

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

**Eighty-First Session  
April 28, 2021**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 9:08 a.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, Online and in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair  
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Annie Black  
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May  
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez  
Assemblyman Andy Matthews  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11  
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senate District No. 12



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst  
Erin Sturdivant, Committee Counsel  
Judith Bishop, Committee Manager  
Lindsey Howell, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Zach Conine, State Treasurer  
Cole Mortensen, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation  
Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors of America  
Richard Daly, representing Laborers Union Local 169  
Warren Hardy, representing City of Mesquite  
Alan (Al) Litman, Mayor, City of Mesquite  
Adam Anderson, Interim City Attorney, City of Mesquite  
Christopher Daly, representing Nevada State Education Association

**Chair Flores:**

[The meeting was called to order. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have two items on the agenda this morning. We are going to take them out of order. Senator Harris is going to be presenting Senate Bill 237. Then we will move into Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). With that, I see Senator Harris here; welcome to your very hardworking Committee on Government Affairs. We will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 237.

**Senate Bill 237: Revises provisions relating to businesses. (BDR 7-548)**

**Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11:**

I represent Senate District 11 in southwest Clark County, and it is my pleasure to present Senate Bill 237 to you all today. I just want to confirm that we have Tim Haughinberry from the Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce available—if not, we will skip him—skip him it is. Senate Bill 237 is a bill that is designed to put LGBTQ businesses, which are also disadvantaged, on the same kind of footing as we have placed minority businesses, women-owned businesses, and veteran-owned businesses. I took the time to go through our *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and add them in their, what I find to be their, rightful place, so that they can have access to additional information, additional assistance from the Office of the State Treasurer, and the ability to bid for transportation projects in the same manner that other disadvantaged business entities do. It is what I would consider a fairly simple bill. You will see the word "LGBTQ" a lot, placed throughout the bill.

Please note: You will see that there are two amendments. One was submitted by the Department of Transportation [[Exhibit C](#)]. We have Mr. Cole Mortensen here to discuss that amendment if you all have questions specifically related to that. Just over broad strokes, the

intent of that amendment is to ensure that there are no conflicts between the state's program and the federal Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program. I wanted to make sure that we do not risk losing any federal funding and that there are no conflicts. I wanted to make sure that when the federal government is ready to do what Nevada is about to do and add LGBTQ businesses, we are already well on our way to doing that and it will be a seamless transition. The second amendment you will see is an amendment from me [[Exhibit D](#)]. I am trying to clean up the definition of LGBTQ a little bit. As far as I know, this will be the first time the term is defined in the NRS, so it is extremely important that we get it right.

At this time, I see we have our esteemed treasurer, Zach Conine, on video. I would like to turn it over to him to talk a little bit about how this bill affects what the Office of the State Treasurer does, if that is okay with you, Mr. Chair.

**Zach Conine, State Treasurer:**

I have the privilege of being your State Treasurer. Throughout the past year, small businesses across Nevada struggled. Business owners have been forced to make tough choices as they have navigated trying to pay their bills and their employees in the midst of one of the worst economic downturns we have ever seen. Thankfully, through much-needed aid from the federal government, through the leadership of Governor Sisolak and this Legislature, vital assistance programs such as the Pandemic Emergency Technical Support grant have ensured that disadvantaged businesses have been able to keep their doors open.

Broadly speaking, [Senate Bill 237](#) seeks to broaden the definition of the term "disadvantaged business" to be more inclusive of Nevada's LGBTQ community. By making this simple change, we can ensure that LGBTQ businesses can access the same kinds of assistance and loan programs afforded to minority-owned, women-owned, and veteran-owned businesses here in Nevada already. As we work through Nevada's economic recovery, we are going to need to make sure that all Nevada's small businesses have a seat at the table and the tools they need. By elevating the voices of our LGBTQ business community, we can work collaboratively to create a state that is more inclusive and prosperous for all of Nevada.

I want to thank Senator Harris for her leadership on this issue. I urge your support and am happy to take any questions.

**Senator Harris:**

Before we move into any questions, let us say, theoretically, you are sitting in your home on a Tuesday evening. You may get a call from the State Treasurer letting you know that you have gotten a grant for some business that you own—maybe you provide wood or timber to lots of different types of construction companies. I think if you are on Twitter as much as I am, you have seen the joy on people's faces when they receive those calls from the Treasurer's Office. We are trying to make sure that we are capturing every entity in the state that should be able to have equal access—and eventually get them off of these programs and grow them into large, striving corporations that bring in tax dollars and create jobs.

**Chair Flores:**

With that, we will open it up for questions.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

I had a question: Based off of the hypothetical you mentioned, I want to understand whether or not this would apply to the timber industry.

**Senator Harris:**

It would apply to every industry in the state. Because we are also focusing a bit on the Department of Transportation (NDOT), I imagine that you might have a few of those companies apply as well.

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

On Tuesday, when I was going over this bill, I was a little timorous about it. When I was reading, this struck me: section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (b), subparagraph (1). I do not understand when we say, "Is owned by a natural person who identifies as LGBTQ." "Natural person"—that struck me; it stood out. Then I get to the veterans, where it says, in section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (d), subparagraph (1), "Is owned by a natural person." Do I have to prove that I am LGBTQ? Do I have to prove that I am a veteran? Because that is what it is saying to me—that I have to prove it in order to get these dollars.

**Senator Harris:**

"Natural person" is a term that was placed there by our Legal Division. I am not sure if there is a standard definition of "natural person" or what the complete impetus behind that was. I do not believe that that piece is intended to require you to prove whether you are a veteran or LGBTQ, although I do understand that there will be processes in place—as they exist today—to ensure that there is no fraud in the program.

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

I know that, as a veteran, I can prove my service with my DD Form 214. But I do not know—how do you prove that you are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or pansexual? How do you prove that to prevent fraud?

**Senator Harris:**

I am married to a woman; I have a marriage certificate. I can imagine that would be one way of proving it. I would also suggest—I get this question a lot—it is my firm belief that there are a lot of people who are actually hiding these identities as opposed to taking them on for any perceived advantage that they might feel they have in society. In actuality, there is no advantage to holding these identities. What you see is folks really afraid to come out and identify in these ways. I have faith in the system, in the treasurer, in NDOT, and in our Small Business Enterprise program—which, by the way, already includes these LGBTQ businesses—that they will continue to take a look at full applications and vet them appropriately.

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

I fully understand this right now.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

My question about your amendment is somewhat aligned with what Assemblywoman Thomas was talking about. In your amendment [[Exhibit D](#)], you have taken out "pansexual," "transsexual," "intergender, and "asexual." Initially, my question was simply going to be this: Why did you take that out? But now, my question is a bit further along because I know, as you said, this will be the definition. But does removing these specific things make it easier to determine who fulfills these?

Let us say that I own a timber business, and I want to apply for these. I do not fall under any of the other things, but I am pansexual. That is potentially much more difficult to prove. I guess my question is this: Why this definition specifically, and does that help or harm the overall goal?

**Senator Harris:**

I think you are hitting on the goal I am trying to accomplish here exactly. I want the definition to be inclusive, but also tight enough that it can be a guide for using it in the future. I also want to address some concerns that, I will admit, even some of my colleagues on the Senate side had about the definition and how expansive it might have been—how do you prove that you are asexual? I have tried to tighten it up. If you take a look at "transsexual," it is actually not substantially different from "transgender." There was no need to have both of those definitions or terms. Yes, the goal is to clean it up, to make it so that it is not so ambiguous, and to address some of those concerns about folks trying to find a way to fit into any of these definitions when they do not necessarily do so.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

Is it your intent to have this definition specifically only for this bill or this area of the NRS?

**Senator Harris:**

Yes. That is how the statute is designed. It applies to each section. But as I went through and was trying to do a search of the NRS, I did note that the term LGBTQ is not currently defined anywhere else, so I also wanted to be cognizant of the fact that this may be referenced or used in the future as we start to use these terms a bit more.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I just want to verify that in the amendment coming from the Department of Transportation [[Exhibit D](#)], the new language of section 4, subsection 6, will include instead the language that you have also amended. Is that correct?

**Senator Harris:**

Yes, it is my intention that the LGBTQ definition I put forward would occur throughout the bill and work in conjunction with the changes from NDOT.

**Assemblyman Matthews:**

I spent a considerable amount of time on Tuesday reading through this bill. Then with the amendment, I saw the guts of it—the timber, if you will—removed. My only question had to do with the breadth of the definition. Anytime you have something such as this, you want to make sure the intent is honored and that it is not potentially subject to manipulation. I wanted to see if, for the stakeholders you have talked with, any concerns regarding the scope of that definition have been adequately addressed.

**Senator Harris:**

I have tried to nail it down. I cannot represent that everyone is perfectly happy with the definition. But in my estimation, I think I have come to a nice, clean space. I am more than willing to continue working on it as folks reach out to me. At this point, I have not heard any additional concerns, but I am open to further discussions if needed.

**Chair Flores:**

Members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I think when I was reading this on Tuesday night, a lot of concerns went down—timber—through your amendments. Thank you for that. At this time, we will go to those wishing to testify in support.

**Senator Harris:**

Quickly though, if you do not mind, could we have NDOT talk a bit about the amendment? Then I believe we do have one person who would like to testify in person, but she would like to hear from NDOT first.

**Chair Flores:**

I would like to say thank you to NDOT. I know that a lot of work was put in on both the Senate side and this side, and that language was worked on all the way up until last night. I wanted to say thank you for everybody working on this collaboratively and finding this common ground.

**Cole Mortensen, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation:**

I would like to thank Senator Harris for working with us on the amendment. I think one of our chief concerns was making sure we had a way to ensure that we somewhat separated the state's efforts in this area from the federal efforts, which do not recognize the LGBTQ community yet. But we are hopeful that they will. This amendment actually allows us to continue to track and reach out to that community, to start getting these businesses certified, and to make sure that we can start setting goals in the future that will help foster our small businesses.

**Chair Flores:**

We will now go to those wishing to testify in support.

**Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors of America:**

The Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors of America represents the commercial construction industry in northern Nevada. We had some concerns with the original bill as it was drafted but are pleased to support it as presented with the NDOT amendment. We would like to thank the sponsors and NDOT very much for hearing our concerns and addressing them with this language.

**Chair Flores:**

Again, I appreciate all the work that was put in up until this morning.

**Richard Daly, representing Laborers Union Local 169:**

With NDOT's and Senator Harris's amendment, I think both are useful. We can be in support. I think this basically clarifies an existing program and will make the existing program better.

**Chair Flores:**

We will go to the next caller in support of Senate Bill 237. [There was no one.] We will go to those wishing to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 237. [There was no one.] We will go to those wishing to testify in the neutral position on Senate Bill 237. [There was no one.] With that, Senator Harris, do you have any closing remarks?

**Senator Harris:**

I just want to thank the Committee for its time today. I truly appreciate it. I want to let you all know that I am open to answer any additional questions that you all may have, and I look forward to being with you all again very soon.

**Chair Flores:**

We appreciate your presentation and work on this bill. With that, we will go ahead and close out the hearing on Senate Bill 237. Next on the very exciting agenda for the Government Affairs Committee today is Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). We will talk a little bit about the city charter of Mesquite.

**Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Charter of the City of Mesquite. (BDR S-619)**

**Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, Senate District No. 12:**

It is an unusual time when somebody calls me exciting—it must be the bill that is exciting. The charter committee and the city council of the City of Mesquite came up with an amendment to the charter for your Committee. It allows the City of Mesquite to deal with appointments that are made by the mayor. It allows the mayor to nominate—which he already can—but it allows an opportunity if the appointment is not approved by four votes, the city council and the mayor each having a vote, then it goes down to an orderly process. I have the mayor of Mesquite here—Al Litman is here. The city manager is here, as is Warren Hardy, the illustrious former state senator and now paid lobbyist. He always fights

for the right for his people. I would love to have them explain any circumstances that would be a problem, but more than likely, there are not any. That is how I will introduce it.

**Warren Hardy, representing City of Mesquite:**

A couple of sessions ago, we did the charter for Mesquite, which was the first charter that had been done in the state of Nevada in, I think, almost 25 years. Through your hard work, through the help of then-Assemblyman Skip Daly and then-Assemblywoman Dina Neal, I bragged to this Committee that we had developed the perfect charter. I was a little off on that, but not far. We do have a very good charter in the City of Mesquite that we think sets the standard.

However, when our city manager retired and had to be replaced, we noticed a defect—a potential defect—in the charter. In fact, our mayor, Al Litman, who is here and will speak specifically to that, noticed a potential problem with the process. Now, I am happy to report that in this case, in hiring our current city manager, it did not actually become a problem. The Senate committee was very interested to hear the backstory. I am happy to report that there was no backstory. The mayor just noticed that this could potentially be a problem.

Before being specific on what the bill does, I will describe the process that we employ in the City of Mesquite. Having spent some time on the Government Affairs Committee, I know it is helpful to the Committee for us to come forward with a concise recommendation that is supported by the community. Our process is such that the charter commission in Mesquite is independent of the city council. They can propose changes and amendments to the charter independent of any of the political activities in Mesquite, which they have done in this case. However, as a point of professional courtesy, it is the policy of the committee to bring those recommended changes to the city council for their consideration. In this case, we have a unanimous recommendation from both the charter commission and the city council for this change.

As drafted, the charter essentially provides that really, the mayor is the only one who can bring forward nominations to fill the position of city manager and city attorney. Mayor Litman recognized that that could be problematic and could create a stalemate situation. What this change proposes to do, Mr. Chair, is provide for the opportunity for the mayor to make the initial nomination for those positions as they become available. But if his or her recommendation fails to get the required number of votes, the floor can be opened to the council as well, to make recommendations that would have the same requirements for a vote as far as the nominee.

That is the change. Again, it has not become an issue, but we wanted to nip it in the bud. Since Mayor Litman was the one who came up with this, and I know it potentially limits the powers of the mayor, we asked him to be here to explain why he thought this was important. Mr. Chair, the rest of the participants today are here to answer questions. I have the city manager; I also have Adam Anderson, who was the chair of the charter commission when this change was recommended. I am not sure if Mr. Weast joined us or not, but he is the current chair of the charter commission and wanted to be here to express his support—but it

does not look as though he was able to join us. With that, Mr. Chair, if it pleases you, I would like to have Mayor Litman take a couple of minutes.

**Alan (Al) Litman, Mayor, City of Mesquite:**

This amendment, that I found originally when we were going through this, would put the mayor, as well as the city council, in an awkward position the way it was currently done. I could make a choice, and then the council would reject that choice without the number of votes. Then it would have to come back to me again, and it would just continue in that circle. This way, it cleans it up very nicely; it allows the council to also do the nominations. It could potentially come back to the mayor, but at least this gives the council an opportunity to also make nominations.

**Warren Hardy:**

With that, we would be happy to stand for questions.

**Chair Flores:**

I know some of us had the pleasure of working on this charter in the past. We thought it was perfect, so for you to come back and try to change it hurts our feelings. Members, we will open it up for questions.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I do have a question about how your charter is. Right now, are the members of the charter committee appointed or are they elected?

**Warren Hardy:**

I might have to pass that to Mr. Adam Anderson. My recollection is that they are currently appointed by members of the council. But I had better verify that.

**Adam Anderson, Interim City Attorney, City of Mesquite:**

I was chair of the charter committee at the time. But yes, the members of the charter committee—certain members of the council have an appointment, and then the charter committee itself elects one additional member. Senator Hardy has an appointment, and Assemblywoman Black also has an appointment to the committee. That is how the committee is appointed.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Mr. Hardy, it would be better if those who make that decision are elected, not appointed, would it not?

**Warren Hardy:**

I think it is important that we have a distinction between the appointment of the charter commission itself and the members of the city council. In the appointment of the members of the charter commission, we followed what we considered best practices throughout the state for the creation of the charter commission. We felt that there was a tieback to the elected representative, much like there is on a planning commission and other advisory

boards. That is what we felt was the best practice at the time and continue to feel is the best practice for appointing that board. But the elected officials are the ones that will make the decision on the hiring of these individuals. The charter commission simply recommends or implements changes as requested by the members of the public. We felt it was important to follow that best practice. This bill does nothing to change or alter the charter commission at all; that is not our suggestion. We believe, to the Chair's point, that it is perfect and has worked perfectly in the process of getting this in front of you.

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

I do have a question—or a concern, actually. In reading and trying to understand where the amendment came in, I am still seeing a quagmire with the process. If two people on the council decide to go against the mayor and his choice, you are still at ground one going right back over. It is like *Groundhog Day*; you are just going over and over and over the same process. I do agree with Assemblyman Ellison—why are these two pertinent positions not elected positions?

**Warren Hardy:**

I think Assemblywoman Thomas raises a valid point that I think we will take under advisement and take back to the community for discussion. I do not know the breakdown in the state—I am not aware of any elected city managers or city attorneys. But it is certainly an issue that we can consider and take back to our charter commission. Again, our charter essentially follows best practices in what is accepted in charters throughout the state, but I do take that suggestion or concern seriously. We will take that back to our charter commission and the city council.

**Chair Flores:**

I think we just got confirmation from our analyst and attorney that, I believe, Reno's city attorney is elected. Members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] Thank you all for joining us this morning. Again, Senator, thank you for the presentation. At this time, we will go to those wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). [There was no one.] We will now invite those in opposition to Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). [There was no one.] We will go now to those wishing to testify in the neutral position for Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). [There was no one.] Senator, do you have any closing remarks?

**Senator Hardy:**

I appreciate the time that the Assembly Committee has spent on this and the thoughtfulness that has come from the comments. I think the mayor and the charter commission people are interested in your comments and will take them to heart.

**Chair Flores:**

Before you leave, I believe our Madam Vice Chair does have a question.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

I think it is the question that the majority of the Committee wanted to know throughout the hearing. We were just wondering if there is a relation between Senator Hardy and Mr. Hardy.

**Senator Hardy:**

I have tried to be related to Mr. Hardy. His family will not let me be.

**Assemblywoman Torres:**

Fair enough. I am happy we clarified that for the record.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

He would have been adopted.

**Warren Hardy:**

I would just like to add that he is welcome in our family any time. I will say that he is the only Hardy in Nevada that I am aware of that I am not related to. I do not know how he pulled that off.

**Chair Flores:**

We appreciate the light humor this morning, and everybody indulging us in that playfulness. I am sure members will reach out should we have any additional questions or concerns. With that, we will go ahead and close out the hearing on Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint). I would like for those of you wishing to testify in public comment to please join us. We will start first with public comment here in person. Then we will make our way back to the phone lines.

**Christopher Daly, representing Nevada State Education Association:**

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. On Monday, 40 educators from across the state convened here for our educator lobby day. Thank you to all of you who sat down and listened to educators this week. One of the concerns raised was the impact of the language included in Senate Bill 543 of the 80th Session, the new school funding formula, which—buried deep, I think, on page 64 of that legislation—includes a change in the amount of ending fund balance walled off from collective bargaining up to 16.6 percent of district operating budgets. Unless amended, this provision is set to go into effect on July 1 of this year, and it would amount to be one of the biggest anti-union shifts of the collective bargaining process in decades.

Just a little bit of history: Back in the late '60s, teacher strikes and walkouts became increasingly common in Nevada, both in the north and in the south. In response to this and a movement across the country, Republican Senator Carl Dodge brought forward Nevada's public sector collective bargaining process, which we now know better as *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 288. This provided public employers and employees a process for discussion and resolution of differences regarding wages, hours,

and conditions of employment while ensuring that services to the public would continue without interruption.

The collective bargaining process is designed to push parties to reach agreement whenever possible. This is accomplished through a series of proposals and counterproposals, where parties move towards agreement. It also includes binding arbitration with a last-best-offer package. If parties cannot reach agreement, either side can declare impasse. Under this method, parties present their proposals to an arbitrator who accepts either the association's position or the district's position, and both parties are bound to that arbitration decision. This process also requires parties to determine the district's ability to pay for the items before the arbitrator. That is why the issue of ending fund balance is so critical.

In most negotiations, ending fund balance is the main source of funds identified to pay for proposals that are in those packages. If an employee association has a proposal for a 2 percent pay increase, for example, there is a process to cost that proposal out. Typically, a district will stipulate to the cost of that. The employee association is then obligated to prove that the district has those funds. If the July 1 "16.6" language goes into effect, basically, employees will never be able to prove that districts would be able to pay for even the most modest proposals that have an economic cost to them. This is not just wages; it is also benefits such as health care and retirement. This also includes proposals, usually around safety issues in the workplace, which oftentimes have a cost.

I am hoping that this Legislature does not let this session expire and that July 1 language to take effect, which really would be one of the biggest steps backward in terms of labor peace and the collective bargaining process for educators and school districts in the state of Nevada.

**Chair Flores:**

We do not have anybody else here in person, so we will go to those wishing to join us for public comment via phone. [There was no one.] If you were trying to call in for public comment, I know sometimes we have some technical issues. Please feel free to message the committee manager and/or analyst if there is something you wanted to be on the record.

With that, members, I want to remind you that tomorrow, Thursday, we will be meeting again at 9 a.m. in this room. We have Senate Bill 12 (1st Reprint) and Senate Bill 138 (1st Reprint). Please give yourself an opportunity to review those ahead of time.

Before we adjourn, I think it is important that we recognize today is Denim Day here. We are all participating. I would like to briefly read the purpose of Denim Day: The Supreme Court of Italy ruled that an 18-year-old rape victim survivor had implied consent because her jeans were so tight, she must have assisted in their removal. The next day, the women of the Italian Parliament wore jeans in solidarity, sending a powerful message against victim-blaming and shaming. In honor of that spirit, Denim Day is a day to bring awareness to

sexual assault and to provide a visible means of protest against misconceptions that surround sexual violence. For all survivors, just know that we see you, we hear you, and we believe you. Today, we are wearing denim in your honor, recognizing you and seeing you.

With that, this meeting is adjourned [at 9:56 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lindsey Howell  
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 Senate Bill 237, dated April 27, 2021, presented by Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11, and Cole Mortensen, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to Senate Bill 237, presented and submitted by Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11.