

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-ninth Session
May 17, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Senator Julia Ratti at 1:59 p.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Assembly District No. 28
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24
Assemblyman Justin Watkins, Assembly District No. 35
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Kevin C. Powers, Assembly Committee Counsel
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeffrey Haag, Administrator, Purchasing Division, Department of Administration
Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 2

Steve Weinberger, Administrator, Division of Internal Audits, Office of Finance,
Office of the Governor

Carlos Hernandez

Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League

Eric Johnson, Administrator, Division of State Parks, Department of
Conservation and Natural Resources

Suzanne Linfante, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor

SENATOR RATTI:

I would like to open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 477.

ASSEMBLY BILL 477: Authorizes appointment of a General Counsel of the
Purchasing Division of the Department of Administration. (BDR 27-895)

JEFFREY HAAG (Administrator, Purchasing Division, Department of
Administration):

Assembly Bill 477 proposes changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes*
(NRS) 333.100 allowing the Administrator of the Purchasing Division,
Department of Administration, to appoint an unclassified General Counsel or
what I would refer to as a contracting counsel position within the Purchasing
Division.

This bill is the result of Executive Branch Audit Report C16-01, State
Procurement Process, which found that the State's procurement contracting
functions lacked sufficient review and oversight. The audit included
nine recommendations, one of which was to create a central contract unit.

In fiscal year 2016, State Purchasing facilitated more than 250 solicitations
resulting in hundreds of contracts representing more than \$430 million in State
spending.

The contracting counsel position, when approved, will replace an administrative
services officer position that has been vacant for more than a year. The
contracting counsel position will be responsible for reviewing solicitations and
contracts to ensure adherence to Nevada law and procurement policies;
managing legal reviews and contract negotiations to ensure the State's needs
are met; providing statute interpretation services for the procurement function;
and continuously reviewing and maintaining the State's procurement policies
and legal documents.

This position will be complementary to the services provided by the Office of the Attorney General (OAG). The OAG provides one Deputy Attorney General (DAG) whose services are shared by four other State agencies.

Where purchasing is in-house, the contracting counsel will work collaboratively with our DAG to address the State's procurement and contracting needs. Supporting this bill will allow the Purchasing Division to set up the central contract unit as recommended in the Executive Branch audit, providing the State much-needed legal review and oversight.

BRETT KANDT (Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):
The OAG supports the creation of a contracting counsel position embedded within the Purchasing Division to be part of a central contract unit consistent with the recommendations of the Executive Branch audit. This is a best practice that is being implemented in other states. It will ensure that our State contracts are solicited and awarded in the best interests of the State under terms and conditions that protect the State and ensure that the State receives the goods and/or services that it expects when it contracts.

I have submitted a letter from Attorney General Adam Paul Laxalt supporting A.B. 477 ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The Purchasing Division is sharing counsel. It does not even have one full-time DAG assigned to it.

MR. KANDT:

A DAG under my supervision is assigned to the Purchasing Division; however, that is not that attorney's only client. That attorney also represents other divisions within the Department of Administration.

The Purchasing Division, like any State agency, has its particular assigned DAG; however, it can draw upon the full resources of the OAG as needed, depending upon the nature of the legal issue, service or advice it seeks. I often interface with the Administrator of the Purchasing Division and Purchasing employees on matters, as do others in the OAG on an as-needed basis.

I want to emphasize that we consider this a contracting counsel position. The OAG will continue to serve as General Counsel to the Purchasing Division to

address the broad range of legal questions or issues that may arise. For example, if the Purchasing Division has a personnel issue, the OAG will represent and advise it on that. If the Purchasing Division has a question on Nevada law on which it wants an official opinion, that would be provided by my office. But for the specific purpose of creating a contract unit, as recommended in the Executive Branch audit, that focuses exclusively on the solicitation and negotiation of contracts through the Purchasing Division consistent with NRS 333, that will be the role of the contracting counsel position.

There is some precedent for this. About a decade ago, the State Public Works Division had its own embedded attorney position created, called construction law counsel. That attorney represents the State Public Works Division in the solicitation and award of public works contracts. That has been successful. Nevertheless, the OAG provides the broad range of general legal representation to the State Public Works Division.

The Division of Insurance has embedded insurance counsel who provides specific legal services and representation in that context. However, once again the OAG still represents the entire Division of Insurance in the general counsel sense.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I see on the heading of the bill that this is in the Governor's budget.

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 477 and open the hearing on A.B. 481.

ASSEMBLY BILL 481: Revises provisions governing the Division of Internal Audits of the Office of Finance. (BDR 31-898)

STEVE WEINBERGER (Administrator, Division of Internal Audits, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor):

This bill is intended to reclassify one of our positions. We have an unclassified Manager of Internal Controls that is in statute. That position was created before the Division of Internal Audits was created. When the Division was created, it absorbed this position. As a result, this is the only unclassified position with the exception of the Administrator in the Division. Therefore, this reclassification will make this position consistent with our other staff positions.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 5

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 481 and open the hearing on A.B. 449.

ASSEMBLY BILL 449 (1st Reprint): Establishes Public Lands Day in the State of Nevada. (BDR 19-770)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

Assembly Bill 449 as amended leaving the Assembly addresses Public Lands Day in Nevada and allows people to partake in our public lands through free entry, free camping and free boating.

There was a fiscal impact with the bill. It went through the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. We discovered that it would be about \$10,000 a year. That amount could be absorbed and addressed because there might be extra visitation to public lands if someone added another one day of camping or boating. That would make a difference. It was difficult to determine that.

The amendment before you, Proposed Amendment 4775 ([Exhibit D](#)), aligns this bill up with Senator Nicole Cannizzaro's bill to ensure they are compatible. It delineates the last Saturday of September as Public Lands Day to make sure we are talking about the same day in both bills.

CARLOS HERNANDEZ:

I am here as a student from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, supporting A.B. 449.

Growing up in Nevada has exposed me to the beauty and appreciation of our public lands. However, that was not always the case when I was growing up. It was not until I got to college that I was able to get a better understanding of the importance of our public lands.

As I visit State parks, my love for public lands grows stronger. By establishing Public Lands Day, this bill gives Nevadans the opportunity to enter, camp and boat in our State parks free. This bill will get more people involved in visiting our State parks by bringing more awareness to these extraordinary public lands and reinforcing Nevada's commitment to public lands.

This bill will encourage not just people from my generation but from all ages to visit State parks. I thank Assemblywoman Carlton for bringing this bill forward, and I urge the Committee to support A.B. 449.

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

We support A.B. 449. Our organization is a strong supporter of our public lands. Many of our members spend a lot of time on our public lands recreating and exploring. That is what makes Nevada such a great state in which to live.

As someone who measures the success of my year based on how many days I have slept outside, I really appreciate Assemblywoman Carlton bringing this bill forward. The provision that will allow free entrance into our State parks will serve to generate more interest in our State parks. I hope it will get more Nevadans outside to see the beauty of our State, most of which is located in Senator Goicoechea's district. I look forward to taking advantage of this opportunity if this bill passes.

ERIC JOHNSON (Administrator, Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I have submitted written testimony on A.B. 449 ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

How are you going to handle free admittance on a Friday night with the new cabin facilities being built at Wild Horse Reservoir and Walker Lake? That could result in a fistfight.

MR. JOHNSON:

I do not envision this applying to the cabin rental fee. This is for entry, camping and boating. The cabin rental would be a different fee; however, I have not had that specific conversation.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I do not know. I am playing the devil's advocate. It looks like the bill covers all fees. The other issue I have is with boating fees. Typically, someone could get a sticker for a boat that would be good for the entire year. You do not have to pay for that boat every time you put it in the water in the State park.

MR. JOHNSON:

That is correct. You have the option of paying for it one day at a time or you can buy a multiuse permit that includes boating and camping.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

There might be people who take advantage of the free boating that day, haul a boat out and put it in the water.

MR. JOHNSON:

Yes, I envision that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I was curious about that. Most people would probably have already paid the fee. I do not think there would be any confusion that this bill removes the requirement of having the boat registered through the Department of Wildlife.

MR. JOHNSON:

No, it does not remove that requirement.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

To me, this bill says any fees are waived. I am still back at your new cabins and the full-service camp hookups. Would those be included in this? I am concerned about that and about people having to stand in line to hook up.

MR. JOHNSON:

Those are fair concerns. To clarify my comments, when a group area is reserved, you pay a reservation fee and an entrance fee for each person coming into the park. This does not waive the reservation fee. A \$10 surcharge for the use of power at a power hookup site is not part of the camping or entry fee. I envision the full-hookup campsite would have free entry and free camping, but the power surcharge would still apply. That is my interpretation, but I have not had any specific conversations.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Maybe getting the intent on the record is enough.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Counsel):

The bill mentions that the fees are waived for entering, camping and boating in any State park or recreational area. It is hard to know all of the fees that can be

charged and are charged in a State park or recreational area. Therefore, to the extent that the Committee thinks there is some ambiguity and would like to clarify which fees specifically are not waived, I recommend clarifying that with an amendment.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

You do not feel that clarifying the intent here on the record would be adequate. I do not want to have Assemblywoman Carlton's bill amended in the final days. Is it enough to establish it on the record that the bill pertains to certain fees only?

MS. CHLARSON:

It is a policy decision as to whether the Committee would like to amend the bill further to clarify the issue. The Committee has been presented with Proposed Amendment 4775, [Exhibit D](#); therefore, I do not know if you want to talk to Assemblywoman Carlton to see if she would clarify it further. It is a policy decision as to whether the Committee wants further clarification in the bill or if clarification on the record is sufficient.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am fine with where we are on the record. Maybe the Vice Chair wants to talk to Assemblywoman Carlton about it also. There is probably some gray there. I can see some park ranger getting into an argument with someone because we say it is free, but then we ask for \$10 to hook up a camp trailer.

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:

We will get clarification.

MR. JOHNSON:

Do you want me to clarify that with the sponsor of the bill?

VICE CHAIR MANENDO:

Someone will. You are welcome to do that, and anyone else who would like to talk to Assemblywoman Carlton is welcome to do so.

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 449](#).

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the work session on [A.B. 5](#).

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 9

ASSEMBLY BILL 5 (1st Reprint): Provides for the creation of certain local improvement districts. (BDR 22-233)

JENNIFER RUEDY (Policy Analyst):
Assembly Bill 5 is summarized in the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

CHAIR PARKS:
Have you met with Nevada Credit Union League on its proposed friendly amendment, and do you find the amendment acceptable?

SUZANNE LINFANTE (Office of Energy, Office of the Governor):
We have met with them, and we find that amendment acceptable.

CHAIR PARKS:
Has there been any other opposition on that proposed amendment?

MS. LINFANTE:
There has been no opposition to that amendment.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
Is it correct that with the amendment any recorded lien has standing?

MS. LINFANTE:
That is correct. Any lien would be senior to the Property Assessed Clean Energy program lien and would require consent.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 5.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:
The next bill in the work session is A.B. 36.

ASSEMBLY BILL 36: Revises the Charter of the City of Reno. (BDR S-448)

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 10

Ms. RUEDY:

A summary of A.B. 36 is contained in the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)). There are no amendments.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 36.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is A.B. 148.

ASSEMBLY BILL 148: Increases the penalty for notaries public and document preparation services that fraudulently provide legal services or advice. (BDR 19-756)

Ms. RUEDY:

Assembly Bill 148 is summarized in the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)). Proposed Amendment 4553 is included in the work session document. A second-proposed conceptual amendment ([Exhibit I](#)) was handed out, but my understanding is that the bill's sponsor would like to pull that second-proposed amendment.

ASSEMBLYMAN EDGAR FLORES (Assembly District No. 28):

Proposed Amendment 4553 in the work session document is to ensure that whenever there is irreparable harm in both the notary statute and the document preparation services statute, that results in a Category D felony if there is a conviction.

In the chaos of this week and working with the Secretary of State, we thought that something was overlooked on my end and that we possibly left out language that we intended to have in the bill. However, we realized that it was unnecessary and that it is already covered as the bill is now written. That is why I want to withdraw the conceptual amendment that was placed before you.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I want to make sure I am clear on it. The language about the fine of \$2,000 for each violation is in the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

That is correct. That addresses the criminal language. The oversight was on the civil side. There is already a clear delineation about the \$2,000 fine per violation. We were trying to be sure about that. That is why we sent out the conceptual amendment. The Legal Division was helpful in explaining that it was already covered in the bill.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Is it correct that the only way it is a felony is if it causes irreparable harm and/or is willful?

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That is what makes it a felony; otherwise, it is just a monetary penalty.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

It has to be irreparable harm. Irreparable harm is anything that cannot be made whole by giving someone some type of compensation, such as someone losing custody of his or her children, someone goes to jail, or someone gets deported. It is something where money will not make the person whole.

SENATOR MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 148.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is A.B. 241.

ASSEMBLY BILL 241 (1st Reprint): Requires baby changing tables in certain buildings and facilities used by the public. (BDR 22-861)

MS. RUEDY:

Assembly Bill 241 is summarized in the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR PARKS:

Assemblyman Watkins, have you had a chance to review the proposed amendment and is it acceptable?

ASSEMBLYMAN JUSTIN WATKINS (Assembly District No. 35):

Yes, it is.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

If the restroom is not accessible to the public, then a baby-changing table is not required; however, if it is a public restroom whether for men or women, they both have to have a changing table.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS:

Almost right, but not quite. A family restroom would require only one changing table because it is be accessible by either men or women. Technically, there is nothing that requires the changing station to be located actually in the restroom; however, from a health perspective, that makes the most sense.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Yes, but a public men's restroom shall have a changing table in it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 241.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HARDY:

Just so I am not confused, when you say a changing table, that does not mean it has to be a table. It can be a counter of a built-in. It does not have to be "a table" as discussed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS:

Yes, your interpretation is correct. Initially, we had a baby-changing station in the bill. That was concerning, so it was changed to a table. Frankly, I do not know how to word otherwise. When you search online for products, baby-changing table seemed to be the acceptable term for fold-downs or actual mobile tables that can be wheeled into a restroom. It seems to be commercially accepted that that is the name.

SENATOR HARDY:

So my legislative intent will be a legislatively baby-changing place.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS:

My intent in the bill is that baby-changing table shall mean any place on which a baby can be changed and is commercially acceptable.

SENATOR HARDY:

I like it. Thank you.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is A.B. 277.

ASSEMBLY BILL 277 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing land use planning. (BDR 22-954)

MS. RUEDY:

Assembly Bill 277 is summarized in the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)). There are two proposed amendments to this bill. One was included in the work session document, Proposed Amendment 4661, [Exhibit K](#), and one was submitted separate from the work session document, Proposed Amendment 4748 ([Exhibit L](#)).

KEVIN C. POWERS (Assembly Committee Counsel):

There are two separate proposed amendments, one is No. 4661 and the other is No. 4748. They do not replace each other. They do not conflict. The Committee

can act on both of them. They deal with three different issues. They could be included in one amendment because they do not conflict.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am still feeling my way through this and trying to determine what it is going to require. This is the one-half-mile buffer around any national conservation area. Which is required, an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement (EIS)?

ASSEMBLYMAN STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

It would be an EIS. If a project is within that one-half-mile buffer zone, then an EIS must be provided to the local government. It would have to be posted on the local government's Website before the hearing so the public has a chance to review it.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

For example, if the project were east of the City of Las Vegas, the county would handle that. However, if it were inside the City of Las Vegas, then the City would require the EIS, publish it and get it out to the public.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

That is correct. We are not changing the decision maker. The decision maker stays where it is now whether it is a city or a county. It is just that additional information that would have to be provided before a final action is taken by the local government within the one-half-mile buffer zone.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Alternatives are offered in an EIS. I am wondering what an EIS would look like for the City of Las Vegas, for example.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

Section 1.7 of the bill specifies what the EIS must contain. The EIS must analyze and explain the beneficial and adverse economic impacts; the significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed projects that could not be avoided; all reasonable alternatives to the project; all mitigation efforts to alleviate or offset the adverse environmental impacts; and the growth-inducing impact of the proposed project.

In addition, in section 1.7, subsection 4, there is another side to that. The EIS can include beneficial environmental impacts such as a renewable energy project or a project for the establishment or maintenance of parks or public recreational facilities. Essentially, the EIS would include both the negatives and the positives of the project. The local government would have that information when it is making the decision to approve any final action.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
Would a bond be required with the EIS?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:
I will defer to Legal. I am not sure of the answer.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
Sometimes, a landscape EIS requires a bond and sometimes not.

MR. POWERS:
Section 1.7 of the bill was drafted based on the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). When preparing an EIS, those are the standard sets of factors that are followed. There are private businesses that specialize in producing EISs.

Section 1.6 of the bill provides that local governments can assess fees and charges for the costs involved in reviewing an EIS. That is the only cost that would be involved as far as the local government could assess. That is no bonding requirement.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:
I am referring again to NEPA and how EISs work on the federal level. I am not sure how that applies here because the federal government can require bonding as an alternative to a condition in an EIS. Are we going that far on this for local governments?

MR. POWERS:
After the developer produces the EIS and the local government goes through the review process and approves the project, then bond requirements could be part of that project. That bonding may result from what is determined from the EIS.

As part of the approval of the project, the local government would have the power to require surety bonds to ensure that the development goes forward and that the major public works are completed. Local governments have the power to require surety bonding on approved development projects.

SENATOR HARDY:

I need to know how this affects most of my district. Therefore, I will be voting no on this bill with the right to change my mind after my concerns are addressed.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 277.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

As this point, I need to delve into it more, but I will support the motion. I am concerned about what happens when you get into a city.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HARDY VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The last bill in the work session is A.B. 379.

ASSEMBLY BILL 379 (1st Reprint): Authorizes certain local governments to create a parks, trails and open space district. (BDR 25-211)

Ms. RUEDY:

Assembly Bill 379 is summarized in the work session document ([Exhibit M](#)).

Several people expressed concerns at the hearing. There were numerous working groups after the hearing that resulted in a 34-page proposed amendment with new language that the bill's sponsor may want to go through.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN AMBER JOINER (Assembly District No. 24):

Most of the cities and counties that were involved are neutral on the bill now. They have not had time to go back to their councils or commissions to get support or opposition, but we have addressed all of their specific concerns.

We made sure that this bill is enabling. Cities and counties do not have to create one of these districts. We have made it clear that they can either accept or deny a petition. Another way that a city or county can create a district is through a resolution. However, that is not required either.

Chapter 308 of NRS, Control of Special Districts, was excluded from the first reprint. Much of the proposed language you see in this draft is just that special districts chapter. We have now included things such as public noticing and, most importantly, the service plan. Now it is very clear to the public and to those who will be involved where the boundaries are, what the financing includes, and it is all very detailed. That is most of the proposed language.

Some people had concerns about eminent domain and private property infringement. We have removed those portions from the bill. They were originally in the General Improvement Districts chapter 318 of NRS, which is why they were copied over, but we do not need them in these districts. We were okay with removing that.

In addition, the counties were concerned about taxing authority. We have created a provision in the bill to enable these districts to tax, create a fee or create an assessment. However, anytime that a tax is involved, the county would need to be one of the entities involved through the interlocal agreement. That made sense to us in the end. We know that some of our counties are at a cap right now. We were able to make that change for them as well.

I would also like to clarify that we definitely wanted cities to be able to create these districts on their own if it is within their city boundaries only or with another city if it is within city boundaries only. During the hearing, Legal clarified that where there is no county unincorporated land, those cities would be able to do that without the county being an involved interlocal entity. We want to clarify that is the intent of this bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 18

A provision in the bill clarifies that local governments do not have to act on a petition if they get one. There are several other provisions in the bill, but those are the main ones to which we were able to make changes.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 379.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HARDY:

I am still processing how this entity will work, tax and deal with all of the political entities that exist. I will be voting no until I am convinced.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am going to vote no on the bill until I get the chance to read this and reach out to some of my local government constituents.

CHAIR PARKS:

We have some time. It will be into next week before we get the amendment delivered from Legal. I hope everyone has an opportunity to look at it.

We have received letters supporting A.B. 379 from Catherine Schmidt ([Exhibit N](#)), Doug Doolittle ([Exhibit O](#)), Julee Conway ([Exhibit P](#)) and David Porter ([Exhibit Q](#)).

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA AND HARDY VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
May 17, 2017
Page 19

CHAIR PARKS:

That concludes our work session for today. Having no further business to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, we are adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
A.B. 477	C	1	Brett Kandt / Office of the Attorney General	Letter of Support
A.B. 449	D	3	Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton	Proposed Amendment 4775
A.B. 449	E	1	Eric Johnson / Division of State Parks	Written Testimony
A.B. 5	F	3	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 36	G	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 148	H	7	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 148	I	1	Assemblyman Edgar Flores	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 241	J	2	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 277	K	3	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 277	L	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Proposed Amendment 4748
A.B. 379	M	35	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 379	N	1	Catherine Schmidt	Letter of Support
A.B. 379	O	2	Doug Doolittle	Letter of Support
A.B. 379	P	2	Julee Conway	Letter of Support
A.B. 379	Q	2	David Porter	Letter of Support