

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 18, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 10:13 a.m. on Thursday, May 18, 2017, in Room 4100 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 Edgar Flores, Chairman
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Chris Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblyman Jim Marchant
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel
Carol Myers, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Warren B. Hardy II, representing the City of Mesquite
Robert D. Sweetin, City Attorney, City of Mesquite
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas
Metropolitan Police Department
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association
of Nevada; and representing the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Chairman Flores:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Today is a work session. We have some lengthy amendments, and I want to ensure we understand what we are voting on. I will open the work session for Senate Bill 56.

Senate Bill 56: Provides a charter for the City of Mesquite. (BDR S-434)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 56 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the City of Mesquite and heard in this Committee on April 19, 2017.

The charter establishes the structure of the City's governance, including provisions relating to the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the City; authorizes the City Council to establish and impose various fees; and establishes other provisions concerning the ongoing operation of the City [page 1, ([Exhibit C](#))].

We have an amendment proposed by Assemblyman Daly [pages 2 through 36, ([Exhibit C](#))]. The attached mock-up makes numerous changes to the bill, including but not limited to the appointment, composition, and duties of the charter committee and the delegation of mayoral duties in certain circumstances. Additionally, it removes language related to the budgeted ending fund balance subject to negotiation with an employee organization.

Chairman Flores:

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

For the record, if there is someone from the City of Mesquite, I would like clarification that the appointment of the Municipal Court Judge and the Justice of the Peace are not in the bill and will not be considered.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing the City of Mesquite:

Our City Attorney, Bob Sweetin, and Aaron Baker from the City Manager's Office are here today. Currently, the Municipal Court Judge and the Justice of the Peace are appointed. There is no requirement for the Justice of the Peace to be an attorney. There is a provision in the bill for the City of Mesquite to elect a second Municipal Court Judge, which is the standard for most city charters. Mr. Sweetin can clarify for the Committee if I have misspoken.

Robert D. Sweetin, City Attorney, City of Mesquite:

Mr. Hardy's statements are accurate.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have a question for our legal counsel. Is a second judge required if the population of a city is over 50,000?

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

I do not know the answer. I will need to research that.

Assemblywoman Woodbury:

I have a question for our legal counsel. Section 1.010, subsection 1 of the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) requires changes to the charter to be approved by the Legislature. I am wondering if that is a typical provision for Nevada's city charters. I have two questions for the City of Mesquite. Were you included in the amendment discussions? Do you agree with it?

Warren Hardy:

We worked very closely with the members of this Committee who expressed interest during the initial bill hearing. Assemblyman Daly and Assemblywoman Neal helped to craft the provisions in the amendment. In answer to your first question concerning section 1.010, subsection 1, that is a standard for Nevada's city charters. The Legislature has ultimate control, but the City of Mesquite created a City Charter Committee. We believe it is one of the strongest in the state and it is a model for the rest of the city charters to follow. The City Charter Committee has the ability to bring recommendations to the Legislature independently, or the City Council can bring recommendations. It is tradition and the statutory scheme that all charter changes go through the Legislature. We are 100 percent comfortable to continue with that process.

Assemblyman Daly:

I would like to address a couple of the questions that have been brought up. Assemblywoman Neal and I worked with Mr. Hardy and the City of Mesquite on the modifications. There was a lengthy discussion concerning the Municipal Court Judge. I did not like that the Municipal Court Judge was appointed, but I understand that Mesquite's population is not large and a Justice of the Peace is sufficient. The currently appointed part-time individual is doing a good job, but the prior individual was not. Mesquite needs the authority to remove an individual if they are not performing the job properly. We agreed when the city reaches the population point and the need for two departments arises that both Municipal Court Judge positions will be elected, and the elections will be staggered. I am satisfied with the current status of the Municipal Court in Mesquite.

The charter language concerning bill drafts is modeled after the Carson City Charter. After the City Charter Committee has made their charter recommendations to the City Council and the City Council agrees, they may use their bill draft. If Mesquite wants to use their bill draft for something else, they may solicit a bill draft. If the City Council is not in agreement with the recommendations, then the City Charter Committee may solicit their own bill draft, but it must be disclosed that the recommendations were not adopted by the City Council.

Chairman Flores:

I want to thank the sponsors and everyone who worked behind the scenes to get this bill where it is now. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 56.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman Daly will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 56. I will open the work session for Senate Bill 138 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 138 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the creation of a local improvement district for a waterfront maintenance project. (BDR 22-678)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 138 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Hardy and heard in this Committee on May 8, 2017.

The bill authorizes a county, city, or unincorporated town to establish a local improvement district to fund a waterfront maintenance project, the purpose of which is to provide ongoing repairs or maintenance in relation to a public body of water or public property that is located along the shore of a public body of water. A waterfront maintenance project may be

combined in the same district with a waterfront project. This bill prohibits the acquisition of a waterfront maintenance project if the local government receives written objections to the project from owners of tracts in the proposed assessment district constituting 50 percent of the basis for the computation of assessments ([Exhibit D](#)). There were no amendments to this bill.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 138 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Woodbury will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 138 (1st Reprint). I will open the work session for Senate Bill 282 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 282 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to peace officers.
(BDR 23-539)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 282 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Segerblom and heard in this Committee on May 15, 2017.

The bill revises provisions relating to the rights of peace officers. In an administrative proceeding or civil action against a peace officer, if evidence was obtained in willful and intentional violation of the peace officer's rights, the evidence is inadmissible and the arbitrator, hearing officer, or court shall exclude the evidence and enter an order ruling that the entire investigation is void and abated; mandating the removal of information relating to the investigation from the administrative file of the peace officer; and dismissing the proceeding or action against the peace officer. Finally, the bill prohibits, with certain exceptions, a law enforcement agency from keeping or making a record of any inadmissible evidence from an investigation that is abated pursuant to an order by an arbitrator, a hearing officer, or the court [page 1, ([Exhibit E](#))].

There were two amendments presented at the hearing. The first amendment was sponsored by Senator Segerblom [pages 2 through 5, ([Exhibit E](#))]. The second amendment was presented by Chuck Callaway of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and defines "willful and intentional" [page 6, ([Exhibit E](#))].

Chairman Flores:

I would like to invite law enforcement to the table to confirm that the amendment is friendly and supported.

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3:

I confirm we are in agreement.

Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

I confirm we are in agreement.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada; and representing the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:

We have met with law enforcement management and worked out this amendment. I confirm we are in agreement.

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

I confirm we are in agreement. We appreciate everyone's work.

Chairman Flores:

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I received the amendment this morning and would like to speak with the sponsor. I will vote to move the bill out of Committee, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman Kramer:

When the bill was previously discussed [Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, May 15, 2017] someone made a really good comment: if you want the perception that things are going right, you have to make sure that there are no cover-ups. I was afraid that things could happen and go wrong, and then those things could not be talked about, which implies there is a cover-up. However, those things cannot be discussed because they would then be inadmissible. Have the parties agreed to a resolution in those cases?

Chuck Callaway:

Both amendments provide a balance concerning the evidence. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 289 provides rights to peace officers. If the evidence obtained is in violation of NRS Chapter 289, it is inadmissible. Management has the ability to have an independent investigation that does not violate NRS Chapter 289, and that evidence is admissible. The amendments provide a balance that we are comfortable with.

Assemblyman Kramer:

I understand suppressing the evidence if an officer's rights were violated, but a third party may ask the same question, and that evidence could be used to further the investigation. That is concerning.

Chuck Callaway:

Yes, that is correct. For example, a first-line sergeant tells the officer, You are going to talk to me. The officer states they want their representative. The first-line sergeant replies, Hey, we have been friends for too long, I want an answer. The officer confesses to some misconduct. The case is turned over to internal affairs for an independent investigation where all of the officer's rights are adhered to. The evidence gained from the first-line sergeant is inadmissible because the officer's request for a representative was denied. The amendment defines "willful and intentional." The scope is narrowed when this is applied. The first-line sergeant would have to know he was violating the officer's rights and then does it anyway. The amendment provides for the burden of proof to be on the officer who alleges it occurred. The arbitrator would have to look at that definition and determine if it was willful and intentional. It strikes a balance and protects both sides; management and the employees.

Assemblyman Kramer:

That was my main concern.

Ron Dreher:

Following up on Police Director Callaway's example, I must emphasize that we would object to evidence from an initial violation being used after a first-line sergeant willfully and intentionally violated an officer's rights. We are not opposed if the investigation is independent. There are two issues. First, evidence cannot be used if the officer's rights were willfully and intentionally violated. Second, if a new investigation occurs and the evidence is discovered, then it may be used.

Senator Segerblom:

If an officer wore a body camera or something of that nature, that would be publicly available. The bill does not prevent information or evidence such as that from public exposure.

Assemblyman Marchant:

You may have just covered my question. During the bill hearing, a situation was described where an officer arrived on a scene that the officer was not dispatched to. Management had access to the evidence on the officer's body camera. Do the amendments satisfy this situation?

Ron Dreher:

We are satisfied. The body camera belongs to the department, and so the camera footage belongs to the department. The body camera stands on its own in our opinion. We are not contesting that. We are contesting if an officer is questioned and the officer's rights are violated.

Assemblyman Ellison:

One of the questions brought up at the hearing pertained to paid leave. If an officer is found to be in violation, would they still be subject to paid leave? Is it determined by the investigation whether they are paid or not paid?

Ron Dreher:

The issue of pay would be contained in the collective bargaining agreement. The words "except for" are described in a collective bargaining agreement. We are asking for that part to be removed because NRS 289.090 covers the situations where an officer is put on administrative leave without pay. The situation I articulated at the hearing was an administrative investigation of an officer. The officer would not be placed on administrative leave without pay until the administrative investigation was complete. It does not stop a criminal investigation or another entity placing the officer on leave without pay. That is the administrative investigation portion covered under NRS 289.057.

Chuck Callaway:

For the record, if there are two simultaneous investigations such as an internal investigation of misconduct and a criminal investigation, the officer could be relieved of duty without pay based on the criminal investigation. The statute provides for that, but there was some confusion.

Ron Dreher:

We concur with that.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass with both amendments; the one proposed by Senator Segerblom and the other by Chuck Callaway.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 282 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Woodbury:

My vote was no for the original bill, but I will vote yes in good faith to move the bill out of Committee based on what I just heard. I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I will vote no, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman Marchant:

I will ditto Assemblywoman Woodbury's statement.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I will ditto Assemblywoman Woodbury's statement.

Chairman Flores:

Is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 282 (1st Reprint). Senate Bill 357 (1st Reprint) will be rolled over to tomorrow's agenda.

Senate Bill 357 (1st Reprint): Restricts certain state and local governmental agencies from performing certain actions relating to immigration enforcement. (BDR 14-748)

[Senate Bill 357 (1st Reprint) was not heard on May 18, 2017.] In its place, we will vote on Senate Bill 356 (1st Reprint) later this morning. I will open the work session on Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint): Authorizes a board of county commissioners to create a committee to review general improvement districts. (BDR 20-496)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System and heard in this Committee on May 8, 2017.

The bill authorizes a board of county commissioners to create a committee to review the existing general improvement districts in the county to determine whether the districts should be continued, modified, consolidated, merged, or dissolved. Each committee is limited to reviewing not more than six general improvement districts in a county per year and must submit a report to the Legislative Commission on or before July 1 of each year regarding its activities and findings. The bill sets forth certain information that each general improvement district under review by a committee may be required to provide to the committee ([Exhibit F](#)). There are no amendments to this bill.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 462 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman McArthur will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint). I will open the work session on Senate Bill 471 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 471 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to improvement districts. (BDR 25-495)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 471 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System and heard in this Committee on May 8, 2017.

The bill revises the Nevada Improvement District Act and abolishes the last remaining district formed under the Act. The Douglas County Lake Tahoe Sewer Authority Act is established, and it creates the Douglas County Lake Tahoe Sewer Authority for the purpose of furnishing certain residents of this state with an adequate system of sewage collection and treatment and disposal of wastewater. The Authority is authorized to enter into certain interlocal cooperative agreements with general improvement districts. The Douglas County Lake Tahoe Sewer Authority assumes the debts, obligations, liabilities, and assets of Douglas County Sewer Improvement District No. 1. The bill requires the submission of the question of merger, consolidation, or dissolution to the board of trustees of a general improvement district with annual revenues of more than \$1 million that was, on October 1, 2005, exercising any of three specified powers related to sanitary sewer improvements; the collection and disposal of garbage or refuse; or the supply, storage, and distribution of water. If the board of trustees of the district does not agree to the merger, consolidation, or dissolution within 90 days after the submission of the question to the board of trustees, existing law prohibits the merger, consolidation, or dissolution of the district [page 1, ([Exhibit G](#))].

There is one amendment [pages 2 through 44, ([Exhibit G](#))] that requires the Authority to enter into an agreement with certain public entities within its service area to administer the collection of sewage and wastewater. The amendment also prohibits the Authority from merging or consolidating with a general improvement district unless it is approved by a majority of the owners of property within the service area and by resolution of the board of trustees of the Authority.

Chairman Flores:

I am going to ask our legal counsel to walk this Committee through the amendment and any additional information available.

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

My understanding of the amendment as it relates to section 30 of the bill is that if an existing public entity within the boundaries of the service area of the new Authority is already performing the activities of collection of sewage and wastewater as of the effective date of this act, which is October 1, 2017, the newly created Authority may not engage in that activity except pursuant to a cooperative or interlocal agreement with the other entity. With respect to the merger or consolidation provision, basically under existing law, a general improvement district cannot be merged or consolidated if a majority of the owners of property within the district file protests against the merger or consolidation. Because that is existing law, that is not addressed by this amendment. However, the amendment provides on that issue that in order for the Authority to merge with a general improvement district, a majority of the owners of property located in the service area of the new Authority must give their approval to the merger or consolidation, and the merger or consolidation must occur pursuant to a resolution of the board. That is the sum of the amendment.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 471 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Neal will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 471 (1st Reprint). I will open the work session on Senate Bill 356 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 356 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to collective bargaining.
(BDR 23-1132)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 356 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Atkinson and heard in this Committee on May 9, 2017.

The bill makes various changes relating to collective bargaining, including but not limited to increasing the amount of time within the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board within the Department of Business and Industry when they must conduct a hearing related to certain complaints; eliminating the restrictions on the continuation of collective bargaining agreements beyond their expiration date, thereby reinstating the ability of the parties to a collective bargaining agreement to include an evergreen provision;

providing for a principal, assistant principal, or other school administrator below the rank of superintendent, associate superintendent, or assistant superintendent to participate in collective bargaining; reinstating the requirement for negotiation sessions as well as the requirement to hold a hearing within 30 days after the selection of the arbitrator and seven days after the notice of the parties; finally, eliminating various restrictions and deadlines on arbitration. There are no amendments to this bill.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 356 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, KRAMER,
MARCHANT, MCARTHUR, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

Assemblyman Ellison:

I would like to meet with the bill sponsors. I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Joiner will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 356 (1st Reprint). I will open the work session on Senate Bill 79 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 79 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning the confidentiality of certain personal information of certain persons and entities. (BDR 20-400)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 79 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Nevada Supreme Court and heard in this Committee on May 2, 2017.

The bill adds to the list of persons and entities authorized to request that certain personal information contained in the records of a county assessor, county recorder, the Secretary of State, or a county or city clerk remain confidential. These persons include any senior justice or senior judge; any court-appointed master; any prosecutor; any state or county public defender; and the spouse, domestic partner, or minor child of any of these people listed. Additionally, a nonprofit entity that maintains a confidential location for the purpose of providing shelter to victims of domestic violence may request that certain personal information remain confidential. Similarly, the bill adds those persons to the list of those authorized to request that the Department of Motor Vehicles display an alternate address on the person's driver's license, commercial driver's license, or identification card [page 1, [\(Exhibit H\)](#)].

There is one amendment to this bill [pages 2 through 14, ([Exhibit H](#))] proposed by Assemblywoman Neal. The amendment adds legislators, any peace officer or retired peace officer, and any firefighter to the provisions of the bill. The amendment also generally requires a request to make personal information confidential to include evidence of a risk of harm warranting the request.

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

As Mr. McDonald indicated, the amendment generally raises the standard of the showing that is required in order to preserve the confidentiality of these records. You will notice, for example, the change made to section 5 of the amendment [page 3, ([Exhibit H](#))] provides that instead of simply setting forth sufficient justification for the request, the requestor must set forth evidence of threats or other evidence of a risk of harm warranting the request. There was one section in the bill that the language was not added but should have been added. That is in section 21, subsection 1, paragraph (b) [page 10, ([Exhibit H](#))]. That language should be changed to correspond with the language elsewhere in the bill.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Members, it is your prerogative to accept or not accept these changes. It was brought up during the hearing because a clerk of a court filed for this confidentiality. I feel that if they are included, then why not legislators. I think as public servants we sign on for these risks and there is a need to increase the burden of proof because it cannot be random or an act of removing yourself. It must be for a legitimate purpose of a threat or harm to you or your family. There has been an incident in this particular legislative session where one of our legislators received real threats of harm or injury to their family, and they needed police support. I felt the amendment was necessary because of the recent event this session.

Chairman Flores:

Is there any discussion? Is there a member of this body who has an issue with this amendment?

Assemblyman Kramer:

My concern is that we are creating a special class of citizens. If an individual works for the courts, district attorney, sheriff's office, or is a legislator, then suddenly different rules apply. I will vote yes to move the bill out of Committee, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chairman Flores:

We have a ditto from Assemblyman Ellison and Assemblyman Marchant. For the record, Assemblyman Kramer will probably be a no. If the Committee wishes to move forward with the amendment from Assemblywoman Neal, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass. If not, I will take the bill as it stands. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 79 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Neal will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 79 (1st Reprint). Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas here for public comment? [There was no one.] This meeting is adjourned [at 10:50 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Carol Myers
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 56](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 138 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 282 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 462 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 471 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 79 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.