

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
April 13, 2017**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard Carrillo at 3:24 p.m. on Thursday, April 13, 2017, in Room 3143 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 Richard Carrillo, Chairman
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Linda Van Vranken, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chairman Carrillo:

[Roll was called. Committee protocols and rules were explained.] We will start our work session, dealing with seven bills. I want to remind you that a work session is not a rehearing of a bill. Mr. Stinnesbeck will walk us through the work session document. We will begin with Assembly Bill 29.

Assembly Bill 29: Revises provisions governing off-highway vehicles. (BDR 18-220)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 29 was heard in this Committee on April 11, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).] The bill places the Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. The bill creates the OHVs Program in the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources in order to provide certain support and assistance to the Commission on OHVs and to administer the Account for OHVs. The bill revises the membership of the Commission and provides a procedure for replacing members. The bill requires the Director of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to prepare the mandatory, comprehensive report, which then has to be reviewed and approved by the chair of the Commission before being submitted to the Legislature for each regular session. Lastly, the bill reduces the late fee for reinstating a lapsed OHV registration to \$10.

There is one amendment on the bill that is provided by State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources which revises composition of the membership to the Commission and clarifies the regulations for the program projects that satisfy multiple grant categories and authorizes preventive projects.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 29.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

We have a problem with section 8 of the amendment to the bill [page 2, ([Exhibit C](#))]. I do not know if the maker of the bill would be willing to remove it in order to pass it. If not, I will be voting no.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I agree with my colleague. The part that bothers us is "prevention of impacts . . . by off-highway vehicles." That was not in the original bill, which means the Department of Conservation would be able to keep off-highway vehicles from certain areas. Before I saw this amendment, I was planning to vote yes. Now, I will vote no.

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

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Watkins will make the floor statement.

We will now have the work session on Assembly Bill 68. Before I open the work session, I want to note that we received a last-minute amendment yesterday that lacked adequate information. No one spoke to me or to other Committee members about the amendment; therefore, we will only consider three amendments on A.B. 68.

Assembly Bill 68: Revises provisions governing the administration of laws relating to transportation. (BDR 43-223)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 68 was heard in this Committee on March 21, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).] It rearranges the provisions relating to the confidentiality and authorization for disclosure of certain personal information that is in the possession of Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The bill authorizes the Department to adopt regulations authorizing the operation of vehicles that use advanced technologies. The bill also alters the requirements for certain instruction permits or driver authorization cards to state the full legal name, address of principal residence and mailing address. The bill removes the requirement that the photograph on a driver's license be in color. Assembly Bill 68 also adds to current acts or practices for which the DMV can refuse to issue a license for operating a driving school and requires that a vehicle be inspected within 30 days after initial use by the school. The bill clarifies the fees for a person 65 years

of age or older who applies for an identification card. Lastly, A.B. 68 removes the authorization for the Department to issue a nonresident commercial driver's license or learner's permit to a resident of a foreign jurisdiction that the Federal Highway Administrator has determined does not test drivers and issue commercial drivers' licenses in accordance with federal standards.

There are currently three amendments being considered for this bill. The first is by Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles which removes the sections related to releasing personal information. It also removes the sections relating to autonomous vehicles.

The second amendment is by Assemblyman Carrillo. It removes the provisions concerning requirements of an applicant for instructional permits or certain driver authorization cards to provide certain information.

Lastly, there is an amendment by Mike Alonso, Caesars Entertainment. This amendment allows for advertising on certain structures.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 68.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman McArthur:

I want more time to go over this. I will be voting yes in Committee, but reserve my right to change my vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Sprinkle.

Assembly Bill 252: Authorizes a peace officer or retired peace officer to request the display of an alternate address on his or her driver's license or identification card. (BDR 43-692)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 252 was heard in this Committee on April 11, 2017. [He read from the work session document, ([Exhibit E](#)).] This bill authorizes a peace officer or a retired peace officer to request the display of an alternate address on his or her driver's license, identification card,

commercial driver's license, or commercial learner's permit. The bill requires a peace officer to use as an alternate address his or her employer's address. The bill requires a retired peace officer to provide an alternate address at the time he or she submits the request. Lastly, the bill requires peace officers and retired peace officers to provide Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles their address of principal residence or mailing address for the purpose of recordkeeping and mailing. There are no amendments to this bill.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 252.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblywoman Titus will take the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 322: Revises provisions governing driver authorization cards.
(BDR 43-955)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 322 was heard in this Committee on April 6, 2017. [He read from the work session document, ([Exhibit F](#)).] The bill requires that the regulations which prescribe the date of expiration of a driver's license also prescribe the date of expiration of a driver authorization card and that they must be valid for the same period.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 322.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Flores will make the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 335: Revises provisions governing motor vehicles and off-highway vehicles. (BDR 43-670)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 335 was heard in this Committee on April 6, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).] It authorizes the operation of an unregistered vehicle in certain circumstances. The bill requires a person driving a moped to drive to the right side of the roadway in certain circumstances and prohibits a driver of a motor vehicle from intentionally interfering with a person lawfully riding a moped. Lastly, the bill removes the requirement for a person operating an off-highway vehicle to wear a helmet.

There is one amendment by Assemblyman Carrillo which removes the sections related to operating an unregistered vehicle and operating an off-highway vehicle without a helmet. It revises the moped requirement to drive in the extreme right-hand lane if the highway has two or more lanes for traffic traveling in the same direction. Furthermore, the amendment would add Assemblyman Carrillo as cosponsor to the bill.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 335.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Edwards will take the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 360: Revises provisions governing transportation. (BDR 35-885)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 360 was heard in this Committee on March 30, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).] It authorizes Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) to solicit a person to enter into an agreement with the Department to develop, construct, improve, maintain or operate, or any combination thereof, a transportation facility, if it is determined that there will be a public benefit. The bill appropriates \$30 million to the Department to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing a high-speed rail system between Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada. Lastly, the bill requires the Department to present its findings to the Board of Directors of the Department and to the Legislature. There is one amendment on this bill, brought forward by Assemblyman Marchant. It removes the appropriation, directs Nevada's Department of Transportation to coordinate with the Office of Economic Development, in the Office of the Governor, and reduces the scope of the feasibility study.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 360.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

One of the things that struck me about this bill is that for almost all of it, we do not need a change in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The one thing that could require a change in NRS is the ability for the Department of Transportation to solicit public-private partnerships, whereas currently they cannot. If someone comes to them with a proposal, they are then allowed to look for additional participants. It is a slight nuance, but because most of what is covered in this can already be done, I will be voting no.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

In the opposite fashion, during the bill hearing I had a lot of questions about what we were trying to accomplish. While I do not disagree with my colleague and the comment she just made, I think the thing that has gotten me to a place where I will vote for this bill is allowing NDOT to investigate the needs for transportation projects to a greater degree. I hope they utilize what we do here today to look at transportation as a whole, not just a high-speed corridor between Reno and Las Vegas. I will be voting yes.

Chairman Carrillo:

There is no further discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL VOTED NO.)

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Marchant will take the floor statement.

I would like to invite Mr. MacKay to come up and clarify the amendment that was added to Assembly Bill 410.

Assembly Bill 410: Authorizing a new vehicle dealer to file a claim for compensation with a manufacturer of motor vehicles under certain circumstances. (BDR 43-1024)

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

Are there specific parts of the amendment that you want me to address? [He references the work session document and amendment ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Fumo had a question that would best be addressed to you.

Assemblyman Fumo:

During the hearing, my question related to when a stop-sale notification was issued through the manufacturer. The bill seemed to indicate that a dealer could still sell such a vehicle. The sponsor of the bill explained to me how that works, and based on our conversation I am in favor of the bill.

Andy MacKay:

The language is correct. There are limited circumstances in which a manufacturer will permit a dealer to sell a vehicle that is still subject to a stop-sale order. The manufacturer may authorize the dealer to wholesale it or sell it under certain circumstances when disclosures are made. When we pulled the language from the bill being drafted in Oregon, we thought it was an error in drafting. It is not. I gave the Committee some bum information when Assemblyman Fumo asked a question relating to prohibitions to sell vehicles subject to stop-sale orders if you are a used car dealer. There is not anything in federal law that prohibits that.

Assemblyman Fumo:

My issue had been that it was a public safety issue if we were selling vehicles that should not be on the road. With the explanation that disclosures would be made, I am no longer concerned. I realize that most of such vehicles are going to auctions, and not being sold to the public.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion on Assembly Bill 410.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 410.

ASSEMBLYMAN FUMO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

I will give the floor statement to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams.

[Assembly Bill 442](#): Revises provisions governing the redesign of certain special license plates. (BDR 43-476)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 442 was heard in this Committee on April 11, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).] It authorizes an organization that is the beneficiary of

a special license plate to apply for a redesign of the special license plate. The bill limits the organization to apply for a redesign not more than every five years. The bill requires the Commission on Special License Plates to recommend to Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles that the Department approve or disapprove an application for such a redesign. The bill authorizes a holder of the original design of a special license plate that has been redesigned to renew and retain his or her original special license plate or obtain the redesigned special license plate. The bill makes conforming changes to the fee structure for obtaining an original or redesigned special license plate. Lastly, the bill specifies that the redesign of a special license plate is not considered a separate design for the purposes of the limitations on the numbers of special license plates that Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles may issue at any one time. There are currently no amendments on this bill.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 442.

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblywoman Spiegel will take the floor statement.

**Assembly Bill 445: Revises provisions governing transportation network companies.
(BDR 57-1027)**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 445 was heard in this Committee on April 6, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)).] The bill revises current prohibitions for insurers to refuse motor vehicle insurance to a driver for a transportation network company (TNC). The bill requires TNC insurance to provide for the medical payments coverage of the driver and any passenger. The bill requires a driver for a TNC to obtain a state business registration from Nevada's Secretary of State and requires the Nevada Transportation Authority to share driver information. Lastly, the bill prohibits a driver for a TNC from refusing to complete a transportation service and makes the driver and TNC liable for an administrative fine.

There is one amendment by Assemblyman Watkins. The amendment revises insurance protection to only apply to a driver during personal use of the motor vehicle, reduces the minimum bodily injury insurance and medical payment coverage, revises the administrative fine to be no more than \$1,000, and changes the effective date to July 1, 2018.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Watkins would like to talk about his amendment to the bill.

Assemblyman Watkins:

There was some confusion that was brought to my attention. I want to make it clear on the record. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a) appears to show new language, "For the payment of tort liabilities arising from the maintenance or use of the motor vehicle" [page 3, ([Exhibit K](#))]. That is actually existing language as you will see in the stricken section in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (2) that used to apply to section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) collectively. All of the coverages being discussed were liability coverages. We added medical payments coverage, which is a nonliability coverage; it is no-fault coverage. We had to separate out the difference between liability coverages and no-fault coverages. The header is not intended to change the character or nature of any of the coverages in existing law.

Chairman Carrillo:

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO
AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 445.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblyman Watkins will take the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 485: Makes various changes relating to school buses. (BDR 43-36)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 485 was heard in this Committee on April 11, 2017. [He read from the work session document ([Exhibit L](#)).] The bill requires that any new school bus that is purchased by a school district or a private school on or after July 1, 2017, must be equipped with federally approved shoulder-harness-type safety belts for each permanent seating position for passengers. The bill transfers the requirement of inspecting public and private school buses from Nevada's Department of Motor Vehicles to the Department of Public Safety (DPS). Lastly, the bill revises the definition of school bus to "carry more than 10 passengers" in order to more closely comport with the definition in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations and makes conforming changes to laws related to school buses.

There are three amendments for this bill. One was put forward by the Friends of ACE Charter High School which exempts from the definition of "school bus" those vehicles to be defined as "multi-function school activity buses" that are not used for transporting students to or from their homes. The second is by the Clark County School District which revises

the effective date concerning seat belts in school buses to July 1, 2019. The last amendment is from Nevada's Department of Public Safety which revises the semiannual inspection requirement by DPS that only applies to school buses as defined in section 1.

Chairman Carrillo:
Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MADE A MOTION TO
AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 485.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:
I will take the floor statement.

If you need time to look over the amendment to Assembly Bill 334, we can allow for that. Assemblywoman Spiegel has had conversations with the bill sponsor regarding an amendment to the bill. I believe they came to an agreement.

Assembly Bill 334: Prohibits a driver from operating a motor vehicle in the extreme left lane of a highway under certain circumstances. (BDR 43-154)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 334 was heard in this Committee on March 28, 2017. [He read from work session document ([Exhibit M](#)).] Assembly Bill 334, with certain exceptions, prohibits a driver on a highway with two or more lanes for traffic traveling in the same direction to continue to operate a motor vehicle in the extreme left lane if the driver perceives to be overtaken in that lane from the rear by a motor vehicle traveling at a higher rate of speed. A violation of the prohibition is a misdemeanor.

There is a newly submitted amendment ([Exhibit N](#)) by Teamsters Locals 631 and 986, as well as a conceptual amendment by Assemblywoman Spiegel.

Chairman Carrillo:

If you need time to look over the amendment ([Exhibit N](#)), we can allow for that. Assemblywoman Spiegel has had conversations with the bill sponsor regarding her amendment to the bill. I believe they came to an agreement.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

My amendment would delete section 1, subsection 3, which contains the penalties associated with this. There are existing penalties in law that are stronger than the penalties here.

Chairman Carrillo:

The amendment keeps the strength of the enforcement in place.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Could Assemblywoman Spiegel speak to the statute and what the current penalties are?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

The current penalty is \$180, but it is not graduated.

Chairman Carrillo:

We are working with a conceptual amendment. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 334.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

The amendment is existing law.

Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel:

I would like to be clear—which amendment are you voting on? Is it both amendments?

Chairman Carrillo:

We are voting on the amendment submitted by Fran Almaraz on behalf of Teamsters Locals 631 and 986 and the conceptual amendment from Assemblywoman Spiegel.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Carrillo:

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Ellison. Is there anyone here for public comment in northern or southern Nevada?

Linda Van Vranken, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I want to comment on Assembly Bill 335. I would like to propose a friendly amendment to the bill. I understand that the deadlines have passed, but I was not informed of the deadline until midnight the day before. I came here to do this by taking two buses to get here, and I walked quite a ways.

I started this campaign initially after attempting to register a moped. I was told that my moped was a 3-horsepower, not a 2-horsepower vehicle. By that process, it was considered a motorcycle. I know that it is not a motorcycle. It cannot drive as fast as a motorcycle does. It does not have the power of a motorcycle, nor does it have the maneuverability of a motorcycle.

I repeatedly argued that, according to the Department of Motor Vehicles website, the deciding factor on a moped is it has a displacement of not more than 50 cubic centimeters. That particular line has since been removed. When confronted with the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482.069 which states that a moped must be 2 gross brake horsepower and 50 cubic centimeters and knowing these two mopeds are basically the same, I started doing some research. I found out that horsepower is a variable. In order to be calculated correctly, you must first obtain the torque, multiply it by the revolutions per minute (rpms), and divide by 5,252. Braking horsepower is calculated without all the extras like carburetors, transmissions, and the like. Horsepower is a calculation of power.

The cubic centimeters (ccs) are the engine sizes. The ccs will always stay the same. A 50cc engine will never be anything but a 50cc engine. It does not matter if it is 2 horsepower, 3 horsepower, or even more—it will still be a 50cc motor. The difference between 2 horsepower and 3 horsepower is so slight, but the difference between a 50cc moped and a motorcycle is enormous. Because they do not really convert, they are like apples and oranges. One is power, and one is size. There is a standard industry approximation which is 15 to 17 ccs is equal to one horsepower, which makes all 50cc mopeds actually 3 horsepower.

I believe this was not realized when this avenue of vehicle registration was ventured into. I also believe that if you tell enough people their mopeds are motorcycles, some will believe you. They will try to drive them on the freeways and other places where mopeds should not really go. This would actually be disastrous. How much time will be taken up by our police officers determining which motorcycles are going over 30 miles per hour and which ones can go over 30 miles per hour? It gets a little messy and complex as we go along.

The bottom line is this: 2 or 3 horsepowers are both mopeds and should be classified as such. I have since purchased a 2-horsepower moped and it is actually faster than my 3-horsepower one. My intent is to correctly bring to your attention what I believe could possibly be a public safety issue and disastrous, even fatal. I realize I missed the deadline, but I hope there is some provision for this to be added as a friendly amendment. The only thing that has to be done is to remove the phrase "produces not more than 2 gross brake horsepower." If this section is removed, then they will both be classified as mopeds, as they actually should be. I have been in contact with Assemblyman Edwards and

Assemblywoman Cohen, who have helped me write this up. I have sent copies to the committee assistant here. If there is anything else I need to do, I would be happy to do it. If more information is needed, I hope you will all realize that this is correct.

Chairman Carrillo:

Thank you for making the trip. Is there any further public comment? [There was none.] This meeting is adjourned [at 4:08 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 29](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 68](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 252](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 322](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 335](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 360](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 410](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 442](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 445](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 485](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 334, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 334 submitted by Fran Almaraz, Political Director, Teamsters Local 631 and 986.