

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 31, 2017**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 9:19 a.m. on Wednesday, May 31, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Keith Pickard (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Erin McHam, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alanna Bondy, Intern, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom; and Privacy Chairman,
National Eagle Forum
Shanna Rahming, Chief Information Officer, Enterprise Information Technology
Services Division, Department of Administration
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County
District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys
Association

Chairman Yeager:

[Roll was called and Committee protocol was explained.] We have one bill and a work session. Because we have Senator Ford here, we are going to hear the bill first and then do the work session. I will now formally open the hearing on Senate Bill 538 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 538 (1st Reprint): Adopts provisions to protect Internet privacy.
(BDR 52-1216)**

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Senate District No. 11:

Recently, Congress voted, in a partisan vote, to repeal Internet privacy rules passed in 2016 by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) that would have given Internet users greater control over what service providers can do with their data. President Trump signed Senate Joint Resolution 34 in April 2017, which used a little-known tool called the Congressional Review Act that allows Congress and the President to overturn recently passed agency regulations. The passage of the bill prohibits the FCC from implementing similar rules in the future. Under the FCC rules that were repealed by Congress and the President, broadband companies would have been required to get permission from their customers in order to use their sensitive data including browsing history, geolocation, financial, and medical information, to create targeted advertisements.

These rules could have served as a bulwark against excessive data mining, which is the collection of personal information on the Internet, as more devices are connected to the Internet like your refrigerator and even your washing machine. In addition, consumers in Nevada have little or no competitive choices for broadband access, which makes them more vulnerable to data collection by Internet service providers. Broadband providers know their

customer's identities, and their position gives them the technical capacity to surveil users in ways that others cannot. Under the FCC's rules, consumers would have had the ability to decide whether, and how much of, the information can be gathered and used by Internet service providers.

Moreover, the lack of privacy rules are harmful to cyber security. We have all heard about the WannaCry ransomware that has been floating around. It is a timely occurrence because Internet privacy rules can help ward against cyber security issues. Often, the injected advertisement and tracking software used by marketers has security holes that can be exploited by hackers. The huge databases of customer data are enticing targets for hackers.

Senate Bill 538 (1st Reprint) is an important bill to provide guidelines for Internet users, Internet websites, or online service owners or operators with respect to using customers' information. I will briefly go over the provisions of the bill and point out the amendments that were adopted in the Senate. Section 3 of the bill defines "consumer" as "a person who seeks or acquires, by purchase or lease, any good, service, money or credit for personal, family or household purposes from the Internet website or online service of an operator."

Section 5, subsection 1 defines an "operator" as a person who "(a) Owns or operates an Internet website or online service for commercial purposes; (b) Collects and maintains covered information from consumers who reside in this State and use or visit the Internet website or online service; and (c) Purposefully directs its activities toward this State, consummates some transaction with this State or a resident thereof or purposefully avails itself of the privilege of conducting activities in this State." I know there are several lawyers on this Committee. You will recognize this language as requiring minimum contacts with our state in order for us to govern and control only those things that are happening inside our state. This is not an effort to control what happens in California or anywhere else. Section 5, subsection 2, states that an "operator" does not include "a third party that operates, hosts or manages an Internet website or online service on behalf of its owner or processes information on behalf of the owner of an Internet website or online service."

"Covered information" is defined in section 4 as, "any one or more of the following items of personally identifiable information about a consumer collected by an operator through an Internet website or online service and maintained by the operator in an accessible form: (1) A first and last name. (2) A home or other physical address which includes the name of a street and the name of a city or town. (3) An electronic mail address. (4) A telephone number. (5) A social security number. (6) An identifier that allows a specific person to be contacted either physically or online. (7) Any other information concerning a person collected from the person through the Internet website or online service of the operator and maintained by the operator in combination with an identifier in a form that makes the information personally identifiable."

Section 6, subsections 1 and 2 of the bill require an operator to make available a notice, containing certain information related to the privacy of covered information about consumers, which is collected by the operator through its Internet website or online service, that: "(a) Identifies the categories of covered information that the operator collects through its Internet website or online service about consumers who use or visit the Internet website or online service and the categories of third parties with whom the operator may share such covered information; (b) Provides a description of the process, if any such process exists, for an individual consumer who uses or visits the Internet website or online service to review and request changes to any of his or her covered information that is collected through the Internet website or online service; (c) Describes the process by which the operator notifies consumers who use or visit the Internet website or online service of material changes to the notice required to be made available by this subsection; (d) Discloses whether a third party may collect covered information about an individual consumer's online activities over time and across different Internet websites or online services when the consumer uses the Internet website or online service of the operator; and (e) States the effective date of the notice." Section 6, subsection 2 states: "An operator may remedy any failure to comply with the provisions of subsection 1 within 30 days after being informed of such a failure."

The first amendment affects smaller Internet providers, and it was requested by Facebook. The amendment—now section 6, subsection 3—provides that those provisions "do not apply to an operator: (a) Who is located in this State; (b) Whose revenue is derived primarily from a source other than the sale or lease of goods, services or credit on Internet websites or online services; and (c) Whose Internet website or online service has fewer than 20,000 unique visitors per year." That is meant to protect the small businesses, the mom-and-pops, the people who have small lawnmower companies, and things of that sort.

Section 7, sets forth that an operator is in violation of section 6 if the operator "(1) Knowingly and willfully fails to remedy a failure to comply with the provisions of subsection 1 of that section within 30 days after being informed of such a failure; or (2) Makes available a notice pursuant to that section which contains information which constitutes a knowing and material misrepresentation or omission that is likely to mislead a consumer acting reasonably under the circumstances, to the detriment of the consumer."

Section 8 authorizes the Attorney General to seek an injunction or civil penalty against an operator who engages in such an act. At the request of the Retail Association of Nevada, the second amendment adopted in the Senate revises the effective date of the bill from July 1 to October 1, 2017. This change allows the Association time to educate and assist its members to comply with the provisions of the bill. I urge your support of this important legislation.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

What do you think would satisfy minimum contacts to rope people in under this bill? Would that be anyone who offers Internet service in Nevada? Would that be sufficient contacts to trigger the provisions of this bill?

Senator Ford:

The minimum contacts analysis would be one that would be conducted in a court, as you would note. The minimum contacts analysis under the scenario you described, I do not believe, would be sufficient. As indicated, the contact has to be purposely directed toward Nevada, it has to consummate some transaction with the state or a resident, or it has to be purposely availing itself of the privilege of conducting activities in Nevada. It is going to be a case-by-case analysis. The consummation of a transaction is one that would likely be required for the purposes of minimum contacts analysis.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in support?

Alanna Bondy, Intern, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

New technologies are making it easier for governments and corporations to learn the minutiae of our online activities. Corporations collect our information to sell to the highest bidder while an expanding surveillance apparatus and outdated privacy laws allow the government to monitor us like never before.

With more and more of our lives moving online, these intrusions have devastating implications for our right to privacy. More than just privacy is threatened when everything we say, everywhere we go, and everyone we associate with is fair game. We have seen that surveillance—whether by governments or corporations—chills free speech and free association, undermines a free media, and threatens the free exercise of religion.

Americans should not have to choose between using new technologies and protecting their civil liberties. The American Civil Liberties Union works to promote a future where technology can be implemented in ways that protect civil liberties, to limit the collection of personal information, and to ensure that individuals have control over their private data. We support S.B. 358 (R1) because it provides notice to consumers about what data is being collected and allows consumers to make more informed decisions about sharing their private information online.

Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada:

We believe that Internet privacy is a growing issue. Big data can create detailed tracking profiles of every user of their services. In the absence of privacy, mass surveillance can lead to a chilling effect on free speech and violates a fundamental American right. We appreciate S.B. 358 (R1) as an answer to the Trump administration's rollback of Internet privacy rules. While we would prefer an Internet bill of rights that went even further in protecting individual data and privacy from both the government and private corporations, we applaud S.B. 358 (R1) as an admirable effort in the correct direction.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom; and Privacy Chairman, National Eagle Forum:

We are pleased to be able to support Senator Ford's measure. We are very concerned about this. In a matter of only four legislative days, Congress wiped out groundbreaking Internet privacy rules intended to empower consumers to protect their privacy. This is also an important issue in protecting us from identity theft. Data mining is very valuable and much of the data that many of these Internet corporations detail is sold to other companies. According to a recent *Consumer Reports'* Consumer Voices Survey, 65 percent of Americans lack confidence that their personal information is private and safe from distribution without their knowledge.

These FCC rules that were overturned will not be coming back because under the Congressional Review Act, the FCC is barred from proposing similar privacy rules. Privacy advocates now say that the best chance for strong Internet rules now resides in the states. More and more states have taken the position that if Congress is not willing or able to enact strong privacy laws, their legislatures will no longer sit on their hands. In fact, some 14 states are in the process of enacting legislation including Alaska, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington. We are ahead of the curve in this and it is very good that Senator Ford has come forward to protect our privacy. We are also concerned about the same issue with our schoolchildren whose privacy and Internet access in the schools is not protected. We appreciate this legislation.

Chairman Yeager:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position?

Shanna Rahming, Chief Information Officer, Enterprise Information Technology Services Division, Department of Administration:

I am testifying neutral on S.B. 358 (R1) because the bill's scope of application is unclear. While I sincerely believe that Nevada consumers are entitled to know how the personal information they provide to a website will be used, the bill text is unclear whether bill requirements apply to government websites in general and to state-owned and managed websites in particular. The bill text does not provide a specific exemption for government websites. The bill definition of websites or online service operators includes the term "for commercial purposes." This is not a clear differentiator. Some government websites are clearly commercial if we think of those relating to procurement activities. Other government websites are commercial in the sense that a Nevada consumer pays money to obtain a good or service.

The bill requires that a covered operator provide detailed notice to the consumer, as provided by section 6. If you simply glance at this section, you will see that a compliant notice needs to be tailored to each website and to the use or uses that each website owner will make of the consumer information. My division, the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division (EITS), manages a number of state websites and provides a platform for many

more, with the state agencies responsible for website content. There are also some agencies that run totally independent websites. Since each notice needs to be constructed for a particular website and content owner, I am currently unable to estimate the time, and therefore the expense, of constructing those pages for those non-EITS state websites using the EITS-provided platform, let alone for those websites that some state agencies run independent of EITS.

I do not know what uses individual agencies might make of collected information nor how difficult it may be to collect that usage information. However, my staff survey shows that as of this week, 66 agency websites on the EITS-managed Ektron contain a total of 236 forms calling for the entry of personal information. The content on these websites is controlled by individual state agencies. They will have to determine internally what use and disclosure is made of the personal information that is gathered on their websites. They will then have to construct appropriate disclosures. I have no information on agency websites that are wholly independent of EITS. In any event, I suggest you consider including language in the bill that would clarify whether the notice requirement applies to government websites in general and those operated by state agencies in particular.

Chairman Yeager:

I would invite the presenter back up for any concluding remarks.

Senator Ford:

To further address Assemblyman Anderson's question on minimum contacts, I would be happy to defer that analysis to Brad Wilkinson for further consideration.

Chairman Yeager:

We will formally close the hearing on Senate Bill 538 (1st Reprint). We are now going to move into our work session.

Senate Bill 361 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions related to domestic violence. (BDR 53-775)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Our first bill on work session today is Senate Bill 361 (2nd Reprint), heard in Committee on May 25, 2017 (Exhibit C). Senate Bill 361 (2nd Reprint) requires an employer to provide paid or unpaid leave to an employee who has been employed by the employer for at least 60 days and who is a victim of domestic violence or whose family or household member is a victim of domestic violence. The leave must be used within one year of the date on which the violence occurred, may be used consecutively or intermittently, and may be deducted from leave permitted by the federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. An employer must maintain a record of leave days used by each employee for a three-year period and make those records available for inspection by the Labor Commissioner, who shall prepare a bulletin setting forth the right to these benefits and require employers to post the bulletin in the workplace.

The Administrator of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation may request evidence to support a claim for benefits, and the Administrator is prohibited from disqualifying a person from receiving unemployment compensation benefits if: (1) the person left employment to protect himself or herself or his or her family or household member; and (2) the person actively engaged in an effort to preserve employment.

An employer must provide reasonable accommodations for an employee who is a victim of domestic violence or whose family or household member is a victim of domestic violence and an employer may not condition employment on or take certain employment actions because the employee or the employee's family or household member is a victim of domestic violence.

An intentional violation of these provisions is a category C felony, and it is a category B felony to commit battery constituting domestic violence if the person has previously been convicted of a felony in this state for committing battery constituting domestic violence or a similar violation in any other jurisdiction.

Senator Cannizzaro proposed two amendments ([Exhibit C](#)). The first amendment would remove section 8 from the bill and delete "roommate" from the domestic violence definition.

Her second amendment clarifies the language in section 7, subsection 1, paragraph (d) so that: "It is unlawful for any employer in this State to discharge, discipline, discriminate against in any manner or deny employment or promotion to, or threaten to take any such action against, an employee because: An act of violence is committed against an employee in the workplace of the employee."

Chairman Yeager:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 361 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 361 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FUMO SECONDED THE MOTION.

I want to thank the parties and let the Committee know that what you have in front of you is the product of the work from the interested parties. We are in a position where there is no longer any opposition to the bill.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Miller.

**Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to criminal procedure.
(BDR 14-113)**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Our next bill is Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint), heard in Committee on May 25, 2017 (Exhibit D). Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint) provides that if a peace officer makes an unlawful stop or seizure and subsequently discovers there is an outstanding warrant that results in an arrest, and the officer conducts a search pursuant to the arrest warrant that results in the officer seizing property discovered during the search, the person whose property was seized may move the court for the return of the property on the grounds that the stop was conducted illegally. A judge shall receive evidence on any fact necessary to make a decision on the motion. If the motion is granted, the property will be returned and will not be admissible as evidence.

Further, the discovery of an outstanding arrest warrant shall not purge the taint of an unlawful stop or seizure or of the seizure of property during a search incident to an arrest pursuant to the outstanding warrant. A motion to suppress evidence in any criminal proceeding in which the defendant is charged with a felony or gross misdemeanor must be made in writing, must be made in the district court with jurisdiction after any preliminary hearing, and must comport with applicable law and court rules. The state may appeal to the district court the order of a justice court granting a motion to suppress evidence in a case in which the defendant is charged only with a misdemeanor and not with a gross misdemeanor or felony.

One amendment was proposed by John Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office, and Robert O'Brien, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office (Exhibit D). The amendment revises section 1 of the bill to allow justice courts to continue to exercise discretion when it comes to determining probable cause and the nature of illegally obtained evidence.

Chairman Yeager:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 368 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FUMO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Do we have any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Krasner:

In reviewing my notes for Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint), I see that the Nevada District Attorneys Association mentioned that they had supplied an amendment and were working hard to come to a consensus so we could all vote yes on this. May we have a brief comment from the Nevada District Attorneys Association as to where we are on this bill?

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:

With the proposed amendment, we would be in strong opposition to the bill.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN KRASNER, TOLLES, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chairman Yeager:

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Thompson.

Senate Bill 488 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to sexual offenses. (BDR 15-1086)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Our third bill on work session is Senate Bill 488 (1st Reprint), heard in Committee on May 25, 2017 ([Exhibit E](#)). This bill expands the current list of crimes related to sex trafficking to provide that a person is guilty of sex trafficking if he or she facilitates, arranges, provides, or pays for the transportation of a person to or within Nevada for the purpose of engaging in unlawful sexual conduct or prostitution or, if that person is a child, engaging in certain acts relating to pornography involving minors.

A person is also guilty of sex trafficking if he or she advertises, sells, or offers to sell travel services that include or facilitate the travel of another person to Nevada with the knowledge that the other person is traveling to this state for the purpose of engaging in sexual conduct with a victim of sex trafficking, soliciting a child who is a victim of sex trafficking, or engaging in certain acts relating to pornography involving minors. Additionally, a person is guilty of sex trafficking if he or she travels to or within Nevada for the purpose of engaging in sexual conduct with the knowledge that the victim is compelled to engage in sexual conduct, prostitution, or acts relating to pornography involving minors.

The Department of Health and Human Services is required to develop a Medicaid service package called the *Sexual Trauma Services Guide*; it must post the information therein on the Department's website and make it available upon request. The Department is also required to hold periodic informational meetings to coordinate efforts to improve services for victims of sex trafficking and to achieve the goals of the statewide strategic plan developed by the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

There are two proposed amendments to this bill ([Exhibit E](#)). The first is a conceptual amendment proposed by Assemblyman Yeager. It clarifies the establishment of additional acts that constitute the crime of sex trafficking. The second amendment was proposed by John T. Jones Jr., Kristin Erickson, and Jennifer Noble, of the Nevada District Attorneys

Association. It would change the definition of victim by adding human trafficking to the language.

Chairman Yeager:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 488 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 488 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

I know it is unusual for us to have a handwritten mock-up, but we are at that point in the session. If there are any questions about what the handwritten mock-up seeks to do, I would be happy to answer them. I have worked with the interested parties including Senator Spearman, district attorneys, public defenders, and victim advocates. We have this bill in a place where everyone is okay with it. I am not aware of any opposition to the bill.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Cohen.

Senate Bill 490 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the foreclosure of real property. (BDR 9-488)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Our final bill on the work session today is Senate Bill 490 (2nd Reprint), heard in committee on May 30, 2017 ([Exhibit F](#)). This bill makes the Foreclosure Mediation Program permanent, requires that the program be administered by Home Means Nevada, Inc., and sets forth the specific functions that the administering entity must undertake, including meeting various reporting and auditing requirements and submitting to the district court the terms of any loan modification or settlement agreement. The bill also separates in statute the additional requirements for residential foreclosures from provisions that apply to real property foreclosures generally.

The Account for Foreclosure Mediation is renamed the Account for Foreclosure Mediation Assistance, which is to be administered by the Interim Finance Committee of the Legislature. Any money collected for the Program may only be expended to support the Program. The bill requires a \$25 filing fee from certain persons who wish to take part in the Program, increases the fee for mediation services from \$400 to \$600, and requires the parties to pay their share of the fee.

Senator Harris proposed the following conceptual amendment ([Exhibit F](#)):

1. Require United States Department of Housing and Urban Development counseling as a prerequisite for participation in the Foreclosure Mediation Program;
2. Add the following language to the bill where applicable: “or by electronic means as authorized by the parties”;
3. Add the following language to section 1.5(13)(b)(2) of the bill: “this Internet portal shall be used to streamline”; and
4. Provide grandfathering language for those caught between programs.

Chairman Yeager:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 490 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT T. ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS SENATE BILL 490 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN, KRASNER, AND
WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Anderson. Would anyone like to give public comment? [There was no one.] This meeting is adjourned [at 9:52 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Erin McHam
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 361 (2nd Reprint), dated May 30, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 368 (2nd Reprint), dated May 26, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 488 (1st Reprint), dated May 30, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 490 (2nd Reprint), dated May 30, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.