

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

**Eightieth Session
May 16, 2019**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, May 16, 2019, in Room 3143 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair
Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Alex Assefa
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblywoman Connie Munk
Assemblyman Greg Smith

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Mark Peckham, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

William H. Stanley, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Southern Nevada Building
Trades Unions
Warren Hardy, representing Associated Builders and Contractors of Nevada

Chair Flores:

[Roll was called. Committee rules were explained.] I appreciate everybody's patience this morning. As is common in these days, we have to make sure we get everything crystal clear before we take a vote and try to fix everything to the best of our ability so that everybody's intent is clear. We will not be hearing any bills this morning; we will just be doing the work session. We are going to be taking the work session bills out of order. We will be rolling two bills over to another date; we will possibly take some action tomorrow. That is at the discretion of the Committee. With that, we are going to open the work session with Senate Bill 113.

Senate Bill 113: Revises provisions relating to the membership of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. (BDR 19-577)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 113 revises provisions relating to the membership of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security ([Exhibit C](#)). This was sponsored by Senator Hammond and heard in this Committee on April 17, 2019. The bill removes the requirement that the governor appoint a representative of the broadcaster community to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security and instead requires the governor to appoint the president and chief executive officer, or his or her designee, of the Nevada Broadcasters Association as an ex officio member of the Commission. We have no amendments on this bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 113.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 113.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Hafen will have the floor statement on S.B. 113. Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 127.

Senate Bill 127: Increases the number of members on the board of county commissioners in certain counties. (BDR 20-855)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 127 increases the number of members on the board of county commissioners in certain counties (Exhibit D). This was sponsored by Senator Parks and heard in this Committee on April 17, 2019. The bill increases the membership of the board of county commissioners in a county with a population of 700,000 or more from seven to nine. The two additional positions on the board may not be filled until after the general election held in November 2022. There are no amendments.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 127.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 127.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, HAFEN, HARDY,
AND LEAVITT VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod will have the floor statement for S.B. 127. Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to land use planning. (BDR 22-775)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to land use planning. This bill was sponsored by Senator Goicoechea, et al., and was heard in this Committee on May 3, 2019 (Exhibit E). The bill requires, with limited exception, the governing body of a city or county to develop and maintain a water resource plan that includes the identification of known water sources available for use by the community and an analysis of the existing and expected demand for that water. One such exception is for a city or county that is located in an area served by a water district or water authority that has already developed and maintained their own resource plan. The measure also authorizes the Board for Financing Water Projects [Department of Conservation and Natural Resources] to provide grants of money to the governing body of a county or city to develop and maintain a water resource plan. We have no amendments on this bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 150 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 150 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Smith will have the floor statement for S.B. 150 (R1). Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 172 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 172 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the Consolidated Local Improvements Law. (BDR 22-30)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 172 (1st Reprint) makes various changes relating to the Consolidated Local Improvement Law ([Exhibit F](#)). This was sponsored by Senator Hardy and heard in this Committee on May 1, 2019. The bill requires a municipality to provide a copy of the annual financial information that it submits to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board related to the issuance of bonds for each improvement district to the director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. If a municipality's treasurer determines that certain events have occurred, a municipality must then prepare a final accounting for each special fund created for an improvement district. Each final accounting must:

1. Contain sufficient detail as required by the municipality's chief financial officer;
2. Indicate the amount of surplus, if any, remaining in the fund;
3. Be completed not more than 18 months after the date the treasurer makes his or her determination with certain exceptions provided for a shorter time frame.

The measure revises the provisions regarding the refund of surplus assessment funds and requires that penalties, collection costs, and interest imposed on assessments in excess of \$100,000 remaining after the bonds and interest on the bonds have been paid be deposited into certain accounts for public capital improvements. If the holder of a certificate of sale for a property sold because of delinquent assessment charges does not demand the deed within three years after the redemption period ends, the certificate is null and void, with limited exception, and no deed may be executed to the holder of the certificate. There were no amendments on this bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 172 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 172 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Munk will have the floor statement for S.B. 172 (R1). Next we have Senate Bill 175.

Senate Bill 175: Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-618)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 175 revises provisions relating to public works. This was sponsored by Senator Parks and others and was heard in this Committee on May 8, 2019 ([Exhibit G](#)). The bill eliminates the authority of a public body to contract with a design-build team for the design and construction of a public work that has an estimated cost of \$5 million or less.

We do have one amendment on this bill that was proposed by Alexis Motarex with Nevada Associated General Contractors. You can take a look at that in your work session document. Essentially this amendment will create a definition of "discrete project" to mean one or more public works which are undertaken on a single construction site for a single public body. The term will not include one or more public works that are undertaken on multiple construction sites, regardless of whether the public body which sponsors or finances the public works bundles the public works together.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 175.

ASSEMBLYMAN ASSEFA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 175.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Assefa will do the floor statement for S.B. 175. Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 207 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 207 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing apprentices. (BDR 28-740)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 207 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing apprentices. This was sponsored by Senators Denis, Cannizzaro, Brooks and others and heard in this Committee on April 25, 2019 ([Exhibit H](#)). The bill requires a contractor or subcontractor on a public work to use, with certain exceptions, one or more apprentices for a certain percentage of the total hours of labor worked for each apprenticed craft or type of work to be performed on the public work. Specifically, at least 15 percent is required on vertical construction and at least 5 percent is required for horizontal construction. The labor commissioner is authorized to adjust annually the total hours of labor required to be performed by an apprentice by not more than 2 percentage points. The labor commissioner is authorized to grant a modification or waiver from the requirements if the labor commissioner finds good cause to do so.

We did have an amendment that was submitted by Senator Brooks subsequent to the hearing. I will briefly review some of the more substantial changes which are:

1. Changes the date authorizing the adoption of regulations to modify the percentage of total labor hours required from January 1, 2022, to January 1, 2021, and clarifies that such regulations shall not reduce the levels below those defined in the bill;
2. Changes the use of apprentices on vertical construction from 15 to 10 percent and the use of apprentices on horizontal from 5 to 3 percent of the total hours of labor when three or more employees are employed on a work site;
3. Clarifies that contractors or subcontractors do not have to use apprentices if the type of work they are performing is not an apprenticed craft within the jurisdiction as recognized by the State Apprenticeship Council;
4. Authorizes a public body, upon a request of a contractor or subcontractor, to submit a request for a modification or waiver of the percentage of hours of labor of one or more apprentices prior to the bid advertisement, the bid opening, or the award of the contract. The request must include certain documentation as defined in the proposed amendment;
5. Authorizes the labor commissioner to grant a waiver from the labor requirements after work on the public work has commenced if the public work body, contractor, or subcontractor submits documentation and evidence that meets certain requirements;
6. Add joint sponsors to the bill that include Assembly members Carrillo, Smith, Martinez, and Duran.

I believe we have somebody here who may be able to answer some questions on the intent in the amendments.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to call up some of our stakeholders to get clarification on the intent of S.B. 207 (R1). I know our labor commissioner is not here, but we will get her intent on the record as well.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

We would like to have clarification on section 1, subsection 9 of the proposed amendment, where it talks about whether or not the contractor or subcontractor shall not be required to execute the agreements as part of the requests. If you could speak to that and speak to the conversations that have taken place as to the intent.

William H. Stanley, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Southern Nevada Building Trades Unions:

Subsection 9, as we had intended it to be, is that if a contractor requests apprentices from an apprenticeship program and that request is granted, then that contractor or subcontractor would have to execute an apprenticeship agreement that details how that apprentice is to be paid and how that apprentice is to be treated. If the contractor or subcontractor refuses to execute the apprenticeship agreement, that could not be used as a request for not meeting the requirements of the bill. I hope that makes sense. If you refuse to execute the agreement, that cannot be the basis for asking for a waiver from the requirements of the bill.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to come up and explain their interpretation just so I can make sure we are all on the same sheet of music, so to speak.

Warren Hardy, representing Associated Builders and Contractors of Nevada:

Our only concern with that concept is, for example, California has a very similar process to that, only the contractor is not required to sign the documents that are associated with it. Now, if they do not sign the documents associated with it, there is no way they should receive the apprentice because they are essentially saying they will not pay for them. They should not be granted the apprentice in that case. In California, and we believe this is because of the law, you automatically receive a waiver in that situation. Our concern is we do not know how that will legally play out. At a minimum, it probably should be at least something that we can take and request a waiver on and let the labor commissioner make a decision. That is my only concern.

Chair Flores:

Right now we are just getting the intent on the record. I am not interested in anybody's concerns or anything like that; that is not the purpose of my calling anybody up. I want to make it abundantly clear what the intent is, and we are going to have our legal counsel look at it. I am going to ask that you give the intent one more time, very clearly, on the record. The intent of having this conversation is just to determine the intent of the amendment.

Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:

My understanding of the intent of this language is that if a request for apprentices is granted, there would have to be an apprenticeship agreement as part of the granting of those apprentices. If a request for apprentices is not granted, then that would form good cause to request a waiver from these provisions. If subsequent to that initial denial of apprentices, apprentices are then granted, there would no longer be good cause for a waiver and those apprentices would have to be on an apprenticeship agreement just as if they had been granted in the first place.

Chair Flores:

I received an email this morning from the Office of the Nevada Labor Commissioner. I will make sure it is sent to each member. It says:

Good morning, Chair Flores. For Senate Bill 207 [1st Reprint] and the subdivision [subsection] 9 (d) good cause requirements, the Labor Commissioner would interpret the proposed language that the contractor or subcontractor cannot simply refuse to sign the agreement if apprentices are made available. If that situation occurred, the Labor Commissioner would not interpret that as good cause pursuant to the intent of Senate Bill 207 [1st Reprint]. Of course, the Labor Commissioner would need to evaluate the facts and circumstances of each situation, but interpreting subdivision [subsection] 9 (d) as stated above would be consistent with the intent of Senate Bill 207 [1st Reprint].

I am reading this into the record simply to make it abundantly clear how this will be interpreted pursuant to how the Office of the Labor Commissioner is reading the intent of the bill as well. With that, I am going to entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 207 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 207 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I appreciate the work that has been done on this and getting it close, but it is not quite there for me yet. I am going to vote no now, but I want to reserve my right to change my vote if we can get there before it goes to the floor.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I, too, echo my colleague's comments. I appreciate the work that has gone into improving it; I believe the bill is closer. I did have some concerns with the testimony that was provided today on the apprenticeship pay. I am concerned that some of these apprentices might end up

being underpaid. Hopefully, that can be addressed. My understanding with the fiscal note is that this will go to the Committee on Ways and Means, so maybe that could be addressed there. I will be voting no today, but reserving my right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Ditto.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

Ditto.

Chair Flores:

We will take a vote on S.B. 207 (R1).

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, HAFEN, HARDY,
AND LEAVITT VOTED NO.)

Assemblyman Smith will have the floor statement for S.B. 207 (R1). Next on the work session is Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint).

**Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to prevailing wages.
(BDR 28-768)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions relating to prevailing wages ([Exhibit I](#)). This was sponsored by Senator Hardy and heard in this Committee on May 13, 2019. Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint) revises the procedure for determining the prevailing rate of wages by changing the geographical area for which the prevailing rate of wages is determined from a county to a region. The bill establishes four regions: the Washoe region; the northern rural region; the Clark region; and the southern rural region. The bill also removes from statute specific requirements for determining the prevailing wage rates, thus providing for those requirements to be established by the labor commissioner by regulation.

The labor commissioner is required to survey contractors only in even-numbered years, instead of annually, to establish rates for prevailing wage. The labor commissioner is required to adjust the prevailing rate of wages on October 1 of each odd-numbered year and reissue the rate only if (1) the collective bargaining agreement provides for such an adjustment; or (2) any change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, West Region has occurred since October 1 of the previous year.

We did have a couple of amendments that were discussed during the hearing. The first is to require the labor commissioner to survey contractors in odd-numbered years instead of even-numbered years and adjust the prevailing rate of wages on October 1 of even-numbered years instead of odd-numbered years. The amendment would also clarify that if there are no collective bargaining agreements, the prevailing wage should be adjusted based on changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 243 (R2).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 243 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Leavitt will be doing the floor statement for S.B. 243 (R2). Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 279.

Senate Bill 279: Revises provisions relating to general improvement districts.
(BDR 25-246)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 279 revises provisions relating to general improvement districts ([Exhibit J](#)). This was sponsored by Senator Kieckhefer and Assemblywoman Krasner, and heard in this Committee on April 23, 2019. The bill requires the board of trustees of a general improvement district (GID) to follow certain procedures before selling real property owned by the GID. The board of trustees must obtain two independent appraisals, with limited exceptions, and must not sell the property for less than the highest appraised value of the appraisals obtained. The board must adopt procedures for creating and maintaining a list of qualified appraisers as specified.

Before ordering the sale of real property, the board of trustees must adopt a resolution at a public meeting: (1) declaring the intent of the board to sell the real property; (2) finding that the sale is in the best interest of the district; and (3) fixing a time for additional public meetings of the board at which sealed bids for the real property will be considered. There are some additional requirements that are listed in your work session document, including additional public notice requirements, if you would like to take a look at them.

We do have one amendment that was proposed by the Chair. This will amend the bill to match Senate Bill 36 which this Committee passed out on May 14, 2019, with respect to the appraisals that a board of trustees must sell property based on the average of two separate appraisals instead of the higher of the two appraisals.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 279.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 279.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Would this lock them in and say they have to go to the highest bidder, or would this allow them, if the property never sold, to go back and renegotiate that? To lower that price? It says that they have to go with the highest bidder. If the property does not sell, could the board at that time lower that price? Based on this, it looks like it will freeze it in there at the highest appraisal.

Chair Flores:

Thank you for that question. We are having our team look into it now.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Mr. Chair, if we need to, I can go ahead and vote this out of Committee and reserve my right to change my vote on the floor, after I talk to the sponsor of the bill.

Chair Flores:

I think our legal counsel has an answer for you.

Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:

This would work similarly to the way that Senate Bill 36 worked where it is initially offered to be sold, there are the two appraisals, and it has to be sold for at least the higher of the two appraisals. If it does not sell, they can offer it a second time. If it does not sell that time, they can list it with a broker. I believe the amendment would change it to be the average of the two appraisals instead of the higher of the two appraisals.

Chair Flores:

Are there any additional comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Ellison will do the floor statement for S.B. 279. Next on the work session is Senate Bill 302 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 302 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to personal information collected by governmental agencies. (BDR 52-547)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 302 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to personal information collected by governmental agencies (Exhibit K). This was sponsored by Senator Seevers Gansert and heard in this Committee on May 3, 2019. The bill requires a governmental agency that collects data to comply, to the extent practicable, with certain information security standards that are published by the Center for Internet Security or the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the United States Department of Commerce. The bill requires the Office of Information Security, Division of Enterprise Information

Technology Services, Department of Administration, to maintain and make publically available a list of controls and standards the state is required to comply with pursuant to federal and state laws or regulations and frameworks.

The bill requires the legislative auditor to review the compliance of the security standards for records containing personal information when conducting a post audit of all accounts, funds, and other records of all state agencies. The results of an audit to determine whether a state agency is complying with the standards that are available for inspection by the general public must be limited to whether the state agency is adequately complying with such standards. Finally, the bill authorizes a governmental agency to require a person to submit personal information by electronic means, but it may also establish procedures for a person to apply for and receive a waiver from submitting a document by electronic means if the document contains personal information.

We did have one amendment that was proposed and discussed at the hearing by Senator Seevers Gansert [page 2, ([Exhibit K](#))]. This amendment would require that Legislative Counsel Bureau audit reports must not contain any information that exposes the state to a potential information security breach. The amendment also requires the Legislative Auditor to immediately report any serious security vulnerabilities he or she discovers to the Governor, the Chair of the Legislative Commission, the Chair of the Audit Subcommittee, and the head of the agency affected. Finally, the amendment changes the effective date for certain provisions of the bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 302 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 302 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Mr. Chair, I am going to vote to get this bill out of Committee, but I want to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor. I still have some questions. It is a good bill, but I want to make sure we tweak the right things.

Chair Flores:

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Hardy will have the floor statement for S.B. 302 (R1). Next on the work session we have Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to county officers.
(BDR 20-1153)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint) revises provisions related to county officers ([Exhibit L](#)). This was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and heard in this Committee on May 9, 2019. The bill increases from \$1 to \$4 the fee that the state registrar must charge and collect for a certified copy of a death certificate. The bill expands the authorized use of such fees to include any program established by the coroner to promote the mental health of the employees of the office of the coroner and any other person impacted as a result of an incident involving mass casualties within the county or to provide bereavement services to members of the public within the county.

The bill authorizes a coroner to test a decedent under his or her jurisdiction for communicable diseases without obtaining a court order under certain circumstances.

We did have one amendment that was proposed by John Fudenberg, Clark County Coroner [pages 2 through 11, ([Exhibit L](#))]. The actual amendment language is on the top of page 5. These amendments would authorize a coroner to test a decedent for communicable diseases without obtaining a court order if a person who renders emergency care or assistance in an emergency, gratuitously and in good faith, came into contact with the blood or bodily fluids of the decedent when rendering emergency care or assistance. This would be the Good Samaritan provision that was discussed at the hearing. The second part of the amendment clarifies who would be authorized to participate in a mental health program established by the coroner.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 463 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 463 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I do believe that this is a good bill. I will be voting yes out of Committee, but I want to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor. I want to look at the amendment further and make sure that it goes far enough for our original intent.

Chair Flores:

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblymen Hafen and Ellison have reserved their rights to change their vote on the floor. Assemblywoman Gorelow will do the floor statement for S.B. 463 (R1). With that we will complete our work session for today.

**Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public retirement systems.
(BDR 23-598)**

[Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint) was not heard.]

**Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to affordable housing.
(BDR 20-1074)**

[Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint) was not heard.]

Is there anyone here for public comment? [There was no one.] This meeting is adjourned [at 10:34 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mark Peckham
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 113, dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 127, dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 172 (1st Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 175, dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 207 (1st Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 243 (2nd Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 279, dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 302 (1st Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 463 (1st Reprint), dated May 16, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.