

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

**Eighty-Second Session
May 12, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:03 a.m. on Friday, May 12, 2023, Room 4100 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/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Bert Gurr (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Lindsey Howell, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1116



OTHERS PRESENT:

A.J. Delap, representing AMAROK
Michael Pate, Director, Government Relations, AMAROK
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County

Chair Torres:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol was reviewed.] We are going to start today with the work session, because the agencies waited so patiently the other day, and then we had to postpone. After that, we will go into the bill hearing.

We will start with Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to emergency management. (BDR 36-237)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

As Legislative Counsel Bureau staff, I do not advocate for or against legislation. I am just going to walk you through the work session document.

[Read from Exhibit C.] Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint) clarifies that, under certain circumstances, the Chief of the Division of Emergency Management of the Office of the Military may activate the State Disaster Identification Coordination Committee or a subcommittee in preparation for an imminent emergency, disaster, public health emergency, or other health event. The bill also makes certain reporting by health care providers mandatory during such emergencies or events. Finally, S.B. 2 (R1) requires the committee to share the information from reports submitted by health care providers with the county or city, upon request, for the purpose of reunification or identification services. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 2 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 2 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Hibbetts, and we will continue with Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint): Revises the membership of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. (BDR 19-236)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit D.] Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint) requires the Governor to appoint the Director of the Department of Public Safety, or his or her designee, to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. There are no amendments.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] At this time, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 3 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 3 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Taylor. We will continue with Senate Bill 8.

Senate Bill 8: Revises provisions relating to juvenile justice. (BDR 23-262)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit E.] Senate Bill 8 designates criminal investigators employed by the Division of Child and Family Services of the Department of Health and Human Services as category II peace officers. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Torres:

At this time, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 8.

ASSEMBLYMAN DURAN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Thomas. We will continue with Senate Bill 16.

Senate Bill 16: Revises various provisions of the Charter of Carson City. (BDR S-350)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit F.] Senate Bill 16 revises the Charter of Carson City to require the Board of Supervisors to realign the boundaries of city council wards whenever:

- Reliable evidence indicates the population of a ward exceeds any other ward by more than 5 percent; or
- The population in a ward exceeds the population in any other ward by more than 5 percent as determined by the preceding national decennial census.

The measure also clarifies the term of office for members of the Board of Supervisors, extends the time period by which the Board must adopt or reject an ordinance, and provides that the mayor pro tempore shall fill a vacancy in the Office of the Mayor for the unexpired term of a former incumbent.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 16.

ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 16.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman DeLong. We will continue with Senate Bill 18.

Senate Bill 18: Revises provisions governing required meetings of planning commissions in certain counties. (BDR 22-307)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit G.](#)] Senate Bill 18 requires each planning commission in a county whose population is less than 100,000—currently, all counties other than Clark County and Washoe County—to hold at least one regular meeting in each quarter. Each planning commission in the county whose population is 100,000 or more—currently, Clark County and Washoe County—must still hold at least one regular meeting in each month. There were no amendments on this measure.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] At this time, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 18.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 18.

ASSEMBLYMAN D'SILVA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, any discussion on the motion? It does not appear there is any.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Nguyen and continue with Senate Bill 21 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 21 (1st Reprint): Revises certain classifications based on populations. (BDR 20-391)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [Exhibit H.](#)] Senate Bill 21 (1st Reprint) revises the classifications of populations in certain provisions of *Nevada Revised Statutes*. There are no amendments for this measure.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 21 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 21 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Carter. We will continue with Senate Bill 25.

**Senate Bill 25: Implements process for long-term planning for state office space.
(BDR 28-217)**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit I.] Senate Bill 25 requires the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration to implement and maintain a long-term plan to address the future need for suitable office spaces for the departments and agencies of the Executive Branch of state government. There were no amendments on this measure.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 25.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 25.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Koenig. Next, we will consider Senate Bill 87 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 87 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to state employment.
(BDR 23-343)**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit J.] Senate Bill 87 (1st Reprint) authorizes a position in the classified service of the Executive Branch of state government to be filled without competition by a person who:

- Meets the minimum qualifications for the position; and
- Has successfully completed at least 900 hours of service in an AmeriCorps, Youth Conservation Corps, or Job Corps program in the state within the two years prior to applying for the position.

The hours of service must be directly related to the position applied for.

There were no amendments.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] At this time, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 87 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TAYLOR MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 87 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman McArthur. Lastly, we will consider Senate Bill 169 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 169 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing master plans. (BDR 22-346)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit K.] Senate Bill 169 (1st Reprint) requires the master plan in a county whose population is 100,000 or more—currently, Clark County and Washoe County—to include a heat mitigation element. The bill also sets forth the requirements for this heat mitigation element, including a plan to develop strategies such as cooling spaces, public drinking water, cool building practices, shade over paved surfaces, and urban tree canopies. There were no amendments on this measure.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 169 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 169 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MCARTHUR VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN GURR WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman D'Silva.

That concludes our work session for today. As a note to Committee members, I expect we will be having several work sessions next week as well. I will make sure I communicate with you all when I have an idea of what bills we are looking at for next week. It is safe to say we will be looking at bills we have already heard.

We will take a one-minute recess [at 9:15 a.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 9:17 a.m.]

We will invite the proponents of Senate Bill 208 (1st Reprint) to come and do the presentation. I will open the hearing on S.B. 208 (R1). We expect this to be a very electrifying presentation. Clearly, that is the word of the day. I definitely expect some charged arguments, but when you are ready, you may begin.

Senate Bill 208 (1st Reprint): Requires counties and cities to enact certain ordinances relating to battery-charged fences. (BDR 20-853)

A.J. Delap, representing AMAROK:

I appreciate the icebreaker to help calm my nerves so I am not too shocked by the views in front of me. I will do the best I can with the puns.

To my left, I have Michael Pate, who is a representative from AMAROK as well. He will be here for the technical questions. If there are any of those, he can enlighten you all—I was working for "electric" somewhere, but I could not find it.

Today, we are presenting Senate Bill 208 (1st Reprint). This bill addresses certain issues local governments are having in permitting electric fences and as they relate to alarm systems. We understand it is an interesting concept and interesting technology. What these fences do is, they create an electrical charge. It is very low voltage—not life-threatening in any way. It is more of a discomfort to those who brush up against it.

It is to prevent folks from deciding to climb over a wall to get into secured areas. Picture a fleet yard with multiple vehicles, or whatever the items might be within that perimeter. In this day and age, catalytic converters are a big deal. You could have a fleet behind those walls. It has happened at times that a fleet has been hit, and as many as 25 or 30 catalytic converters have been taken in one night. One of the options to protect that commodity would be to install one of these alarm systems that incorporates an electric fence as well.

That electric fence would have signage all around it so it is clear what the fence does and what the potential is. However, it is not from ground up. There is a standoff wall in front of it. That would prevent persons from inadvertently brushing up against that electrified fence.

If you are walking your dog in a commercial or industrial area, and maybe you trip and brush up against it, you would not brush up against the electrified fence. You brush up against a normal fence or wall that is not energized. That is to prevent any issues along those lines.

That is a brief description of it. We can certainly go into detail if the Committee would like. What this bill does, though, and the question I would get when I talked to the legislators—I think I have spoken to every one of you—is, Why does this need to go into the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS)? It is to help create the guardrails for the local governments to authorize and permit them. It gives standards that are internationally accepted for what the safety features need to be. It provides a path and a conduit for the local governments to permit them so they can be brought into the communities and help the constituencies there. In a nutshell, that is why it is going into the NRS.

We think it is quality legislation, and we urge your support on it. At this time, we are happy to entertain questions if the Committee has any.

Chair Torres:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman DeLong:

Are there problems in the counties with getting these types of fences permitted?

A.J. Delap:

There have been problems. Sometimes they are authorized, and sometimes they are not. It just depends on the circumstances of the community, because there is not specific clarity involved in how to permit. There is not a particular section that planners and those entities within the government can point to that helps them permit it. That is the point of this.

Sometimes they are approved in the same jurisdiction; sometimes they are not. The inconsistency is a struggle for the company and other companies that have similar products. This is not specific legislation that corners the market for AMAROK, but it does allow for the local governments to permit these types of security systems.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

My question is actually sort of a novice question. As a resident, can I have this in my surrounding household to prevent anyone from invading my privacy?

A.J. Delap:

This is primarily designed for industrial and commercial areas. There is a conceptual amendment I will address in a moment for rural areas that are more residential, but they are large plots of land and that type of thing. I think what you may be referring to is my kind of neighborhood, where we share a tight wall. I feel like when my neighbors barbecue, I am with them, whether I want to be or not. This legislation does not allow for that type of residence to receive this type of system. This is for commercial, industrial, or certain residential areas that are more rural in nature.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you for that clarification. I wanted that on the record.

Chair Torres:

I had heard there was a possibility of an amendment, and we checked. I do not see one posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). If there is a conceptual amendment, then first, after this hearing, please make sure we get that out to Committee members and posted on NELIS. Second, could you go over what that amendment is?

A.J. Delap:

It does not appear that the amendment caught up with the Committee. I apologize for that. I can speak towards that.

Referencing the bill, the amendment is for section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a). This amendment language was brought by the City of Henderson. I would like to mention that they did a great job of working with us so we could get to a point where we agreed this could proceed without opposition. On page 2, line 8, "zoned exclusively" will be struck. The wording "designated by the county" will be in there. For the section involving the municipality, there will be "designated by the municipality."

If you continue on to line 9, where it stops at "for residential use," we are going to add in language that reads "unless such property is located in a rural zoning area or is governed by the provisions of NRS 278.780 through NRS 278.828." What that does is, that brings in the Tahoe regional planning area, which is more of a rural residential area where there are large plots of land. If I can just describe that language, it captures the county and the cities, and it also captures the Tahoe regional planning area so they can authorize these systems.

Chair Torres:

I think that amendment might have brought quite a few more questions.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

Hopefully, this question is not too jolting. When it comes to the actual warning signs, how is that going to look on these fences? Is there a certain distance where you have to have a sign put in place, such as every three feet or every six feet? Also, how large and visible will these signs be?

Michael Pate, Director, Government Relations, AMAROK:

Yes, there are signs. The signs are about this size. [Held up a laptop.] They are bright yellow. They are spaced every 10 meters—in our world, since we live in America, that is about 30 feet. They are in English and Spanish at minimum. They have the international sign for "shock" as a warning. We put them all over the country like that. We currently publish in, I think, 36 different languages. Yes, there will be warning signs up.

Chair Torres:

I appreciate that. Could we see language that maybe codifies that too, so that would be our requirement, just in case there were other competitors? I see there is language requiring the signage, but I am thinking about specifically those details and their size. It seems you are already doing it.

Michael Pate:

The standard we reference is the IEC [International Electrotechnical Commission] ANSI [American National Standards Institute] Standard 60335-2-76. If you want to look it up, you will put yourself to sleep. Basically, it codifies the energizer for the power and output on the energizer. The pulse, the separation, the signage—everything is included within that standard. Everyone has to operate in that standard.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I have a question. I noticed in the amendment to this, it went from "may" to "shall" and from "authorized" to "require." Are we trying to vote them into compliance? Why did that change?

A.J. Delap:

The long and the short of it is, we need to urge local governments to do it. By making it statewide, we create the guardrails for creating the ordinance in the county code for authorizing the construction and operation of the fence. In my opinion, that gives a level of comfort to the local governments that if it meets the standards, they can authorize it. At the same time, it urges the local governments to incorporate these standards into their ordinances and code. That was the prompting of it. The change from "may" to "shall" is just to require the local governments to do that—sometimes they need to be; I cannot put it any other way—so these products can be brought in for the constituencies who live in the communities. That is where the wording came from.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

In situations where there is no fence right now, do they have to go back and add a fence?

Michael Pate:

Yes, that is included in the standard. The standard tells you that you must have a minimum five-foot wall or barrier up before you can ever install these devices. There is always a dead wall or perimeter. This goes behind it as a second device. The alarm device goes behind that.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Say there is a situation where they do not have this.

Michael Pate:

It cannot be installed.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Okay, they have to have a wall.

Michael Pate:

They have to have a wall, fence, or barrier.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Do we have a situation where they do not have an electrified fence right now, but then this will require them to put one in?

Michael Pate:

I do not understand your question.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I am thinking about residential areas. If they have a fence there, and maybe it is electrified, it sounds like they are going to have to go in and put in a wall now.

Michael Pate:

Yes, you have to. That is a safety precaution in a rural and an urban environment. Even though these are safe, reliable, and are not going to harm anybody, you do not want accidental touching. That is why you have the barrier up. If there is not a barrier there, no, you cannot do it. If it is residential, no, you cannot do it—except for the exception A.J. Delap mentioned earlier.

Assemblyman Carter:

My question may have been answered, but I am trying to make sure I understand it. We are having a big problem down in the Las Vegas Valley—and I think they are having it up here too—with the evolving means of predator control. We are seeing lots of home videos of dogs being taken by coyotes, bobcats, and even mountain lions in certain areas. In fact, we had one earlier in this session where there was a coyote wandering around the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

My area is up on the outskirts. If local entities put in the ordinances, would this now be permissive and allow somebody to put an electrified feature on top of, say, a six-foot block wall to try to protect their pets from the coyotes?

Michael Pate:

The answer to that is, you can probably do it right now. You can go down to your local agricultural supply store and buy all the equipment right now, because these devices are all over.

Assemblyman Carter:

I guess the question was, would this make it legal to do that? Right now, yes, you can purchase that stuff at the agricultural center, but it is more than likely not legal to do that.

Michael Pate:

This would not create a legality in a residential zone.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I have two items. One is, with the amendment, I am assuming these fences are still not allowed in residential zoning. Then, how does this amendment affect the rural zoning where you have agriculture and cattle fences? How do those two relate?

A.J. Delap:

This is a security system, not a cattle or livestock control electric fence as we picture it on the open range. This is coupled with motion sensing of sorts—video activation and a standoff wall. It is a security system meant to protect property. The livestock portion is not within the purview of this. This is simply to provide permitting processes for commercial, industrial, and certain rural residential areas for protection of property, not livestock control.

Assemblywoman González:

I know we talked about it—and I think I may have missed this—it is for residential areas and what else? Commercial? My question is, do we foresee governments using this in other entities—for example, our state prison?

Michael Pate:

Usually not. If you have a device in, say, a high-security prison, it is usually a lethal device. This is not a lethal device. This is more of an alarm system that has a shock component. You are trying to keep people off the property. If they happen to bully their way through it or figure out a way to go through it, the alarm goes off. We go through a call list to make sure we have a verified alarm—we know where the break-in was and who is there. Then we call the police. That is what it is for.

It is really not used in prisons. I actually have one in a county jail. The only reason it is there is to keep people from breaking in with contraband, oddly enough. It is not to keep the low-level guys from getting out; it is to keep folks from bringing contraband in. I will not even mention the state it is in.

Chair Torres:

Are there any additional questions, members? We are fully charged and ready to go today. It does not look like there are any additional questions. I might have some additional questions about the amendment after I am able to review that and continue this dialogue offline.

At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 208 (R1). I do not believe I see anyone here in Carson City. Is there anyone on the line wishing to provide support testimony on S.B. 208 (R1)? [There was no one.] At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 208 (R1). I do not see anyone here in Carson City. Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 208 (R1)? [There was no one.] At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 208 (R1).

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:

We wanted to thank Senator Flores, Mr. Delap, and Mr. Pate for working with us on the conceptual amendment. With that amendment, that puts the City of Henderson in neutral. We would have been in opposition with just the "shall" language, but we believe that amendment gets us here to neutral.

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:

We, too, are neutral on the bill and thank the bill sponsors and proponents for consideration of the proposed amendment. Washoe County was included in the conversations on that amendment. I would like to clarify a bit of what our understanding is. Our understanding is that without that amendment, any fence that meets the definition of "battery-charged fence" on page 3 of the bill would not be allowed on a residential property that is designated exclusively for residential use. We believe we have some existing uses on larger residential properties in our rural area this would affect, and it would prevent it in the future without this amendment. We would ask for your consideration of that.

Also, for clarification on the piece regarding properties under the governance of the Tahoe regional planning area, we believe there are some instances where these fences are currently installed for purposes of bear deterrent on properties that are not necessarily as large. The zoning may not be rural, but because of the issue with bears in that area, we think there are some installations and would like to let those property owners continue to have those on their properties.

Chair Torres:

I have a question, and it is definitely a local government question. Would the exemption include or exclude the rural zoning that exists in more urban areas?

Cadence Matijevich:

That is a hard question to answer. It would depend upon the zoning on the property. If the property is zoned as rural, then the exemption the proposed amendment provides for would apply. If the property is not zoned as rural—if it is zoned as suburban or urban, even if it is low-density—we do not believe it would apply.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I have a very specific question for Washoe County in the Huffaker foothills area. You have lots of horse properties with low-level electric fences that do not have walls. Are those the areas you are talking about that could be affected by this bill?

Cadence Matijevich:

I think it depends upon whether or not that fence meets the definition as specified in the bill. As I read the definition, it must also be connected to an alarm system. I do not know whether or not those fences would meet that definition, but we will tell you, that is exactly the area we

were thinking of when we brought forth this amendment. There are certainly areas—more in the outskirts—it would apply to, but the Huffaker Estates area specifically is what came to mind immediately when we saw the bill.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I am concerned about that.

Chair Torres:

Assemblyman DeLong, maybe some clarification—is that because there are wild mustangs that are getting into these properties?

Assemblyman DeLong:

No. There are properties where people have horses. Then they have low-level electric fences around the properties so the horses do not escape from their property.

Chair Torres:

That definitely helps control the horse population. I believe that is all the questions. At this time I do not see anyone else wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 208 (R1). Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 208 (R1)? [There was no one.]

At this time, I will invite the bill sponsors for any closing remarks. It does not appear there are any. We will close the hearing on S.B. 208 (R1). We will move on to our next item on the agenda, which is public comment. [There was none.]

Before we adjourn, members, are there any remarks? [There were none.] We definitely have to note: Congratulations to the Assembly yesterday for winning our softball game. We had some star players on our team. We had Assemblywoman Taylor and Assemblyman Koenig.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

I am proud to announce our colleague, Assemblyman Koenig, was actually awarded our team MVP [most valuable player] for his prowess on the mound. I would like to put that on the record.

Chair Torres:

Assemblyman Koenig, congratulations on your award. I know you have been practicing all session just for that softball game, and we were incredibly impressed. We thought you were going to go pro. We were a little concerned we would lose you on this Committee, but we are happy you decided to put a pause on your professional career in order to continue with us here in the Legislature.

I am canceling our meeting for Monday, May 15, to give you a little extra time at home with your loved ones. We will have a meeting on Tuesday. As a heads-up to the Committee, I expect that to be a longer meeting. We will be meeting at 9 a.m., and we will be hearing Senate Bill 90 (1st Reprint). I expect that to be a lengthy hearing. Are there any additional remarks? [There were none.] This meeting is adjourned [at 9:44 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsey Howell
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 2 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 3 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 8](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 16](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 18](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 21 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 25](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 87 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 169 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.