MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Eighty-third Session
April 23, 2025

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 3:35 p.m. on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 6 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John Ellison
Senator Lori Rogich

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel
Diane Rea, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Eric Witkoski, Colorado River Commission of Nevada
Eric Antle, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Brett Compston, Division of Emergency Management, Office of the Military
Nick Schneider, Vegas Chamber
Sheila Bray, University of Nevada, Reno
Alejandro Rodriguez, Nevada System of Higher Education

CHAIR FLORES:
We have three items on the agenda for today, [starting with] Assembly Bill (A.B.) 1. My understanding is for A.B. 1, they will be joining us from Las Vegas.

ASSEMBLY BILL 1: Voids certain regulations relating to the development and disposal of land in the Fort Mohave Valley. (BDR S-299)

ERIC WITKOSKI (Colorado River Commission of Nevada):
I am the executive director of the Colorado River Commission or the CRC. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on A.B. 1, give you a little bit of history and then the reasons for the need to repeal these regulations. Back in 1957, Congress gave Nevada the option to purchase 15,000 acres in the Fort Mojave Valley land near Laughlin. The CRC was a designated agency to manage the acquisition of that federal land. In 1986 the CRC adopted some regulations pursuant to the authority granted in NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 321.510, those regulations being NAC [*Nevada Administrative Code*] 321.100 through NAC 321.230 entitled "Development in Fort Mojave Valley." These are the regulations at issue here in A.B. 1. In 2007, in S.B. No. 301 of the 74th Session, Fort Mojave Development Land law was amended. The Nevada Legislature determined that it was in the public interest to transfer the land that CRC managed to Clark County, and subsequently, in 2009, A.B. No. 554 of the 75th Session clarified NRS 321.480 through NRS 321.536, where the Fort Mojave Valley Development law was repealed. Thus, the authorizing statutes for the CRC's involvement with Fort Mojave Land were repealed. As a result of repealing those statutes, the regulations adopted by the Commission back in 1986 were no longer needed. We were unaware—the CRC was unaware—of those regulations.

In 2023, the Division of State Lands initiated a rulemaking process to repeal those; the LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] felt that the CRC should be the one to repeal those regulations since we had adopted them back in 1986; however, the CRC no longer has statutory authority to amend or repeal those regulations since that authority was repealed back in 2009, and our regulation authorities are really restricted to chapter 538 [of NRS]. So Legislative Counsel concurred and indicated that no state agency holds authority to repeal the regulations, and it requires legislative action. The purpose of A.B. 1 is to have the Legislature repeal these old regulations.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
I guess my question has to do a little bit [but] not so much with the regulations. Those lands in Fort Mojave, were they set aside for low-cost housing? And is that something the CRC still administers? I wonder if you could speak to that.

MR. WITKOSKI:
As of July 1, 2007, the CRC had transferred all the land over to the county. They kind of ended their involvement at that time. I do not really have any information as to what is going on with the land. It is under the county control.

SENATOR DALY:
I have a similar question you may or may not be able to answer, but if it is under county control, I am assuming that all of the County Land Use Planning rules are still in place for that, but you may not be able to answer similar to the last question. I was just assuming it is under the County Land Use Planning rules that exist already.

MR. WITKOSKI:
I have not fully researched the fund. I do know there are funds available in the account because we were asked a question on the Assembly side, but how the funds are used and how the lands [are] managed, I am just not aware of it.

SENATOR NEAL:
I am just trying to be clear, and you are going to have to repeat just a little bit. You are saying you are bringing A.B. 1 because the land is owned by the county?

MR. WITKOSKI:
These regulations were adopted by the CRC for us to implement the Fort Mojave law. The Fort Mojave law was—the control of the CRC was transferred in 2007 at the end of the session. They did not have time to repeal the regulations, so in 2009, they came back and repealed the statutes that enabled the regulations, but the regulations then went dormant, and they've been sitting there ever since. When State Lands tried to repeal them, that is when this issue came up. But the enabling statutes were repealed in 2009 for those regulations.

SENATOR NEAL:
I guess the thing is, did you mention why this popped up? Why did this pop up as an issue? Because I was going back into the Colorado River Commission

records trying to get an understanding on why we are doing a random act of allowing basically for you to repeal regulations. And what was the—I am not clear on other than the regulations, what was the issue? Because when I was reading in the CRC, it was saying that the Fort Mojave Development law—approximately 9,000 acres of land, and it was land that could be developed or disposed of, and it was with prior concurrence of the Clark County Board of Commissioners. They had some net proceeds from the sale and other disposal. So, what is exactly going on? The Colorado Commission feels that they can't have control over this or the county; they just want the county to have total control over this and no longer a concurrent approval system. I am not clear on the issue. Skip the regulation part; what is really happening?

MR. WITKOSKI:
In 2007, the Legislature transferred the CRC authority over the land to Clark County. Then in 2009, they repealed the statutes that were in place for CRC to have any jurisdiction over that land. The underlying regulations were not repealed in 2009, so they've just been on the books since that time.

SENATOR NEAL:
The CRC no longer wants to have control over this land.

MR. WITKOSKI:
Yeah, that control was transferred in 2007. The land was transferred in 2007. The statutes were repealed in 2009. As of July 1, 2007, the CRC no longer had any possession of any of the property or land.

SENATOR NEAL:
And in 2025 everybody got the aha moment that that was what had been going on?

MR. WITKOSKI:
Yes, what happened was when Governor Lombardo came in, he wanted all agencies to review regulations to see if there were any old regulations. The State Lands review the regulations. They oversee a lot of NAC 300 series. They found these regulations; they went and did a workshop and then proposed to LCB to repeal the regulations. That is when LCB said, "Wait a minute, the CRC adopted those in [19]86, so they probably should be the ones to repeal the regulations." But the dilemma now is the CRC does not have any jurisdiction over those regulations. Our regulation authority is restricted to chapter 538 [of

NRS]. I do not have any authority under this chapter [or] these regulations any further. The Legislative Counsel advice was to do a legislative approach here so that these regulations could be repealed by the Legislature.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I just have a couple of easy questions. Whereabouts is this land located? And how big an area is this?

MR. WITKOSKI:
I do not know. I know back in 1957 they gave the Nevada the option to purchase 15,000 acres. I do not know what was—I think—this is my conjecture. Over time, the CRC sold parts of this property, but I do not know what was remaining when it was transferred in 2007. But the location is in the Mojave Valley, which is near Laughlin.

SENATOR ELLISON:
The reason I ask this, Mr. Chairman, [is] we are talking quite a bit of land, and then we are talking the areas where it is at. It has got a big benefit to the State. But I just do not think we got enough information on this to know what the heck we are up against. I do not know.

CHAIR FLORES:
I do know that we will hopefully have an opportunity to chat with the county as well to just get some cleanup on some of the other questions that have been posed by the committee. We will be sure to follow up.

SENATOR ELLISON:
The other thing is they said they had 15,000 [acres]; they might have sold some off. But you know, that could be used for also expanding water out of the Colorado River.

MR. WITKOSKI:
I mean, any sales—CRC has not had possession since 2007, so any proceeds that would have occurred 18 years ago I am sure would have been somewhere other than the CRC. I do not want to speak for what sales may have occurred. I do know there are funds in the account because I know SNWA [Southern Nevada Water Authority] has talked to them about a possibility of a water tower, but the CRC is just not involved in that. I just know that because we deal with SNWA at times.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Committee Counsel):
I just wanted to clarify for the record, in case it is helpful to the committee members, that the provisions of A.B. 1 do not have any effect on the regulation of the actual land that was part of this for Mojave Valley Development Law. All this bill does is avoid certain regulations that had been adopted previously by the CRC when they did have statutory authority over this land. When the authority over the land was transferred from the CRC by the Legislature to the Board of County Commissioners in Clark County, there was just an inadvertent timing issue where there was no regulatory authority given to another state agency. So currently, the Board of County Commissioners has authority over the land. These regulations currently have no legal effect because they were adopted by the CRC. The CRC no longer has any statutory authority over this land. So the only way legally to avoid these regulations, since there is no agency that currently has statutory authority, is to have the Legislature direct the Legislative Counsel to remove the regulations the next time we codify.

SENATOR NEAL:
I think it begs the larger question is on this authority that the State should have actually given away to the county being that it is such a large amount of land that we have—It is just where it is and what it is actually associated with. I think, that to me, the question that I now have is that if we did something way back in the early 2000s, it would be good if there was any legislative intent that was actually put in the record back then when those regulations—I guess, when this change happened to say why the State was saying we no longer want the Commission to even be involved with that level of acreage even though it is so close to Laughlin and water.

CHAIR FLORES:
We understand that your bill is not addressing that issue, but Senator Neal is now trying to get those 9,000 acres and rule back. I say that sarcastically, or maybe Senator Ellison wants to make sure Elko gets access to them. We do appreciate the breakdown and thank you for the presentation.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 1. Next, we will open up the hearing on A.B. 57.

ASSEMBLY BILL 57: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Intrastate Mutual Aid System. (BDR 36-263)

ERIC ANTLE (Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):
Thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 57. Assembly Bill 57 is a bill that transfers certain duties related to the Nevada Intrastate Mutual Aid System under NRS 414 to the State Forester Firewarden under the Division of Forestry and the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources with the Division of Emergency Management. These duties are pertaining to wildfire suppression and wildfire suppression only. All hazardous mutual aid will still fall under the Division of Emergency Management (DEM). The provisions of the bill also include that the State Forester Firewarden and the chief of DEM will serve as cochairs for the committee for the Nevada Intrastate Mutual Aid System. In reality, this bill is really housecleaning. From many years ago, in 2008, during the Great Recession, the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) attained the authority through NRS 474 to provide all hazard response to all counties that NRS eliminated, and the Division of Forestry only did wildland fire suppression from there on. This bill is to help clean and provide housecleaning today.

I would like to provide a real-time example. If you think of the Davis Fire, originally the Davis Fire—the call breaks out and goes to Truckee Meadows 911. They funnel that call and make a response. The first oncoming resources on that scene establish a footing or anchor into that fire. They realize that they are not able to catch it at that moment. They notify dispatch. The dispatch system then notifies their mutual aid: friends and neighbors or other adjoining local resources within the first 24 hours that are available. That system is what the Nevada Mutual Aid is. The current bill is that dispatch center would then reach out to the [Division] of Emergency Management and notify a bigger mutual aid system. Nevada Division of Forestry retains these agreements as mutual aid to facilitate wildfire response across the State. What happens is the DEM and NDF go into conjunction, and both duty officers are basically being notified about the same thing. If this bill passes, then in that same example, that dispatch center then calls NDF; NDF would then transfer that fire into the Interagency Dispatch Center which then opens more mutual aid and other responses to get to the scene faster.

SENATOR NEAL:
I only have one question, and this is probably out of—in section 8, because both entities, DEM and NDF, will be eligible to submit, basically, if someone asks for reimbursement, what does that really look like? On the finance side, when we normally just see one agency talking about reimbursement, the delays and all of

that, both agencies will now be able to submit. And typically, there are budget implications with that because your payments do not come in on time; sometimes they are delayed. So just kind of talk to me about the reality of section 8, sub[section] 5, where the reimbursement may be facilitated upon request through the DEM and NDF.

MR. ANTLE:
It is a very good question, and it is a complex answer. I will try to make it short. As with inside mutual aid, within that 24-hour [time frame] there should be no cost. The idea of mutual aid is to get as many resources and the appropriate resources on scene as fast as appropriate and the closest resources. The moment that clock goes over 24 hours, then there's a cost all the way back to the beginning of the response. That action of wildfire reimbursement takes place under the NDF in our normal fire billing system. When a resource is currently activated under the DEM, it is a term called EMAC, it is Emergency Mutual Aid Compacts. They funnel that billing. The DEM then submits it to NDF for reimbursement.

SENATOR NEAL:
Basically, we will see both agencies in the other committees if somebody does not get paid; that is the way I interpret it.

MR. ANTLE:
You would be unlikely to see a bill for one of the same resources from both agencies in different actions. You may see different bills that are appropriate for each agency. In the complexity of fire response, the example I gave in the Davis Fire, if we go a little bit further, what happened in reality is all of the resources were depleted. Utilizing local government, all hazard for vehicle accidents, structure fires, et cetera, needed backfill. So the DEM and NDF worked in conjunction to move resources from Southern Nevada, from Las Vegas in particular, into the Washoe area. That cost was submitted to NDF because it was not fire related. It was not that asset being called to the Davis Fire, but then we were able from NDF to show that this asset that was requested was backfill because the engine or the engines that were in Washoe County were being utilized for the Davis Fire. When the two agencies do not work together or do both duties, you can imagine the complexities of capturing in a live event.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
We have had a lot of testimony from people up in Lake Tahoe this session on different bills, and they've expressed a lot of fear that if there's a major fire up there, they are worried about getting out safely. And I wonder, do you think this bill will help that coordination? God forbid something like that happens and there is a major fire that surrounds the whole Lake Tahoe Basin.

MR. ANTLE:
I do not think this bill will help; this bill does not address that issue. It does support the need from both divisions to address the example or the threat within the Tahoe Basin. The Tahoe Basin is high risk due to the vegetation and the egress and exit due to the roads and the choke points. That action would be funneled inside of the DEM evacuations. If there were evacuations due to a wildfire, the bill would be supportive of both divisions now having a clear path of which areas that they cover. Nevada Division of Forestry would address the wildfire concerns, pull all the resources we can from in and out of state. A lot of resources would come from California. There's another bill, Senate Bill 19, that will help NDF with wildfire compacts to be able to retrieve multiple state assets across the nation as we see a decrease in staffing due to some administrative changes across the nation with the federal government.

SENATE BILL 19: Authorizes the Governor to enter into certain interstate fire compacts. (BDR 47-381)

This will help us defend our State and help get multiple resources that are not just—so we will not be as reliant on the federal government as we have been in the past. To answer your question directly, I do not think the language changes—I think the mechanism of knowing the clear roles for both divisions to support that type of incident would be supportive.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
Are you seeing most of the fires in Nevada from natural causes or [are they] manmade? And if they are manmade, could you tell us kind of what those causes are that you are seeing?

MR. ANTLE:
Historically, most fires are caused by human causes. We call them stupid human tricks. So that ultimately could be [that] a lot of it comes from sheer ignorance—dragging chains [while] towing a trailer and it is sparking on a

roadway, or parking on dry grass, or smoking in dry grass, et cetera—even using lawn equipment when the vegetation is conducive to catching a spark. I think last year 86 percent of the fires we had in the State were human caused. A lot of these fires are very hard to determine that they are human caused, so they go undetermined. But we know that, watching with the National Weather Service, there was lightning in certain areas. When there is not lightning in certain areas, there are a lot of fires that are caused generally, or some of the fires are caused around infrastructure, power poles, et cetera, when they receive a bird strike. But in areas where there are no power poles, there is no lightning, it is determined to be human-caused, and collectively, the way that we address that is the Division of Forestry, as we follow through local government overall, follows the tenets of the national cohesive wildfire strategy, and one of those is safe fire-adapted communities and really educating the public of what they need to do and their role to present [prevent] wildfires. The Smokey Bear campaign, if you will.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:
You mentioned the manmade causes; are you seeing fireworks being used in areas of forestry causing forest fires?

MR. ANTLE:
We do see fires caused by fireworks. It is not as prevalent as in the past. So that does show that public outreach is increasing as well as law enforcement presence during events such as the Fourth of July where we see the use of fireworks—or legal fireworks.

SENATOR DALY:
I had a couple of questions but just comments on the first thing. The way I was looking at section 8 when Senator Neal was asking about that is there's a separation. You guys have the fire part, the Office of the Military, DEM, they have all the other stuff. I know there was an audit recently where we were not billing like we were supposed to. Who was dropping the ball there?

MR. ANTLE:
You are correct, that is on both parts. The bills that the DEM would capture would be law enforcement, the National Guard if they are deployed for law enforcement, evacuation costs, emergency management costs at the local county level, facilitation, sometimes of support of intent command post, et cetera, so many different things to build the small city and the big

infrastructure to support a fire. Nevada Division of Forestry picks up the fire suppression cost, the resources that are responding. In the recent audit with the fire billing—those I would have to go back and look if there were any findings with the audit within the conjunction or the trades of funds between the two divisions. But most of that billing is pretty clean because they are separated by nature. The division—I do not think most emergency managers would even know how to bill NDF for the services that they render to support a wildfire. But we do see within the current bill today—or the current NRS today—that fire departments do reach out to DEM and ask for reimbursement, and then that bill gets funneled to NDF for reimbursement.

SENATOR DALY:
On the auditor side, I understand they are going back and cleaning that up, and there were a lot of issues, and hopefully that will be better. I think one thing you said, the way I understood it, is you mentioned the other state compacts. I know we had a bill earlier this session that went through for, I think the plains states compact and the Northwest states count compact [Great Plains and Northwest Wildland Fire Protection compacts], if we join both of those. This seems to me that this would streamline the process if we had to reach out to those people. It is on you guys, not Emergency Management for the fire resource side of it. So that will streamline that the way I am understanding it.

MR. ANTLE:
That is correct.

SENATOR DALY:
My only question on the bill [is in] section 5, subsection 2, [paragraph] (c) [subparagraph] (1) where it says, "Not more than 19 voting members, each of whom: Is appointed jointly by the Chief of the Department of Emergency Management and the State Forester Firewarden." Are you guys going to settle disagreements? You're going to arm wrestle? How is that going to be handled?

MR. ANTLE:
You are referring to the section where they are both to be cochairs of the committee. They are nonvoting members to that committee.

SENATOR DALY:
Understood, but I am talking about the 19 voting members which are jointly appointed. Are you settling that dispute when you appointed?

MR. ANTLE:
Honestly, Senator, I do not have the answer today. I do have Brett Compston, the Chief of Emergency Management, here today. So, I will phone a friend if that is okay since he will be one of the cochairs. I told him I would not do it, but I am going to.

BRETT COMPSTON (Division of Emergency Management, Office of the Military):
I am the administrator for the DEM. The answer is hopefully we have a great working relationship. I can tell you at the point now, between myself and Firewarden Casey, that we are in a great place between the two agencies. I cannot promise that will continue to exist in the future when we rotate out. But I think that a huge part of State government is working together to be able to find commonality in how we do this. This bill is hugely beneficial with the modification. It reflects how we do business right now. Right now, the chair of the commission is an appointee of myself, and the vice chair is one of the deputies or is the fire management officer from the Division. We are already operating in this method, and this just canonizes the way we are doing business today.

SENATOR DALY:
It says up to 19. You could have far fewer; you could have potentially only two. But if you were not getting along, you could end up with ties. "Well, this guy appointed me, so I am with him," and then maybe have an issue. I suppose you would come back with a bill to fix it at that time, but we can put arm wrestling in.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Was there not a point in time where they talked about bringing the two agencies together, NDF and the DEM?

MR. COMPSTON:
Not to my knowledge, but as a new administrator, I do not have the historical on that. Obviously, we are making the transition, or we believe we are making the transition, to the Office of Emergency Management within the Governor's Office. I can't give you the history of if that was a merger or not. At this point, I would not recommend it because the special skills that the DEM and NDF have. You simply do not have that capability within the Division as well as all the other ancillary things that they do with forest management and land

management within the State. Those are far exceeding the capabilities of what I have within the DEM and the specialization that we have.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I thought there was probably before.

NICK SCHNEIDER (Vegas Chamber):
We are here in support of A.B. 57 as we believe that this will increase efficiencies as well as better align the state resources we have in addressing wildfire emergency response.

MR. ANTLE:
I would just like to relay our sincere gratitude to the committee for the support of the bill as well as the support to NDF with the complex issues we have, and all your hard work during this session.

CHAIR FLORES:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 57 and go to our last bill hearing for the evening: A.B. 365.

ASSEMBLY BILL 365: Eliminates provisions requiring the University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine to establish a program relating to the medical use of cannabis. (BDR 19-758)

SHEILA BRAY (University of Nevada, Reno):
Assembly Bill 365 is a cleanup bill related to the evaluation and research of medical cannabis use. The University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), School of Medicine is currently required to prepare and present a quarterly report to the Interim Finance Council [Committee (IFC)] on the research and evaluation of medical cannabis within the school. This statute was added as part of A.B. No. 453 of the 71st Session in the 2001 Legislative Session by Assemblymember Chris Giunchigliani at that time. The UNR Med school has not and is not conducting any research on medical cannabis and has asked for this cleanup bill to repeal areas of NRS 678, as noted in section 2 of A.B. 365. Those sections include [NRS] 678C.700 through [NRS] 678C.730. Section 1 of the Assembly Bill simply eliminates NRS 678C.710 as referenced in the requested repeal section 2 of the bill. Given that UNR Med has not conducted any research on medical cannabis and is not planning to complete research in

this area, the repeal of these sections would eliminate an undue burden of preparing and presenting quarterly reports with no activity in which to report.

SENATOR NEAL:
It is just two questions, but they are interrelated. Under [NRS] 678C.730, did you guys ever—I know you did not have any participants because I was able to go back and look at the reports when Amy Stevenson was GFO [Governor's Finance Office]. But did you ever receive any grants monies? Do you have money sitting in an account? Because in [NRS] 678C.730 which actually was law or became law in 2019, you guys were allowed to have an account that was administered by the Department of Administration at UNR. You could get interest from that account. Did you guys ever get an allocation?

MS. BRAY:
No, I believe we did not get any of that. I can triple check and reply back if there was anything, even one or two types of deposits, but I believe the answer is no completely to that.

SENATOR NEAL:
So, no grants, nothing. Basically, a program was created, then a bill was brought in 2019 that basically gave you the authority to evaluate and then get grants, and then no one ever signed up for the clinical trial.

MS. BRAY:
I believe that is correct.

SENATOR ELLISON:
You guys are going to be starting from scratch. You have not got any special request into any kind of government grants or anything like this to move forward, right? So where are you going to get the money from to get started to do this?

MS. BRAY:
The UNR Med school has not done any research in this area. That account was set up specifically with the intent or thought that this could happen and there would be a special report with IFC reports back on those updates, but it has not been done. There's been no research in this area in particular, and there's no intent to. We are just hoping to clean this up so that we do not have to come

back with an IFC report quarterly of zero pretty much every time. We are just hoping to have a cleanup bill.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Then right now the State, every time they bring in the canvass to be checked or whatever they are doing, the checks on the Ph.D., and all this stuff is right now, do they not? Is this going to be a second study on it or because you are looking for the medical of it, basically, where they are doing the chemical side of it, right?

MS. BRAY:
From the perspective of the UNR School of Medicine, they are not conducting any research in this area. If they were, they would have to report that and provide reply, but they are not. So this is just to clean it up and say we are not going to do it, take it out of statute. And then also that reporting requirement would go away.

ALEJANDRO RODRIGUEZ (Nevada System of Higher Education):
Very briefly, Nevada System of Higher Education is in support of this bill, and we urge your consideration and your support.

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

CHAIR FLORES:
We will close out the hearing on A.B. 365. Lastly on the agenda, we have public comment. Hearing nothing further, this meeting is adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Senator Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster