



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

The Legislative Commission held its first meeting in calendar year 2015 on Friday, January 16, 2015. The meeting began at 9:00 a.m. in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, and was videoconferenced to Room 4101 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chair  
Senator Kelvin D. Atkinson  
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis  
Senator Ben Kieckhefer  
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen  
Senator Michael Roberson  
Senator James A. Settlemeyer  
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson  
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman James Oscarson  
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Rick Combs, Director  
Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division  
Risa B. Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division  
H. Pepper Sturm, Interim Research Director, Research Division  
Janet Coons, Secretary for Minutes, Research Division  
Debbie Gleason, Secretary for Minutes, Research Division  
Sylvia A. Wiese, Executive Assistant, Administrative Division

Chair Kirkpatrick called the meeting to order. [Exhibit A](#) is the agenda; the attendance sign-in sheets are [Exhibit B](#). All exhibits are filed in the Director's Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and are on the Legislative Commission's webpage at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Interim/77th2013/Committee/Interim/LC/?ID=2>. Agenda items taken out of order have been placed in proper agenda order in the minutes for purposes of continuity.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Kirkpatrick called for public comment.

Les Jacobs, Chief Financial Officer, Nevada Senior Services (NSS), Las Vegas, commented on proposed licensing fees from the Bureau of Health Care Quality and Compliance (HCQC), Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), for adult day care. Mr. Jacobs clarified that he is not opposed to the licensing fee, rather, the increased cost from \$0 to \$1,753. He wanted to ensure the Commission was aware that of the 50 licenses issued by the HCQC, 64 percent were no longer in existence. Additionally, NSS estimated licenses would decrease due to pending increases in licensing fees and stagnant adult day care pay for the last 12 years. Eighty-five percent of NSS's clients, approximately 140 per day, are on poverty level scholarship through Medicaid; the Aging and Disability Services Division, DHHS; NSS's scholarship or 3V program; Clark County assistance; or grants from the Alzheimer's Association; or Helping Hands. Without adult day care, those clients would be resigned to living in nursing homes. He explained most nursing home placements occur in California and Utah and those fees would go out of State, which would be detrimental to Nevada. Mr. Jacobs explained duplicative audits were performed by several agencies; however, if the HCQC performed the audits, the information could be shared with the other agencies, which would lower the auditing costs. Mr. Jacobs stated this would afford State agencies additional time to verify service hours and ensure payments and billings were correctly processed. Concluding, Mr. Jacobs supported the idea of phasing in the licensing fee.

Chair Kirkpatrick closed the first public comment period.

**LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION POLICY—Review of Administrative Regulations—**Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB (A list of the regulations may be viewed here: [http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Register/IndexesRegsReviewed/LCMtg\\_List\\_2015\\_Jan16.pdf](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Register/IndexesRegsReviewed/LCMtg_List_2015_Jan16.pdf)).

Referring to the list of State agency regulations to be reviewed by the Legislative Commission ([Exhibit C](#)), the Commission members asked the Chair to hold the following regulations for discussion: R061-13; R123-13; R022-14; R071-14; and R077-14.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED APPROVAL OF R125-13.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Regulation 061-13

A REGULATION relating to motor carriers; revising the definitions of “bus” and “livery limousine”; revising certain provisions regarding the solicitation of passengers by a common motor carrier of passengers or his or her employee; authorizing a designated agent who arranges transportation service through an electronic ride hailing system to charge and collect certain fees; revising provisions relating to fuel surcharges assessed by charter limousine operators; revising provisions governing the period during which certain motor vehicles may be placed in service as taxicabs; and providing other matters properly relating thereto ([Exhibit D](#)).

Senator Settelmeyer commented on current law that provided examples of language that operators may use to greet customers. He questioned the 24-month taxicab vehicle replacement extension for electric vehicles and asked why other alternative fuel vehicles were not included.

Andrew J. MacKay, Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA), Department of Business and Industry (DBI), answered when the regulations were being drafted, it was unknown if Tesla Motors was moving to Nevada. He referred to statutes regulated by the Taxicab Authority, DBI, that encouraged the use of hybrid electric vehicles by allowing them to operate for longer periods due to replacement costs. Mr. MacKay stated if regulation changes were needed to provide for longer periods of use, and with the Commission’s approval, a rate change would likely pass. He reported the NTA has its own authority to deviate from regulations and if due cause existed, a company could use a Tesla-type vehicle while the NTA worked through the process.

Senator Settelmeyer asked if R061-13 included additional definitions for buses. He said it was troublesome when there are several different definitions from the federal government, the NTA, and the DMV.

Mr. MacKay stated the NTA is changing the definition of a bus “used for passenger transportation only” and to the definition of “livery limousines.” He explained vehicles currently defined as charter buses with 16 passengers or more are being converted into 8- to 10-passenger vehicles in order to provide charter limousine service. Mr. MacKay added regulations are being updated to reflect the current manufacturing trends and services.

Senator Settelmeyer asked why the federal definition of a charter bus was not included in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) and *Nevada Revised Statutes*. He suggested it be added for consistency with federal regulations.

Mr. MacKay replied that a definition would still be needed because there are federal terms relative to limousines and livery limousines. Referring to the United States Courts for the Ninth Circuit case law, he said states have the authority to define those vehicles as they wish. He added Colorado defined a 54-passenger limousine as a bus.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked Mr. MacKay for an example of the fee structure for system access and payment set by the NTA.

Mr. MacKay offered the fee structure under current law provides for a 10 percent referral fee if a ride is referred to a certificated carrier. He added because the 10 percent referral fee was insufficient, the application user was charged a \$5 system access fee, in addition to the rate of the vehicle. The user downloads the application to view all vehicle types and availability provided by certificated carriers; the technology used was similar to that of Uber.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked if consideration had been given to a minimum and maximum system access fee. She compared that to the fees incurred by taxi cabs for accepting credit card payments, which she opined was helpful in keeping them within certain parameters.

Mr. MacKay acknowledged that was an option. He added some companies contracted with certificated carriers may not want to utilize the system access fee. Regarding the proposed \$5 charge, Mr. MacKay stated the NTA must approve any tariff rate.

Chair Kirkpatrick recalled the question of fees was raised at the time legislation was passed to allow livery limousines and livery limousine taxi cabs to operate in Nevada. She pointed out that the regulation is broad, which allows the fee to constantly be changed. Chair Kirkpatrick asked if this would be included in the NTA's budget this session. She stated if the purpose of the regulation was for the private sector to acquire more money in order to succeed, it needed to be defined in statute. She stressed that tourism is vital to Nevada's economy and cautioned if added costs were continually passed on to the consumer, it could be detrimental to Nevada's economy.

Mr. MacKay replied it would not be in the NTA's budget because the technology company collected the money. He explained a vehicle might be chartered using the application, in which case the user is aware of the \$5 fee in advance. He offered additional methods for securing a ride, such as contacting a company directly, through the Internet, or through a resort contracted with a company, in addition to many other options.

Chair Kirkpatrick referred back to Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's point of setting a maximum system access fee to ensure the private sector is being charged a reasonable and affordable fee. She conjectured that if the fee became too high, people would not use the service and contemplated at what point would it become a disservice. Chair Kirkpatrick said Nevada excels when it comes to conventions and tourism because it is affordable and competitive. Expressing concern with the broad fee language in the regulation, she asked Mr. MacKay how the NTA planned to exert control to ensure the fee did not become excessive.

Mr. MacKay replied that contracts or agreements between certificated carriers and e-hailing companies will have a system access fee, which the NTA will verify if it is predatory in nature. He stated he did not anticipate the fee maximizing higher than \$5; theoretically, the fee could decrease because of increased users and as infrastructure and technology investment costs were regained.

Senator Settelmeyer expressed his concern over the \$5 fee being charged per ride, as opposed to a one-time application fee for downloading to a smart phone. While he applauded the transportation industry for a technology-based delivery system, he questioned whether the regulation only accommodated hybrid vehicles. He stated he did not support that concept because he understood federal law was clear that states were not to regulate buses.

Chair Kirkpatrick asked Mr. MacKay whether he would be willing to pull the regulation for further legislative discussion or bring it back during the 2015 Session since there did not appear to be full support of the Commission.

Mr. MacKay stated he would return at the pleasure of the Commission. He clarified the State's regulatory authority over the charter bus industry was delineated in 49 U.S.C. § 14501, which gives states the authority to regulate the charter bus industry in areas related to safety and insurance. He stressed as Chair of the NTA and the person tasked by the Governor to oversee the agency and ensure safe and reliable transportation is provided to 45 million visitors, he would continue his duties as provided in statute.

Chair Kirkpatrick stated the regulation would be set aside for further discussion. She commented the fees should have been discussed during the workshops and she was concerned they would continue to increase.

Mr. MacKay asked if sections of R061-13 could be considered instead of discarding the entire regulation.

Chair Kirkpatrick clarified the entire regulation had to be passed. She suggested the Commission move to other regulations and address any additional questions regarding R061-13 at a later time.

### Regulation 123-13

A REGULATION relating to fire protection; adopting and revising certain publications by reference; revising provisions relating to examinations for certificates of registration issued by the State Fire Marshal; revising various provisions relating to interior design, fire systems, portable fire extinguishers and fixed fire extinguishing systems, portable buildings, automatic sprinkler systems, residential systems, day care facilities and fireworks displays; revising provisions relating to reports of deficiencies identified during an inspection of an automatic fire sprinkler system or fire standpipe system; revising the requirements for certificates of registration and licenses issued by the State Fire Marshal; establishing a prioritized schedule for inspections of state-owned and state-occupied buildings; and providing other matters properly relating thereto ([Exhibit E](#)).

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson referred to spirited conversations amid Legislative Committee on Health Care meetings during the Interim regarding proposed regulations to group homes. She recalled that since the meetings, the State Fire Marshal Division (SFMD), Department of Public Safety (DPS), met with the industry and there appeared to be a resolution.

Peter J. Mulvihill, P.E., Chief, SFMD, DPS, stated that a section of the original draft regulation was pulled and the SFMD worked with Kyle Devine, Chief, HCQC, DPBH, DHHS, in establishing a voluntary program in group homes that evaluated the capability of residents. Chief Mulvihill was concerned the homes were being conservatively or liberally classified in a restrictive manner and the terminology in the building and fire code did not use the same categories as the DPBH. He stated the voluntary program determined whether individuals were capable of self-preservation, and, if not, there were substantially higher levels of protection required for the facility.

Chief Mulvihill explained the DPBH implemented a program to evaluate the homes for safe evacuation of the building within a certain period. If a home passed the evaluation, the DPBH deemed it capable of self-preservation. Chief Mulvihill emphasized the resolution did not require changes to the SFMD's regulations. He stated the SFMD received positive feedback and was able to work with the industry on its licensing through the alternative program.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson thanked Chief Mulvihill for the update and for his work, at the same time accentuating the concerns of many people. She continued that based upon her observation of group homes, they appeared to be more aware of a client's ambulatory status and ability to self-evacuate when considering applicants.

Responding to Assemblyman Oscarson, Chief Mulvihill affirmed that parties with which he had met were in agreement with the SFMD's proposed regulation.

Assemblyman Oscarson stated he attended the SFMD's last meeting and thanked Chief Mulvihill for working with all interested parties.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED APPROVAL OF R123-13.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

#### Regulation 022-14

A REGULATION relating to facilities for the care of adults during the day; requiring a facility for the care of adults during the day to provide the maximum number of clients allowed to occupy the facility at one time in an application for a license and notify the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services of any change to that number; requiring a facility for the care of adults during the day to pay a fee for an application for a license or renewal of a license; requiring a facility for the care of adults during the day to keep a separate personnel file for each employee of the facility that must include certain documentation concerning tuberculosis screening; and providing other matters properly relating thereto ([Exhibit F](#)).

Assemblyman Hansen mentioned a conversation he had with the owner of an adult day care facility in Sparks who said the imposed yearly fee would create a financial hardship not only for his fixed-income clients, but also for his family. He suggested a phased-in fee would minimize the financial impact, as opposed to paying it up front, which was a serious concern to the small businessperson.

Laura Freed, Deputy Administrator of Regulatory and Planning Services, DPBH, DHHS, made a distinction between the two fees established by R022-14. She clarified for facilities with 50 clients or fewer, the initial licensure fee was \$1,164, or \$97 per month, and the yearly renewal fee was \$814. For facilities with over 50 clients, the initial licensure fee was \$1,753 and the renewal fee was \$1,227. She continued there were 18 licensed adult day care facilities, with the majority in southern Nevada, four in northern Nevada, one in a rural county, and two applications were pending. Ms. Freed pointed out lower licensing fees in R022-14. She stated that R022-14 implemented Assembly Bill 50 (Chapter 88, *Statutes of Nevada 2011*), which removed the exemption for adult day care centers from paying fees. Ms. Freed explained the fees in R022-14 were lower, when compared to the fees of R124-12, which was withdrawn. She added the HCQC was willing to facilitate payment plans for smaller providers, rather than requiring initial payment in full.

In response to Senator Kieckhefer, Ms. Freed confirmed licensed facilities only paid the renewal fee. She explained the DPBH inspects facilities every 18 months,

unless a complaint is filed. Since licensees are renewed annually, the DPBH reduced the renewal fee by 30 percent to take into account the disparity of paying the fee annually and being inspected every 18 months.

Chair Kirkpatrick expressed concern that the DPBH consistently comes before the Commission at the end of the year with fee requests and emergency regulations. She questioned how the DPBH calculated the number of inspections per year.

Leticia Metherell, Registered Nurse, Health Facilities Inspection Manager, DPBH, DHHS, explained the reason for the higher numbers was that unsubstantiated complaints were included in the cost, in addition to periodic inspections. She emphasized the DPBH billed separately for substantiated complaints, therefore, workload was excluded from the analysis.

Continuing, Ms. Metherell stated the DPBH met with the Adult Day Care Advisory Council (ADCAC), HCQC, DPBH, DHHS, to discuss best practices for recovering costs for unsubstantiated complaints. She noted ADCAC did not want unsubstantiated complaints separated, as opposed to substantiated complaints. The DPBH contended clients may start filing more complaints, and if that occurred, it would diminish their opportunities of acceptance into an adult day care facility because complaints are costly to investigate. Ms. Metherell concluded that ADCAC determined unsubstantiated complaints should be part of the annual fee structure and the substantiated complaints be separate; consequently, the substantiated complaint workload was removed from the analysis.

Responding to Chair Kirkpatrick's inquiry regarding the late submission of the regulation, Ms. Freed responded the DPBH submitted R0124-12, but it was withdrawn due to high staff turnover. She referenced budget account No. 3216 that revealed a 20 to 30 percent vacancy rate and commented the DPBH had not anticipated a meeting of the Commission prior to the 2015 Session.

Chair Kirkpatrick suggested the Commission wait and discuss the subject during the budget cycle noting there was nothing in the regulation that applied to the next licensee. She expressed concern regarding the section that no longer requires employees to produce a certificate from a licensed physician establishing the person was in a state of good physical health.

Ms. Metherell commented the proposal was to have the adult day care facilities follow the standards in NAC 441A.375 ([Exhibit G](#)) by continuing to require a physical examination and conform to the practice of other dependent care facilities that use those standards.

Ms. Freed asserted the facility was required to conform to the tuberculosis standards; therefore, there was no change in the business process.



In response to Chair Kirkpatrick's inquiry whether the fees were included in the DPBH's budget, Ms. Freed said they were not; however, the money committees would see the fees go into Revenue General Ledger (RGL) 3601, which is comprised of various facilities the HCQC licenses. Those licensed by the State go into one RGL and those the HCQC surveys on behalf of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services go into another. She surmised the fee was not calculated as one of the lines that add up to the total in government regulations.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson expressed she would like the DPBH to consider waiving fees for facilities operated by public entities, such as county senior services for adult day care. She also suggested the fee be based on a sliding scale for very low-income persons and allow exemptions for nonprofit associations. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson elaborated on the inspection process noting frustration with the lack of personnel and delayed inspections and stressed the importance of protecting this vulnerable segment of society. She advocated the DPBH seeking additional support and stated there would be more discussion about the fee.

Ms. Freed commented the DPBH would consider a variance or a compliance agreement for adult day care centers run by public entities or nonprofits.

Responding to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams' question regarding how many of the four small business impact questionnaires returned by the industry were from southern Nevada and how many had 50 or more clients, Ms. Metherell said the DPBH did not have those statistics and the questionnaire did not address demographics. She added facilities are not required to identify themselves and conjectured the reason may be for anonymity when providing responses to the DPBH.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams expressed concern that the questionnaire might not be an accurate representation of facilities that stated the regulations would not have an impact on their businesses.

Ms. Metherell said she addressed fees and delineated in the small business impact statement that there would be a fiscal impact to facilities. She said she would try to locate the information and provide it to Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams.

Chair Kirkpatrick supported the need for fees and pointed out regulations should match legislative intent. She said the fees would be considered by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means during the 2015 Session.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN MOVED TO DEFER R022-14.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

#### Regulation 071-14

A REGULATION relating to taxes imposed on special fuels; establishing the procedure by which certain persons who use special fuel in motor vehicles operated or intended to be operated interstate may submit to the Department of Motor Vehicles a request for reimbursement of certain local taxes imposed on special fuels; providing limitations on the sources from which reimbursements may be made and the total amount of money which may be used in any fiscal year to make reimbursements; establishing the amount of the fee which the Department will charge and collect from each person who submits a request for reimbursement; requiring the Department to establish and administer certain trust accounts for the purpose of paying requests for reimbursement which are approved by the Department; providing that the Department may investigate or conduct an examination or audit of a person who receives reimbursement; and providing other matters properly relating thereto ([Exhibit H](#)).

Referring to the \$100 application fee for requesting the tax reimbursement, Senator Settelmeyer asked whether the regulation only dealt with the International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA). Senator Settelmeyer worried the applicant would remit the \$100 for processing the reimbursement application and then receive less than what it cost to process the request itself.

Wayne Seidel, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, DMV, confirmed the regulation only applied to IFTA. He explained the program was the Clark County indexing portion and a Clark County tax the DMV would propose to refund. He noted it was a new program, which the \$100 fee was set with industry and used for processing Clark County application refunds that are separate and independent.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED APPROVAL OF R071-14.

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR ATKINSON.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

#### Regulation 077-14

A REGULATION relating to public safety; revising provisions relating to boilers, elevators and pressure vessels; establishing the Mechanical Compliance Section of the Division of Industrial Relations of the Department of Business and Industry as the agency responsible for the enforcement of the provisions of Chapter 455C of NAC relating to elevators; authorizing the Chief of the Section to issue an emergency order to restrain conditions or practices relating to an elevator in certain circumstances; providing for the certification of authorized inspection agencies; requiring special inspectors to be employed by or affiliated with an authorized inspection agency; revising and establishing fees; and providing other matters properly relating thereto ([Exhibit I](#)).

Assemblyman Hansen noted concern regarding the requirement to remove 50 percent of escalator steps for annual inspections and questioned whether that issue had been resolved.

Donald C. Smith, Esq., Division Counsel, Division of Industrial Relations (DIR), DBI, responded the requirement was never part of the regulation; rather, there was a memorandum that had since been withdrawn, and it also appeared in a guidebook as the appropriate way to inspect sites; however, it was not actively pursued and had been recognized as an onerous requirement on the State.

Assemblyman Hansen expressed concern that 29 small businesses responded to the DIR's survey that they would be severely affected by the proposed fee increase as provided on page 28 of the Informational Statement. He asked whether there was a mechanism that could minimize the impact on small businesses as fee increases were becoming a pattern while the ability to charge customers was declining.

Mr. Smith explained that 3,800 businesses with licensed elevators that serviced four or fewer floors were targeted for the survey, and the regulation exempts certain chargeable fees on shorter distance elevators. The DIR concluded, although there would be fee increases, the smaller businesses would realize a fee decrease because of the elimination of an emergency Phase II switch installation charge and that of monthly mechanical tests on the switch.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANSEN MOVED APPROVAL OF R077-14.

ASSEMBLYMAN STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Kirkpatrick asked Mr. MacKay to return for reconsideration of R061-13. She stated there was an inclination to move the regulation forward, since the Commission just learned Clark County supported it.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED APPROVAL OF R061-13.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

**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—Nevada State Contractors' Board Disciplinary Actions for the Period Ending December 31, 2014, Pursuant to NRS 622.100

There was no discussion on the informational items.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Kirkpatrick called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Debbie Gleason, Secretary for Minutes  
Legislative Commission

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chair  
Legislative Commission

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the "Meeting Notice and Agenda," dated January 16, 2015, provided by Sylvia A. Wiese, Executive Assistant, Administrative Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is the attendance sign-in sheets dated January 16, 2015, from Carson City, Nevada, and Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit C](#) is a table containing a list of State agency regulations to be reviewed by the Legislative Commission, dated January 16, 2015, furnished by the Legal Division, LCB.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Adopted Regulation of the Nevada Transportation Authority, LCB File No. R061-13, effective January 16, 2015, submitted by the Legal Division, LCB.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Adopted Regulation of the State Fire Marshal, LCB File No. R123-13, effective January 16, 2015, provided by the Legal Division, LCB.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Adopted Regulation of the State Board of Health, LCB File No. R022-14, effective January 16, 2015, submitted by the Legal Division, LCB.

[Exhibit G](#) is a copy of *Nevada Administrative Code* 441A.375, "Medical facilities, facilities for the dependent, homes for individual residential care and outpatient facilities: Management of cases and suspected cases; surveillance and testing of employees; counseling and preventive treatment," offered by Leticia Metherell, Health Facilities Inspection Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Adopted Regulation of the Department of Motor Vehicles, LCB File No. R071-14, Sections 1 through 10 and 15 become effective on January 16, 2015, and Sections 11 through 14 become effective on January 1, 2017; provided by the Legal Division, LCB.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Adopted Regulation of the Division of Industrial Relations of the Department of Business and Industry, LCB File No. R077-14; Sections 1 through 10, 13 through 32, 35, 37 and 39 through 76 become effective on January 16, 2015, Section 12 becomes effective on July 1, 2015, Section 11 becomes effective on July 1, 2016; Section 33 becomes effective on January 16, 2017; Section 34 becomes effective on January 16, 2018 and Sections 36 and 38 become effective on the date of the repeal of the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 666, Sections 43 and 44 expire by limitation on the date on the date of the repeal of the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 666. submitted by the Legal Division, LCB.

This set of “Minutes of the Legislative Commission” is an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits are on file in the Director’s Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada.