MINUTES OF THE
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION
NEVADA LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU
***Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 218E.150**

The Legislative Commission held its sixth meeting in Calendar Year 2016 on Wednesday, December 21, 2016. The meeting began at 9:23 a.m. in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada, and was videoconferenced to Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Michael Roberson, Chair
Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Vice Chair
Senator Kelvin D. Atkinson
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman James Oscarson

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, M.D., Senate District No. 12

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Rick Combs, Director
Rocky Cooper, Legislative Auditor, Audit Division
Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Risa B. Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Susan E. Scholley, Research Director, Research Division
Debbie Gleason, Secretary for Minutes, Research Division
Sylvia A. Wiese, Executive Assistant, Director's Office

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.

AGENDA ITEM I—ROLL CALL

Chair Roberson called the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Roberson called for public comment.

Randy C. Cheung, Principal, Lois Craig Elementary School, Clark County School District (CCSD), offered remarks concerning the Achievement School District (ASD) process in Clark County and its effects upon Craig Elementary and five other schools on the Rising Stars List. Mr. Cheung is opposed to Craig Elementary becoming an ASD school because it removes parental choice.

Chair Roberson noted the decisions regarding which schools will be chosen for the ASD will be made by February 1, 2017. He said the State Board of Education (SBE) revised the regulations, which will be ready by January, for Assembly Bill 394 (Chapter 543, *Statutes of Nevada 2015*) in order to address the community's concerns. Chair Roberson noted that regardless of whether the Commission approves the revised regulations, the program is going forward because the Commission has no control of that. He said the revised regulations are intended to address many of the community's concerns; the choice is to approve them or not to approve them, which would mean the concerns would not be addressed.

Pamela S. Simone, Principal, Arturo Cambeiro Elementary School (a Zoom school), CCSD, expressed her approval of Chair Roberson's comments. She requested that special consideration be given to ensure the ASD timeline aligns with A.B. 394.

Alaina M. Criner, Principal, Matt Kelly Elementary School, CCSD, echoed her colleagues' sentiments. Concerning the decision on the proposed ASD regulation, she urged the SBE to visit the schools, meet the students and families, and take notice of the schools' histories and how students' lives are being enriched when making the determination of the five remaining schools. She said Matt Kelly has had humble beginnings since 1960, and it is so much more than is being portrayed by the baseline data.

Brenda J. McKinney, Retired Principal, Wendell P. Williams Elementary School, CCSD, stated she had been the school's principal for 8 years, and she served in the CCSD for 34 years. She said she is now part of an incredible staff at H. P. Fitzgerald Elementary School, CCSD, which had been on the ASD list for the 2013–2014 school year, but since 2015, when the school came under the Turnaround Zone program, 42 percent of the students are proficient in reading

and 26 percent have improved in math. She implored the Commission to allow the school to remain under the Turnaround model and for the opportunity to continue improving its students' academic scores.

Chair Roberson reiterated that the SBE, not the Commission, designates which schools will be placed in the ASD.

Suynn J. Davis, United States veteran, North Las Vegas, Nevada, shared that her children attended Clark County schools, and many of them have graduated from college. In addition, she has grandchildren who attend H. P. Fitzgerald, Matt Kelley, and Wendell P. Williams Elementary Schools. Ms. Davis said her grandchildren can walk to school, and the school is part of the community. She praised H. P. Fitzgerald and said the community does not want it to become a charter school because it appears to the parents that choice is being taken away, and the decisions are being made by the State when it has not even visited the school. She argued that Turnaround schools should be given the opportunity to do what they were asked to do, and the State is making decisions concerning school achievement based upon obsolete data.

Gregory Cole, Principal, Dr. William H. Bailey Middle School, CCSD, was pleased to report that Bailey Middle School was removed from the ASD list and is now in its third year as a Turnaround school. He said he is very passionate about what is going on with the ASD because it raises standards. Mr. Cole encouraged the Legislature to discuss changes to the ASD with interested parties during the 2017 Session in an effort to resolve problems through legislation and to improve achievement. He pointed out the ASD process is disruptive, and although William H. Bailey is not being considered for the ASD, he has lost quality employees due to the uncertainty during the three-month ASD process.

Melinda Hoskins, MS, Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN), Certified Nurse Midwife (CNM), IBCLC, Minden, Nevada, and President of the Nevada American College of Nurse-Midwives, provided written testimony (Agenda Item II A-1) concerning R059-16 (Agenda Item V A-10) where she cited several published national opinions, studies, and reports that support the certification and accreditation of birth centers. She stated that since the Commission's last meeting, when R059-16 was discussed, she and Senator Kieckhefer had the opportunity to discuss his concerns regarding the regulation. Ms. Hoskins provided background information related to her request for reconsideration of R059-16. She explained A.B. 170 (Chapter 383, *Statutes of Nevada 2013)* gave APRNs "full practice authority" to deliver care, to the fullest extent of their education, under the oversight of the State Board of Nursing by removing the licensure requirements for signed agreements between APRNs and collaborating physicians; however, hospitals still require physician supervision over the credentialing of CNMs. She said this requirement fosters vicarious liability for the physicians

because they are held responsible for APRNs' actions; therefore, fewer physicians are willing to sponsor CNMs.

Ms. Hoskins stressed that R059-16 requires national accreditation within six months of State licensure, which adds an additional layer of oversight, and the valuable input of evidence-based standards demonstrated to have maintained a quality program in birth centers in the United States for more than 30 years. She also provided a copy of an April 30, 2014, letter addressed to the Federal Trade Commission on behalf of the American Association of Birth Centers regarding the role of freestanding birth centers, the midwives who staff them, and associated regulations (Agenda Item II A-2).

Robert Uithoven, Representative, TrackingPoint, Inc., testified in opposition to R144-15 (Agenda Item V A-6). He argued that the Board of Wildlife Commissioners (BWC), Nevada's Depart of Wildlife (NDOW), passed R144-15 with TrackingPoint in mind and without first attempting to reach out to TrackingPoint. He said TrackingPoint was informed it could petition the BWC; however, the BWC would likely stand behind its original decision to ban electronic sighting technology, and the BWC's opinion is that the technology violates the fair chase doctrine. He said TrackingPoint's position is the electronic sighting technology assists in upholding an essential part of the fair chase doctrine because it prevents an animal from being wounded and needlessly suffering from an inaccurate or nonlethal shot. Further, electronic sighting technology does not take the hunter out of the equation, as has been alleged by the BWC. A hunter is still required to obtain a license and a tag, in addition to purchasing and loading equipment, navigating the terrain, tracking the animal, and sighting and pulling the trigger. He pointed out that the difference in TrackingPoint's technology is the device will stop the trigger from fully engaging if the aim is not a clean shot or if there is a safety risk; the technology assists in ensuring a kill shot on the first shot. Mr. Uithoven said many hunters are using high-powered rifles and advance scopes from long distances, which are legal, but they do not ensure a clean shot. Finally, TrackingPoint's technology also makes hunting accessible to people who have suffered from an injury or have a medical condition. He asked that the Commission not approve R144-15 and that it permit TrackingPoint to provide a device that increases hunting accessibility safely and ethically.

Jeffrey Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), commented on the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) report titled *Regionalizing the Mental Health System in Nevada: Considerations and Options* (https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/2017/Bulletin17-06.pdf) (Agenda Item VI B) regarding the provision of mental and other behavioral health services in Nevada. He conveyed NACO's statewide challenges in providing mental health services, and the impact on public safety individuals with mental illness can have. Mr. Fontaine requested the Legislature keep NACO in

mind as a key stakeholder during the 2017 Session in developing policies and funding priorities in order to address the needs outlined in the report.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

Chair Roberson announced that Assemblyman James Oscarson, Assembly District No. 36, has been selected by the Republican Assembly Caucus leadership to replace former Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart on the Legislative Commission. Being that both position alternates are no longer members of the Assembly, pursuant to Joint Standing Rule No. 11, the Commission is required to fill the vacancy by appointing an Assembly member of the same party.

MOTION: Assemblyman Hambrick moved approval of the appointment of Assemblyman Oscarson to the Legislative Commission. Senator Atkinson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM IV—APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2016, MEETING

MOTION: Senator Denis moved approval of the minutes of the November 2, 2016, meeting. Assemblyman Araujo seconded the motion. The motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM V—LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION POLICY

A. Review of Administrative Regulations Submitted Pursuant to NRS 233B.067

Please see attached list of regulations (Agenda Item V A-1) to be considered. The list may also be accessed electronically at: http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Register/IndexesRegsReviewed/LCMtg_List_2016_Dec21.pdf.

Chair Roberson identified the following regulations requested by members to be held for discussion:

- Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams—R003-16, R061-16, R088-16, R117-16, R118-16, and R136-16;
- Assemblyman Oscarson—R128-14, R131-15, R138-16, and R086-16;
- Assemblyman Hansen—R016-15 and R139-16;
- Senator Kieckhefer—R059-16 and R089-16;
- Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson—R148-16; and
- Senator Settelmeyer—R144-15.

MOTION: Senator Ford moved approval of R014-15; R015-15; R017-15; R019-15; R026-15; R059-15; R088-15; R100-15; R011-16; R019-16; R024-16; R038-16; R067-16; R078-16; R087-16; R093-16; R094-16; R096-16; R101-16; R104-16; R107-16; R108-16; R111-16; R119-16; R141-16; R147-16; and R152-16. Assemblyman Hambrick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Subsequent to the vote, it was clarified that Assemblyman Oscarson desired to have R038-16 held for discussion.

Chair Roberson asked for a motion to rescind the previous motion.

MOTION: Senator Ford moved approval to rescind the previous motion wherein a number of regulations were approved. Vice Chair Settelmeyer seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Roberson read aloud the following list of regulations to be pulled for discussion: R128-14; R016-15; R131-15; R144-15; R003-16; R038-16; R059-16; R061-16; R086-16; R088-16; R089-16; R117-16; R118-16; R136-16; R139-16; and R148-16.

MOTION: Senator Ford moved approval of the following regulations: R014-15; R015-15; R017-15; R019-15; R026-15; R059-15; R088-15; R100-15; R011-16; R019-16; R024-16; R067-16; R078-16; R087-16; R093-16; R094-16; R096-16; R101-16, R104-16, R107-16, R108-16, R111-16, R119-16, R138-16, R141-16, R147-16, and R152-16. Assemblyman Hambrick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Roberson invited Senator Hardy to testify concerning certain regulations.

Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, M.D., previously identified, stated the Board of Dental Examiners came to an agreement on R086-16 (Agenda Item V A-5), and they will not request that it go forward; he proceeded to testify on R128-14 (Agenda Item V A-2).

Regulation 128-14

A REGULATION relating to the Board of Psychological Examiners; providing procedures for the handling of petitions to the Board seeking declaratory orders, advisory opinions or the adoption, filing, amendment or repeal of certain regulations; revising provisions relating to disciplinary hearings conducted by the Board; setting forth provisions for the handling of complaints filed with the Board against certain behavior analysis professionals; providing procedures for limiting, revoking and reinstating the license of certain behavior analysis professionals; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-2).

Senator Hardy testified that during the 2015–2016 Interim meetings of the Legislative Committee on Health Care (NRS 439B.000), chaired by Assemblyman Oscarson, the Committee looked at all of the different mental health fields. The Committee recognized the overlapping efforts by different boards in an attempt to help mental health patients and the undermining of the potential to bring more mental health providers to Nevada. Therefore, the Committee considered consolidating the boards through legislation during the 2017 Session to facilitate bringing more mental health providers to Nevada and to keep the ones who are already here. He said R128-14 (Agenda Item V A-2) may become moot or counterproductive considering the discussions that will be occurring during session.

Assemblyman Oscarson echoed Senator Hardy's comments. He indicated there was much discussion during the interim Committee meetings, and among others, about the difficulties people faced in the licensing process. He said there is the potential that R128-14 (Agenda Item V A-2), R038-16 (Agenda Item V A-3), and R131-15 (Agenda Item V A-4) will be negated through the legislative process during the 2017 Session. Assemblyman Oscarson suggested continuing discussions in the Assembly and Senate Committees on Health and Human Services during session, as appropriate, and he asked that the Commission not move forward with the three aforementioned regulations.

Morgan Alldredge, Executive Director, Board of Psychological Examiners (BPE), stated the BPE is different from other professions being discussed in that the licensees are a doctorate-level profession and require up to seven years of education. Ms. Alldredge explained that: (1) R128-14 (Agenda Item V A-2) allows the BPE to discipline behavioral analysts if they act inappropriately and further clarifies the nonresident-consultant temporary license; (2) R131-15 (Agenda Item V A-4) clarifies that people working at a university must be licensed if they are providing supervision; and (3) R038-16 (Agenda Item V A-3) is much more involved. She opined that waiting through session to pass R038-16 could be harmful because if something were to happen, the BPE would be unable to move forward with disciplinary action because it does not have that ability, as well as the ability to enforce supervision, noting the BPE's educational requirements are changing at the beginning of the year. Ms. Alldredge stated the BPE would prefer to not have to wait for the regulation to be passed, arguing that it would be negated anyway if the boards are consolidated.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson cautioned that if the regulation is not passed, the boards will be prohibited from carrying out their duties, which is primarily to protect the public. She said although she appreciates Senator Hardy and Assemblyman Oscarson's positions, it does not make sense to hamper the BPE from protecting the public from noncompliant licensees and preventing it from having regulations in place while the measures to consolidate the boards are being discussed.

Senator Hardy acknowledged that not passing R038-16 could adversely affect many students who are in the middle of their program at Walden University, whereby they could lose their opportunity to become accredited or licensed in Nevada. He said the model of consolidation being considered precludes the same type of requirements for psychologists, social workers, and certified professional counselors; it looks at mental health in total rather than a fragmented approach. Senator Hardy pointed out that Utah has established the consolidation model where it uses experienced individuals for specific licenses. He surmised there are no disadvantages to consolidation; however, there may be differences of how things are done, but the Commission has the tools and opportunities to act as it sees fit.

Ms. Alldredge, responding to Assemblyman Oscarson's question regarding the number of disciplinary actions where the BPE has been unable to move forward, said there have not been any, but if something were to happen, not having the regulation in place could hamper the public's safety. Also in response to Assemblyman Oscarson's question of whether there have been any disciplinary processes where a regulation like this would have improved the process, Ms. Alldredge answered the BPE's deputy attorney general suggested changing the regulations for better protection.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson entertained the idea of addressing R128-14 based upon its merit and to not wait for legislation during session. She noted the BPE's mission is to protect the public from its own licensees, and there is no certainty of what can happen during session. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson added it would be a mistake to confuse the two and not allow the boards to conduct business until session, which would do more harm than good.

Chair Roberson agreed with Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's points. He encouraged the Commission to give Senator Hardy, who served on the Committee, and Assemblyman Oscarson, who chaired the Committee, some deference because the topic of board consolidation came before the Committee during the interim.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson pointed out that she also served on the Committee during the interim and that board consolidation is a needed and ongoing conversation, but she wants to ensure everything else is not stalled in the meantime.

Chair Roberson indicated there appears to be a lack of consensus to approve the regulation today, irrespective of its merits. He suggested tabling R128-14 until the next Commission meeting in January and he asked that, in the meantime, Ms. Alldredge try to work with Senator Hardy, Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, and Assemblyman Oscarson in an effort to understand each side's perspective.

Assemblyman Oscarson recognized that Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson is an integral part of the process, her input is extremely valuable, and he welcomes the opportunity to continue the discussion. He said R128-14, R131-15, and R086-16 have significant challenges.

K. Neena Laxalt, Government Relations Consultant, Reno, Nevada, briefed the Commission on what the BPE has been doing since the last meeting of the Committee. Ms. Laxalt explained none of the boards being considered for consolidation had been contacted prior to the interim Committee's last meeting that proposed consolidation of the boards under the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS); therefore, the boards have had to work after the fact. She continued the BPE has been working with Cody L. Phinney, M.P.H., Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), DHHS, and her staff, and they have studied other states that have consolidated their boards. Ms. Laxalt let the Commission know that, although nothing has happened legislatively, the boards, Ms. Phinney, and her staff have been working behind the scenes on this issue.

Chair Roberson stated R128-14 would be brought forward again at the next Commission meeting.

Regulation 038-16

A REGULATION relating to psychology; revising provisions relating to educational and training requirements for psychologists; revising provisions relating to internship requirements for an applicant for licensure as a psychologist; requiring the continuing education received by a psychologist, licensed behavior analyst or licensed assistant behavior analyst to renew his or her license to include instruction in evidence-based suicide prevention and awareness; revising provisions relating to the supervision of a psychological assistant; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-3).

Ms. Alldredge reported the BPE received comments from Capella and Walden Universities (Agenda Item V B) regarding changes to the regulation. She said the BPE made the change that Capella requested, and it did what it could to work with Walden.

Brian Reeder, Representative, Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, remarked that Walden's challenges to the regulation were addressed at the last BPE meeting, and it no longer opposes R038-16.

MOTION: Assemblyman Oscarson moved approval of R038-16. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 131-15

A REGULATION relating to psychologists; clarifying certain requirements concerning the licensure by the Board of Psychological Examiners of a person who is engaged in the teaching of psychology or in psychological research; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-4).

Ms. Alldedge explained R131-15 clarifies NRS 641.390, which states that even though an individual is teaching at a university, that person must also be licensed if the individual is providing supervision or psychological services to the public. She said the question of licensing was brought to the BPE by its licensees at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, who are starting a new clinic and wanted to ensure that because they were professors, they still needed to be licensed. Ms. Alldredge said the BPE wanted it clarified in regulation for the future. She confirmed that Michelle G. Paul, Ph.D., Director, The Partnership for Research, Assessment, Counseling, Therapy and Innovative Clinical Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and president, BPE, is in favor of R131-15 (Agenda Item V A-4).

Senator Hardy remarked that it sounds as though only psychologists can teach psychologists, noting that is a disservice to the field of psychology.

Ms. Alldredge clarified the BPE's current regulation allows for supervision from licensed individuals who are not psychologists; they are doctors, social workers, et cetera. She said as long as they are licensed by their board, they are approved to provide 25 percent of the post-doctoral training. Ms. Alldredge said R131-15 simply states that individuals must be licensees if they are providing supervision because there are individuals at the universities providing supervision who are unlicensed by the BPE; they meet the requirements for licensure, but they choose not to be licensed. The BPE wants to ensure individuals who are providing supervision are licensed.

Ms. Alldredge, responding to Assemblyman Araujo's question of whether the regulation addresses unlicensed individuals currently providing supervision and whether they will be given a grace period to obtain the license or whether they will be immediately prohibited from supervising, replied the question is not addressed in the regulation. She surmised the BPE could enter into an agreement to help them get licensed quickly and to continue with their supervision plans.

Assemblyman Oscarson remarked that Assemblyman Araujo's question needs to be considered for folks who are already engaged in the program. He suggested bringing R131-15 back to the Commission's January meeting after there has been a chance for specific language on how this is going to work.

A discussion took place between Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson and Ms. Alldredge regarding the effect on unlicensed supervisors and the semester

starting in January if the regulation is not approved. Ms. Alldredge confirmed some of the unlicensed individuals providing supervision will be unlicensed going into the semester, but the ones who are registered with the BPE are licensed. Some training is conducted with the BPE prior to registration, and those are the supervisors who are unlicensed; the BPE wants to guarantee they are licensed as well. She indicated the regulation has an enactment date of upon approval, so things would change if the regulation becomes enforceable. Ms. Aldredge stated she did not know how current students would be affected if the regulation is not approved and she would need to consult with Dr. Paul.

Chair Roberson commented there is sufficient uncertainty regarding the regulation and that further discussions between Senator Hardy, Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, Assemblyman Oscarson, and Ms. Alldredge would likely be productive. He suggested bringing back R131-15 to the next meeting in January, which he surmised would take place before the next semester.

Regulation 086-16

A REGULATION relating to dentistry; requiring an applicant for the renewal of a license to practice dentistry or dental hygiene who administers or wishes to administer botulinum toxin, dermal fillers or other facial injectables in his or her practice to provide proof to the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada that he or she has successfully completed certain education; requiring a dentist who is registered to dispense controlled substances to complete 1 hour of continuing education relating to the misuse and abuse of controlled substances; providing that a dentist who is licensed in this State may authorize a dental hygienist to administer botulinum toxin, dermal fillers or other facial injectables under certain circumstances; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-5).

Assemblyman Oscarson offered that Senator Hardy and he met with Robert Talley, D.D.S., Las Vegas, and Member, Advisory Committee on the State Program for Oral Health, DPBH, DHHS, and the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada. He said they will continue to work on R086-16 in an effort to come to a conclusion and that Dr. Talley and the Board have agreed to allow R086-16 to be taken off the agenda or for it to be moved forward to another date.

Senator Hardy shared that during the conversations they recognized there are many issues. He stated BDR 40-677 will address the issues, and it is a policy that requires the dentists, doctors, and others to come to an agreement. Senator Hardy opined this is the best venue for this topic.

Debra Shaffer-Kugel, Executive Director, Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada, said the Board agrees with Senator Hardy, and it knows there are concerns, which it is open to rectifying. She confirmed for Chair Roberson that the concerns can be dealt with during the upcoming session.

Chair Roberson stated the Commission will not take action on R086-16 today, nor will the regulation be brought back in January.

Regulation 144-15

A REGULATION relating to hunting; deleting the prohibition against using smokeless powder in a muzzle-loading firearm while hunting a big game mammal; revising the circumstances under which a person may use a rifle or handgun to hunt a big game mammal; making it unlawful to use certain firearms and cartridges while hunting a big game mammal; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-6).

Tony Wasley, Director, NDOW, provided a brief overview of R144-15. He pointed out that the primary duty of the BWC is to promulgate hunting, fishing, and trapping regulations through the establishment of seasons, bag limits, and methods of take. Nevada has many laws and regulations describing limits on methods of take, which include hunting deer with a spotlight, locating elk from a plane, and fishing with multiple hooks. It is already illegal to hunt water fowl with a shotgun larger than 10 gauge and to hunt with automatic firearms, incendiary bullets, or tracers. *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 503.142 describes methods of take for hunting big game animals with a firearm, and R144-15 is a series of proposed updates to the NAC designed to keep up with evolving technologies. The following is a list of the four proposed changes contained within R144-15:

1. The regulation removes the restriction against using smokeless powder in a muzzle loader, which would allow the use of some modern brands' clean-burning muzzle-loader powder in a muzzle-loader only season. This is in response to a petition to allow some brands of powders, such as Blackhorn 209, that technically would be considered smokeless because of the chemical makeup. The regulation addresses an evolving chemistry surrounding black powder. Cleaner burning powders are illegal; the regulation would broaden the definition and allow them to be used.

2. There is a relaxation of the cartridge restriction on hunting with certain handguns. Currently, the NAC prohibits the hunting of big game animals with smaller handgun cartridges, such as a 9 millimeter, .40 caliber, .45 caliber, and virtually any other popular semiautomatic handgun rounds, including a .40 caliber. The proposed change would relax the prohibition to read that any centerfire handgun cartridge, .22 caliber or larger, is allowed for hunting big game.

3. The regulation prohibits hunting big game with a firearm having an electronic or computer-controlled firing mechanism. This is in response to the development of so-called "smart rifles" (rifles and scopes that acquire a laser lock on a target and then follow that target to compensate for environmental and physical factors needed for ultra-long range shooting, which then launches the round

when the rifle is lined up on the acquired target with the laser point). In the many meetings and workshops held regarding R144-15, there was great concern that using such technologically advanced shooting systems went beyond the ethics of fair chase and hunting and created a huge advantage over the animals being hunted. In some of the marketing videos for these shooting systems, precise accuracy is advertised on targets moving up to 30 miles per hour at distances over one mile.

4. The regulation refers to the caliber restriction for the Browning .50 Caliber Machine Gun (BMG). The regulation proposes to prohibit hunting big game with a firearm using a centerfire cartridge larger than .50 caliber or with a case length longer than three inches. This is in response to the recent crossover of extremely large rifle cartridges, such as the .50 caliber BMG, from military to civilian use. The .50 caliber BMG was originally developed as an antiaircraft weapon but was then adapted for ultra, long-range sniper rifles. Most popular big game hunting rounds use a cartridge case ranging from approximately 1 3/4 inches for a .223 Remington up to 2 9/10 inches for a .30–378 Weatherby Magnum. The .50 caliber BMG case is just shy of four inches. For the sake of comparison, it was commonly thought that the .300 Winchester Magnum (WM) cartridge was the biggest of the big hunting cartridges in North America, comparatively; however, a .50 caliber BMG round has more kinetic energy knock-down power at 8/10 of a mile than the WM has at the muzzle. The concept discussed at the meetings and workshops that led to this regulation change was there needed to be an upper limit placed on the size of big game rifles just as there is for shotguns in order to prevent excessive damage of game meat and to maintain the ethics of fair chase.

Mr. Wasley stated the four proposed changes are the result of a series of public workshops and meetings held throughout the State over the course of one year. The regulation was extensively discussed, and public comment was solicited by the County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife as well as the BWC. He said there were edits and amendments throughout the process, and R144-15 is the product. Mr. Wasley informed the Commission the regulation was workshopped by the BWC on January 29, 2016, in Las Vegas; on March 25, 2016, in Yerington; and on June 25, 2016, in Elko. It was adopted in a 7–1 vote in Las Vegas on September 24, 2016.

Jeremy Drew, former chair, BWC, who served during the majority of the workshops and public meetings, shared the BWC's perspective throughout the process and expounded on the BWC's efforts concerning R144-15. First, he addressed a couple of points that were made during public comment. Mr. Drew said TrackingPoint approached NDOW after the regulation passed, at which point the offer was made to TrackingPoint to come to the November 2016 BWC meeting, noting the BWC held off advancing the regulation to the Commission for that reason; however, none of TrackingPoint's representatives attended the

meeting. He continued that although TrackingPoint is the leader in the field of developing smart-rifle technology, it is not the only company developing that technology. Mr. Drew stated much of the meetings' discussions had to do with the fair chase doctrine. He said the BWC's biggest concern is that sighting systems are not being used on traditional hunting firearms that shoot from 500 to 600 yards, under the best conditions, but rather they are being used on new technologies and with bigger cartridges that allow shots to be made in excess of one mile, which the BWC sees as excessive. When it comes to the fair chase doctrine, the BWC's position is that a person learns what an animal can reasonably do in terms of escaping or evading the hunter pursuing it. Significant portions of the workshop discussions revolved around those concepts.

Continuing, Mr. Drew indicated the BWC's other issue is the accessibility aspect for physically challenged hunters, noting a different regulation is being drafted to allow an assistant to accompany a hunter and to retrieve game that might be wounded. He said the accessibility aspect came up in every BWC workshop, and the BWC specifically directed NDOW to reach out to the Nevada Outdoorsmen in Wheelchairs and the Cody Louk "Dream Keeper" Foundation to ask the following questions: (1) whether they use these sorts of technologies; (2) whether the language in the regulation would prohibit their hunters from hunting; and (3) whether they use Aimpoint, or other similar technologies. Their response was the regulation would not impinge upon their ability to take out physically challenged hunters, which was personally important to him, and something the BWC addressed at length.

Vice Chair Settelmeyer asked whether the BWC has a regulation that prohibits a hunter from taking a shot from a distance of one mile or more, to which Mr. Drew replied it did not.

Vice Chair Settelmeyer shared that he and Senator Pete Goicoechea met with Tyler Turnipseed, Chief Game Warden, NDOW, and Mr. Drew to discuss some of the concerns they and their constituents had. They asked Mr. Turnipseed and Mr. Drew to think about splitting up R144-15 because he and Senator Goicoechea agree with smokeless powder and the cartridge limitations, but they have issues with Section 5. He expressed concern over barring something that is electronically controlled and questioned where that stops. Vice Chair Settelmeyer asked whether there should also be a discussion about electronic scopes, noting they give some hunters an advantage over others. He said a discussion on the .50 caliber ban and cartridge limitation conceptually infers which scopes are allowed on what guns and the calibers. TrackingPoint has a .30–06 Springfield and a .270 Winchester cartridge. Vice Chair Settelmeyer rhetorically conjectured whether those calibers are too large and should not be allowed for hunting and whether the .223 caliber should be prohibited because it is traditionally a military round. He stated his concerns are more policy driven, which is the reason he is against the regulation. Vice Chair Settelmeyer indicated that he and Senator Goicoechea

discussed some of these issues with TrackingPoint's owner. He said he understands the BWC's issues and concerns, but he does not agree with them. Vice Chair Settelmeyer expressed his desire for the BWC to return with more than one regulation to allow the Commission to pass the noncontentious sections.

Assemblyman Hansen echoed Vice Chair Settelmeyer's comments and concerns.

Chair Roberson drew the Commission's attention to an e-mail dated December 20, 2016, from Mr. Turnipseed (Agenda Item V C), which refers to the restriction against using smokeless powder being removed and the relaxing of the cartridge restriction on hunting with certain handguns, of which he understands Vice Chair Settelmeyer and Senator Goicoechea to be in favor.

Regarding the smart rifles and the prohibition on the caliber and length of ammunition, Vice Chair Settelmeyer confirmed those are the two issues with which he and Senator Goicoechea have concerns.

Senator Ford stated that during public testimony, Mr. Uithoven said there was a lack of opportunity to engage with the BWC on this regulation; however, current testimony indicates there were several public meetings held during a year-long process, and even after being invited to the meeting, no one from TrackingPoint attended. He said he was intrigued by this and entertained the possibility of inviting Mr. Uithoven back to the table.

Mr. Turnipseed provided greater detail about the November 2016 BWC meeting. He said Vice Chair Settelmeyer and Senator Goicoechea had a TrackingPoint representative come to Nevada to express TrackingPoint's concerns. Mr. Turnipseed explained that Senators Goicoechea and Settelmeyer invited Jack Robb, Deputy Director, NDOW, and himself to be part of that conversation where they extensively discussed some of the discrepancies over how each party perceives TrackingPoint's product, including the damaging effects of technologies on hunting heritage and traditions versus the advantages TrackingPoint sees their product providing. He said TrackingPoint's position was it had not been given a voice; therefore, Mr. Robb and himself told TrackingPoint their concerns would be addressed with the new BWC Chair, Grant Wallace. Mr. Wallace said he would give TrackingPoint a chance to discuss their concerns during public comment at the November 2016 meeting, and then they could go from there. However, TrackingPoint did not come to the November 2016 meeting, so the BWC Chair determined that in honor of the public process completed over the last year, the regulation would be moved forward as the process dictated.

Senator Ford reiterated his concern over Mr. Uithoven's comments regarding TrackingPoint not being given the opportunity to convey its position particularly when considering TrackingPoint had been made aware that the opportunity to do so would present itself during the November 2016 BWC meeting.

Robert Uithoven, previously identified, emphasized that according to subsection 2(a) of NRS 233B.0608, insofar as predictable, the agency is to consult with the owners and officers of small businesses that are likely affected by a proposed regulation. He said he understands the process that took place throughout the year; however, he argued the statute was not followed. Continuing, Mr. Uithoven pointed out that Section 7 of the document titled "Legislative Review of Adopted Regulations as Required by NRS 233B.066" (Agenda Item V A-6), states there will not be an adverse economic effect or an immediate and long-term effect on business. Clearly, restricting Nevadans from accessing this technology has an impact on the business, and there clearly is an economic impact on business; he insisted TrackingPoint was specifically cited during the drafting of R144-15, and there is an economic impact. He stated the statute puts the burden on the agency seeking the regulation to reach out and make that accommodation, but that was not done until after the regulation passed.

Senator Ford questioned why TrackingPoint did not attend the November 2016 meeting. He disagreed with Mr. Uithoven's interpretation of the statute, and he conjectured an agency is not required to reach out to every potentially affected business. The public process entails providing sufficient public notice so that companies are given reasonable consideration if they choose to attend the public meetings.

Mr. Uithoven replied that a meeting took place in October 2016 between the BWC, certain members of the Commission, and TrackingPoint, but it became clear to TrackingPoint that the adoption of R144-15 was not going to be reconsidered, and it would have to take its concerns directly to the Commission.

Senator Ford took issue with TrackingPoint asking the Commission to override a year-long process because it was displeased with the BWC's decision.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson commented that it is not the State's policy to bend over backwards because one vendor does not like a policy; the ultimate process is about protecting the public and promoting good public policy. She also wanted to ensure that the Commission's actions reflect the deference to its legislative colleagues and not to one specific vendor.

Chair Roberson agreed with Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's remarks. Continuing, he said there is more big game hunting in Senator Goicoechea's and Senator Settelmeyer's districts than there is in his or Senator Ford's districts, and he wants to give deference to those members who have more real-world experience with these types of issues.

Mr. Turnipseed, responding to a question from Senator Denis, said there were discussions during the meetings that raised the question of at what point should there be an attempt to regulate long-range shooting versus the actual weapon.

In the past, a 300-yard shot was considered to be a long shot; those discussions now include one-mile shots, which go beyond anyone's perception of what is fair chase and what is absurd. There is no way to enforce a regulation concerning the maximum distance allowed for a shot; therefore, NDOW focused on the actual tool and how effective it is at making the shot.

Mr. Drew echoed Mr. Turnipseed's remarks, specifically that a maximum shooting distance could not be enforced; however, he indicated there is more to the issue than the distance, especially considering ballistic effects of a .50 caliber bullet on an animal at both close and far ranges. From the aspect of evolving technology, he questioned when the line should be drawn, noting he understands the "slippery slope" argument. He stated these concerns were raised throughout the regulation process, yet, it is ironic that the same argument concerning advancing technological concerns does not apply to the minimum caliber restrictions that have been in place for years. Mr. Drew noted there is no right answer, and there are many different opinions. He explained the regulation changed on multiple occasions to minimize the inclusion of unintended firearms or technologies, which is the reason it took one year to come to a consensus by the BWC commissioners.

Senator Denis asked for someone to follow up with him offline as to whether TrackingPoint possesses the automated ability to shoot around corners and whether those shots can be taken remotely.

Chair Roberson stated no action would be taken on R144-15, and he would like the BWC to return with a different regulation that includes only issues that are noncontroversial among the Commission members.

Regulation 016-15

A REGULATION relating to public sales of livestock; requiring the operator of a public livestock auction to ensure that an accredited veterinarian is present at the public livestock auction on each regularly scheduled sale day; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-7).

Assemblyman Hansen questioned whether livestock auctions currently require a licensed veterinarian to be present during public auctions, and he asked for the purpose of the regulation.

Flint Wright, Administrator of Livestock Identification, State Department of Agriculture, responded that having a licensed veterinarian present during public auctions is a federal law; however, oversight of sale barns falls on the Department. He said the Department cooperates with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), but enforcement staff is not present at the sales. Rather, the USDA works with the Department to enforce the federal law. Mr. Wright also explained the cost for enforcing the presence of a licensed veterinarian is $1 per

head of livestock, or $100 per day, with a two-hour minimum. He further explained that most cattle sales in Nevada occur at trade barns between the months of August and January when a veterinarian can be needed for full days, which is the reason for a minimum. Mr. Wright said a veterinarian typically is only needed for only a couple of hours at a time during the alternate months.

MOTION: Assemblyman Hansen moved approval of R016-15. Senator Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 139-16

A REGULATION relating to vessels; authorizing only vessels without motors on a certain portion of the Truckee River; providing an exception; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-8).

Assemblyman Hansen questioned the need for a regulation that outlaws people from doing something that currently is not being done and penalizes them if it is done, noting his many years of experience on the Truckee River and never seeing motorized craft.

Mr. Turnipseed explained the regulation is in reaction to complaints received about an individual using a hovercraft on the Truckee River with the expectation that there is a law against it, which there is not. The City of Reno suggested the use of a hovercraft is not conducive to other recreational uses of the Truckee River, and they wanted to pass an ordinance against it. Because the BWC is the body that makes boating laws, the City asked it to address the matter. After further discussions with the City's Parks, Recreation and Community Services department, and additional discussions with the City of Sparks and Washoe County, there was a general consensus that motorized vessels do not belong on the Truckee River. The regulation simply adds the Truckee River to the regulation, which was unopposed by the BWC. He stated that the hovercraft owner indicated he was interested in starting a rental business on the Truckee River. The BWC surveyed that gentleman as part of the small business impact statement; he said the regulation would negatively affect his business. The BWC also surveyed some of the other businesses on the Truckee River, such as fishing guides, who said passing the regulation would have a positive impact on their businesses. Mr. Turnipseed noted the individual interested in starting a hovercraft rental business did not attend any of the public meetings.

Assemblyman Hansen suggested not allowing hovercrafts on the Truckee River rather than not allowing any motorized vessels, which would make a canoe equipped with an electric trolling motor illegal. He expressed concern that the regulation makes criminals of people who are not doing anything wrong. Assemblyman Hansen argued that if the problem is with a specific type of watercraft, why not tailor the regulation for that particular problem, arguing against passing an all-inclusive regulation due to an isolated incident. He suggested

allowing the BWC to fine-tune the regulation to deal exclusively with hovercrafts and then bring it back before the Commission.

Senator Ford remarked the Commission could ask Legal Counsel for an interpretation of the law that addresses Assemblyman Hansen's concerns regarding the criminalization aspect of the regulation. He discouraged making the language too specific, which, as new issues arise, could render R139-16 ineffective, thereby requiring the BWC to come back to the Commission with new regulations.

Chair Roberson said he philosophically disagrees, and it is better to enact regulations that, in the future, may be found to be too narrow rather than initially making them too broad.

Mr. Turnipseed stated there were discussions during the public meetings and workshops about the regulation being too narrow or too broad, which included the subject of the use of jet skis. He said although there have not been any issues with the use of jet skis, there could be in the future. Mr. Turnipseed reminded the Commission that the regulation is in response to complaints regarding a specific type of recreational watercraft.

Chair Roberson requested that Mr. Turnipseed work with Assemblyman Hansen on the regulation so that it is not overly broad before bringing it back to the Commission.

Regulation 003-16

A REGULATION relating to taxicabs; authorizing certain certificate holders to lease a taxicab to an independent contractor; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-9).

A discussion took place between Ronald Grogan, Administrator, Taxicab Authority (TA), Department of Business and Industry (DBI), and Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams confirming S.B. 376 (Chapter 447, *Statutes of Nevada, 2015*) requires the TA to create a regulation for allowing taxicabs to lease to independent contractors. Regarding the independent contractors being responsible for their own benefits coverage, insurance, and maintenance costs, Mr. Grogan explained that although they are independent contractors, they are leasing the vehicles under NRS 706.881 through 885, which means there could be some insurance costs, but under the leases, the certificate owners/cab companies are still required to carry full liability for the vehicles and to maintain the automobiles. He said if a lessee damages a cab while not on duty, depending on the lease agreement with the cab companies, there could be some liability.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked for clarification concerning the availability of taxis deployed during the day and no longer being limited by a certificate holder's decision on the number of drivers to deploy at night, as

indicated in No. 7 of page 4 of the document titled "Legislative Review of Adopted Regulations as Required by Administrative Procedures Act, NRS 223B.066" (Agenda Item V A-9).

Mr. Grogan replied that the decision is based on business. He said one of his concerns about leasing is whether the cab companies would lose control of the number of vehicles they can have on the street at any given point in time. The reality is that during events there will not be any trouble getting vehicles on the streets; the concern is the number of vehicles on the streets during down periods. Mr. Grogan pointed out that S.B. 376 restricted cab companies from leasing more than 50 percent of their medallions; therefore, R003-16 will not affect the entire fleet.

In response to an expressed concern from Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams regarding the potential for the TA to lose its ability to oversee long-hauling, Mr. Grogan stated the leases are still governed by NRS 706.881 through 885, which makes long-hauling illegal.

Vice Chair Settelmeyer commented that the concept of S.B. 376 was to allow more flexibility for the cab industry to lease vehicles to independent contractors as is allowed in other states. He voiced concern that the regulation is onerous and wondered whether the TA inquired about what other states do concerning administrative codes in relation to leasing vehicles to independent contractors and how R003-16 compares.

Mr. Grogan replied the TA did review other states, but the mandate was to create administrative codes that are consistent with NRS; therefore, the regulation is restrictive to the extent of NRS. Furthermore, he said the TA looked at leasing in northern Nevada for guidance in an effort to make leasing consistent across the State.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R003-16. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 059-16

A REGULATION relating to obstetric centers; revising requirements concerning the construction, operation and staff of an obstetric center; requiring the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct an inspection of an obstetric center before issuing a license; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-10).

Senator Kieckhefer conveyed a conversation between himself and Melinda Hoskins, previously identified, regarding obstetric centers, noting he had asked for this regulation to be pulled for discussion during the last Commission meeting. He said he now has a better understanding of some of the provisions of the regulation and

the training requirements of some of the professionals staffing the centers; therefore, he is more comfortable with R059-16 as presented.

MOTION: Senator Kieckhefer moved approval of R059-16. Senator Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 061-16

A REGULATION relating to the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety; revising provisions relating to standards for recommendations by the Chief Parole and Probation Officer regarding parole or probation; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-11).

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, referring to the use of an objective evidence-based assessment tool to conduct evaluations as set forth in Section 1, asked for the differences between current best practices versus practices being proposed.

Shawn Arruti, Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, Commissioner, and Compact Administrator, State Board of Parole Commissioners, Department of Public Safety (DPS), explained that the objective criteria-based tool currently being used looks at certain criminal history, incident offense, and social history that the Division uses for assisting in determining the risk to recidivate. The Division is looking to go in a new direction concerning the advancement of risk-assessment tools based on evidence-based practices.

Natalie Wood, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, DPS, added that the tool currently being used is from 1990. Nationally, most of the more evidence-based tools also include many of the tools from 1990. Variables that are part of the evaluation include cognitive difficulties, criminal history, education, employment, family, health, residential stability, and social and behavioral patterns. Although the 1990 tool is still valid and appropriate, there are better tools available nationally that cover many of the variables in the existing tool in addition to others. Continuing, Ms. Wood addressed Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams' question of how the employment factor affects the evaluation. She said case management looks at the individual's stability in the community, how long that person has had a job, whether the person is employable, or whether the person has been on unemployment for any length of time. Additionally, the presentence investigation would show some stability in the community.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R061-16. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 088-16

A REGULATION relating to charter schools; establishing requirements relating to the reporting of data to the State Public Charter School Authority; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-12).

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked whether the unique identification numbers to be used by the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) are the same identifiers used by the CCSD.

Patrick J. Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA, responded they would be very similar. Mr. Gavin clarified the regulation only pertains to schools that are overseen and sponsored by the SPCSA. He noted the SBE also adopted a parallel regulation pertaining to charter schools under the purview of school districts. Mr. Gavin stated the regulation has two purposes. First, it provides the public with transparency regarding the performance of individual charter school campuses, noting there are many charter schools that serve more students than the median school district in Nevada; therefore, it is critical from the perspective of public transparency in giving parents information enabling them to make informed choices about schools' performances. Second, the regulation ensures the SPCSA has the ability to hold the entire school responsible for its aggregate performance versus raising an issue where the SPCSA cannot take action because of a legal argument that only one portion of a school is underperforming. Lastly, Mr. Gavin affirmed sharing the data with the DOE and SBE would be permitted.

Senator Denis surmised the regulation would give the SPCSA an improved opportunity to regulate underperforming schools, to which Mr. Gavin replied the SPCSA's intent is to ensure that the SPCSA would have the authority to intervene pursuant to the charter contract and the performance framework created by the SPCSA for school oversight; the language clarifies the SPCSA's authority in that area.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R088-16. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 089-16

A REGULATION relating to charter schools; establishing the contents and process for the submission of an application to form a charter school to the State Public Charter School Authority; establishing the contents and process for the submission of a request to amend a written charter or charter contract, as applicable, to the State Public Charter School Authority; establishing the contents and process for the submission of an application to renew a charter contract to the State Public Charter School Authority; establishing provisions relating to the investigation and evaluation of such applications and requests by the State Public Charter School Authority; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-13).

Senator Kieckhefer called attention to a letter dated December 20, 2016, from Kara B. Hendricks with the law firm of Greenberg Traurig, LLP on behalf of the firm's client, Nevada Virtual Academy (Agenda Item V D), that states the Academy is of the position that the SPCSA did not follow applicable State law when it approved R089-16 and did not consider the Academy's comments during the regulation hearing. Senator Kieckhefer indicated he recently had two conversations with legal counsel from Greenberg Traurig to discuss its questions, during which time none of the issues outlined in the letter were raised, noting his perplexity when he received the letter just one day prior to today's meeting.

Mr. Gavin vigorously disputed the statement that the SPCSA did not take appropriate public comment. The agenda used for the hearing on R089-16 is the same format used for all other State agencies. He said the Academy's representatives voiced their concerns during public comment, but they did not stay for the remainder of the meeting. Mr. Gavin stated that had the representatives remained, the SPCSA would have given them additional opportunity to speak. Additionally, multiple SPCSA board members requested and received confirmation on the record that there were multiple occasions when the SPCSA reached out to many other schools and to the Charter School Association of Nevada, and at no point prior to the receipt of the letter from Greenberg Traurig did the SPCSA receive feedback concerning the regulation after it had been posted for one month.

Chair Roberson asked how the Academy is affected by the regulation, to which Mr. Gavin answered by first outlining the three sections of the regulation as follows: (1) the initial application to form a charter school; (2) consideration of amendments for schools that want to change some material element of how it operates in relationship to the the SPCSA; and (3) renewal of schools that operate under a charter contract. Continuing, he indicated the Academy would be affected by the second and third sections. However, most of the regulation's language reflects the SPCSA's past practices, or what it has attempted to enforce, until such time as there has been political pressure from organizations, such as the Academy, to deviate from its practices; hence the request to enable regulatory authority to consistently operate all schools the SPCSA oversees.

Mr. Gavin shared that the Academy has a history of underperforming, and, until recently, it was rated at two stars or lower and has a graduation rate below the statutory minimum, which has recently increased. Mr. Gavin commented the star rating calculation for the current year would not be available for another year. He specified the SPCSA is trying to amend a written charter or charter contract and contract renewals. Mr. Gavin explained the charter amendment process has overwhelmed the SPCSA's resources. The SPCSA consistently receives unsolicited amendments that arrive under tight timelines, which cripple the SPCSA's ability to give them the required consideration. Additionally, the SPCSA has been subjected to threats of litigation and other action for failing to meet the demands of the school. According to statute, approval of amendments is discretionary; however,

that has historically been treated by many schools, including the Academy, as a matter of right.

Mr. Gavin said charter contract amendments have been an area of significant consternation in the public sphere with parents raising serious concerns about the SPCSA's decisions to accommodate a school's amendment request in ways that may be detrimental to their children, or they felt they had not been appropriately consulted by the school in those areas. Mr. Gavin delineated that the SPCSA is trying to establish two annual deadlines for amendment requests—one in the fall and the other in the spring—and to clarify the conditions under which the SPCSA may impose or require in exchange for a change in contract. Currently, one party believes it can dictate the terms of the contract versus it being negotiated, or the SPCSA is unable to do the work it needs to do to ensure that public school obligations are protected and that students receive a high-quality education. He noted the regulation makes clear that a school may request an amendment outside of the fall and spring deadlines in the case of unpredictable events. Mr. Gavin insisted the SPCSA is not trying to be unreasonable, but rather it is trying to ensure there is a clear process and that the SPCSA's authority and discretion is fully recognized.

Mr. Gavin said in regard to renewals, the Academy's comments were carefully taken into consideration, which is the case with all sections of R089-16. The reason for posting the changes the day before the meeting was because the SPCSA heard the same remarks from other folks who had concerns similar to those of the Academy, and the SPCSA attempted to address them as quickly and responsibly as possible. He reiterated the regulation codifies the SPCSA's existing practices. The SPCSA's renewal process is to require a school to submit a relatively short document that outlines the following: (1) how it performed in relation to the SPCSA's performance framework—which is also required to be done under contract by statute; (2) how the school performed under the statewide system of accountability (the star system), which is also a statutory requirement; (3) how it performed under the SPCSA's financial framework; (4) organizational performance, which relates to compliance and other inputs; and (5) whether it plans to expand its enrollment during the subsequent charter term. He stated the SPCSA's intent is to ensure the renewal process determination is strictly based on the school's previous performance and not on its optimistic projections or forward-looking statements. Mr. Gavin stressed there is nothing in the regulation that precludes a school from requesting to make other changes following an amendment, such as adding new campuses or changing its program, which a school has the right to do.

Mr. Gavin said the SPCSA is attempting to differentiate between the actions a school should have taken to ensure high academic performance during the previous six years versus what appear to be deathbed conversions where suddenly everyone knows how to get right with the SPCSA, which does not work. Promises during

the renewal to make changes rarely work, or they result in only incremental improvements. That is an area where some schools have concerns they may no longer be able to operate. He opined it was the Legislature's intent to create a system of performance-based accountability for charter schools, which is evidenced by the sweeping reforms that have been in place since 2011 between the creation of the SPCSA and the passage of Assembly Bill 205 (Chapter 484, *Statutes of Nevada 2013*) and Senate Bill 509 (Chapter 516, *Statutes of Nevada 2015*).

Senator Kieckhefer asked for confirmation that the SPCSA has not been operating without regulatory framework, but rather it is operating solely pursuant to NRS, to which Mr. Gavin responded that until the passage of S.B. 509, the SPCSA had no independent rulemaking authority.

Jason Guinasso, a member of the SPCSA, who was present at the SPCSA's hearing, remarked that the SPCSA is trying to create transparent and fair procedures for the charter school application process regarding how contract amendments are treated. He said one of the criticisms from members of the community is they are trying to become participants, but they do not understand the rules and what is expected of them. Mr. Guinasso offered a reminder that it has taken nearly one year to create R089-16 while pointing out there have been many opportunities to provide comment. When the final version of the regulation was prepared, there was a statutory time frame to submit comments—reiterating the SPCSA had not received the letter from Greenberg Traurig until one day prior to the hearing on the regulation. He also reiterated that the SPCSA received the letter, in addition to the Academy's public comments at the hearing, and despite the Academy representatives' immediate departure thereafter, he covered the regulation section-by-section and asked more than two dozen questions—some of which had been raised by the Academy—in order to obtain more information. One of the questions asked was whether the SPCSA would be in compliance with State law if it made nonmaterial changes to the regulation at the hearing and then forwarded them to the Commission, which legal counsel assured the SPCSA it would be in compliance. He assured the Commission there was ample time for comments to be made and perspectives to be considered. Ultimately, nonmaterial changes were made to R089-16 in response to voiced concerns.

Gregory Ott, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, who was present during the SPCSA's meeting, commented that neither he nor Robert Whitney, Deputy Attorney General, SPCSA, saw the changes as substantive nor did they raise any objections at the meeting.

Senator Kieckhefer commented he had no other concerns.

MOTION: Senator Denis moved approval of R089-16. Senator Kieckhefer seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 118-16

A REGULATION relating to the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Program; establishing conditions relating to matching contributions made by an employer of an employee who makes contributions to the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Trust Fund; revising provisions relating to amendments by the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada to change the designation of the qualified beneficiary of a prepaid tuition contract; providing that a prepaid tuition contract may provide for payment by the purchaser on a monthly basis for a period of 120 months; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-16).

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams and Sheila Salehian, Deputy Treasurer—Prepaid/College Savings Plans/Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program, Office of the State Treasurer, discussed the 10-year (120-month) plan. Ms. Salehian explained the State Treasurer currently offers several payment plan options as follows: (1) payment in a lump-sum, which is used by approximately 37 percent of individuals who purchase prepaid tuition; (2) monthly payments that can be initiated from birth through the beginning of college; and (3) a 5-year monthly payment plan. She added the 10-year plan is in response to families with newborns who cannot afford the 5-year plan. Regarding the modified business tax credit for employers if they match employee contributions to college savings plans, pursuant to S.B. 412 (Chapter 426, *Statutes of Nevada 2015*), which became effective on July 1, 2016, Ms. Salehian stated the program should be ready to accept contributions by January 2017. Lastly, the ability to change beneficiaries between siblings will be available sometime in 2017 once the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada approves the actuary new pricing that reflects 10-year payment plans instead of the other plans. She confirmed all of the information will be included in the State Treasurer's annual report.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked for the amount of the fee to change a beneficiary, to which Ms. Salehian replied there is a $20 administrative fee. Continuing, Ms. Salehian explained that Chapter 353B of NAC ("College Savings Plans of Nevada and Education Savings Accounts") applies to the two prepaid tuition programs in R118-16 and R148-16. The difference between them is with college savings plans, individuals may participate without age limitations, whereas the prepaid tuition plan enrollment is exclusive from infancy through grade 9 because it locks in today's in-state tuition for use tomorrow. The Program cannot match contributions if a prepaid tuition contract is paid in full; however, in that situation a plan under 26 U.S.C. Section 529 would be recommended so the employee may still get the employer match. She stated that under R148-16, an employer would be able to contribute to that plan on the employee's behalf.

Ms. Salehian explained the reason for allowing a beneficiary transfer under R118-16, but not under R148-16, is because prices are being locked in with

prepaid tuition. Therefore, in order to ensure that a fund is sound, rules and regulations are needed for multiple transfers of a contract because tuition continues to increase, and the State Treasurer has taken on the risk to invest those funds; hence, the need for limitations on the transfer. She noted that in the past, once a contract was used it could not be transferred. Under the 529 savings plan, beneficiary changes are allowed once per year, and because there are no age limitations and it is an investment on the part of the employer and employee, they take on that risk and can hold that account as long as they like, or the beneficiaries may be changed as long as they are following IRS rules.

Responding to Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's request for clarification regarding the qualifying age of a beneficiary who is receiving a plan as a result of a transfer as indicated in R118-16, Ms. Salehian said if the beneficiary is younger there are no age restrictions; however, the beneficiary cannot be more than three years older than the previous beneficiary. She explained the Program allows students to purchase contracts through grade 9. If the new beneficiary is more than three years older than the previous beneficiary, that person could have already graduated from high school. Ms. Salehian emphasized all of the college savings plans may be used nationwide.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R118-16. Assemblyman Hansen seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Regulation 136-16

A REGULATION relating to transportation network companies; revising provisions relating to the annual regulatory assessment paid by a transportation network company; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-14).

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams questioned the following: (1) the reason for the change in calculating the annual regulatory assessment; (2) the purpose behind requesting the specified information in the annual report provided by transportation network companies (TNCs); and (3) whether there was discussion about the number of entities that obtained a State business license for each of the TNCs.

Alaina Burtenshaw, Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA), DBI, responded to the first question. She explained that after the first regulations passed in 2015, they allowed for 1 percent of gross operating revenue, which was a placeholder while the NTA strived to determine what kind of response it would receive from drivers and Uber. There were a number of issues the NTA needed to deal with related to fiscal years (FY) for the assessments and working through an annual report process, noting R136-16 would create a tiered rate structure. By identifying the assessment of a 1 percent gross operating revenue, it also revealed the gross operating revenues, which created competitive concerns for the TNCs. The tiered rate structure allows the TNCs a level of confidentiality with

regard to their gross operating revenue, and it increases the amount of revenue that TNCs generate for regulation by the NTA.

Ms. Burtenshaw addressed the second question by stating the NTA was attempting to establish a better understanding of how NTAs operate and how to conduct an audit review process to ensure the NTA is collecting the right assessment for verification.

In response to the third question regarding State business licenses and TNCs, she said she would need to follow up with Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams. Referring back to the annual report, Ms. Burenshaw stated it is not shared with the Commission as a body, and the NTA would like to be able to see it every FY.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams said she would be interested in obtaining the annual report and that she is grateful to the NTA for collecting the information in an effort to determine how TNCs are doing in Nevada.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R136-16. Assemblyman Oscarson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chair Roberson reported that R117-16 (Agenda Item V A-15) has been voluntarily pulled by the Office of the State Treasurer.

Regulation 148-16

A REGULATION relating to the Nevada College Savings Program; revising provisions relating to matching contributions made by an employer to the account of an employee; and providing other matters properly relating thereto (Agenda Item V A-17).

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams remarked that she had requested to have R148-16 pulled for discussion, but that her question has been answered.

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of R148-16. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

B. Approval to Transmit Budget for Legislative Counsel Bureau and Interim Nevada Legislature to Office of Finance

Rick Combs, previously identified, referred to a memorandum dated December 20, 2016, from himself to the Commission Chair and Members titled Transmittal of Budgets of the LCB and Interim Nevada Legislature (Agenda Item V E). He stated the figures in the budget outline basically reflect what is being submitted for inclusion in the Governor's Executive Budget. The proposed LCB budget includes General Funds totaling approximately $31.4 million for FY 2018 and $31.1 million for FY 2019. The budget for the

Interim Nevada Legislature calls for General Fund appropriations of $847,060 in FY 2018 and $701,332 in 2019. Mr. Combs noted the $750,000 total proposed biennial appropriation for the 2017-2019 Biennium is an increase of only a little over the appropriation for the current biennium, and, based on the revenue projections of the Economic Forum, Office of Finance (GOF), Office of the Governor, there did not appear to be a need for a 5 percent budget reduction proposal as directed by the GOF. He cautioned that a 5 percent LCB budget reduction would have resulted in layoffs and keeping open positions vacant. The Legislature met with the GOF and attempted to keep the budget as flat as possible without making any of those types of reductions. To that effort, if the LCB was requested to comply with the two times agency appropriations cap for FY 2017, its cap would have been about $63.1 million. Mr. Combs reiterated the proposed budget is slightly more than $64 million.

Mr. Combs drew the Commission's attention to a chart attached to the memorandum for inclusion in the recommended budget titled "Enhancements Included in Recommended Budget for LCB and Interim Nevada Legislature", 2017–2019 Biennium (Agenda Item V E). In summary, the enhancements include but are not limited to: (1) position upgrades; (2) software equipment; and (3) lobby furniture for the Las Vegas office. Mr. Combs stated that in order to keep the budget flat, there are no requests for new positions; however, if funding is available at the time the budget is considered during the 2017 Session, the LCB would welcome the opportunity to request a handful of new positions in areas of need. Additionally, the LCB omitted items normally included in its operating budget; one-shot funding requests are submitted to fund those items. He pointed out that during the last four biennia, the budget has not included funding for legislators to attend out-of-state national organization meetings; the cost to restore that funding would be approximately $225,000 over the next biennium.

Furthermore, Mr. Combs stated the Commission and committees' portion of the budget is based upon members attending meetings at locations nearest to their homes with the exception of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands (NRS 218E.510) and the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System (NRS 218E.555) because those committees often meet in locations other than the Legislative Building and the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas. The recommendation includes $30,000 for interim committees or new statutory committees, as the Legislature deems appropriate. Mr. Combs indicated he would be working with the Assembly and Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections committees as bills for those types of items are heard. Ultimately, the Legislature will decide which ones to pass with the money that is available, or it can add money if it chooses to go above the $30,000 currently in the budget.

Concerning funding for the one-shot request of $1,062,855 for the payment of dues to national organizations ($824,995) over the biennium and computer

hardware replacements for the Administrative, Audit, and Research Divisions ($237,860), Mr. Combs conveyed that the one-shot request during the 2015 Session was over $2 million—the current request is roughly one-half of that amount. The other one-shot funding method being considered is similar to something that was done during the previous session with respect to a couple of big projects underway at the time, which is to fund the $1,963,010 request out of the Legislative Fund's uncommitted balance. The funds would be used to purchase a variety of items throughout the Legislative Branch, including:

- Computer hardware for the Fiscal and Legal Divisions;
- Replacement of components in one of the elevators;
- A new roof on the Sedway Office Building;
- Completion of the telecommunication system replacement project;
- Microsoft Office 2016 upgrades for over 700 computers;
- Usual requests for hardware and software updates;
- Fiber-optic upgrades;
- Legislative Police equipment;
- Replacement of four codec machines;
- Videoconferencing equipment; and
- Storage racks for the warehouse portion of the State Printing Office building.

Mr. Combs requested the Commission's approval to transmit the budget to the Executive Branch of the GOF. He pointed out that approval of the budget and the one-shot funding request does not constitute support by the Commission members; it is simply a motion to transmit the budget for inclusion. Like all other budgets, this budget must pass out of the money committees where much more detail about the budget will be provided. He noted some of the dollar amounts in the budget will change between now and the finalization of the Executive Budget. The GOF will convey its rates for various services used by the LCB as well as for personnel; the LCB will change those rates in its budget to match the Executive Budget. Finally, Mr. Combs asked for the Commission to grant him the authority to make any adjustments to the budget between now and the finalization of the Executive Budget, which would put LCB employees and the Interim Nevada Legislature on the same footing as Executive Branch employees. For example, if furloughs, cost of living adjustments, position upgrades, et cetera, are recommended for the Executive Branch, he would suggest doing the same concerning LCB employees.

Mr. Combs confirmed for Senator Kieckhefer that the $225,000 for legislative travel is not included in the budget. Senator Kieckhefer questioned the justification of the Microsoft Office 2016 upgrade to 700 computers and why there are so many computers, to which Mr. Combs responded approximately 300 people work for the LCB and some of them have more than one device, noting the LCB is making strides toward laptops and docking stations serving as desktops for individuals. There are also computers that need to be maintained during session, and there are additional computers in the Las Vegas office, all of which need to be updated with the proper software.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked what would occur if the costs for replacing the roof on the Sedway Office Building and for the elevator repair exceed the estimates.

Mr. Combs suggested treating the recommended amounts from the fund balance the same way as if they were in a one-shot bill, adding if there is surplus in one area, it can be used to fund an overage in another. He said he can also come back to the Commission to explain the need for additional funding and make a request.

Responding to Senator Denis's request for additional detail regarding the software codes and videoconferencing replacements, Mr. Combs stated the control software was a significant part of the big project that occurred during the 2015–2016 Interim, which entailed developing software because the old software would no longer be supported by the person who created it. Another part of the project was the control room and the router that routes all of the connections between the various rooms to Las Vegas, et cetera. Replacement of every piece of equipment did not occur during the current biennium because the LCB has much of the equipment on a replacement schedule, and the LCB Broadcast and Production Services did not want to replace items that did not need to be replaced until they came up in their cycle. The current request is to simply continue the practice of rotating out equipment after it has gone off of its maintenance schedule.

Mr. Combs also confirmed Senator Denis's statement that the upgrades might allow for videoconferencing to phones, laptops, and other electronic devices, so if someone needs to attend a meeting but cannot get to the building, that person could be videoconferenced into the meeting. He cautioned upgrading videoconferencing functionality is the goal, but not a promise, to increase methods by which someone may communicate with others at a distance.

MOTION: Senator Ford moved approval of Mr. Combs's request to transmit the budget for the Legislative Branch to the Governor's Office of Finance and to allow Mr. Combs to make the necessary modifications and adjustments as requested.

Senator Kieckhefer seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PROGRESS REPORTS AND APPOINTMENTS

A. Litigation Currently in Progress—Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel

B. Appointment of Members to Various Committees and Similar Entities:
   1. Gaming Policy Committee (NRS 463.021)

Chair Roberson stated the Commission must appoint one member of each house to the Gaming Policy Committee for terms that begin on the first day of session (Agenda Item VI A-1). He noted that typically the people designated to chair the Assembly and Senate Committees on Judiciary for the following session are named to the Committee. Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3, and Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9, are the designated chairs for the 2017 Session.

MOTION: Senator Atkinson moved approval of the appointment of Senator Segerblom and Assemblyman Yeager to serve on the Gaming Policy Committee. Assemblyman Araujo seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

   2. Advisory Board on Maternal and Child Health (NRS 442.133)

Chair Roberson said the Commission must appoint one member of each house to the Advisory Board on Maternal and Child Health for terms that begin on the third Monday in January (Agenda Item VI A-2). He solicited nominations from the members.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams nominated Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Assembly District No. 24.

Senator Ford nominated Senator Patricia Farley, Senate District No. 8.

MOTION: Senator Atkinson moved approval of the appointment of Senator Farley and Assemblywoman Joiner to the Advisory Board on Maternal and Child Health. Senator Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

   3. Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending (NRS 645B.019)

Chair Roberson stated the Commission is recommending the reappointment of Janis Grady, Winston McGregor, and Darren K. Proulx, whose terms expire on

December 22, 2016, to the Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending (Agenda Item VI A-3). Two additional names have been provided in a letter from Cathy Sheehy, Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, DBI, in the event the Commission determines it wants to change its recommendations (Agenda Item VI A-4).

MOTION: Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams moved approval of the reappointment of Janis Grady, Winston McGregor, and Darren Proulx to the Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending. Senator Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

4. Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum (NRS 427A.320)

Mr. Combs read the names of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum (NSHLF) members recommended for reappointment whose terms end on December 31, 2018, from a memorandum dated December 20, 2016, by Mary Shope, Coordinator, NSHLF (Agenda Item VI A-5):

- Vicki L. Cameron, Senate District No. 5;
- Barbara Altman, Senate District No. 9;
- Clare Tobler, Senate District No. 12;
- Dr. John A. Yacenda, Senate District No. 16;
- Patsy Metler; Senate District No. 18;
- Doris J. Ahrens; Senate District No. 19; and
- Fred L. Silberkraus, Senate District No. 20.

The following individual is recommended to fill a current vacancy:

- Marilyn E. Jordan, Senate District No. 11.

MOTION: Senator Ford moved approval of the reappointment of Vicki L. Cameron, Senate District No. 5; Barbara Altman, Senate District No. 9; Clare Tobler, Senate District No. 12; Dr. John A. Yacenda, Senate District No. 16; Patsy Metler, Senate District No. 18; Doris J. Ahrens, Senate District No. 19; and Fred L. Silberkraus, Senate District No. 20; and the appointment of Marilyn E. Jordan, Senate District No. 11, to the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

5. Commission on Ethics (NRS 281A.200)

Chair Roberson informed the Commission that Amanda Yen, an attorney with McDonald Carano Wilson LLP in Clark County, is the sole applicant for appointment to the Commission on Ethics (Agenda Item VI A-6).

Senator Kieckhefer shared that he knows Ms. Yen because she is a partner at the same law firm where he works.

MOTION: Senator Kieckhefer moved approval of the appointment of Amanda Yen to the Commission on Ethics. Senator Denis seconded the motion. The motion carried. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was not present for the vote.

C. Presentation of Legislative Counsel Bureau Report Concerning the Provision of Mental and Other Behavioral Health Services in this State—Megan Comlossy, Senior Research Analyst, and Jennifer Ouellette, Program Analyst

Brody Leiser, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB, introduced the presenters of the Legislative Counsel Bureau Report Concerning the Provision of Mental and Other Behavioral Health Services in this State (https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/2017/Bulletin17-06.pdf) (Agenda Item VI B) as follows: Megan Comlossy, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB; Marsheilah D. Lyons, Chief Principal Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB; and Jennifer Ouellette, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB (the Team). He noted that each of the analysts played a vital role in finalizing the Report. Mr. Leiser shared a disclaimer that the LCB is a nonpartisan agency, and as such, LCB staff neither advocates for nor against any issue, position, or ideology. The Report presents information in an unbiased manner to assist legislators in making informed decisions regarding mental health services in Nevada.

Mr. Leiser stated that at the April 4, 2016, Legislative Commission meeting the LCB was directed to study factors that may influence regionalizing the behavioral health system in Nevada. Continuing, he said the Commission requested that the Report build on the work of the Governor's Behavioral Health and Wellness Council and for LCB staff to work with various stakeholders to report on: (1) issues the Legislature may wish to consider in proposing legislation to regionalize mental health in Nevada; and (2) examples of states that have regionalized their mental health system, including strategies, advantages, and disadvantages of transitioning to a regionalized behavioral health system. Mr. Leiser shared that the Team would like to express its gratitude to all of the stakeholders who participated and provided assistance in an effort to finalize the Report, including, but not limited to the DHHS, the DPBH coordinators, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the Nevada System of Higher Education, local government and law enforcement agencies, and various community health care providers.

Megan Comlossy, previously identified, provided a synopsis of the Report. She testified that the behavioral health system in Nevada is centralized at the State level, which means the State manages funds, administers programs, and directly provides behavioral health care services throughout Nevada. She indicated a more regionalized system could take many forms but would entail moving responsibilities to counties, nongovernmental organizations, or other regional entities. Across the nation regionalized behavioral health systems tend to fall along a continuum. At one end is the State centric model, and at the other end regional entities assume control and responsibility for nearly every aspect of the system with much variation in between.

Ms. Comlossy said there are two key issues to consider in evaluating whether to regionalize behavioral health in Nevada. The first is access to care, which is affected by a variety of factors, including the geographic distribution of people throughout the State. Access is also affected by the number of behavioral health care providers, of which Nevada faces a severe shortage. Compared to other states, Nevada ranks forty-seventh in terms of the number of psychiatrists per 100,000 people, forty-eighth in the number of psychologists, fiftieth in social workers, and fifty-first in counselors. Furthermore, existing behavioral health care providers are poorly distributed statewide. The vast majority of Nevada is considered to have a shortage of mental health professionals with Clark County being the exception, and yet, one-third of its population lives in areas where there are not enough providers. This means many Nevadans, especially those living in rural and frontier areas, must travel significant distances for care. It also means individuals with severe mental illness or those without transportation often do not access the care they need or they do so only in crises situations.

She said the second key issue when considering access to care is health insurance coverage. Following the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), Nevada's insurance rate declined from 19 percent to 11 percent; however, the rate is still higher than the 9 percent national average. In addition, while the number of insured has increased in recent years, the number of behavioral health providers has not proportionately increased. Individuals with health insurance also report other barriers to accessing care, including finding behavioral health care providers who are in their health insurance plans' networks, high authorization denial rates of requests for services, and high costs for out-of-pocket expenses, copays, deductibles, and coinsurance. Ms. Comlossy concluded there is much data in the Report that may help the Commission make decisions based on access to care and health insurance coverage as it evaluates whether and how to regionalize the behavioral health system.

Jennifer Ouellette, previously identified, posed how regions throughout the State would be defined under a regionalized model. She reported that Nevada has divided many service provisions throughout the northern and southern rural areas. Ms. Ouellette referred to a map on page 14 of the Report (https://www.leg.

state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/2017/Bulletin17-06.pdf), (Agenda Item VI B) which indicates that a vast majority of behavioral health facilities are located in Clark and Washoe Counties' urban centers with few options in the rural and frontier areas. Therefore, it was important for the Team to understand where residents go in order to access behavioral health care. While most Nevadans access care in counties where they reside, many travel to neighboring counties, which demonstrates some areas of natural regional alignment would occur outside of the traditional northern and southern rural areas. In northern Nevada, for example, residents of Carson City and Douglas, Lyon, and Washoe Counties access services across county lines. Nevadans living in Churchill and Mineral Counties also travel to Carson City and Douglas, Lyon, and Washoe Counties for services.

In southern Nevada, Clark County residents typically stay in that county to access services; however, Nye County residents also access services in southern Nevada. In the northeast portion of Nevada, Elko, Eureka, and Lander County residents primarily receive care in Elko County. These findings demonstrate options for defining regions other than the traditional north and south and create a balance. Figure 13 on pages 42 and 43 of the Report (https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Publications/InterimReports/2017/Bulletin17-06.pdf) (Agenda Item VI B) summarizes several existing entities in Nevada and how they have approached regional organization.

Ms. Ouellette also reported DPBH funded three behavioral health coordinators in 2015 in an effort to assist in identifying local needs and to align efforts with those entities, such as advocacy organizations, community service providers, law enforcement, and social service agencies. The three coordinators were funded to include one each in Clark and Washoe Counties and one to serve in the quad county region of Carson City and Churchill, Douglas, and Lyon Counties. The DPBH will also fund a coordinator for Elko County. The behavioral health coordinators serve as an existing infrastructure that could be utilized in building a regional system. The analysis of regional access to care did not display areas of natural alignment for several frontier counties, which include Esmeralda, Humboldt, Lincoln, Pershing, Storey, and White Pine Counties. The analysis also did not take into account Nye County's size and the probable differences in accessing services between residents in the northern and southern portions of Nye County. Adopting a regionalized model for services in these areas may require the creation of smaller subregions, increasing the availability of services, or leveraging resources such as telemedicine rural health clinics and federally qualified health centers.

Marsheilah D. Lyons, previously identified, informed the Commission that the final section of the Report summarizes governance models used in select states across the nation—each displaying a different approach to regionalization—noting LCB staff contacted each state to gather the most accurate information. In addition, a description of a regional governing body, provided by certain participants in the

Southern Nevada Forum, is also included in the Report. She said in its pursuit of a regional system in Nevada, it helped the Team to observe what regionalization looks like in each state. Quality and cost are always considerations—and to that end—regional systems were developed to both increase stakeholder involvement and improve access to community-based resources. Regarding public policy options, various stakeholders presented options in the two aforementioned areas during the course of the study that might be beneficial for deliberations and efforts to improve Nevada's behavioral health care system.

Ms. Lyons listed some of the options aimed at involving local stakeholders in identifying key issues and developing priorities, which include:

- Establishing boundaries and entities within each region to provide input and feedback;

- Providing a behavioral health program coordinator for every area of the State; and

- Revising the duties and responsibilities of the Commission on Behavioral Health.

Options presented to develop community-based resources and services include:

- Collaboration with rural health care providers to expand behavioral health care services within existing health care facilities;

- Increasing the use of telemedicine;

- Evaluating Medicaid funding and policies to ensure they support the growth of community-based providers (similar to the work done to improve access to inpatient mental health services);

- Working with professional licensing boards, colleges and universities, and others to create a behavioral health workforce development plan; and

- Expanding the capacity of community health centers and other safety net providers to increase their ability to deliver behavioral health services.

Ms. Lyons emphasized the importance of the scope and timing of the staff study, which she remarked did not allow the Team to reach out to all of the stakeholders that will be involved or impacted by a change to a regional-based mental health system. The Report includes options to further study behavioral health regionalization and to develop policy options that support a regional plan, which include: (1) creating a subcommittee of the Legislative Commission; (2) establishing an interim study committee; (3) delegating specific responsibilities to existing legislative, Executive, or public higher education entities that are already

tasked with health care or workforce strategic planning. In closing, she stated the issues, examples, and options described in the Report serve as catalysts for discussions and deliberations related to decentralizing mental health care governance and services in Nevada.

She commented that many factors influence such deliberations, for example:

- Access to behavioral health care across the State;
- Status of private and public health care insurance coverage;
- Effect of the ACA on coverage and providers;
- Vast geographic expanse of the State;
- Collaboration among stakeholders; and
- Costs associated with the transition to and maintenance of a regional behavioral health system.

Ms. Lyons stated as these issues are collectively considered, the Team trusts they will help future efforts to improve the mental health care system in Nevada.

Chair Roberson thanked the Team and congratulated them for their efforts.

Assemblyman Araujo expressed sincere gratitude toward the Team, remarking he had shared the Report with many stakeholders who have been discussing these issues for years. Collectively, they indicated the Report is the most comprehensive study seen in a long time. He said it is a great report that provides clear direction on possible options during the 2017 Session.

AGENDA ITEM VII—INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Summary of Quarterly Reports on Disciplinary Action from the Licensing Boards and State Agencies

B. Miscellaneous Reports or Correspondence from State Agencies and Others:
   1. Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development's Tesla Gigafactory Quarterly Activity Report (Q2 2016)

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams stated that during the 2015 Session, based on the original white paper, Tesla Motors, Inc. projected to invest $2.9 billion in capital by 2016; however, based upon the Tesla Gigafactory (Project) Quarterly Activity Report (QAR) (Agenda Item VII A), as of June 2016, the investment is $607 million. She asked whether those figures were accurate.

Steve Hill, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development (GOED), Office of the Governor, confirmed the figures were correct.

Continuing, Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams pointed out that the difference between the figures is significant and questioned whether GOED was concerned that the investment is lower than what had been projected.

Mr. Hill explained that one of the reasons for the discrepancies between the projections and the actual result of the Project is GOED compiled the projected figures during its beginning discussions with Tesla in March 2014. Dates were applied to those projections, which, in hindsight, should have been named as Month 1, Month 2, et cetera. Once the information was presented, those dates were not rolled forward. There is about a nine-month difference between when GOED originally compiled those projections and when the Project actually started. Additionally, at the time, Tesla intended to build the entire facility all at once; whereas, now it is building it in phases, so that construction process changed somewhat. He said the original building was about 14 percent of the facility (one million square feet); however, Tesla is in the process of expanding the facility on the southern end of the building, which will add another 16 percent, and it plans to continue building out the facility. Mr. Hill stated the Project's progress is significant, is helpful to northern Nevada, and will continue to be so.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, referring to the number of qualified employees referenced in section (c) of the QAR, asked whether GOED had any concerns over the projected number of 1,700 by the end of 2016, and yet, to date, there are only 331 qualified employees.

Mr. Hill replied the number is actually 350 based upon figures from June 2016. He said Tesla publicly and recently stated the qualified employment figure was 850. The GOED worked with LCB staff, the Economic Forum and Tesla over the following biennium in order to project the progress so that the Economic Forum and the GOF could budget the transferable tax credits (TTCs) that may be offered and awarded to Tesla during that time. Mr. Hill reported the GOF expects Tesla to have approximately 3,200 employees on site by March 2018, which would indicate a hiring rate of about 150 employees per month between now and then. Tesla also stated it plans to hire over 1,000 employees during the next six months. He said the GOF also projected Tesla will have invested $2.5 billion in the Project by March 2019, which would indicate an average monthly investment of over $50 million between the present and March 2019. Mr. Hill pointed out that the average annual wage for the 350 employees at the site, as of June 2016, is over $100,000, which is significant, noting the figure should decline as Tesla hires more factory workers.

Mr. Hill responded to a concern expressed by Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams regarding the 3,200 qualified employees' figure and the low unemployment rate in

northern Nevada. He acknowledged GOED is also concerned with that figure and that all of the entities involved in workforce and craft training are working to respond to that need. Mr. Hill stated 3,200 is a large number of employees considering the size of the market, but GOED and the companies—Tesla and Panasonic Energy Corporation of North America—will have to work hard to respond to that need. He also replied to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams' request for the total dollar amount of TTCs issued by GOED for the Project, to which he replied the tax credits are counted when they are awarded. For example, when GOED performed the audit through June 2016, it took time to not only perform the audit, but to also certify the results and then issue the grant award. Therefore, that would count in FY 2017 even though it was for a period during FY 2016. To date, GOED has awarded $34.5 million in TTCs for employment and investment.

Mr. Hill emphasized the legislative measures passed during the 28th Special Session—that are often overlooked—provided offsets to the TTCs in the form of reductions of the film and insurance tax credits that enabled the Project to move forward. The film tax credit reduction was a one-time adjustment over a three and one-half year period; the insurance tax credit change is permanent. Over the course of 20 years, during which time GOED will offer mostly sales tax abatements to Tesla, somewhere between $650 and $750 million will be saved from repurposed programs allowing the Project to go forward. He suggested if the TTCs and abatements awarded to Tesla were added together, the State would be slightly ahead. The reduction in cost, as a result of legislation passed during the 28th Special Session, has more than compensated for the abatements and tax credits received by Tesla. He added that will likely not remain the case for the medium term; they will somewhat begin to diverge, but the cost reductions will be considerable.

Chair Roberson agreed with Mr. Hill's statement that the cost savings aspect of legislation passed during the 28th Special Session for the Project is a great point, and one that is often forgotten.

Mr. Hill added that the $1.3 billion figure for the "package" is often discussed in the press, but in order to achieve that figure in total, Tesla would have to invest $11.5 billion on the site, which was its projection in 2014, and that has not changed. However, it would take that amount because the tax abatements are largely associated with sales tax abatements on Tesla's purchases; therefore, if their purchase investments were to decrease, the abatements would also be lowered proportionately.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams asked whether the gaming industry has taken 100 percent advantage of the $35.5 million in TTCs, to which Mr. Hill confirmed that to date it had, but it is not a future requirement.

Assemblyman Hansen expressed concern that the QAR (Agenda Item VII A) is the last quarterly report required of the Project and that northern Nevada's economy is linked with Tesla's success. He asked about future reports legislators can expect that will assist them in evaluating the Project's progress.

Mr. Hill explained that legislation requires an annual audit be performed. He said GOED has also allowed Tesla to perform audits on an interim basis, up to and as often as quarterly, and that it will likely continue that practice in order to receive the TTCs more often than annually, which he speculated would occur two to four times each year. Mr. Hill also responded to a second question from Assemblyman Hansen about whether Tesla would object to extending the quarterly reports beyond July 2016, noting the Project's duration is 20 years, and there are substantial tax issues involved. He said he would inquire about a possible extension and then follow up with Assemblyman Hansen.

Senator Kieckhefer said a friend of his who is employed at the Project is very happy about its success and is having a much better holiday season because of it, pointing out the work on the Project can have a significant impact on people.

2. More Cops Revenue and Expenditure Reports Submitted Pursuant to Sections 13.5 and 13.7 of the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005, 1st Quarter of Fiscal Year 2017
   a. City of Henderson
   b. City of North Las Vegas

3. Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Annual Cost of Child Protective Services Report for State Fiscal Year 2016 Pursuant to NRS 432B.327

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams referred to the column titled Unique Count in Attachment 1 (Children Provided Child Protective Services FY 2016) of the Report (Agenda Item VII B) and asked why Carson City's and Lyon County's numbers are significantly higher than the larger counties.

Reesha Powell, Deputy Administrator, Child Welfare, Division of Child and Family Services, DHHS, speculated the numbers were based on the number of schools in the areas, population, and the reports and investigations.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams suggested that in the future the population counts be added to the chart in order to better assess the information.

4. Office of the State Treasurer, Annual Report, July 1, 2015–June 30, 2016, Pursuant to NRS 226.120

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, referring to page 9 of the Annual Report (Agenda Item VII C), questioned the number of eligible Nevada families who are not taking advantage of the Silver State Matching Grant Program.

Grant Hewitt, Chief of Staff, Office of the State Treasurer, replied that he did not have those figures at hand; however, he would provide them to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams by day's end.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, referring to the Nevada College Kick Start Program on page 12 of the Annual Report (Agenda Item VII C), stated there are 100,145 kindergarten students participating in the program; she questioned the number of eligible students not taking advantage of the program.

Mr. Hewitt replied that all Nevada kindergarten students are automatically opted into the program and remain enrolled unless they choose to opt out at some point. He reported that to date, 11 students had opted out of the Program.

Referring to the Nevada Prepaid Tuition Program on pages 15 and 16 of the Annual Report (Agenda Item VII C), Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams noted Nevada is only 1 of 11 states still offering prepaid tuition and asked the reason for the decline of this type of program.

Sheila Salehian, previously identified, replied that the primary reason other states no longer offer prepaid tuition programs is because they were unable to keep their programs funded due to the economic recession. She said Nevada has one of the strongest programs at 130 percent funding in 2016, which means if everyone were to cash in on the program or request a refund, the program would be able to pay out 100 percent. During the recession, many programs throughout the country were under funded due to high tuition increases and inappropriately priced contracts.

Mr. Hewitt, responding to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams' question of when funds for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship Program would run out if not replaced, said the funds will run out in FY 2019 if no changes are made during the 2017 Session, which is sooner than the testimony provided during the 2015 Session, due to enhancements made during that session.

Mr. Hewitt referred Assemblyman Hansen's request for clarification of the principal figures versus interest figures for State property taxes on page 39 of the Annual Report (Agenda Item VII C) to Tara Hagan, Chief Deputy, Office of the State Treasurer, to which she stated the chart is the total amount of principal and interest the State Treasurer paid out to bond holders in FY 2016. She explained that within the principal and interest payments, there are varying issuance dates; therefore, there could be bonds that were issued 20 years prior and other more recent bonds issued with lower interest rates.

Senator Denis asked why the educational voucher (aka Education Savings Account Program [ESA]) was not included in the Annual Report, to which Mr. Hewitt surmised it was because of ongoing litigation; however, he would provide a subsequent report on the ESA to the Commission.

Senator Ford requested the inclusion of demographics and income levels of ESA applicants in the subsequent report as well as in future reports.

5. Summary Report of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System Pursuant to Rule No. 6 of the Rules and Policies of the Legislative Counsel Bureau

6. Biennial Report of the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum Pursuant to NRS 427A.390

John C. Yacenda, Ph.D., M.P.H., P.A.H.M., President, NSHLF, introduced a summary of the NSHLF's Biennial Report developed during the 2015–2016 Interim (Agenda Item VII D), which is based upon six hearings held by the NSHLF. He stated the NSHLF's philosophy during the process was to bridge the gap between the needs of seniors and the sources and services available to them throughout the State, such as administrative agencies, district attorneys' offices, law enforcement agencies, the Office of the Attorney General, and other government and nongovernment organizations by proposing clear and meaningful recommendations. Dr. Yacenda indicated that S.B. 28 of the 2017 Session is an attempt to remedy one of the NSHLF's concerns, which is to improve seniors' access to Medicaid providers by annually adjusting Medicaid rates according to the actual costs of providing medical care, noting the rates have not been adjusted in 14 years. He asked the Legislature to carefully study S.B. 28 and all of the factors associated with it. Dr. Yacenda briefly discussed the following NSHLF proposals, and he expressed the NSHLF's support for other efforts to assist seniors as indicated in the Biennial Report (Agenda Item VII D):

- Proposals relating to Nevada veterans advocacy programs and Nevada veterans homes and services;

- Proposals relating to the exploitation or isolation of seniors and elder abuse and neglect; and

- Proposals relating to senior health care and services.

Dr. Yacenda mentioned the National Silver Haired Congress governs itself as a nonprofit organization, as opposed to the NSHLF, which is governed by statute. He noted there are conflicts on a number of issues that need to be statutorily

corrected. Dr. Yacenda added he would be happy to avail himself on the issues whenever the opportunities are presented.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Roberson called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented. He mentioned the next Commission meeting would be in January 2017.

AGENDA ITEM IX—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Gleason
Secretary for Minutes

APPROVED BY:

Senator Michael Roberson, Chair
Legislative Commission

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	WITNESS/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II A-1	Melinda Hoskins, MS, APRN, CNM, IBCLC, Minden, Nevada, and President of the Nevada American College of Nurse-Midwives	Written testimony regarding R059-16
Agenda Item II A-2	American Association of Birth Centers	Letter dated April 30, 2014, regarding freestanding birth centers
Agenda Item V A-1	Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)	List of regulations
Agenda Item V A-2	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Board of Psychological Examiners (BPE), LCB File No. 128-14
Agenda Item V A-3	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the BPE, LCB File No. 038-16
Agenda Item V A-4	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the BPE, LCB File No. 131-15
Agenda Item V A-5	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada, LCB File No. 086-16
Agenda Item V A-6	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners (BWC), LCB File No. 144-15
Agenda Item V A-7	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Director of the State Department of Agriculture, LCB File No. 016-15
Agenda Item V A-8	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the BWC, LCB File No. 139-16

Agenda Item V A-9	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Taxicab Authority of the Department of Business and Industry, LCB File No. 003-16
Agenda Item V A-10	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the State Board of Health, LCB File No. 059-16
Agenda Item V A-11	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety, LCB File No. 061-16
Agenda Item V A-12	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), LCB File No. 088-16
Agenda Item V A-13	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the SPCSA, LCB File No. 089-16
Agenda Item V A-14	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Nevada Transportation Authority, LCB File No. 136-16
Agenda Item V A-15	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the State Treasurer, LCB File No. 117-16
Agenda Item V A-16	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada, LCB File No. 118-16
Agenda Item V A-17	Legal Division, LCB	Adopted Regulation of the State Treasurer, LCB File No. 148-16

Agenda Item V B	Capella and Walden Universities	Letters dated August 11, 2016, June 14, 2016, and August 12, 2016, respectively, regarding R038-16
Agenda Item V C	Tyler Turnipseed, Chief Game Warden, Nevada's Department of Wildlife	E-mail dated December 20, 2016, regarding R144-15
Agenda Item V D	Greenberg Traurig	Letter dated December 20, 2016, regarding R089-16
Agenda Item V E	Rick Combs, Director, LCB	Memorandum dated December 20, 2016, regarding transmittal of budgets of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and Interim Nevada Legislature
Agenda Item VI A-1	Rick Combs, Director, LCB	Appointment of Members to the Gaming Policy Committee
Agenda Item VI A-2	Rick Combs, Director, LCB	Appointment of Members to the Advisory Board on Maternal and Child Health
Agenda Item VI A-3	Rick Combs, Director, LCB	Appointment of Members to the Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending
Agenda Item VI A-4	Cathy Sheehy, Commissioner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of Business and Industry	Letter dated December 20, 2016, regarding the appointment of members to the Advisory Council on Mortgage Investments and Mortgage Lending

Agenda Item VI A-5	Mary Shope, Coordinator, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum (NSHLF)	Memorandum dated December 20, 2016, regarding appointments to the NSHLF
Agenda Item VI A-6	Rick Combs, Director, LCB	Appointment of Members to the Commission on Ethics
Agenda Item VI B	Research Division, LCB	*Regionalizing the Mental Health System in Nevada: Considerations and Options*
Agenda Item VII A	Steve Hill, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development (GOED), Office of the Governor, on behalf of Mike Dang, Director, Business Operations, GOED	Letter dated August 17, 2016, and the *Tesla Gigafactory Quarterly Activity Report*
Agenda Item VII B	Reesha Powell, Deputy Administrator, Child Welfare, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, on behalf of Kelly C. Wooldridge, LCSW, Administrator, DCFS, DHHS	Letter dated November 30, 2016, and the *Annual Cost of Child Protective Services Report for State Fiscal Year 2016*
Agenda Item VII C	Grant Hewitt, Chief of Staff, Office of the State Treasurer	Office of the State Treasurer, *Annual Report, July 1, 2015 -June 30, 2016*
Agenda Item VII D	John C. Yacenda, Ph.D., M.P.H., P.A.H.M., President, NSHLF	*Summary Report to the Legislative Commission and the Governor*

This set of "Minutes of the Legislative Commission" is an informational service. Meeting materials are on file in the Director's Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada.