

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 15, 2017**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chairman Michael C. Sprinkle at 2:56 p.m. on Monday, May 15, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Chairman
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Patricia Farley, Senate District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst
Mike Morton, Committee Counsel
Kailey Taylor, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1097



OTHERS PRESENT:

Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services
Lee Elkins, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Denise Lopez, Personal Attaché for Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13
Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office

Chairman Sprinkle:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] There are a lot of moving parts right now. With that, we are only hearing two bills today, Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint) and Senate Bill 480 (1st Reprint). First we will do the work session which will include Senate Bill 59 (2nd Reprint), Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint) has been pulled, Senate Bill 159 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 165 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 262 (1st Reprint), and it should have been Assembly Bill 374, not Senate Bill 374 (2nd Reprint). Finally, Senate Bill 481 (1st Reprint) has also been pulled from work session today. We will begin our work session with Senate Bill 59 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 59 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the program to monitor prescriptions for certain controlled substances. (BDR 40-386)

Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first bill before the Committee is Senate Bill 59 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions relating to the program to monitor prescriptions for certain controlled substances. This bill requires law enforcement officers who encounter certain situations involving prescribed controlled substances or who receive a report of a stolen prescription for a controlled substance while acting in their official capacity in the regular course of an investigation to report certain information to their employer. A coroner, medical examiner, or deputy thereof who determines a person died as the result of using a prescribed controlled substance must upload certain information to the database or report such information to someone who can upload it. The employer of a law enforcement officer, coroner, or medical examiner who receives such a report must upload the report to the State's prescription monitoring program database as soon as practicable and may postpone uploading it if such action will interfere with an active criminal investigation. A law enforcement officer, coroner, or medical examiner who makes a good faith effort to comply with these requirements is immune from civil and criminal liability for any act or omission relating to the transmission of this information.

Finally, the bill requires a practitioner to obtain a patient utilization report from the database before initiating a prescription for an opioid that is a controlled substance listed in schedule V.

Brett Kandt, Chief Deputy Attorney General, proposed an amendment to address several concerns expressed by law enforcement regarding reporting cause of death and access to the prescription drug monitoring program. The amendment is in the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will take a motion for amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 59 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN EDWARDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE
VOTE.)

Assemblyman Oscarson will take the floor statement. We will move on to Senate Bill 159 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 159 (1st Reprint): Provides for the regulation of the sale of dextromethorphan. (BDR 40-543)

Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst:

Moving on, Senate Bill 159 (1st Reprint) provides for the regulation of the sale of dextromethorphan. This bill prohibits a person from knowingly selling or offering to sell a substance containing dextromethorphan, a common ingredient in cough syrup, to a minor under certain circumstances. It also prohibits a minor from knowingly purchasing a substance containing the drug. A retail establishment must, before selling such a substance, demand a valid identification if the purchaser appears to be under 25 years of age. The bill also prohibits a local government from enacting a local ordinance or regulation that conflicts with this bill or further regulates the sale, receipt, or possession of dextromethorphan.

There are no amendments in the work session document for this measure ([Exhibit D](#)).

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will take a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 159 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE
VOTE.)

Assemblyman Thompson will take the floor statement. Next is Senate Bill 165 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 165 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning the prevention and treatment of obesity. (BDR 40-791)

Marshellah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 165 (1st Reprint) makes various changes concerning the prevention and treatment of obesity. This bill defines, for the first time in the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, the term “obesity” as a chronic disease. In addition, S.B. 165 (R1) requires the board of trustees in each school district in a county whose population is 100,000 or more (currently Clark and Washoe Counties) to measure the height and weight of a representative sample of pupils enrolled in grades 4, 7, and 10 in schools within the school district. The bill requires the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, to compile a report of the results of the height and weight measurements by region, publish, and disseminate the report. A copy must be submitted to the superintendent of each school district in a county whose population is 100,000 or more. The Division must also submit an annual report regarding obesity to the Nevada Legislature.

Senator Denis submitted an amendment subsequent to the hearing. The stated purpose of the amendment is to allow local public health authorities and educational agencies to be involved in collecting data and then the creation of the sampling framework. In addition, the sponsor would like to add Assemblyman James Oscarson as a cosponsor to the measure. The amendment is attached to the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will take a motion for amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 165 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Carrillo will take the floor statement. Next to be heard is Senate Bill 262 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 262 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning payments for treatment relating to mental illness or the abuse of alcohol or drugs. (BDR 57-455)

Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst:

Next is Senate Bill 262 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions concerning payments for treatment relating to mental illness or the abuse of alcohol or drugs. This bill requires payments made pursuant to a health insurance policy for mental health or alcohol or drug abuse treatment be made directly to the provider of the treatment rather than to the person receiving the treatment. A licensed clinical alcohol and drug abuse counselor must be directly reimbursed for treatment relating to the abuse of alcohol or drugs. The measure allows a provider to refund a person receiving treatment any amounts that the person paid to the provider.

Senator Farley worked with certain interested parties to prepare an amendment to address expressed concerns. That amendment is attached to the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will take a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 262 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON WAS ABSENT FOR THE
VOTE.)

Assemblywoman Joiner will take the floor statement.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I made a mistake on Senator Farley's bill. I voted no, but I will be changing my vote on the floor to a yes. I apologize.

Chairman Sprinkle:

We will move to Assembly Bill 374.

Assembly Bill 374: Requires the Department of Health and Human Services to make coverage through the Medicaid managed care program available for purchase. (BDR 38-881)

Marshellah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst:

I apologize for the mistake regarding Assembly Bill 374 and Senate Bill 374 (2nd Reprint). Assembly Bill 374 requires the Department of Health and Human Services to make coverage through the Medicaid managed care program available for purchase. It requires the Director of the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services to seek any necessary waiver of certain provisions of federal law to allow a Medicaid managed care program to be offered for purchase through the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange to persons who are otherwise ineligible for Medicaid. Additionally, the bill requires the Director to seek any necessary federal waiver to allow persons to use the federal income tax credits and cost-sharing reductions authorized by the Act to purchase coverage through a Medicaid managed care program, which is made available for purchase from the Department or on the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. The measure revises the definition of “qualified health plan” to include the Medicaid managed care program so that it may be offered for purchase in the same manner as other health plans through the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. The Department is required, to the extent allowed by federal law, to make coverage through the Medicaid managed care program available for purchase to any person who is not otherwise eligible for Medicaid. To purchase such coverage, the person must apply to the Division or may purchase coverage through the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange if the waiver has been obtained from the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services. The measure requires the annual premium charged for such coverage to be set at an amount, which represents 150 percent of the median expenditure paid on behalf of a Medicaid recipient during the immediately preceding fiscal year. Further, the bill requires the benefits offered in such a managed care program to be the same as those provided to other Medicaid recipients. Finally, the measure prohibits the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services from using any federal money to carry out the provisions of that section.

At the hearing, Assemblyman Sprinkle presented an amendment to replace the measure and to amend that bill. That is included in the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

Chairman Sprinkle:

Is there any discussion or comments? [There was none.] I will take a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 374.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement for this bill.

Chairman Sprinkle:

That will end the work session. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to sibling visitation in child welfare cases. (BDR 38-925)

Senator Patricia Farley, Senate District No. 8:

Across the nation, approximately two-thirds of the youth in foster care have a sibling who is also in the system. For many children entering the child welfare system, sibling relationships are important because siblings provide support that may not be consistently provided by their parents. Research shows that sibling relationships promote resilience for many children. For those entering the child welfare system, being placed with siblings can promote a sense of well-being and safety, while separation can trigger negative feelings and outcomes. However, it is not always possible to place siblings together.

Currently, when a child who is in need of protection is placed with someone other than a parent, state law requires a report to be submitted to the court prior to the hearing to review the placement of a child. If a child is not placed with his or her siblings, the report must include a plan for that child to visit those siblings. Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint) takes these requirements a step further, requiring a sibling visitation plan to be presented at the first hearing after the siblings are separated. It also requires that the plan be updated to reflect any changes in the placement of a child or his or her siblings, including any changes after parental rights are terminated or following adoption. Once the sibling visitation plan is approved by the courts and the child welfare agency requests the court issue an order requiring such visitation, S.B. 274 (R1) requires the court to provide each of the child's siblings with the child's case number. These changes will better enable a sibling to petition the court for visitation or enforcement of a visitation order. Existing law provides that a written agreement for post-adoptive contact between a child and/or his or her natural parents or between a child's adoptive parents and the natural parents is enforceable if signed by both parties and incorporated into an order of decree of adoption. Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint) requires that if such agreement concerns a child who was in the custody of the child welfare agency prior to the adoption, the agency or the court must determine whether the agreement is in the child's best interest.

Existing law also requires a court to hold a hearing to decide whether to include a sibling visitation order in the adoption decree. Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint) instead requires the court to incorporate such an order in the decree unless an interested party petitions the court to exclude or amend the order of visitation. In addition, the bill requires this hearing to be

held on a different day than the day of the petition for adoption, which gives an interested party the right to participate in the hearing and requires the court clerk to provide notice of the hearing to certain individuals. Lee Elkins will talk about the amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) and Bailey Bortolin will answer more in-depth questions.

Bailey Bortolin, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services:

Senator Farley approached a lot of the stakeholders, social services, and the people who work around foster care and asked us for problems that we saw concerning why siblings were not able to contact each other after they had been separated through adoptions and termination of parental rights. The genesis of this bill was some of the problems that we saw around that. There are varieties of reasons that we have seen from the practitioners' side, on siblings who get sibling visitation orders and end up not being able to enforce them. This fixes those holes so that if there is a problem where one party is withholding contact from another, we can have an avenue where it is safe and appropriate to allow these court orders to be enforceable.

The Public Defender's Office approached us and said they were having the same problems with post-adoptive contact agreements, which is when the biological parents agree to relinquish their parental rights in exchange for some kind of continuing relationship. That could be as small as a postcard, or it could be an actual relationship. We put that in here as well to help fix some of the problems we were having with these existing court orders that we are putting in our cases but, for a variety of reasons, they become unenforceable. They are just pieces of paper that we cannot do anything with. We worked with the courts around the parent part. We worked closely with Judge Walker, who does all of the foster care cases out of Washoe County. He is in Michigan today, but is in full support of this bill with the amendment. He was working with Judge Gonzalez out of Clark County. We believe both of the court systems think this is a positive change for some legal procedures we are missing around the process we already have in place.

Lee Elkins, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I was a judge in New York City for about 17 years in the juvenile court and have spent about 5 years at the Public Defender's Office in Washoe County. In our experience, our clients who are parents who relinquish parental rights rather than go through a termination process in trial, in exchange, usually receive an agreement to communicate with the child or to get information about the child by mail and will occasionally get a picture. We found that they were not enforceable. We brought proceedings to try to enforce them, and the logistics were such that we were told we had to bring a separate action contract. It was so cumbersome and expensive that there was no representation for the parties.

The flipside is that the foster or adoptive parent can seek to modify that agreement at any point when it is no longer in the best interest of the child to enforce it as written. So, it works both ways. This seeks to make sure those agreements are actually enforceable, so as on one hand, not to commit a consumer fraud on the parent who relinquishes their parental rights, and on the other hand, to make courts accessible to the parties to the agreement. What it does

is, it allows access to the case number in the adoption, which would not be otherwise available to the parties, allows a \$1 filing fee, and then, on petition to enforce the agreement according to existing law, allows the judge who heard the adoption, if available, to rule on that petition.

In addition to that, the law now requires for children in foster care that the social services agency approve the agreement before it is incorporated into the adoption decree and/or that there is a hearing to make sure that it is in the best interest of the child. The most recent amendment here ([Exhibit H](#)) arises from the fact that neither the court nor social services wanted to be responsible for service. Because almost all of these agreements include an address to which a picture or postcard can be sent, the proposal is to incorporate that address into the agreement where the petition can be served. It can be a post office box if the parties do not want a residential address. If for whatever reason a party does not provide that address for a child in foster care, the agency will provide an address known to them and that will be appended to the contract at the time of incorporation into the adoption decree. Obviously, we want people who enter into these agreements regarding their children, even if they are giving up their parental rights, to have the benefit of their agreements. Otherwise, it would be extremely unfair. We also want the adoptive parent, if they feel it is no longer in the child's best interest, to have access to the court. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Chairman Sprinkle:

I believe you already answered this, but I just want to be absolutely clear. With this amendment, this still allows the agency discretion in making decisions that they feel are in the best interest for the kids under their jurisdiction. Most of the time it is very important to keep the siblings together, but there are those situations where it is not.

Lee Elkins:

Let me just point out that there are two aspects to this. There is the parental agreement for post-adoption contact, and that is what the most recent amendment was designed to address. Then there is the sibling aspect. My remarks were addressed to the closed adoption contact agreement of the natural parent and the adoptive parent.

Senator Farley:

On the sibling part, the judge has to make a ruling with what is in the best interest of the child. There will never be a situation where a sibling can ever contact the other child or the adoptive family without a court order or without the court determining it is in the best interest of the children to have contact with one another. That is very clear in the bill as well as in law.

Assemblyman Edwards:

Do either of the siblings have a veto if they do not want to talk to them? Does the court allow them not to talk to each other?

Bailey Bortolin:

Typically, the sibling visitation order, if it is entered, is something that everyone agrees to. It is not something that is highly litigious. If one child does not want to have that relationship, it is not something that is forced. If that would be the reason for the no contact once the order has been entered, the court would take that into consideration and does not have to hold a hearing to force that to happen. It could allow the court order to be modified or revoked so that we do not have a court order making them do something that is not happening or should not be happening.

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone here in support?

Jared Busker, Policy Analyst, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

We are in support of this legislation, as we believe it strengthens sibling relationships and makes it easier for them to stay connected.

Chairman Sprinkle:

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral to this bill? [There was no one.] Do you have any closing remarks, Senator?

Senator Farley:

During the interim, I spent quite a bit of time touring Eagle Quest and Boys Town and some other congregate living situations for kids in foster care. I asked them what the one thing was I, being a state senator, could do for them that would make this experience better for them or for the kids that will come after them. Resoundingly, most of the time with tears, the answer was that they wished they knew where their sibling was or that they wished they could see their brother or sister. Many of those responses came from boys between the ages of 15 and 18 years old. This is on behalf of those children and, hopefully, it will make it better for the children who will follow them in our foster care system. With that, thank you very much.

Chairman Sprinkle:

Thank you for being here with this bill. I am going to close the hearing on Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint), and I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 480 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 480 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the protection of children. (BDR 38-1089)

Denise Lopez, Personal Attaché for Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13:

Senate Bill 480 (1st Reprint) is essentially the federal Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA), which was enacted July 22, 2016. The CARA legislation modifies the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) requiring each state to address the needs of infants born with and identified as being affected by substance abuse or withdrawal

symptoms of fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act requires federal funding to states in support of prevention, assessment, investigation, prosecution, and treatment activities, and also provides grants to public agencies and nonprofit organizations. The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act is in response to the national opioid epidemic which includes an increase of the incidence of neonatal abstinence syndrome from 1.2 per 1,000 hospital births in 2000 to 5.8 per 1,000 hospital births in 2010. In addition, the rate of neonatal intensive care unit admissions for neonatal abstinence syndrome across the country increased from 7 cases per 1000 admissions in 2004 to 27 cases per 1000 admissions in 2013.

As a result of CARA, CAPTA now requires health care providers to notify child protective services of all infants born and identified as affected by substance abuse withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure or a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. These changes require intervention of all substances, not just illegal substances as was the requirement prior to this change. Notification is not to be construed to require prosecution for any illegal action, nor to establish a definition under federal law of what constitutes child abuse and neglect.

The goal of CARA is not to remove children or punish mothers for drug use, but to develop plans of safe care to address child safety and address the health and substance abuse disorder treatment needed for infants and affected family or caregivers. The federal expectation is for the child welfare agency to collaborate with community health and substance abuse providers to ensure the infant and family receive appropriate services even when there is no child abuse or neglect. The federal government expects states to collect and report on the number of infants identified as being affected by substance abuse or withdrawal symptoms resulting from prenatal drug exposure or a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, the number of infants for whom a plan of safe care was developed, and the number of such infants for whom a referral was made for appropriate services including services for the affected family or caregiver. Brigid Duffy can answer any questions you may have.

**Brigid J. Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Division, Clark County
District Attorney's Office:**

On behalf of the child welfare agencies, we are very pleased that Senator Ratti agreed to take this bill forward to help us become compliant with the federal act. Again, this bill is not to punish parents for using legal substances; it is to help them access services for medically fragile children, as well as to get any treatment they may need. It is not about putting people on child abuse and neglect registries.

Chairman Sprinkle:

This is a federally recognized term that we are just coming into compliance with, is that correct?

Brigid Duffy:

That is correct.

Chairman Sprinkle:

Are there potentially federal dollars associated with this that we could lose if we do not do this?

Brigid Duffy:

We are provided with federal funding in order to assist with the prevention and assessment investigation, prosecution, and treatment of everyone. It is all tied into that. We do need to be in compliance with CARA, which is making sure that we are now receiving phone calls from hospitals when children are exposed to or born positive for legal substances, not just illegal substances. This is really addressing the opioid epidemic, where we have a lot of children that are born positive for legal drugs as well as fetal alcohol spectrum disorder—alcohol is a legal substance. This is really about addressing the use of those legal substances. The federal government did a whole study on how this was affecting our children, and now they want us to be able to intervene and be able to help families and children with a plan of safe care.

Chairman Sprinkle:

In order to be in compliance with the federal act, we need to adopt "fetal alcohol spectrum disorder," is that correct?

Brigid Duffy:

Yes.

Chairman Sprinkle:

Is there anyone wishing to come up in support here or in southern Nevada? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral to this bill? [There was no one.] Do you have any closing comments?

Denise Lopez:

No, we do not.

Chairman Sprinkle:

We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 480 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing Medicaid payments for ground emergency medical transportation services. (BDR 38-411)

[This bill was not considered.]

Senate Bill 374 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the use of marijuana or industrial hemp. (BDR 40-185)

[This bill was not considered.]

Senate Bill 481 (1st Reprint): Creates the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired. (BDR 38-604)

[This bill was not considered.]

Is there anyone wishing to come up for public comment? [There was no one.] We will close public comment. We are in the homeward stretch. Thank you for all of the hard work. This meeting is adjourned [at 3:28 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kailey Taylor
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 59 (2nd Reprint), presented by Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 159 (1st Reprint), presented by Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 165 (1st Reprint), presented by Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 262 (1st Reprint), presented by Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 374, presented by Marsheilah Lyons, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 274 (1st Reprint) presented by Lee Elkins, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office.