

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eightieth Session
May 17, 2019**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Ellen B. Spiegel at 2:58 p.m. on Friday, May 17, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst
Wil Keane, Committee Counsel
Katelyn Malone, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

Chair Spiegel:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will begin with our work session.

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

We will begin with the consent calendar. The bills on the consent calendar do not have proposed amendments, further discussion, or debate. If any member wishes to discuss, debate, or vote no on one or more bills on the consent calendar, the member may request for the measure to be removed from the consent calendar with the Chair's approval. The bills that are removed from the consent calendar may have further discussion and a separate vote.

The following measures are on the consent calendar: Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint), which requires health insurers to provide coverage for certain services and equipment; Senate Bill 208, which revises provisions governing cosmetology; Senate Bill 219 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to certain regulatory bodies; Senate Bill 220 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to Internet privacy; Senate Bill 385 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to insurance for personal property at storage facilities; and Senate Bill 397 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions governing contractors.

Chair Spiegel:

Are there any questions, comments, or requests to have a bill removed from the consent calendar?

Assemblyman Kramer:

Senate Bill 397 (1st Reprint) would allow some handyman services to be performed by a contractor without a license, so long as the value of the work is less than \$1,000. There is an issue with contractors having to shut down the job site in order to subcontract electrical or plumbing work, and I am hoping this is an issue that we can work to resolve next session.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to do pass the consent calendar.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 200 (1ST REPRINT), SENATE BILL 208, SENATE BILL 219 (1ST REPRINT), SENATE BILL 220 (1ST REPRINT), SENATE BILL 385 (1ST REPRINT), AND SENATE BILL 397 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement for Senate Bill 200 (1st Reprint) to Assemblyman Edwards, the floor statement for Senate Bill 208 to Assemblyman Kramer, the floor statement for Senate Bill 219 (1st Reprint) to Assemblyman Yeager, the floor statement for Senate Bill 220 (1st Reprint) to Assemblywoman Martinez, the floor statement for Senate Bill 385 (1st Reprint) to Assemblyman McCurdy, and the floor statement for Senate Bill 397 (1st Reprint) to Assemblyman Daly.

[[\(Exhibit C\)](#), [\(Exhibit D\)](#), [\(Exhibit E\)](#), [\(Exhibit F\)](#), [\(Exhibit G\)](#), and [\(Exhibit H\)](#) were not read.]

We will move to the next item on the work session.

Senate Bill 37 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the regulation of marriage and family therapists and clinical professional counselors. (BDR 54-250)

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from [\(Exhibit I\)](#).] Senate Bill 37 (1st Reprint) revises provisions regarding licensing and the scope of practice for marriage and family therapists and clinical professional counselors. The bill revises the fees collected by the Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors and establishes a minimum and maximum fee schedule. Additionally, the bill establishes new fees for licensing or approving interns, supervisors, and continuing education. Finally, the bill clarifies that funds collected by the Board may be used to compensate its employees.

Helen Foley, representing the Nevada Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, proposes the following and attached amendments to S.B. 37 (R1):

1. Amend subsection 3 of section 6 to require the Board to prorate the fee for an initial license based on the number of months remaining in the two-year cycle that expires on January 1 of each even-numbered year; and
2. Replace section 14 with the new fee schedule as provided in the attached amendment [page 2, ([Exhibit I](#))]. The amendment deletes the entire floor for certain fees and establishes new ceilings. The new schedule also splits up the fee for application and issuance for an initial license into two fees.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I want to thank the sponsors of this bill and those who worked on it. During the interim, as chair of the Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board, I heard some of the issues that the Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists was having with processing license renewals. I fully support the bill and hope it will solve some of their problems.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 37 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Hardy. We will move to the next item on work session.

[Senate Bill 86 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes relating to the regulation of insurers by the Division of Insurance of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 57-238)

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from ([Exhibit J](#)).] Senate Bill 86 (1st Reprint) is the omnibus bill of the Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, which makes numerous changes to provisions governing insurance, including:

- Modifying certain provisions related to expenses incurred for administrative supervision of insurers;

- Revising requirements for physicians when reporting to the Division certain information about closed claims;
- Revising various provisions related to financial statements submitted to the Division;
- Adopting a recommendation of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) to require insurers to submit quarterly statements to the commissioner, as well as to the NAIC;
- Making changes to the certificate of registration as a service contract provider;
- Making changes to provisions related to adjustors, administrators, captive insurers, and domestic surplus lines insurers;
- Authorizing the commissioner to assess against an insurer the expenses incurred for the external actuarial review of a proposal to make changes to a rate of a health plan;
- Establishing provisions related to a certificate of dormancy; and
- Making various other technical changes affecting the regulation of insurance.

Nick Stosic from the Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, proposes the following amendments to S.B. 86 (R1):

1. Delete section 8, which provides that money accepted by a life insurer pursuant to an annuity agreement may be considered income and taxable upon receipt.
2. In section 29, subsection 1 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 686B.112, delete language that the commissioner shall perform an actuarial review of and consider each proposed increase or decrease in the rate of a health plan. Instead, require the commissioner to review and consider any proposed rate filing. Furthermore, make conforming changes throughout the entire NRS section. The intent is to correct current statutory language that refers to rate filings seeking an increased or decreased rate, when the actual health plan filing review is required regardless of changes to rates.
3. In section 29, revise subsection 5 of NRS 686B.112 to permit the commissioner assessing against an insurer the actual cost for an external actuarial review of a proposed rate filing. The intent is to correct language that would allow the Division to assess carriers for the actual cost for any actuarial review of a proposal to increase or decrease a rate.

4. In section 79, revise subsection 1 by adding section 29 to the list of bill sections that become effective upon passage and approval.

Jeanette Belz, representing Liberty Mutual Insurance, proposes the following amendment to S.B. 86 (R1):

5. In subsection 4 of NRS 679B.700, increase the annual assessment the commissioner shall collect from each insurer authorized to transact insurance as provided in the table [page 2, ([Exhibit J](#))].

The Nevada Surplus Lines Association proposes the following amendments to S.B. 86 (R1):

6. In subsection 4 of NRS 685A.075, revise the appointment process of a board of a nonprofit organization of surplus lines brokers so that a board director shall be appointed in accordance with the bylaws of the organization. Any proposed director may be disapproved by the commissioner and serves at the pleasure of the commissioner.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill?

Assemblyman Kramer:

Amendment 5 states that "the commissioner shall collect from each insurer authorized to transact insurance." Who is the insurer—the insurance agent or the insurance company?

Wil Keane, Committee Counsel:

The insurer is the insurance company, not the individual insurance agent.

Assemblyman Kramer:

An insurance agent pays the fees each year and completes his continuing education requirements to maintain his insurance license, but the annual assessment is paid by the insurance company he works for. How, then, is his premium total amount reported?

Wil Keane:

In NRS Title 57, "insurer" is defined as the entity providing insurance. Each insurer receives a certificate from the commissioner of insurance. The total amount of premiums they write is known because that is what the premium tax is based on.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Unfortunately, with amendment 5 included, I will not be able to support the bill.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 86 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Tolles. We will move to the next item on work session.

Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions governing the interstate practice of physical therapy. (BDR 54-514)

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from ([Exhibit K](#)).] Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint) enacts the Physical Therapy Licensure Compact. The interstate Compact allows a person who is licensed as a physical therapist or physical therapist assistant in a state that is a member of the Compact to provide services in person in other states that are members of the Compact. Before providing such services, the Compact requires a physical therapist or physical therapist assistant to meet certain specified requirements.

Senator SeEVERS Gansert submitted the attached amendment [pages 2 through 5, ([Exhibit K](#))], which proposes to:

1. Delete all of the existing sections of S.B. 186 (R1);
2. Define the practice of dry needling;
3. Specify dry needling is within the scope of practice of certain qualified physical therapists; and
4. Require the Nevada Physical Therapy Board to establish, by regulation, the qualifications a physical therapist must obtain before he or she will be authorized to perform dry needling; the qualifications must include no less than 150 hours of didactic training and education in the procedure.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

After reviewing the amendments, I believe that the language "to prohibit needle retention" has been excluded from the definition of "dry needling." I believe that would make clear what the practice of dry needling is.

Assemblyman Edwards:

I think the language would fit rather nicely into section 1, in a new paragraph (d) in subsection 2.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I will vote the bill out of Committee, and if there are lingering issues with the definition, I would be happy to work to resolve them. I am glad to see that we have come to a consensus, because this has been a contentious issue.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 186 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Jauregui. We will move to the next item on work session.

**Senate Bill 197 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to trade practices.
(BDR 52-746)**

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from ([Exhibit L](#)).] Senate Bill 197 (1st Reprint) makes it unlawful for a manufacturer to import, sell, or offer for sale in this state any cosmetics for which animal testing was conducted, if the animal testing was conducted on or after January 1, 2020. A person who violates such provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor. The bill provides certain exemptions to the prohibition if the animal testing is conducted to comply with a requirement of a federal, state, or foreign regulatory agency. Additionally, the bill prohibits a political subdivision of this state from establishing or continuing prohibitions that are not identical to the provisions of this bill. Finally, the bill allows an inventory of cosmetics, which is otherwise in violation of the prohibition on or relating to animal testing, to be sold on or before June 30, 2020.

Senator Scheible proposes the following amendments to S.B. 197 (R1):

1. In section 1, modify the language in subsection 1 so that a manufacturer shall not import for profit, sell, or offer for sale any cosmetic for which the manufacturer knew or should have known that animal testing was conducted. Remove language making it "unlawful" for a manufacturer to do so. This amendment also deletes the misdemeanor penalty.
2. Revise section 1, subsection 4 and add subsequent subsections to provide for civil penalties for a violation of this bill's provisions. Under this amendment, a manufacturer that violates the provisions of subsection 1 shall be given a civil penalty of \$2,500 for the first violation and \$5,000 for each violation for the second or subsequent violation. Additionally, the court may award up to \$10,000 in punitive damages if the facts warrant. The amendment also provides for recovery of certain costs related to a civil penalty and that any money awarded by a court must be awarded to the person or governmental entity that brought the action, except that punitive damages must be awarded to the applicable county to care for animals. The civil remedy provided in this amendment is in addition to, and not exclusive of, any other available remedy or penalty.
3. Add to section 1, subsection 5 a definition clarifying that "consumer" means a natural person.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill?

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I want to thank the sponsor for answering questions and incorporating more specific language into the bill. I am happy to support the bill.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 197 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Neal. We will move to the next item on work session.

Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to maintenance of manufactured home parks and repairs of manufactured homes. (BDR 10-303)

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from ([Exhibit M](#)).] Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint) authorizes a person to maintain the property in a manufactured home park, including a manufactured home, without any license, if the maintenance does not affect fuel systems or the structural systems of a manufactured home, and the value of the maintenance is less than \$1,000. Additionally, a person who is licensed as a contractor may perform any maintenance in a manufactured home park, including on a manufactured home, if the maintenance does not affect fuel systems or the structural systems of a manufactured home.

The Nevada State Contractors' Board submitted the attached amendment [pages 2 through 5, ([Exhibit M](#))], which proposes to allow the Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry to receive complaints concerning work performed by a person licensed as a contractor pursuant to the chapter of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) governing contractors. Should the Division determine a violation of NRS 489.416 has occurred, the Division is required to forward its final decision and order to the Board for further discipline, as appropriate.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill? [There was none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 371 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Edwards. We will move to the last item on work session.

Senate Bill 432 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to certain financial transactions. (BDR 52-1146)

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from ([Exhibit N](#)).] Senate Bill 432 (1st Reprint) authorizes the commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions of the Department of Business and Industry to license and regulate a consumer litigation funding company. The bill provides that a consumer litigation funding company is one that engages in a consumer litigation funding transaction, whereby a company provides money to a consumer and the consumer assigns to the company a contingent right to receive an amount of the potential proceeds of an award, judgment, settlement, or verdict obtained in the legal claim of the consumer. A person who engages in

such business without a license is guilty of a misdemeanor. The bill requires a contract for a consumer litigation funding transaction to meet certain requirements and contain certain disclosures regarding fees and the rights of the consumer. Additionally, the bill requires a company, licensed by the commissioner, to maintain assets of at least \$50,000 and submit an annual report regarding the activities of the licensee that are to be made available to the public. Finally, the bill authorizes the commissioner to impose fines and suspend or revoke a license for certain violations.

The American Legal Finance Association proposes the following amendments to S.B. 432 (R1):

1. In section 4, exclude a "one-time document preparation fee" from the definition of "charges," so that the provisions of the bill relating to charges, such as the 40 percent annual rate limit, will not apply to the one-time document preparation fee.
2. In section 8, exclude from the definition of "consumer litigation funding company" a medical factoring company. Additionally, Assemblyman Yeager proposes to exclude from the definition a medical provider that provides medical services on the basis of a lien against any potential litigation recovery.
3. Add a new section 11 that defines "document preparation fee" as a one-time fee per legal claim, not to exceed \$500, assessed for document preparation services related to the preparation of a consumer litigation funding contract.
4. In section 17, or section 18 of the mock-up, subsection 1, delete the phrase "and make orders" and delete subsections 2 through 4. This amendment deletes the authorization of the commissioner to adopt orders for the administration and enforcement of this bill's chapter.

Amendments 5 through 11 refer to section 18, or section 19 of the mock-up:

5. Revise the language in subsection 1(c) so that a consumer litigation funding contract must advise a consumer of the right to cancel or rescind the contract. Remove language "entitling" consumers to this right.
6. Revise the language in subsection 1(c)(1) and 1(c)(2) to provide that a consumer may cancel or rescind a contract if: (1) delivering in person to the consumer litigation funding company at the address listed in the contract, the uncashed check issued by the company or the full amount of money that was disbursed to the consumer; or (2) mailing the uncashed check issued by the company. Remove language to deliver an uncashed check to the company's office as well as returning the full amount of money disbursed to the consumer by certified check or money order.

7. Revise subsection 1(e) to specify that a statement must contain that the consumer is not required to pay any other fees or charges other than what is agreed to and disclosed within the contract.
8. Revise subsection 1(f) to specify that a statement must contain an additional disclosure of the cumulative amount due from the consumer for all consumer litigation funding transactions that also includes all fees.
9. Revise subsection 1(h) to specify that a statement must contain clear, conspicuous, and accurate details of how charges are incurred or accrued.
10. Revise subsection 2(a) by adding language that the legal claim of a consumer litigation contract must additionally contain that any applicable fees have been disclosed to the consumer.
11. Revise subsection 3 by providing that if the acknowledgment is completed, the contract shall remain valid if the consumer terminates the representation of the initial attorney and/or retains a new attorney.

Amendments 12 through 14 are in section 19, or section 20 of the mock-up:

12. Revise subsection 1(b) through (d) to include any fees in the disclosure of a consumer litigation funding contract.
13. Modify in subsection 2 the language of the form to make conforming changes according to the revisions of subsection 1(c)(1) and 1(c)(2) of section 18, or section 19 of the mock-up.
14. Revise subsection 4 of the disclosure so that it states a consumer will not owe anything to a consumer litigation funding company unless the consumer violated any material term of the contract or has knowingly provided false information or committed fraud against the company.
15. In section 30, or section 31 of the mock-up, delete subsection 1(c) that provides for an additional application fee of not less than \$200 and not more than \$1,000, prorated on the basis of the licensing year as prescribed by the commissioner.

Other amendments include:

16. Add a new section 38 that requires the commissioner to at least annually examine each licensee and collect from the licensee an examination fee.

17. Add a new section 39 that requires every licensee to pay the assessment levied pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 658.055 and cooperate fully with the audits and examinations performed pursuant thereto.
18. Add a new section 40 that requires every licensee to pay the assessment levied pursuant to NRS 658.098.
19. Add a new section 41 that requires the commissioner to assess and collect from each licensee the reasonable cost of auditing the books and records of a licensee, in addition to the annual fee.
20. In section 38, or section 44 of the mock-up, revise subsection 3 to require the commissioner to make the information contained in a licensee report available to the public upon request. Remove the language requiring the commissioner to make the report public no later than 1 year after the report is submitted.
21. Add a new section 44 that authorizes the commissioner to take certain actions to enforce the provisions of this bill and any regulations adopted under this bill. The actions include ordering a licensee or a director to cease and desist, correct, or make restitution to a person, as well as impose a civil penalty of no more than \$5,000 for any violation. If a person violates or knowingly authorizes, directs, or aids in the violation of a final order, the commissioner may impose a civil penalty not to exceed \$10,000 for each violation. The commissioner may maintain an action to enforce this bill in any county and may recover certain reasonable costs. The commissioner shall consider various factors prior to imposing a civil penalty.
22. In section 38.3, or section 44.3 of the mock-up, revise subsection 2 to require the commissioner to afford to any person fined notice and an opportunity for a hearing.

Other amendments include:

23. Add a new section 45 that authorizes the commissioner, upon filing of a complaint, to investigate and conduct hearings concerning possible violations. The amendment includes certain specifications that must be included in the complaint.
24. In section 39, or the first section 46 of the mock-up, delete the provisions of subsection 1 of section 39. Additionally, section 39 provides the continuation of consumer litigation funding of certain licensees who were licensed prior to the effective date of this act, provided the licensee submits an application for licensure on or before January 1, 2020.

25. In section 40, or the second section 46 of the mock-up, revise section 40 to provide that the amendatory provisions of this act do not apply to any contract entered into before July 1, 2019, until the contract is extended, amended, or renewed.

Chair Spiegel:

Is there any discussion on the bill?

Assemblyman Yeager:

The revised effective date was agreed upon by the sponsor and interested parties. I think the bill addresses this issue appropriately. Consumer litigation funding transactions are not loan products, but are unique products that may or may not get repaid. I appreciate that we are not trying to fit this product into an existing chapter of NRS that regulates traditional loans.

There is an error in the mock-up in section 31, subsection 1, paragraph (c) [page 15, [Exhibit N](#)]. The language "prorated on the basis of the licensing year" should be the only language stricken from this paragraph, or else there is no annual fee for the application. I have confirmed with the sponsor that there should be an annual fee, so I ask that "A fee of not less than \$200 and not more than \$1,000" be maintained in section 30, subsection 1, paragraph (c) of the bill.

Wil Keane:

We can revise the mock-up to reflect this change.

Assemblyman Kramer:

To clarify, if a landlord's tenant cannot afford their rent, but has a pending consumer litigation funding transaction, would the landlord have to register as a consumer litigation funding company in order to dismiss the rent until the transaction is approved?

Wil Keane:

The bill would not affect the landlord if he does not take a security interest in the tenant's litigation. The landlord may allow his tenant to not pay rent until the transaction is approved, but the problem is that the landlord does not have a security interest in the proceeds, so the tenant could conceivably take the proceeds and leave.

Chair Spiegel:

To further clarify, this is not a loan; it is a deferred collection.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I will vote the bill out of Committee, but would like to read the final version of the bill. I am happy to support the bill today, but it is very comprehensive, and I would like to reserve the right to change my vote on the floor.

Chair Spiegel:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 432 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Kramer. That concludes our work session. Is there anyone who wishes to provide public comment? [There was no one.] The meeting is adjourned [at 3:28 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Katelyn Malone
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 200 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 208](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 219 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 220 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 385 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 397 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 37 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 86 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 186 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 197 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 371 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 432 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.