

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

**Eightieth Session  
May 17, 2019**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 11:59 a.m. on Friday, May 17, 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](http://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  
Geigy Stringer, Committee Secretary  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mike Ramirez, Director of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.; and representing Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition

**Chair Flores:**

[Roll was called.] We have seven items on the work session document, and we are going to take them in the order that they appear. First on the work session is Senate Bill 10.

**Senate Bill 10: Revises provisions governing compensation of members of a board of trustees of a general improvement district. (BDR 25-432)**

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 10 revises provisions governing compensation of members of a board of trustees of a general improvement district. This was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities and heard in this Committee on April 19, 2019 ([Exhibit C](#)). The bill increases from \$6,000 to \$9,000 the amount a member of a board of trustees of a general improvement district (GID) may be compensated annually. The measure further increases from \$9,000 to \$12,000 the amount a member of a board of trustees of a GID that is granted certain powers relating to sewer, waste, and water may be compensated annually. Compensation is defined as salary and wages.

**Chair Flores:**

Thank you, Mr. McDonald. Assemblyman Smith, please.

**Assemblyman Smith:**

After reviewing this bill and speaking to my particular GID folks, I felt that the bill did need something added to it. The Committee was not completely in favor of the bill originally, so I have sent out an amendment to the Committee members. I think you all have that; I would ask that you please consider it. You all do not have the situations in your particular districts, but mine is a hardworking bunch from Sun Valley, and I really think that they deserve this. My amendment says that they would get half of the initial ask in the original bill. That is what I am proposing at this time, and I would make a motion to accept my amendment in my offer.

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 10.

**Chair Flores:**

Members, to clarify: Assemblyman Smith has moved to amend and do pass Senate Bill 10 with an amendment specifically to the section that changed \$6,000 to \$9,000; his proposed amendment is changing the amount from \$6,000 to \$7,500 and leaving the rest of the bill as is.

In addition to Assemblyman Smith's amendment, there is an amendment that was proposed and submitted. However, at this time we are only entertaining the motion and the amendment proposed by Assemblyman Smith.

Again, we are not looking at the amendment that you received from Wes Henderson; we are looking specifically at the amendment that was sent via email this morning to all members of the Committee by Assemblyman Smith, wherein he amends the bill so that instead of changing the amount from \$6,000 to \$9,000, he changes it from \$6,000 to \$7,500 and leaves the rest of the bill intact as originally written by the sponsor and presented before this Committee. Do I have a second?

[There was no second to the motion by Assemblyman Smith.]

Not having a second to support the motion, Assemblyman Smith's amendment will not be considered. At this time I would like the Committee to consider to amend and do pass Senate Bill 10 with the amendment that was previously submitted and that everybody should have a copy of in the work session document. The amendment was proposed by Wes Henderson of the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS SENATE BILL 10.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod moved to amend and do pass Senate Bill 10 with the amendment as proposed on the work session document. Do I have a second?

ASSEMBLYMAN ASSEFA SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I am going to vote this out of Committee, but I am going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I still have some problems with the bill with the areas that have the very small GIDs. I am going to vote to get the bill out of Committee, and I will get with Mr. Henderson about my concerns before it goes to the floor. I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CARRILLO AND DURAN  
VOTED NO.)

Assemblyman Smith will have the floor statement for Senate Bill 10. Next on the work session is Senate Bill 14.

**Senate Bill 14: Provides for the removal of certain gubernatorial appointees under certain circumstances. (BDR 18-186)**

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 14 provides for the removal of certain gubernatorial appointees under certain circumstances. This was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Hearings Division of the Department of Administration and was heard on April 29, 2019 ([Exhibit D](#)). The bill provides that any gubernatorial appointee to any board, commission, or similar body is a civil officer of this state and authorizes the Governor to remove such an appointee for misconduct in office, incompetence, or neglect of duty unless a specific statute requires other removal procedures. The Governor must give the appointee 45 days' notice of the removal unless the Governor determines that circumstances require the immediate removal of the appointee.

The measure further declares that an appeals officer is a civil officer of this state and authorizes the Governor to remove an appeals officer prior to the expiration of his or her term for misconduct in office, incompetence, neglect of duty, or if his or her license to practice law is revoked or suspended. The Governor must give the appeals officer 45 days' notice of the removal unless the Governor determines that circumstances require the immediate removal of the appeals officer.

We have one amendment for you to consider. We are going to swap out some words in section 1, subsection 2, and section 2, subsection 6, and we will be voting to delete "misconduct in office, incompetence, or neglect of duty," and replace that in both aforementioned subsections with "malfeasance, or nonfeasance in the performance of his or her duties."

**Chair Flores:**

Members, I want to remind you that during the hearing for Senate Bill 14, some of us expressed concern dealing with how broad the language in the specific sections that dealt with "incompetence" and that used the term "neglect." We were concerned about what that meant. For the sake of clarity and in order to get everybody on the same page, we instead decided to look at the *Nevada Constitution*, specifically Article 7, Section 4, which talks about the removal of civil officers. If we look at that specific section, it uses this exact language. Instead of our going out of our way to create new language, we thought it would make more sense to use language that has already been used in the past. You can find case law on what it means; that way we are not trying to recreate the wheel. That was the intent of the offered amendment; that is the amendment that is on the table.

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 14.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 14.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON AND FLORES VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Martinez will be doing the floor statement on Senate Bill 14. Next on the work session is Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to employment. (BDR 18-5)**

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to employment. This was sponsored by Senator Spearman and others and heard in this Committee on May 14, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)). The bill revises several provisions relating to unlawful employment practices and governing the filing of complaints of employment discrimination with the Nevada Equal Rights Commission. First, the bill sets forth a tiered system of civil penalties, which progressively increases if an employer, with 30 or more employees, is found to have multiple instances of pay discrimination within a five-year period. Second, applicants for employment are added to the list of persons who are protected from certain unlawful employment practices. Third, the bill provides that it is an unlawful employment practice to use an occupational qualification, which: (1) is based on gender differences, or (2) the employer has refused to change after being presented by an affected person with an alternative practice that would serve the same purpose in a manner that is less discriminatory on the basis of sex.

We have one amendment that was printed out and given to all the Committee members. It is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System and at the back table. This is actually the mock-up that was presented on Wednesday; we just did not get it into the packet ([Exhibit E](#)). We also have another amendment that was proposed by Senator Spearman that would delete section 6, regarding "bona fide occupational qualification" [pages 2-11, ([Exhibit F](#))]. As I understand it, this piece is covered under federal law.

**Chair Flores:**

For the sake of clarity, when Senator Spearman presented her bill she presented a mock-up on that same day. We are working from the mock-up that she provided on the day that she presented the bill ([Exhibit E](#)), along with the amendment that has now been proposed [pages 2-11, ([Exhibit F](#))]. That is what is on the table. At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 166 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

I was not sure whether there is another amendment regarding where the fines would go. Was that ever discussed?

**Chair Flores:**

We have a first and a second. As there is a question, Assemblywoman Munk, I would ask that you rescind your motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK WITHDREW HER MOTION TO AMEND  
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 166 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY WITHDREW HIS SECOND.

**Chair Flores:**

The motion has been rescinded and Vice Chair McCurdy has rescinded his second. I am going to ask the Committee to go into a one-minute recess. [The Committee recessed at 12:13 p.m.]

[The Assembly Committee on Government Affairs was called back to order at 12:15 p.m.]

We wanted to put forth clarification to questions that members had. At this time we will once again entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint) with the amendment as proposed.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 166 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I am still confused by the language. The proposed mock-up with the amended language does not match the proposed amendment in the work session document. I am trying to understand what the motion is, what the intent of the motion is, and where we are. There are two different amendments.

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

What you will be voting on is the amendment that was presented on Wednesday ([Exhibit E](#)). In addition to that, Senator Spearman has requested to have section 6 deleted. You have the mock-up in front of you [pages 2-11, ([Exhibit F](#))]. It is on page 8 of that mock-up; the whole of section 6 is deleted.

**Chair Flores:**

Assemblyman Hafen, I want to make sure that that is now clear to you. The document that is titled, "Proposed Amendment 5909 to Senate Bill No. 166 First Reprint" ([Exhibit E](#)) is the mock-up and the language that we were working off of when the bill was originally presented before this Committee [on May 15, 2019]. The amendment that is now on the table—from that mock-up that you have in your hand—deletes subsection 7 of section 6.

Are we clear now? For those of you looking at the mock-up, if you look at page 9, you will see in blue font, lines 15 through 24, which is subsection 7 of section 6—that is the language that is now being removed per this amendment.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I am still confused by this. Therefore, I am just going to have to vote no today.

**Chair Flores:**

Understood. Members, any additional comments?

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am really confused. I am going to vote no, but I am going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor. I am trying to understand—there was so much deleted from this. I am hoping I can get with the sponsor or somebody to help me walk through this.

**Assemblywoman Hardy:**

I am just a little confused about what is in and what is out. I want a little more time. I am going to vote no now, but may get to a point to vote yes.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I had worked on an amendment with Senator Spearman, and I wanted to get the intent of the amendment that I had that I thought we were going to be voting on today. I very much wanted any fines that were collected to go back to the express intent to alleviate any further problems that would exist, so maybe someday, we would not even need this bill. I guess, unfortunately, there was a problem with that. I just hope that that intent will be taken into effect so any fines that are collected can go back into the system, whether it goes into marketing or to hire more hearing officers, et cetera.

**Chair Flores:**

Members, any additional discussion?

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

Assemblywoman Duran will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 166 (1st Reprint). Next on the work session is Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint).

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

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to public retirement systems. This was sponsored by Senators Ratti, Parks, and Woodhouse and heard in this Committee on May 6, 2019 ([Exhibit G](#)). The bill provides that certain information about a member or retiree that is contained in a record or file of a public retirement system administered by the Public Employees' Retirement System Board is a public record—namely the identification number, last public employer, number of years of service credit, retirement date, amount of the person's annual pension, and whether the person is receiving a disability or service retirement allowance. All other information regarding a member, retiree, or beneficiary that is contained in a record or file in the possession of a public retirement system is confidential, regardless of the form, location, and manner of creation or storage of the record or file containing the information.

The measure also clarifies that the board is prohibited from disclosing confidential information about a member or retiree to a third party unless the disclosure is necessary for the board to carry out its duties and the board executes a confidentiality agreement with the third party before providing the third party with any confidential information.

We have one amendment that was being proposed by the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs ([Exhibit G](#)). The amendment replaces "identification number" with "name" and removes other information about a current or former member of a public retirement system administered by the board. If you look on page 2 of [Exhibit G](#), you can see under section 1, subsection 2(a) where it replaces "identification number" with "name" and removes from subsection 2 "(b) The last public employer . . ."; it removes "(c) The number of years of service credit . . ."; it removes "(d) The retirement date of the current or former member"; and it also removes "(f) Whether the current or former member receives a disability . . . ." What you would be left with is the name and the amount of annual pension benefit paid to the current or former member.

**Chair Flores:**

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 224 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

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



**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am going to vote to get this out of Committee, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I reserve my right too.

**Chair Flores:**

Assemblyman Carrillo will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 224 (1st Reprint). Next on the work session, we have Senate Bill 242 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 242 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to peace officers. (BDR 23-1066)**

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 242 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to peace officers. This was sponsored by Senator Cannizzaro and heard in this Committee on May 10, 2019 ([Exhibit H](#)). The bill provides certain rights to peace officers. It requires that a suspended peace officer be granted back pay under certain circumstances. A superior officer must stop questioning a peace officer if the peace officer reasonably believes the questioning could result in punitive action and the peace officer requests representation. A peace officer's compelled statement may not be used against the peace officer in a civil case without his or her consent with limited exceptions. A law enforcement agency is prohibited from initiating certain investigations of a peace officer more than one year after the misconduct allegedly occurred unless the alleged misconduct would be a crime punishable pursuant to state or federal law. A law enforcement agency may not reopen an investigation of a peace officer if the agency determines that no misconduct occurred unless the agency discovers new material evidence related to the matter. A peace officer may not be reassigned without his or her consent during an investigation or hearing related to misconduct. A peace officer's representative must be allowed to inspect any evidence the law enforcement agency has in its possession related to the investigation.

We have one amendment that was proposed by the bill sponsor [pages 2-8, ([Exhibit H](#))]. The amendment provides a definition of "law enforcement agency" in section 1.5, subsection 3 [page 3]. The amendment creates an exemption in section 4, subsection 5, allowing for the reassignment of a peace officer without consent under certain circumstances [page 5]. Finally, the amendment clarifies, in section 6, subsection 4, what types of information may be inspected by a representative of a peace officer who is under investigation [page 6].

**Chair Flores:**

Thank you, Mr. McDonald. Vice Chair McCurdy, please proceed.

**Assemblyman McCurdy:**

Could we have Mike Ramirez come up and provide clarification as to what is going to happen in section 2, subsection 5 for the Committee's edification, please?

**Mike Ramirez, Director of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.; and representing Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:**

If you recall the hearing on this bill on May 10, 2019, there was an issue raised by Lisa Rasmussen regarding the "civil" part. She spoke to the attorney for Las Vegas Police Protective Association, David Roger, and with her approval, the word "such" was removed; so now it just says "in a civil case" [page 4, ([Exhibit H](#))]. They removed the word "such" and she was fine with that.

**Assemblyman McCurdy:**

Therefore, we did have clarification that we are now at a place where everyone is on the same sheet of music, correct?

**Mike Ramirez:**

Correct.

**Chair Flores:**

Having that clarification, I would at this point like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 242 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 242 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Hafen will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 242 (1st Reprint). Next on the work session, we have Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint).

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

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to affordable housing. It was sponsored by Senator Ratti and heard in this Committee on April 30, 2019 ([Exhibit I](#)). The bill provides that a board of county commissioners and a governing body of an incorporated city have certain powers to ensure the availability or affordability of housing within their respective jurisdictions, as it is deemed one of the necessary powers to address matters of local concern. The bill allows a board of county commissioners or governing body of an incorporated city, respectively, to accept a payment of money in lieu of the performance of an obligation imposed upon a person by ordinance. The board of county commissioners or governing body of an incorporated city, respectively, which accepts a fee in lieu of affordable housing, must account separately for that money and use that money only for the development or redevelopment of affordable housing. We have no amendments.

**Chair Flores:**

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN SMITH MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 398 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I know a lot of us have had many people talk to us about this bill. I am going to vote it out of Committee, but I want to continue to talk to the sponsor of the bill as well as additional folks. I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I talked to one of my county commissioners and her county, and they had a few problems with the bill. I am going to vote no, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor as I am waiting to hear back from two other counties that I operate with.

**Chair Flores:**

Members, is there any additional discussion? I will say to the Committee that I have never been a big fan of home rule. I have consistently said that. However, it is my understanding that this body in 2015 made it abundantly clear that they wanted home rule. It is my understanding that this language before us now is something that the local governments can do already. We have had our Legal Division [of the Legislative Counsel Bureau] give an opinion and legal thought that they could do this already. While I have been consistently against home rule, I think this is something that local governments can do now, and this bill is just clarifying language.

The other thing: There has been a perception that this bill will somehow do something amazing for affordable housing. I want to make it abundantly clear to our constituents that this is permissive language. Unfortunately, this bill is just allowing our locals to take action should they want to. This is not a bill that is going to change anything; it is just giving permission to our locals to get involved in the affordable housing crisis. I also do not want us to try to paint this bill as something that fixes the problem; it just opens a door for us to start addressing the issue. I do not want us to paint this as something that it is not because, unfortunately, we are not fixing the housing crisis with the bill. We are only opening the door and allowing tools to be put on the table.

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

Assemblywoman Munk will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 398 (1st Reprint). Next on the work session is Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to constables. (BDR 20-754)**

**Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to constables. This was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and heard in this Committee on May 10, 2019 ([Exhibit J](#)). The bill makes various changes to provisions governing constables. It revises the required level of certification that each constable and deputy constable must receive from the Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission. If the constable of an office established as an enterprise fund appoints a deputy constable, the compensation of the deputy constable shall be subject to the approval of the board of county commissioners. The bill clarifies that a person employed as clerical or operational staff of a constable may not carry a firearm, concealed or not, while performing the duties of the office of the constable.

This bill increases the amount that a constable is entitled to receive for collecting sums on execution or writ. A constable of an office established as an enterprise fund must account for and forward every five business days any fees received within the preceding period. The office of constable is designated nonpartisan; however, this designation does not apply to a constable who is in office on October 1, 2019, unless he or she is elected or appointed to a term of office on or after October 1, 2019. We do not have any amendments.

**Chair Flores:**

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint).

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

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Leavitt will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 462 (1st Reprint).

That concludes our work session document today. [The upcoming Committee schedule was explained.] Is there anybody here for public comment? Seeing no one, this meeting is adjourned [at 12:35 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Geigy Stringer  
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 10](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 14](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is a mock-up amendment dated May 13, 2019, titled "Proposed Amendment 5909 to [Senate Bill 166 \(1st Reprint\)](#)," submitted by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 166 \(1st Reprint\)](#), including a mock-up amendment dated May 15, 2019, titled "Proposed Amendment 5924 to [Senate Bill 166 \(1st Reprint\)](#)," presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 224 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 242 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 398 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

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