

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eighty-First Session
May 13, 2021**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 2:40 p.m. on Thursday, May 13, 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:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman C.H. Miller
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Susan Fisher, representing PeopleForBikes

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Thank you for your patience. We have a number of items on our work session. The first item on our work session is Senate Bill 18 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 18 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing penalties for certain violations relating to public utilities. (BDR 58-277)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 18 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) [[Exhibit C](#)]. It was first heard before this Committee on May 6, 2021. Senate Bill 18 (1st Reprint) increases the maximum allowable administrative fines imposed by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada for violation of statutes relating to public utilities. The maximum amounts are increased for both daily fines and a fine for any related series of violations. The bill also authorizes an administrative fine for the submittal of information that is materially false or misleading and which the person knew—or should have known using reasonable care and diligence—was materially inaccurate. If the PUCN determines certain violations are knowing and willful, or detrimental to public health and safety, S.B. 18 (R1) allows for higher maximum fines. Certain limits on administrative fines do not restrict the PUCN's authority to require public utilities to restore funding to accounts and programs as necessary to achieve compliance with statute, regulation, or orders of the PUCN. The measure also increases the allowable administrative fine from \$500 to \$50,000 for certain violations of *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 704, "Regulation of Public Utilities Generally," and for a failure to obey decisions, orders, or regulations of the PUCN. Senate Bill 18 (1st Reprint) adds to the factors the PUCN must take into consideration when determining the amount of an administrative fine to ensure it is proportional to the violation. The additional factors include, but are not limited to:

1. The nature and circumstances of the violation, including actual or potential financial or public health and safety impacts;
2. Willfulness;
3. Good-faith efforts to detect and voluntarily disclose violations to the PUCN;
4. Good-faith efforts to attempt to achieve compliance following notification of violations and to prevent the reoccurrence of similar violations in the future;
5. History of compliance and noncompliance;

6. The economic benefit—or lack thereof—to anyone charged;
7. The amounts of fines previously assessed by the PUCN for similar violations; and
8. Other factors deemed necessary to determine the reasonableness of the administrative fines.

There are no amendments for this Committee's consideration. There are no fiscal notes associated with this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there questions or comments on the measure? [There were none.] I will ask for a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 18 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I would like to have seen the civil penalties be even higher amounts because of the kinds of violations we are talking about, but I think progress is being made. For that reason, I will support the bill.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Ditto.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I see no other discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON AND WHEELER
VOTED NO.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller. We will close the work session on S.B. 18 (R1), and we will open the work session on Senate Bill 59 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 59 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning the judicial review of decisions of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada. (BDR 58-331)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 59 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada [[Exhibit D](#)]. It was first heard before this Committee on May 6, 2021. It provides that after service and filing of

a reply memorandum by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada and any other respondents in an action seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commission, no further memoranda may be filed. There are no amendments to this measure, and there are no fiscal notes associated with it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or discussion on Senate Bill 59 (1st Reprint)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 59 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Watts. With that, we will close the work session on Senate Bill 59 (1st Reprint) and open the work session on Senate Bill 259 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 259 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to tow cars. (BDR 58-179)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 259 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Moises Denis [[Exhibit E](#)]. It was first heard before this Committee on May 6, 2021. Senate Bill 259 (1st Reprint) requires the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA) of the Department of Business and Industry to conduct annual training for compliance enforcement officers employed by the NTA and tow car operators under NTA jurisdiction on any additions or revisions to the laws or regulations governing the licensing and regulation of motor carriers. If no laws or regulations were enacted or revised in the preceding year, the NTA is not required to hold such a training. The first training session must be held no later than October 1, 2022. The NTA is authorized to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of the bill. There are no amendments to this measure for the Committee's consideration. There has been one fiscal note received by the NTA showing no fiscal impact for the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 259 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. With that, we will close the work session for Senate Bill 259 (1st Reprint). We will now open the work session for Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to transportation.
(BDR 43-965)**

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris [[Exhibit F](#)] and was first presented before this Committee on May 4, 2021. Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint) requires driver training courses to include the "rules of the road" relating to bicycles, including electric bicycles, electric scooters, and pedestrians. The measure allows a motor vehicle to pass a bicycle or electric scooter in a no-passing zone or by crossing the center line of a two-lane divided road or highway provided there are no unsafe conditions, prohibitions, or restrictions to overtaking on the left, and the required minimum three-foot passing distance is maintained. If the right side of the road contains surface hazards or is blocked by objects, or the travel lane is too narrow to accommodate both a motor vehicle and a bicycle, the bill adds an exception to the rule that bicycles and electric scooters ride as far to the right side of the road as possible. A county or regional transportation commission is required to integrate facilities, lanes, routes, and signage for bicycles into plans for construction or maintenance of roads as part of its Complete Streets Program, to the extent feasible. With respect to Nevada's Department of Transportation, counties, and regional transportation commissions, the bill expands the scope of the users to be considered in Complete Streets Programs to include users of all abilities and ages. There are no amendments for consideration, and there are no fiscal notes associated with this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions on Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 285 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I am appreciative of this measure, in particular the training of the rules of the road for bicycles. As someone who has recently gotten into biking, it can be of concern to be on the roads in southern Nevada realizing that most drivers do not understand how they should

react. As a new avid bicyclist, I want to thank the sponsor for making this part of the training that will take place. Hopefully, we will be able to cut back on some of these tragic incidents on our roads.

Assemblyman Ellison:

How will counties implement this process?

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11:

The counties in the south and north have their own regional transportation systems, and there is the Nevada Department of Transportation. This bill would apply to each transportation entity that currently participates in the Complete Streets Program. There is no expansion of whom the program would apply to.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I would like to thank the sponsor for bringing this forward. As I talked about in the hearing, I have lost people I know personally to biking accidents. Pedestrian fatalities and bicycle fatalities are a huge issue in the urban areas in our state. If we can save one life, it is worth every ounce of ink to print this bill. I will support it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I had initial reservations on this bill. I will vote for it.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Roberts. We will close the work session on Senate Bill 285 (1st Reprint) and open the work session on Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to transportation network companies. (BDR 58-935)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris. It was first heard before this Committee on May 4, 2021 [[Exhibit G](#)]. Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint) authorizes providers of monitored autonomous vehicles (MAVs) to enter into contracts with transportation network companies (TNCs) to receive connections to potential passengers and related services for a fee in the same way that a driver enters into an agreement with a TNC. A "monitored autonomous vehicle" is defined as an autonomous vehicle with a safety engineer in the vehicle at all times while in operation. The measure adds "monitored autonomous vehicle provider" to the provisions applicable to a driver, including but not limited to accident reports, inspections, insurance, passenger services, and recordkeeping requirements. Monitored autonomous vehicle providers must disclose the license plate

number of a vehicle to a passenger, and safety engineers may only accept compensation from the MAV provider employing them. A TNC must include information on providers of MAVs in its reports to the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA) of the Department of Business and Industry. The measure clarifies that MAVs are not commercial vehicles, and the provisions relating to MAVs do not apply to fully autonomous vehicles or autonomous vehicle network companies that have been permitted by the NTA.

There is one amendment proposed for the Committee's consideration. It is attached to the work session document. The proposed amendment would:

1. Replace the term "safety engineer" with "autonomous vehicle operator";
2. Specify that autonomous vehicle providers have the same duties and obligations to operate the vehicle in a safe manner as drivers providing transportation services;
3. Require autonomous vehicle providers to carry the minimum amount of insurance required for vehicles providing transportation services through TNCs under subsection 1(a) of *Nevada Revised Statutes* 690B.470 at all times while the autonomous vehicle is operating;
4. Remove "monitored autonomous vehicle provider" from subsections 1(b), 1(c), and 1(d) of section 22.7; and
5. Amend the effective date to upon passage and approval.

There has been one fiscal note submitted by NTA showing no fiscal impact from the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I hope you have all had an opportunity to review the amendments. Are there questions on the bill or the amendments?

Assemblyman Watts:

I wanted to express my appreciation to the sponsors and supporters of the bill for listening to some of the issues and concerns that came up during the hearing and working to address them with this amendment.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 288 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I want to repeat the comments of my colleague. I appreciate the work on this. This is an interesting area because we are getting into technology spaces that are creating new dynamics when it comes to driving and ride sharing. I had some concerns about how these things would be looked at regarding insurance and liability. I appreciate the hard work of the sponsors and those interested. This is a great amendment; it takes us in the right direction. I will happily be supporting the bill.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have voted against almost every autonomous bill so far, but I think this has roots. I think it could take us to the next level, so I support the bill. I would like to see people working and driving instead of seeing a car driving itself.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler. We will close the work session on Senate Bill 288 (1st Reprint) and open the work session on Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint): **Revises provisions relating to motor vehicles.**
(BDR 43-837)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure [[Exhibit H](#)]. This was first heard before the Committee on April 27, 2021. Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) makes three changes to the vehicle-miles-traveled pilot program currently being conducted by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The changes:

1. Remove recreational vehicles from the list of vehicles for which odometer readings must be submitted to the DMV;
2. Prohibit the DMV from disclosing information provided to the DMV under the pilot program to an insurer, self-insurer, or an organization that provides assistance or support to an insurer or self-insurer in connection with certain activities relating to motor vehicle insurance; and
3. Authorize the DMV to adopt regulations providing for an administrative fine for failure to report an odometer reading or any other information required by the DMV under the pilot program in a timely manner, if required.

There are no amendments for this Committee's consideration. A fiscal note provided by the Office of Project Management within the DMV shows no fiscal impact for the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint)?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

When we passed the original bill for a study for mileage, I voted against it. I thought it was the beginning of fines, and here are the fines. To me, it is an invasion of people's privacy to not make it voluntary for them to give us that information. I will be a strong no on this bill.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Of the complaints coming into my office, this bill is one people are really upset about as they try to do their mileage. My area is not like Las Vegas or Washoe County where you can just go down the street to go to the doctor; people must drive hundreds of miles. They are worried about what will happen in the future with this reporting. I am a no also.

Assemblyman Watts:

As one who worked on establishing this last session, I would like to note a few things. When we first set this up, we deliberately made sure there were no penalties whatsoever. We heard from the Department in the presentation of this bill that one-third of the reporting we are getting is either missing information or is inaccurate. I have heard a lot of the misconceptions that this would lead, not to fees, but to some sort of new taxes. That is not the case. Compared with some of the other potential consequences, such as not being able to register a vehicle, I think granting the Department the ability—if they believe this is a serious issue—to administer a fine is the lightest way we can go in an effort to make sure we have robust data on driving patterns in our state. I will be supporting the measure.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I appreciate the first two sections of the bill. The ability to collect fines is an issue for me. We have been doing the pilot program for over a year. I do not know how long we are going to do the pilot to collect data, but the fine issue concerns me. I cannot support it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I appreciate the comments. As long as people follow the rules, they do not have to pay the fine. I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 371 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, LEAVITT,
ROBERTS, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will take the floor statement. I will close the work session on Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) and open the work session on Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to electric bicycles.
(BDR 43-835)**

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. This was first heard before the Committee on May 4, 2021 [[Exhibit I](#)]. Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint) creates and defines three classes of electric bicycles based on their specifications. The measure clarifies that electric bicycles are permitted wherever bicycles are permitted except as otherwise specified or prohibited in federal law. Local governments and state agencies may prohibit the use of electric bicycles on bicycle paths or shared-use paths as needed to protect public health and safety or to comply with other laws or obligations, and they may also regulate their use on unsurfaced trails designated for nonmotorized use. The bill prohibits persons under 16 years of age from operating a class 3 electric bicycle—although they may ride as passengers on class 3 electric bicycles that are equipped to carry passengers—and requires operators and passengers of class 3 electric bicycles to wear bicycle helmets. New electric bicycles sold in Nevada on or after October 1, 2021, must comply with federal manufacturing and equipment standards. Further, beginning January 1, 2022, manufacturers and distributors of electric bicycles must apply a label containing specified information. The measure requires certain equipment on electric bicycles and prohibits tampering with the speed capability or disengagement devices unless the classification label is replaced. Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint) adds electric bicycles to the statute protecting property owners against liability for injuries to people or property resulting from recreational bicycling on their property and to the statute making it a crime to throw objects or substances at a bicycle or to damage or deface a bicycle.

There has been a conceptual amendment proposed that would remove both the minimum operator age for class 3 electric bicycles and the helmet requirement for both operators and passengers. That amendment follows the work session bill page.

There have been two fiscal notes received. Both the Office of Project Management within the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of Transportation have determined there is no fiscal impact from the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on the bill or the amendment?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I have a question about the conceptual amendment. I see that it keeps section 8, subsection 2, which talks about people under the age of 16 being able to ride as a passenger, but we are also striking section 8, subsection 1, which indicates that someone under the age of 16 could operate an electric bicycle. I wonder about the necessity of keeping subsection 2 in the amendment. Is there a reason it is there? It seems to be unnecessary. Why does the amendment retain subsection 2?

Susan Fisher, representing PeopleForBikes:

I, a nonlawyer, wrote the proposed amendment myself. We wanted to clarify that there could be a passenger on the bicycle in case there was any question. We are fine with it either way, whether that stays or goes.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I appreciate the answer. I am sorry I did not reach out to you earlier. I do not think we need to figure this out now, but in consultation with the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, we can figure out if we need to maintain that language. It seemed to me to be clear that if you are 16 and under and you can drive the vehicle, you could logically also be a passenger. Perhaps we can work that out in the drafting. I wanted to be sure there was not something else going on that I was not aware of.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I wanted to make sure we were not mandating helmets for either the operator or the passenger. I have a question about the fiscal note. Regarding the bill's effect on local government, it says it increases or newly provides for a term of imprisonment in county or city jail or detention facility. I am curious to know if someone can clarify that.

Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel:

The fiscal note may be based on the bill itself. Those fiscal notes are based on bills as introduced, so they do not change even if the bill is amended to take out the prohibition.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Although this bill still makes me a liar to my children, I appreciate the bill sponsor's taking our concerns about the age limit and the helmet requirement into consideration to follow current law.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Yeager, did you want to remove that section from the bill while we are discussing it?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I would make a motion with a note that the conceptual amendment will also delete section 8, subsection 2, about the passenger. The entire section 8 would be deleted. I would move to amend and do pass with that caveat.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AS STATED AND
DO PASS SENATE BILL 383 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Watts:

I appreciate the work from the sponsors of this measure to address some of the comments and concerns that came up during the hearing. We have had discussions about helmet use. For where we are in general, this makes sense to ensure that implementation of this bill is smooth. I wanted to express my appreciation for working on this change. I will be supporting it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing no other comments, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Yeager. We will close the work session for Senate Bill 383 (1st Reprint) and open the work session for Senate Bill 387 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 387 (1st Reprint): Provides for the regulation of certain suppliers that provide an inmate calling service. (BDR 58-1015)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 387 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris and first presented before this Committee on April 29, 2021 [[Exhibit J](#)]. Senate Bill 387 (1st Reprint) requires the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) to adopt regulations governing the provision of inmate calling services, including a procedure to establish rate caps and limitations on ancillary service charges and certain other taxes and fees for intrastate calls made by inmates incarcerated in a public or private correctional facility in Nevada. The PUCN must also adopt regulations for approving a schedule or tariff that exceeds the established rate caps; or charges that fail to comply with the prescribed limitations. The rate caps set by the PUCN must not exceed the rates set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for interstate and international calls by inmates, and the other limitations set by the PUCN must be consistent with limitations set by the FCC for interstate and international calls by inmates.

Before providing an intrastate inmate calling service, a telecommunication provider must file a schedule or tariff with the PUCN specifying and seeking approval for the rates and terms and conditions applicable to its inmate calling service. The PUCN must approve any schedule or tariff that does not exceed a rate cap and that complies with the limitations prescribed by the FCC. The PUCN may also approve a schedule or tariff that exceeds a rate cap or fails to comply with the limitations prescribed by the FCC, in accordance with the regulations of the PUCN governing approvals of exceptions. The rate caps and limitations on charges must be reviewed annually by the PUCN and revised as needed. A supplier of inmate calling services must submit a revised schedule or tariff within 30 days after the PUCN revises a rate cap or limitation if the supplier's schedule or tariff on file exceeds the new rate cap or does not comply with the new limitation. Current suppliers have 30 days after the effective date of the regulations adopted by the PUCN pursuant to this bill to file a schedule or tariff with the PUCN. A supplier of inmate calling services must publish its

rates, terms, and conditions by posting such information on its publicly available website and by having a copy available for public inspection at its principal Nevada office. The supplier must also provide a written copy of the rates, pricing, and terms and conditions to the inmate with the first billing statement or invoice.

There has been one amendment proposed to add Assembly members Cameron (C.H.) Miller, Shondra Summers-Armstrong, and Howard Watts as nonprimary sponsors and to add juvenile detention facilities to the definition of correctional facility. There are no fiscal notes associated with this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions or discussion on Senate Bill 387 (1st Reprint)?

Assemblyman Ellison:

The phone bill for one of my businesses had an extra \$360 in charges. It was from one of my employees receiving several calls from her son. I could not believe how many minutes were on the bill and how high the bill was. Now we have to pay to have calls blocked from a facility like that. I think this is a great bill. I hope it can address that because inmates need to talk to somebody, but the fees are so high.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I would agree with you. Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG MOVED TO AMEND
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 387 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong.

With that, we are at the end of our formal agenda. That brings us to public comment. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

That concludes today's meeting. We have an agenda posted for tomorrow for a meeting at the call of the Chair for any other matter that was not taken care of today. I will let you know as soon as I can if we are going to have a meeting. This meeting is adjourned [at 3:22 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 18 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 59 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 259 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 285 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 288 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 371 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 383 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 387 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.