

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

**Eightieth Session
March 25, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 1:09 p.m. on Monday, March 25, 2019, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible, Vice Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator James Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17
Assemblywoman Robin Titus, Assembly District No. 38

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Pete Olsen, Chair, Board of Commissioners, Churchill County
Mark Feest, CEO/General Manager, CC Communications
Marc Ellis, Communications Workers of America, Local 9413, AFL-CIO
Jamie Rodriguez, Washoe County
Dylan Shaver, City of Reno

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 25, 2019
Page 2

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open this meeting with the introduction of eight bill draft requests (BDRs):

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 23-536: Provides for collective bargaining by employees in the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 459](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 20-540: Revises provisions relating to public administrators in certain counties. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 460](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-733: Revises provisions relating to the powers and duties of special districts. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 461](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 20-754: Revises provisions relating to constables. (Later Introduced as [Senate Bill 462](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 20-1153: Revises provisions related to county officers. (Later Introduced as [Senate Bill 463](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1154: Revises provisions relating to local governments. (Later Introduced as [Senate Bill 464](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1155: Revises provisions relating to capital projects. Later Introduced as [Senate Bill 466](#).)

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 22-1159: Revises provisions relating to redevelopment areas. (Later Introduced as [Senate Bill 465](#).)

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 23-536, BDR 20-540, BDR S-733, BDR 20-754, BDR 20-1153, BDR S-1154, BDR S-1155 AND BDR 22-1159.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 341.

SENATE BILL 341: Revises provisions relating to Enterprise Funds created by local governments for the purpose of providing telecommunication services. (BDR 31-1009)

SENATOR JAMES SETTELMAYER (Senatorial District No. 17):

Enterprise funds, according to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), provide goods or services for a fee. We are asking for some flexibility specifically for enterprise funds that fall under NRS 710, Utilities Owned by Local Governments, Telecommunication Services. Why allow this just for those falling under NRS 710?

We are talking about an entity that actually started back in the time of the "Victorian Internet"—Western Union, the precursor of the internet.

Western Union operated in Churchill County. It decided it could no longer make money because everyone was switching over to phone lines. Western Union decided to sell. However, no one wanted to bid on it. So, literally, the citizens of Churchill County came forward with their County Commissioners and decided to buy it. In 1889, the citizens of Churchill County bought the Western Union lines for \$975. In 1896, they change to a phone system. In 1899, they came before the Legislature and asked for *Nevada Revised Statutes* 710 to be created. That is why we are here today.

However, from that day, things have changed for that company. I find it fascinating that over 80 percent of the citizens of a smaller community such as Churchill County are on fiber optics. Eighty percent are able to have high-speed internet. That is remarkable considering other more populated areas are nowhere near 30 percent to 40 percent of their citizens having that capability.

One of the company's slogans is it is "big enough to deliver, yet small enough to care." There is no fear of this morphing into other areas. There would have to be a company willing to become a telecommunications company, a government that would want one and the company would have to be the provider of last resort. In every bill that I ever heard on this topic, more and more businesses are trying to figure out how not to be the provider of last resort in this industry.

CC Communications is the only company in Nevada or the United States that is owned by a municipality. We are definitely in a unique situation.

PETE OLSEN (Chair, Board of Commissioners, Churchill County):

In 2011, A.B. No. 471 of the 76th Session, now codified as NRS 354.613, was passed. The intent of the bill was to prevent local governments from transferring money from their enterprise funds to their general funds to support general government operations.

Enterprise funds were generally in the form of water and sewer funds. These funds were designed to pay for operations from fees charged to customers. The Legislature found that the fees for these services should only support the services for which they were created, not general government operations.

Unfortunately, when A.B. No. 471 of the 76th Session was passed, it resulted in an unforeseen consequence to my community. Churchill County owns a telephone company called CC Communications. It has been in service for 130 years to the people of Churchill County. It was also used to support County finances. The County transfers money annually from CC Communications Telephone Enterprise Fund to the County's general fund based on a formula approved in the 1980s. That formula takes into account what a private company would pay in local taxes as well as a return on the equity component. These transfers have been used for decades to support various County operations and services.

In 2014, we asked for an opinion from the Department of Taxation as to whether the transfers to the County violated new prohibitions contained in NRS 354.613. Two years later, we received a response that the transfers did indeed violate NRS 354.613.

We do not believe that when A.B. No. 471 of the 76th Session was passed, anyone intended to prohibit the types of transfers occurring from CC Communications to Churchill County. These types of funds were not of concern to the Legislature in 2011.

With normal utility service such as water and sewer, customers cannot look for another service provider. Therefore, there is no incentive to keep fees down. With CC Communications, customers can look for another provider. Normal utility service customers are using an essential service. With

CC Communications, customers do not have to use our service. With a normal utility service, local governments can set the fees at a level that pays for costs but avoids unreasonable profits. CC Communications' pricing is regulated. The rates charged by CC Communications are kept in check by the National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA) tariffs filed with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), by FCC's rate floor and by competition from providers entering the market due to the deregulation of services such as standalone broadband and local dial tone. A minimum tariff rate must be charged and reported to NECA and the FCC.

The benefit to Churchill County is one of the reasons the County created the phone company. It was to create a profit to support County operations. We have relied on those funds for over one century.

We ask that you pass S.B. 341 exempting county-owned telecommunications companies from the prohibitions contained in NRS 354.613.

MARK FEEST (CEO/General Manager, CC Communications):

As noted, CC Communications has operated since 1889. We provide more than 80 percent of the homes in Churchill County with fiber optics with speeds up to 1 gigabyte per second (GBps). Over the next 18 months, we are executing a plan to bring fiber optics to over 95 percent of the homes and businesses in Churchill County. We have that plan engineered, and it is just a matter of time to do that construction. The remaining locations are in low-density areas and are projected to cost \$4,000 and above per location to bring fiber optics to those homes.

I highlight that because there are many rural, independent companies across the Country. Many are co-ops or family-owned businesses. The challenge is that in those low-density areas, the cost of bringing fiber optics to the home will never really be recouped. Our unique circumstances of being owned by Churchill County has allowed us to take some other things into consideration, such as the best interest of the community. That is because the return on investment or return on equity is not a priority. Nevertheless, as Commissioner Olsen noted, for 100 years CC Communications has been making these fund transfers to the County which support some general fund activities. It is a legitimate transfer because the County owns a former telegraph company that has turned into a premier broadband provider, especially among rural areas.

The County has done that with the expectation of receiving a return on equity and a return on its investment which is transferred each year.

One concern about the bill in 2011 was that customers were going to be gouged in order to have fees above the cost to provide the service. That money would then be moved into the general fund to circumvent a tax increase. No one wants to vote for a tax increase, so here is an opportunity.

As Commissioner Olsen noted, rates are regulated through the NECA tariff. Therefore, for broadband we have a minimum rate that we must either impute or charge to a customer. The FCC has a rate floor which is \$18 before taxes for a telephone line. We actually had to raise our rate to comply with the FCC because CC Communications' rate was below that. Increasing rates in order to subsidize local government has never been an issue. In fact, it is probably quite the opposite when you consider bringing fiber optics to homes in more rural areas would cost \$4,000 or more per home.

In Churchill County, we have what is often referred to in the industry as the "donut in the hole." The "hole" being the area where a competitor provider of broadband exists. In our case, it is a national cable company. As noted, when we set our rates, there is no intent to charge a price that creates a revenue opportunity that can then be transferred to the County. Our prices are based on the NECA tariffs, the FCC's rate floor and competition. Approximately 60 percent of our customers could choose to go someplace else with a substantially similar service. The remaining 40 percent could choose to go someplace else with what would be a degraded level of service because it would not be facilities-based.

Nevertheless, throughout our entire service territory, we charge the same rates for the same packages. Those who sit on the "donut" portion, not in the "hole" where there is stiff competition, get the benefit of the same low rates. We are servicing our constituents, our customers and our residents in that way. That eliminates one of the concerns the original bill in 2011 had attempted to address.

We have been making a funds transfer to the County for many years. Without the passage of S.B. 341, the only way the County and, in turn, the residents of Churchill County would be able to realize the equity built up over the last 130 years would be to divest of the enterprise operation. That would not be in

the best interests of the citizens. Our example of the level of service, the fiber optics to the home and the low prices in high-cost delivery areas is evidence that the citizens would not be better off if the County were to divest of this operation. The County believes it is in the best interest of the residents to retain both ownership and the opportunity to receive that annual return on equity.

Tax dollars are not used in the operation of this Enterprise Fund. By State law, money can only be transferred from the Enterprise Fund to the County. It cannot be transferred from the County to the Enterprise Fund. I still consider it public money because we are a public entity, but it is not tax dollars.

CC Communications is operated in a separate Enterprise Fund operation supported only from the revenue from services offered. Those are services to both the residents and small businesses as well as to other carriers for middle-mile and long-haul services.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

On average, how much is the transfer to the general fund?

MR. FEEST:

Historically, it has been approximately \$1.8 million.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Senator Settelmeyer opened by saying this is the only one of these in the State.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

It is the only one in the Nation.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

How many customers does CC Communications have?

MR. FEEST:

From a residential and small business standpoint, approximately 8,000 different accounts. There are 25,000 people in Churchill County. We offer service to all of them. We also offer services to other carriers such as wireless internet service providers with middle-mile dense wavelength division multiplexing services.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

You mentioned trying to get fiber optics to those remote areas. Are those residents still on old, traditional landlines or have you replaced all of those?

MR. FEEST:

No, they are not on traditional landlines. They are still on copper at some point in the network. They are on a digital subscriber line—a DSL line. However, we have taken fiber optics all the way out to their neighborhoods and from there the last mile distribution is through copper. The FCC says that a provider of last resort must provide services at 25 megabytes per second (Mbps) at an absolute minimum. All of our customers exceed the 25 Mbps through fiber optics and copper deployment. Fiber optics all the way to the homes will enable them to get up to one GBps.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

You supply both residential and commercial. Do you supply government agencies and schools as well?

MR. FEEST:

We do. Churchill County School District just conducted a bid through the FCC Form 470 which is for the FCC schools and libraries fund. Those forms are public documents. Two carriers provided bids for one GBps services to nine locations. We were awarded that bid at a price of \$106,000 over 3 years. That includes wide area network services. The only other bid submitted was \$316,000. We are not gouging our customers. We are an asset to our community. We serve the schools and the charter school, Oasis Academy. We provide circuits to Western Nevada College and multiple federal agencies, including the Naval Air Station Fallon.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

When you bring out the fiber optics and hook up all the new technology, does that old network go dormant, or is it still used?

MR. FEEST:

There are a couple of ways to do it. Some customers choose to have a landline telephone only. They do not want to change to what we consider advanced services—internet and Internet Protocol television. Those customers may be left on copper. We choose not to do that because customers left on copper tend to have more trouble tickets. For example, in Churchill County, we have had much

rain. We track all our trouble tickets. Copper does not like rain, especially really old copper. It is wrapped in paper and direct-buried into the ground. Over the years, it deteriorates. If water gets to the copper, you get noise on the phone line. We do not leave that copper there. We cut everyone over, but we have to get into their garages to do it. Some customers on dial tone do not want it. However, we have a plan to convince them it is the right thing to do. Some companies would leave customers on copper if they do not take advance services.

CHAIR PARKS:

You indicated that the minimum level of service you provide is 25 Mbps.

MR. FEEST:

Our minimum package is 25 Mbps upload, 3 Mbps download. That is an FCC requirement. If a company receives Universal Service Funds, it has to be able to get to that point. That is the minimum service for someone on copper.

CHAIR PARKS:

Does your service area include the entire geographic area of Churchill County?

MR. FEEST:

Yes, the service area is the boundaries of the County. It is called an incumbent local exchange carrier service territory. We are the provider of last resort in that area under FCC regulations and the NECA tariff.

CHAIR PARKS:

Do you extend beyond the boundaries of Churchill County?

MR. FEEST:

We do, but not for residential customers. In 2006, we were putting fiber optics in the home. In 2003, we started Internet Protocol television. We then found there was no provider in what is called a middle-mile problem. From a central office, the last mile would be to the person getting internet. From our central office, it is getting to 200 South Virginia Street in Reno. At that point, we cross-connect with a long-haul carrier that takes us out to the internet gateway.

When our customers were able to get higher bandwidth on that last mile, they started using more bandwidth. This was in the early days when people really used a lot of broadband. The options through other carriers were poor and in

some cases cost us \$27,000 to \$30,000 a month to move our traffic to Reno where we cross-connect and get to the internet gateway. At that time, we built our own route in the Union Pacific Railroad right of way which goes to 200 South Virginia. At 200 South Virginia, we cross-connect with major carriers that take us to the internet gateway.

When the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center (TRIC) was developing, our lines were on the south side of interstate 80 buried in the railroad right of way. We were asked to come into TRIC to complete the Switch SUPERLOOP. We participated with Switch to complete the SUPERLOOP in that area. We acquired fiber optics from Churchill County into TRIC. It also goes to Leeteville Junction down through Carson City and through every point of presence all the way down to the Switch Data Center in Las Vegas. At each of the points of presence along the way, in places like Beatty, Tonopah, Yerington and Silver Springs, we have to regenerate that light because with the equipment we use it only goes a maximum of 63 miles. We made quite an investment to regenerate that light. You might ask how was this is our mission. Why are we doing this? It is for redundancy. We have one path that goes out to Reno and out to the internet at large. We have a second path that goes down to Las Vegas and out to the internet at large. In either case, if one of those lines is cut or there is an electronic failure, our customers have redundancy that is second to none in rural areas.

At that time, we went through certain towns along that route that did not have internet access or backhaul. Their internet providers could not get to the internet gateway in the capacity necessary, so we service other internet providers along that route but not their end customers. We carry their traffic down to the Switch facility in Las Vegas so they can reach the internet.

CHAIR PARKS:

You mentioned an Assembly bill. Was that the reason for this change? When was that?

MR. OLSEN:

That was in 2011.

CHAIR PARKS:

We created a problem for you in 2011. Does any part of Churchill County provide administrative services for your communications telephone service? Are you 100 percent standalone?

MR. FEEST:

We have our own accounting, administrative and corporate departments. However, under NRS 710, the Churchill County Commissioners sit as our board of directors and develop our tentative budget. They take that to a budget hearing and then it gets rolled up into Schedule F1 for Churchill County's Budget.

CHAIR PARKS:

Does Churchill County charge for any of those services to your company?

MR. FEEST:

No, it does not.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Being the only provider like this in the Nation, I do not know where else you could find voters who actually have the opportunity to change the board of directors if they do not like the service. It is a good service and a good program.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Is a utility owned by a county like CC Communications subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada?

MR. FEEST:

No, it is not. It is in State law that the county commissioners fulfill the role of a "state commission." In 1996 under the Telecommunications Act, the FCC said that a state commission must act. We had a case in which a customer was dissatisfied with the ruling of our county commissioners acting as a state commission. The customer was able to appeal to the FCC, and the FCC made a ruling.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

This bill only adds one new section to this chapter of NRS. What was the problem? Is there something that the Telephone Enterprise Fund or the company wants to do but cannot or has been doing and was not supposed to?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

In 2011, this Legislative Body decided that an enterprise fund could no longer transfer money to a county. Prior to that, CC Communications would transfer about \$1 million to Churchill County to cover different expenses occurring within the County. When that was changed in 2011, that practice ended. CC Communications would like to continue to transfer excess revenue to Churchill County to cover some costs.

MR. FEEST:

Just to clarify, when that bill was passed, there was a five-year transition period because the Legislature understood that money was being spent. In that five-year period, we had to come up with a plan to stop transferring money. The Nevada Tax Commission indicated that possibly we were not subject to that bill. It took some time for it to determine that we were indeed subject to that bill. It tolled the time from 2011 until it made its decision, then we started our five-year transition period. In order to continue to transfer revenue we need this legislation passed.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

When does your five years run out?

MR. FEEST:

The five years runs out in 2020.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I need to clarify that you are talking about CC Communications revenue going one way, but in the event you had a major meltdown, would the County be able to commit money to your program?

MR. FEEST:

We would have to get a legal opinion on that. However, in the plain language of this bill, no; the money flows one direction.

MARC ELLIS (Communications Workers of America, Local 9413, AFL-CIO):

Many good things were said, but no one spoke about the 55 employees of CC Communications who are paid good wages. Some of them are part of my union. Therefore, I support this bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 25, 2019
Page 13

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me, and we will get the answers.

CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 341 and open the work session.

SENATE BILL 25: Revises provisions governing the administration of the surcharge imposed on telephone users. (BDR 20-442)

JENNIFER RUEDY (Committee Policy Analyst):

I will give the Committee an overview of S.B. 25 and the proposed amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

The proposed amendment adds subparagraphs (4) and (5) to paragraph (b) of subsection 3 of section 1 for clarification [Exhibit C](#), page 2.

CHAIR PARKS:

There was some contentious discussion when we heard the bill originally. This amendment is coming from Washoe County. Washoe County opposed the bill when we first heard it. I want confirmation that everyone is in agreement.

JAMIE RODRIGUEZ (Washoe County):

During the hearing we expressed some concerns. We worked with the City of Reno on the proposed amendment which is before you today. It clarifies the responsibilities of the entities imposing the surcharge to ensure it is used appropriately.

DYLAN SHAVER (City of Reno):

I want to thank Washoe County for being accessible in getting the amendment so quickly. We are on board with what the County is proposing.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 25.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

That takes us to S.B. 172 in the work session.

SENATE BILL 172: Makes various changes relating to the Consolidated Local Improvements Law. (BDR 22-30)

Ms. RUEDY:

I will summarize S.B. 172 as introduced and its proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

There are two proposed amendments to the bill. One was prepared by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Legal Division at the request of the bill's sponsor and was presented at the bill hearing. It removes all of the accounting language in section 2 and instead requires a municipality to provide a copy of the annual financial information submitted to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board to the Director of the LCB. It also states that a municipality is not required to submit to the Director any audited financial statements of the municipality, [Exhibit D](#), page 3.

Then it further clarifies section 7, subsection 6, [Exhibit D](#), page 8, by adding the language:

The time limitation for the expiration for a certificate of sale is tolled for any period during which the demand for or execution of a deed is prevented pursuant to any applicable law or by a stay of proceedings, an injunction or any other court order.

There is an additional amendment which was worked out following the hearing among various individuals. It is from the City of Las Vegas. The City had raised concerns about lawsuits regarding the notification requirements. Section 1 is actually section 7 of the bill, [Exhibit D](#), page 10. The new language is in section 7, subsection 3 regarding the noticing requirements.

Committee Counsel advised me that these two amendments do not conflict with each other and may be adopted together.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 25, 2019
Page 15

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Does the second amendment, received from John Swenseid, [Exhibit D](#), page 10, address the situation in which property is lost due to nonpayment of taxes? How would that amendment work?

CHAIR PARKS:

The basis for this bill was due to the closure of several improvement districts that did not refund the unspent shares to the property owners. This bill tries to reconcile that problem and ensures that money left over after a project is completed is returned to the rightful person. Some of these were special assessment district projects.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 172.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The next bill in the work session is S.B. 331.

SENATE BILL 331: Designates the new Interstate Highway No. 11 as the Purple Heart Highway. (BDR S-78)

MS. RUEDY:

I will present S.B. 331 from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)). The fiscal note came in after the meeting on the bill and shows no impact.

CHAIR PARKS:

There was a question as to the cost. It is my understanding that the Nevada Department of Transportation could absorb the costs and accept gifts, grants and donations.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 331.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:

The last bill in the work session is S.B. 336.

SENATE BILL 336: Requires the Governor to annually proclaim Juneteenth Day as Buffalo Soldiers Day in the State of Nevada. (BDR 19-791)

Ms. RUEDY:

I will summarize S.B. 336 as introduced from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

We have an amendment from the bill's sponsor that would change the date from June 19 to July 28.

CHAIR PARKS:

I would like to be added to the bill as a sponsor.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Since the amendment would no longer make it Juneteenth, is there a way to amend the name of the bill to prevent continued confusion over the Juneteenth date?

Ms. RUEDY:

I am not sure. I will relay that question to the Legal Division and see if it can do that.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

If necessary, maybe we could make a friendly amendment to rename the bill.

CHAIR PARKS:

We can do that in our motion.

Ms. RUEDY:

The Legal Division does not need a motion to rename the bill. It will be done when the amendment is drafted.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 336 WITH THE SPONSOR'S AMENDMENT AND ADD SENATOR PARKS AS A SPONSOR.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PARKS:
We have one more BDR introduction.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 22-377: Revises certain definitions of affordable housing for consistency. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 473](#).)

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 22-377.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 25, 2019
Page 18

CHAIR PARKS:

Having no further business to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, the meeting is adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 25	C	2	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 172	D	10	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 331	E	1	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
S.B. 336	F	2	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document