

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 10, 2017**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 5:11 p.m. on Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 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/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Anderson
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Janice Wright, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After a call of the roll, Chair Carlton made opening remarks including asking the audience to turn off all electronic devices. The Committee would begin a work session on various bills. She asked for a motion to request a bill to be drafted to create a General Counsel position to allow the Nevada Gaming Control Board and the Nevada Gaming Commission to have an independent legal team. She worked on the composition of the bill draft. She would accept



a motion to have that bill drafted. [Bill Draft Request 41-1223 was later introduced as Assembly Bill 513.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO DRAFT A BILL TO ALLOW INDEPENDENT COUNSEL FOR CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES THAT REGULATE GAMING.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson, Sprinkle, and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said that after the bill was drafted she would ask for a Committee introduction to send the bill to the Assembly floor for further action.

Assembly Bill 49 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to charter schools. (BDR 34-255)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that there were nine bills for the work session this evening. Assembly Bill (A.B.) 49 (1st Reprint) made various changes related to charter schools. The bill was originally heard by the Committee on May 8, 2017. The bill made a number of changes to the statutes that governed the activities of the State Public Charter School Authority. The State Public Charter School Authority issued a fiscal note of \$175,000 for each year of the 2017-2019 biennium for estimated investigation costs. The estimates were based on the investigations conducted in 2015. The fiscal note was removed later because the State Public Charter School Authority projected a reserve of \$1.9 million in fiscal year (FY) 2019. Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, State Public Charter School Authority, agreed that the investigation costs could be absorbed by the agency's reserves. The State Public Charter School Authority might require a work program to be processed if the investigations proved costly. Mr. Gavin testified on the bill, but no testimony was presented in the neutral position or in opposition to the bill. No amendments were proposed to the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee members had any questions about the bill. Hearing none, she said she would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 49 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson, Sprinkle, and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton asked Assemblywoman Diaz to present the floor statement on the bill.

Assembly Bill 110 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-327)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 110 (1st Reprint) revised provisions governing education. Assembly Bill 110 (R1) required the establishment of a pilot program to provide competency-based education to the extent that money was available. The bill authorized competitive grants for the pilot program. The measure would become effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations, and the remainder of the bill would become effective on July 1, 2017. The Department of Education submitted a fiscal note for the travel costs to conduct at least one meeting with superintendents of the school districts related to competency-based education. Funding would be provided by a State General Fund appropriation of \$1,500 for each year of the 2017-2019 biennium, for a total of \$3,000 to pay for travel costs.

Ms. Jones stated that the bill amended Chapter 389 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). During the hearing, Fiscal staff expressed a concern about the amended language in section 1.6, subsection 2, and the reference to the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation. That budget account was included in The Executive Budget and would be renamed the Contingency Account for Special Education Services and used for the competency-based education program. The renaming and change of use of the account was also contemplated in Senate Bill 518 (1st Reprint). The specific categorical programs included in the account would be moved to the Other State Education Programs budget. Fiscal staff suggested that the Other State Education Programs budget would be the appropriate budget account for the competency-based education program as well. An amendment to the bill was suggested by Fiscal staff to change the language in section 1.6, subsection 2, from "Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation" to "Other State Education Programs." She suggested changing the language at the end of section 1.6, subsection 2: "Grants must be awarded by the Department to schools selected to participate in the program based upon money available." She recommended adding the words "for that purpose" to the end of section 1.6, subsection 2 to ensure transparency and accountability for the use of funds by the program.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions.

Assemblywoman Diaz asked for clarification about where the funding stream would come from for the competency-based education program.

Ms. Jones responded that the bill contained no funding. The only fiscal note on the bill included travel costs of \$3,000 for the 2017-2019 biennium. That funding would have to be appropriated from some source if the Legislature intended to fund the competency-based education program. No specific funding was provided in the bill or The Executive Budget to fund the program. The bill stated, "to the extent money is available." The bill established the competency-based education program in statute, but did not fund the program. The only

funding that would be provided through the bill and through the amendment would be the \$3,000 for the travel costs in the fiscal note. Fiscal staff's proposed amendment would include the \$3,000 State General Fund appropriation, the correction of the budget account title, and clarification that the program would be funded based on money made available for that purpose.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any other questions on the bill and, hearing none, said she would accept a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 110 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DIAZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson, Sprinkle, and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement on the bill because of its complicated nature and multiple changes.

Assembly Bill 414 (1st Reprint): Requires the electronic recording of interrogations under certain circumstances. (BDR 14-600)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 414 (1st Reprint) required electronic recording of interrogations under certain circumstances. Assembly Bill 414 (R1) was heard on May 1, 2017, by the Committee. Assembly Bill 414 (R1) required law enforcement agencies to make an electronic recording of custodial interrogations of a person who was suspected of committing homicide or sexual assault. The Nevada System of Higher Education, specifically the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), submitted a fiscal note for \$25,790 for surveillance equipment. After the hearing, UNLV sent an email to Fiscal staff that stated that the fiscal note was submitted in error. Therefore, there was no fiscal note on the bill as amended. John Ocegüera, Senior Vice President, Nevada Operations, Strategies 360, testified in support of the bill, and there was no other testimony on the bill. No amendments were proposed for the bill. The fiscal note had been removed from the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions on the bill and, hearing none, said she would accept a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 414 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson, Sprinkle, and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton asked Assemblyman Araujo to present the floor statement on this bill.

Assembly Bill 474 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to drug overdoses and prescribing and using drugs. (BDR 40-1102)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 474 (1st Reprint) made various changes related to drug overdoses and the prescription and use of drugs. Assembly Bill 474 (R1) was sponsored by the Office of the Governor and was heard on May 1, 2017, by the Committee. Assembly Bill 474 (R1) revised certain provisions concerning the computerized program to track each prescription for a controlled substance, authorized certain occupational licensing boards to access prescription drug monitoring program databases, required such boards to review and evaluate certain information, and imposed disciplinary action when appropriate.

Ms. Jones mentioned that the bill changed a permissive training requirement to a mandatory requirement of the State Board of Pharmacy in certain instances and reduced the period from 180 days to 60 days for the Board to hold a hearing. The act became effective upon passage and approval for the purposes of adopting regulations and performing administrative tasks that were necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. The bill became effective on January 1, 2018, for all other purposes. A fiscal note from the State Board of Pharmacy stated that the Board was unable to determine the effect of the original bill, and Fiscal staff was unsure whether the amendment changed that. Fiscal staff noted that no testimony was provided during the hearing that state agencies would experience any fiscal effects. The Investigation Division, Department of Public Safety, stated that the State Board of Pharmacy was responsible for the management of the database, and no fiscal effects were foreseen. However, some local governments said they might experience some fiscal costs related to training and monitoring the program. The Office of the Governor supported the bill, and a representative provided testimony. No other testimony was received on the bill in the neutral position or in opposition to the bill. There were no amendments presented to the bill. Fiscal staff was unable to determine any fiscal effects of the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee had any questions on the bill and, hearing none, said she would accept a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 474 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson, Sprinkle, and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton asked Assemblyman Sprinkle to present the floor statement because he was the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services that originally heard the bill.

Assembly Bill 487 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to vehicles. (BDR 58-783)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 487 (1st Reprint) revised provisions related to vehicles. Assembly Bill 487 (R1) was referred by the Assembly Committee on Transportation and was first heard on May 1, 2017, by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. Assembly Bill 487 (R1) conferred upon the Taxicab Authority (TA) and the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA) concurrent enforcement jurisdiction in Clark County over certain activities regarding transportation network companies (TNCs) and their drivers. The bill made various changes to provisions related to taxicabs. The measure was effective on July 1, 2017. The Department of Taxation had submitted a fiscal note on the original bill for \$2,386 to pay for information technology expenses. However, the Department said in an email to Fiscal staff today that the amendment to the bill eliminated the fiscal costs. The Taxicab Authority said it might experience some additional overtime related to the provisions of the bill, but was unable to determine the cost or provide a fiscal note. Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18, presented the bill. Alfredo Alonso, Principal, Lewis and Roca, testified in support of the bill. Some concerns had been raised about the bill. Assemblyman Carrillo worked with the parties on the bill and the amendment. Exhibit C was the proposed amendment to A.B. 487 (R1) presented by Assemblyman Carrillo to address those concerns. A copy of Exhibit C was provided to the members of the Committee.

Chair Carlton said the members now had a copy of the amendment (Exhibit C). During the discussion of the bill, concerns were raised after the testimony, and Chair Carlton asked the parties to discuss the differences to reach a compromise. She asked whether the members had any questions about the amendment.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked for details of the amendment because it appeared that the TA and NTA no longer had joint concurrent enforcement.

Alfredo Alonso, Principal, Lewis and Roca, testified that the quest was to narrow the scope of the TA's involvement related to the TNCs. That was done in two ways. First, a TNC driver could only be stopped when probable cause existed of a violation of Chapter 706A of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). Matters related to the digital network or the software applications were not the purview of the TA, and there was no attempt to include those matters as violations of Chapter 706A of NRS. He spoke about the "cash runs" and the "gypsy cabs." Those included the vehicles parked on one side of the street that were not subject to enforcement, but those taxicabs parked on the other side of the street were subject to enforcement. The amendment was an attempt to narrow the focus, ensure it was as unobtrusive as possible, and enforced on the TNC drivers only.

Mr. Alonso explained that the second part of narrowing the scope related to the dynamic display devices that was a concern presented by Washoe County. The concern was the dynamic display at high speeds might cause undue distraction to other drivers. The discussion addressed the technology to freeze the dynamic display system at 55 miles per hour. He understood that it was impossible to freeze the system at a lower speed than 55 miles per hour. The sheriffs of various counties wanted to freeze the display at high speeds. He was unsure the displays could be frozen at any speed lower than 55 miles per hour. He said the ads were one of the only ways that the taxicabs could recoup some of the revenue that they had lost to the TNCs.

Chair Carlton said this discussion was outside of the normal realm for the Committee, but it had been addressed, and the Committee wanted to process the most effective bill possible. She had given Assemblyman Carrillo the opportunity to work on the bill and present it to the Committee. She asked whether there were other questions from any of the members.

Assemblyman Anderson asked whether the bill expanded the enforcement scope. He understood that the intent of the amendment was to narrow the scope. However, it appeared that the enforcement piece expanded the scope currently available to the TA and NTA. He believed that expanding the scope would incur a cost for the enforcement piece. He asked for details about changing the scope of the authority.

Mr. Alonso responded that the amended bill would cost less because the scope was narrowed to just Chapter 706A of NRS. The enforcement officers were already on duty. In a perfect world, one agency potentially might be fully funded with sufficient officers to deal with all problems. This was not a perfect world. The only fair process available for enforcement was for the NTA to adjudicate and the TA to issue citations for violations for all parties. Enforcement for TNCs and the taxicabs would be combined.

Assemblyman Anderson said his struggle was with the policy piece of the bill, and he did not want to delve into policy because he realized this Committee would address the fiscal cost of the bill. He understood that the policies in the bill related to the enforcement matters. Some statutes related to the gypsy cabs and cash runs. However, this was a larger scope that the bill attempted to enforce. His struggle was whether enforcement was the problem or whether the bill attempted to obtain more resources for enforcement. He was unsure how either problem would be solved by this amendment. That was the policy question that he needed to leave for another time. However, if the problem was about enforcement and resources, it seemed as though the solution could be addressed in a different way.

Mr. Alonso responded that the resources were available and that was the point of the bill. Officers were already on the ground where the problems developed in Southern Nevada. The amended bill proposed to borrow those resources and use them for enforcement, but still have the problems adjudicated at the NTA. The authority would remain with the NTA as the ultimate authority. It was an efficient way to solve a problem without funding additional resources or changing how the job was currently performed. Enforcement officers right now were in the same area as the TNCs and the taxicabs. Those transportation entities were both

in the same place. The taxicabs were subject to enforcement, but the TNCs were not subject to enforcement. The amended bill was a fair and efficient way of adding the enforcement resources. Again, no changes were made to the TNCs, and the enforcement was driver-based. When the drivers violated the law, they were cited. The NTA was the ultimate authority. Citations found to have no merit could be absolved by the NTA.

Assemblyman Edwards said he had difficulty understanding the cost structure. It appeared to him that the NTA and the TA performed enforcement mostly for the taxicab companies. The authorities could also perform enforcement on the gypsy cabs. However, adding the enforcement responsibility of the TNCs might expand the cost and expand the scope.

Mr. Alonso responded that he believed that those enforcement officers were already on the ground and could easily walk across the street to ticket a TNC that failed to adhere to the law because the driver had turned off his app or was doing a multitude of things that were deemed inappropriate for the industry. He did not imply that the TNCs did anything wrong. He believed that there were many things that were right, but enforcement was one-sided. The taxicabs were being overenforced. This proposal was a way to use resources that already existed, and the NTA would not have to add any resources. The change would be adding the NTA borrowed officers who were already on duty. It was an efficient way to regulate the TNC industry until the Legislature changed the requirements in the future. He expected that, as transportation evolved, the state would consider different ways to regulate the industry. During the 78th Session (2015), the discussion centered on enforcement and making sure enforcement was equitably applied to all parties, but that was not happening right now.

Assemblyman Edwards said that maybe the missing piece was who paid for the cost of enforcement on the TNCs now.

Mr. Alonso responded that the taxicabs paid the costs now. The taxicabs paid the TA, and the trip charges on the taxicabs paid for the enforcement of the TNCs as well. Therefore, the scope was expanded in a narrow fashion, but the enforcement was paid by trip charges. No funds were needed from the TNCs, which was why this proposal was so efficient. Individual officers were already on the ground and were doing the job, and the NTA could simply borrow additional officers to use for enforcement.

Chair Carlton said this proposal had gotten more complicated than it should be for a fiscal committee. She asked Assemblyman Carrillo to work on a proposal to address the problem, because she had not realized that it would be so complicated. She said there was no fiscal effect other than the pay for the enforcement officers. There was a lack of clarity surrounding this problem, but she felt comfortable in allowing the bill to move forward because there was no fiscal effect. The Committee could let the bill move through the legislative process. She asked for further questions from the Committee members. There were none. She suggested that Assemblyman Carrillo and Mr. Alonso work on the amendment to the bill and follow up with those Committee members who had questions to ensure they received the answers needed. The fiscal part of the bill had been addressed. She would accept a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 487 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS SECONDED THE
MOTION.

Assemblyman Anderson understood that no fiscal note was attached. However, he thought there was still a cost for increasing the scope of the bill and expanding the number of drivers subject to enforcement. He preferred to address the fiscal part of the enforcement and help the industry in that manner. He struggled because he recognized the need and intent of the bill. However, he would vote no on the bill and ask the sponsors to work on the policy matters.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Anderson, Edwards, Hambrick, and Oscarson voted no. Assemblymen Sprinkle and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Assembly Bill 493: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Corrections for a projected shortfall related to outside medical expenditures. (BDR S-1177)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 493 made a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Corrections for a projected shortfall related to outside medical expenditures. The appropriation from the State General Fund was for the current fiscal year (FY) 2017. The Executive Budget included a request for the supplemental appropriation of \$1,327,561. Several amendments had been submitted by the Executive Branch to increase the amount of the supplemental appropriation. On March 28, 2017, the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, sought to amend the bill to increase the supplemental appropriation by \$3,739,583 for a new total of \$5,067,144 for inmate-driven medical expenditures. Another increase was requested on May 4, 2017, to amend the supplemental appropriation to add another \$321,239 for contracted temporary professional services related to prison medical expenditures, making the new total \$5,388,383. An additional request was received to amend the supplemental appropriation to provide an appropriation to Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center in the amount of \$564,152 for personnel related expenditures and to cover revenue shortfalls. The amendments would increase the total amount of the supplemental appropriation to \$5,952,535, which was \$4,624,974 more than the amount included in The Executive Budget. The supplemental requests would fund the current FY 2017 expenses. John Borrowman, Deputy Director, Support Services, Department of Corrections, testified at the Committee hearing about the need for those funds.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee members had any questions. The request was typical of shortfalls that occurred during this time of year. She would accept a motion on the request.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 493.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Sprinkle and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement on the bill.

Assembly Bill 494: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy of the Department of Health and Human Services for a projected shortfall resulting from an increase in the Medicaid caseload over the amount legislatively approved for Fiscal Years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. (BDR S-1176)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 494 made a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, for a projected shortfall resulting from an increase in the Medicaid caseload over the amount legislatively approved for the past two fiscal years. The supplemental appropriation needed for fiscal year (FY) 2017 would fund the shortfall of the last two years. A supplemental appropriation of \$16,391,696 that was included in The Executive Budget would pay for the projected shortfall of State General Fund expenditures. The bill also requested revenue authority for federal fund expenditures not supported by the General Fund in the amount of \$130,930,190.

Ms. Jones added that several amendments were proposed to the bill. The first amendment presented on April 5, 2017, reduced the amount of General Funds requested from \$16,391,696 to \$8.8 million and the non-General Fund portion from \$130,930,190 to \$78.3 million. Fiscal staff received another request on May 6, 2017, to further reduce the General Fund amount from \$8.8 million to \$4.6 million and change the non-General Fund sources to \$119 million. She expressed concern that the funding might be insufficient and result in a shortfall in FY 2017. Fiscal staff worked with the agency to update the projections. She suggested that the request be changed to \$5,800,224 for the General Fund portion and \$124,074,692 for the other funds authority, including federal funds. The additional authority would allow the agency room for changes in the actual expenditures, but any amount that was unexpended would revert to the General Fund.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee had any questions about the supplemental appropriations to ensure that the agency had sufficient funds to pay the expenses of the Medicaid clients.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 494.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE
MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Sprinkle and Titus were not present
for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement on the bill.

Assembly Bill 495: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Emergency Management of the Department of Public Safety for a projected shortfall for activities related to reimbursements for the 2017 floods. (BDR S-1171)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 495 made a supplemental appropriation of \$70,387 to the Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety, for a projected shortfall for activities related to reimbursements for the floods that occurred in January and February 2017. The bill was heard on May 8, 2017. The bill provided funding for costs associated with setting up a joint field office with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to process flood reimbursement requests. Caleb S. Cage, Chief, Division of Emergency Management, and Homeland Security Advisor, Department of Public Safety, had testified that the joint field office was operational with current staff, but the supplemental appropriation would support six additional staff to process flood-related claims. There was no other testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There were no amendments to the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee had any questions about the supplemental appropriation to ensure that the agency had sufficient funds to pay the flood expenses. Hearing none, she said she would accept a motion on this bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 495.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE
MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Sprinkle and Titus were not present
for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement on the bill.

Assembly Bill 496: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Secretary of State for a projected shortfall related to credit card processing fees. (BDR S-1168)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 496 made a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Secretary of State for projected shortfalls related to credit card processing fees. The bill was heard by the Committee on May 8, 2017. The supplemental appropriation of \$598,200 was included in The Executive Budget. Fiscal staff received an email that the supplemental appropriation should be increased by \$90,549. Later, Cadence Matijevich, Deputy for Operations, Office of the Secretary of State, advised that the amount included in The Executive Budget was sufficient because the Office could use vacancy savings from the personnel category. If that funding proved insufficient, the Office would process a work program to move other funds before the close of the fiscal year to cover any additional costs. The Office believed that the amount included in The Executive Budget of \$598,200 was sufficient, and the email request to increase the supplemental appropriation had been withdrawn.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee members had any questions about the supplemental appropriations to ensure that the agency had sufficient funds to pay the credit card fees. There were no questions, and Chair Carlton said she would accept a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 496.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Sprinkle and Titus were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement on the bill. She opened the meeting for public comments, and there were none. There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janice Wright
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 487 (R1) presented by Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18.