

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 30, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 10:15 a.m. on Tuesday, May 30, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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:

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.
Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada
Scott A. Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers' Association
Steve Grammas, President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Michelle Jotz, Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Rusty McAllister, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Thomas Morley, representing Local 872, Laborers' International Union of North America
Todd Ingalsbee, Legislative Representative, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Tess Opferman, representing Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees, Inc.; and Local 1107, Service Employees International Union Nevada
Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association
Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Ryan Beaman, President, Clark County Firefighters, Union Local 1908
Mary C. Walker, representing Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, and Storey County

Chairman Flores:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have one bill hearing and one bill on work session. When we complete today's agenda, we will recess to the call of the chair. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 290.

**Assembly Bill 290: Makes various changes relating to collective bargaining.
(BDR 23-35)**

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39:

I will present Assembly Bill 290 in its amended form. The proposed amendment is number 5026 ([Exhibit C](#)). All the language has been struck out except for section 8.3, and we are using a different *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) chapter. Thank you to the Committee for allowing us to do that.

Chairman Flores and members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, I am here today to request your support for A.B. 290. This legislation will revise NRS 288.225 by clarifying existing concession language regarding employee organization leave time. If leave time existed in a collective bargaining agreement prior to June 1, 2015, the employee organization or union shall be deemed to have made the concessions to offset the past, present, and future cost of such leave for the number of employees to whom such leave was approved as of that date. New employee organizations or associations adding to their existing release time shall pay the full cost of such leave or provide concessions to offset those employee costs.

I would like to simplify what I have just said by saying A.B. 290 codifies what is in practice now, and the organization doing the bargaining will actually pay for the leave time of the employee who is working on their behalf. For example, a municipal or a county employee will not be charged. This is the current practice and A.B. 290 will codify it. I was approached before this hearing, and The Chamber, Reno-Sparks-Northern Nevada and the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce gave me permission to state their support on the record. Presenting this bill today will be Rick McCann, Mike Ramirez, and Ron Dreher.

Richard P. McCann, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:

I am a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. We would like to thank Assemblymen Wheeler, Ellison, Hambrick, and Kramer for bringing this bill forward. They have permitted us to work with their bill to advance this very important legislation. Also, thank you to Assemblyman Paul Anderson for his support of this amendment.

In 2015, Senate Bill 241 of the 78th Session was passed. It was an attempt to reform collective bargaining. The purpose was to force employee associations to the bargaining table by removing incentives, which would allow the negotiating of contracts in a timely manner. There were three principal parts of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. The first was to bring an end to the evergreen clause. That language existed within labor contracts and extended the current contract, allowing contractual rights and obligations to survive beyond the contract's expiration date, including giving public employee raises. Second, it prohibited retroactive payment of compensation and benefits after the contract has expired unless negotiated between the parties. Third, it allowed the labor associations to have "union leave time" to conduct the important business of the association, including negotiating their own contracts, only if they continue to pay or provide new concessions in exchange for those union hours. Today, we are discussing number three. We are not here to discuss the evergreen clause or retroactivity of salary and benefits.

Personally, I testified against number three in 2015. Assembly Bill 290 is not repealing S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. This bill will not roll back the evergreen clause or retroactivity. This bill seeks to advance the logic of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session and get employee associations to the bargaining table, as was the intent of the sponsors of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. How will that be accomplished by A.B. 290?

I represent about 20 separate law enforcement employee associations across Nevada. Many of those associations are small groups of 5, 11, 15, 26, 30, 59, or 74 members. Like each of my law enforcement associations, these groups have previously negotiated their union leave time, and they rely on that time to get to the bargaining table and negotiate new contracts. In other words, they need time to fulfill the goals of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. They cannot pay more for their leave time than they have already given. They have no money; they have no concessions to give. They should not have to take their vacation, days off, or sick time to negotiate their contracts. They may work nights, weekends, or holidays and many times the employers will not accommodate them. Ask yourself this question, how will the employee associations get to the bargaining table without time to get to the bargaining table?

The term "unintended consequence" is overused in this building, but it is part of the legacy of S.B. 241 of the 78th Legislative Session, which intended to get the employee associations to the bargaining table, while at the same time standing in the way of that. That is not fair. They cannot get to the bargaining table unless they are provided the opportunity, the means, and the tools to get there. That is all we are asking. For two years, we have experienced the unintended consequences of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. Assembly Bill 290 is a paragraph remedy. This amended version of A.B. 290 ([Exhibit C](#)) does not seek to turn the clock back on the premise of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session; rather it retains the purpose and intent of the framers and fixes one small part. Accordingly, we fully support A.B. 290, and we urge this Committee to do the same.

Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.:

I am a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. We would like to thank Assemblyman Wheeler and others for allowing us to use this bill and for sponsoring it. We do not want to repeal S.B. 241 of the 78th Session; we would like to clarify its effective date. The language clarifies any future cost of going forward. Clark County may testify today, and they have had two collective bargaining sessions since S.B. 241 of the 78th Session. Both parties made their concessions. The legislation works, but the effective date needs clarification in the statutes. I ditto and echo the same sentiment of Mr. McCann's testimony. We urge your support, and as Assemblyman Wheeler mentioned, we spoke to different entities, such as the chambers, to ensure everyone is on board with A.B. 290.

Ronald P. Dreher, Government Affairs Director, Peace Officers Research Association of Nevada:

I am a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. We would like to thank Assemblymen Wheeler, Ellison, Hambrick, and Kramer for bringing this bill forward. Also, thank you to Assemblyman Paul Anderson for meeting with us and hearing our side of the story. I will echo the comments of Assemblyman Wheeler, Mr. McCann, and Mr. Ramirez in asking for your support for A.B. 290.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I am reading the existing statute NRS 288.225. Section 8.3, subsection 2 of the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) states, "For the purposes of this section, if such leave was provided by a local government employer as of June 1, 2015, the employee organization shall be deemed to have made concessions to offset the past, present and future costs of such leave for the number of employees to whom such leave was provided as of that date." How is the future cost of leave offset if it has not occurred yet?

Ron Dreher:

That language explains what occurred prior to June 1, 2015. It provides that concessions were made and that those concessions concerning leave are in effect. Any leave thereafter will be borne by the employee associations. That is the purpose of section 8.3, subsection 2.

Assemblywoman Neal:

Please walk me through an example of how that works.

Ron Dreher:

Prior to June 1, 2015, an association had six members on its bargaining team who were released for the negotiation. Concessions were made by the employee association to provide leave for those six members. After June 1, 2015, a new negotiation began, and the employee association added two new members to its bargaining team. The employee association will pay for those two new members, but the other six members are paid through the concessions that were made prior to June 1, 2015. That is a real-life example.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I would like to know what situation occurred under NRS 288.225.

Ron Dreher:

The situation is ongoing from years past. The employee associations made concessions for union leave. Since S.B. 241 of the 78th Session, the language in NRS 288.225 has caused some confusion with its interpretation. We are making sense of the first paragraph by adding the language in section 8.3, subsection 2 to the first paragraph of NRS 288.225.

Assemblywoman Neal:

The language is codifying a prior practice and the expectations of what it is supposed to mean.

Mike Ramirez:

Prior to 2015 and prior to S.B. 241 of the 78th Session taking effect, there were no issues. Our treasurer looked up old notes from bargaining negotiations in 1988 and 1994. Those negotiations contained a concession of 1 percent to add another member to an employee association's bargaining team. Instead of receiving a 4 percent raise, they received a 3 percent raise. The process has worked this way long before my time as a policeman and since 1973 when the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department was incorporated.

After June 1, 2015, S.B. 241 of the 78th Session became effective. Now the employee associations are paying for the leave of their existing bargaining team members when they had previously made concessions for them to attend the negotiation. In 2011, the employee associations conceded longevity. Longevity compounded over 30 years is over \$800 million. That, in and of itself, would pay for 50 members. Prior to A.B. 290, concessions were made. We are asking from this day forward if employee associations want to add additional members, they will make concessions for those members. Concessions have already been made for existing members.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I would like to know what this means for local government. I will use North Las Vegas as an example, because they are an entity that may be cash-strapped. The employee association made concessions in the past. After 2015, North Las Vegas can no longer support the concession. How would North Las Vegas interpret this language?

Mike Ramirez:

Let me add to your scenario. There are 300 officers, and every officer receives eight hours of sick time. Those hours are banked and released to provide the leave concession if the money was not available.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to speak in support of A.B. 290?

Scott A. Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers' Association:

I represent the corrections officers at the Clark County Detention Center, and I am the president of the Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs, which represents the majority of the southern Nevada law enforcement organizations. We wholeheartedly support this bill.

In response to Assemblywoman Neal's question about local governments' ability to pay for the leave concession, prior to 2015, we had a pool of hours. Our contract expired after S.B. 241 of the 78th Session became law, and the City of Las Vegas required us to negotiate for those hours. Many of my colleagues throughout the state have stated their employee associations have had to repay hours negotiated in previous contracts after their current

contract expired. Assembly Bill 290 clarifies the intent of S.B. 241 of the 78th Session, which is hours prior to S.B. 241 of the 78th Session were previously negotiated, and if additional hours or people are needed going forward, we will come to an agreement with the employer.

In 2008, the City of Las Vegas went through major financial hardships. Hand in hand with the city, we worked out some compromises. The groups I am aware of have always tried to help the local governmental entities as much as possible to make sure they are doing well. At the end of the day, they are our employer, and without the employer, we would not have any negotiations to attend.

Assemblywoman Neal:

If an employee association has repaid what it already paid for, how does this provision work going forward? Will the employee association receive credit for something it has technically paid twice for?

Scott Edwards:

I would say whatever had been negotiated prior, the employee association would get credit for those hours. We will work that out going forward as we have done with everything else.

Steve Grammas, President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:

I would like to thank everyone who has supported and worked hard on A.B. 290. We echo the sentiment from those who testified today and wholeheartedly support A.B. 290.

Michelle Jotz, Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association:

I am a member of the Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs and the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. I would like to thank Assemblyman Wheeler for his willingness to entertain our participation and the changes to this bill. Regarding the question about double paying, from our position, we will write off the monies we have paid to this point and start fresh going forward. I cannot speak to the other organizations that are having to come out of pocket. We are in support of the amended bill.

[Assemblywoman Neal assumed the Chair.]

Rusty McAllister, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO:

We are in support of the amended version of A.B. 290. For clarification, the language that we are discussing today is language that I came up with the last session. Senate Bill 241 of the 78th Session was sponsored by Senator Roberson. He was gracious enough to allow an amendment stating, ". . . providing services for an employee organization if the full cost of such leave is paid or reimbursed by the employee organization or is offset by the value of concessions made by the employee organization in the negotiation of an agreement with the local government employer pursuant to this chapter." [Senate Amendment No. 608 to Senate Bill 241 (1st Reprint) of the 78th Session.]

The term "offset" was used because we understand that when negotiating contracts, nothing is free. Everything an employee association requests has a value associated with it. If the request is for a 2 percent raise, the local government's finance person plugs the numbers into the computer, and they can tell their lead negotiator exactly what the value of that would be. Nothing is for free; there is always a value to an item whether giving or receiving. If there is leave time in our contracts, we would have negotiated it. If the issue has been negotiated and paid for, we do not want to negotiate and pay for it again. For example, if a 0.5 percent pay raise was negotiated, then it remains in perpetuity every year going forward. That is the purpose of section 8.3, subsection 2 stating, ". . . and future costs of such leave" That is the reasoning behind the language, and Senator Roberson was gracious enough to allow us to do that.

The problems arose after the 78th Legislative Session because of how the local governmental entities interpreted the language. They took it as the leave concession must be negotiated every time we are at the bargaining table. That means the employee association is paying multiple times for that concession. The amendment to A.B. 290 will clarify and codify if leave was negotiated prior to June 1, 2015, it has been paid for. We stand in support of A.B. 290.

Thomas Morley, representing Local 872, Laborers' International Union of North America:

We support this bill as well as our brothers and sisters in law enforcement.

Todd Ingalsbee, Legislative Representative, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

We would like to thank Assemblyman Wheeler for bringing this bill forward, and we support it. We are not trying to receive any additional benefits, but we are trying to maintain the benefits we had prior to our 2015 concessions. If we require additional benefits, we will receive those through negotiations.

Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO:

We would like to thank Assemblyman Wheeler, Assemblyman Kramer, Assemblyman Hambrick, and Assemblyman Ellison for facilitating the clarifying language in section 8.3, subsection 2. In 2015, NRS 288.225 was amended, and A.B. 290 will aid both parties in going forward with negotiations. We support this bill as the Local 4041, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and as members of the AFL-CIO and the Public Employees Coalition.

Tess Opferman, representing Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees, Inc.; and Local 1107, Service Employees International Union Nevada:

We would like to state our support and thank the sponsors for bringing this bill forward.

[Assemblyman Flores reassumed the Chair.]

Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association:

I am a special education teacher, and we represent 40,000 employees throughout the state. We support the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to A.B. 290. We support our union brothers and sisters, and we understand the unintended consequences of the leave. It impacts our local affiliates and us as a state organization.

Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

I am the collective bargaining agent for academic faculty at the College of Southern Nevada. We support A.B. 290 and ditto to the previous testimony of those in support.

Ryan Beaman, President, Clark County Firefighters, Union Local 1908:

We appreciate Assemblyman Wheeler bringing this important piece of legislation forward and clarifying it. We are in support of A.B. 290.

Mary C. Walker, representing Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County, and Storey County:

We are in support of A.B. 290 as it is amended. We believe this is a reasonable compromise, and we appreciate Assemblyman Wheeler, the cosponsors, and the unions for working this out.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 290? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Assemblyman Wheeler, do you have any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Thank you for allowing us to present A.B. 290. As you have heard, there is no opposition to the bill. We still need to get it over to the Senate, and if you have not changed your Committee rules, I would love for you to vote this out of Committee today.

Assemblyman Ellison:

For the record, what will be the impact to the local governments?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

The impact will fall on the employee association and not the local government.

Chairman Flores:

For clarification, should we maintain your name and the sponsor's name on the bill?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Yes.

Chairman Flores:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 290. I will open the work session for A.B. 290. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 290.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman McCurdy will take the floor statement. I will open the work session for Assembly Bill 475.

Assembly Bill 475: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 31-975)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 475 is sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor and was heard in this Committee on April 7, 2017.

The bill requires the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada to establish the Nevada College Kick Start Program to create college savings accounts for pupils enrolled in kindergarten in public schools in Nevada who are residents of Nevada. The bill requires the Board, within limits of money available for this purpose, to deposit money in the accounts to be used for the costs of higher education of pupils. Additionally, the bill also requires the Board to adopt regulations for the implementation of the Program and authorizes the Board to apply for and accept gifts, grants, and donations to carry out the Program. The bill limits the purposes for which the State Treasurer is authorized to expend money in the Endowment Account only to purposes related to the Nevada College Kick Start Program or the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program.

Finally, the bill requires the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada to transfer to the Endowment Account the balance in the account of a pupil created under the Nevada College Kick Start Program that has not been accessed by a parent or guardian of the pupil by the time the pupil is enrolled in the third grade or which otherwise has not been used within the time prescribed by regulation ([Exhibit D](#)).

There is one proposed amendment [pages 3 through 7, ([Exhibit D](#))]. This amendment was submitted by Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson. The amendment makes the following changes: it extends from third grade to fifth grade the time parents or guardians have to access a college savings account; it revises the composition of the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada by increasing the number of members appointed by the Governor from two to three, making the State Treasurer an ex officio nonvoting member; and it requires the Board to elect a Chair from among the members of the Board. It expands the sources of money for the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Trust Fund to include a loan made for the purposes of fiscal stabilization of the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Program and expands and clarifies the use of the money in the Endowment Account to include expenditures for the purposes of funding college savings accounts created under the Nevada College Kick Start Program, the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program, the payment of certain administrative and marketing costs, and the costs of providing financial education programs to residents of this state.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 475.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Flores:

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

If the bill goes forward with the amendment, I will vote no.

Assemblyman Marchant:

Ditto.

Assemblyman Kramer:

I also have some issues with the amendment, specifically section 6, subsection 5, paragraph (d). Without any discussion, I will vote no.

Chairman Flores:

The bill sponsor is not in the room. Therefore, your no vote is justified.

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

[([Exhibit E](#)) was submitted but not presented and will become part of the record.]

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Joiner will take the floor statement. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas here for public comment? [There was no one.] I am anticipating we will be getting together at least one more time today. We are in recess [at 10:54 a.m.].

[The Committee reconvened behind the bar of the Assembly at 6:19 p.m. There was a quorum present.]

Chairman Flores:

I would like to call the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs back to order. I will open the work session on Assembly Bill 515.

Assembly Bill 515: Revises provisions governing payday lending. (BDR 52-1227)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 515 is sponsored by Assemblyman Frierson and Assemblywoman Swank and was heard in this Committee on May 29, 2017.

The bill requires the Commissioner of Financial Institutions to develop, implement, and maintain, by contract with a vendor or service provider or otherwise, a database of all deferred deposit loans and title loans in this state. A licensee who makes such loans must enter and update certain information concerning each deferred deposit loan and title loan made by the licensee. Further, the bill requires the Commissioner to establish a fee, which must be charged and collected by the vendor or service provider from a licensee who is required to enter information into the database. The fee must be used to pay for the administration and operation of the database ([Exhibit F](#)).

There is one amendment to the bill [page 2, ([Exhibit F](#))]. The conceptual amendment makes the following changes: it requires that information relating to any high-interest loan as defined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 604A.0703 also be entered into the database and exempts from the database information about a “long-term high-interest loan” as defined in the conceptual amendment.

Chairman Flores:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 515.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Kramer:

I thought there was an amendment to change the name of a category of loans to something less contentious. Do you know anything about that?

Chairman Flores:

Tennille Pereira, the attorney with the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, mentioned removing a category of loan under the *Nevada Revised Statutes* and putting it into its own stand-alone installment category of loans, but we found that it was not legal.

Jered McDonald:

When the interest rate is above 40 percent, it is classified as a high-interest loan. When it is below 40 percent, it is not classified as a high-interest loan.

Chairman Flores:

We found that it was not germane to the bill, so we scrapped it.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I still have questions about the bill, so I will be voting no, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, MARCHANT,
AND McARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Swank will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on A.B. 515. This meeting is adjourned [at 6:23 p.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 a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 290 presented by Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 475, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated May 30, 2017, regarding Proposed Amendment 4311 to Assembly Bill 475 to Chairman Flores and members of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, authored by Grant Hewitt, Chief of Staff, Office of the State Treasurer.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 515, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.