

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-first Session  
March 1, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, March 1, 2021, Online. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair  
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair  
Senator Dina Neal  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Ira Hansen

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Joseph Hardy, Senatorial District No. 12  
Assemblywoman Annie Black, Assembly District No. 19

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst  
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel  
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General  
Liz Ortenburger, CEO, SafeNest  
Jennifer Noble, Nevada District Attorneys Association  
John Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office  
Jim Hoffman, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
Kendra Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office  
Warren Hardy, City of Mesquite  
Allan Litman, Mayor, City of Mesquite  
Zach Conine, State Treasurer

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will open the hearing with Senate Bill (S.B.) 45.

**SENATE BILL 45**: Revises provisions relating to crimes. (BDR 18-421)

JESSICA ADAIR (Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General):

Senate Bill 45 is intended to enhance the State's ability to combat domestic violence. It is a fitting coincidence that we are hearing this bill on the first day of Women's History Month.

According to the Department of Public Safety's Uniform Crime Report, 30,357 domestic violence offenses were reported to Nevada law enforcement agencies in 2019. This represents one domestic violence offense reported every 17 minutes and 18 seconds. This shocking number does not account for the many domestic violence offenses that go unreported every day.

At the Office of the Attorney General, combating domestic violence and supporting survivors is a key priority we achieve in several ways. Nicole Reilly has served as the Ombudsman for Victims of Domestic Violence in the Office of the Attorney General for several years, managing many Statewide programs on domestic violence and assisting individual victims by connecting them with services and even holding their hands in court.

Attorney General Aaron Ford chairs the Statewide Committee on Domestic Violence (CDV). The CDV is comprised of diverse stakeholders and experts who help lead the way on domestic violence awareness and identify gaps in legislation, services and systems that support families experiencing domestic violence. This bill helps strengthen the services provided by the Ombudsman and the CDV.

I would like to bring the Committee's attention to an amendment to S.B. 45 (Exhibit B) provided by this Office which I will go through section by section. This amendment reflects changes approved by the CDV and other stakeholders.

Sections 1 and 2 expand the duties of the Ombudsman to include providing services to victims of sexual assault and human trafficking in addition to victims of domestic violence. These expanded duties reflect a common reality that many victims of domestic violence also experience sexual assault and human trafficking. Service providers, law enforcement and other stakeholders

frequently serve these victims as well. It is critical that we do not work in silos and support a more comprehensive approach to victim services.

The Office of the Attorney General does not have any victim services staff dedicated to sexual assault or human trafficking. This bill will allow the Office to serve many different kinds of victims seeking our help during their time of need. As a reminder, the Office has concurrent jurisdiction over human trafficking offenses.

Section 3 clarifies that while the Ombudsman will have expanded duties and serve victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and human trafficking, the Account for Programs Related to Domestic Violence, created to support and serve the CDV, will still be focused solely on domestic violence programs.

Section 4 makes several changes to the CDV to better serve its goals. While the Office of the Ombudsman for Victims of Domestic Violence will serve victims of sexual assault, human trafficking and domestic violence, the CDV will continue to focus on domestic violence issues. That clarification is made throughout the amendment.

The amendment adds two critical members to the CDV. Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (9) adds one representative from the Office of Court Administrator. From protective orders to sentencing, the courts are a key partner in the judicial response to domestic violence; adding this member will facilitate communication and a better understanding of domestic violence.

Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (b) adds a member who is a representative of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) of the Department of Health and Human Services who is experienced in the certification of programs for the treatment of people convicted of domestic violence. This section goes hand in hand with section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (b) which removes the CDV's statutory responsibility of certifying treatment programs.

Those who are convicted of domestic violence offenses must attend treatment programs as part of their sentence. Those programs are recommended by the CDV and then officially certified by the DPBH. This bureaucratic process is inefficient, often leading to delays in certification since the CDV meets quarterly; one of those meetings is dedicated to the Statewide fatality review.

This bill would place the responsibility of certifying treatment programs solely with the professional staff at the DPBH. Appointing that staff member to the CDV will maintain the communication and shared expertise between the program certification staff and the CDV itself. For example, the CDV is conducting a study on the efficacy of these treatment programs. Having certification staff on the CDV will help inform the study, and the study results will help inform the work of the staff who certify treatment programs.

Section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (e) adds a statutory duty to the CDV to study and consider the intersection between domestic violence and other issues such as sexual assault and human trafficking. The remaining changes to section 4, subsection 2 are technical changes to improve the CDV's efficiency.

Sections 5 and 6 make conforming changes.

Section 7, subsection 4, paragraph (a) makes corrections to the sentences for those convicted of domestic battery against a pregnant victim.

The Legislature passed A.B. No. 60 of the 80th Session which was sponsored by the Office of the Attorney General and made many sweeping changes to the domestic violence statute. One of those changes created a new crime: domestic violence against a pregnant victim when the offender knew or should have known the victim was pregnant. This is in recognition of research that shows homicide is one of the leading causes of death of pregnant women.

Additionally, pregnant people who experience domestic violence have greater health risks due to their medical condition, and pregnant people experiencing abuse are more likely to delay prenatal care.

*Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 200.485, subsection 4, paragraph (a), states a first offense for domestic battery against a pregnant victim is a gross misdemeanor. The standard sentence for a gross misdemeanor is incarceration from 1 day to 364 days. In practice, this leads to absurd and unjust results when compared to the mandatory minimum and maximum sentences for misdemeanor domestic violence or battery if a victim is not pregnant.

Under NRS 200.485, a first-time misdemeanor domestic battery offense is punishable by a minimum of two days incarceration and a maximum of six months. A second-time misdemeanor domestic battery offense is punishable

by a minimum of 20 days incarceration and a maximum of 6 months. Because the standard sentence for a gross misdemeanor is incarceration from 1 day to 364 days, a person convicted of the more severe gross misdemeanor crime of domestic battery against a pregnant victim could be incarcerated for a fewer number of days than a person convicted of a standard misdemeanor battery. This is not fair and defeats the intent of the statute.

On the other hand, punishment of 364 days incarceration is heavy-handed for a battery that did not result in substantial bodily harm, particularly considering the maximum for a standard misdemeanor is 6 months. This amendment, [Exhibit B](#), seeks to strike a balance that is fair, just and reflects the intention of the statute.

The new sentence proposed for a first offense of domestic battery against a pregnant victim is a minimum of 30 days incarceration and a maximum of 6 months. The statute also clarifies that offenders must attend treatment programs like those convicted of standard domestic violence battery. The fines associated with this statute are equal to the fines for a standard domestic violence battery.

SENATOR NEAL:

I have a question on the Behavioral Health Division language in section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (b). What do you seek to gain by having a DPBH representative on the CDV?

MS. ADAIR:

The reason it is in section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (b) and not in the list under section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (a) is because the DPBH representative is not appointed by the Attorney General but rather by the Administrator of the DPBH.

We seek to gain greater communication between the DPBH, which is already certifying these treatment programs, and the CDV. One of the things the CDV has been looking at and wants to improve is the efficacy of these treatment programs. When someone is sentenced under the domestic violence statute, he or she must attend treatment programs, formerly called batterer's intervention programs, that seek to break the cycle of domestic violence. This is not just punishment but also rehabilitation.

We have found that some of these programs are effective, and some are not effective. We are trying to ensure that batterer's treatment programs certified by the State are effective. The CDV takes that seriously.

SENATOR NEAL:

I am trying to determine how a sex trafficker is reformed and what the certified program is.

MS. ADAIR:

That language might be a remnant of the old language of the bill. We need to strike "sexual assault, or human trafficking." It should only be for the treatment of persons who commit domestic violence. That is in accordance with the rest of the statute which sentences people who commit domestic violence to treatment programs certified by DPBH. I can clarify that in a further amendment to the bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I would like clarification on section 7, subsection 4, paragraph (a) regarding the imprisonment issues. It changes the penalties for domestic violence with no substantial bodily harm. How is the mental health piece of that determined? We know what bodily harm is. We can see the bruises and injuries. How do we address the mental issues? For example, the victim's fear because he or she may not have been physically abused but may have been beaten down mentally.

MS. ADAIR:

The reference to substantial bodily harm is taken from other references in NRS. In terms of domestic violence, a separate statute addresses domestic violence battery resulting in substantial bodily harm. That is a Category B felony.

It is difficult for a court to quantify mental distress. When looking at a battery, we are looking at the physical harm suffered by the victim. Mental distress is not a standard in NRS when it comes to battery statutes, whether domestic violence or otherwise. The harm committed toward a victim is taken into account by a judge and jury when sentencing someone for any crime, including these statutes.

In the standard domestic violence battery penalty scheme, a first-time domestic violence offense is a minimum of two days incarceration and a maximum of six months. A second-time domestic violence, simple battery, within 7 years of

the first offense is a minimum of 20 days and a maximum of 6 months incarceration. The third-time offense is a Category B felony.

In this statute, the standard sentence for a gross misdemeanor for domestic violence against a pregnant victim could be anywhere between 1 day and 364 days.

In practice, judges are sentencing someone for this gross misdemeanor crime at a lesser amount than what they would be sentenced under a standard domestic violence battery. That defeats the purpose of the statute, and it is unjust.

But on the flip side, someone could have committed a domestic violence battery against a pregnant victim without substantial bodily harm. The sentence could be up to 364 days incarceration. Domestic violence battery causing substantial bodily harm is a category B felony in a separate statute. That is what we are trying to rectify here.

Regarding mental harm, the NRS is focused on bodily harm in terms of battery.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Did the passage of A.B. No. 60 of the 80th Session have a preventative effect on the incidences of batteries on pregnant women? Have the sentences been lighter than if the offense had still been a misdemeanor? Has there been any tracking?

Ms. ADAIR:

I have anecdotal evidence that offenders are receiving lighter sentences than for the standard misdemeanor. That is what brought this portion of this bill.

I do not have overall statistics. The Department of Public Safety's Uniform Crime Report has not been published for 2020. I am hoping that when we move to the National Incident Based Reporting System, we will get more data on this crime in particular. But given that the law is new and only went into effect in October 2019, we do not have more comprehensive data regarding prosecutions and any deterrent effects.

SENATOR NEAL:

Section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (b) is about the CDV's review and evaluation of existing programs provided to peace officers for training related to domestic

violence, sexual assault and human trafficking. Who is reviewing the peace officers? What is the standard? It says, "make recommendations to the Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission regarding such training." The Nevada Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Commission does not seem to have time to implement certain things. How will this work going through POST? Who is reviewing POST?

Ms. ADAIR:

That is an existing statutory duty for the CDV. In the amended version of this bill, we removed the references to sexual assault and human trafficking. It is only domestic violence.

This bill does not seek to change any of the statutory duties of the CDV regarding making recommendations for programs for peace officers. As to who is making those recommendations, the CDV includes many different stakeholders such as a representative from the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, courts, judges, district attorneys and others.

In the past two years, under Attorney General Ford's tenure, a training subcommittee was created which specifically reviews and addresses training issues regarding peace officers, court officials, judges, schools and others. The CDV as a whole and the training subcommittee review training issues.

The ability of officers to absorb, implement and attend training is an ongoing issue. By the nature of their jobs, peace officers have difficulty getting off work to attend training even though it is part of work. Many localities have problems making sure they have coverage and also have people attend training. We found that was an issue in the Nye County Sheriff's Office. It has a limited number of deputies who cannot attend training programs and perform their regular duties.

This bill is directed at an existing statutory duty required of the CDV, which seeks to enhance the quality of training programs for domestic violence and to work with POST in that regard.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

As a note to Committee members, there is a proposed amendment to S.B. 45 online for your review. That is what Ms. Adair is speaking to. Is that correct?



MS. ADAIR:

Yes, that is correct. I am happy to work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau to ensure this bill is correct. We submitted an amendment that reflects what I was speaking to when I went through the bill section by section earlier in the presentation.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I wanted to confirm that.

LIZ ORTENBURGER (CEO, SafeNest):

SafeNest is a domestic violence agency in Clark County. We serve over 25,000 victims of domestic violence each year. We are unique as an agency because we also serve batterers in the domestic violence space.

We support the name change in the Ombudsman's title and the overlapping duties. There is an overlap between domestic violence, sexual assault and human trafficking.

As a provider of batterer's treatment, we also support having a new member of the CDV from the Department of Health and Human Services which is overseeing that program. This will decrease bureaucracy and long committee meetings, and it will be essential to continue to move our State forward in this space.

JENNIFER NOBLE (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

The Nevada District Attorneys Association supports S.B. 45. This bill will better serve survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence and ensure more equitable sentencing in domestic battery cases, especially those involving pregnant women. Pregnant women have the highest chance of being murdered while pregnant than at any other point in their lifetimes.

JOHN PIRO (Chief Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office):

The Clark County Public Defender opposes only section 7, subsection 4, paragraph (a) regarding mandatory minimum sentences. This bill does many other great things.

We rely on the criminal legal system to fix the State's problem of intimate partner violence, but it has become an ineffective tool. It has neither deterred

nor fixed the problem because we are still leading in all of the bad categories when it comes to this issue.

Perhaps more focus should be on funding places like SafeNest that support victims. Housing victims of domestic violence has shown to be the most effective way to get them out of the situation. However, we continue to increase mandatory minimums. That is why we oppose that part of S.B. 45.

JIM HOFFMAN (Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice):

The Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice oppose this bill for the same reasons just stated by Mr. Piro.

This bill will be counterproductive in helping victims of domestic violence. We know from a policy perspective one of the main drivers of domestic violence is economic dependency. Victims want to leave their abusers but they cannot afford to because the abuser pays half of the bills. This is especially true of pregnant women because babies are expensive and more money than usual is needed to take care of one.

Having a mandatory minimum of 30 days will discourage reporting because half of the income is gone for a month. Victims face the prospect of not being able to pay the rent and getting evicted. That is always a problem, but it is especially threatening for a pregnant person.

This bill will not help these people get out of abusive situations. It will just discourage them from getting help. For these reasons, we oppose S.B. 45.

KENDRA BERTSCHY (Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

Our concerns with S.B. 45 are the same as those of Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Piro regarding the mandatory minimum sentence. The Department of Justice has done a study on the efficacy of increasing and having mandatory minimums. It found that increasing the severity of the punishment does little to deter the crime.

I have had at least two cases involving this charge for first-time domestic battery. We are concerned about people becoming involved in the criminal justice system for just this incident when there are no prior incidences of

domestic battery or violence and being sentenced to the mandatory minimum of 30 days.

MS. ADAIR:

Mandatory minimums exist for the simple domestic violence battery misdemeanor. The mandatory minimum in this bill is not out of character or out of step with our current statutory scheme when it comes to domestic violence penalties. The mandatory minimum of 30 days is because of the gross misdemeanor in this case and the fact that pregnant people are the most vulnerable during this time.

As much as I respect the opinions of the Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice and Mr. Piro, I am not sure I believe the deterrent for reporting or the economic effect of the mandatory minimum. The reverse is true. If this amendment is not passed and the status quo remains, an offender could be punished up to 364 days. I would argue that a year's incarceration would significantly deter reporting if we do not pass this amendment. That argument is short-sighted though I do respect their position.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 45 and open the hearing on S.B. 127.

**SENATE BILL 127**: Revises provisions relating to the Charter of the City of Mesquite. (BDR S-619)

SENATOR JOSEPH HARDY (Senatorial District No. 12):

Senate Bill 127 is a charter change for the City of Mesquite to make it more inclusive when appointing city officers or officials.

Two additional Assembly members wanted their names added to the bill as cosponsors, Assemblyman Glen Leavitt and Assemblywoman Annie Black. I have submitted a proposed amendment to add their names to the bill ([Exhibit C](#)).

WARREN HARDY (City of Mesquite):

I have been involved with the City of Mesquite in one capacity or another since 1991. When we adopted this charter a few sessions ago, we thought we had the perfect charter. However, here we are a few sessions later asking for changes. The mayor noticed a weakness in the charter regarding nominations

for the positions of city manager and city attorney. The initial city charter might lead to a stalemate in those positions if the mayor is unable to obtain the required two-thirds majority vote.

This issue was sent to the Mesquite City Charter Committee to develop legislation. On the issue of hiring a city manager or a city attorney, this bill proposes that the mayor makes the initial motion or suggestion for filling those positions. If the mayor is able to get a two-thirds majority of city council members, then that individual is appointed. However, if that fails, we would like to have it open to the rest of the Mesquite City Council to make nominations. At least four affirmative votes would still be required. The mayor would be a voting member in all circumstances under this bill, although, under the charter, the mayor breaks ties and can veto ordinances.

It is a simple change. We have not had this issue yet. We wanted to do a preemptive strike to resolve this before it becomes an issue.

ALLAN LITMAN (Mayor, City of Mesquite):

I noticed this problem some time ago. It is a minor change, but it needs to be corrected because a stalemate could occur. My nomination could go to the City Council; it could be rejected, go to another council person and eventually come back to me if there was no consensus.

This bill clarifies how this would be accomplished. We would put together a city ordinance with the City Council to decide the order of the Council on the nominations rather than just throw it open on the floor.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Has this been approved by the Mesquite City Charter Committee?

MR. HARDY:

Yes, it was a unanimous vote of the Committee. The Committee is not required to take it to the Council for approval; however, we always do that as a matter of practice.

We do not bring an issue to the Legislature unless we have worked it out locally. This was unanimous in both the Committee and the Council.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 1, 2021  
Page 13

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANNIE BLACK (Assembly District No. 19):

I was a former city councilwoman for the City of Mesquite, and I support this bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 127, and we will move on to the work session.

ALYSA KELLER (Policy Analyst):

The first bill in the work session is S.B. 37. I will briefly summarize S.B. 37 from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)). There are no amendments.

**SENATE BILL 37**: Revises certain provisions relating to the process by which a district attorney may request assistance in criminal cases from the Office of the Attorney General. (BDR 18-411)

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 37.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

MS. KELLER:

The next bill in the work session is S.B. 38. I will present a brief overview of S.B. 38 from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)). An amendment, [Exhibit E](#), page 3, was proposed at the hearing by the Office of the Attorney General.

**SENATE BILL 38**: Establishes provisions governing the retention of pro bono legal assistance by the Office of the Attorney General. (BDR 18-409)

SENATOR HANSEN:

I will vote no on this bill. Not-for-profit political advocacy groups could be included in this and given the credibility and the authority of the Attorney General. I am uncomfortable with that. The language is too broad. Too much flexibility is given to the Attorney General.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 38.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HANSEN VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

MS. KELLER:

The next bill for the Committee's consideration is S.B. 46. I will summarize S.B. 46 from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)). There are no amendments.

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

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 46.

SENATOR NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

MS. KELLER:

The next bill in the work session is S.B. 47. I will summarize S.B. 47 as contained in the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

**SENATE BILL 47**: Revises provisions governing public borrowing. (BDR 30-395)

SENATOR NEAL:

I will vote no on S.B. 47. I cannot accept the expansion of power. Senate Bill No. 4 of the 31st Special Session came before the Legislature, not just the Interim Finance Committee (IFC). I had a problem with this in the Special Session. Still, because it was a special session in the middle of the pandemic and we did not know where our finances were going, I was okay then to agree to limited unpledged revenues to be a part of the conversation.

I cannot agree with making permanent the use of unpledged and unrestricted revenue in which approval is automatic if the IFC does not respond within 15 days. I cannot support this expansion of power.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 1, 2021  
Page 15

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This must be brought before the IFC to be approved within 15 days. The bill does not state that the IFC can deny it.

ZACH CONINE (State Treasurer):

That is right. It goes before the IFC. The IFC can either approve, deny or change the dollar amount. If there was a concern and the IFC did not want to approve it, it would be able to change the amount to zero, which would stop the process.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

I respect the concern of my colleague from Las Vegas. However, with the IFC's oversight, which has been in statute for almost 50 years, this is a tool that we may not have to use but will be available if there is an urgent need. With our part-time biennial Legislature, the difficulty in calling a special session, and the expense, I will support this bill.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 47.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS HANSEN AND NEAL VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

MS. KELLER:

The final measure in the work session is S.B. 68. I will summarize S.B. 68 as contained in the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)). No amendments were proposed for this bill.

**SENATE BILL 68**: Revises provisions governing public investments. (BDR 31-399)

SENATOR HANSEN:

Under the definition of corporations for public benefits, assuming the new innovation zone type of laws that are being discussed in the Legislature will pass, would they qualify as corporations for public benefit?

Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 1, 2021  
Page 16

TREASURER CONINE:

Absolutely not. We are talking about the Nevada Capital Investment Corporation.

SENATOR NEAL:

I will vote no on this bill. Although I support the public education component, which has been functioning well, I do not support the reverse-repurchase agreements. I did not support it in 2015 and 2017, and I have not changed.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 68.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I will support the bill but I would like an opportunity to discuss this further with one of my colleagues. If I change my vote on the Floor, I will let you know. I will support the measure to get it out of Committee.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NEAL VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.



Senate Committee on Government Affairs  
March 1, 2021  
Page 17

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We are finished with the work session and having no further business to come before the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, we are adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Suzanne Efford,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Begins on Page	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 45	B	1	Jessica Adair / Office of the Attorney General	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 127	C	1	Senator Joseph Hardy	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 37	D	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 38	E	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 46	F	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 47	G	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 68	H	1	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document