

						Staff Analysis
HB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name (Primary), Sponsor Name (Co-Sponsor), Sponsor Name (Co-Sponsor), Sponsor Name, Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Oppose	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Police] on 04/10/2023 at 04:53 PM: Oppose</p> <p>PD is neutral on this bill. We have concern with this legislation that 2 milligrams of fentanyl is a very small amount for a mandatory 5-year minimum prison sentence.</p> <p>In addition, if all we have is 2mg to work with and we are required to provide some for defense testing, then we are not going to be able to meet that requirement due to the small amount needing to be tested. This could get us in the quantitation business (determining concentration of fentanyl in a tablet) and this would be very problematic for the Lab creating significant amounts of additional work and financial requirements for new equipment/reagents.</p> <p>PD is changing our stance to opposing this bill based on the following feedback from our Lab: This could get us in the quantitation business (determining concentration of fentanyl in a tablet) and this would be very problematic for the Lab creating significant amounts of additional work and financial requirements for new equipment/reagents.</p> <p>And, this essentially means that if an AP is found to be in possession of 1 tablet (for sale) which contains on average 2.3 mg of fentanyl, they are going to receive at least 5 years in prison minimum. This is not a good idea and reminiscent of the 750mg threshold for crack cocaine. Additionally, it is going to be very challenging to prove that 1 tablet constitutes ‘sale’.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [City Attorney & Prosecutor] on 02/10/2023 at 08:26 AM: Neutral</p> <p>Adds subsection E to 13-3408 (sentencing scheme). Requires law enforcement to submit fentanyl confiscated during investigation to appropriate crime lab for testing so it can be determined which charges are appropriate. Impacts felonies only.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Municipal Court] on 02/09/2023 at 06:07 PM: Neutral</p> <p>This bill does not affect CITY Municipal Court operations, or create misdemeanor offenses, over which CITY MC has jurisdiction.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Undetermined	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Aviation] on 02/15/2023 at 09:48 AM: Undetermined</p> <p>The airport may qualify as critical infrastructure and this could prohibit flights to the identified countries. I would recommend adding an exception to the first line:</p> <p>EXCEPT FOR ACCESS THAT IS SPECIFICALLY ALLOWED FOR PRODUCT WARRANTY AND SUPPORT PURPOSES OR FOR TRAVEL.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed		
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Neutral	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 03/14/2023 at 02:09 PM: Neutral</p> <p>The bill requires public schools to be closed during every General Election days except teachers cannot use personal or vacation leave and are required to conduct in-service training and development. This bill does not directly impact city elections.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name (Primary), Sponsor Name, Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed		
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Oppose	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [City Attorney & Prosecutor] on 02/06/2023 at 02:13 PM: Oppose</p> <p>This is the sister bill to HB2195 ACJC data collection bill. Opposed as written.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Municipal Court] on 01/31/2023 at 09:54 PM: Oppose</p> <p>This bill is really similar to HB ####. Under this bill, the STATE Criminal Justice Commission is required to implement the state, county, and municipal open data system. The Commission is required to publish the data system on its website in an electronic format accessible to the public. Beginning on January 1, 2024, and unless prohibited by any other law, criminal justice agencies in STATE are required to submit specified data into the system. The Commission is required to establish policies to protect confidential information.</p> <p>The bill appropriates \$4.7 million in FY2023-24, \$4.8 million in FY2024-25, and \$4.8 million in FY2025-26 from the state general fund to the Commission to implement the data system. “Criminal justice agency” (as defined by [STATE CODE]) means a court at any governmental level with criminal or equivalent jurisdiction, including courts of any foreign sovereignty duly recognized by the federal government.</p> <p>[STATE CODE], which begins on Page 4, Line 27 of the bill and ends on Page 5, line 23. Some of the information required to be provided, courts may not have, and at times, will not have, for instance: (1) whether an individual is deceased, and date of death; (2) an individual’s physical gender and sex; (3) any alias the individual may have had; (4) the country where the individual lives (which is not necessarily the mailing address for the individual). Further, the bill wants disclosure of information in relation to every single event that takes place in an entire case (not just the final disposition) for example: (1) the type and date of any motion filed; (2) the type of any hearing and date. In any single case there are many events and proceedings that take place. Establishing systems to generate and report this data comes with a cost to every court in the state, and apparently in only appropriating money to CJA, the sponsors of this bill have not considered these costs that will be incurred by the “reporting” courts. If this bill is passed and signed by the Governor, the development of systems and processes, including IT systems and processes, to comply with the reporting obligations will have to be developed.</p> <p>This bill, in its current form, is opposed because of the data it requires courts to report, where certain such data courts will not have.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name, Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Not Applicable	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Municipal Court] on 01/31/2023 at 09:42 PM: Not Applicable</p> <p>This bill deals with clarifying those convicted sex offenders to be listed on the DPS sex offender website and does not affect CITY Municipal Court.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed		
HB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Monitor	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/14/2023 at 08:57 AM: Monitor</p> <p>This bill would remove the requirement that all attorneys must be members in good standing of the State Bar of STATE and prohibit the Supreme Court of STATE from requiring any attorney from being part of any organization to be a license attorney in the state. The bill moves the requirement for licensing attorneys to the Supreme Court of STATE directly and also replaces all areas in the STATE Revised Statutes that require people to be members of the State Bar of STATE to instead to simply be licenses attorneys in the state. The bill also moves the duty of dismissing any disciplinary matters against attorneys and for compensating attorneys who prevail against charges in disciplinary proceedings. This bill appears to have the intent of neutering and effectively removing the authority of the State Bar of STATE (and any other prospective private organization with the same mission statement) and instead shifting regulation entirely to the STATE Supreme Court. It’s unclear whether the text of the bill as written would remove the State Bar of STATE’s ability to investigate and conduct disciplinary matters, as the language doesn’t expressly remove that but instead appears to rely on the idea that the Bar can’t regulate anyone who isn’t a member. The bill also does not ban the Bar, so it’s unclear if it would create separate disciplinary oversight bodies for attorneys depending on whether they are members of the Bar or not. The bill does not change the requirements for licensing (nor does it say what they should be), so facially it doesn’t necessarily change the requirements for being an attorney in good standing in the state other than shifting the oversight and licensing of attorneys from the Bar to the STATE Supreme Court.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Municipal Court] on 01/31/2023 at 07:02 PM: Not Applicable</p> <p>This bill modifies many statutory provisions that establish instances, or proceedings where either a licensed attorney is, or now is not, required. From a review of all the statutory provisions modified, the CITY Municipal Court is not affected by this bill.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name (Sponsor), Sponsor Name (Co-Sponsor)	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed		

						Staff Analysis
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Neutral	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Human Resources] on 03/20/2023 at 02:20 PM: Neutral</p> <p>Human Resources is Neutral.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 03/17/2023 at 11:32 AM: Neutral</p> <p>I agree with Alisa's analysis. The engrossed version of the bill would require all investigations initiated before September 24, 2022 to be completed within one year of the effective date of the statute. I think this is fair and “doable” for the City.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/27/2023 at 07:59 AM: Neutral</p> <p>By all appearances, it appears that multiple strike all amendments were submitted after February 14, with the final strike all amendment being submitted on February 15, 2023. The Amendment does not make clear where in [STATE CODE] et seq the bill language would go, which does make analysis somewhat challenging. The strike all amendment requires that all investigations initiated before September 24, 2022, be completed within one year of the effective date of the statute otherwise the investigation would be dismissed. While generally speaking, I am not in favor of retroactive statutes, this provision feels otherwise fair as it gives employers almost 1.5 years to finish any investigations pending on September 24, 2022.</p> <p>Analysis added by Charles Consolian [Police] on 02/14/2023 at 01:22 PM: Oppose</p> <p>PD is undetermined as we do not know how this will affect prior cases of misconduct that have already been investigated and adjudicated. Also, how does it affect discipline that has already been rendered. This requires an analysis by City HR.</p> <p>With the new striker language, we oppose it as written. This does not address suspension timeframes in the event of criminal cases, other agency involvement, emergencies such as natural disasters, mobilization of resources due to significant events, much like [STATE CODE] does. Unfortunately, at times, there are things outside of our control that should allow for an extension.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/14/2023 at 07:53 AM: Oppose</p> <p>In 2022, the legislature placed limitations on the time to complete misconduct investigations involving police officers and supervisors. Laws 2022, Chapter ### added these provisions to [STATE CODE]. The law requires investigations to be completed within 180 days. The investigation may continue for an additional 180 days only if the employer can demonstrate that additional time is necessary to obtain or review evidence. If the investigation is not complete by the end of the extension period, the matter must be dismissed. The effective date of the law was September 24, 2022, so it only applied to investigations initiated after that date. This bill appears to make the time limitations retroactive to investigations that were initiated as far back as September 18, 2007.</p> <p>The time limitations have already imposed significant burdens on the City. The Equal Opportunity Department and CITY SB have been required to adjust their processes and protocols to meet the new requirements. Essentially, EOD will have to prioritize investigations of police officers and supervisors over investigations of other City employees. If the City does not comply with the time limitations, we cannot hold sworn Police Department employees accountable for misconduct. This bill would only compound the problem.</p> <p>And because the bill imposes requirements ex post facto, it arguably violates due process. Investigations initiated prior to September 24, 2022 may be close to exceeding or have already exceeded the time limitations. The bill would presumably require those matters to be dismissed even though the City had no notice of the time limitations when the investigations began.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/14/2023 at 07:51 AM: Oppose</p> <p>(LAW) If passed, this Bill would potentially create an unmanageable administrative nightmare. As written, it appears that the city would need to go back to 2007 and review all police disciplinary investigations to determine if the timeframes imposed in 2022 were met. The 2022 changes prevented discipline from being imposed if the 180 day (at most 360 day) timeframe were not met. For those investigations where the timeframes were not met, it appears the City would need to rescind that discipline. it is unclear how far reaching the implications of that would be. It would also be complicated by the fact that many of the employees who received discipline from 2007 forward are likely no longer employees.</p> <p>If it was a suspension, the City would likely need to refund the suspension amount. However, until recently, suspensions up to 40 hours could be taken by just subtracting annual leave hours from their banks. Again, if the employee was not employed any longer, it is unclear how this would be accomplished. If it was a demotion, the City would likely need to fund the difference between actual wages and what the employee would have been making. Again, for former employees this would be particularly challenging and would have an impact on DROP amount and pension amount. I am not clear as to whether that could even be accomplished under the PSPRS statutory scheme.</p> <p>For terminations, this would obviously have the most significant impact. Would the City have to rehire employees it fired in 2008? What if they no longer had their certification? Would the city have to pay them for the time they claim they would have continued to work? How would this play into ABC and DEF? For example, if we fired an employee at 15 years of service in 2010, but going back now, the investigation took 400 days, to follow this law would require the city to reinstate this employee. How precisely would this work? If they claim they would have worked 5 more years and then put into DROP and then retired in 2020 - would the City being paying the wages and PSPRS contributions and into DROP for 10 years? What if they went to work for another law enforcement agency and retired from PSPRS there? What if they lost their certification during this time? Or could no longer qualify?</p> <p>To summarize, this is an unworkable Bill that, if passed, would cause a significant administrative as well as financial burden on the City. There is also an argument to be made that this Bill, by retroactively holding employers to a strict standard they couldn't have anticipated, is unfair and lacks due process for employers, but that would appear to be the intent of the Bill.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed		<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Administrator] on 03/24/2023 at 03:39 PM</p> <p>Please refer to Strike Everything Amendment [hyperlink to amendment]</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Oppose	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [City Clerk] on 02/06/2023 at 12:15 AM: Oppose</p> <p>This bill prescribes that voter registration information shall be made available to the public online and removes the restrictions on posting precinct register lists. It also allows voters to make requests related to the AEVL verbally instead of written. Additionally, it prescribes that observers be allowed to observe electronic vote adjudication.</p> <p>The City Clerk Department opposes this bill because of the risk that publishing voter registration information online poses for voters. Which also can contribute to voters being disenfranchised. Additionally, it is preferred to continue only allowing written requests for modification of the AEVL. Regarding observation of electronic voter adjudication, this is achievable from a distance but not inside the area where vote adjudication is occurring.</p>
HB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name (Primary), Sponsor Name (Co-Sponsor), Sponsor Name (Co-Sponsor), Sponsor Name	Vetoed	06/20/2023 - Governor Vetoed	Neutral	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 03/14/2023 at 01:59 PM: Neutral</p> <p>No objection to the additional language proposed to be added to envelope.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 01/29/2023 at 07:13 PM: Neutral</p> <p>This bill requires additional language be added to the early ballot envelope that aa voter returns with their early ballot that states that the failure to mail an early ballot or deposit an early ballot in a ballot drop box by the Friday before the election will result in delayed election results. I don't have an issue with this language really, but I'm not certain that the statement if factually accurate.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Passed	06/20/2023 - Chapter 202	Not Applicable	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Finance] on 03/05/2023 at 03:19 PM: Not Applicable</p> <p>This bill relates to changes for private activity bonding to the STATE Finance Authority, which is under Title ##, State. As there is no effect on City debt, Finance considers this NA.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Housing] on 03/02/2023 at 07:46 PM: Support</p> <p>Housing's Perspective: Modifies the allocation of the state ceiling for private activity bonds, increasing qualified residential rental projects to 45% from 15%. Eliminates restriction on state ceiling confirmation for qualified residential rental projects.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/03/2023 at 01:22 PM: Neutral</p> <p>The move from 15% to 45% of the allocation going to qualified residential rental projects is probably a good thing. The last paragraph appears to give some flexibility to fund another, similar project in the same jurisdiction.</p>
SB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name, Sponsor Name	Passed	06/20/2023 - Chapter 199		
HB ####	BILL TITLE	Sponsor Name	Passed	06/20/2023 - Chapter 197	Undetermined	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 03/14/2023 at 02:10 PM: Undetermined</p> <p>Update on 2/22/2023 draft. No substantive change to my analysis below. No significant impact to CITY.</p> <p>This bill makes technical corrections and addresses a number of administrative issues in statutes that were adopted under the bill from the last legislative session that significantly expanded the authority of the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority. None of the corrections appear substantive. The bill would have no impact on CITY.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Finance] on 02/16/2023 at 09:42 AM: Neutral</p> <p>Language changes regarding WIFA. Since there is no financial impact on the City, Finance position is neutral on SB1390.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Finance] on 02/02/2023 at 12:46 PM: Neutral</p> <p>SB 1390 : water infrastructure finance authority; amendments Neutral</p> <p>The language added by the bill would specify the authority of the board in determining terms and conditions of the director's and staff's employment and other minor changes.</p> <p>There is no financial impact to the City from this proposed bill.</p> <p>Prepared by: [POLICY ANALYST NAME] 2/1/2023</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Water Policy] on 02/01/2023 at 04:45 PM: Neutral</p> <p>This bill does make some corrections to the original bill adopted at the end of the last legislative session. Most changes appear to be true corrections or clarifications, although one regarding public-private partnerships and the pledge of funds appears to be directed at a recent specific project considered by the WIFA Board. Because it does not pose significant substantive changes, I would suggest a position of neutral.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Finance] on 02/01/2023 at 10:45 AM: Undetermined</p> <p>Water Infrastructure Finance Authority, Amendments.</p> <p>This bill as written, does not impact Title ##-taxation.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Budget & Research] on 01/31/2023 at 03:48 PM: Undetermined</p> <p>Defer to WSD's assessment of this bill.</p>

#	Title	Sponsor(s)	Status	Last Action	Position	Staff Analysis
SB 1189	BILL TITLE	<i>Sponsor Name</i>	Passed	06/20/2023 - Chapter 192	Neutral	<p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Finance] on 02/13/2023 at 12:26 PM: Neutral</p> <p>SB ### – [BILL TITLE] Neutral</p> <p>This proposed bill adds the following words to a paragraph in the STATE revised statutes that relates to Universities. The words are “and”, “the”, and “an”. No material effect to the City. The City is neutral as no impact.</p> <p>Note - This is striker bill.</p> <p>Prepared by: [POLICY ANALYST NAME] 2/10/23</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Budget & Research] on 02/10/2023 at 12:51 PM: Neutral</p> <p>The initial bill simply fixing grammar and wording relating to the STATE Board of Regents. An amendment has been added to this bill that would allow the City to adopt an amendment of the CTC if the amendment is a result of a statutory change. This bill has no fiscal impact on the City.</p> <p>Commentary from: Budget & Research Department with the City of CITY</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Law] on 02/10/2023 at 12:24 PM: Oppose</p> <p>This legislation will eliminate the Municipal Tax Code Commission on 7/1/27. Further, the statute governing the TCC will be repealed effective 1/1/28. Losing this forum will negatively impact CITY and the cities. The elimination of this forum will likely, ultimately, indirectly result in a decrease in tax revenue. Note, there is a positive part of the bill that requires the department to update the CTC faster, which will help for the next 4 years. The City should oppose this bill.</p> <p>Analysis added by [FIRST LAST NAME] [Administrator] on 02/09/2023 at 05:36 PM</p> <p>Please reference striker in references tab</p>