MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY

Thirty-Sixth Special Session
November 15, 2025

The Select Committee on Public Safety and Security was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 4:17 p.m. on Saturday, November 15, 2025, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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/36th2025Special.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Venicia Considine
Assemblymember Joe Dalia
Assemblymember Cecelia González
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember David Orentlicher
Assemblymember Jason Patchett
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adam Drost, Committee Fiscal Analyst
Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst
Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Legal Counsel
Kathleen Capron, Committee Legal Counsel
Cyndi Latour, Committee Manager
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary
Shiloh Reading, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Enterprise Mobility; and Nevada Urban Consortium
Victoria Supple, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Ryan Beaman, District Vice President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Danny Thompson, Private Citizen
Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Harrison Porter, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association; and representing Public Safety Alliance of Nevada
Rick McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Jason D. Mills, Immediate Past President, Nevada Justice Association
Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Christopher Ries, Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County
Dalton L. Hooks, Jr., representing Nevada Self-Insurers Association

Chair Miller:
[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] We will be taking the agenda out of order. The first bill we will hear today is Senate Bill 2, then Senate Bill 1, Senate Bill 7, and then we will have a work session. For presenters, we ask you to keep your presentation to 15 minutes each. After that, we will have testimony, and we ask each speaker to state your name, spell your name, and keep your comments to two minutes. We will have public comment at the end. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 2.

Senate Bill 2: Revises provisions relating to legislative affairs. (BDR 17-30)

Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau:
Given the lateness of the hour and the specialness of the session, I will keep my remarks on this bill brief. This bill is very similar to Assembly Bill 600 of the 83rd Session. There are three things this bill does. The first is, you may have noticed we have delis now on both the northern and southern campuses of the Legislature. We had some questions from the State

Controller about whether the law was clear enough that we could keep the revenue from the proceeds of those delis within the Legislative Fund. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill make it clear the revenue from those delis would remain within the Legislative Fund.

Moving out of order to section 4, you may recall near the end of the regular session, the Legislature authorized the purchase of a parking lot that is contiguous to the legislative property in the north. That purchase was actually completed. Section 4 of the bill adds that property to the list of properties in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 331.135 that are under the exclusive control of the Legislature. That is a housekeeping piece to reflect the purchase of that property authorized by the Legislature.

The final item in section 3 relates to the codification of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. I promise not to pull a full Kevin Powers and go back to the *Magna Carta* of 1215 on you. For a little bit of history, the *Nevada Revised Statutes* came into existence in 1957, by an act of the Legislature. That was the conclusion of a six-year process that began in 1951, with the creation of the Statute Revision Commission to create the *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

The charge for the Statute Revision Commission from the Legislature was to organize all of Nevada's laws in the following order: beginning first with laws of a remedial nature, so remedies that are available in court; moving second to laws of a civil nature, so laws that govern civil procedures in court; third to laws of a criminal nature, so laws dealing with crimes and punishment; and finally laws of a political nature, which is literally everything that does not relate to either remedies, civil law, or criminal law.

For the laws of a political nature, which are the bulk of NRS, the direction to the Legislative Counsel Bureau in Chapter 220 of NRS is to organize those by subject. There was a recent Supreme Court decision where the court, I think, erroneously assumed the provisions of NRS are organized by branch of government as opposed to topic. Under the law in NRS Chapter 220, they are required to be organized by topic.

We are currently in the process of codifying NRS following the 2025 Regular Session. If this language were not adopted, that opinion from the Supreme Court would require us to recodify all of NRS into 4 Titles rather than the 59 that exist, which would be a large undertaking that would burn hundreds of hours and likely millions of dollars of staff time. I also think no one wants NRS to be in 4 giant Titles instead of 59 Titles. Passing this bill would allow us not to do that during the codification process that is currently underway and leave NRS organized the way it currently is.

That concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support of Senate Bill 2. If there is anyone who would like to provide support testimony in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward. [There was no one.] I will open testimony in opposition.

[There was no one.] I will open neutral testimony. [There was no one.] Mr. Killian, do you have any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 2. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 1. I will give you a few moments to get settled.

Senate Bill 1: Revises provisions governing the short-term lease of a passenger car. (BDR 43-26)

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Enterprise Mobility:
We are here for a technical change to what we believe better represents what we tried to do last session in Senate Bill 194 of the 83rd Session. I will try to anticipate a couple of questions. Why did we not get this right in the regular session? What in this rises it to the level of a special session request?

In S.B. 194 of the 83rd Session, I represented Enterprise Mobility, which is a large multinational corporation. We do have partners who are family-owned franchisees who are represented by my esteemed colleague and friend, Charlie De La Paz, who has joined me at the table. They came to us last session and told us the law, as it currently exists—which is prior to the passage of S.B. 194 of the 83rd Session—prohibits a rental car agency from denying a rental to an individual who does not have insurance and is unwilling to purchase a supplemental insurance. They were not permitted to deny a rental; they had to rent a car. That is not an issue my client was concerned about. Ms. De La Paz's client did have some liability concerns with that, but we supported them in moving forward. My only request at the time was, Please do not do anything that changes the way we do business. Enterprise Mobility would like to do business as usual. We will rent you a car regardless of whether the person has insurance because all of our cars are insured. We are a major corporation and have the appropriate insurance on all the vehicles, so we moved forward this legislation.

I asked in the end if this changes the way we do business. No, it does not, was the answer. The provision I just referenced in statute that was law before says, "Except as otherwise provided in section 2, subsection 2, a short-term lessor shall not require the purchase of a waiver or damages . . . ." It kept the existing law, except it added subsection 2.

Subsection 2 provides an opportunity for the rental car company to optionally deny a rental if they felt there was liability associated with the renter. Their reasoning made sense to me. Although we have not experienced it, or are not aware we experienced it, the concern they were trying to address was for an individual who, for whatever reason, is uninsurable. Warren Hardy has three DUIs. I get my license back but I cannot get insurance. Insurance underwriters will not underwrite me or I have an SR-22 that is very expensive. I decide instead of owning my own car, I will rent a car, which effectively passes the liability onto a company who has no ability to do an actuarial, and because of the previous law, has no ability to deny insurance. Again, not something my client concerns itself with, but I certainly understand why our franchisee partners did. That was what this was intended to fix. How I missed it last session is, I was under the impression subsection 2 was an optional alternative

process we could follow if we wanted to, or we did not have to do it if we did not want to. Since my client intended to continue on the status quo and rent cars regardless, we did not think much about it.

It got to our actuarial folks who read, "A short-term lessor shall require that a person seeking to lease a passenger car provide proof of insurance that satisfies the minimum amount of insurance coverage . . . ." in the state of Nevada. We have no way to do that. We have no way to verify someone from Japan, someone from New York, someone from Utah, who has different minimum standards. They could provide us the insurance card, but we do not know if it is valid. Our guys are not trained to know what the minimum requirements of those states are. That is why we wanted it optional.

For the first time in this statute and what brings it to the level of a special session fix is my client felt there was a possibility for a significant liability if we have a statutory obligation to perform a duty, which in this case is to verify they have insurance that meets the minimum standards. We are unable to do that.

What this change does—going from "shall" to "may"—simply takes us back to what we all understood the original legislative intent was, which is to say, If you want to avail yourself as a rental car company of subsection 2, you can. If you do not want to, you do not have to. My client wants to continue with the status quo. Ms. De La Paz may want to do something different. This accomplishes that. We missed the "may" and the "shall," and the "may" gives us the flexibility. That was as brief as I could be, Madam Chair. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support in Carson City. Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 1? You will have two minutes for your testimony.

Victoria Supple, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:
We support Senate Bill 1 because it provides reasonable flexibility for short-term lessors by allowing, rather than requiring, them to collect proof of insurance. This small change helps streamline the process for loaner and rental vehicles while maintaining all existing insurance protections. We appreciate the bill sponsor and ask for your support.

Chair Miller:
Not seeing anyone else in Carson City, is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] I will open opposition testimony in Carson City and Las Vegas. [There was no one.] I will open neutral testimony in Carson City and Las Vegas. [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 1. I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 7 and welcome the presenters.

Senate Bill 7: Revises provisions relating to occupational diseases. (BDR 53-36)

Ryan Beaman, District Vice President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:
Thank you, Madam Chair and Committee, for hearing this important piece of legislation, Senate Bill 7. I am here today to testify in support of this bill to clarify and restore the collusive presumption for lung disease, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 617.455.

As a quick background on this piece of legislation, in 1965, the Legislature enacted the lung disease statute with causation-based standard, proof that lung disease resulted from exposure to heat, smoke, fumes, tear gas, or other noxious gas. That structure remains today as the bill is written in section 1, subsection 1. In 1989, through Assembly Bill 755 of the 65th Session, the Legislature made a deliberate policy shift, recognizing the difficulty of proving causation for both heart and lung claims. Lawmakers adopted a conclusive presumption for professional firefighters, arson investigators, and police officers after two years of continuous, uninterrupted salary service. This created two distinct mechanisms, exposure-based claims under section 1, subsection 1, which remain available for volunteers. Another provision, conclusive presumptive claims under section 1, subsection 5, based solely on the years of qualified service for professional firefighters, police officers, and arson investigators.

The Nevada Supreme Court confirmed this reading for heart disease in *Manwill v. Clark County* in 2007, holding that the conclusive presumption operations independently of causation and applies even to congenital or pre-existing heart conditions. This is exactly how the 1989 Legislature intended the presumption to function.

The problem is, the past two appellate decisions, *Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and CCMSI v. Sonia Watterson*, and a recent one that just happened in the last couple of days from the Supreme Court, which is *Holguin v. City of Henderson*, have upended this settled understanding. Both courts held the lung conclusive presumption in section 1, subsection 5 is not independent and the claims must prove exposure under subsection 1.

The interpretation collapses the conclusive presumption into nonexistence, reverses decades of consistent practice, and undermines the Legislature's clear intent in 1989. The result is immediate disruption in lung disease claims for professional firefighters, police officers, and arson investigators will now be denied unless they can prove a specific exposure. An impossible burden in many cases.

This not only affects active employees, but our current retirees who served decades under the belief their lung claims were protected, just as their hearts, and are now faced with uncertainty. Many of them are already battling chronic lung conditions after years of service. Their families relied on the conclusive presumption for security in their retirement. These were promises Nevada made in 1989; after two years of continuous service, it would be conclusive presumed job related.

What we are trying to do, the understanding of the bill, makes the North American Risk Services statutory change necessary to restore the legislative intent. It aligns the lung conclusive presumption language, NRS 617.455, section 5, with the heart conclusion presumption language in NRS 617.457, section 1(a) through 1(c). It ensures lung presumption functions exactly the same way as heart presumption does under the *Manwill* case, preserves volunteer firefighters protection under subsection 1, maintaining their ability to bring exposure based claims, and clarifies that retroactively applying to all open and pending active and reopened claims because Nevada's first responder communities have long relied on this conclusive presumption. When I say retroactively, I am just talking about—like I said, this decision happened three days ago. We actually have over a couple hundred claims that are in the process, meaning they are either going through discovery or they are at the first step of the hearings level, appeals level, or district court. We want to make sure these individuals do not fall into a donut hole, so if you do pass this legislation, local governments cannot come back and say, Well, that group is exempt because it is now going forward. We do not want them to be in that donut hole when we fix this. That is what the retroactivity means, and it is not a new cost to the local employer. This is an existing cost that has been there since 1989, for 35 years.

To quickly walk through the bill and the change, section 1, subsection 1 remains unchanged. Exposure-based claims are still available. Subsection 5 is updated to mirror the heart statute, providing a stand-alone conclusive presumption for two years of continuous service. It means as a firefighter or police officer, I do not have to show causation. All it is, is I have the two years and as long as I do all my other physicals, then I fall under the conclusive presumption, just as we have done for the last 35 years.

In closing, this is not an expansion of benefits, as I said. It is a restoration of the legislative intent of 1989. The Legislature recognized providing causation for heart and lung claims was impossible and gave our protectors the conclusive presumption. This bill corrects the misinterpretation with the smallest statutory change possible; it preserves the rights for volunteer firefighters; restores fairness for professional firefighters and police officers; and reaffirms Nevada's promise to those whom we protect. I urge your support and stand for any questions. I do have two other presenters who will be quick in their testimony.

Chair Miller:
To be clear, is it testimony or part of the presentation?

Ryan Beaman:
Sorry, part of the presentation.

Danny Thompson, Private Citizen:
I am here today representing myself. In 1989, I was in my fifth term as the State Assemblyman from District No. 21 in Henderson. I was the chairman of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, which I had been on for eight years. I was the vice chairman of the Assembly Committee on Labor and Management, which I held for ten years previously. During that time, workers' compensation was not privatized. Workers'

compensation was the State Industrial Insurance System, which was run by the State of Nevada. All the people who worked there were state employees, and it was a State-run function of State government and a constitutionally mandated function.

In my years on those committees, I had constituents come to me and say, I filed a workers' compensation claim and I have been denied. In fact, in checking, the local governments were denying every single case in those days. The problem was so rampant, if you look at the North Las Vegas fire stations, they are almost all named after a dead firefighter who died of cancer or some other disease. I served on the Labor and Management Committee all those years and I heard all of this stuff.

I went to Kim Morgan, who at the time was in the Legal Division—she was not the director yet—she was a lawyer and bill drafter. I said, I want to know what is the strongest standard we can put into law to say I really, really mean if you get cancer and are a firefighter who puts on their turnouts every day, who uses the hose and squirts the foam which contains PFAS [polyfluoroalkyl substances]—and we all know PFAS are forever chemicals and that case has been settled now—these guys still have PFAS in their turnouts. I wanted the strongest standard we could put in the law. The strongest standard you can put in law is a conclusive presumption. Ms. Morgan said, If it is conclusively presumed that you have this problem, it is caused by your job.

When you talk about the intent—that was my bill, I introduced the bill, and I explained it just like I am explaining to you—I really, really meant it and we really, really want these people covered. We passed the bill and it was signed by the Governor. Today, every one of these cases are denied and they have to go through the process. But with that conclusive presumption, they have a way to win.

This is very important and this truly is an emergency because there are people who are going to get caught up in this thing who truly need coverage because they got their problem on the job. This is something I think is appropriate to be done. I would urge you to pass this bill to right this wrong decision.

Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:
I want to thank you all for taking the time to hear this important legislation. This legislation is important because not having it in place puts our members in harm's way. It not only prevents them from getting back to see the doctor, to getting treatment, to get back to the jobs they love, which is taking care of our citizens and your constituents, but also, worst case, they can die from this. Heart and lung are two issues, and if you have ever had any of those issues, and we run into them every day, time is of the essence. These cases will prolong the treatment they are able to get and, honestly, put people in harm's way. We have had people up here, until we started changing these laws and clarifying these things, who have lost their lives, literally, going through the workers' compensation process. I do not think it is fair. I knew some of them and was friends with them. We are all family. We live with each other

three-quarters of the year. We all know each other's families, we take care of each other on and off the job. This is very important for us. That is why it is so important it is coming up during the Special Session.

I just want to also explain; this is not an expansion. This is about restoring what was in place since 1989—36 years ago—and that changed three days ago. That is why we are here in front of you, and we beg for your support.

Chair Miller:
I will now open the hearing for member questions. [There were none.] I will open the hearing for support testimony in Carson City. You will each have two minutes. I should also remind everyone, the Committee rules are you are either in full support, full opposition, or neutral. Neutral is not taking a position, just presenting information about the bill.

Harrison Porter, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association; and representing Public Safety Alliance of Nevada:
Police officers encounter a wide range of airborne hazards during tactical operations, crowd control incidents, meth lab responses, and emergency calls. In many cases, it is simply impossible to isolate a single exposure, especially years later after symptoms develop, yet occupational risks are undeniable. Our first responders have never conditioned their willingness to act on whether the air they breathe is safe. They step into unknown and dangerous environments every day to protect our communities. This bill simply ensures the State honors its commitment to them when the long-term consequences of that service takes a toll. I urge your support on this bill.

Rick McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:
Simply put, the court got it wrong in my humble opinion. It happens. Fortuitously, this emergency we have right now has a fix—you. We can stop the devastation of this decision that puts our public safety officers into harm's way, including it may kill them. They had this benefit, and that benefit, I believe, was mistakenly taken from them.

Senate Bill 7 returns that benefit and avoids harm to our first responders, which is why we have all been sitting here listening to this. By the way, just a few months ago, this body extended the heart and lung benefits to all police officers throughout this state; a monumental decision. For that, I thank you. I was privileged to help present that bill. Do not allow a misinterpreted judicial decision change what you want and have always wanted: to protect our first responders. We support S.B. 7 and we encourage this Committee to do the same.

Chair Miller:
We will move to Las Vegas for testimony in support of S.B. 7.

Jason D. Mills, Immediate Past President, Nevada Justice Association:
I would urge your support of this bill, particularly so, as the presenters indicated, because this right has been in place since 1989. The distinction between the heart and lung statutes are

based upon historical changes that happened in those particular statutes, dating back to 1965 and 1989. There are still separations or differences between one of the subsections on the lungs that requires causation, such as for volunteer firefighters and those folks who do not have continuous and uninterrupted time on service. Proving exposure still exists for those claims. When the Legislature modified the rule in 1989, there was no such akin in the heart statute because it only applied to continuous, uninterrupted members back then. What they did is they removed that causation from the heart because it did not apply to volunteers and it did not apply to those who were not in continuous, uninterrupted service. When they added the section in 1989, as Mr. Thompson indicated when he brought the bill, the entire point was to separate those two different categories of people and also allow those who meet the classification to have the conclusive presumption.

Without this conclusive presumption, I can tell you with absolute certainty, not a few but hundreds of police officers and firefighters in this state will be harmed. No question, no discussion. It will absolutely happen. I am at two minutes. If there are any questions you or the Committee members have, since this is an area I do practice in and understand, I am more than happy to answer any legal questions.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support. [There was no one.]

[Exhibit C was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will open opposition testimony in Carson City.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Urban Consortium:
It is always difficult to oppose a bill like this. When I testified three hours ago in the Senate, I had about two minutes prepared. I have now read the Supreme Court ruling. I am not an attorney and I have not become one in the last three hours, but I do want to bring up some concerns the cities have with regard to the expansive nature of this.

It is true, the statute does provide a conclusive presumption that if you have a lung injury or lung disease, you are conclusively presumed to have acquired that on the jobsite. The statute also has a second, and it is a conclusive presumption, but that ties it back to the five or six items of the statute listed. That was the nature of the lawsuit; that was the reason for the lawsuit. The court ruled the individual did automatically have the conclusive presumption benefit in the first instance. The case was COVID-19. He claimed he got it on the jobsite. That conclusive presumption helped him and took care of that. What the court ruled was, he did not show the injury was caused by the five or six things mentioned in the statute.

Yes, my friends and colleagues have spoken to the first conclusive presumption, but they have ignored the second. I would argue, not being an attorney, the court applied the current law appropriately. I have been told by my friends, it is really not done that way in practice.

That may be the case, but it does beg the question for me of why there was a lawsuit when someone was trying to make them pass the standard of the second standard. This will have the effect of removing the second causation—

Chair Miller:
Your two minutes are up. If you have any additional comments, please submit them in writing.

Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties:
We serve all 17 Nevada counties. As I mentioned in the prior house, we needed some opportunity to review this legislation. You will hear from a county who has had an opportunity to give some community-specific impacts to this legislation. Some of our concerns we expressed when this legislation was introduced less than six hours ago, remain. We still believe this is outside the scope of the Special Session Proclamation, and all of our counties have some issues on some provisions in here on retroactive applicability. I will echo the comments from my colleague from the cities and leave it at that. We are opposed at this time, as we continue to assess some of the impacts of this.

Christopher Ries, Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
Even though it is well intentioned, we do oppose S.B. 7. While we have not had a full amount of time to complete the analysis of how much this would cost, it will have a significant financial impact, which does equate to police officers.

The bill does change substantively the heart and lung provisions of workers' compensation. This is a very nuanced issue. Frankly, it deserves a much more detailed and robust discussion. At this time, we are in opposition.

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County:
I echo the comments from the previous speakers. We are still trying to determine the impacts of this legislation. I wish we did have some time to try to work on some of these issues. I will tell you our initial concerns are about the retroactive applicability in the bill. I want to let you know, we are in the process of determining the impacts. Currently, Clark County experiences impacts based on what we have to hold in reserves for workers' compensation, what we have for claims data, and what we expect in presumptive liability. We have audited numbers we just completed in fiscal year 2024, and our costs are $267 million. It is very serious that we want to be able to look at what the impacts would be. Because of the time and the expeditious nature of this bill, I did feel it important to say we do have concerns about the retroactiveness. Any expansion will impact our liability. We are hoping that is not true, but wanted to put it on the record.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to offer opposition testimony?

Dalton L. Hooks, Jr., representing Nevada Self-Insurers Association:
We are in strong opposition to this bill. As someone who is a lawyer and practices in this area, I can certainly talk about this. It is important to understand for the members of the Committee, this is a decision that was decided on November 13, 2025, by the Nevada Supreme Court. That was two days ago. It was also similarly decided, as was mentioned by the proponents, by the State Court of Appeals reaching the same conclusion. They reached the same conclusion because this is longstanding, black-letter law. It is not a change. They are not mistaken. The law is very clear.

The happenstance of this Special Session exists to allow the litigants in this matter who lost to use these proceedings instead of the judicial process to seek an en banc hearing from the Nevada Supreme Court and is, in my opinion, inappropriate. The idea we are "fixing" this during the Special Session is a misnomer.

The law below simply requires, as was stated before—and I join all the comments from the folks up north—there is a presumption. However, the underpinning of this law is it needs to tie to the work. Therefore, it has to arise out of an exposure to heat, smoke, fumes, tear gas, or other noxious gases, the things our firefighters and first responders are exposed to that they cannot get a material safety data sheet to show what they were exposed to. That is the purpose. In the case underlying, the individual was exposed to a sick coworker who had COVID-19, to which every citizen of the state of Nevada was exposed to during that timeframe, irrespective of their position.

Our first responders have some of the best health insurance for any citizens in the state. The question is not whether they should be treated for COVID-19, the question is whether that should be treated under the Nevada Workers' Compensation Act. This body decided in 1989, and since then, it was mentioned we had a legislative session where we went through this omnibus bill for workers' compensation. This was not addressed. It came up because of a loss. We urge you to oppose.

[Exhibit D was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify? [There was no one.] I will open the hearing for neutral testimony in Carson City and Las Vegas. [There was no one.] I welcome the bill presenters back for any final remarks.

Ryan Beaman:
Again, regarding the retroactive for the bill, we are talking about current claims that are pending, not claims we have lost. This is about claims that are pending, meaning they are at some level of the appeals or they might even be going through discovery. That is what we are talking about with retroactive. That is the current thing that has been in the statute and that is what we are trying to make sure those people are protected in the donut hole.

There was a question about the constitutionality of this bill. I have been here a long time, and I think the Legislative Counsel Bureau does a fabulous job. They are the ones who drafted the bill draft. They looked at the Proclamation and made the decision this is germane to the issues here, and it is an emergency. Meaning, we do have those members out there who cannot wait two years to determine if they are going to have an accepted claim or not or legislative intent. Members will die. That will happen. That is why we are here saying it is an emergency to fix now.

Todd Ingalsbee:
I echo Mr. Beaman's sentiments. This will harm our members. This will harm our brothers and sisters who do what they do every day to protect our citizens—your constituents—just like our brothers and sisters on the police side of it. This will harm them 100 percent.

Chair Miller:
I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 7. Next on our agenda, we do have a work session. We will be having a work session for Assembly Bill 6, Senate Bill 1, Senate Bill 2, and Senate Bill 7. As I stated yesterday, Speaker Yeager has waived the rules for us to be able to work session bills and not be held to the 24-hour rule we typically have. I will hand it over to our Committee policy analyst to begin with Assembly Bill 6.

Assembly Bill 6: Revises provisions governing traffic laws. (BDR 43-23)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
As nonpartisan staff, I can neither support nor oppose any of the measures that come before this Committee. Assembly Bill 6 revises provisions governing traffic laws. It was sponsored by this Committee and heard yesterday [Exhibit E].

There is an amendment attached to the work session document submitted by Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County. The amendment clarifies the statutory reference, specifies that local governments and the Nevada Department of Transportation are responsible only for zones within their jurisdictions, and requires the use of standardized signage to mark the beginning and end of each designated school or school crossing zone. Those are all the amendments.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 6.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Marzola. We will move on to Senate Bill 1.

Senate Bill 1: Revises provisions governing the short-term lease of a passenger car. (BDR 43-26)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Senate Bill 1 is sponsored by the Senate Select Committee on Public Safety and Security. This bill relates to short-term leases of passenger cars. There were no amendments submitted to the Committee.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 1? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 1.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 1.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hansen. We will move on to Senate Bill 2.

Senate Bill 2: Revises provisions relating to legislative affairs. (BDR 17-30)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Senate Bill 2 is sponsored by the Senate Select Committee on Public Safety and Security. The bill revises provisions relating to legislative affairs. There were no amendments submitted.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 2.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 2.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GURR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Gurr. We will move on to Senate Bill 7.

Senate Bill 7: Revises provisions relating to occupational diseases. (BDR 53-36)

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
Senate Bill 7 is sponsored by Senator Cannizzaro. The bill revises provisions relating to occupational diseases. There were no amendments submitted.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 7.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 7.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DALIA SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblymember Hansen:
I am not comfortable with the number of complications I think we need to address in this bill. This is my first time even hearing some of this. I know the original legislation was very complicated. I love and appreciate our firefighters and police officers and the exposures and the things they do. At this time, I do not feel I can support the bill.

Assemblymember Gurr:
I am not quite where Assemblymember Hansen is at, but I will vote it out of Committee and reserve my right until I find out more.

Chair Miller:
Is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Considine. We are in recess.

[The Committee recessed at 5:05 p.m. and reconvened at 5:19 p.m.]

The Committee will come to order. What is happening right now is, there is an additional amendment [Exhibit F] to Assembly Bill 6, which we have already work sessioned. In order to include that amendment, we are going to rescind the motion as if it never happened and then make a new motion to include the new amendment.

Assembly Bill 6: Revises provisions governing traffic laws. (BDR 43-23)

Chair Miller:
I will entertain a motion to rescind the activities on Assembly Bill 6.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO RESCIND THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 6.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will turn it over to Mr. Melgarejo to explain Assembly Bill 6 for our work session.

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst:
This amendment [Exhibit F] is in addition to the amendment already approved by the Committee. This is a conceptual amendment that will be uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System after the Committee hearing.

The conceptual amendment prohibits the inclusion of certain information concerning pupils within a directory of pupils; prohibits the provision of certain information concerning pupils to third parties; sets forth the method for a third party to request certain information concerning pupils; and requires the compilation of lists containing certain information included in such requests for information.

Chair Miller:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended Assembly Bill 6.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 6.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Marzola. That concludes our work session for today.

The last item on our agenda is public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.] I will close public comment. Members and the public, pay attention to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System for posted agendas for tomorrow. It will be at the call of the Chair. Thank you, members, for your work today. Thank you to the public for participating. We are done with our business today. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:22 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Traci Dory
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Lori McCleary
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 7	C	Shelly Capurro, representing Nevada Police Union	Letter in support
S.B. 7	D	Lea Cartwright, representing American Property Casualty Insurance Association	Letter in opposition
A.B. 6	E	Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 6	F	Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Assembly District No. 21	Conceptual amendment