

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
April 2, 2015**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Paul Anderson at 8:08 a.m. on Thursday, April 2, 2015, in Room 3137 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/78th2015](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015). In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Chair  
Assemblyman John Hambrick, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Derek Armstrong  
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson  
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblyman Chris Edwards  
Assemblyman Pat Hickey  
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
Assemblyman Randy Kirner  
Assemblyman James Oscarson  
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle  
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Stephanie Day, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Jaimarie Dagdagan, Program Analyst  
Barbara Williams, Committee Secretary  
Cynthia Wyett, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 782



Chair Anderson asked the Committee Assistant to call roll. A quorum was present.

Chair Anderson opened the meeting to public comment. There being no public comment, he opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 474.

**Assembly Bill 474: Revises certain fees paid by homeowners' associations.  
(BDR 10-1170)**

Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of Business and Industry, introduced Lisa Figueroa, Administrative Services Officer, Department of Business and Industry. Ms. Figueroa explained that the proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 474 added one fee increase that had originally been in Assembly Bill (A.B.) 475.

Mr. Breslow stated that the bills on the agenda were budget related, and if the Committee intended to pass the agency's budget, the bills were necessary to fund the budget requests.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether the proposed community manager initial application fee was a new fee or an adjustment to an existing fee.

Joseph Decker, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry, stated that there was currently a community manager license renewal fee but the initial application fee was new. He said that the fee increases reflected services provided to the licensee sector.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked how many applications the agency had for community managers and how much projected revenue would be generated.

Mr. Decker responded that there were approximately 2,000 licensed community managers, and the agency anticipated close to 100 new applications each year.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked for assurance that the agency was not proposing raising the rate on community manager license renewals, and Mr. Decker said it was not.

Chair Anderson asked what feedback the agency had received from industry on the proposed fee.

Mr. Decker said the industry supported the increase in the community manager application fee and the increase in the per-door fee included in the bill.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the homeowners supported the bill.

Mr. Decker replied that the Nevada Chapter of Community Associations Institute (CAI) was a nonprofit organization with membership of licensed community managers and board members. He stated that CAI represented the sector generally and had submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit D](#)) for the increase in per-door fees.

Mr. Breslow noted that the Department of Business and Industry had told the Committee previously that the Real Estate Division was not meeting the needs of the community on either the real estate side or the homeowners' association (HOA) side, and that the agency needed to be rebuilt. He said that without the fee increases in the current budget request, the agency could not continue to operate. The increase in the per-door fee would be used to pay the Attorney General assessment. He explained that Mr. Decker had been meeting with managers and associations to form a good working relationship with them and to build consensus on the role of the Real Estate Division.

[Note: at this point, A.B. 474 was still being heard; however, there was no subsequent testimony in favor of, opposed to, or neutral on A.B. 474, and Chair Anderson would shortly close the hearing on that bill. The following short exchange between Assemblyman Oscarson and Ms. Figueroa, which occurred while A.B. 474 was being considered, properly belonged to the testimony on A.B. 475, so it was included as part of the discussion on that bill.]

**Assembly Bill 475: Revises provisions governing the financial administration of the Real Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 54-1171)**

Assemblyman Oscarson commented on what appeared to be a reduction in fees in Assembly Bill (A.B.) 475 and asked for an explanation because, in light of Mr. Breslow's comments, it would appear the Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry, needed to increase fees.

In response, Lisa Figueroa, Administrative Services Officer, Department of Business and Industry, explained that many license renewal terms had transitioned from 48 months to 24 months, and some from 24 months to 12 months, and many of the fees had been halved in A.B. 475 to reflect the shorter terms. Additionally, there were added fees in the proposed initial budget that, after reflection, were excessive. The increases had been removed and thus appeared to reflect fee decreases.

Joseph Decker, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 475, along with an agency proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)), included significant reductions in the agency's original proposed fee increases and the transition from a four-year to a two-year licensing renewal cycle for real estate brokers.

Chair Anderson asked Mr. Decker to go through the major sections of the bill, explain the methodology used to arrive at the amounts, and provide information regarding the coordination with industry.

Ms. Figueroa said the fees related to licensing renewals had been halved, as had the renewal terms. She noted that there were two line items for late filing penalties that had not been cut exactly in half, and she left it to the discretion of the Committee whether to adjust the amounts. One proposed increase, which had industry support, was a fee of \$100 for changing broker status. Another proposed increase, from \$50 to \$100, was for renewal of accreditation of a course of continuing education. She said four new fees had industry support.

Assemblywoman Carlton noted a new \$25 fee for a deficient application and wondered whether that meant the Division was going to charge a fee to fix every mistake made on an application.

Mr. Decker said that when an application was deficient, the agency had to process it twice, and there was an additional charge for that. He explained that the Division provided a specific checklist with steps that were required for an application, including fingerprints, background checks, and other detailed information. A deficient application would be one in which the checklist was not followed, required information was not provided, or steps in the process were omitted.

Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of Business and Industry, stated that the Division could only increase fees with the approval of the Department of Administration, and he emphasized that fee increases could only help pay for the services provided, not to raise additional funds.

Assemblywoman Carlton said she wanted to be sure that the change did not result in applications being bounced back to applicants numerous times and requiring an additional fee each time.

Mr. Decker confirmed that was not the case and added that the Division lost money on applications, stating the agency's goal was for applicants to follow the checklist and be approved quickly and efficiently the first time.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked what effect the reduction of renewal terms would have on the cash flow of the Division. She wondered how the change to a fee-based agency was going to affect the funding mechanism.

Mr. Breslow explained that the shift to fee funding would entail the necessity of an advance from the State General Fund, because the fees would not be collected right at the outset.

Ms. Figueroa said that the bill was written with existing language used by other divisions that had experienced the same issue. She considered the amount a "first quarter, start-up advance" that would maintain operations until fees were received, at which point the Division would reimburse 100 percent of the funds advanced. She said the repayment method could be set up in any fashion that the Committee was comfortable with, and she believed that there were other agencies that operated in a similar manner.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked where the Department of Administration would get the funds for the advance.

Ms. Figueroa explained that it would be an advance from the General Fund.

Chair Anderson asked for more information regarding the added cost to the agency for deficient applications.

Mr. Decker said the Division did not have the ability to process electronic applications. Deficient applications, when the deficiencies were discovered, had to be packaged and returned to the applicant, and the file was put on hold awaiting the resubmitted application or missing information. He emphasized that processing applications took twice as much staff time when they were found to be deficient.

Chair Anderson said that, aside from postage and packaging costs, the agency was not incurring extra costs because of deficient applications, because staff time was already budgeted for. He understood that it likely created a backlog, and asked for clarification of the added costs.

Mr. Decker agreed that the hard cost of deficient applications was postage and packaging. Although staff time was already paid for, spending the extra time on deficient applications was keeping staff from efficiently completing their normal duties.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked for more detail regarding the industry support to which Mr. Decker had referred.

Mr. Decker said the agency had support for the major fees included in A.B. 475 from the American Resort Development Association, representing the timeshare sector, and from the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, representing the builders and developers sector. The fees originally proposed on the real estate licensees were removed based on conversations with the associations. The fees included for the real estate sector were either optional, such as the penalty fee for a deficient application, or avoidable, such as the fee for a real estate licensee becoming an instructor. From the common-interest community sector, he cited [Exhibit F](#), a letter of support from Community Association Management Executive Officers (CAMEO) and [Exhibit G](#), a letter of support from Complete Association Management Company (CAMCO). He summarized that the agency had the support of the sectors that were footing most of the bill.

Assemblyman Oscarson inquired whether there were any other agencies that charged a fee for reprocessing deficient applications. Ms. Figueroa said she did not know, but would follow up with the Committee with more information.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked whether the Division was required to hold public hearings regarding fee increases.

Mr. Decker replied that many of the fee increases were put in regulation, requiring the agency to hold a workshop, hold public hearings, and get approval from the Real Estate Commission.

Mr. Breslow added that the current Committee hearing was the public hearing for the fees in the bills. He said the agency was failing, and that the first step to turning it around for the future was changing it to a self-funded agency that could slowly build its reserves and try to fix its problems. The agency under its previous administration had submitted what it thought would be the least burdensome increases to try to self-fund the agency, he said, but that was just a starting point. If the reserves grew as more real estate agents, brokers, and community managers came on board, the agency would be coming back to the Committee looking for electronic upgrades and additional positions.

Mr. Breslow stated that the industry was already paying fees that went to the General Fund before being allocated to the Real Estate Division's budget. Going forward, the agency needed the start-up advance to pay expenses until the fees became available.

Assemblyman Oscarson expressed the opinion that the process was not that easy, and Mr. Breslow agreed.

Chair Anderson noted that during the recession the agency had severe cutbacks, closed offices, and reallocated personnel; therefore, there was rebuilding that needed to be done.

Assemblyman Armstrong asked what the total of the fee increases and rate changes was.

Ms. Figueroa stated that the bill was written to support The Executive Budget. The agency had amended the budget, and the dollar amounts would depend on the number of applications or penalties assessed. A preliminary projection of revenue from the real estate and timeshare sectors was \$660,000.

Ms. Figueroa also addressed the deficient application fee, saying that when the applications were submitted without the required information, the processing of new, incoming applications was delayed. The backlog on the applications processing was a problem for the agency's client base.

Assemblyman Armstrong asked for a breakdown of the revenue projections from A.B. 474 and A.B. 475.

Ms. Figueroa said that the anticipated increases from A.B. 474 were \$8,500 for the initial community manager application and \$41,000 from the homeowners' per-unit fee. The increases from A.B. 475 were projected as \$7,000 from the broker change fee, \$100,000 from the deficient application fee, \$10,000 from the real estate instructor applications, \$24,000 from the renewal of continuing education courses, and \$1,200 from the processing penalty.

Assemblyman Armstrong pointed out that the fee for deficient applications comprised 15 percent of all the anticipated revenue, which seemed punitive.

Mr. Breslow noted that the proposed bill amendment had significantly reduced the increases and the new fees in the original bill, and he believed that the bills with the proposed amendments reflected a reduction to the lowest possible amounts, providing the smallest possible negative effect on the industry. There had been several fees on real estate agents that had been eliminated because of industry complaints.

Assemblywoman Titus, pointing out that Mr. Breslow had said that the Real Estate Division was failing, wondered what the agency was doing to help the consumer and convince the Committee that the agency needed to exist at all.

Mr. Breslow said that his words regarding the agency's failing were made to the 77th Legislature (2013). The Real Estate Division at that time had been the subject of so many office and personnel cuts that it had become ineffective. The timeshare sector had several projects that were ready to go, but could not be started because the agency had only one person with the expertise to approve them, and that individual had been out for more than a year. He categorized the agency as "in desperate need of an outside-the-box way to turn the ship around."

Mr. Breslow explained that the move to become self-funded was step one of turning things around to address the needs of the public. The backlog of homeowners' association (HOA) and real estate agent complaints, while somewhat shortened, was still unacceptably long. When the agency became self-funded and reserves grew, it would be back before the Committee or the Interim Finance Committee for more positions and better ways to help the customer. High on the list was the goal of reopening a small office in northern Nevada.

Assemblywoman Titus said her concern had been addressed when Mr. Breslow spoke of the needs of the public rather than the revenue streams.

Assemblyman Sprinkle questioned the rationale behind removing the language on lines 19-21 on page 3 of A.B. 475 regarding direct legislative appropriation for the support of the Division.

Ms. Figueroa replied that the transition from General Fund support to self-funded operations was the reason the lines had been struck.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson commented that, as a legislator, some of her most frustrating calls had been from constituents with complaints about a real estate agent or an HOA. When she had referred them to the Real Estate Division, she frequently heard back that the consumer was told nothing could be done, or that the complaint could take more than two years to resolve. She believed this was because the Division was not funded well enough to be responsive to the people of Nevada, and it could be funded two ways: by fees from the associations or by taxes. She wanted to remind the Committee that if tax policy was not going to collect revenue from the industry, then there must be fees collected from the industry so that the agency could be properly funded and serve the people.

Mr. Breslow responded that he completely agreed, and that the final ingredient was attitude and customer service. He maintained that the culture of the



agency was improving with an eye for treating people politely, returning phone calls promptly, and providing service.

Assemblywoman Carlton expressed concern over the fact that the intent was for the agency to be totally fee-funded and not funded with General Funds. She was concerned that when General Funds were not involved, the agency responded to the industry and not to the people of the state. She did not believe that the people's needs were served if the Legislature was cut out of the process.

Mr. Breslow pointed out that the Legislature would still control the purse strings of the agency. The self-funded model simply meant that instead of fees first going to the General Fund to be doled out to the agency, the fees were collected by the agency, and the excess went to the General Fund. As the industry grew and the agency was run properly, the reserves would grow, and the manner in which the reserves were spent would still be controlled by the Legislature.

Mr. Breslow reminded the Committee that in the 77th Legislative Session, there was a Letter of Intent to bring forward a self-funded budget. What the Committee was seeing in the bills before them was the result of the work that the agency had done since the Letter of Intent was issued.

Chair Anderson opened the floor to testimony in favor of A.B. 475.

Kandis N. McClure, representing the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, stated that the Association was in favor of the switch to a self-funded agency model. The Association, while always cautious about supporting increased fees, recognized the fees in A.B. 475 would allow the industry growth that would help pay for increased levels of staffing and services that were needed.

Chair Anderson opened the floor to testimony in opposition to A.B. 475.

Jenny Reese, representing the Nevada Association of Realtors, stated that the Association was opposed to A.B. 475. It supported the move to a fee-based budget and the reduction of terms of the real estate licenses, but opposed any fee increases. She said that during the economic downturn, the Real Estate Division suffered many cutbacks including the loss of an office in northern Nevada. The most common complaint heard from real estate agents who wanted to renew their licenses at an office was that they had to fly to Las Vegas to do so.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked whether the Nevada Association of Realtors had held meetings for membership feedback or whether there had been a letter writing campaign.

Ms. Reese replied that there were five local associations within the state, and she believed that all the boards of directors took action to oppose the fee increases.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick inquired whether there had been any discussion at the Association as to how to improve service without raising fees.

Ms. Reese said that the Real Estate Division provided a net surplus to the General Fund, and therefore, the Association could not support any increase in fees.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked what funding stream the Nevada Association of Realtors would be supportive of, given the desire for better service, but the unwillingness to pay increased fees.

Ms. Reese said that although the Association supported the transition to fee-based budget, it would also accept keeping the Division funded by the General Fund.

Assemblyman Oscarson asked whether the Real Estate Division had contacted the Nevada Association of Realtors for dialogue and wondered, if so, how it had progressed.

Ms. Reese said she had not been a part of any meetings, but the chief executive officer of the Association and the state president had met with Mr. Decker many times to discuss the proposed changes, and there had been some disagreement in the meetings.

Chair Anderson opened the floor to neutral testimony regarding A.B. 475, and hearing none, asked Mr. Breslow for any closing comments.

Mr. Breslow noted that several fee increases on real estate licensees and brokers had been removed at the industry's request; he maintained it was unfortunate that the Association wanted better service and an office opened in northern Nevada, but had not offered any means to pay for those things.

Chair Anderson asked Mr. Breslow to comment on the positive net surplus to the General Fund in the current funding model.

Mr. Decker said the Division collected about \$6.8 million in fees and used about \$4 million in operating costs, leaving about \$2.8 million retained by the General Fund.

Assemblyman Edwards asked what the overall cost of opening an office in northern Nevada would be, and Mr. Decker said he did not have those numbers.

Assemblyman Edwards asked how much the office cost when it was open prior to the economic slowdown.

Ms. Figueroa said the office in northern Nevada was staffed with three positions and she estimated that the operational costs were about \$250,000. A new office would also entail the cost of office space and provisions.

Assemblyman Edwards asked whether that amount of money would allow the Division to open a northern Nevada office, and Mr. Breslow said if it was funded out of General Fund dollars, the agency could open a small office. He said if the Real Estate Division remained a General Fund agency, the General Fund received all the real estate fees. The real estate agents, he said, were claiming that more General Fund dollars should be funding the agency, but in previous sessions had been unsuccessful at increasing agency funding in such a manner.

Chair Anderson summarized that the Real Estate Division had a budget process to go through, but had been given direction from the previous Legislature to look at being a fee-funded agency as opposed to a General Fund agency. He reminded the Committee members that it was their responsibility to determine the ongoing funding for the Division, considering previous legislative direction.

Chair Anderson closed the hearing on A.B. 475 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 478.

**Assembly Bill 478: Revises certain fees collected by the Real Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry and imposes certain new fees to be collected by the Division. (BDR 10-1173)**

Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of Business and Industry, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 478 and an agency proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) were related to fees collected by the Real Estate Division from the subdivided land and timeshare sectors. The fee increases had been proposed and were supported by industry.

Joseph Decker, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry, reiterated that A.B. 478 imposed fee-schedule increases on builders and developers and the timeshare industry. The fee increases had been worked out by the Real Estate Division with industry sector input. The bill included some new fees for new processes, specifically, for expedited processes that were key to the operations of both sectors.

Chair Anderson requested that Mr. Decker do a quick overview of the fee changes proposed in the bill.

Mr. Decker explained the following line-item changes to developer's fees:

- For each application for a developer's request for an exemption from any provision of chapter 119 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), an increase from \$275 to \$500.
- For each application for renewal of an exemption from any provision of NRS chapter 119, an increase from \$275 to \$500.
- For each amendment to a developer's permit, an increase from \$150 to \$300.
- For each penalty for the untimely filing of an amendment to a developer's permit, a new fee of \$125.
- For each filing of a Project Registration Form 649, a new fee of \$25.
- For each project request for processing within five days after a complete filing was made, a new fee of \$1,000.

Mr. Decker explained that many of the proposed changes brought the Division's fees in line with those of other western states. He noted that the fee for expedited project request processing within 5 days was a specific request of the builders and developers because the current processing time was between 30 and 90 days. During that 30- to 90-day window, he said, the developer may have model homes open for business, and the broker may be sitting there waiting to sell, but until the subdivision permit was approved, no sales could be made.

Assemblywoman Titus expressed concern that setting a fee for expedited service gave the appearance of forcing the industry to pay an extra \$1,000 to ensure the agency did its job.

Mr. Decker reiterated that the fee was requested by industry. Because of the cuts to the Division in 2009, the backlog began increasing, and in 2011, the only staff person devoted to the process was on leave for over a year. The Division had been trying to reduce its backlog since 2012.

Assemblywoman Titus asked how the fee of \$1,000 would change how the process was handled.

Mr. Decker replied that the fee was worked out with industry with the understanding that the agency would devote whatever time and resources were necessary to get the project requests processed quickly. He said it was a long-term plan to make sure the Division acquired and devoted the resources necessary to eventually bring the backlog to within a 30-day window, while also offering the expedited fee service when the need was critical to the developers.

Assemblywoman Titus noted that she wanted to hear that the expedited fee was bringing service to the client, and Mr. Decker agreed that it was.

Assemblyman Sprinkle inquired whether the reason that industry came to the Division asking for the fee was that they assumed that with increased funding, the backlog would be cleared.

Mr. Decker clarified that industry had made it clear it needed the ability for expedited project approvals for an effective business model, and the agency anticipated that the increased funding would allow it to provide the needed service.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked whether industry's acceptance of the other fee increases followed the same reasoning.

Mr. Breslow noted that the builder and developer industry had been begging to be able to move forward and build houses. The transition to being fee-funded and the flexibility to have funds to pay overtime would allow the agency to meet industry needs. In essence, the industry had said the expedited fee was worth it if it resulted in improved services and allowed them to start building.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick understood that time was money for the business community. It was her understanding that Clark County had two dedicated staff to handle expedited project applications. She asked for a breakdown by county, when available, of who was using the expedited permitting process, and Mr. Decker said he would provide that to the Committee.

Mr. Decker outlined new fees for the timeshare sector as shown in the proposed amendment to A.B. 478 ([Exhibit H](#)).

- For each timeshare sales agent change of employer, \$25.
- For each timeshare exchange company registration fee, \$500.
- For each timeshare abbreviated renewal registration, \$7,500.

Mr. Decker explained that the registration renewal that timeshares must currently submit annually were very detailed and required legal counsel and extensive research. He said there was a one-time conversion available in which the timeshare could convert from the full registration to an abbreviated registration that required the Division to perform a significant amount of research. Once the registration was converted, it made the timeshare's annual renewal much simpler. Finally, the conversion to an abbreviated renewal registration was a long-term plan for the timeshares to reduce their need for resources to perform the annual renewals.

Chair Anderson asked for testimony in support of A.B. 478.

Kandis N. McClure, representing the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, thanked Mr. Decker for reaching out to industry to modify the fee structure and allow for growth and increased staffing levels and service. She said the Association looked forward to the shorter processing times enabled by the bill and expected to be back in the interim tracking the progress that the Division was making.

Hearing no response to his request for testimony opposed to or neutral on the bill, Chair Anderson closed the hearing on A.B. 478 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 480.

**Assembly Bill 480: Provides for the licensing and regulation of mortgage loan servicers and revises provisions governing the administration of the Division of Mortgage Lending of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 54-1174)**

Chair Anderson mentioned a letter of support ([Exhibit I](#)) from Charles Mohler, President, Eagle Private Lending, and Chair, Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending, sent regarding to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 480 from Las Vegas because the meeting was not being videoconferenced.

Jim Westrin, Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of Business and Industry, explained that A.B. 480, along with an agency proposed amendment ([Exhibit J](#)), was written to do three things: provide clarifying and

cleanup language to chapter 645A of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) regarding escrow companies and in-state mortgage servicers, provide a fee increase for initial branch office license fees for mortgage brokers and mortgage bankers, and provide an increase in association fees for mortgage agents. He added that the bill also set forth a comprehensive residential mortgage servicing, licensing, and supervisory framework.

Mr. Westrin said that, under existing law, Nevada did not license or regulate out-of-state mortgage servicers. He stated that there were only two in-state mortgage servicers licensed under chapter 645A of the NRS, which created a large gap in Nevada's regulatory scheme. He added that recent years had shown the significant consumer harm that could be caused by lack of regulation. Assembly Bill 480 proposed a licensing scheme that would close the gap.

Chair Anderson asked Mr. Westrin to go through the major changes in the bill, including the proposed amendments.

Mr. Westrin summarized the following components of the bill:

- Section 11, subsection 2 of the proposed amendment removed increases to escrow fees in A.B. 480 as originally written.
- Section 4 provided for using the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as a conduit to have licensees submit their filings electronically to the Division.
- Section 5 clarified that an escrow agent was prohibited from acting as such unless associated with an escrow agency.
- Section 6 clarified definitions related to the national registry, such as "administering escrows" and "control person."

Chair Anderson asked what the impetus was behind adding the definitions to section 6 of A.B. 480.

Mr. Westrin replied that clarifying the definitions allowed for the future use of the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry as an electronic conduit for escrow registrations.

Mr. Westrin explained that section 7 clarified that no person could operate in Nevada as an escrow agent without first obtaining a license. He said under

current law, consumers who used an escrow agent from outside Nevada for property within Nevada had no regulatory recourse if they were harmed.

Mr. Westrin continued with the major provisions of A.B. 480:

- Section 8 clarified language on the initial application.
- Section 15 provided that a mortgage broker shall not service loans unless licensed under the servicing program, and further defined loan terminology.
- Section 16 provided for fee increases for licensing of branch offices.
- Section 17 provided for a fee increase for mortgage agents to change the mortgage brokers with whom they were associated.
- Section 18 stated that a mortgage banker shall not service loans unless licensed as a mortgage servicer.
- Section 19 raised fees for mortgage bankers' branch offices.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick asked how A.B. 480 compared to a bill [Assembly Bill (A.B.) 311] heard recently by the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor; she noted the topics seemed similar to concerns expressed by the Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending.

Mr. Westrin explained that A.B. 311 was more comprehensive and written to separate out commercial mortgage companies from residential mortgage companies and private money.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick inquired which sections of the two bills were consistent.

Mr. Westrin said the fee increases and the mortgage servicing sections were very much alike in the two bills.

Chair Anderson requested that Mr. Westrin keep to the fee changes that affected the budget discussion because the policy discussion was outside the jurisdiction of the Committee.

Mr. Westrin reiterated that section 16 covered fee increases for mortgage broker branch offices from not more than \$100 to not more than \$500, which



was more closely aligned with other western states' fees. The proposal in section 17 raised the mortgage broker association fee from \$10 to "not more than \$50," again keeping Nevada more closely aligned with fees in other western states. The same rationale was used for section 19, which increased mortgage banker branch office license fees from not more than \$100 to not more than \$500.

Terry Reynolds, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Business and Industry, noted that the Division of Mortgage Lending had been supported by National Mortgage Settlement funds for some time, and those funds were terminating. Because the continued activities of the Division were important to the industry, the agency was looking to move to a fee-based funding model.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked whether the agency had documentation of what other western states were charging for similar fees, and Mr. Westrin said that he would provide the information to the Committee.

Assemblyman Hambrick inquired whether the charges were reduced for loans secured by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Westrin said the fees in A.B. 480 were not related to the type of loan involved, but were assessed to the company that brokered or made the loan.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked what improvements in customer service to the industry would result from the increased fees.

Mr. Westrin said that over the last several years, the Division had been fee-funded and the fees had been insufficient to cover operating costs. By reviewing the existing fee structure and comparing it to other states, the agency had arrived at which fees could be raised appropriately.

Mr. Reynolds emphasized that the consumer currently did not have anywhere to go if they had a mortgage-servicing problem. Under current law, they could only go to the Division of Mortgage Lending if the mortgage servicer was licensed in Nevada, and there were only two. The majority of mortgage servicers that the public dealt with were not licensed in Nevada. Nevada had a high incidence of mortgage service fraud, and he said the agency had been involved in discussions with attorney general's offices in other states to try to deal with the problem. He explained that A.B. 480 was an attempt to work with the mortgage service companies that operated in Nevada to license and regulate them. He reiterated that because the National Mortgage Settlement funds were running out, the agency needed fees to be commensurate with services offered.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams noted that her constituents that had mortgage servicing problems would be served in a better way with the passage of the bill, and Mr. Reynolds agreed.

Chair Anderson, hearing no more questions on the fiscal aspects of A.B. 480, said arrangements would be made to have a broader policy hearing in the future for this and similar bills.

Chair Anderson asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 480.

Ernest Figueroa, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Consumer Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General, said he wanted to provide informational testimony. He said that companies not licensed in Nevada and not part of the National Mortgage Settlement were not regulated currently by any state entity and were often the source of consumer complaints.

Chair Anderson closed the hearing on A.B. 480 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 481.

**Assembly Bill 481: Provides additional authority for the enforcement of the laws prohibiting deceptive trade practices. (BDR 52-1168)**

Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of Business and Industry, explained that Nevada once had a Consumer Affairs Division, which had been eliminated because of the fiscal crisis. Assembly Bill (A.B.) 481, with an agency proposed amendment ([Exhibit K](#)), was an attempt to maintain a small but effective consumer affairs unit within the Department of Business and Industry (B&I) Director's office. Both the Governor and the Legislature had asked for such a unit, and The Executive Budget proposed funding it with National Mortgage Settlement funds.

Mr. Breslow said that the Office of the Attorney General (AG) had a Bureau of Consumer Protection, but that it was not cost effective for them to investigate and pursue small cases. The consumer affairs unit within the Director's office would act as a small claims court for consumer protection. He said the unit was currently operating that way through the power of persuasion only, having no authority to pursue penalties or avenues of redress. An administrative law judge position had been authorized by the 77th Legislature (2013), but without the authority to bring cases; the position was currently vacant. The proposed bill would allow for fraud and deceptive trade practices to be fined, giving some teeth to the unit. The unit would track and follow through on all complaints.

Mr. Breslow continued, saying that, in cooperation with the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the AG's Office, A.B. 481 was written to address previous legislation regarding the Consumer Affairs Division, which had repeatedly been deferred, bringing it all together in one bill with a funding method. The amended bill had the support of both B&I and the AG's Office.

Mr. Breslow explained the unit would be small, having two investigators and two administrative assistants in Las Vegas and one investigator and one part-time administrative assistant in northern Nevada. The administrative law judge position already existed but was vacant.

Ernest Figueroa, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Consumer Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General, agreed with Mr. Breslow that the AG's Office had worked with B&I to amend the bill to prevent the AG's Bureau of Consumer Affairs activities from having an effect on it. He stated that the proposed amendments restored language that existed prior to the introduction of A.B. 481 and maintained the status quo for Nevada deceptive trade practices as it pertained to AG jurisdiction.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick agreed that the state needed a consumer affairs unit and asked about the funding source.

Mr. Breslow responded that the unit was already established within the Director's office and the funding from the National Mortgage Settlement, being approximately \$550,000 annually, was built into the budget of the Department. The purpose of A.B. 481 was to provide for administrative fines that would be used to help finance the unit in future biennia when the mortgage settlement money would be gone. In two years the Department would have some data regarding numbers of cases and fines collected to help the Legislature make funding decisions in the future. He stated that the reason for the lengthy verbiage in the bill was that it addressed the question of what to do with the language that was already in statute regarding the previous Consumer Affairs Division, which had been defunded some years before and whose operations had been suspended every subsequent legislative session.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick noted that the bill allowed the Department to accept grants and fees for restitution.

Mr. Breslow responded that much of the language of the bill mirrored what was in the original legislation; B&I was simply trying to create the best law to effectively manage the consumer affairs unit.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick asked how much revenue the Department anticipated would be generated with the fines and grants referred to in sections 4 and 7 of A.B. 481 with the proposed amendment.

Terry Reynolds, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Business and Industry, said the bill gave the agency the ability to impose fines and penalties on violators, which it did not have in the past. The fines would go back into the unit. For budget purposes, the unit billed back the AG's Office and was reimbursed with National Mortgage Settlement funds. If the fines resulted in the account growing, the agency would be able to better serve the public by increasing the time spent on investigations and enforcing the laws regarding deceptive trade practices.

Mr. Breslow agreed that much of the bill was standard language, and much was language from the original legislation. The agency had no estimate of the number or amount of any fines that might be generated, and it currently was not budgeted for fines to finance the unit. The unit would not be able to spend any fine revenue without legislative approval. He added, however, that in two years when the numbers were available, the Department would have a better idea of how much revenue would be generated from administrative fines and how much funding would be needed from the State General Fund.

Assemblywoman Titus asked for clarification of fines that may be currently levied when the Attorney General takes a violator to court.

Mr. Reynolds explained that the consumer affairs unit was designed for civil actions, and all criminal actions would be referred to the AG's Office.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether a consumer complaint through the consumer affairs unit would deprive the business of its ability to respond to the charges in court.

Mr. Breslow explained that when a consumer complained to the consumer affairs unit, the claim was investigated. If the investigation determined that the consumer had been harmed, the unit would contact the business and try to arrange restitution. If the company refused to pay restitution, the case could be brought to the administrative law judge, and a hearing would be held with both sides having the opportunity to testify. The judge could determine fault and levy an administrative fine. Under current law, he continued, the consumer's only recourse was small claims court, which was much more costly.

Mr. Figueroa clarified that the Attorney General shared coenforcement authority under the deceptive trade practices law [chapter 598 of NRS]. The AG had

criminal and civil authority, and what Mr. Breslow was referring to was an administrative process that still contained all the due process required by law, while being far less costly.

In response to a question by Assemblywoman Carlton, Mr. Breslow clarified that the unit was currently budgeted to be funded in The Executive Budget from National Mortgage Settlement funds of approximately \$550,000 each year of the biennium. The fines that may or may not be levied by an administrative law judge should lead to a better understanding of how to fund a budget for the unit in the following biennium.

Assemblywoman Carlton expressed concern that enabling agencies to be supported by fines would incentivize agencies to levy fines.

Mr. Breslow said the bill was written to have any levied fines deposited into a separate account, where the funds would sit until the agency came to the Legislature and sought permission to spend those funds. He said if the Committee wanted to create a different avenue for the fines to go through, the agency would be satisfied with that. The key was having the ability to levy fines, which was the "stick" that pushed companies to do the right thing.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick wondered whether the fine mechanism was similar to the National Settlement Administration budget account at the AG's Office, and Mr. Figueroa said that it was.

Mr. Breslow stated that the consumer affairs unit was only funded for two years unless the Governor and the Legislature chose to continue it with a new funding source.

Hearing no response to his request for testimony in favor of, opposed to, or neutral on the bill, Chair Anderson closed the hearing on A.B. 481 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 486.

**Assembly Bill 486: Revises provisions governing the budget accounts of the Division of Insurance of the Department of Business and Industry and certain fees collected by the Division. (BDR 57-1169)**

Scott Kipper, Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 486 with a proposed amendment (Exhibit L), saying the bill was related to the Division's budget and the funding of its administrative, regulatory, enforcement, and consumer protection duties.

Mr. Kipper said that Senate Bill No. 426 of the 75th Legislative Session (2009) established the Fund for Insurance Administration and Enforcement: all funds collected were to be used solely for the administration and enforcement of the Nevada Insurance Code and other laws and regulations enforced by the agency. He said that one of the main reasons for moving to a self-funded model was to allow the Division to address some internal shortcomings affecting Nevada's accreditation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). Owing to the resulting changes and additional resources, Mr. Kipper was proud to say that the Division was fully accredited by the NAIC.

Mr. Kipper stated that, working with industry, an independent fund for administration and enforcement was determined to be the optimal solution to provide funding, and would eliminate a State General Fund appropriation of approximately \$8 million over the biennium.

Mr. Kipper continued, saying that when the Division transitioned to a self-funded model, the Legislature established a statutory fee schedule, currently set at \$1,300 annually. The agency had no ability to adjust the fees to reflect economic or budgetary fluctuations. He believed the inability to adjust fees contradicted the self-funded enterprise model and had resulted in significant reserves in some budget accounts.

The nature of the assessment collections could be cyclical, Mr. Kipper stated. The result was that Division and Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division staff had to produce a number of transfers between a variety of accounts that all technically supported the core functions of the agency.

Mr. Kipper said A.B. 486 sought to provide the Division of Insurance a process to establish a sliding corporate assessment scale based on the premiums written by each carrier in the prior year.

Mr. Kipper categorized the insurers paying an annual corporate assessment into three groups:

- Traditional insurers—approximately 1,400 life, health, dental, property and casualty carriers.
- Nontraditional companies—approximately 300 accredited reinsurers, medical discount plans, and service contract providers.
- Captive insurers—approximately 485 risk purchasing and risk retention, and total captive groups.

Mr. Kipper said that the first two groups currently paid a statutory annual assessment of \$1,300, and the third group paid \$250 annually. Section 4 of A.B. 486 proposed a realignment of revenue for the traditional insurers by eliminating the flat fee and providing the Division with the authority for the development of an annual assessment based upon the annual gross insurance premiums written in Nevada during the prior year. A fee calculated this way allowed for a correlation between the premiums written in the state and the amount of the assessment.

Mr. Kipper added that the bill would eliminate three smaller fees that the Division was required to charge for various services and which added a considerable administrative burden to the agency. The three fees were the NAIC fee, cost-stabilization fee, and insurance-recovery fee. The change would allow the Division to send a single invoice containing the annual assessment rather than generating separate billings. Consolidating and eliminating certain extraneous fees would make the process of administering the business of insurance less burdensome for all parties involved.

Mr. Kipper added that the bill required the Division to be responsible for ensuring adequate funding and created a level of transparency regarding the budget process. He anticipated working closely with all interested parties—consumers, insurance agents, and insurers—so that all would understand the basis for the assessments.

Mr. Kipper described the process envisioned for building the budget through a public budget workshop where the Division would present its preliminary budget request, justification, and estimated corporate assessment needed to fund the request. The agency would make itself available to answer questions from anyone who attended the workshop. The Division would seek input from the industry and modify the budget request based on feedback, if necessary. The request would follow the current process for inclusion in The Executive Budget. Once the budget was adopted, the Division would hold another workshop to finalize the annual corporate assessment based on the legislatively approved budget. At that time, contingent on reserve levels, the Division could consider cost savings such as those realized from a vacancy the prior year and apply that to the assessment discussion.

Mr. Kipper summarized by stating that the ultimate goal was to provide a truly transparent process that equated revenue to expenditures.

In the absence of Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Hambrick assumed the duties of the Chair.

Assemblywoman Carlton indicated that she understood and appreciated the evolution of the Division into an enterprise fund. She asked whether the prepaid limited health insurance organizations were the same as medical discount plans.

Mr. Kipper said that she was correct. He noted there were not many operating currently, and they were not very active in Nevada any longer because of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Assemblywoman Carlton said it was her opinion that such plans should not exist anymore because everyone should have health insurance. She felt the companies were taking advantage of people and selling them something that did not comply with the provisions of the ACA. She asked for clarification on whether the proposed changes shifted costs based on premiums and did not increase overall costs.

Mr. Kipper said that Assemblywoman Carlton was mostly correct. The proposed estimated assessments ranged, based on premiums written, from \$1,700 for companies writing under \$100,000 in premiums, to \$2,000 for companies writing over \$50 million in premiums. One reason for any assessment increase was that The Executive Budget asked for a net gain of two new positions. Another reason was a couple of significant cost-allocation increases: he stated that the cost allocation from the Office of the Attorney General (AG) had nearly doubled.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked when the AG's fees had doubled.

Nicole Lambole, Deputy Administrator, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, stated that the AG cost allocation had been received after the agency submitted its budget request. Another allocation that had a significant increase was the statewide cost allocation, which also had a significant effect on the Division's budget.

Assemblywoman Carlton appreciated the open meeting process the Division had planned for budget discussions, which allowed the licensees to give feedback before the budget was completed. She expressed concern that as costs went up, the insurers would pass the costs on to the consumer, and wanted to make sure that the regulatory burden that was shifted to the consumer had some checks and balances.

Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of Business and Industry, clarified that the cost allocations were received in February, which was after the budget-building process. He said the AG cost allocation for the Department of Business and Industry had increased by over \$2 million. He said the Department was



working with the new Attorney General and his staff to find a way to better anticipate what the cost allocations would be.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the AG cost-allocation plan was charged to all agencies that used the Office of the Attorney General's services. The process for developing the AG cost-allocation plan was a look back over three years of agency usage of AG services combined with a projection of expected usage over the upcoming biennium. Staff had noted that there were large changes to agency assessments and was working with the Department of Administration and the AG's Office to validate the cost-allocation model. She added that it was released in February as part of the Governor's recommended budget. Like all internal service funds, the cost allocations were adjusted during the Governor-recommended phase of the budget and were published with The Executive Budget.

Assemblywoman Titus asked for clarification on whether the bill just consolidated fees or established new fees.

Mr. Kipper agreed that the Division was consolidating the assessment into a single fee for operational efficiency. In addition, the agency was changing the assessment amounts to be more reflective of the agency needs and assessing the fees based on the size of the insurers.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether that meant it was a readjustment of fees rather than a new fee, and Mr. Kipper said that was accurate.

Assemblyman Sprinkle asked for clarification of where in the bill the fee assessments were located and for an explanation of how the new assessments would be calculated.

Mr. Kipper directed the Committee to page 9, section 4, subsection 6(a) of the bill, which stipulated that the Commissioner must consider the direct written premiums reported to the Commissioner by the insurer for the previous year. He said the bill directed the Division to take a number of items into consideration for the calculation of assessment.

Mr. Kipper referred to the following table:

	Premium	Assessment	Number of Traditional Carriers Reporting to NAIC as of 12/31/2013	Traditional Total
Level 1	\$0 to \$100,000	\$1,700	573	\$974,100
Level 2	\$100,000 to \$1 mil	\$1,700	276	\$469,200
Level 3	\$1 mil to \$10 mil	\$1,800	354	\$637,200
Level 4	\$10 mil to \$50 mil	\$1,900	133	\$252,700
Level 5	Over \$50 million	\$2,000	49	\$98,000
TOTAL				\$2,431,200

Mr. Kipper explained the process as beginning with an evaluation of what the needs of the Division were, in this example, \$2.4 million. The Division would break down that total based on the amount of premiums that a company had written. In the example, the premium-written ranges were \$0 to \$100,000, the second level was \$100,000 to \$1 million, and the fifth level was anything over \$50 million. To continue with the example, if the Division assessed \$1,700 for carriers who wrote \$0 to \$100,000 in premiums and on up to \$2,000 for carriers who wrote over \$50 million, the agency would multiply each assessment by the number of carriers that fell into each premium range to arrive at \$2.4 million, which was the target that was being sought. He emphasized that the table was for illustrative purposes only.

Mr. Kipper added that the process would be fully vetted by the industry so that carriers would have the opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions. He believed that was a more transparent and fair method than a single flat fee.

Assemblywoman Dickman asked whether the fee could change each year and how that potential uncertainty might affect the insurers.

Mr. Kipper responded that the fees could have some movement year to year, but the Division regulated a \$12 billion annual premium industry, and he did not feel there would be a significant effect on carriers or consumers. He reminded the Committee that in some years, if the agency was overreserved, the assessment might decrease.

Vice Chair Hambrick asked for testimony in favor of A.B. 486.

Jim Werbeckes, Vice President for Government and Regulatory Affairs, Employers Insurance Group, told the Committee that Employers was one of the largest domestic carriers in Nevada. He spoke in support of the Division of Insurance and A.B. 486.

Mr. Werbeckes said *Nevada Revised Statutes* 679B.230 required the Commissioner of Insurance to examine each authorized insurer no less frequently than every five years. Only domestic carriers were examined, which he understood amounted to 30 to 35 carriers being examined each year. Alien insurers, which were domiciled in other states, were typically examined in their home states.

Mr. Werbeckes said that under *Nevada Administrative Code* 679B.0335, subsection 6, the Commissioner could add an additional administrative charge to an exam. The current charge was 50 percent, which for his company meant they were billed \$446,000 for the cost of the exam four years ago, and were billed an additional \$223,000 as an override charge to help fund the Division. He believed that since the Division was moving to consolidate budget account 3817, Insurance Examiners, into another account, that the 50 percent override should be eliminated so that domestic carriers in Nevada did not carry a larger burden of the consolidated account for core functions of the agency. He said he believed that the Division collected about \$2 million dollars from the override charge. He said that dividing that charge between the approximately 35 carriers that were examined each year meant that each carrier would be charged about \$57,000. He believed it was easier and fairer to spread the expense across the 1,400 carriers doing business in Nevada. Other than the override charge, Mr. Werbeckes said that Employers supported consolidating the budget accounts, receiving one bill, and apportioning the assessment charge so carriers that wrote a larger premium paid a larger share of the insurance regulation.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether it took more resources to conduct insurance exams on larger companies.

Mr. Werbeckes said that was correct, and the company was billed for the full cost of the exam. He said the 50 percent override charge was just a means to help fund the Division.

Assemblywoman Carlton commented that when the Division became self-funded in 2009, it was at the request of the industry.

Mr. Werbeckes responded that the industry had no objection to paying the examination fees and assessment, but did not feel it was fair for only the domestic carriers to be paying an additional \$2 million to fund the Division through the override charge.

Assemblywoman Carlton said that alien carriers were presumably paying for their examinations in their home state, and it would not be fair to make them pay here as well.

Mr. Werbeckes responded that states differed in how they funded their insurance operations: many states used the insurance tax premium to fund their insurance departments, but in Nevada, the insurance premium tax went to the General Fund.

Assemblywoman Carlton expressed concern that the costs of the Division be allocated fairly because she knew that all expenses would ultimately be borne by the consumers.

Vice Chair Hambrick asked for testimony opposed to or neutral on A.B. 486. Hearing none, he invited Mr. Kipper to respond to Mr. Werbeckes' comments.

Mr. Kipper explained that the Division of Insurance had charged a 50 percent override on examinations, and the charge was at the discretion of the Commissioner. The total amount of the override collected in the past year was \$570,000, not the \$2 million that Mr. Werbeckes cited. He said that if the override were removed, it would have to be replaced by an additional assessment on the insurers.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked again whether any cost a carrier had could be recouped through a rate filing, and Mr. Kipper agreed that it could.

Vice Chair Hambrick asked whether there was any more testimony, and hearing none, he closed the hearing on A.B. 486.

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means

April 2, 2015

Page 29

Vice Chair Hambrick called for public comment. Hearing no comments, he adjourned the meeting at 10:49 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Barbara Williams  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Paul Anderson, Chair

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

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>			
<b>Committee Name: <u>Committee on Ways and Means</u></b>			
<b>Date: <u>April 2, 2015</u></b>		<b>Time of Meeting: <u>8:08 a.m.</u></b>	
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 474	C	Joseph Decker, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry (B&I)	Proposed amendment
A.B. 474	D	James Gibson, CAI, Nevada Chapter	Letter of support for fee increases
A.B. 475	E	Joseph Decker, Real Estate Division, Department of B&I	Proposed amendment
A.B. 475	F	Tony Ledvina, President, CAMEO	Letter of support for fee increases
A.B. 475	G	Randolph Watkins, Chief Executive Officer, CAMCO	Letter of support for transition of the Real Estate Division to fully fee-funded
A.B. 478	H	Joseph Decker, Real Estate Division, Department of B&I	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 480	I	Charles Mohler, Chair, Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending	Letter of support
A.B. 480	J	Jim Westrin, Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of B&I	Proposed amendment
A.B. 481	K	Bruce Breslow, Director, Department of B&I	Proposed amendment
A.B. 486	L	Scott Kipper, Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of B&I	Proposed amendment