

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

**Eightieth Session
April 11, 2019**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Vice Chair William McCurdy II at 8:47 a.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/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:

Assemblyman Skip Daly, Assembly District No. 31
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig Madole, CEO, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors
Scott McCullough, Project Manager, Douglas County School District
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Darren Schulz, Public Works Director, Carson City
Laurie Thom, Tribal Chairman, Yerington Paiute Tribe
Amber Torres, Tribal Chairman, Walker River Paiute Tribe
Marla McDade Williams, representing Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
Ernie Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
William Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Sherry Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission
Mike Draper, representing Fingerprinting Express
Ash Mirchandani, Owner, A1 Fingerprinting Services
Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchise Auto Dealers Association
Monica Pappas, Owner, Fingerprinting Express
Supriya Mirchandani, Owner, A1 Fingerprinting Services
Gail J. Anderson, Deputy for Southern Nevada, Office of the Secretary of State
Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League

Vice Chair McCurdy:

[Roll was called. Committee rules were explained.] We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 162. Assemblyman Daly, please begin when you are ready.

**Assembly Bill 162: Revises various provisions relating to governmental administration.
(BDR 18-777)**

Assemblyman Skip Daly, Assembly District No. 31:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 162. You should all have an amendment ([Exhibit C](#)); we are going to take out many sections of the bill and get it down to just a few, mostly cleanup provisions and a couple of new provisions to give some clarity to the regulatory process under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 233B.

With that, I will go through the bill, or what is left of it ([Exhibit C](#)). Section 1 is being deleted. Section 2 is deleted. Section 3 is deleted. There were some objections from the Office of the Governor on many of those provisions, so we are going to move on to section 5. The only remaining change in section 5 is to delete the word "minimum" under the

procedures for this chapter. The word, in my view, creates confusion there; these are the provisions, not the minimum provisions, in order to promulgate regulations. Section 6 is proposed to be deleted by amendment. Section 7, under NRS Chapter 233B, changes the date of the *Nevada Administrative Code* most recently revised or supplemented. You can see the last time it was updated was 1987. Now, the Legislative Commission reviews legislation on a regular ongoing basis. Since then they have been added to the registry of regulations, so this is an update. The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) made this change to get us current up to the beginning of this legislative session for regulations that have been previously adopted through the process by the Legislative Commission.

Section 8 amends NRS Chapter 233B with a small technical change deleting the reference to disclosures of the source. The current language says to include the price, but it has become problematic for LCB to do that because there are member prices and nonmember prices— mostly in reference to types of materials. They give a link to a website where you can look up the price and buy it or get the document if you need to. Having the price in there means they are constantly changing as prices go up and having to revise statutes and various things. So they said, Let us take the price out, and they still have to give the website where you can find those documents. Then subsection 4 clarifies some language on the time frame that agencies are supposed to have to provide regulations. If they go through the workshop and then the hearing and then turn it in to LCB and adopt it, they are supposed to turn it in to LCB and try to get it in front of the Legislative Commission as timely as possible. They have two years. That is just some cleanup language to further clarify what they are supposed to do and when it is supposed to be submitted for review.

Section 9 is deleted by amendment. Section 10 is cleanup language, where we are deleting the words "With respect to substantive regulations." In my understanding there is no difference between a substantive or a nonsubstantive regulation. A regulation is a regulation. Those words just create confusion and are being proposed to be deleted. Section 11 of the bill is regarding the adoption of emergency regulations. It is just giving language that says, when they want to adopt emergency regulations, to submit it to the Governor. So we are clearing up what they are supposed to do, what they are supposed to provide to the Governor. There is a companion section to this that says, when they actually get through with the emergency regulation, they have to turn the regulation in along with the document where the Governor agreed it was an emergency. This part here is clarifying that they have to go to the Governor and he has to agree that there is an emergency. You can see that continues on the next page, clarifying those issues. Of course, we are deleting some language that would have been with other sections that we are deleting as well.

Section 12 clarifies that if you are going to object to a regulation, the two years' provision in there is not the only reason you can object to a regulation. I believe that an important piece of this cleanup is getting clarification on the regulatory process. There is an argument that has been made that once you are past the two years, whether they did any of the procedure or not, you would be unable to object because the time limit has passed. This makes it clear that if you are precluded under the two years, if they just never did any of the procedures, you would still be able to make an objection.

Section 13 is deleted by amendment. Section 14 is cleanup language as well. It states, "The Legislative Counsel shall periodically prepare and publish electronically a Register of Administrative Regulations on the public website of the Legislature on the Internet." Then you can see deleted language referring to how, prior to the Internet, they would publish adopted regulations. They would update it similarly to how they update the books—the paper book of the statutes that you get. They do not actually do paper versions anymore—it all gets put up on the website. This is to clean up and clarify and get our statutes in line with actual practice. As soon as a regulation gets adopted and approved by the Legislative Commission, it goes up into the registry on the website once it has been delivered to the Secretary of State and that last little bit of paperwork is done. That gets us in line with actual practice and gets old language out of the law.

Sections 15, 16, 17, and 18 are all being deleted. Those were in the original bill talking about the subcommittee to review regulations. We are not doing those portions of the bill any longer.

Section 19 is the provision I mentioned earlier where it says, if they are going to submit an emergency regulation that, in addition to a copy, they have to also include a written statement of the emergency endorsed by the Governor, pursuant to the statute. It was not in there before. They could have just said, Yeah, we got the okay from the Governor. I am sure they did, but now they have a document that goes on the record that shows that the Governor endorsed it.

Sections 20, 21, 22, and 23 are deleted. Section 24 repeals NRS 233B.0656 on the register that I talked about. Section 25 specifies that, if passed, it becomes effective July 1, 2019.

That is what is left of Assembly Bill 162. It is not the biggest bill in the world. There is some good cleanup language, some things that would help our legislative staff carry out the provisions they need to, and then some clarification and commonsense additions and provisions regarding the regulatory procedure. I am happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Does this bill prohibit the recording or preparation of documents nonelectronically? I know it mentions in here that these are now to be done electronically, but is there some fail-safe mechanism instilled in this bill that would allow for if your system is down and there is no Internet available, to record these documents the old-fashioned way?

Assemblyman Daly:

I guarantee they still have paper documents. This is just for the distribution of it. As you know, if you ask the Legislative Counsel Bureau if you can have the actual NRS in your office in a book, you can. Every year after the session is over they go through and they codify everything and they update those books. People can still get paper versions. Not very

many people ask for them. The bill used to require it to be put in these books. They update the copies if you want them, but the Internet is how it is distributed now. No, it does not prohibit it.

Assemblyman Hafen:

My question may be for legal counsel more than for Assemblyman Daly—a clarification on the technicalities of the deletions in the amendment. Is it the intent that when we are deleting entire sections that those entire sections would come out of the NRS?

Assemblyman Daly:

When I was first here in 2011, I asked the same question. When you are deleting it out of the bill, what you are doing means that it will stay in statute unchanged. It does not delete those provisions out of statute; it just deletes it out of a bill.

Asher Killian, Committee Counsel:

Assemblyman Daly's representation of the process is correct. When it says "deleted by amendment," that is merely deleting it from the bill. The only way to take it out of NRS is, I believe, section 24 of the bill where we "repeal" it. If we are not repealing it, it remains in NRS.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Members, are there any additional questions at this time? [There were none.] Assemblyman Daly, please sit back and we will invite those wishing to speak in support at this time. [There was no one.] If there is anyone wishing to speak in opposition, please step forward. [There was no one.] Is there anyone here to speak in the neutral position? [There was no one.] We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 162. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 179. Assemblywoman Swank, please come forward.

Assembly Bill 179: Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-622)

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16:

As seems to be the theme of many different bills this week, this is a very different bill than we started with. We have been working on it over the session. I will pass things off to my copresenter to take you through the bill.

Craig Madole, CEO, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors:

First and foremost, I would like to thank Assemblywoman Swank for sponsoring Assembly Bill 179. As she stated, while the original intent of the bill was very different from the current amendment ([Exhibit D](#)), we appreciate her willingness to address issues in the public works construction arena. We will be presenting A.B. 179 as amended ([Exhibit D](#)); the original bill has been fully replaced by this amendment.

The purpose of the amended version of A.B. 179 is pretty simple and straightforward. In 2013 the Legislature approved a significant modification of the construction manager at risk (CMAR) law [Assembly Bill 283 of the 77th Session]. After countless meetings and

negotiations with all interested parties, it was agreed that all awarding agencies with a population of less than 100,000 people could award two CMAR projects per year. It was required that each CMAR project be considered a discrete project. While the dictionary defines "discrete" as individually separate and distinct, there had been some scenarios where this definition was not applicable to the contract awarded. It is the intent of our amendment to clearly define projects as occurring at a single site, and not numerous, bundled projects awarded as one CMAR contract. We feel that this clarification is simply rewording and clarifying the intent of the legislation from 2013.

With that I am happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Members, are there any questions at this time? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify against A.B. 179?

Scott McCullough, Project Manager, Douglas County School District:

Since 2011 Douglas County School District has been utilizing the CMAR delivery method with great success. Last year we had maintenance projects that we put into one CMAR project. We believe these maintenance projects are discrete, as it is all one type of work that we are executing. The school district is in the process of our next project, which is single-point entry and security fencing on five campuses in Douglas County, and we planned on using the CMAR delivery method with this bundling, as this legislation is attempting to prevent. This bundling, for small counties, gives us much more leverage for getting better pricing. We are 40 miles from Reno, so putting a project together like that gives us better representation. We do the same thing for hard bid projects. We just let a pavement maintenance project where we put five different sites together and received excellent pricing from Sierra Nevada Construction in Reno. We were able to do this because we had a project that we made attractive for the size of the project to bring the contractors to Minden and Gardnerville to execute these projects. With that, I am available for any questions.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

We are opposed to the amendment to A.B. 179. There are three different areas that are important to us. The first reason we are opposed is because it delays work. This limits our school districts, especially in our smaller counties, and delays our work because there can only be two CMAR projects a year. That is the first problem with it. It also increases costs. Not being able to bundle similar work would increase the total cost of executing the work due to the requirement to award and administer multiple contracts and subjecting the contracts to increased construction costs over time. The third problem that we have, especially in our remote rural areas, is attracting qualified contractors. We are able to do that when we bundle different projects, and this limits us from doing that, so we are opposed. Thank you.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

You had mentioned a particular project, fencing around various schools. If this legislation were to go through and you were not able to bundle various projects, what would you do?

Scott McCullough:

We would have to make a decision, either to do it as a hard bid design-build or do single CMAR projects on multiple sites. The number of bid documents required for either is excessive, in our opinion, and could also be seen as our trying to keep it under \$250,000, which is the threshold for a public works project for prevailing wage, and we have come across that before. We do not break stuff apart to avoid that requirement. This may appear that we are breaking up a project that we want to put together. Our budget for this single-point entry security fencing project is \$1.2 million, which obviously exceeds that threshold and is a prevailing wage project. To answer your question, we would still do fencing and single-point entry if that was applicable to that single site, either hard bid or CMAR, for that single campus.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I believe you said you were looking at five different locations. Did I mishear you?

Scott McCullough:

No, you did not. The project we have, the Douglas County School District Board of Trustees plan on awarding a contract for architectural services to begin the project on single-point entry and security fencing on five different campuses for Douglas County School District. That is the real-time project I am referring to that this would greatly affect.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Are there any others in opposition, either in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Does anyone wish to testify in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 179?

Darren Schulz, Public Works Director, Carson City:

We are neutral to this amendment. We just want to go on the record and say that our CMAR is a very applicable delivery process that we use here in Carson City on a regular basis. We do fall under the threshold of 100,000 people, so this does apply to us and we just want to make sure that everybody is aware that this delivery method is extremely beneficial to our taxpayers. Over the last four years we have done three CMAR projects. All have come in under budget and ahead of schedule. We do not want to lose this opportunity to keep this method in our toolbox and want to be careful anytime we are revising things so that it becomes more stringent or difficult for us to use. At this point we are neutral.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

We will ask that our sponsor please come forward and provide closing comments.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I will say that CMAR was forever seared in my brain in 2013 when I sat on this Committee, and there are some things I do remember from that session and being on the Assembly

Committee on Government Affairs. The intent for CMAR is to apply to more complex projects, and that "discrete" was never meant to be bundled projects. Those are things that I remember among many other things that I take away from many other discussions in 2013. With that, I am going to pass things off to Mr. Madole, if you do not mind, for a few other comments.

Craig Madole:

I did just want to quickly read the declaration of legislative intent on construction manager at risk [*Nevada Revised Statutes* 338.1685]. It states, "To better equip public bodies to address public works that present unique and complex construction challenges." I would take the position that putting up some fencing may not necessarily present those unique and complex construction challenges. I think Assemblywoman Swank is correct; the intent of CMAR was never to bundle projects. It was for a single project that did present those unique and complex challenges, and we believe this is good clarification of current law.

Assemblyman Ellison:

A question I have is, can they bundle projects at a 100,000 population and above?

Craig Madole:

Those restrictions only apply to counties of less than 100,000, so in Clark County or Washoe County it is my understanding that yes, they could.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 179. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 264.

Assembly Bill 264: Makes various changes relating to relations between state agencies and Indian nations or tribes. (BDR 18-671)

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

I am happy to be introducing today Assembly Bill 264, which is the Nevada State-Tribal Collaboration Act. I want to give a little bit of background on this because sometimes the state engagement with tribal governments can be foreign to folks who do not work within that area. We have 27 federally recognized tribal governments in the state of Nevada, and they are considered sovereign nations. We leverage and share resources with these governments, and the members of these tribes are also citizens of the state of Nevada. What this bill attempts to do is create a bridge and a process for honoring and maintaining that sovereignty, while also maintaining relationships that allow us to leverage those resources together. We are looking to build a consistent process that enables resources to be utilized and leveraged. Some of our state offices already have existing liaison programs; this codifies how those liaison programs work and the process in which to engage with tribal governments. We are creating a bridge with this document, a tool for the process of working and engaging with tribal governments and their programs.

I want to go through the bill with you and to discuss some of the changes that are made in the amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) as well. Because this document is related to tribal governments in the state of Nevada, we have stricken "American Indian or Alaska Native" because this really pertains to tribal members of Nevada tribes, and specifically to government coordination between those governments. We changed the definition of Indian tribe to be consistent with existing *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). In section 6, we added a section that develops a process for engagement. When a tribe engages with our state government, it can happen in one of two ways: the tribe can make the first steps and ask for engagement, or the state can take the first steps and ask for engagement. Section 6, subsection 1, is when a tribe asks for engagement. This develops a process so that the appropriate representation can come together to coordinate on the issue that they are discussing or working towards, specifically, enabling their representative and the Governor to get together to resolve issues.

Throughout the document we changed "state agency" to "The Nevada Indian Commission" so that the process and the development of training programs and the development of protocol is all housed in one center, and that center can then distribute these resources and this process to agencies as appropriate. Not every agency in the state of Nevada engages with tribes in a way that would require coordination and consultation. We can see in the fiscal note that this had a significant impact if we had to engage every state agency in requiring a liaison program. This eliminates that issue. The Indian Commission would also help the state agencies develop their liaison program. Some state agencies already have an existing liaison and others do not. If they do not have to have a single unique liaison, they can designate a liaison to assist in the process of collaborating with a tribe on a program. That liaison would, though, have to go through a training protocol and submit some records of that process to the Indian Commission to keep track of, and the Indian Commission would send those to the Office of the Governor and the Legislature.

This year our Governor made a significant effort to engage with tribal governments to ensure that we were coordinating and consulting in a way that was effective and efficient, to engage in areas where there were significant concerns. Specifically, the example that comes to mind is when the federal government shut down and our tribes that are dependent on federal funding were trying to figure out how to maintain programs including food distribution programs and health care programs. The Governor made sure to reach out and let them know that we had support at the state level to ensure that our citizens in the state of Nevada were all taken care of. Section 7 codifies that there will be a state-tribal summit to address matters of mutual concern, to keep those conversations and dialogues going. Those are so important when we are talking about issues that have a different flavor because they come from a different culture, they come from a different life perspective. Ensuring that we have that dialogue and that narrative to engage in a way that is effective is really important for these relationships.

I believe that covers most of what I wanted to cover in this document about what we are doing with it. I am open to questions before I pass this off for some supportive testimony from my colleagues.

Laurie Thom, Tribal Chairman, Yerington Paiute Tribe:

[Speaking in Paiute]

What I am saying is: Good Morning, my name is Laurie Thom, I am from the *Taboose-ddukaka* Nation. I am the Chairman of the Yerington Paiute Tribe. As we come together, I pray to our Father that we have good words and good listening.

I just wanted to state that the thought for this bill came from a meeting of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration that Chairman Amber Torres and I attended. We realized that there was a missing piece in the collaboration when tribal nations work with the state government agencies. We also saw the need for that during the deferral process of the Anaconda Mine. That deferral was done and processed with the Environmental Protection Agency and the previous Governor, and it was done without our consultation, it was done without our input, it was done behind locked gates, and I do not think that is right. We are citizens of the state of Nevada, but we are still a sovereign nation and we are citizens of that nation also. We would like to protect our resources, we would like to protect our citizens, and we would like to continue to work with the state and the agencies we have been working with. We believe that this bill will give us that process.

We will have a standard for cultural relevancy so that those liaisons understand who they are working with and who we are. Because we are the first inhabitants of the state of Nevada, we would like that respect. We would like to ensure we are working together on different programs because there are ways we can benefit each other in this process. Speaking with Governor Sisolak, we do appreciate everything that he has done so far to meet with our tribes. He has fulfilled his promises of meeting with us and collaborating. He has fulfilled our requests for meetings. We have also supported him in the opposition to the plutonium. It was shown by the tribal nations sending letters to the federal government. We plan on continuing to send letters until he gets a meeting with the appropriate people because we have that government-to-government collaboration at the federal level, and we would like to provide that assistance to do so.

Working with the Nevada Indian Commission has been great. I think there is a way for the state to use that commission to be able to better coordinate with us, to understand who we are, who the next tribal leader is. We have elections that are completely different than the regular elections in the state of Nevada, so leadership does change, and we would like to make sure that that communication is open and that it is relevant to what we are talking about. Those are issues, not just on the reservation, but ones that border our reservations. That is why we are in support of this bill. We thank Assemblymen Peters, Flores, Fumo, Neal, and Senator Scheible for supporting us in this effort because this is necessary and it has been a long time coming. We would like to make sure we have this process available to the tribes and to the state agencies so we can better educate them on our needs.

[Assemblyman Flores assumed the Chair.]

Amber Torres, Tribal Chairman, Walker River Paiute Tribe:

I first of all want to thank you for the opportunity to advocate for A.B. 264. I want to thank you for allowing us a seat at the table regarding any decisions that are made that could impact our people. First of all, we want to advocate for this bill for the simple fact that we want to continue to build a rapport, build a partnership with the state of Nevada. Thus far it has been a very good working relationship with the Governor and his administration. He has looked out for us. He is backing all the Indian initiatives and tribal issues, and we greatly appreciate that.

With this bill we want to make sure that all state employees have the training that is necessary to understand who we are, what we are about, and how we operate. The other thing is to make sure they have cultural competency. When you put a tribe liaison to work with tribal governments, we want them to understand how we work so that we can continue to build that partnership, so we can continue to offer services for our people. We also want to include the Nevada Indian Commission to strengthen that relationship between the state and tribal governments. We are just asking for your support with the Nevada State-Tribal Collaboration Act. We thank you for that seat at the table because if you are not at the table you are on the menu. We appreciate that, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I am new to this, and I am not very familiar with the Nevada Indian Commission, but I know that we have had a couple of presentations and I am grateful for you guys being here. I see in here that we are trying to promote positive relationships, which I think is a great idea. We have current relations with the current Governor. I am just wondering if there is anything that prohibits us from continuing those good relationships, or if I am missing something that we cannot already do? I do think that having good relationships with your neighbors is a good idea. Could you clarify that for me?

Assemblywoman Peters:

It has always been at the whim of the governor how our government treats tribal governments, and this codifies what those relationships should look like. It creates transparency and accountability, and it enables the Indian Commission to take steps to ensure that there is appropriate training and mechanisms for maintaining these relationships. One of the things we see in our state agencies is that when there is turnover, there can be inconsistencies when the person taking over the liaison position does not fully understand the process and does not have the institutional knowledge brought to them. This creates a narrative that allows for a new person to come in with the same abilities and the same knowledge base to be able to facilitate those healthy relationships. This will go on beyond the current administration into the next administration and ensure that we are able to sustain these positive relationships into perpetuity. I think one of the things we have seen over the last five or so years is a resurgence of power from our tribal governments, and it is appropriate, it is necessary that they engage and take their power back in a way that ensures that their members and their culture exists in perpetuity. It is important for us, as representatives of this state, to represent those members as well, and to engage in this process

in a way that makes room for everyone at the table. I am really proud to bring this piece of legislation. I think this is one of the most important things we could be doing right now to engage with members in our state.

Chair Flores:

Thank you, Assemblywoman Peters. I think we all are in agreement that our Governor presently has a very strong and positive agenda to ensure that all of our tribes are given a voice. This is an opportunity for us to ensure that any governor in the future, whoever that may be, will continue to do the same thing. The agenda that we set now is replicated through NRS for years to come. I appreciate all of your testimony.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

Thank you for bringing this forward. Could I be added as a cosponsor?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I would be honored to add you.

Chair Flores:

I would like to invite those wishing to speak in support of Assembly Bill 264 to please come forward.

Marla McDade Williams, representing Reno-Sparks Indian Colony:

We stand in support of Assembly Bill 264, as amended. As Assemblywoman Peters noted, although there is the current authority for state agencies to interact with tribes, there really is not a formalized system and it is needed. There are multiple issues that occur in state government every day. One of the issues that we are dealing with right now relates to protection of cultural resources, and we continue to have those conversations, but when we get stalled, there is no place to go. We believe that this will formalize it and allow us to have a better path to pursue when we run into barriers. We extend our appreciation to Assemblywoman Peters and the other leaders who have put this measure forward.

Ernie Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe:

The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe has had very good relationships with all the state agencies and has not had any problems scheduling meetings with agency heads. The Governor had a town meeting at Pyramid Lake where he met with all the elected officials and members of the community. He has had a very good relationship also with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; but I think there does need to be more of a formal process for them to meet with agency heads. I think the idea of an annual meeting, which is in section 7, would be excellent to implement because it would help further communications, although, like I say, at the moment communications are good with the state government and the tribe.

William Adler, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe:

On the points Assemblyman Hafen brought up: yes, currently we have a very free-flowing process between tribal communities and state agencies in Nevada. Historically, this has not been the case, especially going back more than 20 years into 50 years or 100 years.

The current enlightened culture we have today under Governor Sisolak and the current agency heads that are free-flowing with communication is definitely not the historic path of Nevada, it is sad to say. Having this bill in law adds some mandates and does add some requests, but I think it is just setting up a good structure for all frameworks going forward with consultation with tribal communities across Nevada. We are in full support of this bill.

Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

As Nevada faces critical decisions that impact resources, we believe forging a partnership with the state's tribes is essential. Assembly Bill 264 makes a strong commitment from our state to collaborate on policy and programs with Nevada's indigenous communities, and we ask you to support the bill.

Chair Flores:

Is there anyone else wishing to speak in support of Assembly Bill 264? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to speak in opposition to Assembly Bill 264? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to speak in the neutral position?

Sherry Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission:

I just want to note that there have been instances where the state could have done better and this bill, as stated, does help to improve the collaboration and accountability for state agencies. I have been doing this for quite some time as the executive director and the tribal liaison for the Governor to our 27 tribal nations, and I think the work that we do is very important. There is definitely room for additional education of our state agencies in regard to our tribes. That is some of the work that we currently do now, but the way this is stated, it would allow the Nevada Indian Commission to improve and to enhance what we do.

Chair Flores:

Is there anyone else wishing to speak in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Peters, we have another question for you.

Assemblyman Ellison:

How many other states have implemented a program like this, that you are aware of?

Assemblywoman Peters:

California did it through an executive order a couple of years ago. New Mexico has a similar act. Those are the two that come to the top of my head, but they are very similar to how this is written.

Chair Flores:

Give us any closing remarks that you may have.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to present this bill. I have been working with tribal governments for most of my career, and I am so proud to be able to bring this

piece of legislation, and I am so proud to see these wonderful, amazing women in their ribbon skirts here today supporting this as well. I just want you to know how much this means for us as a state. I appreciate your hearing me cry on camera and on record.

[Not referenced in testimony, but a letter in support of A.B. 264 was submitted by Patrick Donnelly and submitted as ([Exhibit F](#))]

Chair Flores:

Thank you, Assemblywoman Peters. I think our state is better because of our tribes, and we often do not do enough to recognize them. The fact that you are emotionally connected to it, I think, is a good thing. I want to thank you for that. We as a state have an obligation to do more. I am going to go ahead and close the hearing on Assembly Bill 264.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

On behalf of my Native American heritage, I would like to make a motion to amend this bill, adding myself as a sponsor, as well as those discussed, and do pass this bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 264.

Chair Flores:

Assemblyman Leavitt has made a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 264, adding himself as a cosponsor, and the conceptual amendments that we put on the record. Assemblywoman Martinez has also asked that she be added as a cosponsor. Assemblywoman Duran has asked that she be added as cosponsor. Assemblywoman Munk has asked to be added as a cosponsor. Assemblyman Smith has asked to be added as a cosponsor. Assemblywoman Gorelow has asked to be added as a cosponsor. Assemblyman Carrillo has asked to be considered as a cosponsor. Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod has asked to be a cosponsor, along with Assemblyman Assefa, as well as Assemblyman McCurdy.

I just want to make this abundantly clear: Assemblyman Leavitt has made a motion to amend and do pass, with all conceptual amendments put on the table. On top of that, Assemblyman Leavitt, Assemblywoman Martinez, Assemblyman Carrillo, Assemblyman Smith, Assemblyman Assefa, Assemblywoman Duran, Assemblywoman Munk, Assemblywoman Gorelow, Assemblyman McCurdy, Assemblyman Hafen, Assemblywoman Hardy, and Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod have all asked to be added as cosponsors. That is the motion that is on the table.

ASSEMBLYMAN ASSEFA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Peters, please take the floor statement. With that, I am going to hand over the dais to Assemblyman McCurdy.

[Assemblyman McCurdy assumed the Chair]

Vice Chair McCurdy:

We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 425.

Assembly Bill 425: Revises provisions governing fingerprinting services. (BDR 19-945)

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Assembly District No. 28:

I represent the hardest-working women and men in the state. It is an honor to be here today on their behalf. I wanted to, very quickly, apologize that we are not going to move Assembly Bill 425 the way it is written now. Let me give you some insight on the genesis of Assembly Bill 425. Right now, there is a whole host of small businesses that focus on fingerprinting and do an amazing job. However, as you know, there is a whole host of different industries or agencies that do not utilize the private sector for fingerprinting. An example would be the Clark County School District. They do their own fingerprinting, and when we talk about fingerprinting in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and in other police departments, they handle all of that. The reason the structure is set up in that way is because we do not have a lot of rules in place for fingerprinting companies. My intent with Assembly Bill 425 is to ensure that the private sector, the small business community, can come into this space and be successful while at the same time having the necessary safeguards to ensure that all biometric information that is housed by them is secure.

There are three purposes to this bill. The first is to allow the private sector to control it. When we talk about fingerprinting, there is this automatic knee-jerk reaction that we have to go to law enforcement or that certain industries do it themselves. That results in very long wait periods. I will give you an example. I know individuals who wanted to be volunteers at a school, either helping with the soccer team or tutoring. One of the requirements is that you get fingerprinted because they have to do a background check. Specifically, in this scenario that I am telling you, there were parents and myself who wanted to do it and it took two to three weeks before we could get all that done. It is problematic because, obviously, there are people who want to help, but because of the way it is structured, and because there are no real rules regulating fingerprinting companies, the schools feel obligated to do everything themselves. That is one of the reasons I think it is imperative that we all try to get involved in this area and help.

Second, I want to give law enforcement and the school districts and everybody who is in this space the necessary confidence that the private sector, the small business community, will have the necessary safeguards in place so that they can come into this space and say, We are going to manage all of this, we are going to come in and handle fingerprinting, and we have the necessary safeguards in place so that everybody's information is protected. Ultimately, that is my objective.

Lastly, I had the privilege and honor of working with the Office of the Secretary of State, and the people within this space who do this as a living and have many businesses, both in northern Nevada and southern Nevada, in the fingerprinting world.

With that, I am going to hand over the presentation. However, I wanted to make it abundantly clear that there are three things we are trying to do, and I want to reiterate them. First, this bill is not going to mandate that the private sector has to do it; the bill is intended to put the safeguards in place to give the confidence so that law enforcement and the school districts can say, Look, we are going to step out of this and allow the private sector to come into this because we know the safeguards are in place to ensure that information is protected. The second intent is to ensure that those who are in the arena of fingerprinting are good actors. Like any other industry, there are businesses that are considered problematic for a whole host of reasons. I will let the businesses speak about that; the stakeholders who are in that area will address those issues. Third, I want to ensure that the stakeholders, as well as the Secretary of State's Office, are on the same page.

With that, we are going to work off of a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit G](#)). I want the intent to be abundantly clear on the record that we are going to create safeguards so that this industry is regulated with the objective of ensuring that the private sector can come into this space and own it, control it, and really be more effective at it. Right now, with the school districts doing things themselves, there is an unnecessary period of time that goes on before someone can go into one of our schools. In my opinion, it is not good because if you are not part of this arena, you are adding work unnecessarily.

What we will do is we will go to Las Vegas, we will put on the record the conceptual amendment, I will have the stakeholders bring up their specific intent, and then we will open it up for questions, if that works, Mr. Vice Chair.

Mike Draper, representing Fingerprinting Express:

I just want to start by thanking Assemblyman Flores for allowing us to pester him for the last year and a half and working with us on this bill, which really does set up criteria and regulations around the fingerprinting industry in the state of Nevada. To elaborate a little bit more on what he just touched on—and by the way I am joined by the owners of Fingerprinting Express and the owners of A1 Fingerprinting here in Las Vegas—several years ago, when the marijuana industry regulations went into effect and everyone needed a fingerprint background check to be an investor or an owner or to work at a marijuana facility, we started talking to law enforcement. We had a lot of people come into our office complaining about the wait times that they were having to do with law enforcement. Effectively, we were putting civilians through a criminal process, as far as fingerprinting goes, so they were waiting for hours. Law enforcement acknowledged readily that fingerprinting for them, while absolutely necessary, is something that they would like to see done more effectively and would be open to working with private industry on, but they needed some confidence that private industry was going to be able to maintain and secure the private and confidential information we are talking about. Right now, 80-plus industries are required by statute to have fingerprint background checks. While we have 80-plus industries that the state deems so important that thousands of employees are required to undergo fingerprint background checks, we really have little to no regulation on fingerprint background checks.

The Department of Public Safety has some baseline criteria that they make sure a facility is adhering to when that facility opens, but outside of that, as far as the securing of the confidential information, as far as who is doing the fingerprint background checks, as far as the effectiveness of the fingerprint background check, we have little to no regulation. We approached Chair Flores about a year and a half ago about this and really started working on how we could make this happen with various stakeholders in the fingerprint industry. Fortunately for us, about a month or two ago the Secretary of State's Office said, Hey, we might be able to help make this a lot easier for you guys. We already do document services. This is very similar to document services; we have a statute set up for that. Why do we not do something similar and replicate our document services statutes? We were thrilled to work with the Secretary of State's Office. They have been very patient working with us, to the point where even this week we realized that maybe we could do this a lot more simply than the original bill, which was found to be a little onerous for some of the private fingerprint background check companies.

We are trying to balance providing the security and safety that the public needs when they are getting their fingerprints done with also making sure we are promoting business. A lot of these fingerprint companies are small businesses with just a couple of employees, so to overregulate them or burden them with too much regulation might put them out of business or dramatically hinder their business. We really worked hard with the Secretary of State's Office and with Chair Flores to find something that danced that line of providing effective regulation but also promoting business. I think we found it in the conceptual amendment. Very quickly, I will talk through the conceptual amendment, and if anyone has questions and needs me to go further into detail, I will.

As you will see, section 5 essentially requires anybody who goes into the business of a private fingerprint company has to be registered with the Secretary of State's Office. Section 3 outlines the definitions. "Fingerprint technicians" are the people administering the fingerprints and background checks. A "fingerprint facility" is the brick-and-mortar location. A "fingerprint applicant" is the customer. The "fingerprint service" is anything collecting biometric data. The "registrant" is the owner; we will refer to a registrant throughout this conceptual amendment; it is the owner of the fingerprint business.

Section 5 requires the owner of the business to be registered with the Secretary of State's Office annually. Section 5, subsection 2, is criteria for fingerprint technicians; essentially what it says is that fingerprint technicians must undergo annual fingerprint background checks. We require that in many other industries, so it only makes sense that the people who are handling that information and transmitting that information undergo annual fingerprint background checks, and it provides the criteria for which they will not be licensed or certified by the Secretary of State's Office. If they have a class D felony, if they have had a license in another state that was revoked, or something like that, the Secretary of State's Office would not certify or license them as fingerprint technicians. Section 5, subsection 3, is the criteria for the registrant and owner of the business to be licensed by the Secretary of State's Office. It requires a nonrefundable application fee of \$50. It requires a cash or surety bond based on the number of employees, which you will see later addressed in this amendment. The rest of

that section is the standard criteria that is used for document services and document preparation by the Secretary of State's Office. The Secretary of State's Office is represented here today and will be available to answer questions and clarify some of this as well, if there is a need. Subsection 6 requires that these registrations be renewed annually. It is annual fingerprint background checks both for the owners of the business as well as for the fingerprint technicians.

Section 6 requires an annual renewal of the application. That renewal fee will be \$25 for both the technician and the registrant, and again, if the cash or surety bond is not still active or in effect, that bond will need to be brought up to active at the time of renewal as well.

Section 7 outlines that the application fees will go to the Secretary of State's Office to help administer the program. The Secretary of State's Office is on hand to discuss what it will take to administer the program.

In section 8 are the bonding requirements. As of last night and this morning, it was realized that there is still a little bit of cleanup that is going to be needed on the bonding requirements, probably on the Senate side, to make sure they come into compliance with the Secretary of State's Office's requirements. Section 8 outlines the bonding requirements based on the number of employees in a fingerprint business.

In section 9 are the additional requirements required by the Secretary of State's Office to be licensed. They require a social security number to be included in the application. It then shows the rest of the criteria about any court findings, which are the standard criteria used in document services preparation which is the chapter right before this.

Section 10 allows for the Secretary of State's Office to suspend certification or licensure upon a court order. If a court order is issued pursuant to NRS 425.540 that provides for the suspension of all professional and other licenses, the Secretary of State's Office will in turn suspend their fingerprint license as well. Section 10, subsection 2, contains the conditions for reinstatement.

Section 11 requires that all private fingerprint companies that have been certified by the Secretary of State's Office permanently display that certificate as long as it is active.

Section 12 requires that all fingerprint background check companies obtain a state business license and meet the requirements of a state business license.

Section 13 outlines the protections and confidentiality and security of personal information. Part of this is working with document preparation services and the Secretary of State's Office to ensure the confidentiality and security of personal information. You will see what the criteria are under section 13, and that if a person is requesting to get their information back, a fingerprint background check company must immediately return a customer's information to them. Section 13, subsection 5, also outlines that a fingerprint facility must have a brick-and-mortar location that is available for inspection should there be any complaints or

need for inspection from the Secretary of State's Office or law enforcement. That does not mean they cannot have a mobile service, but they have to have a brick-and-mortar location in order to operate and be licensed by the Secretary of State's Office. Part of that also outlines the various security measures that need to occur at that brick-and-mortar location, from alarm systems to cameras in the lobby and fingerprinting area. It also talks about what the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) prefers as far as where the biometric data is actually transmitted.

Section 14 addresses the criteria for law enforcement. An applicant can provide written permission to a fingerprint background check company for that company to share their information with law enforcement, with the Office of the Attorney General, and with the Secretary of State's Office. It also outlines that a fingerprint background check company must keep records on hand for at least six months but no more than a year, the idea being to let people's personal and private information be destroyed when it is deemed no longer necessary.

Section 15 allows the Secretary of State to adopt additional regulations as necessary to administer this program.

Section 16 outlines the criteria for investigation and gives the powers of investigation to the Secretary of State's Office should they deem that necessary. Subsection 2 of section 16 outlines, if the Secretary of State determines that a violation has occurred, the process by which that violation will be addressed. If a violation occurs three times in a year, the Secretary of State's Office has the ability to suspend or revoke that license.

Section 17 allows the Secretary of State's Office to examine the records of a fingerprint background check company when they deem it necessary.

Lastly, section 18 allows the Secretary of State's Office to suspend, revoke, or refuse to renew the fingerprint license based on if a company had violations in the year prior, or violated any of the other parts of this bill.

This bill would go into effect immediately upon passage. The Secretary of State's Office would begin to establish the criteria necessary to administer the program, with the goal of the rest of the provisions of the bill going into effect on January 1, 2020.

That is it for the highlights of the bill. If there are questions, we have a full team that can answer them, and certainly people much smarter than me to answer most of those questions.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I know there is probably a need for this; my biggest fear is fraud. Anytime you have employees, you can have fraud. My biggest fear is that if they do, then information can be leaked or somebody who should not be fingerprinted could get false information. I see your penalties in here, but do you not think that that is pretty light? If you know that you are willingly taking false information, should that not be a felony?

Mike Draper:

I think we share exactly your same concern, which is why we are here today. There are several private fingerprinting companies—in fact I can tell you one example. We went into a store that sells knock-off purses, and they were doing fingerprint background checks at the back of the store. We have got to provide some criteria to make sure the right people in the industry are doing it. This statute is not to supersede any of the criminal statutes. If somebody is committing fraud, this allows us to revoke their license and make sure they never do fingerprints again in the state, but of course, then they will also have to answer to law enforcement under those same penalties that are in place right now.

Assemblyman Ellison:

But the penalties under section 10 do not show that is a felony. Fingerprints are very serious, and maybe you could consider that as a friendly amendment or something, but I think if this bill is going to pass, it should have some very serious consequences for those who break the law.

Ash Mirchandani, Owner, A1 Fingerprinting Services:

In section 16 it says the Secretary of State's Office can refer the matter to the Office of the Attorney General when any of these things happen, and the Office of the Attorney General can take appropriate law enforcement action.

Mike Draper:

To your point, Assemblyman Ellison, I think we are willing to clarify that the extent of these penalties is to the greatest extent of the law; we are happy to work with you to do that.

Ash Mirchandani:

If you would refer to section 16, subsection 2, paragraph (c).

Assemblyman Ellison:

The other thing is, could this also be amended to include Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)?

Mike Draper:

To include DMV in what capacity?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Well, the DMV does not do fingerprinting.

Mike Draper:

Assemblyman Ellison, the DMV requires fingerprinting for a number of their services, obviously not for a driver's license. Right now we are trying to separate this out for private companies, but we are certainly happy to have a conversation. I think the next step is to address how we will work with state agencies to help provide efficiencies through the private sector. One of the things we are doing right now is, by licensing and requiring the industry to

undergo strict regulations from the Secretary of State's Office, that puts us in a position to work with different state agencies to make sure they are doing fingerprint background checks and doing it in an appropriate and equal fashion.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I will take any further questions I have offline with Assemblyman Flores.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Thank you for raising those concerns, Assemblyman Ellison.

Are there any additional questions from the Committee right now for the presenters? [There were none.] We will ask that you sit back, Assemblyman Flores, and we will invite those wishing to speak in support of Assembly Bill 425 to come forward now.

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchise Auto Dealers Association:

We are in full support of this bill. The reason is, as Assemblyman Ellison somewhat alluded to, many of our employees are required to get fingerprint background checks pursuant to DMV statutes and regulations. Anything that strengthens this industry, which this bill clearly does, and makes it easier and more efficient for applicants to be able to go to work, we are in full support of. We are thankful to the sponsor for bringing the bill forward, and for consideration by the Committee. Thank you.

Monica Pappas, Owner, Fingerprinting Express:

I have four stores statewide in Carson City, Reno, and two in Las Vegas. We started in 2003, so we have held a lot of hands of Nevadans over the years, helping them get to work faster through our processes in the civilian private sector of collecting fingerprints. The information that we collect is more than just fingerprints. We are collecting name, residential address, date of birth, place of birth, citizenship, race, height, weight, eye color, hair color—there is a lot of information that we are working with. Most companies collect that on a piece of paper, type it into the system, and then hopefully send those off in a secure fashion. We absolutely need these regulations in place to protect Nevadans' identities. We fingerprint for several reasons, more than just for employment licensing, volunteering, and adoption. We also fingerprint when there is a case of identity theft and someone is arrested using someone else's name and date of birth. I had a customer email me yesterday very concerned about his information that he provided to us for his FBI criminal record when he had his services done for the purpose of identity theft. It is a definite concern, and there are things we can do to actually protect this industry.

Supriya Mirchandani, Owner, A1 Fingerprinting Services:

We are a certified minority-owned business with three fingerprinting locations in Nevada. We have been operating for the last three years and find that the industry lacks operating standards which would ensure that fingerprinting providers follow consistent rules of engagement, and also provide assurance to fingerprint applicants about the quality and level of services while protecting their personal information. Private fingerprinting providers, when held to good standards, can assist by providing periodic, fast, safe, and accurate

third-party fingerprinting services for Nevada licensees. [This would help eliminate the wait times experienced in some categories.] In summation, this all will lead to consumer protection and shorter applicant wait times to get licensed. We look forward to working with all involved to make sure that this bill meets all of those standards. Thank you for your time and for working on this very important bill.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Are there any more speakers in support of Assembly Bill 425? [There were none.] Are there any people in Carson City or Las Vegas who wish to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 425? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here to speak in the neutral position?

Gail J. Anderson, Deputy for Southern Nevada, Office of the Secretary of State:

I have been working with the sponsor and the constituents on how our office could implement this proposed registration program and do it as efficiently and cost effectively as possible for, basically, a new regulatory jurisdiction. As Mr. Draper mentioned, our office would use the existing infrastructure of the document preparation service registration program, with the online application system and renewal system. The qualifications and the bond are all closely similar to the framework we already have in place. I do want to mention and put on the record that we need to clarify the language about the bond. I need to be sure both an individual doing business as a sole proprietor is required to have a bond in a minimum amount and that a business entity may choose to hold a business entity bond. That covers registrants under the tiered structure, as proposed in the conceptual amendment today.

Our office does—I want to mention and put on the record—have a fiscal note on this. It is fiscal note No. 9950 for two positions—one compliance investigator 2 and one administrative assistant. I know this Committee is not the fiscal committee, but I do want to put that on the record because this is going to involve some additional work. This includes processing as well as annual examination of offices, as proposed to be regulated in this bill, and ensuring the confidentiality of the processing and the storage of personal identifying information. That is going to be a really important component for us to be able to do this within the infrastructure that we already have.

I want to also be clear that every technician will be registered individually. There is a business as well, but I just want to be sure on the record that everyone knows that every fingerprinting technician will have to undergo a background check, as well as being covered by a bond—whether it is an individual bond or a business entity bond. This bill addresses a very important issue as to handling confidential information. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I was wondering how many people in your office you have working on document preparation businesses currently?

Gail Anderson:

We currently have one statewide investigator and one administrative assistant. We would consolidate those resources to do both of these aspects—both document preparation services and the fingerprinting services.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

So you have one person statewide for the document preparation, but you think you would need two additional people for fingerprinting?

Gail Anderson:

To clarify, we have one investigator and one administrative assistant. We would double that and consolidate those resources for both the investigation and examination aspects of both programs and the registration processing to make that as quick as possible.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I am just thinking that the fingerprinting aspect is a smaller industry, and so, would we really need to double that up? It seems a little bit excessive. We are not the money committee, but I just wanted to put that out there that that does seem a little bit excessive, given the size of the industry.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

Are there any other questions from the Committee at this time? [There were none.] We will now ask our presenter to come forward and give his closing remarks.

Assemblyman Flores:

Thank you again, Vice Chair and members of the Committee. This is really an attempt to make sure the private sector can effectively come into this arena, take over, and do a great job while also ensuring that we have the proper safeguards in place so that we can give everybody who is in this world the confidence that we are making sure that their information is being protected. With that, I look forward to continuing to work with these stakeholders and with Gail Anderson at the Secretary of State's Office. I appreciate all the work they have been doing.

Vice Chair McCurdy:

We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 425.

[Assemblyman Flores reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Flores:

I wanted to publically thank those of you who have reached out with concerns and/or enthusiastic support on the bills in work session today. Obviously I get that we are on a time crunch, but it is very difficult for me and this Committee to take your concerns when you bring them up the morning of the work session, when you have never brought up that issue before, or talked to me or members of the Committee about it. It is problematic, and it is difficult for us to really assess those concerns or your enthusiastic support when you do it 30

minutes before we start the Committee meeting. Just please, reach out as soon as you can. I get it. We are on a time crunch. Please reach out as soon as you can. It is in your best interest to do that. With that, we are going to move forward with the work session document as we have it presently printed. First on the work session document is Assembly Bill 18.

Assembly Bill 18: Authorizes certain local governments to install and maintain ramps on certain public easements and rights-of-way. (BDR 21-433)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 18 authorizes certain local governments to install and maintain ramps on certain public easements and rights-of-way [page 1, ([Exhibit H](#))]. It was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities and heard on February 28. The bill authorizes incorporated cities, unincorporated towns, and general improvement districts to provide for the construction, installation, and maintenance of ramps that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The government entities may only locate such ramps within a public easement or right-of-way if they can be completed without damaging the facilities of other persons who are authorized to place their facilities within a public easement or right-of-way.

We did have one amendment that was submitted by the bill's sponsor. You can take a look at that on page 2. This amendment clarifies that the placement of ramps in a public easement or right-of-way should not damage or force the relocation of facilities, including those of a public utility. The amendment further adds language requiring the notification of annexation to be provided to public utilities; and finally, the amendment deletes sections 2, 3, and 4 of the bill that would remove towns, counties, general improvement districts, and special districts from provisions of this bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 18.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 18.

ASSEMBLYMAN ASSEFA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Assefa will have the floor statement.

Next we have Assembly Bill 39.

**Assembly Bill 39: Revises provisions relating to governmental financial administration.
(BDR 31-477)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 39 revises provisions relating to governmental financial administration and was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the State Treasurer and heard on March 8 ([Exhibit I](#)). The bill limits the types of state or national banks in which state money is required to be deposited to insured state or national banks. The bill also includes trust companies as one of the entities with which a depository that is not participating in the collateral pool program is authorized to pledge securities as collateral, and it includes certain registered broker-dealers as entities that are authorized to hold securities as such collateral on behalf of depositories. Finally, the measure revises monthly reporting requirements to the State Treasurer for depositories in the collateral pool program to a list of accounts at the depository that hold public money and requires the depository to direct a third-party depository that holds certain securities in trust for the depository to submit directly to the State Treasurer the monthly report that is currently required to be submitted by the depository under existing law. We have no amendments on this measure.

Chair Flores:

Thank you, Mr. McDonald, and I want to thank the Office of the State Treasurer for being so patient and working with us. We are always concerned about, not the current treasurer, but the treasurer that may come in the future to make sure that we are not setting ourselves up to do anything recklessly.

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 39.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 39.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Leavitt will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we will go to Assembly Bill 34.

Assembly Bill 34: Revises provisions governing the investment of money held by the State or certain political subdivisions of the State. (BDR 31-476)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 34 revises provisions governing the investment of money held by the state or certain political subdivisions of the state ([Exhibit J](#)). It was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the State Treasurer and heard on March 8. The bill expands the list of authorized

investments for the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Fund, the State Permanent School Fund, the money invested through the state's General Portfolio to include certain bonds, notes, and other obligations that are issued or unconditionally guaranteed by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, or the Inter-American Development Bank, and to certain banks, bonds, notes, and other obligations, commonly called "Yankee bonds," that are issued by a foreign financial institution, corporation, or government. The bill also authorizes the governing body of certain local governments and certain administrative entities established by cooperative agreements entered into by cities and counties to invest in the additional types of securities described above.

In addition to other investment-related provisions, the bill increases, from 20 percent to 25 percent, the maximum share of the aggregate value of the General Portfolio and certain local governments that is authorized to be invested in commercial paper, notes, bonds, or other obligations of certain corporations and depository institutions operating in the United States, and it requires that not more than 5 percent of the value of certain local government portfolios be in the obligations of a single corporation or depository institution.

We did have one amendment proposed by the bill's sponsor from the Office of the State Treasurer. The amendment requires the State Treasurer to take certain actions when the rating of an obligation is reduced to a certain level, including to proceed in a manner to preserve principal value and the integrity of the portfolio as a whole and report any activity associated with this procedure to the Board of Finance. The amendment also limits the total par value of the portfolio that may be in commercial paper issued by any one corporation or depository institution to not more than 5 percent. Finally, if the rating of an obligation does not meet certain requirements, the amendment requires an investment advisor to, as soon as possible, report the reduction in the rating to the governing body of the local government that purchased the investment, or, the State Treasurer, acting as the administrator of the pool, shall proceed in a manner to preserve principal value and the integrity of the portfolio as a whole and report any activity associated with this procedure to the Board of Finance. I believe that amendment was presented during the hearing.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 34.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 34.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 56.

Assembly Bill 56: Revises provisions governing the administration of state public works. (BDR 28-185)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 56 revises provisions governing the administration of state public works ([Exhibit K](#)). This was sponsored by this Committee, but on behalf of the State Public Works Division in the Department of Administration. It was heard on February 21. The bill requires the State Public Works Board to submit to the Governor and the Legislature, before October 1 of each even-numbered year its recommendation for projects for deferred maintenance in the next biennium. The bill also requires the administrator of the Division to delegate certain oversight authority to a requesting state agency relating to its own public work if the agency demonstrates to the administrator that it has sufficient experience in various aspects of designing and managing the construction of a public work. If the administrator denies an agency's request for the delegation of such authority, the requesting agency may seek an appeal with the State Public Works Board. Finally, among other provisions, the bill also exempts the Division from the requirement of providing engineering and architectural services for nonstructural remodeling or repair of buildings of the Nevada National Guard property that are estimated to cost less than \$200,000. We did have an amendment that was presented at the hearing that was proposed by Mr. Goulart with the Nevada Army National Guard. The amendment proposed a conceptual amendment which, as discussed in the hearing increases the proposed remodel/repair projects from \$200,000 to \$250,000 and expands the type of exempted projects by adding the term "grounds."

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 56.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 56.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Gorelow will have the floor statement. Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 274.

Assembly Bill 274: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 18-86)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 274 revises provisions relating to governmental administration ([Exhibit L](#)). This was sponsored by Assemblywoman Neal. I am not going to review the whole bill. I will remind the Committee that this bill was actually passed out on April 5 with a motion to amend and do pass. Shortly after the hearing, we received notice from the bill's sponsor that she would like to have the Committee reconsider the amendment and in doing so to remove

the civil penalty that is in sections 4 and 5. What you have here is actually the original work session document and amendment, so I believe the appropriate action for the Committee to take would be to rescind its original motion and then take a new motion on the amendment without the civil penalty. One note on the motion to rescind, it needs to be made by somebody who voted in favor of the original motion.

Chair Flores:

Just to reiterate: the bill's sponsor has made an additional amendment. As we originally moved Assembly Bill 274, there was a civil penalty that was included in that bill. She is now hoping to remove that from the bill. At this point I would like to entertain a motion to rescind our original motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO
RESCIND THE PREVIOUS MOTION MADE ON APRIL 5, 2019, ON
ASSEMBLY BILL 274.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We have rescinded our original motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 274. At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 274 with the new amendment as presented by Mr. McDonald and previously requested by the bill's sponsor, in that we are taking away the civil penalty.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO
AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 274.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Assefa:

Mr. McDonald, could we get some clarification about what the new amendment is and what the penalties are if we have removed the civil penalties?

Jered McDonald:

What you will be voting on is the amendment that Assemblywoman Neal originally proposed, except that you will be removing the civil penalty from that amendment.

Chair Flores:

For the sake of clarity, Assemblyman Assefa, we will no longer have a civil penalty. At this point, as the bill is written, my understanding per the bill's sponsor is that, should an agency or an individual within an agency try to retaliate against a certain individual, the recourse would be to fire that individual rather than the civil penalty that we were originally pursuing.

Any other discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Neal will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 353.

Assembly Bill 353: Revises provisions governing the disposition of certain types of materials and waste produced by certain governmental entities. (BDR 40-623)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 353 revises provisions governing the disposition of certain types of materials and waste produced by certain governmental entities (Exhibit M). It was sponsored by Assemblywoman Swank and heard in this Committee on March 28. The bill requires courts, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), state agencies, school districts, and the Nevada System of Higher Education to recycle electronic waste and other recyclable materials. Among other provisions, the bill also requires the director of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to report the amount of recycled material reported by state agencies in an existing biennial report to the director of the LCB regarding the status of current and proposed programs for recycling and reuse of materials. We did receive one amendment after the hearing from Assemblywoman Swank. You can take a look at that on the second page of the work session document [page 2, (Exhibit M)]. The proposed amendment provides a definition of "solid waste" so that it does not include construction waste. I believe that issue was raised during the hearing.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 353.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 353.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will have Assemblywoman Swank give the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 399.

Assembly Bill 399: Provides for the establishment of a retirement savings program for private sector employees. (BDR 31-606)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 399 provides for the establishment of a retirement savings program for private sector employees (Exhibit N). This was sponsored by Assemblywoman Spiegel and heard in Committee on April 5. The bill establishes the Nevada Employee Savings Trust under the

direction of the board of trustees for the savings trust. The bill requires the State Treasurer to provide staff support to the board within the limits of appropriations and authorizes the board to delegate to the State Treasurer any of its administrative powers and duties. In addition to the other provisions, the bill authorizes and empowers the board to design, establish, and operate the Nevada Employee Savings Trust Program; charge and collect fees on money invested through the program to defray the costs of administering the program; adopt regulations, rules, and procedures; and borrow money or enter into certain long-term procurement contracts with financial providers until the board determines that the program is financially self-sustaining.

Finally, the bill establishes certain attributes that the board must include in the program including that: (1) covered employers must automatically enroll covered employees in the program; (2) contributions to a covered employee's Individual Retirement Account must be withheld from the employee's compensation at the rate set by the board unless the employee elects not to contribute or contribute at a different rate; and (3) finally, the board must prepare informational materials, disclosure statements, forms, and instructions concerning the program for distribution by covered employers to covered employees. The only amendment we had for this bill was to add cosponsors, and those members are Assembly members Assefa, Carrillo, Flores, Martinez, Munk, Neal, Smith, and Yeager; and Senators Parks, Ratti, and Washington.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 399.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 399.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I am going to be voting no on this. I still think it is going to have an impact on small businesses. I am hoping to change my vote on the floor after I talk to the sponsor.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

At this time I am going to be a no also. There were some concerns expressed by the business community, but maybe some of those can be addressed as the bill goes forward because I think this is a great program and I am hoping to get to the point where I can support it and work with the business community on that.

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

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 406.

Assembly Bill 406: Makes various changes relating to the Airport Authority of Carson City. (BDR S-50)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 406 makes various changes relating to the Airport Authority of Carson City ([Exhibit O](#)). This was sponsored by Assembly members Kramer, Titus, and others and heard in this Committee on April 4. The bill makes various changes to the Airport Authority of Carson City, including but not limited to the following: authorizes a member to serve not more than two consecutive terms and allows reappointment after a lapse of four years; removes the requirement that the Board of Trustees of the Authority obtain the approval of the Board of Supervisors of Carson City to acquire real property by lease and to acquire personal property by purchase or lease; and removes the authority of the Board of Trustees to provide emergency services for the authority. Finally, the bill clarifies the types of agreements into which the Board of Trustees and the Board of Supervisors may enter. We did have one amendment on this bill, provided by Mr. Tackes. He is the Carson City Airport Authority Counsel. The amendment authorizes the Board to lease real property on the airport.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 406.

ASSEMBLYMAN ASSEFA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 406.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Our bill sponsor is here in the room. Assemblyman Kramer will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 413.

Assembly Bill 413: Revises provisions relating to local governments. (BDR 19-893)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 413 revises provisions relating to local governments. This bill was sponsored by this Committee and heard on April 5 ([Exhibit P](#)). Assembly Bill 413 provides that if a governing body fails to consider the business impact statement before taking action to adopt a proposed rule, the action taken by the governing body is void. Further, the bill authorizes a business to file a petition objecting to a rule on the grounds that the governing body of a local

government failed to consider the business impact statement before adopting the rule. Finally, the governing body may take action to readopt the rule after the governing body considers the business impact statement.

We did have one amendment; this was submitted by Paul Moradkhan with the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce. The amendment requires a governing body to consider a business impact statement at a public meeting held at least 10 calendar days before the adoption of the proposed rule. It adds "health district" to the definition of local government. It provides that a failure to follow the provisions of *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 237 shall result in an invalidation of any action taken by the local government. We also did have one verbal request to add a cosponsor at the hearing, and that would be Assemblyman Ellison.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 413.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 413.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Martinez will have the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 416.

Assembly Bill 416: Revises provisions relating to the collection of delinquent fines, administrative assessments, fees or restitution. (BDR 14-429)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 416 revises provisions relating to the collection of delinquent fines, administrative assessments, fees, or restitution ([Exhibit Q](#)). This was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the interim Committee to Study the Advisability and Feasibility of Treating Certain Traffic and Related Violations as Civil Infractions. The bill was heard in this Committee on April 9. The bill removes the ability of a state or local entity to report a delinquency to a credit-reporting agency, and it removes the ability of the court to request that a prosecuting attorney undertake the collection of the delinquency or to order the suspension of the driver's license or prohibit a defendant from applying for a driver's license. Further, the bill authorizes a state or local entity responsible for collecting the delinquent amount to request the court enter a civil judgement for the amount due in favor of the state or local entity, and if the court determines that the defendant has the ability to pay the amount due and is willfully avoiding payment, ordering the confinement of the defendant. The entity is authorized to contract with a licensed collection agency to collect the delinquent amount and the collection fee. Finally, the bill provides that

any delinquent fee, administrative assessment, or fee owed by a defendant is deemed to be uncollectable if after five years it remains impossible or impractical to collect the delinquent amount.

We did receive an amendment after the hearing that updated an amendment that was presented during the hearing [page 2, ([Exhibit Q](#))]. The amendment changes from five to eight years for when an amount due is deemed uncollectable. It also allows for the suspension of a driver's license for delinquency in payment, but specifies that such suspension must only be permitted when the court determines that a person has the ability to pay the amount due and is willfully avoiding payment, or when an indigent person has been offered the opportunity to perform community service to satisfy the entirety of the fines/fees and has failed to do so. The amendment also adds provisions defining when a person is considered indigent and presumptively does not have the ability to pay a fine or fee.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 416.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 416.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

I just wanted to double-check, because according to the amendment, section 1 was amended from five years to eight years and according to my notes from the hearing, it was going to be amended to seven years to align with credit report standards. I just wanted to see if that was a typo or if that had gotten changed?

Jered McDonald:

We did receive an updated amendment after the hearing and one of the changes from the amendment from the hearing to the one that was sent after is increased from seven to eight years.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I am going to be voting no on this. I am going to get with the sponsor and I will reserve my right. One of the things I am concerned about is the amendment. I thought it would also be a revocation of the license if it goes from five to eight years. For now, I will be voting no.

Chair Flores:

Members, any additional discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. [ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, HAFEN, AND
HARDY VOTED NO.]

Assemblywoman Martinez will do the floor statement.

Next on the work session document we have Assembly Bill 486.

**Assembly Bill 486: Creates the Division of Outdoor Recreation within the State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. (BDR 18-840)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

The final bill on your work session is Assembly Bill 486. This bill creates the Division of Outdoor Recreation within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) ([Exhibit R](#)). It was sponsored by the Committee on Ways and Means. It was heard in this Committee on April 4. It creates two administrator positions, one located in Carson City and one in Las Vegas, and each administrator has a different focus. The bill also requires or authorizes the administrators to employ at least two persons to carry out the duties of the Division; to submit certain reports to the director of DCNR; designate an employee or employees to act as a deputy or deputies; adopt regulations for carrying out the duties of the Division; accept gifts, grants, and contributions; and then finally creates the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation and requires the board to advise the administrators on any matter concerning outdoor recreation in this state.

We do have one amendment that was presented at the hearing by Mr. Davis, from the Nevada Conservation League, and Mr. Clark from the Outdoor Business Coalition. The amendment provides for one administrator with two deputy administrators, each with specific knowledge and experience, one in the classified service and one in the unclassified service; and locates one deputy administrator, to the extent practicable, in a county with a population over 700,000. The amendment deletes a provision requiring one administrator to coordinate all activities relating to conservation. The amendment also revises the membership of the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation and deletes the requirement that the Division shall prepare and maintain a comprehensive statewide recreation plan.

Chair Flores:

At this time I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 486.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUNK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 486.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I would like clarification. I did ask this from the sponsor, but I just want to get it on the record. This will not try to tie up or restrict any lands whatsoever, correct? I am hoping I can get that on the record from the sponsor of the bill.

Chair Flores:

We do have a stakeholder here.

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

The design of this office is just to create an office that is looking at promoting outdoor recreation and looking for opportunities for Nevadans to be able to engage in outdoor recreation. We do not envision that this office would have any ability to make land use decisions.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Thank you. I just wanted to get that clarified.

Chair Flores:

Members, any additional discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod, please do the floor statement. That is it for the work session. In the interest of time, and I want to make sure that everybody is on the same page, I am going to recess for a moment.

[The Committee recessed at 10:56 a.m.]

[The Committee came back to order at 10:59 a.m.]

Chair Flores:

Members, thank you. I would like a motion to rerefer without recommendation to the Committee on Ways and Means Assembly Bill 33, Assembly Bill 366, Assembly Bill 86, and Assembly Bill 296.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO REREFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION ASSEMBLY BILL 33, ASSEMBLY BILL 366, ASSEMBLY BILL 86, AND ASSEMBLY BILL 296 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any discussion? I just want to put it on the record that some of these bills have fiscal implications, and that is why we are rereferring them. They are still working on one of the bills, and I do not want it to die. I want to give the stakeholders an opportunity to work on the bill, so that is the reason we are rereferring.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Is there anybody here for public comment? [There was no one.] This meeting is adjourned [at 11:01 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 a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 162](#), submitted by Assemblyman Skip Daly, Assembly District No. 31.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 179](#), dated April 10, 2019, submitted by Craig Madole, CEO, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors.

[Exhibit E](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 264](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24.

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony supporting [Assembly Bill 264](#), submitted by Patrick Donnelly, State Director, Center for Biological Diversity.

[Exhibit G](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 425](#), submitted by Ash Michandani and presented by Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Assembly District No. 28.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 18](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 39](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 34](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 56](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 274](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 353](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 399](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 406](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 413](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit Q](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 416](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit R](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 486](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.