I think there was a general sense that it needed to include all parts of the criminal justice system—victims' advocates, prosecution, defense, and the judiciary legislators. My read-through—I do not know that anything is ever perfect, but I think that it makes a good attempt to involve all sectors and people who have an interest in it. To the extent that people have an issue with it,

I guess we could talk about it. I think there has been a good attempt to get a few people in here. This can always change. Members can always be added if people have a problem with it. I am happy to see this doing so well at this time.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Is the member from the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association supposed to represent the rurals? We have someone from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, but no one else is specific for other locations?

Ben Graham:

I can remember in the rurals, sometimes a person would get sent or revoked from probation or parole for residue of a controlled substance in the barrel of a pen, and they would get sent back to prison for it in a rural jurisdiction, where a case like that probably would not even be filed in one of the more urban areas.

One of the points in here would call for uniform sentencing throughout our jurisdictions. I think that should be studied and looked at. Mr. Roshak just reminded me that a Sheriffs' and Chiefs' representative could be from a rural standpoint. I think that the effort is going to try to get some uniformity throughout our state, and remembering that 80-some percent of the population are in the two major metropolitan areas.

Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

With regard to the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association membership, yes, our membership does encompass all of the rurals, and if it would be the pleasure of the Committee to ensure that a rural representative was placed there, we could easily arrange that.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I wanted to make sure. I was looking at the makeup of the board and was thinking about geography, and was wondering if the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association appointee was supposed to be the representative of the rurals, but that is not what I am hearing.

Ben Graham:

Frankly, that would be a decision from the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, but I think since you have a representative of the major law enforcement community that it would not be unreasonable to encourage the sheriffs and chiefs to appoint someone from the rurals. I think that has historically been the situation where a more rural law enforcement officer is involved.

Robert Roshak:

Currently, on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, we do have a representative elected by the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association to be on that committee and that individual does report back to the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

You are talking about the current Advisory Commission?

Robert Roshak:

Yes.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is that member from the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association from one of the urban counties or the pioneer counties?

Robert Roshak:

No. Currently, it is Lieutenant Spratley from Washoe County.

**Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We are in support of this bill. Getting back to what Mr. Roshak said, in section 5, the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association elect a member to it. Yes, that would be representative of the rural counties.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Why does the Office of the Attorney General have two appointees and members? They seem to be the only organization with two on the board.

Ben Graham:

I am not privy to how that particular situation occurred, except that as the chief law enforcement officer of the state and representing various offenses involving administrative issues—such as insurance fraud or Medicare fraud—that possibly would be the thinking where the law enforcement community does not get involved in those. That would be my thinking, but I am not certain.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I will leave it at that. I am very happy about the bill and interested in it, but I do have some concerns about the makeup of the board.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? [There were none.] I have a couple of questions. I do not know if you were present at the meetings of the Advisory Commission, but I am surprised that a member was not suggested from an organization that works with inmates once they have been released and trying to get them on their feet and find employment. I know there is an organization in Las Vegas called Hope for Prisoners, and I think there is one similar to that in northern Nevada that tries to help inmates once they have gotten out finding employment, finding housing, and not ending up homeless and maybe falling into bad habits again. We have also heard Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation Director Soderberg testify quite a bit this session, on Chairman Thompson's "ban the box" and some other bills, about how he sees anything that we can do

to help offenders land on their feet and find housing, find employment and training, as a workforce development issue. Was it ever discussed to include someone from the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, or include someone who works with inmates once they have been released?

Ben Graham:

I love the way this is going, because that exactly represents why we need to continue to have the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. This bill deals with sentencing. Let us get the sentencing appropriate. I am not being critical, Mr. Chairman, but that is how we can wander off into so many other tangents. Hopefully, the Commission on the Administration of Justice can get in those. If we can reduce the prison population or reduce the length of stay, there is going to be a savings, which can go into some of those front-end and back-end projects. As you know, I have worked for years with people, and I know a lot of people who say that if they can get a job, they do not go back to prison. That is outside the focus of what we are trying to do here, and that is why I would encourage you to continue the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

You bring up a good point. I certainly do not want to get off on a tangent, but I think anyone who is trying to help someone get on their feet, it makes a difference if the person has served 18 months versus 15 years and how employable they will be and how open an employer might be to giving that felon a chance. I know Assemblyman Hansen has spoken on the record about how he tries to hire ex-felons and give them another chance in his plumbing business. I think employers might look at the length of the sentence.

Something that has troubled me a lot this session is the testimony of Department of Corrections Director Dzurenda as to how the prisons are so overcrowded right now that inmates are basically sleeping out on cots and there are not too many cells and they are refurbishing an old wing to make it livable again at one of the prisons. I think it is important work. I just want to make sure that the composition of this sentencing commission is right.

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? [There were none.]

Ben Graham:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I will see you next time.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone in support of S.B. 451 (R2)?

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We definitely support this bill and think that sentencing reform needs work. I agree with Assemblyman Anderson's statement that it is a large task that needs a certain amount of focus. As far as the composition of the board, I have concerns, even though I would support this bill even if nothing changed on it. I will say that just counting the vote when things are going to get voted on—you have five law enforcement votes that are going to be there: the

person from the Attorney General's Office, the district attorneys, and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Public defense is a little bit different, both in the north, the south, and in the rurals. You may want to think about making one public defender from the north, one public defender from the south, and the state public defender as part of this committee because it is different all over the state. What we handle in Clark County is different from what they handle in Washoe County, and both of our counties are very different from what they handle in the rural counties. That is something that this body may want to look at when taking this into account when we move forward with it.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Were you part of the Advisory Commission as well as Assemblyman Anderson that recommended this?

John Piro:

No.

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

Although Mr. Piro was not a member of the committee, his boss, the Clark County Public Defender, was a member of the committee. In terms of representation on the Advisory Commission, which ultimately made this recommendation, it is very similar to the makeup of this future sentencing commission. In fact, when they discussed making this sentencing commission, they used Connecticut as a guide. The makeup of the Connecticut commission is very similar to the commission proposal that is before you today.

While there may be five law enforcement positions, as Mr. Piro indicated, this is out of 22 members on the commission. We are anything but a majority who can dictate what this commission does. There are varied interests in law enforcement, all of whom must be represented on the board. I would also argue that if you are talking about adding rural prosecutors, I see the rural defense attorneys, and I think it makes sense to add rural prosecutors as well because, quite frankly, the same argument holds true for an urban prosecutor and a rural prosecutor. We are very sensitive to the makeup of the commission. If we start adding people, which starts to tilt the balance of what is a fairly balanced commission right now, then we would start looking at this bill with a little bit more of a skeptical eye.

I also want to say that the Nevada District Attorneys Association has—at least in the last four sessions that I have been here—been a willing participant in recategorization of offenses in Nevada. In fact, when the Advisory Commission this past interim began to look at recategorization, it was the Nevada District Attorneys Association who actually brought up the first of a few category Bs that we were okay with recategorizing to category Cs. So we have been a willing participant in this issue for quite a while.

One other thing that has not been discussed which I think is a very important part of this bill is under section 6, subsection 3, paragraph (e), "Offenders sentenced to imprisonment must receive sentences which do not confuse or mislead the public as to the actual time those offenders must serve" This is an issue that I think both prosecutors and defense attorneys all agree on. Our sentencing credit structure is so confusing right now that no one can really look at a defendant and say how much time they are actually going to spend in prison. This hurts defense attorneys when they are talking about potential negotiations with defendants, and it hurts us when we are talking about negotiations with a victim or how long a defendant is going to stay in prison.

What we like about this bill is that it talks about recategorization of offenses. We are not talking about literally dropping every offense. We are talking about maybe increasing some offenses where it is not proportional. The example I can give now is battery resulting in substantial bodily harm is a category C, punishable from one to five years in prison, whereas assault with a deadly weapon where no physical harm comes to the victim is one to six years in prison. Maybe those two should be treated the same. Those are the types of things this commission is supposed to look at and we encourage and are excited about its work.

Assemblyman Yeager:

In looking at the makeup of the board, I certainly understand the balance that needs to be achieved, but I will say that I am not comfortable with the Attorney General's Office having two representatives on the board. It seems to be an outlier. The only other people in the makeup of the board who would have two would be the Senate and the Assembly, which I think makes sense legislatively, but it seems to me that particular one could be combined into either the Attorney General or a representative. I will note that it would give the commission an odd number of members, which could potentially come into play when voting.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I appreciate your comment that if there were an expansion to include a public defender from Washoe County and the state public defender's office who works in the pioneer counties, I could see perhaps adding a prosecutor from those two to balance it out. I think an odd number is also something that is very valuable. I would really like to see someone who has been exonerated and found to be innocent. Those cases are rare. We have fine prosecutors in our state who work very hard, but we have had some examples—the *Vanity Fair* article is very troubling about Mr. Steese.

Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

We greatly respect the spirit and intent of what this measure is attempting to do. If we could climb into the Wayback Machine one final time this session and go back to my opening comments at the beginning of this session, I talked about how the Washoe County Public Defender's Office subscribes to a theory of defense called holistic defense, where you are not just looking at the crime itself and the elements of the crime and treating it, but you are also looking at every single factor or variable that goes into it and taking a holistic approach. I think this measure accomplishes that in great detail. It looks at everything from the plea

bargaining, probation measure, and supervision. Sentencing is where the rubber meets the road for a criminal defendant. It is going to have the greatest impact, whether it is just a gross misdemeanor or a felony, and whether they are facing probation for up to five years or facing the rest of their life in the Nevada Department of Corrections. It affects the offender, it affects their family, friends, and all of their loved ones. This measure is a very important step for taking a holistic look at sentencing in Nevada and having consistency and fairness as Assemblyman Anderson discussed. I thoroughly agree with this measure. I think it is very important. I think the time is right for this measure to go through.

The only other comment—I did not really want to touch on the makeup of the membership, but I would just throw my two cents in and possibly consider alternate public defenders or special public defenders. Those are the conflict attorneys who handle conflict cases when Mr. Piro or I cannot handle those cases. Other than that, I wholeheartedly respect the spirit and intent of what this measure is trying to do and I would ask and urge for your support.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Mr. Sullivan? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support of the measure here in Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in support of the measure in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition to the measure? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is neutral on S.B. 451 (R2) who wants to be heard? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments that you would like to make, Mr. Graham?

Ben Graham:

Keep in mind that we will be back here in 18 months. We are almost talking like these recommendations are going to become law. It would be nice if we could do that and make sure that we got a good measured balance, but whatever comes out of this study, we are going to be back here and the BDR is going to be in front of you and you are going to have fun with it. Do not be too disturbed about the particular makeup. I think there are a couple of good suggestions that were made which might put things in more of a balance. This is not going to be law when it comes out. You are going to be the ones who make it the law. This is a big task, and I do not want to get it bogged down too much.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I appreciate what you said. That is true for everyone here except me. I will not be back, but I just want to say that from 2007 on, it has been a pleasure working with you on this Committee. I believe when I started you were representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association, and then the Clark County District Attorney's Office. I have known Mr. Graham for many years, actually since I was a small child—he and my mom were friends back when the State Bar in Las Vegas was a much smaller bar, and most attorneys knew each other in the 1970s. You have been a tremendous advocate, and we appreciate your work with the Supreme Court and all the very many kind things you have done, even though they have had a lot of calories for our Legislature. It has been a pleasure to work with you for the past six sessions and one part that I will truly miss, but I am glad you will be back and the other members will be back to try to work on this bill at the next session.

Ben Graham:

Thank you. We will have a lot of good experiences as we trudge the happy road to destiny.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I would be remiss if I did not mention Ms. Kristin Erickson of the district attorney's office. I believe this is her last session lobbying too. It has been a tremendous pleasure working with her and getting the perspective of the prosecutors in Washoe County and everything they have had to face. It has been really good to work on these issues.

I will close the hearing on S.B. 451 (R2). Is there any public comment? [There was none.] I would like to recess our meeting today [at 10:51 a.m.].

[Chairman Ohrenschall called the meeting back to order [at 1:59 p.m.] behind the bar of the Assembly. [([Exhibit C](#)) was submitted for the record.]

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 451 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will do the floor statement.

The meeting is recessed [at 2:06 p.m.].

Chairman Ohrenschall:

The meeting is adjourned [at 7:19 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Whimple
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 451, dated June 1, 2017, proposed by Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Assembly District No. 12.