

STATE OF NEVADA

STEVE SISOLAK  
*Governor*

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS  
*Director*



LISA SHERYCH  
*Administrator*

IHSAN AZZAM, PhD, MD  
*Chief Medical Officer*

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH  
HEALTH WELLNESS AND PREVENTION**

Office of HIV/AIDS  
4126 Technology Way, Suite 200  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
Telephone: (775) 684-4200 · Fax: (775) 684-4056

<https://notice.nv.gov/>

**SB 284 – ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON HIV EXPOSURE MODERNIZATION**

July 22, 2020  
5 p.m.

*Webex Teleconference*

**Final Minutes – Approved 08/05/2020**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator David Parks  
Senator Dallas Harris, Co-Chair  
Steve Amend  
André Wade, Chair  
Stephan Page  
Ruben Murillo  
Octavio Posada  
Vince Collins

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Quentin Savwoir (excused)

**DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH STAFF PRESENT:**

Tory Johnson, MMgt, Section Manager, Office of HIV  
Rhonda Buckley, Administrative Assistant II, Office of HIV  
Juan “Tony” Garcia, Grants & Projects Analyst I

1. Call to Order, Roll Call – Chair André Wade asked Administrative Assistant II Rhonda Buckley to conduct roll call. Seven (7) Task Force members are present, two (2) absent; quorum met.

2. Public Comment

*(No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been included specifically on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.)* –

Chair Wade asked if there was any public comment and for the person to state their name and to know they have one minute to speak; there was no public comment.

3. Review and Approval of meeting minutes (For possible action) – Chair, André Wade

- July 8, 2020
- July 15, 2020

Chair Wade asked for any corrections to the meeting date of July 8, 2020. Mr. Murillo noted no corrections and moved adopt to accept the minutes of July 8, 2020. Chair Wade noted he has a couple of items for clarification to the minutes of July 8, 2020. The first is clarify the acronym of “SARA” to “SERO.” Chair Wade also said he did not see in the minutes of Senator David Parks being okay with Senator Dallas Harris being Co-Chair. Sen. Parks commented that on Page 2 of the July 8, 2020 minutes, that typically if there is a Chair there is a Vice-Chair, as opposed to two Co-Chairs. He did not know if the Task Force wanted to do anything in the minutes, but that it appears to be correct in the discussion that took place. He suggested maybe the group would want a Chair and Vice-Chair. Sen. Harris said she had no problem with either title, as to how the Task Force decides the structure. Chair Wade also questioned a section (Page 2) of Mr. Page and Mr. Johnson talking about NRS sections of the by-laws in a workshop. Mr. Page reviewed the minutes and noted, “Mr. Page asked Mr. Johnson if he would like him to type the NRS sections of the by-laws into the group chat.” No revision needed. Chair Wade also noted a portion of Page 2, “A law firm working with Silver State Equality that had findings in alignment with the HIV Coalition and some additional items that could be shared out.” Mr. Johnson asked what page this information was on for easier reference. After reading the section, Chair Wade noted the information was accurate. Chair Wade noted Stephan Amend has joined the meeting. Eight members of the Task Force are now present. Chair Wade asked if there were any other revisions to the minutes of July 8, 2020. Chair Wade asked for a motion to accept the minutes of July 8, 2020. Mr. Murillo went back to his original motion to accept the minutes of July 8, 2020, as amended. Sen. Harris seconds the motion. Chair Wade asked for a vote of all in favor to say, ‘Aye,’ none opposed/abstained. Motion carried.

Chair Wade then referenced the minutes of July 15, 2020, and if there were any corrections to the minutes to be made. There were none. Chair Wade asked for a motion to approve minutes of July 15, 2020 as presented. Mr. Collins moved to approve the minutes of July 15, 2020; Mr. Page seconds the motion. Chair Wade asked all in favor say, ‘Aye,’ none opposed/abstained. Motion carried to approve minutes as submitted.

4. Presentation concerning work around HIV Modernization in Nevada

- Presenter #1: Antioco Carillo, Executive Director, Aid for AIDS Nevada (AFAN)
- Presenter #2: Chris Reynolds, Chair of Nevada HIV Modernization Coalition
- Presenter #3: Scott Schoettes, Counsel and HIV Project Director, Lambda Legal

Chair Wade introduces Chris Reynolds to the Task Force. Mr. Reynolds speaks to the group and identifies he is currently one of five (5) Co-Chairs of the Nevada HIV Modernization Coalition. Mr. Reynolds gave a brief history of the Modernization Coalition and the work the group is doing. He noted the Coalition met in 2019 in conjunction with the SERO Project to

work with the process was of modernizing laws, and how to look at what the State's situation with the laws were at the time. They worked with Counsel Scott Schoettes of Lambda Legal, on the process of modernizing laws. And also met with Senator Parks to talk about the actual title of the Task Force. The Coalition sent a letter to Senator Ratti in support of SB 284 (2019), and have been working with HIV is Not a Crime (a community conversation), a series hosted by SERO. Mr. Reynolds announced The Coalition meets twice a month in support of the Task Force and what they are doing in reference to specific Nevada Revised Statutes.

Chair Wade asked if there were any comments or questions for Mr. Reynolds. Mr. Murillo thank Mr. Reynolds for speaking on the work the Coalition is doing, and spoke on behalf of Mr. Carillo, as Mr. Carillo was unable to attend. Mr. Reynolds noted he has sent attachments for review to the Task Force, based on HIV Modernization in Nevada and Elements of Modernization, and why current laws are problematic. He also said the information is based on science, not stigma, as right now there is a lot of stigma throughout the laws. Specifically legal prostitutes in brothels, and illegal sex workers. He noted since 1982, no woman working in a legal brothel has tested positive for HIV, due to screening, testing and mandatory condom barrier laws. However, when looking at Clark County, the unlicensed or illegal sex workers, there have been more than 800 sex workers (in the illegal industry) who have tested positive for HIV since 1982. He recommends taking a look at the statutes and how they are worded, because as it is worded now, it may prevent people from being tested.

Mr. Posada asked Mr. Reynolds that within the Coalition, are there any particular groups representing 'street workers,' ie, "Cupcake Girls." Mr. Reynolds said he has personally reached out to this group and when he talked with them about the Coalition and the work they are doing, the response he received was, "We are not political, that's not what we do." So the Coalition has not been able to get a representative from the Cupcake Girls to be a part of the Coalition. He said one of the ladies who has been a member of the Coalition, has kind of represented the legal side of sex work in Nevada, and is doing her thesis on legalized sex work at UNLV. Mr. Reynolds said it is a difficulty in getting people who are engaged in unlicensed, illegal sex work to step forward and say they are a sex worker in Clark County, because it is a risk of them admitting that and being arrested, and easily targeted. He said the population they need to get more involved (in this work) are representatives from the sex work industry. Legal or illegal, preferably from the illegal side.

Mr. Amend asked if the Coalition planned to offer any model legislation or recommendations to modernize the actual statutes. Mr. Reynolds said the group sent a packet prior to the first meeting to see what the Task Force to see where they're at and what the report says. Then if there was something the Coalition felt if they didn't see what they were looking for, then they would talk about submitting suggestions or changes for legislation. Mr. Page said the Task Force reviewed the packet at the meeting of July 15, 2020, that identified the four statutes. He gave his recommendations on behalf of the Coalition, plus the third-to-last page of the packet had generalization modernization recommendations.

Mr. Reynolds noted the goal of the Coalition is to make sure the bill got passed and the Task Force was put into place. Now the Coalition is here to support the Task Force in whatever ways they can and any additional things after that. They are waiting for the report from the Task Force, from what information was originally sent, and go from there.

Mr. Amend noted that with the Task Force being down to the wire, any help they can get – knowing what the Coaliting is thinking now – they can incorporate that into the report and it would be more helpful than the Coalition waiting on the Task Force to put together a 'half-baked' first draft of the report together then commenting on it. Mr. Amend asked if the Coalition had some ideas in specific language they would love to look at that. Mr. Reynolds

believed this was provided in the packet. He would review the packet and if there were not specific language, he would discuss with the Chairs and move forward on.

Mr. Collins noted part of the conversation, stigma and science-based information as it pertains to modernizing the language in the statutes has only happened recently. And he has been tasked to look into how the Task Force can bring in more information around that. Mr. Collins is willing to reach out to the Coalition to bridge some of this information into the work they are currently doing. Mr. Reynolds said this would be helpful, and one of the documents provided is “Person-first Language,” and to look at language that is stigmatizing and language that should be used.

Chair Wade asked if there were any more comments or questions of Mr. Reynolds. There were none. Chair Wade asked Mr. Page if he had heard from Presenter #3, Scott Shoettes. Mr. Page said he has not been able to get in touch with him. He would try again and hope to have him as a presenter for the next meeting or another future meeting.

Chair Wade continues to Agenda Item 5. Mr. Murillo has a question regarding the composition of the Task Force. Mr. Murillo directs the question to Mr. Johnson, that if there are to be fifteen (15) members appointed to the Task Force. Mr. Johnson notes his understanding is the maximum number of members is 15, and 15 have not been appointed, yet. The Governor’s office makes the final decision. Mr. Murillo notes with the Task Force having nine members with the potential for 15, he would like to see if they could add to the number of members to assist with the objectives and timelines as it would be beneficial to the Task Force’s work. Mr. Johnson note adding members is an additional process and he was not sure where an applicant would go to begin, except it does go through the Governor’s office. Mr. Murillo asked if Chair Wade could reach out to the Governor’s office to see if they could a couple of people to the Task Force. Chair Wade said he understood. Sen. Harris added the chance of having 15 members before reaching their goal would be pretty small. Mr. Page said he has referred people to apply for a position on the Task Force and encouraged others to do the same. Chair Wade said he recommended people as well, and, according to the by-laws the Task Force can continue to make recommendations but they will have to go through the regular process via the Governor’s office. Mr. Murillo noted he wanted his comment on the record that the Task Force should have more people on it. And he’s comfortable knowing the group has input from the Coalition. He’s happy with that. Mr. Posada suggested the topic be tabled for another time. And to include committee members who would be impacted by whatever recommendations are put forward. Chair Wade said it is unfortunate the group only has nine people, but they can do whatever they can to try to get others before the end of the Task Force’s deadline. With no other questions, Chair Wade moved to Agenda No. 5.

5. Review and discuss requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 201.205, 201.358, 441A.300, and 441A.180 pertaining to 2019 Senate Bill 284 (19 SB284) and approve recommendations for the report to the legislature from the Task Force (*For possible action*) – Chair, André Wade

Chair Wade opened the item for discussion. Mr. Page suggested repealing the first section, NRS 201.205, and the HIV Coalition is also in support of it. He added that if the group does go forward with this recommendation, and it cannot be repealed, the group provide some information on how to amend it. Mr. Collins asks for clarification from Mr. Page on the penalty phase of the NRS; could there be a reduction of classification of the penalty or fine. Mr. Page noted if the section is not repealed, the classification be reduced from a felony to misdemeanor charge. Mr. Amend gave information on the charge of misdemeanor being \$1,000, and gross

misdomenior being \$2,000, and felony Category E is \$5,000, Category C is \$10,000, and Category B (which is what the crime is listed at now), is defined by the specific statute. Mr. Collins asked if they could recommend reducing the classification of the crime. Mr. Amend recommends if they still have the statute in some form, subsequent events could be a felony, as they do for other types of criminal offenses. Mr. Collins said the recommendation be to reduce the charge to a misdomenior, if the statute is not removed. Mr. Page said that would be a great idea. And, with the recommendation of lowering the charge from felony to misdomenior, also add an alternative recommendation of (the disease being) undetectable, or untransmittable, or something around condom use (taking precautions), that HIV not be criminalized. Chair Wade asked for clarification on his comment. Mr. Page clarified. Mr. Amend said they recommend it be an affirmative defense, proved by the accused, similar to how it is listed currently. Chair Wade asked Mr. Collins to clarify which part of the language he is referring to. Mr. Collins noted it is in the second graph, section 'a'. Mr. Page said if they were talking about, for example, 2(d), if the victim was unprepped. Senator Harris said another thing to consider in regard to people who are undetectable, is making a change to the definition of what it means to be positive. Chair Wade asked if there were any other discussion points for NRS 201.205; there were none.

Chair Wade then moved to NRS 201.358. Mr. Amend noted this statute is the only that has been appealed to the Supreme Court, in a 1994 case. He then gave a description of the case, sentencing, reason for appeal, and noting none of the appeals were based on the constitutionality of the statute. But that it was appealed because the sentence was disproportionate to the crime and it constituted cruel and unusual punishment. What Mr. Amend noted is important about the Supreme Court's decision, is it talks about the legislative intent when they first passed this law. He said HIV was a much different disease and diagnosis back then and it was seen as a deadly disease and it is no longer seen that way. Mr. Amend thinks the legislative history and this particular decision can be used as further support that these statutes do need to be modernized and 1-10 years in prison is and probably be considered cruel and or excessive. Also with the fact if someone is soliciting and an unlicensed sex worker, there is a risk they're taking, especially if they're not using protection, if they're not on prep, and they know an unlicensed sex worker is not required to be tested monthly like licensed sex workers. He said today's world is much different than it was back when this statute was first passed. Chair Wade asked Mr. Amend if he had any recommendations around 201.358. Mr. Amend said they should probably mimick the recommendations they have on the last statute. It's similar, but the only difference is whether it's an unlicensed or even licensed sex worker. He does know if the punishment should be different than if it were just two people. There could be an additional punishment if they're HIV positive, but he does not think it needs to be a felony. And, the group could incorporate of the recommendations from NRS 201.205 that were made. Mr. Page noted it is a pretty good idea, and the remaining concern with that is; undetectable, untransmittable, or as Sen. Harris said changing the definition of HIV positive. Mr. Amend said one argument is, currently prostitution is illegal in Nevada, and a person does this, is HIV positive and is going to be irresponsible by not being in HIV medication, maybe there should be an increased punishment. Because the person is creating a greater risk to the citizens and visitors of Nevada. But if they're compliant with their HIV medication, it could downgrade the offense. Mr. Posada asked if there is currently anything under this statute, for someone who may have been found guilty, as part of the sentencing, for the person to seek some sort of education or workshop. Mr. Amend noted that when he was a public defender, both the sex worker and the 'john', if convicted, as part of their sentence, were to attend some type of class. Mr. Page noted some of the statutes in the Sidley Memo, NRS 174.031, allows for a pre-

prosecution diversion program. It is not specifically HIV related, but specifically mentions as an option for people who are criminalized under this statute. Also, the California Bill under the Sidley Memo, did legislate some training around it. (Do not quote him on that.)

Mr. Reynolds commented he used to teach the court-ordered classes for a first-time offender prostitution program. There is also a court-ordered AIDS awareness class. What needs to be considered in regard to this statute is, the terminology. It's a really good idea. Chair Wade asked if there were further discussion on 201.358, there was none. He then moved discussion to NRS 441A.180. Mr. Page noted NRS 441A.300 was recommended for repeal at last meeting, and that it specifically targeted HIV, not AIDS. And, that 441A.180 is essentially the same, but is for all communicable diseases, it does not target any specific disease. So if they have 441A.180, they would not reason for 441A.300. Mr. Amend agrees with Mr. Page. For his own clarification, Chair Wade repeats what Mr. Page stated. Mr. Page confirmed, and also said since 441A.180 already covers HIV, it could be used as case to repeal 201.205. Chair Wade asked if there was further discussion; there was none. He then recommended keeping the agenda item for a future meeting for further discussion. Mr. Page motions for the recommendation; Sen. Parks seconds. All in favor said, 'Aye,' none opposed/abstained. Motion carried. Chair Wade moved to Agenda Item 6.

6. Review Sidley memo to discuss Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 174.031, 441A.230, 209.385, 441A.320, 201.356 and 201.354 pertaining to 2019 Senate Bill 284 (19 SB284) and approve recommendations for the report to the legislature from the Task Force (*For possible action*) – Chair, André Wade

Chair Wade opens the item for discussion, beginning with NRS 174.031. Mr. Page said this item does not mention HIV at all. He personally does not have any problems with this statute and feels the Task Force could leave as is. Chair Wade asked for other thoughts, recommendations or considerations; there were none. Chair Wade then brings up 441A.230 for discussion. Mr. Page said he does not think it mentions HIV, and personally has no recommendations. Mr. Amend has no comment.

With no other comments, Chair Wade moves to 209.385 for discussion. Mr. Page noted has does have an issue, that there is a statement that essentially says, if you are imprisoned in Nevada and you test HIV positive, you must be segregated from people who are HIV negative if the director thinks you are engaging in behavior that could increase the risk of transmission. Mr. Page feels this is problematic in the chances of getting HIV. Maybe sleeping in the same cell as someone are not that high. And feels it goes back to the issue of the director having a lot of jurisdiction over, if the person is doing 'risky behavior.' Chair Wade found this concerning himself, as it applies to director, administrative officer, managers or warden, and anyone who might be a staff member whose going to be dealing with coming in contact with someone's blood or bodily fluid of the offender. This information is good to know.

Mr. Amend read section 4; and said the Task Force may need to look at those regulations as he's not sure what behavior they're talking about. Mr. Amend said it is a felony for inmates to engage in sex and if is what they're talking about he certainly has an concern with that. Another issue is prison rape. He said if the group could find out what those regulations are, they don't want to see them arbitrarily applied by the director of the prison. If they (prison) has no other way to prohibit the offender from continually doing this behavior, then the director should have the ability to segregate them. Mr. Page described the 'risky behavior' that was included, but amended out in 2017. Mr. Collins asked if there was any reference to the defendant's viral suppression. Mr. Page said he thinks it needs to be included if they are virally suppressed. Mr.

Posada asked what does segregation really mean? Mr. Page said it was a great question. He was not sure if 'segregation' is defined in the NRS. Mr. Posada wondered if segregation is for the benefit of the health of the person who tested positive, or the cell mates? Mr. Amend said he feels the intent is to protect those who are non-HIV positive, from the way the statute is written. Mr. Collins said he knows that in county facilities, they do not segregate those who are HIV positive. But these facilities have a program with the health district to monitor HIV inmates. Mr. Page said this was not required, but gives the director authority to segregate. Chair Wade proposed a question to the group, if they needed to look at cross referencing the Prison Rape Elimination Act. Mr. Page said it is not a bad idea to look into. Chair Wade asked if there was further discussion; Mr. Page said they should probably revisit this statute. Chair Wade then moved to 441A.320 and opened the floor for discussion. Mr. Page said he did see any particular problem with this statute, except to remove HIV as it does mention HIV and STDs, as there is no reason to single it (HIV) out. Chair Wade asked if there were any more comments, suggestions. Mr. Amend asked if the more modern term was Sexually Transmitted Infection, rather than Disease. Mr. Page said he thought this was true, so they could change HIV/STD to STI. Mr. Posada said each term is used, depending on where you go, so they could include both. Chair Wade noted they could refer to the bylaws, letter 'd', if they want to do further research on STI or STD. Mr. Amend noted he visited the CDC (Centers for Disease Control) website, and they refer to it as STD, and to keep it at that since it is most commonly used. With no further comments, Chair Wade moved to 201.356 for discussion. Mr. Page said personally he sees a problem with it, and he may be a minority, that the statute says if you're arrested for prostitution you will be tested for HIV. If you are charged with prostitution, you have to pay \$100 for the HIV test. He thinks it's problematic, because he does not think the HIV test costs \$100, as they are done for free all over the state. But in general he sees a problem with having the person pay for the test. Mr. Posada concurred. Mr. Amend said he personally does not have a problem with the imposition of the fee if the person is found guilty of the offense. He said it is standard for people convicted of crimes to pay restitution, fines and court costs. Mr. Page noted the crime mentioned in question, is just for being an illegal sex worker. Mr. Octavio said to meet somewhere in the middle, that only if the person tests positive (for HIV), then they pay the cost of the test. Mr. Page he feels it should be removed entirely, but, this is a better middle-ground answer. Chair Wade asked if it was stigmatizing to have someone pay for a test just because they are positive, and if there's a precedent around offenders having to pay restitution. He recommended looking at the language. Mr. Amend said the one issue he sees with charging only the person who tests positive, at least in the courtrooms he worked in, if the sex worker tested positive, normally the judge would call the person up to the bench and tell them privately. So if they are being charged for a test everyone would (then) know the person tested positive. Mr. Collins said the State of Nevada provides free testing and has a program in detention to test individuals. Maybe just add a mandate to get tested. Mr. Page said this would be fine. Mr. Amend said it's not so much the punishment, but who should bear the cost (of the test). The courts, detention center. He thinks the legislature would have a hard time agreeing the cost should be bore on the detention center, police department or the courts. Mr. Amend noted felons are to pay for a DNA-marker test. He said there a quite a few people arrested for solicitation and for those costs to be shifted to another would only increase the cost overall. So he has no issue for the person to pay for this test. Mr. Posada asked Mr. Amend how difficult it would be for a person to be reimbursed (for the test). Mr. Amend said the cost is bore once the test is given, it doesn't cost any more whether positive or negative. So if a person is convicted of the crime, there are costs associated with it. Mr. Collins asked with this cost would compound other fines or penalties. Mr. Amend said yes,

it would add to any and all other costs, which is common for many other types of crimes. Mr. Collins agrees but says they are singling out HIV for the cost, and not including all STIs, which are more prevalent. Mr. Amend said it was a good point and maybe there should be a flat fee for all STD testing and not just HIV specifically. He said other STD tests are much more expensive than the HIV test. Mr. Collins noted there are sex workers who test for HIV, and the State pays for it. Mr. Amend asked Mr. Collins if he was suggesting the person get the HIV test on their own and provide the results to the court. Mr. Collins said yes. Mr. Amend said the only issue he sees with that is with the statute they are reviewing, you have to show notification by the courts to the defendant, not to violate that law, they want to be sure in order to get a conviction they can prove all the elements beyond a reasonable doubt. And the only way than do that is if it's done by the court or the jail, and specifically provided to the offender. Mr. Amend said if the other statutes aren't changed, there is no way they would agree to this one. Chair Wade noted this was great discussion and wanted to move on to 201.354 for discussion. Mr. Page noted this statute also does not mention HIV and he has no recommendations as the statute basically defines illegal prostitution, and has nothing to do with HIV. Chair Wade noted there was mention of prostitution being a misdemeanor in this section. Mr. Amend said yes, that is was a misdemeanor for the first offense; second or subsequent offense is a gross misdemeanor. He said a one point it was a felony but was changed a while back (for multiple offenses). Mr. Page asked if this was in regard to illegal sex work (only). Mr. Amend confirmed it did. Chair Wade asked if there was any other comments/discussion on 201.354; there was not. Chair Wade asked for a motion to table Item 6 for the next meeting. Mr. Amend motions to table Item 6 to the next meeting; Sen. Parks seconds the motion, and asked if the Task Force was following "Robert's Rules of Order" or any other rules. He comments that if you table an item you hope to bring it back up for consideration. Sen. Parks said to refer to Items 5 and 6 for further discussion to another meeting. Mr. Amend amends his motion to that respect; Sen. Parks seconds the motion. Chair Wade asks Sen. Parks to explain what it should be, as he is no expert on Robert's Rules of Order. Sen. Park explained that if the group votes to table something, you have to vote at a subsequent meeting to bring it back up for consideration or further discussion. So he was suggesting for Items 5 and 6, refer or continue them at a subsequent meeting. Chair Wade thanked Sen. Parks for the clarification, and noted according to the by-laws, the Task Force will work under Robert's Rules of Order. Chair Wade then asked for a motion to place Items 5 and 6 on an agenda for a subsequent meeting. Mr. Amend said this motion was pending. Chair Wade asked all in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed/abstained. Motion carried.

7. Review, discuss and approve of research in HIV Modernization done by the HIV Modernization Coalition and Silver State Equality (For possible action) – Chair, André Wade  
Chair Wade there was only about seven (7) Minutes left in the meeting. Mr. Amend had a question about Item 'b' on the timeline, and he was not sure what this was asking as it was a pretty broad statement. Chair Wade noted there was a particular discussion at the prior meeting under letter 'b'. Mr. Page said he thinks this discussion was in general. But they have discussed education, for lack of a better word. He said general research shows that HIV criminalization laws don't actually reduce incidents of (HIV) transmission. Mr. Page said this would be a good thing to point out in the report. And, he would find more concrete research on this comment. Mr. Johnson notified the group they had about four minutes before the WebEx meeting would cut off. Chair Wade noted he wanted to move Items 7 and 8 to a subsequent meeting. Mr. Murillo motioned to move items to subsequent meeting; Sen. Parks seconds the motion. All in favor said, 'Aye,' none opposed/abstained.



8. Review and approve timeline with benchmarks to complete report by due date to legislature (For possible action) – Chair, André Wade.
  
7. Public Comment  
*(No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been included specifically on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.)*  
Chair Wade asked if there was any public comment to be made and if so, state their name and keep comments to 1 minute in length of time. There was no public comment.
  
8. Adjournment  
Chair Wade asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Amend motions for adjournment; Mr. Page seconds the motion. All in favor said, ‘Aye,’ none opposed/abstained.  
Chair Wade adjourned the meeting at 6:59 p.m.