

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eighty-second Session
April 24, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Pat Spearman at 8:00 a.m. on Monday, April 24, 2023, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Pat Spearman, Chair
Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Julie Pazina
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Jeff Stone

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Scott Hammond (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cesar Melgarejo, Policy Analyst
Veda Wooley, Counsel
Kelly K. Clark, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Margi Grein, Executive Officer, State Contractors' Board
Noah Allison, General Counsel, State Contractors' Board
David Behar, Director of Investigations, State Contractors' Board
Chase Whittemore, Nevada Builders Alliance
Lindsay Knox, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association; Nevada Home Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 24, 2023
Page 2

Sarah Collins, National Electrical Contractors Association
Craig Madole, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Chapter Associated General
Contractors
Paul Rozario
Merrilou Thomas

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We will start today with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 23. Margi Grein with the Nevada State Contractors' Board will begin.

ASSEMBLY BILL 23 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the resolution of certain administrative citations issued by the State Contractors' Board. (BDR 54-266)

MARGI GREIN (Executive Officer, Nevada State Contractors' Board):

Assembly Bill 23 expands the existing process for the resolution of an administrative citation to allow individuals the opportunity to request an informal conference with the Executive Officer or his or her designee for the purpose of reviewing the alleged offense and proposed penalty.

Across fiscal years (FY) 2019-2020, FY 2020-2021 and FY 2021-2022 a total of 1,173 administrative citations were issued to both licensed and unlicensed contractors. Approximately 5 percent of those resulted in contested cases.

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 624 does not provide a process for an individual to seek an informal resolution or settlement. Pursuant to NRS 624.351, the Board is required to hold a formal disciplinary proceeding should a person choose to contest any portion of an administrative citation. Under A.B. 23, individuals who received an administrative citation by the Board would have 15 days to request the informal conference. The requested conference must be conducted within 60 business days by the Executive Officer or a designee.

Resolution of the citation may be agreed upon during the conference including affirmation, modification or dismissal of the allegations. Should the citation be modified or affirmed, an individual would still have the right to contest the citation formally within 15 business days by requesting a hearing pursuant to NRS 624.345. It is anticipated this process proposed by A.B. 23 will reduce the number of contested administrative citations adjudicated through the formal

hearing process as well as reduce costs incurred by the Board and respondents in the cases.

Based on discussions with interested parties, the bill was amended in the Assembly to include a provision that any hearing required by these provisions must be held within 90 days of receiving a written notice of intent to contest the citation. This amendment will ensure timely resolution of these matters.

SENATOR DALY:

It is a good process to start with, but when someone contests, what are the normal processes?

Ms. GREIN:

An investigation takes place prior to the citation. At the end of the investigation, if a violation is determined that can be resolved through an administrative citation, there is no harmed party. If something cannot be resolved between the two parties, an administrative citation would be issued.

One of the problems with that is there is no appeal process at that time for the respondent to contest the citation rather than go to a hearing. This new process puts something in place where, if contesting, he or she can request a formal meeting with myself or my designee. We would go through the charges and present evidence that disputes or validates our charging information. This will be a way to resolve it prior to the hearing.

SENATOR DALY:

You try to involve the contractor and whoever filed the complaint, but it does not always happen where the contractor gets to provide the information other than in a statement. Are you intending to have the person who filed the complaint in the process as well or is it just the contractor?

Ms. GREIN:

When it gets to the citation process, only the contractor or the respondent gets to come in for the informal conference. We do not bring the other party back in at that point.

SENATOR DALY:

The process is more of a settlement conference type of situation, like in the court system or a prehearing conference. That is a term the Labor Commissioner uses before you go to a hearing and at those conferences. I do not see the language here, and it needs to be added. Confidentiality is not the right word, but it should not be recorded. People should be open and fair. You must notice them on all the information—anything that may have been said or cannot be used in the following proceeding.

Both sides should be present, but everybody must put their evidence on the table. You would have to show what information you have so they can fully explain and go from there. Do you object to having those types of parameters, or is that what you already intended?

Ms. GREIN:

I would like to ask our counsel, Noah Allison, in Las Vegas to respond since it is more of a legal question.

NOAH ALLISON (General Counsel, State Contractors' Board):

I envision it the same way as you do. A settlement conference is akin to a mediation settlement conference in the court where the judge can order that. Under all the mediation rules, nothing said in a mediation can be used later. An admission or anything like that can be used to support the allegations made later. I agree that is how it should be with these informal settlement conferences.

SENATOR DALY:

We need to specify that. The language in *Nevada Administrative Code* 607.300 regarding prehearing conferences with the Labor Commissioner spells out that it cannot be recorded; no information can be used in a subsequent proceeding, and both sides must bring their evidence and put their cards on the table to reach a settlement. At the minimum, this language needs to be added.

Ms. GREIN:

We are happy to investigate that for you.

SENATOR STONE:

My colleague was alluding to an issue I had concerning exculpatory evidence that should not be recorded. That is the intent of the bill; but I hope per my

colleague's request for language written, that anything discussed in mediation cannot be used in a discovery process going forward if a settlement cannot be made. I support what you are doing, and it is business-friendly to bring people in when they have violations in the informal process. Is there ever a recommendation to the contractor that his or her licenses be suspended or revoked, or is that reserved for the full Board?

Ms. GREIN:

That would be reserved for the hearing. We cannot do it in a settlement.

SENATOR STONE:

Given a lot of complex laws, sometimes you inadvertently do something you did not think about, and you get cited for it. It is nice to have an avenue where you are not putting somebody before an entire board and having to hire an attorney if you can settle it in an amicable way. It is a business-friendly attitude, and I applaud you for bringing this bill forward with the protections articulated.

DAVID BEHAR (Director of Investigations, State Contractors' Board):

This newly implemented process would allow our staff and contractors to resolve these ongoing matters timelier and more efficiently. It would also provide a remedy to members of the industry to have a matter heard in an informal setting, which would allow the possible resolution we discussed and avoid unnecessary fees and costs.

SENATOR DALY:

You talked about unnecessary fees and costs on various things. If a person exercises the right to have a prehearing conference, is it typical for the Board to request other information from the contractor without any more probable cause? If so, you basically create another penalty for exercising the right. For example, if a contractor says I think you are wrong, you have not shown me any evidence until 15 days before the hearing. You send a contractor a letter who is just exercising his rights, saying we want to audit your books and spend three times what the citation might be worth if you have a hearing. That is an unfair disadvantage to the contractor. That is an unfair penalty and should not be imposed.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 24, 2023
Page 6

MR. BEHAR:

One of the purposes behind this bill is to avoid that process and streamline it, bypassing the additional cost sometimes applied when it ends up going to a hearing.

CHASE WHITTEMORE (Nevada Builders Alliance):

We are in support of this bill. We would be even more in support with those changes Senator Daly mentioned. It would make a lot of sense to ensure nothing is recorded so people can present evidence and not have that fear. You will have better discussions and outcomes.

LINDSAY KNOX (Southern Nevada Home Builders Association; Nevada Home Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada):

The enforcement of NRS 624 is important to the integrity of the construction industry. This bill will help provide some efficiency to allow the Contractors' Board to do its job. We also agree with Senator Daly's suggestion for the amendment.

SARAH COLLINS (National Electrical Contractors Association):

We support this legislation.

Ms. GREIN:

Thank you for allowing me to present this bill today. We look forward to working on a possible amendment.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 23 and open the hearing on A.B. 27.

ASSEMBLY BILL 27 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to contractors who provide management and counseling services on construction projects. (BDR 54-269)

Ms. GREIN:

I am here in support of A.B. 27 which seeks to amend the language in NRS 624.215 as it relates to construction management and counseling services. This bill is primarily housekeeping in nature, intended to ensure a construction manager is properly licensed and skilled for the type of construction project covered by the contract. The lack of specificity in the statute passed in 2019 was questioned by an administrative law judge in a disciplinary proceeding and

resulted in the decision ([Exhibit C](#)) that a licensee holding any one of the general building classifications could act as a construction manager on any type of construction project.

Under this ruling, it is feasible someone holding a license classified for premanufactured housing or residential remodeling with only these limited skill sets would be permitted to act as a construction manager on a high-rise hotel-casino or other significant complex projects. The decision poses a significant health and safety risk to the public. This amendment would remedy the unintended consequences and ensure the work is only performed by licensees with the proper qualifications and skill sets based on the scope of work for the project.

SENATOR DALY:

Will this solve that problem?

Ms. GREIN:

The simple answer is yes.

CRAIG MADOLE (Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors):

We agree with Ms. Grein. This bill is good clarification of the law. If you are to be managing any construction, you should be licensed appropriately.

MR. WHITTEMORE:

I agree with Craig Madole, and I thank Ms. Grein and the Contractors' Board for meeting with us and answering all our questions.

Ms. COLLINS:

We supported this legislation in the Assembly, and we support it again.

Ms. GREIN:

Assembly Bill 27 will clarify a problem we did not see coming until the past couple of years.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

The Committee has a letter ([Exhibit D](#)) in opposition to A.B. 27 from Marcos Lopez, Nevada Policy Outreach and Coalitions Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute. I will close the hearing on A.B. 27 and open the hearing on A.B. 39.

ASSEMBLY BILL 39 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to contracts for work concerning certain residential improvements. (BDR 54-265)

Ms. GREIN:

Assembly Bill 39 aims to strengthen protection for consumers looking to contract for certain residential improvements. Residential contractors are relied on by the consumers we serve. They are the ones we invite into our homes, who we call in our time of need, and who help to restore our environment when disaster strikes or to make needed and planned improvements.

The contractors believe consumers deserve to have standard contract expectations because of the variety of contract work needed to sustain a home. Expectations that guide their best interests ensure the contract is enforceable for both parties. The common trend noticed among the complaints filed with our office is a validation of overpayment, whether too large a down payment, up to 50 percent of the contract price, or charges that exceed the amount of work completed. Most homeowners would benefit from specific contract terms guaranteeing important project details are defined and agreed on up-front.

Across FY 2018-2019, FY 2019-2020, FY 2020-2021 and FY 2021-2022, the Contractors' Board validated 135 complaints of contractors accepting money when little or no work was performed, resulting in damages to residential homeowners for more than \$1 million. It is important to note that these are only representative of the homeowners who have chosen to contact the Board with their concerns.

Assembly Bill 39 speaks on behalf of all homeowners facing these circumstances and offers them protection from becoming our next statistic.

Following the investigative process, eligible consumers have access to the Residential Recovery Fund (RRF) created by the Legislature and enacted into law in 1999. The RRF provides monetary relief to qualified homeowners the Board finds were financially harmed by licensed residential contractors. Each of the 135 cases I referenced had their claims heard by the RRF Subcommittee, and a total of \$1,057,707 was awarded upon validating the financial harm incurred. This award alarmingly represents 32 percent of the total amount awarded to homeowners from the RRF during that same period.

The Contractors' Board favors the new requirements proposed, which will establish contract terms such as: limiting initial down payments or deposits not to exceed \$1,000 or 10 percent of the aggregate contract price, whichever is less; providing a consumer protection bond; documenting the estimated date of completion; writing a description of work to be performed under the contract; any change orders incorporated with progress payment requirements and specifying the total amount to be paid for the work performed.

Assembly Bill 39 provisions provide necessary safeguards to enhance consumer protection while reducing the gray areas caused by miscommunication and poor contracting practices. The Contractors' Board finds the language specific to residential improvement projects to be sufficient and appropriate, given the enhanced statutory requirements for work concerning residential photovoltaic systems and contracting for residential pools and spas already exists in Nevada law. These areas of the construction industry were addressed and improved following similar rises in complaints with concerning trends.

In the 1990s, we noticed an increase in pool construction complaints. More complaints ensued in 2020 when solar contracting issues trended upward. As we have experienced in the pool and solar industries, once contracting requirements were standardized, the industry responded to the heightened accountability by fulfilling the new statutory expectations. It is our belief that A.B. 39 will have the same outcome, and we will begin to see a noticeable decrease in complaints filed with the Board against licensed contractors that took payments from homeowners without performing any work or providing any materials.

Assembly Bill 39 is a win for consumer protection in Nevada, but it is also an opportunity to standardize contracting for Nevada, affording businesses of all sizes to have confidence in the work they are engaging in.

MR. BEHAR:

As the director of investigations for the State Contractors' Board, it is my responsibility to continuously work toward protecting the health, safety and welfare of the public, while assuring licensed contractors throughout the State are treated fairly and equitably. An important aspect of this responsibility involves proactively working with the public and members of the industry to provide practical and effective consumer protections for everyone.

Too often, cases have been brought before the Board that are issues involving homeowners who pay significant down payments for work that is either partially completed or completely abandoned. These harmed homeowners are left with significant financial losses and dire conditions at their residences. Based on the circumstances, A.B. 39 would significantly safeguard consumers and members of the industry by providing protection to both parties.

The following is an example of why the Board is seeking your support for this bill. An investigation in northern Nevada identified a licensed contractor who took over \$380,000 in contract deposits from more than 38 different homeowners without performing work. During the investigation, it was revealed that funds received were being diverted for personal use and past debts incurred by this licensed contractor. The contractor subsequently lost his or her license by having it revoked. The widespread financial losses associated with that activity impacted a significant number of consumers.

A second example involved 36 homeowners who were harmed by a licensed contractor who did little to no work after receiving payment. In this instance, more than \$321,000 was collected by the contractor, who abandoned the work and also diverted the money. This licensed contractor had three separate licenses revoked by the Board, forcing homeowners to endure lengthy and incomplete project delays and remedy through the Board's RRF.

A third example involved over 20 homeowners who hired a licensed contractor to fabricate and install security screens at their residences. Each of these homeowners paid up to 50 percent down prior to any work being performed. The licensed contractor received funds from consumers and abandoned work once payments were received. The Board revoked that license and worked with victims to help them obtain recourse through the RRF.

To emphasize the severity of this issue, between 2021 and 2022 alone, 85 separate RRF claims brought before the Board involved money taken by licensed contractors from homeowners without any work being performed. These claims alone totaled over \$767,000 awarded through the RRF.

SENATOR DALY:

Within the first two to three years when new contractors get licensed, are they required to put up a bond to the Contractors' Board as a condition of their licenses?

Ms. GREIN:
Yes.

SENATOR DALY:
How much is the bond? Is it different for everybody? Is it just one sum?

Ms. GREIN:
It depends on the monetary license and limit issued to each contractor.

SENATOR DALY:
After a period, if a contractor has performed well, that individual can request to not be required to have that bond. It takes two or three years of being in business before the Board allows that. Is that correct?

Ms. GREIN:
Yes, Senator Daly. That is correct. They can apply to be relieved of the bond requirement.

SENATOR DALY:
If a contractor takes a smaller amount as the down payment, then he or she does not have to put up the \$100,000 bond. Is it \$100,000 in addition to the bond you already asked them to put down?

Ms. GREIN:
Yes, Senator Daly. That provision allows contractors to put up a special \$100,000 consumer protection bond solely for consumers that relieves them of the requirement of the initial down payment. If they wanted to charge a different amount for a down payment rather than the \$10,000 or 10 percent, or \$1,000 in the statute, they could waive that by providing a consumer protection bond.

SENATOR DALY:
Would they have to get a bond for each project, or would it be one that covers all the work they do?

Ms. GREIN:
It would be one bond.

SENATOR DALY:

In checking with smaller contractors I know, it would be \$2,000 to get a \$100,000 bond if you have good credit. If you do not have good credit or are a brand new contractor, it is \$3,000 to \$5,000. This cost could be a barrier. It can be prohibitive for some small and startup contractors.

If you violate any requirements, the owner files a complaint, and the contract is voidable if you missed anything. The guy should be paid for his work before it gets voided.

MR. ALLISON:

I am looking at the language in NRS 624.875 and with respect to the comment made about it being voidable, I will read it into the record. It says,

With respect to a contract executed before October 1, 2021, if any schedule of payments set forth in the contract does not comply with the provisions of this chapter or any regulations adopted pursuant thereto, the obligation of the owner of the single-family residence to make payments in accordance with the payment schedule is voidable.

So, if you are presented a contract with a schedule requiring a 50 percent down payment or something that does not comply with the law, the homeowner can void that section of the contract. The right to restitution and equitable compensation for work performed is not affected by making the contract voidable. It would just render that section voidable.

SENATOR DALY:

I appreciate that, but A.B. 39, section 1, line 12 says "A contract that does not comply with the provisions of this section and all applicable regulations adopted by the Board is voidable by the owner of the single-family residence." No other conditions are voidable if you miss something.

MR. ALLISON:

Yes, I see that. The intent of that section is not to prevent the contractor from recovering payment in the event the contract is deficient. It is our hope this statute leads to the development of a uniform model contract for this area. If it is deficient in an area, it is voidable under the law but does not render the obligation to be paid for the work void or make it impossible to recover payment

for the work. It means you go into court in a restitution posture for the fair value of the work performed.

SENATOR DALY:

I understand the intent, but that is not what the words say. If I am a homeowner and I want to do this, I have those words right there. If I find out after the work is done and before payment is made that the contractor did not follow a regulation, I can say the contract is voided, and that is it. The only obligation the owner must pay the contractor is through the contract; if the contract is voided, the obligation is voided with it. We need some changes there, and the Board should provide some model language.

You say the contract must be in writing, then in section 1, subsection 5, it says any contract can be voided.

MR. ALLISON:

I do agree with much of what you said. The intent of this statute is that these contracts must be in writing. It is in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare to not have verbal contracts for residential improvements. We want something in writing to protect both the homeowner and the contractor with some basic information, such as what are you going to do for me? How much is it going to cost? When is it going to be done? Those items need to be in writing.

SENATOR DALY:

I do not disagree. They should be. You need to put language in the bill that if the contractor does not comply with the contract, he is assuming the risk, which forces him to put it in writing. We need to make sure the words match the intent.

PAUL ROZARIO:

I am the former Director of Investigations for the State Contractors' Board, and I am here to testify in support of A.B. 39. Over the past four fiscal years, the Board has seen a significant increase in complaints from homeowners who paid down payments to contractors, as much as 50 percent in some cases, and did not receive any work or materials. It appears contractors on the verge of their businesses closing took on several contracts with large down payments with the anticipation of closing their doors. Some brazen contractors sent out notifications to homeowners advising them to file claims against the RRF to receive their down payments back. These contractors took thousands of dollars

from homeowners knowing they would never start the construction projects. These actions by contractors resulted in over \$1.2 million paid out to homeowners from the RRF, a fund with limited resources. Unless legislative action is taken to limit down payments, the RRF may be severely reduced and in jeopardy.

Assembly Bill 39 provides requirements for residential improvement contracts, such as an estimated completion date for all work to be performed. The contract should include a description of the work to be performed, any change orders and the total amount to be paid by the homeowner for work performed.

Assembly Bill 39 allows an initial down payment or deposit to pay the contractor not to exceed \$1,000 or 10 percent of the aggregate contract price, whichever is less. This is an important element of the legislation which provides some financial safeguards for homeowners.

Assembly Bill 39 will help provide a more standardized contracting practice within the residential improvement industry, allowing the Board to hold the industry more accountable and ensuring consumers are treated fairly by contractors.

MERRILOU THOMAS:

In February 2022, I noticed a leak in my house and called a plumber I had used for small jobs before. After assessing the problem, he informed me I needed new pipes inside and out of my house. He charged me \$24,000 for which I had to refinance my home to pay him. I was told I would pay half down and half in two weeks when the job was to be finished. This necessitated my son and I to move into a converted garage, which fortunately had a small bath that was not affected. After he received his money, things slowed down. I realized I could call my insurance company, and it advised me to contact the State Contractors' Board, which I did. I found out at that time the plumber had lost his license in January 2021.

It is 14 months later, and my house has been in shambles. My son and I are still living in the garage. Thanks to the Board, there is light at the end of the tunnel; I cannot thank them enough for what they have done for me.

MR. MADOLE:

We submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) for the Committee's consideration that would partially address some of what Senator Daly had asked. I want to point out that we made a typo on the amendment. It should reference NRS 624, not the mortuary statute.

It is our intent that a contractor is no longer required to post a bond to the Board and is also exempt from the provision of law requiring them to post the \$100,000 bond. These are the established contractors who have proven financial strength. They have been in business for a minimum of five years pursuant to this section of law. This change would be a good clarification and keep the costs down because any time you increase cost on a contractor, he or she must pass it on to the homeowner.

MR. WHITEMORE:

Nevada Builders Alliance is neutral. A lot of intent behind this bill is good. This bill will strengthen and help improve the RRF. Some concerns around voidability language could be easily addressed if you had a standardized form created by the Board, and we have had those discussions with them. It is in the Board's interest to have a standardized form that would be super helpful for the industry; if contractors do not use a standardized form, the homeowner could void the contract.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Your website has the admonition that if the person is over aged 60, it is an enhanced penalty. What would that look like?

MS. GREIN:

There are enhanced penalties for senior citizens, the disabled and in other circumstances such as a repeat offender. In Ms. Thomas's case, we revoked the contractor's license. She is among the hundreds of people we see every year where this has happened; the increase is on the rise.

We are neutral on the amendment from Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors. We do not feel it changes the bill. Approximately 4 percent of contractors have been relieved of the bonding requirement, so the amendment will not harm the intent of the bill.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:
Is there a statute of limitations on this?

Ms. GREIN:
Could you clarify the question?

CHAIR SPEARMAN:
I am just thinking of the person who did this to her. She has been living in the garage for 14 months and has filed the complaint. Is there a statutory limitation if she were to wait three years?

Ms. GREIN:
It is four years from the time the work occurred. The contractor she was referring to has since been revoked. He also had other cases in southern Nevada where he did the same type of thing to other victims.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:
On your forms, you have it as a criminal complaint. Do you work with the Office of the Attorney General and district attorneys' offices on these issues?

Ms. GREIN:
Yes, we do work with outside authorities when the charges are such that we can bring criminal cases or charges in addition to administrative charges.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:
Sometimes, they move from state to state. Do we have anything in place where we cooperate with other states if someone here loses their license or has been found guilty in a criminal complaint and moves to California, Montana or somewhere else? Does any database follow them, or is it just a catch-as-catch-can situation? The same would be a requirement here if someone from another state came in and applied for a license but had already done some horrible things in other states.

Ms. GREIN:
Yes, we do have reciprocity for disciplinary actions on a national basis. There also is a databank through the National Association of State Contractors Licensing Agencies where we enter information about bad actors who have had discipline in this State, and we do not want contractors from another state who are disciplined coming here. We have done extensive background research on

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 24, 2023
Page 17

that, and there is reciprocity. We see a lot of these contractors prefer to move to Texas because there is no contractor licensing in Texas.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 39. We are adjourned at 8:56 A.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Pat Spearman, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 27	C	7	Margi Grein / Nevada State Contractors' Board	Interim Decision and Order
A.B. 27	D	7	Senator Pat Spearman	Nevada Policy Research Institute Opposition Letter
A.B. 39	E	15	Craig Madole / Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors	Proposed Amendment