MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eightieth Session
March 20, 2019

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:07 a.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2019, 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblywoman Selena Torres
Assemblyman Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Lucas Glanzmann, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alison Brasier, representing Nevada Justice Association
Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Kara Jenkins, Administrator, Nevada Equal Rights Commission, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
Lauren A. Peña, Directing Attorney, Civil Law Self-Help Center, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Susan L. Fisher, representing Nevada State Apartment Association

Chairman Yeager:
[Roll was taken. Committee protocol was explained.] We have two bills on the agenda this morning. At this time, I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 248.

Assembly Bill 248: Prohibits a settlement agreement from containing provisions that prohibit or restrict a party from disclosing certain information. (BDR 2-1004)

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8:
Today, I present Assembly Bill 248 for your consideration. It is in regards to settlement agreements. As a general rule, settlement agreements are useful tools in civil litigation. They have been called the grease that keeps the wheels moving in the civil justice system. They encourage timely resolution of claims and avoid the time and expense of going to trial. Confidentiality provisions in settlement agreements are often referred to as nondisclosure agreements (NDAs). These NDAs were originally developed to be used for reasonable business purposes such as preventing employees from sharing trade secrets. More recently, though, the use of NDAs has received a lot of public attention because they are being used by high-profile individuals accused of sexually assaulting women—including Hollywood producers and a lot of folks we have seen in the news—to shield themselves from being held accountable. These types of NDAs protect serial abusers. They prevent the details from becoming public. I believe they target more vulnerable victims. Not only do they hang consequences over the heads of their victims, but their victims are frequently folks who have a financial need that is being taken advantage of. I believe this further enables that abuse.

Most of these settlement agreements do include a financial settlement between the accuser and accused and bar the victim who is receiving a financial settlement from talking about the

allegations or revealing the amount of the settlement. The penalties for breaking this type of agreement can also be steep. For example, the alleged victim can be forced to pay back the full amount of the settlement in addition to the other party's legal fees.

I am aware there are some advocates who worry that A.B. 248 will make it harder for victims to obtain settlement agreements from their abusers. Given the difficulty of criminally prosecuting sexual assault cases, I understand that sometimes the only legal recourse a victim may have is civil litigation. However, I am here today making a public policy argument that these types of agreements are just inappropriate. The claims, which involve vulnerable victims, felony behavior, and other egregious conduct, create an unfair justice system that is weighted against the victim. That is the background of how we got here today. I believe we need to make a strong public policy argument against exploiting victims who are subject to this kind of behavior.

With that, I will go through the provisions of the bill. It is a pretty straightforward bill. It prohibits restrictions on a party disclosing factual information, but only applies to information regarding a claim that relates to conduct that would constitute a sexual offense that could also be punishable as a felony. It prohibits nondisclosure relating to sexual discrimination by an employer or landlord and also retaliation by an employer or landlord concerning a person reporting sex discrimination. I intentionally made this public policy about this type of behavior, not employment-related behavior and not the type of information that is prohibited in human resources-type NDAs.

A court is prohibited from entering any order that prohibits or restricts the disclosure of such factual information. It allows the accusers to shield their identity along with any facts relating to the action that could lead to the disclosure of their identity. I also thought that it was important to protect these victims. It applies as long as the case does not involve a public agency or public officer because, of course, when you are talking about government agencies, you are talking about transparency and the use of public resources. I think we do have an obligation in those settings to be transparent.

Lastly, this would only apply to those NDAs that are entered in or after July of 2019. I recognize the existence of claims. This is not an effort to go back and revisit situations that are already being looked at or have been looked at in the past. This is just public policy moving forward. I was not interested in making a show of this. This is not about getting attention or fanfare. This is just about advancing public policy to protect victims who might find themselves in these circumstances. With that, I would be happy to answer questions.

Assemblywoman Miller:
I have two questions. First, do you know of any other states where this type of policy—this timely policy—has been introduced? Second, in your mind would there be any exceptions to this that you would find digestible or tolerable?

Assemblyman Frierson:
I am aware that it exists. As a matter of fact, our neighbors to the west recently passed similar legislation. In Nevada, there has been a lot of news. I had thought about it during the last interim. When I saw there was a state acting on it, I thought it was good public policy. I am certainly not reinventing the wheel. I do not recall more than that, but I do know, at least, that California has done this.

As for exceptions, I am certainly open to anything that makes good policy. I recognize this is sensitive, and there is always going to be a class of victims that simply will not come forward. There is always going to be a class of victims that would want to take advantage of the opportunity to obtain a settlement for different reasons. I have discussed this with some stakeholders. I am open to adjustments that would make good policy.

Assemblywoman Backus:
I have been struggling with section 1, subsection 6, paragraph (b). In the agreement, it sounds explicit that the policy is to preclude making certain factual allegations confidential, but there could be other terms of the settlement agreement that could be confidential—for example, the amount that is being paid in exchange for an early settlement. Am I understanding that correctly?

Assemblyman Frierson:
That is correct. The intention is to avoid the victim being shamed by reference to an amount of the settlement. Again, I am open to anything that would improve this.

Assemblyman Daly:
We do not want to condone any bad behavior, let people off the hook, or let people abuse their position and wealth. However, from my point of view, the system may be too far one way, and we may swing it too far the other way. If you are innocent and get accused, you might want a settlement agreement because it is not worth the time and effort to go through a trial. Section 1, subsection 1 says you cannot prohibit a person from disclosing factual information. However, the facts have not been tried. They do not know; it is one story against another. I do not know how that balances out. If I were wrongfully accused, I would fight all the way to acquittal. Otherwise, you would get a settlement, and the person can still say what he thinks the facts were and benefit from the accusation. I am uncomfortable with swinging it too far the other way. I do not know if you can solve that, but that is the issue I see.

Assemblyman Frierson:
It is a balancing act. It is a difficult policy to take everything into consideration. One of the reasons it specifically references felony behavior is because we do not want to open the door to everything. We do want to make sure, when we are talking about serious conduct, these types of agreements are not used against an accuser. Again, it is a tough balancing act. I agree with you that folks are entitled to due process. I think folks should exercise their right to due process, but these things get complicated when you are talking about reputations. I certainly understand that. This is a public policy balance that we have to find. If this body

believes this is worthwhile to pursue in a way that does not unduly take away someone's right to due process, I think it is something worth considering.

Assemblywoman Krasner:
Currently, if somebody has alleged sexual misconduct and the victim's attorney and the perpetrator's attorney decide they want to settle that case, they sign an agreement whereby the victim would get, for example, $2 million, and the alleged perpetrator would not have to go through some type of public embarrassment. Do you see that this bill will now cause people to pursue fewer settlement agreements and cause more cases to go to court relating to this issue?

Assemblyman Frierson:
Yes. I think we are talking about millionaires. I am not talking about settlement agreements involving average folks who are accused of sexual assault; we are talking about folks with means who are treated differently as a result of having those means. That is really the balancing act I was talking about earlier. First, NDAs target vulnerable victims and take advantage of that vulnerability. Second, they are also an opportunity that exists only for those with means. I do not think that is what our system is designed to do.

Assemblywoman Tolles:
I do know this has gained some traction after a lot of media reports over the last couple of years. I did begin to read about other states that are implementing similar policies. In your research, I wonder whether you came across ways this has been implemented in other states and whether this was modeled after some of those other states. It is still fairly new, but if you can, please speak to how it works in those other states.

Assemblyman Frierson:
I have not. The example I have from California was recently passed, so I do not have information on how it has been implemented or whether it has worked. I do know there are other states that have started to implement this. California was the example I had. I am happy to follow up with some research on the other states and whether there have been problems with implementing or enforcing it.

Assemblywoman Tolles:
If this passes, I would imagine it is something with which we can continue to collaborate with other states to see if there are other ways to strike that balance. I am curious if you can give more clarification on the landlord situation and what led to the inclusion of that in this bill.

Assemblyman Frierson:
The landlord piece was a reflection of the exercise of authority over someone. I believe we have seen examples in other states. Again, we are talking about someone vulnerable. If it is a roof over your head and there is a landlord who has taken advantage of you, what more can they take from you than that roof over your head? I think that dynamic of the power difference is the reason that was included. It was included in other states as well.

Assemblywoman Hansen:
I have a question regarding section 1, subsection 1. It says, "A settlement agreement must not contain a provision that prohibits or otherwise restricts a party from disclosing factual information relating to a claim in a civil or administrative action." Say the alleged does have a lot of money. I am wondering if the victim is then being pushed into a court proceeding because the alleged says he will take this to court and not settle since he will not be protected anyway. I can see how it might be almost a vindictive thing. That is just a thought I had.

Assemblyman Frierson:
Again, I understand it is a tough balancing act. I think there are a couple of issues that mitigate that concern. In particular, the system is dependent on a victim coming forward. A victim does not have to come forward. This does not require that a victim do anything in that regard. In my opinion, the vindictiveness is more related to the underlying conduct of sexual assault. If a victim did not want to come forward and go through the court proceeding, they would not have to.

I also want to comment that we are talking about this today because NDAs have existed that prevented victims from being able to have their day in court with an attorney because they entered into an agreement with this power difference. That is why we are talking about it today. We would not be talking about it if there were not victims out there who felt as though they were rushed or somehow convinced—in a way that was not in their best interest—to sign an agreement and not have the opportunity to tell their story. I do not want to overstate how difficult the balance is. I acknowledge it is not an easy set of circumstances to figure out how to move forward in the best way. I think it is certainly worthwhile having a conversation about it.

Assemblywoman Hansen:
I appreciate your recognition that it is a balance. I can appreciate that we are trying to get to a solution without tipping the cart to harm any parties that are innocent. I think all of us worry sometimes that we do not have the resources in court for things to continue and be dragged out. That would be my concern. We should watch out for that.

Chairman Yeager:
Are there any more questions from Committee members? [There were none.] At this time, I will open it up for testimony in support of A.B. 248.

Alison Brasier, representing Nevada Justice Association:
We are here to give our support for the bill.

Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:
We represent low-income and vulnerable Nevadans. While we may not necessarily have statistics about how often we see these cases, we do see NDAs abused quite a bit to create a power imbalance or to emphasize a power imbalance where one exists. I would encourage you to pull *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 179D.097. I think the crimes listed there are

things that you would not want someone to be able to pay someone off to not come forward. They are pretty serious criminal offenses: date rapes, sexual assaults, and sexual abuses against a child. They are things you would hope people would come forward to tell the police and allow our justice system to work. We see that this tool of an NDA often prevents that access to justice because somebody has the means to prevent somebody from having that access to justice. While a victim might—in the moment—feel the money may be more useful; in the end, it is often used to keep them as victims and can allow the perpetrator to victimize other people. We strongly support Speaker Frierson's intent here and appreciate his bringing this bill.

Assemblyman Roberts:
Would there be a reason that claimants would sign an agreement and not want their abuser to not be able to talk about it? Would we be taking away any protections from the victim? If they sign an agreement and they can talk about it, would there be a reason the victim would not want the person to be prohibited from talking about it?

Bailey Bortolin:
I do not want to speak on behalf of all victims and victim advocates. I understand the concern. I can say a victim often does not have that type of power over somebody who has done something to them. They would not have the power to make the person who has wronged them remain silent, not use it in a power imbalance, or to hold it over the victim's head. Oftentimes, when I think about the victims we represent, the reality is that a mother is more likely to move to California to get away from an abuser than to assume a piece of paper will have power over him. Does the situation exist? Probably, but it is not the day-to-day reality I see for victims.

Chairman Yeager:
I will add to that. I think the situation we are in now is that when these agreements are signed, the victim cannot say anything about what happened without violating the terms of the settlement agreement. Usually there is a clawback provision in there that if the person violates the terms, they have to pay back the settlement, sometimes with penalties and interest. I think what this bill would do is say you cannot put that term in one of these agreements. It would still be up to the victims to decide whether they want to say anything about it. This bill does not require them to go to the authorities or talk about it. It simply says that cannot be a term of the settlement agreement. I think there is still some autonomy there. Each individual in the situation would have the right to determine in his or her best interest what they want to do with that information. The way it exists now, if that provision is in there, they simply cannot say anything without violating the agreement.

Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
I just want to touch on something. I was involved in a settlement agreement where confidentiality was a factor. It has remained confidential for six years. After six years, it is no longer confidential. You might want to look into that part of it and maybe amend it. Maybe after six years, the victim can publicly speak. You do not know in the future if that

same person is going to do it ten years down the road. Now she can publicly come out and say, Hey! Just a thought.

Chairman Yeager:
Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 248? [There was no one.] Is there anyone opposed? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in neutral?

Kara Jenkins, Administrator, Nevada Equal Rights Commission, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:
The Nevada Equal Rights Commission (NERC) has jurisdiction over complaints of employment discrimination based on sex—which includes sexual harassment—for any employer with 15 or more employees. For anyone who is working for an employer who has fewer than 15 employees, we do not have jurisdiction. How we settle these cases is through a settlement agreement where we do use confidentiality provisions. We are also already protected under NRS 233.190 from disclosing it. There are also provisions in NRS that prohibit both parties from discussing their settlement. In my neutral testimony here, I would like a little bit more clarification. The Clark County Board of Commissioners does have some of the same questions that some of the members have expressed, especially when you are talking about administrative actions in the language.

We understand that criminal matters of sexual assault would carry with it penalties of criminal liability that would not deal with an administrative agency, such as NERC, taking complaints of discrimination based on sex and settling them. We already have provisions of confidentiality, and we have NRS 233.190 which prohibits folks from speaking of the terms—especially NERC. We would need our deputy attorney general to weigh in on this. Perhaps once I speak to our deputy attorney general, we might suggest some friendly amendments to exclude NERC from this particular bill should it pass. We seem to already have our framework, and it also mirrors that of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's way of settling complaints of sexual harassment in the workplace—again, for an employer with 15 or more employees. That is not speaking for victims who may only work for a small company of 14 or fewer employees. I do not want to disclaim that or the criminality of sexual assault. However, NERC is trying to understand where we fit into this and how it would jibe with what we already have in place.

Chairman Yeager:
When you get a chance to talk to your deputy attorney general, I would recommend that you or that person contact Speaker Frierson to get some of those questions answered. That would be helpful. We will not work session this bill any time soon, so you will have at least a week to get some of those questions answered.

Susan Meuschke, Executive Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:
I am here today to testify as neutral on A.B. 248. First, we appreciate and applaud the Speaker's intent to remove this shield of money from wealthy perpetrators of sexual harassment and assault. If a perpetrator believes he or she can buy the victim's silence, it is

more likely for the crime and abuse to continue. However, as has been raised in this Committee, we also have concerns about a total ban. For some victims, this may be the most important way they can move forward. We have talked with Speaker Frierson to make sure he is aware of our concerns. We will be sharing some thoughts about ways to move forward. California is the only state that has passed similar legislation. Texas is thinking about it. We would be blazing some new trails, and I think we can figure out a way to get this right. There is a way, and we want to be a part of that.

Chairman Yeager:
Is there anyone else in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 248. [(Exhibit C) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 266.

Assembly Bill 266: Revises provisions governing the sealing of records relating to evictions. (BDR 3-809)

This bill was brought forward by Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod. Unfortunately, she cannot join us in Committee, but we have Ms. Bortolin here to present the bill on her behalf.

Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:
As the Chairman said, I will do my best Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod impression. I want to introduce the bill. It is actually a fairly simple cleanup bill from a bill we brought last session to seal eviction records.

Most evictions happen because renters cannot or do not pay their rent. Unfortunately, it has been found that most poor renting families spend at least half of their income on housing costs, with one in four of those families spending over 70 percent of their income just on rent and utilities costs. When looking at who is most at risk of eviction, it has been found that low-income women—particularly those involved in domestic violence, as well as families with children, are at high risk. The outcome of evictions can be detrimental and have a lasting negative impact on the entire family. In addition to losing a home and often possessions, a legal eviction comes with a court record. This record can prevent families from relocating to other housing because most landlords screen for evictions.

According to the Eviction Lab at Princeton University, in 2016, Nevada had a 3.41 percent eviction rate, which means there were 36.83 evictions per day, totaling 13,478 per year. This is a 1.07 percent higher rate than the United States average. When looking at rankings for top evicting cities in the United States, North Las Vegas ranks 28th with a 5.82 percent eviction rate. This means that 5.82 households in 100 renter homes are evicted each year. There were 1,720 evictions in 2016, which amounts to 4.71 households evicted every day in North Las Vegas.

In 2019, we brought Assembly Bill 107 of the 79th Session, which passed, to provide that the eviction case court file in any action for summary eviction is automatically sealed if the summary eviction is denied or dismissed by the court or the landlord fails to file an affidavit of the complaint. Before the passage of this bill, even if you were successful as a tenant in eviction court, that case would still appear on your history and it would be very difficult to move forward from that history when you try to rent in the future.

This is a simple cleanup bill. We have had some problems with implementation and rollout that we think can be easily fixed. We are operating off of an amendment that is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) (Exhibit D).

Chairman Yeager:
I should have mentioned there is an amendment to this bill on NELIS (Exhibit D), and I did confirm with Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod that it is a friendly amendment.

Lauren A. Peña, Directing Attorney, Civil Law Self-Help Center, Legal Aid of Southern Nevada:
We provide a free service in which we provide forms, legal information, and resources to members of the public who find themselves unrepresented in the Clark County court system. We see 50,000 customers per year, and a great percentage of them are looking for answers to their landlord-tenant questions. I am here today as an attorney who assists low-income individuals with those landlord-tenant issues on a daily basis. As Ms. Bortolin referred to, the eviction record-sealing bill that passed in 2017 made it so that tenants could apply for housing without having to worry about their eviction record. Having even meritorious convictions on their history made it so that landlords would hold that against them.

Briefly, I want to remark that the eviction-sealing law that passed has been tremendously successful, and we have heard wonderful stories at the Self-Help Center about its rewards. We had one particularly memorable tenant who came back. She had fought habitability issues with her landlord several months in a row. She ultimately won all of her cases, but she had an eviction record. When she was applying for housing, this record would come up, and—even though she had won—landlords saw her as a tenant who knew her rights and was not afraid to use them. She became attached to these eviction cases when she was really the true victim. After the law passed in 2017, she successfully moved to seal her records and came back to the Self-Help Center to thank the staff for their part in helping her. On behalf of her and all the tenants who were positively affected, I pass along that thanks to you.

This bill before you today is a cleanup bill. It addresses some unintended consequences. First, the law, as it is written right now, automatically seals a case after an eviction is denied. The issue created was that landlords lost their opportunity to appeal or move to set aside a denial without first unsealing the eviction case. This bill and the amendment allow for the passage of ten days—which is the appeal time for summary eviction—before the case is automatically sealed. We believe this language resolves that issue for the landlords. Secondly, the current law does not seal from public record constables' or sheriffs' public databases which reveal to the public when a notice is issued at all. The language of the bill

does make it so that constables' and sheriffs' websites are now sealed from public record in terms of the eviction notices. Again, that is with the intention of making it so that tenants are not being discriminated against just for having had an issue noticed against them.

We worked with the Nevada State Apartment Association. We also communicated with Las Vegas Justice Court Judge Melissa Saragosa, and she collaborated communication with Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction and the Nevada Real Estate Division. The language of the amendment before you represents the friendly collaboration between all of those parties. We want to thank everyone for their support and work on this language. I am happy to answer any questions and I urge your support.

Assemblywoman Backus:
Are you seeing the automatic sealing of the cases, or are you having to actually file motions after a summary eviction is denied?

Lauren Peña:
The cases are automatically sealed. As soon as the denial is entered, the case is removed from public record.

Assemblyman Roberts:
I have a question regarding situations where we might have a problem landlord who continually files false evictions that get denied. If we seal the records, are we still able to track those folks in the industry who are wrongfully attempting evictions? Once we eliminate the records, if you have people doing things they should not be doing, are we still able to track them?

Lauren Peña:
I cannot speak on behalf of the court administration. However, I do know there are available reports that show which landlords are commonly filing cases. I do know there is an opportunity for tenants to move to unseal a case, which does happen. Landlords also have that opportunity. That happens often. They move to unseal a case so they can gather the minutes and use that later in a small claims case, for example. Again, I do not want to speak for the court administration, but I do believe there are ways to track who is filing and for what reasons.

Assemblyman Roberts:
Basically, the records still exist, and we still have the ability to get at them in some shape or form?

Lauren Peña:
Yes. As far as I can tell, there is a way for it to be unsealed. There is a record somewhere; it is just not accessible to the public.

Chairman Yeager:
I just want to confirm. I think it was clear in the presentation, but it sounds as though this bill attempts to build off the bill from last session. We do not want unsuccessful attempts at evictions to haunt a tenant. When we talk about the sealing or making things confidential, it is in situations where the eviction is not successful—whether it is because the court dismissed the action, denied the action, or the landlord did not follow through with the filing of an affidavit in a timely manner. Is that correct?

Lauren Peña:
Yes, that is exactly correct. It is intended to protect tenants from having eviction records that were meritorious haunt them for no good reason.

Chairman Yeager:
Are there other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open it up for testimony in support. [There was none.] Is there anyone opposed? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral?

Susan L. Fisher, representing Nevada State Apartment Association:
We are neutral on the bill. We did have some concerns as it was introduced, but we appreciate Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod and both Clark County and Washoe Legal Services working with us to address our concerns. We are cool.

Chairman Yeager:
Is there anyone else neutral? [There was no one.] At this time, we will close the hearing on A.B. 266. Would anyone like to give public comment? [There was no one.] We are going to start at 8 a.m. tomorrow. We have Assemblyman Fumo's bill dealing with bail. For Friday, we have two bills on the agenda so far. We will likely have a work session on Friday with a handful of bills just to keep things moving along. With that being said, I hope everyone has a fantastic day. This meeting is adjourned [at 8:55 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Lucas Glanzmann
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A is the Agenda.

Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

Exhibit C is written testimony dated March 20, 2019, submitted by Caroline Mello Roberson, State Director, National Abortion Rights Action League Pro-Choice Nevada, in support of Assembly Bill 248.

Exhibit D is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 266, submitted by Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers.