

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eighty-First Session
May 12, 2021**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 10:06 a.m. on Wednesday, May 12, 2021, Online and Room 3138 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 Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola
Assemblyman C.H. Miller
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager
Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mindy McKay, Administrator, Records, Communications and Compliance Division,
Department of Public Safety
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts

Chairman Yeager:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have a work session today. The work session documents are on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. We will start from the top, and I will hand it over to Ms. Thornton to take us through Senate Bill 7 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 7 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes to the jurisdiction of certain courts relating to certain orders for protection where the adverse party is a child under 18 years of age. (BDR 1-391)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit C.] Our first bill on the work session is Senate Bill 7 (1st Reprint). It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Nevada Supreme Court and was heard on April 21, 2021. This bill provides that the district court has exclusive jurisdiction over any action relating to the issuance or dissolution of an order for protection against domestic violence, workplace harassment, high-risk behavior, sexual assault or stalking, aggravated stalking, or harassment that is sought against a child who is under 18 years of age. However, the juvenile court has exclusive jurisdiction over any action in which it is alleged that a child has committed a delinquent act by violating such an order. The bill also provides that the district court may appoint a master to hear these matters.

There is one amendment proposed by Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office. The amendment requires the appointment of counsel at all proceedings for a child who is the adverse party. It provides that the juvenile court must seal all records when the adverse party reaches the age of 18 or upon the expiration of the order, whichever occurs earliest. Lastly, it also allows the adverse party to petition the court for an order declaring that the basis for the information transmitted to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History no longer exists.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 7 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 7 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? I do not see any discussion, so we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblywoman Nguyen.

Senate Bill 31: Makes various changes relating to public safety. (BDR 14-337)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit D.] Senate Bill 31 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Records, Communications and Compliance Division of the Department of Public Safety. It was heard in Committee on April 14, 2021.

Senate Bill 31 revises provisions relating to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History. The bill expands the definition of a "record of criminal history" to refer to any prosecuting attorney rather than only to a district attorney. The bill eliminates the requirement for the Central Repository to prepare and post certain reports on its website. Instead, the Central Repository must provide electronic access to this statistical data on its website and include data on certain orders for protection and on crimes against older or vulnerable persons. Lastly, the Central Repository is also required to provide to an entity authorized to review such records the criminal history of a person generally, rather than limiting the information provided to convictions only or to incidents for which the person is currently involved in the criminal justice system.

There are two amendments to this measure. The first is proposed by the Department of Public Safety and it retains the language in section 3, subsection 5(a), of the bill that requires the Central Repository to disseminate records of criminal history to an authorized participant that reflect convictions only.

The second amendment was proposed by Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert and authorizes the Central Repository to monitor the agencies of criminal justice in this state for compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the submission or transmission of certain information relating to mental health records and certain other records, reports, compilations, and information. It also requires the Central Repository to prepare an annual report

regarding such compliance and post the report on its Internet website if the Central Repository chooses to perform such monitoring. It authorizes the Central Repository to contact the agencies of criminal justice in this state to coordinate efforts to ensure the timely submission or transmission of such information and records, and it revises the effective date of the bill.

Chairman Yeager:

Before I take questions, I will remind Committee members there was some discussion on the bill and some concern expressed about what information would be turned over if the bill were to be passed. The Department of Public Safety, Records Division, did reach out and worked on the first amendment, which you will see was to restore the existing language, that is "convictions only," that will be disclosed. Then, as was mentioned, there is a second amendment from Senator Seevers Gansert that simply allows the Central Repository to do some follow-up when they are not getting the records they should be getting from courts, and then to provide that information to the public. Hopefully, the compliance rate will be greater in terms of courts giving records of convictions timely to the Central Repository. With those explanations, I would be happy to take all questions if there are any on Senate Bill 31 as detailed in the work session document.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Your explanation reduces my question. With the changes in the amendment that are being proposed, will it require any additional programming and/or a fiscal note from the Department of Public Safety, Records Division?

Chairman Yeager:

Ms. McKay is probably the most appropriate person to answer that.

**Mindy McKay, Administrator, Records, Communications and Compliance Division,
Department of Public Safety:**

The portion of the bill that is being amended to retain the language in section 3, subsection 5(a), to only produce records of convictions for civil name checks will require system programming; however, we will be doing that during our Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS) modernization effort, so it is already being funded through this session and the next biennium as well. It is a matter of time when we will be able to modify our system to produce records of convictions only. All the other sections of the bill are already being handled with existing resources, so there will not be a fiscal note regarding any other sections of the bill. There will not be a fiscal note on section 3, subsection 5(a), because it is part of the NCJIS modernization.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to amend and do pass with both amendments as listed in the work session document.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KASAMA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 31.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblywoman Kasama.

**Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to orders authorizing the
installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device. (BDR 14-412)**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit E](#).] Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Attorney General. This bill was heard in Committee on April 22, 2021.

This bill prohibits a person from installing or using a pen register or trap and trace device without first obtaining an order from a district court and provides that a peace officer may apply to a district court for such an order. The bill includes certain federal officers in the definition of "peace officer" when they are acting as members of a task force comprising federal and state or local enforcement agencies. It authorizes a court to accept a facsimile or electronic copy of a signature on an application for such an order. It also authorizes the use of secure electronic transmission for the application and issuance of such an order. There are no amendments.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 41 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions, so I will be looking for a motion do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 41 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman O'Neill.

Senate Bill 49 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to cannabis. (BDR 56-268)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit F.](#)] Senate Bill 49 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services on behalf of the Cannabis Compliance Board and was heard in Committee on May 5, 2021.

This bill makes various changes related to cannabis, including authorizing the Cannabis Compliance Board to employ the services of people it considers necessary for the purposes of hearing disciplinary proceedings. It also authorizes the executive director of the Board to serve a complaint upon a respondent who is subject to a disciplinary proceeding. It removes authorization for the Board to take the testimony of a witness by deposition in hearings before the Board. It also authorizes the Board to adopt policies and procedures to waive registration requirements and revises various labeling requirements.

There is an amendment proposed by Mr. Klimas, executive director of the Cannabis Compliance Board. This amendment revises the definition of "marijuana" to include certain commodities or products made using hemp; revises the definition of "THC" to include other structural, optical, and/or geometric isomers of tetrahydrocannabinol; revises the definition of "hemp" to provide that the THC concentration in hemp must not exceed the "Acceptable Hemp THC Level" as defined by the State Department of Agriculture; and lastly, it adds a new definition of "synthetic cannabinoid" to statute.

Chairman Yeager:

Do we have any questions on Senate Bill 49 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 49 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will go ahead and take the floor statement on Senate Bill 49 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 50 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to warrants. (BDR 14-405)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit G.](#)] Senate Bill 50 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Attorney General and was heard in Committee on May 6, 2021.

Senate Bill 50 (1st Reprint) prohibits the issuance of a no-knock arrest warrant or a no-knock search warrant unless it is demonstrated via sworn affidavit that the underlying crime involves a significant and imminent threat to public safety and that giving notice in serving a warrant is likely to create an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officers executing the warrant or to another person. The bill sets forth criteria that an application for a no-knock warrant must meet and sets forth the manner in which a no-knock warrant must be executed.

There is one amendment to this bill sponsored by Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General. He proposed revising section 1.1 to provide circumstances when a no-knock warrant issued is void.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 50 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 50 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG SECONDED THE
MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I will be a yes on this. I appreciate talking with the Attorney General after the Committee meeting, and we discussed some of the facts of the bill and clarified a few things. I also talked with law enforcement on their position. I will be a yes, but I would like to reserve the right to change my mind.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there further discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion, the motion is to amend and do pass.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

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

Senate Bill 62 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the solicitation of contributions. (BDR 7-413)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit H](#).] Senate Bill 62 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Attorney General and was heard in Committee on May 6, 2021.

This bill expands the types of organizations that must register with the Secretary of State as charitable organizations to include entities that solicit donations but are not exempt from federal income taxes. The bill makes several technical changes to reflect that these entities may not be required to register as tax exempt organizations with the Internal Revenue Service or be organized as entities that file with the secretary of state. Similarly, the bill revises information required to be disclosed in solicitations made by these organizations and makes them subject to laws governing deceptive trade practices. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 62 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions, so at this time I will be looking for a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 62 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I will be a yes in Committee and reserve my right. I want to thank Ms. Adair in appreciation for taking time to meet with me and representatives from some groups that had concerns about how this bill might apply to them and their activities. I am happy to say that she was able to put to rest many of our concerns. The groups we met with are now okay with the bill, so I will be a yes, but will reserve my right to change my mind in case there are a few things that I still need to address.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I do not see a lot of problems with this bill, but I see future problems that can be built upon this bill. For that reason, I will have to vote no on it.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I will be voting yes to get it out of Committee, but I am going to reserve my right to change.

Assemblywoman Hardy:

Same for me. I will be a yes out of Committee.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I am going to be a no.

Chairman Yeager:

I will remind the Committee that you always have the right to change, but please let me know if you are going to do that. It is always helpful to avoid surprises on the Assembly floor. Now is probably the appropriate time for the vote. The motion is to do pass.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN KASAMA, O'NEILL, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN ORENTLICHER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Marzola.

Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to business entities. (BDR 7-493)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit I](#).] Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Ohrenschall and was heard in Committee on April 22, 2021.

This bill is an omnibus measure that revises various provisions governing Nevada business entities. Among other things, the bill: transfers from the clerk of the court to the party who serves the document responsibility for mailing certain documents to a company's management; moves the definition of "publicly traded corporation" to a different section of statute to make it more generally applicable; allows a corporation to include a federal forum selection clause in its articles of incorporation or bylaws; clarifies a corporation's fiduciary duties; expands the definition of "distribution" regarding classes or series of shares; and revises provisions concerning the ability of a corporation to hold virtual meetings and who may attend such meetings.

The bill also: revises provisions concerning the applicability of certain voting agreements and time limits placed on such agreements and clarifies the voting requirements for certain types of business entities; expands a corporation's ability to indemnify managers in certain circumstances; clarifies that certificate of membership interest requirements for some associations do not apply to common-interest communities; clarifies the terms "distribution" and "in interest" as they relate to limited liability companies and their members; revises provisions concerning the notification of stockholders concerning actions that create dissenter's rights; and clarifies provisions governing a stockholder's demand for payment of shares and requires a stockholder to file a statement of intent under certain circumstances.

Senator Ohrenschall proposed two amendments to this bill. The first amendment, as presented in the mock-up, revises the language in section 22.5 to clarify what a contribution may consist of to the capital of a member to a limited-liability company or series. The second amendment provides that the definition of "market value" remains in *Nevada Revised*

Statutes (NRS) 78.424 and provides that the definition of "resident domestic corporation" remains in NRS 78.427, which moves the definition of "voting shares" to NRS 78.010. It also deletes the new subsection 3 of NRS 78.010, provides that NRS 78.424 is not repealed, and repeals NRS 78.432. Lastly, the amendment adds Assemblyman David Orentlicher as a primary sponsor of the bill.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document?

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I was not here for this presentation, so I am sure I will be fine with it, but I need to take a look at this and digest it. I can circle back.

Chairman Yeager:

Before we move on, are there any other questions or comments on Senate Bill 95 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 95 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

It was unanimous since Assemblyman Orentlicher has joined us. Since he is a sponsor of the bill, I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Orentlicher.

Senate Bill 168 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to cannabis. (BDR 56-135)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit J](#).] Senate Bill 168 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senators Lange and Brooks and was heard in Committee on May 6, 2021.

This bill makes various changes related to cannabis. Specifically, it requires the Cannabis Compliance Board to adopt regulations governing curbside pickup and allowing certain records to be created and maintained electronically.

The bill also authorizes the Board to adopt regulations imposing packaging and labeling requirements for cannabis products. In addition, cannabis sales facilities are authorized to engage in curbside pickup in accordance with Board regulations. The bill revises labeling requirements to require cannabis establishments to ensure that all cannabis products are

labeled with certain information, and it requires cannabis sales facilities to "convey" certain information, rather than providing written notification. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 168 (1st Reprint) as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions at this time, so I will be looking for a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 168 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN, KRASNER,
O'NEILL, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller.

Senate Bill 357: Requires the Department of Corrections to track and report expenses that are directly related to housing youthful offenders. (BDR 16-499)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit K.] Senate Bill 357 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Judiciary on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice and was heard in Committee on April 15, 2021.

This bill requires the director of the Department of Corrections to establish a system to track expenses directly related to housing youthful offenders who are under 18 years of age. Expenses to be tracked include education, communication and interaction with family members and others, health care, mental health, recreational programming, and other costs the director determines to be appropriate. The director is required to report the expenses tracked by the system to the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice by July 30 of each year. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chairman Yeager:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 357 as detailed in the work session document? I do not see questions, so I will be looking for a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 357.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? I do not see any.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor statement to Assemblywoman Krasner.

That takes us through our work session document. We have one item left on the agenda and that is public comment. Public comment is a time to raise matters of a general nature within the jurisdiction of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. I will open public comment.

Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:

I am Annemarie Grant, sister of Thomas Purdy, who was murdered by Reno Police and Washoe County Sheriff's officers.

"I am going to build a couple of AR pistols just for BLM, Antifa, or active shooters who cross my path and can't maintain social distancing." "I would be a good helper and throw a lot of gasoline in their direction as they held their lighters, and then say 'oops' as I walked away." That was just two of the vile, disgusting, disturbing, and fear-generating tweets sent out by a Sparks Police Department officer, George Forbush.

Officer Forbush alleges he was unjustly disciplined for misconduct after he posted on a personal social media account about "matters of public concern." He was suspended for four days without pay. He is seeking \$1 million in damages because the suit said the disciplinary action caused him psychological, emotional, and reputational harm and will hurt his post-retirement employment prospects. Another bad cop costing the taxpayers money.

The Sparks City Council, at their May 10, 2021, meeting, approved retaining Holland & Hart as special counsel to the city in the lawsuit. The fees for service are billed by the hour, and the hourly rate varies based on the person performing the work. The total financial impact to the taxpayers will depend on how the case progresses.

What is most troubling is that the officer sees nothing wrong with his statements as someone who has the ability to kill without consequence. His attorneys want to pretend that the community does not have a legitimate fear based on his statements. He is a member of the special weapons and tactics team that is typically sent to, proclaimed by police, "volatile situations." I know many people do not want him showing up for their call.

You may recall I spoke to this committee on February 23, 2021, about 30-year-old Kristofer Talancon, who was asphyxiated by Sparks Police on October 15, 2016. Officer George Forbush was one of those officers. Please support bills that promote transparency and accountability from law enforcement.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there anyone else for public comment? [There was no one.] I will now close public comment. Is there anything else from Committee members this morning before we talk

about the rest of this week? I do not see anything, so I have a couple of announcements. Number one, we do not have a meeting of this Committee tomorrow. As you all know, we do not have any bills in the Committee right now, so we do not have anything to hear. We are going to get more bills, but I just do not know when. It is not going to be this week.

That leaves us with Friday. We will be having a meeting on Friday. We are planning on a 9 o'clock start, and we will only have a work session. By my calculations, we have up to 12 additional bills that we might work session on Friday. For those of you who have been in the building before, you know this deadline is always a unique one where we typically take some bills and then recess and then come back together and vote on some more bills. That will happen, not just in this Committee, but probably in all your other committees as well. We will recess to the call of the chair at some point, so please keep your phone close by or have your attaché reach out because we may try to get together quickly when we have an opportunity. Obviously, every other committee in the building is trying to do the same thing. Logistically, it is a bit challenging. I will continue to work on getting the work session document together. I am still waiting on some amendments to be finalized. Once I have those, I will try to get those out to all of you in a timely manner. You can let me know if those amendments are going to satisfy any concerns that were expressed on the bills.

That is what we have for the moment. I do not know what next week is going to look like. It depends if we get any bills on the floor this week. I think that is everything. Thank you all for your hard work, and we will see you back here at 9 o'clock on Friday. This meeting is adjourned [at 10:39 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 7 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 31](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 41 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 49 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 50 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 62 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 95 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 168 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 357](#), presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.