

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AGRICULTURE,  
AND MINING**

**Eightieth Session  
April 10, 2019**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Heidi Swank at 4:11 p.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Alex Assefa  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters  
Assemblyman Greg Smith  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus  
Assemblyman Howard Watts  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst  
Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel  
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary  
Alejandra Medina, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Bradley R. Crowell, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Tim Wilson, Acting State Engineer and Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Steve Walker, representing Eureka County  
Jeff Fontaine, representing Central Nevada Regional Water Authority; and Humboldt River Basin Water Authority  
Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League  
Kyle Roerink, Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network  
Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity

**Chair Swank:**

[Roll call was taken. Rules and protocol of the Committee were reviewed.] We will be having a work session today, starting with Assembly Bill 30.

**Assembly Bill 30: Revises provisions governing the appropriation of water. (BDR 48-214)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 30 was brought forth on behalf of the Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, and was heard in this Committee on February 27, 2019 (Exhibit C). This bill provides that before rejecting an application for a permit to appropriate water to beneficial use because the proposed use or change conflicts with existing rights or protectable interests, the State Engineer may consider certain proposals to avoid or eliminate the conflict. The State Engineer is authorized to approve the application for such a permit on the conditions that before the water is appropriated for beneficial use: (1) every measure or action included in the proposal that the State Engineer determines is necessary to avoid or eliminate the conflict is taken; and (2) the conflict is avoided or eliminated.

There is one amendment proposed by this Committee. The amendment:

1. Provides that if water is available within the duty set forth in the application for appropriation and the application may conflict with existing water rights or protectable interest in domestic wells, the State Engineer may consider an applicant's proposed monitoring, management and mitigation plan. Prior to this consideration, the applicant has to take every reasonable effort to avoid the conflict and must provide to the State Engineer documentation that the following efforts have been made:
  - Configure points of diversion and diversion rates of proposed wells to avoid any conflicts;

- Reduce the size of the project or improve water efficiency, which sufficiently reduces the duty of water necessary to avoid any conflicts; and
  - Work cooperatively with existing water right holders and domestic well owners to resolve conflicts or potential conflicts by mutual agreement.
2. Provides that the State Engineer may require a monitoring, management and mitigation plan if the State Engineer does not find that the application conflicts with existing water rights or protectable interests;
  3. Provides that the State Engineer shall give notice and conduct a public hearing on the monitoring, management and mitigation plan before approving or denying such plan;
  4. Provides that the notice has to be republished at the expense of the applicant if the plan is amended;
  5. Provides that the State Engineer may approve the application if the State Engineer determines that the conflict will be avoided; and
  6. Provides that the State Engineer shall deny the application if the State Engineer determines that the conflict will not be avoided.

**Chair Swank:**

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 30.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 30.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

We will now hear very brief comments about the amendment.

**Bradley R. Crowell, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

I want to extend special thanks to the Chair and various members of the Committee for helping us get to where we are today. I am sure everyone remembers the initial hearing on this bill. It was not looking very favorable for finding a path forward. I am grateful that the various stakeholders, as well as Committee members, were able to come together and help us find a path forward with this amendment. The importance here is that we have set in motion a framework for implementing mitigation in a constructive way for managing water resources in the areas of Nevada where there is still water available to appropriate. This bill will also set the framework moving forward with additional amendments in upcoming sessions for best managing our water resources. I would like to allow our State Engineer to make a few brief comments and a short summary of what the amendment does.

**Tim Wilson, Acting State Engineer and Administrator, Division of Water Resources,  
State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

I would like to thank the Chair and Committee members for allowing our office this opportunity to not only present our friendly amendment, but to provide some testimony regarding the amendment and the process that led us to submit this proposal. As you are aware, A.B. 30 was previously heard by this Committee on February 27, 2019. At that hearing, I stated that my office was open to an ongoing dialogue as to how to best achieve the purpose of this bill. After the hearing the Division has been actively engaged with various groups to see if compromised language could be reached to allow the bill to move forward. The amendment before you today is a result of those efforts.

Assembly Bill 30, as amended, achieves the Division's original intent of the bill by providing statutory clarity on the use of monitoring, management, and mitigation plans, otherwise known as 3M plans. The Division continues to believe that having the flexibility to consider 3M plans as part of our application review process is an important tool in managing Nevada's limited water resources. The ongoing discussions have made it clear that there is a degree of consensus that 3M plans have a limited place and can be an appropriate tool in our water allocation and management process. However, the Division believes that it is important to restate our view that 3M plans will not be used to push through water development projects that do not meet all statutory requirements and will not be used where there is insufficient available water to meet the needs of a particular project. At this time I wish to offer a summary of A.B. 30 as amended [pages 3 and 4, ([Exhibit C](#))].

Section 1 proposes to add a new section to *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 533. This new statutory section clearly identifies the conditions under which the State Engineer may consider a 3M plan proposed by an applicant. Specifically, additional language states that water is available and is also within the duty of water set forth in the application. Subsection 1, paragraph (a), paragraph (b), and paragraph (c), impose certain required actions an applicant must engage in before submitting a proposed 3M plan. Those required actions include efforts to configure points of diversion and diversion rates of proposed wells to avoid any conflicts; to reduce the size of the project or improve water efficiency, which sufficiently reduces the duty of water to avoid any conflicts; and work cooperatively with the existing water right holders and domestic well owners to resolve conflicts or potential conflicts by mutual agreement.

Under section 1, subsection 2, the State Engineer may require a person who submits an application or a change to an application to appropriate water for beneficial use to submit a monitoring, management, and mitigation plan to the State Engineer if there is uncertainty as to whether the proposed project would have an adverse impact on existing rights or interests. Basically, if an applicant does not want to put forth a 3M plan, subsection 2 allows the State Engineer to still require one.

Section 1, subsection 3, requires an administrative hearing prior to the approval or denial of any 3M plan. Typically, the State Engineer has discretion over when a hearing is conducted. This section would require that the State Engineer hold a hearing whenever he is considering

a 3M plan. Subsection 4 requires that the Division republish any application that is amended that includes a 3M plan. Subsection 5 allows for the approval of an application subject to conditions of the 3M plan. Subsection 6 reaffirms that if a conflict cannot be avoided, the State Engineer shall deny the application.

Again, Chair Swank, thank you for this opportunity to present this amendment which we believe is a demonstration of the good faith efforts of many of the stakeholders and parties involved in this discussion.

**Chair Swank:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will move on to very brief statements.

**Steve Walker, representing Eureka County:**

Eureka County has moved from opposed to neutral on A.B. 30 based upon our opportunity to provide input and our input being accepted. We would like to thank the Director of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) and the State Engineer's office and his staff. I would also like to thank Chair Swank for her time. Assembly Bill 30, by and large, is about rural Nevada. Hydrographic basins in populated areas are designated; there is no unappropriated water that applying for would cause a conflict. Assembly Bill 30 is about large project applications in rural areas where we need to get it right. The burden to get it right needs to be on the applicant, not on the holders of existing water rights. This bill addresses that need.

**Jeff Fontaine, representing Central Nevada Regional Water Authority; and Humboldt River Basin Water Authority:**

Together, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority and Humboldt River Basin Water Authority include nine rural counties as members. We appreciate the opportunity to provide some comment on A.B. 30 as amended. We want to express our appreciation to the Great Basin Water Network for drafting the amendment and working with us and other stakeholders. We would also like to acknowledge the leadership of Director Crowell and acting State Engineer Wilson for listening to our concerns and helping us hammer out the final language. I feel, like others, that we came together in good faith to develop something we could all live with and improve upon as needed. I would conclude by saying, time will tell if this bill will provide the clarity that the State Engineer seeks, and also address the concerns that were raised during the initial hearing. In the spirit of compromise and cooperation, we are moving from opposition to neutral on A.B. 30 as amended.

**Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:**

I would like to thank DCNR Director Crowell and acting State Engineer Wilson for working on this issue with us. Certainly, we had a lot of concerns with A.B. 30 as it was originally contemplated, especially the idea of potentially opening the door to being able to mitigate environmental resources, which we do not think is possible. We are pleased to see the language that you have in front of you today. It does not contemplate mitigating environmental resources; and it does set up a scenario in which conflicts would need to be avoided. That threshold is high enough that we are comfortable with it. We look forward to

continuing to work with the DCNR as well as with members of this Committee as we think of ways we can ensure that our water law protects important environmental resources moving forward.

**Kyle Roerink, Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network:**

We are here today because we found some neutral ground, which is a long way from where we were a few weeks ago. A wise politician used to tell me that the best way to legislate is to follow the 80-20 rule. The 80-20 rule is when you admit 20 percent of what is problematic and come to terms with everything else. That is what we did here. We removed the misguided and ill-intended sections of the bill; we stripped things down to bare bones and honed in on a very small issue area. We did this with stakeholder input from the onset. That is why we are not here with pitchforks and torches. We cut out a few words, added some safety nets, and built a foundation for what is likely going to be a long, difficult process in addressing our state's water future.

That process is predicated on trust. We have assurances that there will not be a new radical interpretation of this bill if it is signed into law and applied by regulators. Despite our litigation with DCNR and the State Engineer, I believe Director Crowell, acting State Engineer Wilson, and Deputy Fairbank are looking to compromise. I think if we continue down that path that we forged in the past few days, only good things will come of it. I thank them for their willingness to listen and work with us. I look forward to working with them on more of these issues.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I did not thank members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle. No matter what way you vote on this, we know that many of you had our backs from the beginning and we are grateful for that. Also, Madam Chair, thank you for facilitating all of this dialogue.

**Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity:**

We are neutral on the amended version of A.B. 30. I want to recognize the hard work of DCNR, the State Engineer, Great Basin Water Network, and other stakeholders in reaching middle ground. I want to thank the Chair and Committee members for allowing the space for us to work on this and ensuring that we all sat at the table together. I want to say one thing very clearly—which is the difference from the original part of this bill—this bill does not authorize the Las Vegas pipeline. Attorneys who have been working on this for many years are confident that these changes will give the State Engineer the flexibility he needs to avoid conflicts while not making fundamental alterations to the law.

This is a win for the environment because sometimes you win by not losing. Again, I want to thank the Chair, DCNR, and the State Engineer for listening to the voices of stakeholders and ensuring that whatever bill moves forward does not have unintended consequences. We will continue to struggle against the pipeline, but today is a milestone, because we are all laying down our arms and working together for progress.

**Chair Swank:**

This is how it is supposed to work. We are supposed to spend some time and get together and have those hard conversations. We will not always come together and have a nice moment like this, but when we do, we should all remember it.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I appreciate that there has been a lot of discussion. Being a freshman, and with such a huge issue, and since I received this amendment not too long ago, it is a lot to wrap my head around. We do not have the ability to vote neutral. I am going to be a no, but that is because I represent a huge district, seven counties, all mostly rural. I have not had enough time to digest all of this. I want to put on the record that I do appreciate so many stakeholders who have come to the table trying to come up with some solutions. With that being said, I am going to be a no—this impacts a lot of my constituents.

**Chair Swank:**

With that, I will take the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, HANSEN, TITUS, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters. We will now move on to Assembly Bill 93.

**Assembly Bill 93: Revises provisions relating to the Account for License Plates for the Support of the Preservation and Restoration of the Natural Environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR 26-437)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 93 was brought forth on behalf of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System, and was heard in this Committee on March 4, 2019 ([Exhibit D](#)). The bill extends the authority of the administrator of the Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to provide grants for the support of programs for the preservation and restoration of the natural environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin by allowing the administrator to offer grants to nonprofit organizations. Any such grants are to come from fees currently collected in connection with the issuance and renewal of Lake Tahoe special license plates. There were no amendments for this measure.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 93.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 93.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Assefa. We will now move on to Assembly Bill 233.

**Assembly Bill 233: Revises provisions related to water. (BDR 48-45)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 233 was sponsored by Assemblyman Kramer and was heard in this Committee on March 27, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)). The bill authorizes a county to pay certain salaries and expenses of well supervisors, assistants, and the Well Drillers' Advisory Board by appropriating money from the general fund of the county if the amount of the special assessment upon a property owner is less than the cost of collecting the assessment. Under these circumstances, the board of county commissioners may exempt the property owner from the assessment.

There was one amendment proposed by Assemblyman Kramer, which authorizes a county to pay such expenses by appropriating money from the general fund of the county if the amount of the special assessment upon a property owner, when combined with the amount of all other taxes and assessment levied upon such property owner, is less than the cost of collecting the assessment.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 233.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 233.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)



I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Titus. We will now move on to Assembly Bill 331.

**Assembly Bill 331: Creates the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program.  
(BDR 35-89)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 331 was sponsored by Assemblyman Yeager and was heard in this Committee on April 1, 2019 ([Exhibit F](#)). The bill creates the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program. To carry out the Grant Program, this bill creates the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program Account and the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program Endowment Fund.

There was one amendment proposed by Assemblywoman Swank which provides that one member of the advisory committee for the Grant Program be an alumni member of a program funded by the Grant Program if such an alumni is available. If such an alumni is not available, provides that one member of the advisory committee of the Grant Program be a representative of pupils in this state who has experience in, and knowledge of, outdoor education and recreation programs.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 331.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 331.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Yeager. We will now move on to Assembly Joint Resolution 3.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 3: Expresses support for the Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan and the Nevada Conservation Credit System and urges the United States Bureau of Land Management to require compensatory mitigation to offset anthropogenic disturbances in accordance with the Nevada Conservation Credit System. (BDR R-511)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 was brought forth on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands and was heard in this Committee on April 1, 2019 ([Exhibit G](#)). The resolution

expresses support for the implementation of the Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan and utilization of the Nevada Conservation Credit System to provide compensatory mitigation on state and federal lands. This joint resolution further urges the United States Secretary of the Interior of the U.S. Department of the Interior to direct the Bureau of Land Management to require compensatory mitigation to offset anthropogenic disturbances in accordance with the Credit System. There were no amendments for this measure.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to do pass Assembly Joint Resolution 3.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Smith. Next, we will hear Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 7: Expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the proposed expansion of the Fallon Range Training Complex. (BDR R-1099)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Joint Resolution 7 was sponsored by this Committee and was first heard on April 8, 2019 ([Exhibit H](#)). The resolution expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the expansion of the Fallon Range Training Complex as described in the Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There were no amendments for this measure.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to do pass Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Chair Swank:**

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

I am going to be in support of this resolution, but I also want it documented that I have tremendous respect and support for our Navy and our military as a whole. I want to ensure that it is my understanding that this is a resolution for Nevada lands and not an anti-military resolution.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I truly believe that the Navy, and the Air Force as well, needs the extra space to do some of the standoff missiles that they are doing. Of course they do a wonderful job for us and are keeping us safe. By the same token, and what tipped me on this bill, is that the federal government owns so much of this state that they can do whatever they want with it, whenever they want. I just do not believe that we should bow down to that.

**Chair Swank:**

With that, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters. Next we will move on to Assembly Joint Resolution 8.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 8: Expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the elimination of the Nevada State Office of the Bureau of Land Management. (BDR R-506)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Joint Resolution 8 was brought forth on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands and was heard in this Committee on April 8, 2019 ([Exhibit I](#)). The resolution expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the elimination of the Nevada State Office of the Bureau of Land Management. There were no amendments for this measure.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to do pass Assembly Joint Resolution 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement. We will now move on to Assembly Bill 404.

**Assembly Bill 404: Requires the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to establish certain programs authorizing a person to transfer a lawfully obtained tag under certain circumstances. (BDR 45-1029)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 404 was sponsored by Assemblywoman Titus and was heard in this Committee on April 8, 2019 ([Exhibit J](#)). The bill requires the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to adopt regulations establishing a program that authorizes a person who is 21 years of age or older to transfer a tag to hunt certain animals to his or her child, stepchild, grandchild, or step-grandchild who is under 18 years of age and is otherwise eligible to hunt in this state. This bill also authorizes Nevada's Department of Wildlife (NDOW) to charge and collect a fee of not more than \$50 for transferring a tag pursuant to the program. Lastly, this bill also authorizes the Commission to adopt regulations establishing a program that authorizes a person who is 21 years of age or older to transfer a lawfully obtained tag to hunt certain animals to certain qualified organizations. One note that is not on this work session document: Assemblywoman Hardy has asked to remove her name as a sponsor.

There is one amendment proposed by Assemblywoman Swank. The amendment would:

1. Add Assemblywoman Swank as a primary sponsor;
2. Remove existing provisions of this bill; and
3. Authorize the Commission to adopt regulations that establish:
  - What constitutes an extenuating circumstance that causes a person not to use his or her tag to hunt a big game mammal;
  - A process whereby a person who holds a tag to hunt a big game mammal can provide documentation that shows that he or she qualifies for an extenuating circumstance; and
  - A program whereby a person who qualifies for an extenuating circumstance may transfer his or her tag to hunt a big game mammal to another individual, defer use of his or her tag to the next hunting season, or return his or her tag to NDOW for restoration of any bonus points used by the person to obtain the tag.

**Chair Swank:**

I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 404.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 404.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Although this essentially gutted my bill, it is still a win for the hunter. I think putting at least some of these programs back into the hands of the Wildlife Commission to determine what the appropriate avenue is here is very appropriate. I appreciate allowing us some leeway in what these tags are going to do and what a person can do.

**Chair Swank:**

Thank you for working on this with me.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

If you transfer the tag to another individual, do you still keep your bonus points?

**Chair Swank:**

If you transfer your tag, you do not get your bonus points back, but if you return the tag, you do. We will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Titus. That is seemingly a wrap on our Assembly bills. I will now take public comment. Seeing no one, we are adjourned [at 4:42 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Davis  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 30](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 93](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 233](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 331](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 3](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 7](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 8](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 404](#), dated April 10, 2019, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.