

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

**Eighty-First Session
May 14, 2021**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 10:27 a.m. on Friday, May 14, 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.

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 James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

Minutes ID: 1062



OTHERS PRESENT:

None

Chair Flores:

[The meeting was called to order. Committee protocol was explained.] Good morning. I appreciate everybody's patience this morning. We wanted to make sure that we had the opportunity to work with everybody. We have a host of bills and negotiations going on, and I appreciate everyone's indulgence in working to the very last minute collectively.

Members, we are going to meet twice today. We will have some items on work session now, and as folks continue to amend and work their bills, we will be meeting again probably after the evening committees meet, likely after the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor meets. So please do not leave the building, as we will most certainly have to come back at least once more for a few more work session documents in the afternoon.

For now, we are going to entertain Senate Bill 46, Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint), and Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint). Those are the ones we will be taking action on now. For those of you wishing to speak during public comment, know that we will be doing that at the conclusion of today's evening meeting because we are going to recess. We will not be doing public comment this morning; we will move that to the evening when we meet again. With that, I want to start off with Senate Bill 46.

**Senate Bill 46: Revises provisions relating to the Office of the Attorney General.
(BDR 20-410)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from [Exhibit C](#).] Senate Bill 46 revises provisions relating to the Office of the Attorney General. This bill was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of the Attorney General and heard in this Committee on April 14, 2021.

The bill authorizes any person employed by the Office of the Attorney General who prosecutes or defends actions on behalf of the State of Nevada or the Executive Branch to obtain a court order to require a county assessor, county recorder, secretary of state, or a city or county clerk to maintain personal information contained in their records in a confidential manner. In addition, S.B. 46 authorizes certain persons employed by the Office of the Attorney General to request that the Department of Motor Vehicles display an alternate address on their driver's license or identification card. Finally, the bill authorizes the Office of the Attorney General to obtain permits from the Department of Public Safety to own and operate emergency vehicles in the performance of their duties. We have no amendments on this bill.

Chair Flores:

At this time, I would like to entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 46.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 46.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I have no problem with the Attorney General's people getting these protections in the assessor's and recorder's offices. The top law enforcement officer in the state is the Attorney General, yet peace officers are excluded from *Nevada Revised Statutes* 247.540 of the recorder's office. They are included in the assessor's, so I do not understand why they are not included in the recorder's office. Peace officers deal with the public every day, and no one needs these protections more than they do. I have a constituent who has been harassed at home; he is a police officer. His wife calls me, crying. I do not understand; I presented an amendment to include them in this bill, and it was rejected by the Attorney General's Office. I do not understand; therefore, I will have to be a no.

Chair Flores:

Thank you, Assemblywoman Dickman. Are there any additional comments?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I thought the bill would have seen a good cleanup with the amendment. For the record, I am going to be a no. I think the amendment should have been added; I thought that was important.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional comments? I want to say thank you to Assemblywoman Dickman. I know she worked hard at trying to get her amendment going and, unfortunately, was unsuccessful in making that work. I appreciate you. Members, is there any additional discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, DICKMAN, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Anderson will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 46. Next on the work session we will do Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public bodies. (BDR 19-466)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit D.] Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to public bodies. This bill was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf

of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands and heard on May 4, 2021. The bill exempts from the requirements of the Open Meeting Law certain meetings conducted by a public body for the purpose of engaging in predecisional and deliberative discussions relating to an action under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969.

The bill requires that any such closed meeting discussions must: (1) occur before the federal agency publicly releases the document addressing the action under NEPA and begins the corresponding public comment period; and (2) be required by the federal agency to be kept confidential under the memorandum of understanding or other agreement.

I believe Assemblywoman Torres would like to propose an amendment for this bill, so I will leave it right there.

Assemblywoman Torres:

The conceptual amendment that I would like to propose at this time is that the addendum must not have any additional items on it except for what is covered under the memorandum of understanding (MOU).

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Torres has proposed an amendment. Assemblywoman Torres, please restate your amendment and then make the motion.

Assemblywoman Torres:

Once again, the amendment that I am proposing at this time is that the meeting should not have any additional agenda items except what is covered under the MOU.

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Torres has made a motion to amend and do pass with her verbal amendment.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 77 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, DICKMAN,
ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Torres will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint).

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I am sorry, I should have made this comment during the discussion. I really appreciate this amendment because I had some deep concerns that were brought up during the hearing. I think this amendment recognizes the fact that there is a need to have communication—sometimes of more than just one commissioner and one staff member—but how easy it is sometimes to go beyond that small conversation. I really appreciate this amendment. It is really the only reason why I am supporting the bill now.

Chair Flores:

Thank you. Next on the work session is Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to discrimination in housing. (BDR 18-38)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit E.] Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to discrimination in housing. This was sponsored by Senator Dina Neal and heard on May 6, 2021.

The bill revises various provisions relating to discrimination in housing. Specifically, the bill establishes new procedures and requirements with respect to investigations and hearings regarding complaints to the Nevada Equal Rights Commission alleging an unlawful discriminatory practice in housing and revises the prohibited practices that constitute an unlawful discriminatory practice in housing in Nevada. The bill prohibits, with certain exceptions, a person seeking to rent or lease a dwelling from:

- Inquiring into the arrest record, conviction record, or record of criminal history of an applicant or tenant;
- Refusing to rent or lease to an applicant on the basis of the applicant's arrest record, conviction record, or record of criminal history;
- Making or publishing any notice or advertisement that indicates a preference based on the arrest, conviction, or criminal history record of an applicant; and
- Evicting a tenant on the basis of his or her arrest record, conviction record, or record of criminal history for a misdemeanor offense unless the offense occurred on the premises of the dwelling.

The bill also prohibits a person from refusing to allow a person with a disability to make reasonable modifications to a dwelling provided the individual pays for the modifications; or make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services that may be necessary to afford a person with a disability equal opportunity to use and enjoy the property.

We have one conceptual amendment proposed by Senator Neal [page 2, [Exhibit E](#)]. This conceptual amendment will delete section 33.5 regarding discrimination based on source of income.

Chair Flores:

At this time, I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 254 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN THOMAS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 254 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I really appreciate the sponsor of the bill bringing it forward. The only problem I have is where it goes into private property rights. Therefore, I cannot support this.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any additional discussion?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I really appreciate the work that Senator Neal has done in reaching out and discussing it. I continue to have concerns, however, on moving this under the Nevada Equal Rights Commission (NERC) and the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) because of the staffing and with everything else. During the hearing, there was a discussion about who would be able to have extra individuals for this very reason; it would be between the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and NERC. I continue to have this concern.

At this time, I am going to vote it out of Committee for the basic reason that I have not had the opportunity to talk about this with the people at DETR to double-check the staffing and everything, because I know how much work has gone into it. I will be voting for it out of Committee with the hopes that maybe we can get some of the information clarified between the time of it being out of Committee and the time it is on the floor. I just want to put that on record.

Chair Flores:

Thank you, Assemblywoman Anderson. Assemblywoman Anderson will be reserving her right to potentially change her vote. For now, she will be supporting it out of Committee. Members, is there any additional discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, CONSIDINE,
DICKMAN, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Thomas will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint). Last on this morning's agenda is Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public health. (BDR 40-90)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from [Exhibit F](#).] Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to public health. This bill was sponsored by Senator Ohrenschall and others and heard on May 11, 2021.

The bill authorizes a governing body of a city or county to establish an urban composting zone. The city or county may establish by ordinance the terms and conditions for the use of land owned by the city or county for the purpose of community composting. The new provisions relating to urban composting zones or community composting do not apply to any contract for the exclusive franchise to provide waste services that is awarded before October 1, 2021. A master plan adopted by a planning commission or the governing body of a county or city may include an urban composting element. Finally, the State Board of Health and local boards of health may regulate, but not prohibit, the sale of unpackaged produce at farmers' markets.

We have an amendment that was posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) for everyone to see [[Exhibit G](#)]. We have Senator Ohrenschall in the room to provide a little bit of testimony on that amendment.

Chair Flores:

Senator Ohrenschall, welcome. You may begin whenever you are ready.

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21:

It is a pleasure to be here. Thank you for considering Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint). I submitted an amendment to the Chair [[Exhibit G](#)]; it is posted on NELIS. You will see from the amendment that I do not have any future career in the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau because the amendment did not come out quite as nice and as clean as they do from the Legal Division.

The crux of my amendment is I have taken the concerns addressed by the Division of Environmental Protection within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources that the definition of composting not be placed in statute and be left up to regulation. I have also deleted any language in Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint) which defines a particular method of composting. I think all methods of composting are good; the method that was listed in the bill was what we believed had the least externalities to neighbors in terms of odor and bugs, or anything like that from happening because of the method, but by leaving it up to regulation as we heard from the Division of Environmental Protection, I believe all methods of composting should be allowed.

I think this bill will support community composting, which can then help community gardens, and help agriculture—help things be locally grown. As we saw during the last year with the pandemic, sometimes when people panic, there are shortages. If there is more produce that is locally grown and locally available, maybe there will not be as many runs on supermarkets and the big box stores. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Thank you, Senator Ohrenschall. I appreciate your breaking that down. At this time, I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint) exactly as Senator Ohrenschall has mentioned.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 349 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I just want to say, sometimes, we get a lot of trashy pieces of legislation before us. But I can say that this legislation has composted very well.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I think this is a great bill, especially the farmers' market and the composting. I appreciate and am glad that Senator Ohrenschall and I talked this morning to confirm that anyone who creates this community composting can do it any way that they, as a community, determine. It does not have to be any single way. That was my only comment.

Senator Ohrenschall:

Certainly, what would be permitted through regulation—leaving it up to regulation. Hopefully, the more methods, the better; and the more communities that can participate, the better. If there is a better method in northern Nevada or in Elko versus Clark County, then I would love to see all those methods happen.

Assemblyman Ellison:

That is a close friend of mine who introduced this bill. I really appreciate it, and I am glad he brought it forward. I am glad you made the changes. However, I have a couple of complaints from some of the areas in my communities, so I told them I will go ahead and vote no. I am hoping we can work this out and make this sane with the changes that they propose before it goes any further. I said you would have to do it next session, but I am sure you would be more than happy to meet with them.

Senator Ohrenschall:

I appreciate your friendship. We were always good friends when I had the privilege of serving over here. I am happy to talk to anyone. We certainly have amended this bill in the Senate and amended it in the Assembly, trying to take into account concerns. I have not been able to make everybody happy—I am not sure I will, but I am happy to talk to anyone you would like to refer to me.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Thank you. Assemblywoman Torres said it quite well. She must have stayed up all night making that statement up.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I want to clarify that I think it would be overly trashy to stay up all night to make up puns, so I would never do that.

Senator Ohrenschall:

Chair Flores, maybe I had better leave before you trash this bill.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I still have not fully digested the amendment, so I am going to be a no, but I am going to reserve my right. I may change because I love the Senator.

Senator Ohrenschall:

Thank you. Perhaps if you let the amendment have a little acidic, aerobic fermentation, it will get to a point where it is going to really fertilize and grow.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

That is what I am hoping.

Chair Flores:

Members, is there any additional discussion? [There was none.] I will say thank you to Mackenzie Warren and Edith Duarte; I know that they worked really hard on this bill with Senator Ohrenschall. I appreciate you, Senator Ohrenschall, for being so willing to work with them. They still do not like the bill a lot, but they worked incredibly hard, and I know they worked with all the members. I wanted to acknowledge them; they deserve credit for all the work they put in.

Senator Ohrenschall:

Agreed. Thank you very much, Chair Flores. And again, thank you to my friend, Senator Fabian Donate, over in the other house, who also worked very hard on this bill.

Chair Flores:

Absolutely. I am grateful to everybody working together. Thank you for all that work.

Assemblyman Matthews:

I cannot come up with any of my own clever jokes this morning, so I may just recycle some of the others that we have heard. Like Assemblywoman Dickman, I do appreciate the amendment and the work that has been done on it. I am going to be a no today, but I will continue to look at it and I will reserve my rights.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional comments? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, DICKMAN, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Martinez will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint).

Members, that concludes the agenda for this morning. We will most definitely be meeting again in the afternoon. I will send out an email as soon as I have confirmation on what those bills will be for our work session in the afternoon. I appreciate everybody's indulgence.

We are in recess [at 10:49 a.m.].

[The meeting was called back to order at 5:15 p.m.]

Chair Flores:

Please let the record reflect, all members are present, and we have a quorum. Members, thank you for your patience. I want to specifically say thank you to Joanna Jacob, who has been working incredibly hard, running up and down these flights of stairs, working with a thousand different stakeholders, and doing the best she can. I am very appreciative of your hard work. It should be memorialized, and everybody who is not in this building should know just how much you have been doing. Thank you.

We have three items that we are going to be discussing: Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint), and Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint). We will start off with S.B. 150 (R1).

Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint): Makes changes to provisions relating to housing. (BDR 22-221)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint) makes changes to provisions related to housing. This bill was sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris and others and heard in this Committee on May 6, 2021.

The bill requires the governing body of a county whose population is 100,000 or more or a city whose population is 150,000 or more to designate zoning districts where a tiny house may be located, as follows: (1) at least one zoning district in which a tiny house may be located and classified as an accessory dwelling unit; (2) at least one zoning district in which a

tiny house may be located and classified as a single-family residence; and (3) at least one zoning district in which a tiny house may be located in a tiny house park. The bill also provides that all smaller counties and cities must designate at least one of these zoning districts where a tiny house may be located. Finally, the bill authorizes the governing body of a county or city to set forth additional requirements for tiny houses and tiny house parks. We have an amendment from Assemblywoman Torres.

Assemblywoman Torres:

At this time, I would like to propose a conceptual amendment. The amendment would be that in designating a zoning district for tiny houses, the governing body must consider the environmental implications of the location of the zoning district. So that the Committee will understand the amendment, I will explain it one more time: In designating a zoning district for tiny houses, the governing body must consider the environmental justifications of the location of the zoning district.

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Torres, are you making a motion?

Assemblywoman Torres:

Yes. At this time, I make a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint).

Chair Flores:

Assemblywoman Torres has made a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 150 (R1) with the conceptual amendment she just explained.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 150 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I am just clarifying—the digest did show that this only qualifies where populations are 100,000 or more. Is that correct? Is that still there?

Erin Sturdivant, Committee Counsel:

Subsection 1 of section 1 of the bill requires a governing body of a county whose population is 100,000 or more or a governing body of a city whose population is 150,000 or more to adopt the ordinance. Subsection 2 requires a smaller governing body of a county whose population is less than 100,000 or a city whose population is less than 150,000 to designate at least one of these zoning districts, whereas the larger entities have to designate all three.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Although I started out supporting this bill, and I believe there is some merit to it, after discussing the unintended consequences with my city council in Sparks, I cannot vote for it at this time.

Chair Flores:

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, DICKMAN, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Torres will do the floor statement for Senate Bill 150 (1st Reprint). I want to acknowledge Wesley Harper. I recognize that you obviously had a concern with this bill, and I want to acknowledge your work. You have been working very diligently in explaining those concerns and fears. Also, I want the record to be clear how much work you have put into educating the Committee. I want to thank you for your time. Next on the work session is Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the imposition of certain penalties by ordinance for certain violations relating to fireworks. (BDR 20-402)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reading from Exhibit H.] Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to the imposition of certain penalties by ordinance for certain violations relating to fireworks. This bill was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs on behalf of Clark County and heard on May 13, 2021.

The bill clarifies that criminal or civil penalties, or both, may be imposed for violation of an ordinance that regulates the sale, use, storage, and possession of fireworks. The bill provides that a civil penalty imposed may not exceed \$10,000 for a single violation and requires the consideration of certain factors in determining the amount and category of civil and criminal penalties. Finally, the bill provides that civil penalties may not be imposed on a person who has received a license or permit pursuant to the ordinance and that the ordinance does not apply to a child under 18 years of age unless the child has been emancipated.

I failed to mention that this Work Session Document is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System for the members and the public to take a look at. An amendment was proposed by Clark County [Exhibit H]. This amendment proposes to amend subsection 1, paragraph (b) of section 2 to authorize fines for a single violation of any ordinance adopted pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 244.367, based on the volume of fireworks. If you take a look, it has different fines based on the volume of fireworks: at the low end no less than \$250 or more than \$1,000 for violations involving less than 100 pounds in gross weight of illegal fireworks, including packaging; no less than \$1,000 or more than \$5,000 for violations

involving not less than 100 pounds or more than 5,000 pounds of illegal fireworks, including the packaging; and no less than \$5,000 or more than \$10,000 for violations involving more than 5,000 pounds of illegal fireworks, including the packaging.

Chair Flores:

Again, Ms. Jacob, thank you for working with us in creating that tiered system and ensuring that we have a mechanism in place where we can go after those very bad actors and hit them with a hard fine but not have the young 19-year-old who may have just purchased fireworks be treated at the same level, because we are trying to go after those third-party illegal fireworks sellers. With that, I would like to entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 4 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Matthews:

I want to acknowledge that I started out as a very firm no on this. I appreciate the work that has gone into resolving some of the concerns I had. I am still going to be a no in Committee today, but I am going to be sure to spend considerable time going through the details further before we get to floor, and I will keep an open mind. But I will be a no today.

Chair Flores:

My understanding is Assemblyman Matthews will be voting no but will reserve his right to change his vote on the floor. Thank you for that. Maybe if we convince you otherwise, Assemblyman Matthews, we can celebrate with some illegal fireworks.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We talked this morning about where my concerns were. This does help a lot, but it is still a problem at 5,000 pounds. That is a lot of fireworks. But even transporting could fall into that \$10,000 tier. I am going to vote no, but I am going to reserve my right because I am hoping that somebody is going to convince me that it is not just for transport, it is the firing.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

As someone who has had hot ashes raining down on my roof—the chart that Ms. Jacob had showed us no police reports for Assembly District 31, but that is only because we have not called the police. Also, seeing some of the big fires we have had, in the north particularly, I appreciate that you have come down with the fines. I have to support it.

Chair Flores:

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Dickman will do the floor statement for S.B. 4 (R1). That way, you can do an Order of Business 15 [of Assembly Standing Rule No. 120] and tell the story of those hot ashes. Last on the work session is Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint): Creates a pilot program to gather data on the use of job order contracts for certain public works. (BDR S-400)

Chair Flores:

[[Exhibit I](#) was submitted but not presented and is a part of the record.]

I want to provide some context on where we are. As I previously mentioned, Ms. Jacob has been working with 40 different stakeholders—all coming from different angles and different concerns—some wanting it to live and others wanting to kill the bill. There are a lot of members who still have some hesitation and concerns. We want to allow Ms. Jacob to continue doing her work, and she needs additional time to work on several amendments that she is looking at; she needs to get together with all the stakeholders.

[[Exhibit I](#) was submitted but not presented and is a part of the record. It reads as follows:

Senate Bill 67 establishes a four-year pilot program to gather data on the use of job order contracts for certain public works in Clark County, the City of Henderson, the City of Las Vegas, the City of North Las Vegas, and the Clark County Water Reclamation District, and it provides certain requirements for the solicitation and fulfillment of job order contracts. The bill requires a public body to submit a quarterly report on the job order contracts pilot program to the director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.]

Therefore, to allow the bill to get some breathing room and to recognize Ms. Jacob's work and let her continue doing what she is doing, at this time we would like to entertain a motion to refer it down to the floor without recommendation. That will allow her to continue to do the work and, whatever issues and concerns we still have as members, we can continue to work with her.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MADE A MOTION TO REFER
SENATE BILL 67 (1ST REPRINT) WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, DICKMAN, ELLISON, MATTHEWS, AND MCARTHUR VOTED NO.)

Assemblyman Ellison:

I would still like to reserve my right.

Chair Flores:

Assemblyman Ellison is reserving his right on supporting the bill later.

Members, those were the only three items we had pending. I appreciate everybody's willingness to work with us; we made a bunch of changes in the last couple of hours. I appreciate your time.

Members, know that we are not done with the people's work. As you know, there are a lot of bills that are still stuck in the money committees that at some point will make their way out. We will continue to have hearings once the bills make their way out of committee and get referred to us. The other thing I want to make clear is we will not be meeting this Monday. Next week will be very long days; we will be on the floor most of the time as you all know. Keep checking the agenda, but we may not meet the first two to three days of next week to allow the floor to do whatever they have to do; they will take up most of the day.

With that, I will go to public comment. I want to remind folks that it was not intentional; we were not very clear as to what time we were meeting. That is just the nature of how today works. If there is anybody for public comment, we appreciate your being so patient with our Committee. [There was no one.]

Members, thank you again for your hard work. To our staff, thank you for your patience in working with us. I think our legal counsel got 40 different amendments for one bill today. I am very appreciative of her patience and hard work. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:31 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Geigy Stringer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 46, presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 77 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 254 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is an amendment to Senate Bill 349 (1st Reprint), submitted and presented by Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 4 (1st Reprint), presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint), submitted by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.