

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

**Eighty-First Session
April 15, 2021**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 9:03 a.m. on Thursday, April 15, 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:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Judith Bishop, Committee Manager
Zachary Khan, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Kevin Remus, State Staff Judge Advocate, Nevada National Guard
Karen-Nicole Randel, State Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, Nevada National Guard
Katie Robbins, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada
Zach Conine, State Treasurer

Chair Flores:

[The meeting was called to order. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Welcome to our very first meeting here in our Committee room for the session. I wanted to give some quick updates. Things are going to be slightly different now, as we have gotten accustomed to doing everything on Zoom.

Members of the public, for those of you who are joining us today and are interested in visiting the building now that we are partially reopened: As you will see, we have numerous safety precautions that have gone above and beyond. Our staff has done a phenomenal job in ensuring our safety and your safety, should you wish to visit us. You can always reach out to our committee manager and/or staff here at the building; they can explain the process. I am not going to go through the process for you to visit the room. But you can reach out to them, and they can break that down for you so that you can join us here, should you wish to do that.

We are going to continue doing the live Zoom videos that everybody has gotten accustomed to doing. You can log in and participate remotely, as we have done throughout the session up to this point. That is obviously the safest and easiest thing to do, so we encourage people to continue to do that. Because we are partially opened, we are going to have some people who come before us and others who will decide to do it all via Zoom. Again, we will get used to that rhythm. We will make it work and improve as we go along.

Members, we have two items on the agenda. We have Senate Bill 28 and Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint). We will take them in that order. At this time, we will open up the hearing on Senate Bill 28.

Senate Bill 28: Revises provisions of the Nevada Code of Military Justice. (BDR 36-261)

Kevin Remus, State Staff Judge Advocate, Nevada National Guard:

[He read from Exhibit C.] I am here today from the Office of the Military to provide testimony and to answer questions regarding Senate Bill 28. With me is Ms. Nikky Randel, the Joint Forces Headquarters Sexual Assault Response Coordinator. Our goal is to provide some background on the Nevada National Guard, discuss the background and context for the proposed revision, and outline why this revision is in the best interest of the state, the Nevada National Guard, and its service members.

The Nevada National Guard supports a dual-hatted mission and answers the nation's call for overseas contingency operations, as well as domestic response assistance within the United States for both the federal government and the state of Nevada. Guardsmen can be called at a moment's notice by the Governor of Nevada or activated into a federal status. Members of the Guard commit to military training one weekend a month and 15 days each year in their respective military occupations and career fields. When we are activated into federal service, Guardsman will often deploy for periods ranging from several months to a year or longer. When activated by the state of Nevada, the lengths vary depending on the incident and situation. The Nevada National Guard includes roughly 4,000 uniformed personnel with the Army component being larger than the Air component. During the past year, the Nevada National Guard has been deployed overseas to multiple locations for its federal mission, has assisted and continues to provide significant assistance to the state for COVID-19 response, supported local law enforcement during the civil unrest events of last summer, and sent troops to Washington, D.C., to support the security mission for the presidential inauguration.

Senate Bill 28 amends a section of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to modify provisions of our military justice code, specifically concerning the punitive provisions of the state military justice code. Violations of the punitive provisions can subject service members to varying degrees of discipline. The purpose of the modifications being proposed here is to strengthen the Nevada National Guard's efforts to support the Adjutant General's goal to eliminate sexual harassment and sexual assault in the Nevada National Guard.

One of the main priorities for Major General Berry is to ensure that all service members in the Nevada National Guard are treated with dignity and respect. Sexual harassment is clearly contrary to that goal and is not tolerated in the Nevada National Guard. At the present time, sexual harassment violations are generally disciplined under NRS 412.562 "Disorder and neglect prejudicing good order and discipline." This is what we call our general article that is used when a specific punitive provision does not cover misconduct. Misconduct covered under the general article is often not punished as severely when compared to a punitive provision. By adding a specific punitive provision for sexual harassment, commanders have a more effective tool for disciplining a service member who sexually harasses another member. This addition of a punitive provision makes it absolutely clear that violations of sexual harassment will be punished under the military justice code.

The second part of our proposed amendment will align our state military justice code with United States Department of Defense (DoD) policy, mainly DoD Directive 6495.01. This alignment helps in several ways. First, these amendments provide more clarity as to the definition of sexual assault. In doing so, the legal analysis for determining whether a sexual assault has occurred is simplified. Second, these amendments also allow law enforcement agencies and the National Guard Bureau's Office of Complex Investigations to determine whether a sexual assault has occurred as defined by the Department of Defense, as opposed to only looking at Nevada criminal statutes. It is important that the agencies that conduct sexual assault investigations on our behalf are using the correct military legal standard to allow us to pursue disciplinary action.

In conclusion, S.B. 28 will better facilitate good order and discipline in the Nevada National Guard while promoting several of the Adjutant General's command priorities. It is in the best interest of the state to adopt this bill into law and help the Nevada National Guard continue to build a safe environment for our soldiers and airmen that is free of sexual harassment and sexual assault. Thank you for your consideration of this bill and your support of the state's military. With the Chair's permission, I would now like Ms. Randel to say a few words.

Chair Flores:

Thank you for your service and for joining us.

Karen-Nicole Randel, Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, Nevada National Guard:

[She read from [Exhibit D](#).] I am a captain and full-time employee for the Nevada National Guard. I serve as the State Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, and I am responsible for developing and managing the state's sexual assault prevention and response program. I also serve on the National Guard Bureau's Sexual Assault Prevention Task Force. The goals of this task force are to identify areas where we can focus our prevention efforts, and then to identify prevention tools we can adopt—or create—to address those specific areas.

Over the last year, the Nevada National Guard has seen a significant improvement in the implementation of our equal opportunity and sexual assault prevention and response programs addressing sexual harassment and sexual assault in Nevada's military population. Both programs have conducted significant awareness campaigns to ensure that all military and civilian employees know the definitions of sexual harassment and sexual assault and understand their option to report these behaviors. These efforts have also resulted in an increased rate of reporting. Major General Berry has made it clear to all members of the organization that these behaviors will not be tolerated and that he will hold each individual accountable when an investigation reveals they are guilty of these offenses. The proposed revisions strengthen these efforts. These issues are not specific to the Nevada National Guard and are part of the larger conversation about making the military a safe place for all service members, regardless of rank, gender, sexual orientation, or race.

The revision to NRS Chapter 412 to include sexual harassment addresses the statistics presented in the 2019 DoD Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military, which shows that as many as 50 percent of reported sexual assaults in the military were preceded by sexual harassing behavior. This inclusion recognizes that the only way to eliminate sexual assault is by first intervening in and ending sexual harassing behavior. The revisions to NRS Chapter 412 definitions of consent and sexual contact provide consistency between the Nevada definitions, Uniform Code of Military Justice of the United States, and the United States Department of Defense and reduce confusion between federal and state definitions.

Thank you for your consideration of this bill and for your support of the state's military. We are both standing by for your questions.

Chair Flores:

Thank you again for the presentation, and to both of you for your service. I am sure the members are very proud to have you presenting for us. We do have some questions for you. We will start off with Assemblywoman Anderson.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for your service, Lieutenant Colonel Remus and Captain Randel. My question has to do with section 1 of the new language, where it has to do with nonjudicial punishment. Looking through the information for NRS Chapter 412, it often talks about the court-martialing, so I understand that part. But what, exactly, does the nonjudicial punishment entail?

Kevin Remus:

Nonjudicial punishment is administrative action that we take against soldiers. I guess I would explain it as one step below a court-martial. In a nonjudicial punishment hearing, a soldier or an airman is presented with charges, which are violations of NRS Chapter 412 punitive provisions, and a proposed punishment. Then the airman or soldier is given a chance to speak to an attorney and then come back to a second reading to make his or her case as to why he or she should not be punished as part of nonjudicial punishment. *Nevada Revised Statutes* also specifies, under Chapter 412, the different punishments that are available as part of nonjudicial punishment.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you, Colonel Remus and Captain Randel, for your service. I appreciate your presentation. My question is this: Is this like double jeopardy? I know that you, Captain Randel, kind of explained the difference between the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the Nevada Code of Military Justice. But when the punishment is meted out, is this a form of double jeopardy?

Kevin Remus:

No, it is not. In the National Guard, we have different statuses, which subject us to different military codes. If someone is on active duty, they would be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). When someone is in a National Guard status, they would be subject to NRS Chapter 412. There are no double jeopardy issues with that, and it is the same way with nonjudicial punishment versus a court-martial. It would be one or the other; we would not punish them in two ways.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I have a clarifying question. Could they then still be subject to criminal proceedings even if they have dealt with the matter in a nonjudicial punishment? Obviously, that is if the event was eligible.

Kevin Remus:

No. The way we investigate sexual assaults in the National Guard, according to the National Guard Bureau of Regulations, is that we first send them to civilian law enforcement. If

civilian law enforcement investigates and finds that there are no criminal charges, then it is referred back to us. If criminal charges were found during the law enforcement investigation, that would be prosecuted by local authorities—the Washoe County District Attorney, the Clark County District Attorney. If there are no criminal charges, but there is still a violation of NRS Chapter 412 sexual assault—because there are different standards between the NRS criminal provision for sexual assault and the military provision for sexual assault—once the criminal charges are cleared, then it would come to us for nonjudicial punishment.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I think that answers my question.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Thank you both for being here and for your service. I have a quick question about section 3, subsection 4, paragraph (a), subparagraph (2), sub-subparagraph (I), where it defines the circumstances that do not constitute consent. "A lack of verbal or physical resistance"—I am not sure what, exactly, that means. Could you give me a little example or something?

Kevin Remus:

We used the Department of Defense definitions. Consent cannot be implied if someone does not resist in some way. Consent would not be justified just because someone did not verbally or physically resist. Does that help?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

It is just a little hard to understand. Would it be hard to understand for the people involved in an incident?

Kevin Remus:

I think these definitions are clearer than they were before because the previous version defined everything as what is nonconsensual, whereas here we tried to follow the Department of Defense definition that more soldiers are familiar with through their basic training, initial entry training, and things such as that. We thought it was clearer to use the Department of Defense (DoD) definition.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

In their training, they would be trained regarding this?

Karen-Nicole Randel:

With that, we do train this. We do include the conversation about what constitutes consent and what does not constitute consent in all of our training. We use the DoD definition, the UCMJ definition, and right now, we have a separate clause that explains the NRS definition of nonconsent. This makes our training a lot clearer, so there is not that confusion about, Well, are we under the DoD definition? Are we under the NRS definition? But we do discuss that when we talk about that particular line, "A lack of verbal or physical resistance." That means the person does not have to say no, or they do not have to physically resist or

fight the individual for it to be nonconsensual. Consent has to be defined by that person saying yes and agreeing to the conduct at issue.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Mine was basically the same question. The only question I really have is this: Is there going to be a legal problem proving the charges? That is really a question for the Legal Division [Legislative Counsel Bureau], but it is the same question we just had.

Kevin Remus:

Sir, this is where we would rely on our law enforcement investigation partners to help us determine whether consent occurred or not.

Chair Flores:

Assemblyman McArthur, did you have a follow-up question?

Assemblyman McArthur:

No, I was just curious if this was going to be a legal problem. But it looks like they are going with this anyway, so I have no further questions.

Assemblywoman Considine:

If I may give a hypothetical situation about this section of the bill: Say someone in the Guard is pushed up against a wall, groped, and kissed, and then the other person walks away. That would fall under this definition—there is a lack of consent because that person did not consent. Is that correct? Am I reading that right? If they express a lack of consent through words or conduct, in that situation, that person has not expressed consent, but obviously, that is not something that that person wanted to happen. Is that a good hypothetical to explain that?

Kevin Remus:

Yes.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Colonel Remus, just a quick question: When we are meting out discipline, is there an Article 15 under the Guard?

Kevin Remus:

Yes, we have an Article 15 in NRS Chapter 412. That is our nonjudicial punishment.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Is Article 15 the greatest punishment?

Kevin Remus:

No, we could go to court-martial. Article 15 is our strongest internal punishment that we have used since I have been in this position. If an actual sexual assault occurred, we could also refer it to the district attorney.

Chair Flores:

Members, do we have any additional questions? [There were none.] At this time, we will open up the hearing for those wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 28.

Katie Robbins, representing Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada:

We would like to voice our support for S.B. 28. Our service members should not have to feel that sexual harassment or sexual assault will not be properly punished or taken as seriously as these offenses deserve. Putting an end to sexual harassment will be an important step forward to ending sexual assault, and we applaud the National Guard for bringing this bill and urge the Committee's support of S.B. 28. Thank you.

Chair Flores:

Could we have the next caller wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 28? [There was no one.] At this time, we will invite those wishing to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 28 to call in. [There was no one.] Lastly, we will go to those wishing to testify in the neutral position for Senate Bill 28. [There was no one.] Would either one of our presenters like to make any closing remarks at this time?

Kevin Remus:

I have no further remarks. Thank you for your support of the military.

Chair Flores:

We appreciate your time. With that, we will close out the hearing on Senate Bill 28. Next, I believe we will have our Treasurer, Mr. Conine, joining us. At this time, we will open up the hearing on Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing public borrowing.
(BDR 30-395)**

Zach Conine, State Treasurer:

It is my pleasure to be here this morning to present to you Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint). In response to the devastating financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, during the 31st (2020) Special Session, the Nevada Legislature passed Senate Bill 4 of the 31st Special Session. Senate Bill 4 of the 31st Special Session permitted the State Board of Finance to issue interim debentures if the balance in the State General Fund was insufficient to meet future obligations. Provisions vested before are set to expire on June 30, 2021. Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) makes the provisions of S.B. 4 of the 31st Special Session permanent and slightly modifies the process to ensure greater checks and balances.

Upon expiration of the provisions of Senate Bill 4 of the 31st Special Session, the state will have no mechanism or ability, other than calling the Legislature into special session, to borrow money in an emergency. Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) puts a permanent tool in Nevada's tool box to address financial crises, whether caused by severe economic downturn, public health emergencies, or other extreme, extenuating circumstance in which the state is unable to pay its bills. Nevada is one of only four states with a biennial budget process,

which makes it challenging to respond efficiently and adequately to evolving economic conditions. Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) will provide the state with a level of flexibility to ensure that General Fund appropriations made by the Legislature can be fulfilled in an economic downturn without taking significant losses in the state's investment portfolio.

Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint), much like Senate Bill 4 of the 31st Special Session, permits the State Board of Finance to issue not more than \$150 million in interim debentures through the following steps:

Step one: The State Treasurer determines that the balance in the General Fund is insufficient to meet upcoming obligations. Step two: The Treasurer notifies the Interim Finance Committee of the amount of insufficiency and transmits a request to allow for the issuance by the State Board of Finance. Step three: The Interim Finance Committee has 15 days to decide to consider the item and, if approved, delivers a resolution establishing the maximum amount that may be issued. This step was revised on the Senate side with an amendment allowing the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) greater oversight in the process. In the original bill, if the IFC did not take up the request in 15 days, the request would be automatically approved. However, in this updated, amended version, if the IFC does not take the request up within 15 days, the request is not automatically approved, and the State Board of Finance shall not issue debentures.

While it will only be utilized in limited emergency circumstances, we believe Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) is necessary to ensure that the State has the tools it needs to respond effectively and efficiently in times of crisis. With that, I am happy to take any questions.

Chair Flores:

Thank you for that presentation. Members, at this time we will go to questions. We will start off with Assemblyman Matthews.

Assemblyman Matthews:

Does that \$150 million count against the state's constitutional bonding limitations? It is 2 percent of the assessed value of the state—I believe that is spelled out in Article 9, Section 3 of the *Nevada Constitution*.

Treasurer Conine:

Absolutely. Everything we do—as you know and as we always focus on—is subject to our constitutional limits. There are two things that affect how much money we can borrow in the state. One thing is the bit that you talked to on the constitutional cap. The other bit is affordability, which is basically how much money the state is able to borrow and pay back at any given time, including existing borrowing and future borrowing. Every two years, we put out a debt affordability report—it is a real page-turner; I encourage you all to read it—that says how much we can borrow over the next legislative biennium. That lets the Governor put together the Capital Improvement Program, and you all approve it. If we were to use this emergency mechanism in between bienniums, and we did not pay it back by the time our next affordability report came out, that would, of course, decrease the affordability going

forward. This bill does not allow us to borrow more money than we would be able to borrow typically. What it allows us to do, in an emergency, is take money and borrow it so that we can pay our bills.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

How often would you say that we, as a state, have applied emergency funding? Is there any data to substantiate your request here?

Treasurer Conine:

To date, the state has never needed emergency funding. But that is the point of bills like this. You do not put on a parachute because you are expecting the plane to go down; you put on a parachute because if the plane does start to go down, you want to make sure that you do not go down with it. This bill gives us the flexibility—as most other states have—to be able, in times of emergency, to do things such as make payroll; make sure that individuals can keep showing up at the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation to take phone calls; the Department of Motor Vehicles stays open; and the National Guard gets paid. It is for emergencies. We do not have emergencies that often; that is a good thing. But we still want to be prepared for them when we do.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

With that, we have never had this before, so why the \$150 million?

Treasurer Conine:

What we looked at was historically, if there was a problem, how big that problem was likely to be. What the \$150 million represents is an amount that we believe, at most, would be necessary in order to get us through a temporary financial crisis until a long-term solution such as a legislative session could be brought into play or budget cuts could be made. Remember, right now, if the State does not have an ability to pay its bills—because, say, we have to shut down gaming in order to deal with a financial crisis—we do not have any way to borrow money. Most other states get a temporary line of credit, a tax anticipation note, a revenue anticipation note—they would borrow money temporarily in order to do things such as make payroll. Nevada does not have the ability to do that. The only thing we can do is call everyone back into a special session immediately. Most other states have a tool like this in order to make sure the State does not have to liquidate long-term assets in order to pay short-term things. In other words, we can spend a little bit of money to borrow, as opposed to losing millions of dollars in State assets by selling off long-term investments or by running a special session that would need to happen 72 hours after we called for the money.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

With that said, will the IFC only get 15 days? Is that business days or consecutive days? How is that?

Treasurer Conine:

I would turn that over to the Legislative Counsel Bureau Legal Division folks. I am not actually sure if it is business days. But we know that when we had to bring emergency measures before IFC during the pandemic and before for things such as expanding the Pandemic Emergency Technical Support grant program, putting money into affordable housing, and helping landlords get paid back for commercial rent, IFC has always been willing and able to move quickly in order to handle it. That is where that timeline comes from.

Chair Flores:

Our legal counsel is not in the building for today, but I am sure we will get the question over to her and we will have a response for the team by no later than tomorrow—I am confident. Members, any additional questions?

Assemblyman McArthur:

Debentures were mentioned a lot in this bill. Can you give me a short definition of what an interim debenture is?

Treasurer Conine:

Sure. It is effectively a borrowing. That means it could be a revenue anticipation note, which is effectively borrowing on future revenues; a tax anticipation note, which is effectively the same thing but borrowing on future taxes; it could be a line of credit; it could be the issuance of warrants. It could be a lot of different things. The goal of the Board of Finance is to determine what the most effective and cheapest way to borrow funds is. We could choose different ones depending on what the scenario was. Interim debentures mean that they have a duration of less than five years, and that is defined by statute. The separation I would make there is that most state borrowing is a 20-year window; we borrow money and pay it back over 20 years. Interim debentures, by definition, are a shorter window because they are supposed to be used for purposes like this—for an interim purpose as opposed to a long-term, say, capital planning, purpose. You would not use things like this to pay for a school.

Assemblyman McArthur:

Does that include something like bonds?

Treasurer Conine:

Bonds in a broad sense are debentures, but we are talking about more specific types of things. A revenue anticipation note, for instance, is functionally a bond. We are borrowing money, and paying back a coupon or an interest rate on that borrowence for the maturity gate, which is the amount of time between when we borrow and when we actually pay it back.

Chair Flores:

Members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] Thank you, Treasurer Conine. At this time, we will invite those wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) to call in. [There was no one.] At this time, we will invite those wishing to

testify in opposition to Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) to call in. [There was no one.] Lastly, we will invite those wishing to testify in the neutral position for Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint) to call in. [There was no one.] Treasurer Conine, do you have any closing remarks?

Treasurer Conine:

Three quick notes: One, my staff is telling me it is 15 calendar days. I am sure the Legal Division can confirm that. Two, on the interim debenture's side, if you want to direct people, the statute is *Nevada Revised Statutes* 349.216. That kind of outlines some of the different bonding we can do. Lastly, I will just offer this for anyone: Last time around, when we were all in person, we were able to do a fun sort of Bonds 101—well, it was fun for us. If anyone would like that, we can certainly offer it in a one-on-one session. We love to take people through all the different ways the state borrows money to help create jobs and opportunity for Nevadans. Thanks so much for having me.

Chair Flores:

Members, I encourage you to continue to work with the Office of the State Treasurer, and as other questions arise, give yourselves an opportunity to work with them and do that fun Bonds 101 exercise that he mentioned so enthusiastically. With that, we will close out the hearing on Senate Bill 47 (1st Reprint). Next on our agenda, we have public comment. [There was none.]

Members, thank you all. I know today was slightly different, and I appreciate everybody being ready, attentive, and rolling with the flow of the meeting today, as it was obviously very different from anything we are accustomed to this session. For tomorrow, we do not have an intended meeting at this time. As you know, we anticipate having very long floor sessions for the next several days, so I encourage you to utilize this time to prepare, to review all those bills that we have for floor. Continue to work your bills, make sure that they are in good footing and people are supporting them—it is always good to count your votes. With that, please keep checking the agenda. We do not anticipate meeting Monday or Tuesday either. We may have to—or should we see an opening—but the intent as of now is not to meet Monday and Tuesday so that all the necessary time that we need on the floor can be utilized. Then we will come back Wednesday. We will hit the ground running, and we start this exercise all over because a lot of bills are going to start coming our way, as you have noticed.

One more time, a big shout-out and thank-you to our staff for getting ready for today. You all did an amazing job. Give them a quick round of applause. We have some amazing staff. Thank you for working with us in this hybrid model now. You ran a perfectly smooth meeting. This meeting is adjourned [at 9:44 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Zachary Khan
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsey Howell
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is written testimony presented by Kevin Remus, State Staff Judge Advocate, Nevada National Guard, regarding Senate Bill 28.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony presented by Karen-Nicole Randel, Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, Nevada National Guard, regarding Senate Bill 28.