

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

**Eighty-First Session  
May 14, 2021**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Sandra Jauregui at 12:17 p.m. on Friday, May 14, 2021, Online and in Room 4100 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/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran  
Assemblyman Edgar Flores  
Assemblyman Jason Frierson  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez  
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst  
Sam Quast, Committee Counsel  
Terri McBride, Committee Manager  
Paris Smallwood, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

None

**Chair Jauregui:**

[Roll was called.] Members, I think everyone is familiar with our housekeeping items. I am going to skip those so that we can get straight into our agenda items. We only have a couple of items on our agenda: work session and public comment. We can move straight into our work session. We are going to take everything in order with the exception of Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint). Senator Spearman has requested that we take that last so that she can be present and hopes that the Senate floor session ends so that she can make it here. With that, I will turn it over to our policy analyst, Ms. Paslov-Thomas, to walk us through Senate Bill 44.

**Senate Bill 44: Revises provisions governing behavioral health professionals.  
(BDR 54-428)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The first bill is Senate Bill 44, and it revises provisions governing behavioral health professionals [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit C]. It is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor on behalf of the Rural Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board. It was heard on May 5, 2021. Senate Bill 44 revises provisions concerning the administration and licensure of certain behavioral health professions. The bill authorizes certain behavioral health licensing boards to issue a temporary provisional license to an applicant who meets certain requirements. The bill requires the Legislative Committee on Health Care (LCHC) to study the licensing practices of behavioral health licensing boards and identify barriers to licensure. The bill further requires behavioral health licensing boards to implement strategies to eliminate each barrier identified, unless a barrier is deemed necessary to maintain the quality of services provided by licensed behavioral health professionals. In addition, the bill makes various changes to the Board of Examiners for Social Workers, including:

- Authorizing the Board to issue a license as a master social worker to an applicant who possesses a master's or doctoral degree in social work and meets certain other requirements;
- Authorizing a master and independent social worker to engage in clinical social work as part of an approved internship program;
- Authorizing the Board to issue a license to an applicant who has graduated from a foreign college or university if the applicant submits certain documentation and meets other licensure requirements;
- Authorizing the Board to refuse to issue a license if an applicant has committed an act that constitutes grounds for initiating disciplinary action or

entered certain pleas or been convicted of a crime that demonstrates an applicant's unfitness to engage in social work; and

- Making it a misdemeanor to practice as a social worker unless appropriately licensed.

There are five proposed amendments by Senator Goicoechea, and there is a mock-up attached behind the bill pages [pages 2 through 40, [Exhibit C](#)]. This mock-up is different than the one that was referenced during the Committee hearing. The mock-up below actually includes what is being proposed in the amendments:

1. Amend the bill to revise provisions concerning the issuance of an expedited license by endorsement by the Board of Psychological Examiners pursuant to Chapter 641 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), the Board of Examiners for Marriage and Family Therapists and Clinical Professional Counselors pursuant to Chapter 641A of NRS, the Board of Examiners for Social Workers pursuant to Chapter 641B of NRS, and the Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors pursuant to Chapter 641C of NRS, for the purpose of:
  - a. Combining sections governing expedited licensure or certification by endorsement for a general applicant with sections governing licensure or certification by endorsement for an active member, or the spouse of an active member, of the Armed Forces of the United States, a veteran, or the surviving spouse of a veteran;
  - b. Revising certain requirements for issuing an expedited license by endorsement;
  - c. Authorizing the applicable boards to grant a provisional license at any time before making a final decision on an application for a license by endorsement in accordance with regulations adopted by the regulatory body; and
  - d. Making conforming changes so that active members or the spouses of active members of the Armed Forces of the United States, veterans, and the surviving spouses of veterans continue to receive reductions in fees.
2. Amend the bill to add new provisions to Chapters 641, 641A, 641B, and 641C of NRS to require the applicable boards to provide an alternate means for an applicant to submit official transcripts if: (1) the college or university from which the applicant graduated has closed or merged with another institution; and (2) the provision of official transcripts by ordinary means is not available or possible.
3. Amend the bill to add new provisions to Chapters 641, 641A, 641B, and 641C of NRS requiring the applicable boards to adopt regulations authorizing remote supervision, including electronic supervision, and prescribing standards for such remote supervision.

4. Amend sections 3, 6, 12, and 24 of the bill to: (1) require each board to submit the specified report to the chair of each regional behavioral health policy board; and (2) authorize the report to be submitted in a written format.
5. Delete section 32 of the bill, which requires the LCHC to study the processes of licensure or certification in professions regulated by those licensing boards and identify barriers for licensure or certification.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions on the bill or amendments before you?

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

In the original mock-up we had section 2, subsection 5, paragraph (d), that added the requirement to put prohibited crimes on the website, and I see that in this mock-up that is not there. I just wanted to confirm that has been removed.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Correct, we did get that section removed. I shared the same concerns that you had, Assemblywoman Tolles. When I submitted the request to our Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau and our policy analyst, too, I had the same questions when I saw the work session document to make sure that all the sections where we all had concerns—Vice Chair Carlton, myself, and you—were taken care of.

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I would accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 44.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS SENATE BILL 44.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Kasama. Next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 75 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 75 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to unemployment compensation. (BDR 53-349)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 75 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to unemployment compensation [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit D]. It is sponsored by the Senate Committee on

Commerce and Labor on behalf of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and was heard on May 12, 2021. Senate Bill 75 (1st Reprint) makes various changes to the administration of the Nevada unemployment compensation program, including:

- Revising provisions concerning the weekly benefit amount for unemployment compensation;
- Establishing requirements for determining the eligibility for unemployment benefits for persons who provide services in multiple capacities for educational institutions in accordance with federal guidance;
- Providing that, for the second and third quarters of 2020, all contributory employing units will not have benefits charged against their experience rating records and for the second, third, and fourth calendar quarters of 2020, reimbursements in lieu of contributions will be reduced as allowed by federal law;
- Authorizing an extended benefits period to begin before the fourteenth week following the end of a prior extended benefits period, if authorized by the United States Department of Labor;
- Revising requirements for the payment of certain refunds;
- Prohibiting the State of Nevada from being charged fees of any kind in a proceeding under the Unemployment Compensation Law;
- Revising provisions concerning the confidentiality of information related to unemployment compensation and the circumstances under which the administrator of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation is authorized to disclose such information in accordance with federal law; and
- Authorizing the administrator to send, by electronic transmission, certain communications related to unemployment compensation.

Christopher Sewell, Chief Operating Officer, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, proposes the following amendments:

1. Amend section 5.5 of the bill to replace "the United States Department of Labor" with "federal law."
2. Amend subsection 2 of section 19.5 of the bill to require the amount of payment, by way of reimbursement in lieu of contributions, due by an employer who has elected to make payments, by way of reimbursement in lieu of contributions, to be reduced by an amount of state liability relief for the weeks of unemployment beginning on or

after March 13, 2020, at an amount prescribed by the administrator. Require the administrator to determine such amount so as to utilize all available relief pursuant to section 903(i) of the Social Security Act of 1935 and result in such employers owing no amount for the weeks that such relief is available.

John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office, and Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office, propose the following amendments:

1. Amend section 3 of the bill to require the administrator, in response to a request from a court official with subpoena authority and in compliance with federal law, furnish certain information concerning persons who receive benefits for use in the selection of trial jurors.
2. Delete section 19 of the bill.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, is there any discussion on the bill or amendments before you? [There was none.] I would accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 75 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 75 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Martinez. Next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 141 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 141 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-44)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 141 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to public works [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit E]. It is sponsored by Senator Brooks and was heard on May 7, 2021. Senate Bill 141 (1st Reprint) removes the prospective June 30, 2021, expiration of the authority for public bodies to enter into contracts with construction managers at risk, therefore making the authorization permanent. The bill also revises the type of work that is included in the definitions of "horizontal construction" and "vertical construction." There are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Is there any discussion on the bill before you? [There was none.] I would accept a motion to do pass Senate Bill 141 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 141 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Dickman. Next on the agenda is Senate Bill 179 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 179 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to sign language interpreting and realtime captioning. (BDR 54-386)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 179 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to sign language interpreting and real-time captioning [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit F](#)]. It is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults With Special Needs. It was heard on May 12, 2021. Senate Bill 179 (1st Reprint) makes various changes to provisions governing the practice of sign language interpreting. Among other things, the bill:

- Replaces the term "practice of interpreting" with the term "practice of sign language interpreting" and revises the definition of that term;
- Replaces the term "certification" with the term "credentialing" in provisions governing the qualifications of sign language interpreters and real-time captioning providers;
- Establishes qualifications for registration to engage in the practice of sign language interpreting in a primary or secondary educational setting or a community setting and establishes provisional registration requirements for interpreters who do not meet the proposed standards for registration with a 3-year time frame for them to improve their knowledge and skills to meet such requirements;
- Requires the Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) of the Department of Health and Human Services to adopt, by regulation, qualifications for professional mentors of interpreters;

- Authorizes the ADSD to adopt regulations establishing professional classifications of the practice of sign language interpreting that are in addition to existing statutory standards; and
- Removes the exemption from registration requirements for persons who engage in the practice of sign language interpreting or the practice of real-time captioning solely for meetings of nonprofit civic organizations.

Finally, the bill establishes that an interpreter who is registered to practice sign language interpreting as of July 1, 2021, but does not meet the requirements established by this bill, is to be issued a provisional registration that expires on July 1, 2024.

Brad Keating, Ed.D, Director of Government Relations, Clark County School District, proposes the following amendment:

1. Amend section 18 of the bill to change the expiration date of a provisional registration issued pursuant to this section from July 1, 2024, to July 1, 2026.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions about the bill before you? [There were none.] I would accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 179 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 179 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Marzola. The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 181 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 181 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to alcohol and drug counselors. (BDR 54-558)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 181 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to alcohol and drug counselors [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit G](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Goicoechea, et al. and was heard on May 5, 2021. Senate Bill 181 (1st Reprint) consolidates the postgraduate counseling program requirements for licensure as a clinical alcohol and drug counselor into a single program consisting of at least 3,000 hours. The bill allows a licensed clinical professional counselor who meets certain requirements to be licensed as a clinical alcohol



and drug counselor. The bill also reduces from 4,000 to 3,000 the minimum hours of supervised counseling of persons with alcohol and other substance use disorders that are required for licensure as an alcohol and drug counselor. There are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, is there any discussion on the bill before you? [There was none.] I would take a motion to do pass Senate Bill 181 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 181 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Tolles. Next item on the agenda is Senate Bill 184 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 184 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the practice of medicine.  
(BDR 54-25)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 184 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to the practice of medicine [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit H](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Hardy. It was heard on May 3, 2021. Senate Bill 184 (1st Reprint) authorizes the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine to issue a license to certain applicants who completed two or three years of postgraduate residency training and received a medical degree from a medical school in the United States or from a foreign medical school, as applicable. The bill allows these medical boards to issue a special volunteer medical license to such applicants and exempts these applicants from the general requirements for licensure as a physician. In addition, the bill exempts an applicant for a license to practice medicine who has completed three years of postgraduate residency training and graduated from a foreign medical school from the requirement that the graduate must have passed the examination given by the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates.

In addition, the bill makes various changes relating to the licensure and regulation of physician assistants (PA) by the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine, including:

- Prohibiting the boards from requiring that a PA receive or maintain certification by the National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants to satisfy any continuing education requirements for the renewal of a license;

- Providing that provisions governing allopathic and osteopathic medicine do not apply to the performance of medical services by a student enrolled in an accredited PA educational program or a PA performing his or her official duties as part of any division or department of the United States unless licensure by a state is required by such division or department;
- Establishing provisions for a PA to obtain a simultaneous license from the licensing boards of allopathic and osteopathic medicine and requires the fees for a simultaneous license to be half the fee each board would charge for a person licensed by only one board; and
- Requiring the respective boards to supply a list to each other of all PAs who are licensed by the respective boards.

Assemblywoman Jauregui proposes the following amendment:

1. Delete sections 2 and 24 of the bill, which authorize the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine to issue a license to practice medicine or a license to practice osteopathic medicine, respectively, to certain persons.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, is there any discussion on the bill or amendment before you? [There was none.] I would take a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 184 (1st Reprint)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 184 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Considine. We will move past Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint) and save that for the last work session bill. We are going to jump into Senate Bill 190 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 190 (1st Reprint): Provides for the dispensing of self-administered hormonal contraceptives. (BDR 54-3)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 190 (1st Reprint) provides for the dispensing of self-administered hormonal contraceptives [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit I](#)]. It is sponsored by

Senators Cannizzaro, Ratti, Lange, Dondero Loop, and Scheible, and Assembly members Torres, Nguyen, Gorelow, Marzola, and Flores, et al. It was heard on May 10, 2021.

Senate Bill 190 (1st Reprint) requires the state's chief medical officer to issue a standing order allowing a pharmacist to dispense self-administered hormonal contraceptives in accordance with a protocol established by the State Board of Health. In order to dispense such contraceptives, a pharmacist must provide a risk assessment questionnaire to the person requesting such contraceptive, create a record, provide the patient with certain information, and comply with relevant regulations and guidelines. The State Board of Pharmacy may suspend or revoke the certificate of a pharmacist who does not comply with these requirements.

The State Board of Pharmacy and the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services must post on a website a list of pharmacies that dispense self-administered contraceptives under the standing order. Finally, the bill requires certain health insurers to cover self-administered hormonal contraceptives dispensed by a pharmacist.

Senator Cannizzaro proposes the following amendments and a mock-up is attached [pages 2 through 32, [Exhibit I](#)].

1. Delete section 8, which requires: (1) the chief medical officer to issue a standing order to allow a pharmacist to dispense a self-administered hormonal contraceptive to any patient; and (2) the State Board of Health to prescribe a protocol for dispensing a self-administered hormonal contraceptive. Instead, require the State Board of Pharmacy to adopt certain regulations establishing a protocol to allow a pharmacist to dispense a self-administered hormonal contraceptive to any patient. Make conforming changes throughout the bill to account for the deletion of section 8 and the establishment of the protocol by the State Board of Pharmacy.
2. Add Assemblywoman Considine as a cosponsor to the bill.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, is there any discussion on the bill or the amendment?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I still have some concerns, especially about minor children getting birth control dispensed without seeing a doctor. I am going to be a no right now; I might change on the floor.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I would accept a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 190 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO  
PASS SENATE BILL 190 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CONSIDINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN CARLTON AND DICKMAN VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Considine. Next on our agenda, we have Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to applied behavior analysis. (BDR 54-533)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint) revises provisions related to applied behavior analysis [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit J]. It is sponsored by Senator Seevers Gansert and it was heard on May 5, 2021. Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint) transfers full responsibility and authority for the regulation of behavior analysts, assistant behavior analysts, and registered behavior technicians from the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services to the Board of Applied Behavior Analysis. The measure makes certain changes to ensure the Board processes applications, investigates complaints, adjudicates contested cases, imposes discipline, and operates in generally the same manner as other boards regulating health care professionals. Further, S.B. 217 (R1) revises requirements related to the supervision of assistant behavior analysts and behavior technicians. The bill includes "Board Certified Behavior Analyst-Doctoral" within the definition of behavior analyst and makes other changes concerning the practice of applied behavior analysis.

Senator Seevers Gansert proposes the following amendment:

1. Amend section 55 of the bill to remove provisions requiring the Board to prescribe, by regulation, fees for the issuance, renewal, and reinstatement of a license or registration and any other service provided by the Board. Instead require the Board to establish a schedule of fees and charges for certain specified items relating to licensing and registration with certain specified maximum amounts, which are based on the type of fees and amounts currently charged by the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services as set forth in section 10 of Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) File R045-19 Board of Applied Behavior Analysis, with the following exceptions:
  - a. Set the maximum amount of a fee that may be charged for the biennial renewal or reinstatement of:

- i. A license as a licensed behavior analyst at \$550;
  - ii. A license as a licensed assistant behavior analyst at \$425; and
  - iii. A registration as a registered behavior technician at \$100.
- b. Do not include a fee for an examination for licensure as a behavior analyst or assistant behavior analyst.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Before I go to members for questions on the bill, I know I got my question answered. Just to put this on the record, it was my request, and Vice Chair Carlton's concern, too, that we add the fees to statute. I know we only see some fees listed here, but the amendment that was requested would require that all their fees be in *Nevada Revised Statutes*, correct?

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas:**

Correct. They are the ones you see in section 10 of the regulations.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any other questions on the bill or amendment before you? [There were none.] I would look for a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS SENATE BILL 217 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Duran. Next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to apprenticeships.  
(BDR 53-575)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to apprenticeships [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit K](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Dondero Loop and was heard on May 7, 2021. Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint) revises existing requirements regarding registered apprenticeship programs to conform to federal laws and regulations. The bill prohibits the State Apprenticeship Council of the Office of Workforce Innovation in the Office of the Governor from approving a program proposed for a skilled trade when there is already a program approved for that skilled trade, unless the new program requires the completion of at least as many hours of on-the-job learning or at least the same number and

quality of skills as all existing programs. Finally, the bill prescribes elements the Council is required to consider when determining whether to approve or reject such a program. There are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions on the bill before you? [There were none.] I would look for a motion to do pass Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 247 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I was looking for an amendment on the very last sentence in Senate Bill 247 (1st Reprint) because that was the one we asked some questions about and had some concerns about. I still have some concerns even though I appreciate the discussion, so for those reasons I am going to be voting no.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, is there any other discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN, KASAMA,  
O'NEILL, AND TOLLES VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY  
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Carlton. Next on our agenda, we have Senate Bill 269.

**Senate Bill 269: Revises provisions relating to dental insurance. (BDR 57-817)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 269 revises provisions relating to dental insurance [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit L](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Kieckhefer, et al. It was heard on May 3, 2021. Senate Bill 269 requires certain health insurers who provide dental coverage—including state and local governmental employer-based plans—to provide a written notice to a dentist of any attempt to recover an overpayment, other than a duplicate payment. The bill also requires dental insurers to establish written procedures allowing a dentist to challenge an attempt to recover an overpayment. Dental insurers are prohibited from attempting to recover an overpayment more than 12 months after the date of the overpayment except in certain circumstances. The bill also prohibits certain dental insurers—including state and local governmental employer-based plans—from refusing to pay a claim for which preauthorization was granted except in certain circumstances.

Paul J. Klein, M.B.A., Government Relations and Public Affairs, TriStrategies, proposes the following amendment:

Amend subsection 1(g) of section 5 and subsection 1(g) of section 11 to delete the requirement that, in order to deny a claim for which prior authorization was granted because the insured was not eligible to receive the dental care for which the claim was made, the dental insurer or administrator must not have known of the eligibility status of the insured and could not have discovered the eligibility status of the insured through reasonable care.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Carlton:**

This amendment reads a little wonky, but I believe it actually gets to the point. The Committee had concerns about folks going in, eligibility and prior authorization are not necessarily the same thing; they are not all in real time. I think this addresses the issue to make sure that the dental practitioner knows the rules of the road and the patient knows the rules of the road when they go in to get these procedures taken care of. I am really hoping this says what I think it says.

**Chair Jauregui:**

At this time, I would look for a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 269.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS SENATE BILL 269.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblyman O'Neill. Next on our agenda, we have Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to workers' compensation. (BDR 53-713)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to workers' compensation [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit M]. It is sponsored by Senator Harris and was heard on May 7, 2021. Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint) revises various provisions concerning workers' compensation. The bill prohibits an apportionment of percentages of disabilities



where no rating evaluation was performed for the previous disability unless the insurer proves by a preponderance of the evidence that certain specific medical evidence supports a specific percentage of previous disability. The bill further prohibits any reduction of the percentage of present impairment if no medical documentation or health care records of a preexisting impairment exist, unless certain evidentiary requirements are satisfied. The bill also requires an insurer to commence making installment payments to an injured employee within a specified period of time and without requiring the employee to elect a method of payment, for that portion of an award of compensation for permanent partial disability which is not in dispute. The bill further requires an insurer to send its determination by facsimile or electronic transmission to a claimant if requested and provides for the tolling of certain periods to request a hearing or appeal if the insurer fails to send a determination regarding a claim for compensation.

In addition, the bill authorizes a physician assistant or an advanced practice registered nurse to examine a patient for the purpose of ascertaining the character and extent of an injury and to file a claim for compensation for an industrial injury or occupational disease. A claim for compensation may be signed with the original or electronic signature of the injured employee and the treating health care provider. Further, the bill authorizes a person's compensation payable or paid for an industrial injury or occupational disease may be subject to an attorney's lien. Finally, the bill revises certain requirements governing the appointment of a vocational rehabilitation counselor for an injured employee. There are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint)? [There were none.] I would look for a motion to do pass Senate Bill 289 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 289 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CONSIDINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Considine. Next on our agenda, we have Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to professions. (BDR 54-669)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to professions [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit N]. It is sponsored by Senators Brooks and Spearman and was heard on



May 5, 2021. Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint) provides for the regulation by the State Contractors' Board of contractors who install residential photovoltaic systems used to produce electricity and includes:

- Responsibilities of a contractor who installs a residential photovoltaic system;
- Required components of a written contract for such an installation;
- Consumers' rights;
- Authorization for the adoption of certain regulations by the State Contractors' Board;
- Involvement of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada;
- Restrictions on advertising and solicitations and a requirement for the State Contractors' Board to adopt further regulations on advertising;
- Conditions under which such contracts are deemed unenforceable or void;
- Applicability of statutes related to deceptive trade practices and enforcement by the Office of the Attorney General; and
- Enforcement authorities of the State Contractors' Board.

There are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint)? [There were none.] I would accept a motion to do pass Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 303 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblyman Flores. Next on the agenda, we have Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to the sale of alcoholic beverages. (BDR 52-945)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint) revises provisions related to the sale of alcoholic beverages [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit O](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Dondero Loop and it was heard on May 10, 2021. Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint) makes various changes to the regulation of brew pubs, craft distilleries, suppliers, and wholesalers. The bill requires a supplier to approve any assignment, sale, or transfer of wholesaler's stock or assets within 30 days after receiving a notice of the transaction, if the person to be substituted under the terms of the franchise meets certain reasonable standards. The bill expands certain provisions imposed on suppliers by prohibiting certain conduct in relation to wholesalers.

In addition, the bill authorizes a person who operates one or more brew pubs to manufacture and sell an additional 20,000 barrels of malt beverages to a wholesaler located outside of this state, subject to periodic auditing by the Department of Taxation. Further, S.B. 307 (R1) requires that a person who possesses, sells, or transports liquor be duly designated by the supplier or to have purchased the liquor from certain authorized sources. Finally, the bill provides that a person who enters this state with one gallon or less of alcoholic beverage per month, for household or personal use, is exempt from licensing requirements.

Alfredo T. Alonso, Principal, Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie, LLP, proposes the following amendments:

1. Amend section 1 of the bill to: (1) change the time in which a supplier is required to approve a specified transaction from 30 days to 60 days; (2) require approval or denial to be in writing and, if denied, require the writing to state the material reasons for the denial; and (3) provide that the failure to approve or deny within 60 days has the effect of approving the request.
2. Amend subsection 9 of section 3 of the bill to remove the provisions prohibiting a supplier from requiring a wholesaler to keep a certain minimum inventory. Instead, prohibit a supplier from requiring a wholesaler to make payment for the purchase of any malt beverage until at least seven days after the delivery or under the terms of the credit policy, whichever is greater. Provide an exception from this prohibition for situations involving a wholesaler who has failed to make a payment to the supplier on or before the due date.
3. Amend section 3 of the bill to provide that a waiver of any provision of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 597.120 through 597.180 is void and unenforceable.
4. Amend subsection 13 of section 3 of the bill to delete the specified prohibition concerning payment terms between a wholesaler and a supplier. Instead, prohibit a supplier from failing to: (1) pay a wholesaler for invoices or claims for reimbursement within 30 days after approval by the supplier; or (2) approve or disapprove such invoices or claims within 30 days after receipt.

5. Amend section 7 of the bill to provide that the provisions concerning the unlawful possession, sale, or transportation of liquor set forth in subsection 1 do not apply to licensed original package retailers or their delivery support services while acting in their professional capacities to deliver to consumers liquor that the original package retail liquor store purchased from a state-licensed wholesaler and within the retail liquor store licensee's jurisdiction. Require the Department of Taxation to adopt regulations setting forth certain specified requirements governing such delivery.

Senator Goicoechea proposes the following amendments:

Amend NRS 597.240 to:

1. Authorize the activities specified in subsection 1 to be engaged in at a licensed noncontiguous location of a winery within Nevada;
2. Revise the provisions of the section concerning the percentage of wine that is produced, blended, or aged by a winery from fruit grown in this state to also take into account wine that is produced, blended, or aged from honey produced in this state; and
3. Authorize certain wineries to sell alcoholic beverages to consumers on their premises, so long as the winery has obtained a retail liquor store license from the city or county in which the winery is located and complies with certain requirements relating to the purchase of liquor from a licensed wholesaler.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there questions on the bill before you?

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

I am going to try to make Vice Chair Carlton proud of my humor here: if whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting, then wine is for making you dizzy. This amendment certainly has a lot going on. I am very appreciative of, particularly, a certain mead distributor who is excited about the pieces in Senator Goicoechea's amendments. There are some pieces that I really like in these amendments. Unfortunately, I have some real concerns about the invoices, some of the specific transactions, and ways the added language in this amendment that unfortunately have caused me to have to be a no. I will certainly reserve my right if we can work that out. I would like to be a yes, but unfortunately, I am a no.

**Assemblyman Frierson:**

I just wanted to point out procedurally where we are. If we consider this without the amendments, then it is the end of the conversation. From a procedural standpoint, there are some unresolved questions. I think there are some significant concessions that have been made. Otherwise, this allows us to continue to have that conversation, and what I do not want to do is cut that off. While I have a little bit of concern about what I have perceived as not everyone necessarily being on the same page, I do recognize concessions that have been

made. In the big scheme of things, I recognize that by agreeing to amend and sent it back, it allows for the conversation to continue, and for some of these issues that seem to be confusing, a little bit more time to be worked out by the sponsor in the sponsor's house. For that reason, I think while there are possibly more conversations that need to take place, I would like the conversation to continue, so I will be supporting it.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

There is so much of this bill that I really like; I think there are a lot of good things. I am concerned with restricting the ability to check creditworthiness of somebody when you are extending credit, which I think is fairly common for businesses. Unfortunately, I will be a no at this time with my right to reserve to change on the floor.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I find this amendment and this whole thing confusing. I think I am seeing something about putting mandatory credit in statute. I am not sure I like that, but at this point I am going to be a yes reserve because I especially like the wine part.

**Assemblywoman Carlton:**

I understand where some of the concerns are, but when you have to have a mandatory stock when you do business with these folks, they tell you how much you have to buy. In no other business does your vendor tell you, You must buy 300 cases of this, 200 cases of this. It is not fair to mandate how much you have to buy and not give you the credit to do it. To me, that is a two-way street. I understand where some of the concerns are, but whenever this Legislature gets involved in a three-tiered system, these things always get a little confusing, but they do not operate like any other business does in this state for a reason. We put in safeguards for it. We just want to make sure that it is a level playing field for everyone, and I want to thank Senator Goicoechea for his hard work. He had to really talk a lot to convince me to take some of these amendments, and it is just because it was he that I am doing this. Otherwise, I would not have gone down this road. Whoever benefits from this, thank Senator Goicoechea, because he worked his butt off convincing me to support this bill.

**Chair Jauregui:**

I am going to ditto the amendment from what my Vice Chair said. Senator Goicoechea fought a good fight.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I am going to say ditto and when I sober up from this, I will try to get to a yes.

**Chair Jauregui:**

I would look for a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 307 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS SENATE BILL 307 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN KASAMA, O'NEILL, AND TOLLES VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take that floor statement. The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint): Enacts various provisions relating to food delivery service platforms. (BDR 52-591)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint) enacts various provisions relating to food delivery service platforms [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from [Exhibit P](#)]. It is sponsored by Senator Neal and was heard on April 30, 2021. Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint) requires a food delivery service platform provider to enter into a written agreement with a food-dispensing establishment before facilitating an online food order. The bill prohibits a food delivery service platform provider from using a food-dispensing establishment's likeness, registered trademark, or intellectual property without written consent. A food-dispensing establishment may at any time submit a written request for removal from the food delivery service platform. A food delivery service platform must disclose to a user in a conspicuous manner certain information associated with the online food order, as well as on the receipt provided for an online food order. A person who knowingly violates the requirement to disclose certain information is deemed to have committed a deceptive trade practice.

The bill provides that a food delivery service platform that violates certain provisions is subject to a daily \$500 civil penalty. In addition, the bill authorizes a food-dispensing establishment to bring an action if their likeness, registered trademark, or intellectual property was used in violation of the prohibition. Finally, during the period in which the Declaration of Emergency for the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 is in effect, a food delivery service platform is prohibited, with certain exceptions, from charging a food-dispensing establishment a fee or combination of fees for an online food order that exceed 20 percent of the food purchase price.

Senator Neal proposes the following amendments:

1. Amend the definition of "food delivery service platform" in section 4 of the bill.
2. Amend subsection 1(c) of section 16 of the bill to delete the requirement that the specified statement include a disclosure of the average commission.
3. Amend section 19 of the bill to: (1) lower the limit on the maximum commission that may be charged by a food delivery service platform provider from 20 percent to 15 percent; (2) provide that the limitation on the maximum commission that may be charged is effective only in a county in which a declaration of emergency is in effect,

which includes social distancing or other occupancy limitations on capacity in a food-dispensing establishment; and (3) provide that the provisions of the section do not preempt any local ordinance which places limits on the maximum commission that may be charged, so long as such ordinance was in effect before April 30, 2021.

4. Amend the effective date of the bill to upon passage and approval.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint) or the amendment? [There were none.] I would look for a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 320 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 320 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblyman O'Neill. Members, we are going to revisit Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint). It does not look like the Senate has adjourned floor yet, so we are going to go ahead and take Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to collection agencies. (BDR 54-582)**

**Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to collection agencies [Ms. Paslov-Thomas read from Exhibit Q]. It is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor and was heard on May 10, 2021. Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint) prohibits a collection agency from collecting a debt from a person who owes fees to an apartment manager, homeowners' association, or tow car operator, under certain circumstances. In addition, the bill requires a collection agency to file an annual report with the Commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions of the Department of Business and Industry that includes certain information pertaining to a debt collected for a homeowners' association during the immediately preceding year. The manager of the collection agency must provide a signed statement affirming the collection agency did not collect a debt against a prohibited person.

Senator Spearman proposes the following amendments:

1. Provide that if a homeowners' association (HOA) uses the foreclosure process, the home may not be sold to: (1) any person who was involved in the foreclosure process, including, without limitation, a collection agency used by the HOA to collect

- an obligation relating to the property, a community manager of the HOA and his or her assistants, an HOA board member, and an attorney who represented any of the parties with regard to the foreclosure; or (2) any person who is related within the third degree of consanguinity to a person described in item one. For purposes of this provision, "any person who was involved in the foreclosure process" means any person who exercised discretion in any decision relating to the foreclosure of a lien and any person employed by such a person.
2. Require an HOA to send its notices and communications by mail and to the electronic mail address designated by a unit's owner, unless the unit's owner has opted out of receiving electronic communications or has not designated an electronic mail address.
  3. Require each HOA in a common-interest community that has 150 or more units, to establish either a website or electronic portal which may be accessed by its members. Specifically, this provision would provide that:
    - Beginning on January 1, 2022, each HOA in a common-interest community that has 150 or more units must establish a website or portal and post on the website or portal documents which relate to the HOA, including, without limitation, the most recent copy of the covenants, conditions, and restrictions, the HOA bylaws and rules, the articles of incorporation, the HOA's annual budget, any proposed budgets, notices, and agendas for upcoming meetings, and any other documents required by regulation to be posted.
    - Beginning on January 1, 2023, these HOAs must establish, on the website or portal, the ability for units' owners to pay their assessments online.
    - Homeowners' associations with less than 150 units are authorized and encouraged to create such websites or portals.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any questions on the bill or amendment before you?

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

It is in regard to the portal on the website. As I read it, it is my understanding that it is mandatory to have either a website or a portal for communities with over 150 units, but then it is encouraged to create such a website or a portal. If I could get little more clarity around that, that would be appreciated.

**Chair Jauregui:**

I believe, if I read it correctly, the "encouraged" was for those who have 150 or less. It is mandatory for those with 150 or more and encouraged for those with 150 or less. If you look at this work session document [[Exhibit Q](#)] and compare it to what was originally proposed at

the hearing earlier this week, it had originally been for HOAs with 100 homes or less. In working with the industry partners, in order to bring them into a neutral position, they requested it be 150.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Thank you, Chair Jauregui. I know there was a little bit of concern around section 1 with the requirements of gathering that reporting data, but it is my understanding that those HOAs would already have that information. This is really just sending it somewhere so that we can review it, correct?

**Chair Jauregui:**

Correct.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Thank you so much, I appreciate it. With that, I will be in support.

**Chair Jauregui:**

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I would look for a motion to amend and do pass for Senate Bill 186 (1st Reprint).

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN DICKMAN AND  
KASAMA VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN HARDY WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Carlton.

[[Exhibit R](#) were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]



Members, thank you all so much, I know this was a long work session. I appreciate your all being here. I want to thank our staff for getting us through yet another deadline. Thank you, everyone. Even though we are going to stand in recess, I am going to take public comment now so that if we do not meet to adjourn, we have fulfilled our obligation and taken public comment.

Is there anyone in the queue to give public comment? [There was no one.] Members, at this time, we are going to stand in recess [at 12:53 p.m.].

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Paris Smallwood  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair

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

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 44](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 75 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 141 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 179 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 181 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 184 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 190 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 217 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 247 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 269](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 289 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit N](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 303 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit O](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 307 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 320 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit Q](#) is the work session document for [Senate Bill 186 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit R](#) is an email dated May 13, 2021, submitted by Lorrie Olson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, in opposition to [Senate Bill 186 \(1st Reprint\)](#).