

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 6, 2015**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair James Oscarson at 2:05 p.m. on Monday, April 6, 2015, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Rooms 4401 and 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Oscarson, Chair
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman David M. Gardner
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Brent A. Jones
Assemblyman John Moore
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Glenn E. Trowbridge

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18
Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Assembly District No. 32

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Karen Buck, Committee Secretary
Jamie Tierney, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Julie Kotchevar, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services
Farrell Cafferata, President, Board of Directors, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Advocacy Resource Center, Reno, Nevada
Gary W. Olsen, President, Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.
David Daviton, Member, Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.
John Sasser, Statewide Advocacy Coordinator, Washoe Legal Services; and representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Mike Eifert, Executive Director, Nevada Telecommunications Association
Randy J. Brown, Director, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, AT&T Nevada
Misty Grimmer, representing Cox Communications, Inc. and State Contractors' Board
Randy Robison, Director, State Legislative Affairs, CenturyLink
Samuel Crano, Assistant Staff Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Mandi Lindsay, Executive Vice President, Mechanical Contractors Association of Las Vegas and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern Nevada
Dwight Perkins, Senior Vice President, Field Services, International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials
Craig Madole, Assistant Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., and representing the Nevada Association of Mechanical Contractors
Thomas Gugino, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mac Bybee, President, Nevada Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc.
David Bold, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Wade Mohr, Training Coordinator, Local 525, United Association,
Union of Plumbers, Fitters, Welders, and Service Technicians
Greg Esposito, representing Local 350 and Local 525, United Association,
Union of Plumbers, Fitters, Welders, and Service Technicians
Richard (Skip) Daly, Business Manager, Local 169, Laborers' International
Union of North America
Nathan Ring, representing Local 872 Training Trust, Board of Trustees of
Southern Nevada Laborers
Gustavo Nuñez, P.E., Administrator, State Public Works Division,
Department of Administration
Lisa Foster, representing Boulder City Chamber of Commerce
Jill Lagan, Chief Executive Officer, Boulder City Chamber of Commerce
David Fraser, City Manager, City of Boulder City
Kevin Dick, District Health Officer, Washoe County Health District
Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services,
Clark County
Ryan Beaman, President, Clark County Firefighters, Local 1908,
International Association of Firefighters
Gary Milliken, representing American Medical Response, Medic West
Tom Clark, representing Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority,
Washoe County
Joseph P. Iser, M.D., Dr.P.H., M.Sc., Chief Health Officer,
Southern Nevada Health District
Louis Mendiola, A.E.M.T., Wellness Coordinator, Humboldt General
Hospital, Winnemucca, Nevada

Chair Oscarson:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will now begin our work session. I have pulled Assembly Bill 463.

**Assembly Bill 463: Enacts the Recognition of Emergency Medical Services
Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact. (BDR 40-1020)**

We have one bill on work session today, Assembly Bill 152.

**Assembly Bill 152: Enacts certain requirements governing child care facilities.
(BDR 38-623)**

Kirsten Coloumbe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 152 was heard on March 9, and it is sponsored by Assemblyman Araujo (Exhibit C). Assembly Bill 152 requires the State Board of Health to adopt regulations prescribing requirements for all meals and snacks

provided to children at a child care facility. The regulations must comply with the minimum food requirements of the Child and Adult Care Food Program. The bill requires a facility to provide a program of physical activity and prohibits physical activity from being withheld as a form of discipline. In addition, a facility must limit the amount of time a child may spend viewing media and provide a private space where mothers may breastfeed. The sponsor has worked with interested parties and has proposed the following amendments:

- Section 2, subsection 1, removes the requirement that meals or snacks comply with the Child and Adult Care Food Program.
- Section 2 adds language to allow a parent to request an alternate feeding plan and ensure the regulations do not apply to food brought to the facility by a parent or guardian.
- Section 3 requires the State Board of Health to adopt regulations prescribing the requirements listed in subsections 1 through 3.
- Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a), clarifies that physical activities are age appropriate.
- Section 3, subsection 3, limits the amount of daily "sedentary" activity.
- Section 3, subsection 3, removes provisions related to viewing of media.
- Section 3, subsection 5, paragraph (a), removes the term "yardwork" from the list that may be considered for physical activities.

The sponsor would like to add four additional sponsors, who are attached for your consideration ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 152.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblywoman Titus:

I want to acknowledge Assemblyman Araujo's willingness to work with me and my concerns regarding limiting media, as I felt that was a form of censorship getting dangerously close to crossing over appropriate bounds. I appreciate that.

Chair Oscarson:

For the legislative record, this was a collaborative effort by members of the Committee and the sponsor of the bill.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I will vote to get the bill out of Committee, but I would like to reserve my right to vote no.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Oscarson:

Assemblyman Araujo, I will give you the floor statement.

[Submitted but not mentioned is written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 200.

Assembly Bill 200: Revises provisions relating to the program to provide devices for telecommunication to persons with impaired speech or hearing. (BDR 38-419)

Chair Oscarson: This bill revises provisions relating to the program to provide devices for telecommunication to persons with impaired speech or hearing.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, District No. 27:

Before you today we have Assembly Bill 200 to present. You should have the most recent mock-up of the language, which we believe to be consensus language. Please refer to the amended language that helps to clarify many sections of the bill, as well as our overall intent ([Exhibit E](#)). I am going to give more of a synopsis of this bill and the history. It is much lighter and condensed, the abridged version, to be sensitive to the fact that we have a time limit with our interpreters. What is most important is to allow those folks the ability to communicate.

A quick overview of this bill: I was chair of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs, and we heard this item regarding the Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) fund and the budget of the Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) for grantees' dollars, which are collected from access points for wireless phones. On your phone bill, you will see a surcharge that says TDD. Those dollars are collected and used to help support services for the deaf and hard of hearing in the state of Nevada. They specifically go to the state ADSD and are then granted out to

two different organizations, the Centers for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, which has northern and southern Nevada offices, and the Centers for Independent Living.

Over the interim, there was an issue about the usage of these dollars that resulted in a lawsuit, a Supreme Court of Nevada case [Docket #64474]. This amended language represents consensus that has been worked on for the past year and a half in many different types of conversations and types of forms. It takes the best parts of the results from the Supreme Court decision, as well as balancing it to make sure that we are being fair and equitable to rate payers and that there is a lot of transparency for them. Our policy analyst is going to walk us through the language, and then I will take questions.

Kirsten Coloumbe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Legal Counsel will most likely adopt this in a different form than what is before you ([Exhibit E](#)). The reason this mock-up was done is because there were multiple amendments for this bill, so this is an attempt to try to bring them all together. In section 1, subsection 1, after paragraph (b) the proposed amendment removes "The program must be approved by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada," and replaces that with "The Legislature shall review and approve the program as part of the biennial budget review of the Division." Moving on to the bill as introduced, there is a correction to the mock-up in section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b). It would not be to strike "devices for telecommunication" but to add "contemporary technology." There was also a proposed amendment to add paragraphs (e) and (f), so (e) would be "Providing programs designed to increase access to education, employment, and health or social services," and also (f) "Providing a pool of interpreters for use by executive and legislative branch agencies to ensure appropriate access is provided for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing." There is also a proposed amendment to add a cap to the surcharge "of no more than .08 cents [speaker said "8 cents"] per local exchange or wireless personal access line." Those surcharges shall be used to "cover the costs of the program."

The last proposed amendment is on page 3. It adds a new section to the bill if Legal Counsel deems it to remain. That would be to revise the membership of the Subcommittee on Communication Services for Persons Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Persons With Speech Disabilities. On page 3, it is to change the membership of the member who is of the Division to a "nonvoting member. . ." On page 4, it would be under paragraph (d) to change the membership of "the Executive Director of the Nevada Telecommunications Association or, in the event of its dissolution, a nonvoting member who represents the telecommunications industry."

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

As Ms. Coloumbe said, Assembly Bill 200 represents a number of different types of amendments that we have had along the way. It comes together in one bill that, like Frankenstein, has been pieced together but is working well and will move us forward. It captures the intent of this legislative body, which is to support services for those who are deaf or hard of hearing, allow fairness to rate payers with transparency on how those budgets are going to be reviewed, and make a cap to ensure that we are always being fair with ratepayers, who are all of us.

**Julie Kotchevar, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division,
Department of Health and Human Services:**

I have been administering the deaf and hard of hearing program for a number of years. I was asked to provide a quick background on what this program actually pays for. A large piece of it is the TDD system, which is Relay Nevada 711, so that persons who are deaf can communicate over the telephone. It also pays for the deaf centers and services related to regulating community interpreters and education-based interpreters who interpret for children in the schools. The area that all the stakeholders are seeking to clarify is what is included in the deaf centers.

Historically, what we had paid for was a broader range of services, both to help deaf persons access services in the community and also to help the community provide services to persons who are deaf. An example is helping doctors' offices understand that they have to have an interpreter present and how that works at a physician appointment. Another example is getting people not to hang up on Relay Nevada operators because they think they are telemarketers, which happens more frequently than you would think. That interpretation of what is included in the services of the deaf centers is what we were seeking to clarify. Adding a pool of interpreters and access to interpreters, which I am sure many legislators, as well as state employees can attest to, is difficult. Also difficult is having a pool of trained interpreters to ensure that persons who are deaf have the access that they need when they need it. I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Farrell Cafferata, President, Board of Directors, Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Advocacy Resource Center, Reno, Nevada:**

Currently, through Public Utility Commission of Nevada (PUC) cuts, we have had to really limit the services that we provided to the deaf and hard of hearing. The biggest way that we helped in the past was through system advocacy. When a deaf person moves to the state of Nevada they often have multiple needs. What we end up doing, instead of being able to hold their hand or help them be guided through the different social services programs, we have to send

them out by themselves. The access to the services is the language barrier. When we were providing that sort of hand-holding, we could go with that person to the different service agencies and help them understand how they could help the deaf person to access their services. Oftentimes, their inability to understand the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act really impedes the deaf person's access to services. By cutting these services and all the social service support that we did before, the system advocacy as well as educational support, folks who are trying to access these services are encountering this huge language barrier again and again and again. Finally, they just give up. By changing the language of this bill and changing the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), it will give those dollars back and the help that these people need to be able to do what everybody else does. You can just go the social security office and stand in line. However, deaf people have to stand in line twice because the first time, they did not understand what they needed to do. There was no interpreter provided because the social security office does not even understand that they have to have an interpreter ready, not when the deaf person calls and begs and says, "Please, please, please, I have a disability. You have to help me." That is not dignity. The social security office should understand on a systems level that they need to provide access, which should be provided without someone having to ask for it. That is why we really want this language to change so that these people get the support that they need. They are our community, our voters, and people who access all the social services that everyone else does. Therefore, we are very much in favor of this bill.

Chair Oscarson:

For the record, social security is a federal program, not a state program.

Farrell Cafferata:

I understand it is a federal program, but it is accessed within the state.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

On page 3 of the mock-up, on line 14, there is a definition of device for telecommunication, except that on page 2, line 8, "devices for telecommunication" was crossed out and "contemporary technology" was put in its place. I was wondering if the intent was that the language for "contemporary technology" would replace "devices for telecommunication," also on page 3?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

For clarification, that is the part of the review Ms. Coulombe presented that telecommunication in section 2 was inadvertently stricken out. We do not want

to remove that definition, but have it stay in place. The only change to that section would be the language saying "inclusive of contemporary technology."

Assemblyman Thompson:

I would like to talk about page 2, line 15. Thank you for looking at "Providing programs designed to increase access to education, employment, and health or social services." That has been a struggle for a long time in all of the communities, and it is time to address it and make it happen. However, on lines 20 through 21, where it says, "A surcharge of no more than .08 cents [speaker said "8 cents"] per local exchange. . ." Who are the people that pay, or is it the agency that pays? If it is the consumers, what happens to the people who may not have that ability to pay?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

This assessment has been charged quarterly since 1985. It says TDD on your phone bills. It has been different amounts over the years, as low as 3 cents and as high as 8 cents. In 2002, 2003, 2004, and part of 2005, it was an 8-cent assessment. After many different conversations, 8 cents was determined to be the cap that would be put in place. It is status quo the way the rate is collected. This just puts a cap on that assessment.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Are you saying that all taxpayers are paying this?

Julie Kotchevar:

It is on your landline telephone bill and your wireless telephone bill at 3 cents a month. It is part of the taxes that are itemized on every person's phone bill, wireless and landline.

Assemblyman Thompson:

For the use of that tax revenue, is it like a pool that goes to the deaf and hard of hearing community?

Julie Kotchevar:

The surcharge comes to ADSD, and then we contract with Relay Nevada for those services. It is free for anyone to use 711, and then we provide the TDD devices. The deaf person accessing is not charged. Every telephone user pays for it.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any testimony in support?

Gary W. Olsen, President, Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.:

[Andrea Juillerat-Olvera was the interpreter for Mr. Olsen.] In the interest of time, I am going to allow the interpreter to read my statement to you. That way I will not have to sign a whole bunch for people who do not understand sign. I will save you time and let the interpreter read it.

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. For the record, I am Gary W. Olsen, representing the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Nevadans. Assembly Bill 200 is an important bill to us Nevadans who are deaf and hard of hearing, and we do want to thank you for doing all you can to help change the adversities we confront daily in our lives. [Ms. Juillerat-Olvera continued reading Mr. Olsen's written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

I know it has been a long journey for you. You have my commitment, and I am sure Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson will keep working toward your goals.

Gary W. Olsen:

I will be watching you.

David Daviton, Member, Nevada Association of the Deaf, Inc.:

[Andrea Juillerat-Olvera was the interpreter for Mr. Daviton.] My name is David Daviton, and I want to add a little more clarification on what Mr. Olsen just said. In 1985, we began this journey with the surcharge. That was in 1985, and it has been going on all this time. What we have been trying to emphasize is that it is not just for the deaf, but it is for the hearing people who benefit as well because it builds a bridge between the deaf and hearing communities where we can meet together. We obviously need interpreters just like you. It is not just that we need to understand you, but you need to understand us. The frustration can occur on both sides. The benefit occurs on both sides. So I am here to support Assembly Bill 200, but I also feel like some language in it could be improved. There was recently a final decision made by the Supreme Court of Nevada related to the PUC, and yet it has been appealed. We do not know when that is going to be decided. It may not even be decided until the fall. So we are here to work with you now to see that both communities can benefit, the deaf community and the hearing community, to maintain this bridge that has been built between us.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other testimony in support of A.B. 200?

John Sasser, Statewide Advocacy Coordinator, Washoe Legal Services; and representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada:

I am also the legislative chair of Nevada's Commission on Services for Persons with Disabilities. This was a major priority of the Commission for the interim and moving into this session. We are very pleased by everybody's hard work and their willingness to come together to fashion a piece of legislation that we could all support.

Chair Oscarson:

I know you have worked diligently on it as well.

Mike Eifert, Executive Director, Nevada Telecommunications Association:

As you can see in the amendment, I no longer have a vote. However, the Nevada Telecommunications Association would like to thank Chair Oscarson and Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson for their great efforts in helping draft this amiable solution and understanding the importance of the bill for all those involved, including the deaf community, taxpayers, and ratepayers. It has been noted that all parties, in an effort to carve out the best possible solution, made compromises. As such, all parties may have not gotten everything they had hoped for. However, the amendment as drafted, supplies a workable framework under which the TDD program will continue to fund the needs of the deaf, hard of hearing, and speech-impaired communities; the interest of the Nevada Telecommunications ratepayers are addressed. Therefore, the Nevada Telecommunications Association is in support of this bill and would welcome any questions the Committee might have.

Chair Oscarson:

Mr. Eifert, that is music to my ears. I appreciate your willingness to work and adjust and put all these things together for this important bill.

Mike Eifert:

We appreciate all the effort that you put into this.

Randy J. Brown, Director, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, AT&T, Nevada:

I, too, would like to echo Mr. Eifert's comments. First, we appreciate Ms. Coulombe's work on preparing the amendment. It was a tough job to synthesize each party's amendments, and we are deeply grateful for her help. Secondly, we would like to thank Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson for her willingness to work with us, as well as you, Chair Oscarson. With the clarification in section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (b), to add that device for telecommunications back in, we, too, are in support of this bill. As was mentioned earlier, it was a give and take for all parties. We are pleased with the result.

Chair Oscarson:

Thank you for your many hours as well.

Misty Grimmer, representing Cox Communications, Inc.:

I would say ditto to what the last two gentlemen said. We are also in support of the bill as amended.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other testimony in support?

Randy Robison, Director, State Legislative Affairs, CenturyLink:

I originally signed in as neutral, but now having heard the outline of the amendment, we would like to indicate our support for the bill, as well as echo the comments of thanks to you, Chair Oscarson, and especially to Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson for allowing us to work at length to produce this piece of legislation. As amended, we support A.B. 200.

Samuel Crano, Assistant Staff Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada:

We also signed in as neutral but after reviewing the amendment, we would also support A.B. 200, as amended, and thank Chair Oscarson, Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, and everyone else for the hard work in crafting this compromise language.

Chair Oscarson:

I want to personally thank you and Chair Alaina Burtenshaw of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada for meeting with us on multiple occasions, working through the process, and figuring how we can get the best legislation we can. Is there any other testimony in support, either here or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in neutral for A.B. 200? [There was none.] This will be on Monday's work session.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I just wanted to make sure, Chair Oscarson, that the intent of the last piece of language in this bill would be upon passage and approval. We very much look forward to having this piece come back through the legislative process for important funding.

Chair Oscarson:

I want to personally thank you for all your work on this, and working together with all of us. Seeing no further testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 200.

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 298.

Assembly Bill 298: Revises provisions concerning building codes. (BDR 40-30)

Chair Oscarson:

Assembly Bill 298 revises provisions concerning building codes.

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18:

I come before you as the sponsor of Assembly Bill 298, a bill that protects decades of investment and ensures public safety for the future. Specifically, this bill marries two complimentary building codes, one presently in statute, the Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC), and another voluntary code, the Uniform Mechanical Code (UMC). These two building codes exclusively apply to the life safety trades in construction—plumbing, mechanical and sheet metal; creating a standard for all of Nevada. [Assemblyman Carrillo continued to read from his written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Mandi Lindsay, Executive Vice President, Mechanical Contractors Association of Las Vegas and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern Nevada:

I thank you for your consideration of Assembly Bill 298. I also thank Assemblyman Carrillo for sponsoring this legislation, that closes a loop to a legacy begun by this body back in 1971. For a quick trip down memory lane on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), you will find photos and a news story highlighting Governor Michael O'Callaghan's May 4, 1971, signing of Assembly Bill No. 385 of the 56th Session, codifying the UPC ([Exhibit H](#)) in statute. [Ms. Lindsay continued reading from written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Dwight Perkins, Senior Vice President, Field Services, International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials:

I am the senior vice president of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO). I am here today in support of Assembly Bill 298. I want to clarify a few things about what this UMC does or does not do. The UMC is supported by several national organizations, such as the American Society of Sanitary Engineering, Mechanical Contractors Association of America, the National Association of Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors, the United Association, and the World Plumbing Council. In addition to the UPC and the UMC, we also promulgate and publish the Swimming Pool, Spa, Hot Tub Code and the Solar Energy Codes. We are the premier listing agency and the third-party certification body for plumbing and mechanical products in the United States, and in some cases, throughout the world. Our world headquarters is in Ontario, California, and we have offices and laboratories throughout the world. To ease some of your concern about what people or

organizations may say, the code is going to divide work between crafts or cause licensure issues. I assure you there is nothing in the UMC that dictates installers be licensed for doing work or that divides the work from one craft to another. This is a code that has precise guidelines for safe installation of mechanical systems. That is it. We offer and encourage all segments of the building environment to come to our code hearings and have a say and a vote during our code proceedings every three years when the code comes out. Each year, we have a subsequent annual business meeting and seminars throughout the country. As a matter of fact, our eighty-sixth annual education business conference will be held September 27 through October 1 in Las Vegas, Nevada. If any of you are down there, please come by and see what we do to protect the public safety.

In addition, IAPMO supports our document. The illustrated training manual is used in training schools and facilities for the apprentices and journeymen to know what the code is about. We have study guides for the inspectors so that they understand the test prior to getting their certifications for the cities and counties. We also provide educational seminars for the industry as a whole.

I want to assure you that there is nothing sinister about this code. We only benefit by having the code that has been used in Nevada for many, many years, codified in the state of Nevada. I would ask your support for that and would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Currently and for many years now, the industry associations that you are here representing have all made sure that their employees are utilizing the UMC. Is that correct?

Mandi Lindsay:

Yes, that is correct up until last spring. All of the public entities in Nevada had voluntarily adopted the UMC as a result of it being a sister code to the UPC, which is in statute. We have union contractors and nonunion contractors alike who have all trained to that UMC. To Mr. Perkins's comments, the code does not specify who should have the work or which craft should have the work. It simply specifies the standard to which the work should be done. Probably in southern Nevada right now, we are all operating under the UMC. However, we are concerned that with one public body doing their own thing, we may see this as a future problem.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

One of the fundamental differences between the UMC and the International Mechanical Code (IMC) is the way that codes are updated. As you just

indicated, we can come down to Las Vegas and see and hear what you are doing every three years. You do this as a body where, in a sense, there is almost a public hearing where people are allowed to give input from the industry as to what should be in the future code, as opposed to the IMC, where there is either one group or even one individual that makes decisions and determinations for future code. Is that correct?

Dwight Perkins:

You are pretty close. Our process is followed by what is called the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). It allows for everybody to have a say, a vote, and due process if for some reason they do not like what the body has voted on. Everybody has a say. The code cycle is a three-year code cycle. We are just starting our 2018 code, as the 2015 code just came out, but we are already starting the next one. Each year subsequent to that, we meet at various places throughout the country. There is debate, discussion, proposals, and then a vote is taken. Therefore, we allow everybody to come to the hearings and offer scientific testimony of why they think they should have their day in court. The building environment that we live in is what we carve out on the plumbing and mechanical portions. Those industries and trades come together for the betterment of society to offer safe, prescriptive guidelines for the installation and training of those individuals that do install. Everybody has a say whether it is contractors, laborers, academia, or design professionals. They all come to the table. Because of the way our process happens, per the ANSI standard, not more than one-third of any organization can dictate or align votes for the changing of any code process. In other words, that one-third has to convince the other two-thirds by scientific and proven data that what they are proposing will make a difference. That is the clarification I would give you.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I still did not hear about the second part, as far as the process for the IMC.

Dwight Perkins:

As I understand it, the IMC has what is called the governmental consensus process. In the final voting hearing for code change proposals, only those officials that have been appointed by governmental jurisdiction or a governmental agency have the right to vote. In our process, it is one man, one vote. We think that the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), which is a worldwide authority, is looked to by third-world nations for adopting things as far as the processes. The U.S. government mandates the use of ANSI processes for not just plumbing and mechanical things, but across the lines for their various agencies. It is a tried-and-true method, allowing everybody the opportunity to have a voice, a vote, and a right to appeal.

Chair Oscarson:

For those of you in Las Vegas, we are going to lose the feed at 3 p.m. We are working on getting another room. We may need to recess for a minute, and staff will let you know which room to move to. Is there any other testimony in support of A.B. 298?

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Assembly District No. 32:

As you know, I am a C-1 licensed contractor. That is a full mechanical, plumbing, heating, ventilating, and air conditioning contractor. I am also a member of the IAPMO. They have been involved in a lot of these code issues over the years. I have to tell you, from the field perspective of a guy that runs a small business, it is very, very frustrating, especially in the north, when you have three different areas, Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County, all using different codes. When my workers would go to different parts of Washoe County, they were not sure of which code they would fall under. In many cases, there were substantial differences among the codes. After reviewing and working under different codes, almost all of the jurisdictions have come to the UMC and the UPC. Just for purposes of simplification, these are excellent codes. They are thoroughly vetted by experienced people. They have reasonable levels of change built into them every few years to deal with changes in the industry, materials used, health and safety standards, and so forth. From my personal experience, I would strongly urge our body to adopt the concept that the state stays with the UMC, just as it has done with the UPC. They are similar in makeup and timing. For the people that actually work in the field, it is the best way to go. I would encourage you to pass Assembly Bill 298.

[Assemblywoman Titus assumed the Chair.]

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Assemblyman Hansen, I appreciate the perspective of somebody who deals with this every day.

[Assemblyman Oscarson reassumed the Chair.]

Craig Madole, Assistant Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., and representing the Nevada Association of Mechanical Contractors:

To reiterate what Assemblyman Hansen said, by codifying the use of the UMC with the UPC that has been in statute since 1971, it will make construction easier. Ultimately, it will avoid any confusion and extra work that would need to be done to comply with multiple codes under different jurisdictions. We would urge your consideration of this bill.

Thomas Gugino, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am speaking in favor of Assembly Bill 298. I have been a resident of Las Vegas since 1961. I served a five-year apprenticeship with Local 525 starting in 1970, and I graduated in 1975 by passing my Journeyman Plumbing Exam. [Mr. Gugino continued to read from his written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

This Committee is in recess [at 3:02 p.m.].

I am reconvening the meeting for Health and Human Services [at 3:03 p.m.]. Please continue with your testimony.

Thomas Gugino:

[Mr. Gugino finished reading his written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Mac Bybee, President, Nevada Chapter, Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc.:

I want to echo the sentiments of the other individuals on the panel, and that we support A.B. 298.

David Bold, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I own Done Right Plumbing, and we have been in business for 25 years. I am the past president of the Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors of Nevada. When I first started plumbing 30 years ago, you plumbed one way for the code on one side of the Sahara Hotel and Casino, and on the other side of the street, you plumbed a different way. When you went to Henderson, it was a different way, and when you into North Las Vegas, it was different. It is nice to know right now that all the codes can be the same, so I would like to see you guys approve this. If you do not, you are not only talking about Done Right Plumbing retraining our people, but every entity in this state reeducating each individual inspector. The cost that it would be for each county and city right down the line is unbelievable, not to mention the slowdown of work and the difficulty of getting inspections. I hope you understand what I am trying to say.

Wade Mohr, Training Coordinator, Local 525, United Association, Union of Plumbers, Fitters, Welders, and Service Technicians:

I would like to show my support for the implementation of the UMC being adopted as the statute code for the state of Nevada. I would like your consideration of this being the one and only adopted code, along with its sister code, the UPC. [Mr. Mohr continued to read his written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

Greg Esposito, representing Local 350 and Local 525, United Association, Union of Plumbers, Fitters, Welders, and Service Technicians:

I represent the Nevada state pipe trades, which is composed of a couple thousand craftsmen across the state. We are speaking in support of this bill because if different jurisdictions around the state start playing fast and loose with codes, it would create confusion among craftsmen as to which code they should use, causing slowdowns, confusion, and potentially unsafe situations. We urge you to be in support of this bill.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 298, either here or in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] I will now call for testimony in opposition.

Richard (Skip) Daly, Business Manager, Local 169, Laborers' International Union of North America:

I want to say that because we have done something for a long time—since 1971—does not always make it right. There are a couple of things here. I know you heard a lot of testimony that this will be easier. It is simpler. Everyone understands it. It is what we are already doing. However, what you did not hear in the testimony is that when one building official in one county opted for a different standard with a competing organization, he was allowed to do that, and we generally like competition. There is now a tailspin, and the world is coming to an end, so now we have to put one code into our law.

You also heard testimony here that there is nothing in the code that allows this or mandates that, et cetera, as far as craft jurisdiction and various things. That is most likely true, although I have not read the 1,200 pages of either one of the codes. However, that does not stop that from potentially happening in the future. This is not the only state where they are trying to move for these types of things. I understand it is happening in Illinois and the state of Washington. One organization improves its national clout over what the codes are and various things. We are removing the competition of other codes. Essentially, you will end up with only one choice over time. In a few years from now, you will say, Well, how did that happen? They adopted a change in their code. In the meantime, that does address some of the issues that we are currently concerned about, such as the split in the industry. That is the reason for our opposition. We think there is an easy fix. I know we put in one other amendment, which Chair Oscarson said he was not going to accept. That is fine, but we have another alternative that might address it.

To Assemblyman Sprinkle's question about the difference in the industry, a couple of things were mentioned. Almost all the projects and the life safety that everyone supports is about building construction inside the building.

There is an industry represented in the adoption and promulgation of these codes. The mechanical contractors and all of the people who were listed on that are all on the inside of the building. Outside of the building, there is a different group of contractors, which are the general engineering contractors for the work that goes back to the rest of the system. So, whether you like it or not, there is a division in the industry between inside the building and outside the building. That is where the concerns are on what could be addressed in this code, who is controlling it, and then what changes will affect people outside the building. Our proposed amendment would make it clear that these codes are for work that is performed inside the building, and work outside the building would not be affected by this, which would alleviate our concerns. That is the actual natural division in the industry now, inside the building versus the outside. We do not want to be here in a few years saying how did we get to this one agency dictating to the state what your code is going to be because you adopted what they said, and you do not have control over their amendments.

Chair Oscarson:

I am asking you to continue to work with Assemblyman Carrillo.

Richard (Skip) Daly:

I am happy to work with my friend Assemblyman Carrillo.

Nathan Ring, representing Local 872 Training Trust, Board of Trustees of Southern Nevada Laborers:

I will reiterate the comments made by Mr. Daly. In addition, the health and safety discussion that took place earlier are admirable goals that were stated by the proponents of the bill. We do not disagree with those being admirable goals. However, there is concern when you are granting authority over building codes to an outside independent industry group, which was part of the discussion by Mr. Daly. As he stated, this bill in Nevada is very similar to several other states. When this group consolidates power, they will essentially have the ability to dictate what the standards are going to be and may be able to move forward into other areas as far as the regulation of work. Even though it is not done now, it could be done later. What we would like to do is see the amendment, as stated by Mr. Daly, that limits this code to inside the four walls of a building. That is where these codes should apply, and not deal with anything outside the building itself.

Chair Oscarson:

I will also ask you to continue to work with Assemblyman Carrillo. We have a very limited amount of time, so please do that expeditiously, and

Assemblyman Carrillo can let us know the results. Is there any other testimony in opposition to A.B. 298 either here or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in neutral?

Misty Grimmer, representing the State Contractors Board:

We are neutral on the bill, but we wanted to confirm what Assemblyman Carrillo testified to, that the UMC is what is recommended for the study guide for applicants when they come in to take the examination. It is what they are allowed to bring in with them for the open book portion of the examination.

Gustavo Nuñez, P.E., Administrator, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration:

I have no issues with A.B. 298. However, we have offered some amendments that are housekeeping in nature, and hopefully will be accepted as friendly amendments ([Exhibit L](#)). They deal with the fact that in the current law, there are some references to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The last edition of the UBC was in 1997. This code is no longer supported. It is outdated, and therefore, it is no longer coordinated with all of the other codes. As far as I know, no one in the state is currently using the 1997 UBC, at least I hope not.

The only matter we propose in our amendment to existing law is to delete on the existing law, section 2, subsection 3, in its entirety. This provision is already covered by the requirement of the UPC, sections 604.11, 605.3, and 605.4. It is redundant. It would be best to leave the code provisions for how things are supposed to go together and the materials to be used to the folks who are responsible for writing the codes. It is just a suggestion to you. Hopefully, you and the proponent will see it that way, and maybe we can clean up some of the existing law.

Chair Oscarson:

Mr. Nuñez, if you could meet with Assemblyman Carrillo and the others and get that information to them, I would appreciate it. In the essence of time, knowing that we only have until Friday to get this bill out of here, we need to work together to make that happen. Is there any other testimony in neutral? [There was none.]

Assemblyman Carrillo:

One thing that I would like to say to the Committee members is we should have one code complement the other. Right now, we have competing codes, which were even stated on record, for one side of the street versus the other side of

the street. To me, that is a big issue. Having this in statute will codify what is already there. I am open to discussions, but at this point, that is what we are going to keep it as. Thank you for hearing A.B. 298.

Chair Oscarson:

Discussion will be fast and furious in the next short period of time. Seeing no further testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 298.

[Submitted but not mentioned is ([Exhibit M](#)).]

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 308.

**Assembly Bill 308: Revises provisions relating to emergency medical services.
(BDR 40-798)**

Chair Oscarson:

This bill revises provisions relating to emergency medical services.

Lisa Foster, representing Boulder City Chamber of Commerce:

I am going to give a brief introduction to Assembly Bill 308, and then Jill Lagan, the chief executive of the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce, and Dave Fraser, the City Manager of Boulder City, will explain why this piece of legislation is so important to their organizations and the community. For those who are not from southern Nevada, you may not realize that Boulder City, which is a small city on the southeastern side of Henderson, puts on a number of special events each year that raise money for charitable groups. The change in the law that occurred with Assembly Bill No. 286 of the 77th Session may have provided some helpful assurances of safety for some of the larger cities. However, for Boulder City, it has caused a duplication of efforts and has been very expensive. The city has had a plan in place and has always made sure that special events were covered in past years, in terms of emergency medical services. Assembly Bill 308, as written, applies only to Clark County and Washoe County. All other counties, and the towns and cities within them, were exempted when A.B. No. 286 of the 77th Session was passed last session.

Assembly Bill 308, as written, would add to that exemption two other small cities, Boulder City and Mesquite. You are going to hear a couple of amendments today. The bill further exempts towns in two counties, but one of the amendments that you will hear would remove that exemption, as townships do not have municipal level emergency response. This amendment is from Clark County ([Exhibit N](#)), and Boulder City has no issue with that. The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce also has an amendment, which

Ms. Lagan will explain ([Exhibit O](#)). It assures there is no doubt any city exempted still has the necessary medical services in place to add language to the current requirement. With that, I will turn it over to Ms. Lagan who can better explain the need for this bill.

Jill Lagan, Chief Executive Officer, Boulder City Chamber of Commerce:

I am here to formally support A.B. 308 as amended. In watching the floor session of the adoption of A.B. No. 286 of the 77th Session, I completely understood the need to have legislation that would provide public safety to all involved in attending special events in the state of Nevada. [Continued to read ([Exhibit P](#)).] However, we are before you today with a requested amendment to that new law, due to unintended consequences that befell the rural communities inside the counties with a population over 100,000 ([Exhibit O](#)). [Finished reading ([Exhibit P](#)).]

David Fraser, City Manager, City of Boulder City:

Ms. Lagan does an outstanding job at everything she does, and the testimony that she has provided is no exception. She stated very well what the issues are for us. I would like to amplify one point that she made a couple of times. You heard her refer to the rural communities like Boulder City, and interestingly, we occasionally see through the Legislature legislation aimed at urban communities and counties. So the Legislature will put in population caps for those. Such was actually the case with A.B. No. 286 of the 77th Session, that created the law we are now seeking to amend. In that bill, it only applied to counties with populations greater than 100,000. In my opinion, it would have clearly been the intent of the Legislature for it not to apply to the rural communities of the state. However, in Clark County, even though we are an urban county, we do have some rural parts like Boulder City and Mesquite, although I am not here speaking for Mesquite. Whenever legislation is designed to apply only to the urban counties, it does capture some of the rural community within that same net. I want to stress that we are clearly in favor of having appropriate medical services at our events. It is a high priority for the city that we take very seriously. I would like to point out that not only is the effort being duplicated, but in fact, it would be my contention that original legislation was intended to not apply to rural communities. As you look around the state, there are many communities that look much more like Boulder City than our own neighbors do in Clark County. I would certainly take any questions you may have.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other testimony in support of Assembly Bill 308? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.]

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

It is my understanding, especially with this amendment then, that we are only talking about Mesquite and Boulder City in Clark County. Is that correct?

Lisa Foster:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

The testimony that I just heard was that there is specific desire by these authorities to still provide emergency medical services (EMS) at these special events. I was here two years ago when we initially discussed A.B. No. 286 of the 77th Session, and truly, the legislative intent was public safety. I am not quite sure if the intent of these municipalities is to still provide EMS at these special events. Why is there a need to be exempt from the statute? Are they looking to provide a lower level of EMS? Is it purely a money thing? Why exactly are we looking to exempt them from something everybody has agreed is necessary at these special events?

Lisa Foster:

There has been a duplication of effort because of the way the law was written in the first place. I believe Ms. Lagan, and perhaps the city manager in Boulder City, can best address that.

Jill Lagan:

In the last year of working with our local emergency medical services through our city level fire department, and also going through Clark County Health District's application process for special events, we are realizing that we literally have the exact same application. We have the exact same requirements, if not somewhat more difficult ones, because our fire chief is very conscientious. Each of us that are providing and producing events in Boulder City realize how important emergency medical services are and especially from career and professional services. We also realize that it would be a black eye for us if we were to have a public relations issue occur for not having those emergency medical services in place.

We, at this point in time, actually find ourselves in an even better position with the plan we already have. We not only have our own municipal fire department, but also an emergency medical plan in place, which is a special event policy. It is very important that we, as event producers, be held to a higher standard than what is required by the county. In this particular situation, Assemblyman Sprinkle, we are not trying to provide less. We actually opt to provide more, and we are simply asking the Committee to consider not requiring double oversight, double application processes, double fees, and allow us at a

city level to make sure that we provide adequate services based on our unique needs.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

For me, as a public official, it is all about public safety. I am glad to hear you put that on the record, and that satisfies my curiosity.

Assemblywoman Titus:

With all the testimony that I have heard today, I am not convinced that we should even be in this discussion. I understand the state's business of public safety, but as you mentioned in Las Vegas, it seems like there is some duplication, and you are already exceeding what the recommendations are. I am not sure we should be dealing with this at the state level at all, as opposed to allowing the counties to figure out what their needs are at special events. In rural areas, especially, each event itself is unique, and may or may not require more services. Having worked at several of them, including the Night in the Country Music Festival in Yerington and at Burning Man in northern Washoe County, I am wondering why the state even got involved in this issue two years ago.

Chair Oscarson:

We will have to go back and find out what the legislative intent was, Assemblywoman Titus. I was on the committee and what this really boiled down to, as I recall, was significant costs. There are costs to hire other folks. There are those who are able to do it within their purview. There was a lot of discussion about the caps and the things that were happening at the events, which was how the current numbers were determined. As with all legislation, sometimes it impacts in ways it was not intended to do. I think that is why Boulder City, with some of the events they have, is coming to us and asking us to review the legislation.

Lisa Foster:

I think what you just said, Chair Oscarson, is exactly what happened. Boulder City was caught up in that legislation, which was targeting the entire state initially. All the counties were exempted from the bill except for the two large counties. What happens often with legislation directed at the urban counties is that Mesquite and Boulder City, as the only tiny cities, get pulled in. It does not happen in Washoe County because the cities are all larger, and the other cities in Clark County are all larger. You will see this a number of times during your legislative career that Mesquite and Boulder City are affected by legislation that was never intended for them.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I am trying to recall the testimony from last session. I think that the goal of the bill was, and I still stand behind it, to create some consistency and a baseline because there were variations in what different municipalities did. The goal was to say that, at a minimum, this is what should be done and this is the type of resources we should have at a special event. We heard testimony that at certain events, not all were as diligent as they should have been. The Boulder City people that we have before us might be, so my hat is off to them for having a system in place. However, I think it is okay to say, at a bare minimum, this is what we expect if you hold such an event. That is what the state's policy is, so I do not necessarily see the need of your bill if you are exceeding it. I congratulate you, but having a baseline in place for process is important.

Lisa Foster:

I agree, but I think what has happened is the duplication of fees that has taken place. Ms. Lagan could probably explain to you that for some of the events in Boulder City, they cannot even raise money for the nonprofits they were intending to raise money for because they have to pay the fees to the city and to the county at the same time.

Jill Lagan:

It is really a focus for us to make sure that we bring plenty of events to the community to try and draw those tourism numbers into our city. In doing so, as we were looking at the application process for many of our nonprofits, not only is it the fee process, but it is also the application process with extra oversight and a second inspection on top of the things that we had already done. It was time consuming preparing documents that were needed for both and has become a difficult situation for us. The burden falls, not only on the fee side, but also with the time and the application process. Two governmental agencies are doing the exact same thing and looking at the exact same application. We are not really sure why we need both when we already have something in place. That is why the language in the amendment for Assembly Bill 308 was specifically asking for municipalities to be exempt if they had both a career professional firefighting service agency and the emergency medical plan. In the language, it states that it would make it very simple to be able to say, You still have towns or townships that need to have oversight from Clark County. We understand that you want to have that public safety there. However, in this particular situation, the way that we are wording this, it would exempt the two municipalities, Boulder City and Mesquite, because they have their own fire departments and emergency medical plans in place.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I find myself agreeing with Assemblywoman Titus. I think this is a state overreach. If the local entities have legal responsibility for what goes on under their jurisdiction, and if the sponsor of the event has responsibility for what goes on with the event, the state sending in a third level is getting involved in potential liability. I think the state has set itself up to get involved in something it does not want to get involved in. Are you honestly going to send a state inspector down to make sure that all of these things are done in compliance with *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) or Assembly Bill 308? I would speculate not. We are going to invite whoever needs to look at it and see why we are involved in this at all. We need to take a close look.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 308?

Kevin Dick, District Health Officer, Washoe County Health District:

I have provided written testimony in opposition to this bill with the proposed amendments that I am aware of ([Exhibit Q](#)). Our big concern was with section 1, subsection 2. If the towns and townships are removed as proposed from the bill and the provision for EMS from a career fire department is included, I am willing to withdraw my opposition to the bill, pending those amendments. I would also like to add that I included in my testimony that this bill was originally drafted based on guidelines from the Washoe County Health District, which have been in existence since 1991. In that, we used a medical contact number of 0.7 percent, and in the 2013 legislation, that was put into NRS as 0.07 percent. We would also suggest that be corrected to 0.7 percent in the legislation. That was the original intent, based on following the Washoe County guidelines.

Chair Oscarson:

Have you submitted an amendment?

Kevin Dick:

I submitted a written comment, but I did see an amendment.

Chair Oscarson:

That was the one from the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce ([Exhibit O](#)).

Kevin Dick:

I saw that one, but there was another one from Humboldt General Hospital that included the 0.7 percent correction ([Exhibit R](#)).

Chair Oscarson:

I think the one with the 0.7 percent was from Southern Nevada Health District ([Exhibit S](#)).

Kevin Dick:

Yes, I saw that and am aware of that one, also.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other testimony in opposition either here or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] I will ask for testimony in the neutral position.

Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:

Our amendment ([Exhibit N](#)), as you see on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), essentially "retains that host organizations of special events that hold events in towns or townships with a population less than 25,000 are still required to provide certain emergency medical services. The particular types of emergency medical services at those events would still be determined based on the size of the event and the population of the county in which the special event is held." The amendment that we have proposed has the same changes in three different sections of the bill. In section 1, subsection 2, we strike "town or township." Again in section 2, subsection 2, "town or township" and in section 3, subsection 2, "town or township" is also stricken. That is the purpose of this amendment. You have heard a lot of testimony about this. As to the reasons why, it is really for those communities that we serve, Laughlin, in particular, and also Logandale, where we hold large events that have thousands of folks attending.

Chair Oscarson:

You are getting ready for a big event in Logandale next week at the Clark County Fair.

Ryan Beaman, President, Clark County Firefighters, Local 1908, International Association of Firefighters:

We did testify in support of this bill last legislative session. We, in Clark County, run about 145,000 EMS calls per year. We are having a huge impact with all the special events, which are important. They help out with our economy and everything in Clark County. However, the special events definitely have a huge impact on the 911 services that we provide. In particular, when we testified last legislative session, we had the marathon that takes place every year at night. At that event, we are now able to provide EMS services with this language. A lot of the events that the promoters

brought in had no real bottom level of requirements in statute or in county code that required this level of services. At the last legislative session, we even testified in regard to what was called a Mountain Dew Event Tour, taking into account that these were kids of a younger age. A lot of things were not provided by these groups, such as water and emergency medical services. It had a huge impact on our services, and actually caused a mass casualty event at the Event Tour because of the time of the day it was held and the high temperature. A lot of these things need to be taken into account when you have these types of events.

It is an ongoing thing now, not just in Clark County and Las Vegas, but also in Laughlin. We have large events that take place there, such as outdoor concerts. We often have from 8,000 to 10,000 people at these events. We have the River Regatta event and the Las Vegas BikeFest. As Chair Oscarson mentioned, we have the Logandale fair coming up, with anywhere from 8,000 to 20,000 people per day who participate. We are also seeing in unincorporated Clark County, the Primm and Jean area, events that are taking place such as the RiSE lantern festival that just took place this last year with an attendance of approximately 10,000 people. We have all kinds of crossfit events, like Spartan and Ragnar. These are events that are happening in Mount Charleston or the Jean Dry Lake bed, so they are happening throughout our community. That is why we proposed the amendment. We understand what is going on in Boulder City, but we also need to address what is still going on in Clark County with regards to the towns and townships of these small areas that are still having an impact on our services. With our amendment, we would support the bill.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

Does Clark County really need the state's help to develop standards like this?

Alex Ortiz:

I think we do well enough on our own. We have standards and have been doing this for many years.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

That is my point. In Boulder City, I am sure it could do the same.

Gary Milliken, representing American Medical Response, Medic West:

We testified in favor of A.B. No. 286 of the 77th Session. Many of these events contract with us prior to the event, like the Electronic Daisy Carnival. We supply most of the EMS service there. We have Rock in Rio every year, have already signed a contract for this year, and are preparing for the services we will provide. As amended, we are in favor of this bill. We just want to be

certain that the bill does not exclude these companies from contracting because there is a private ambulance company that provides some of the EMS services at these events.

Tom Clark, representing Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority, Washoe County:

Today, I am here on behalf of Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority, Washoe County, and also on behalf of Burning Man because these pieces of legislation affect that event as well. We worked very closely with the sponsor of the bill in the last legislative session to make sure it was pretty tight and solid. We are also now working with the working group on community paramedics. There could potentially be some issues in section 2, subsection 1, on the "more than 5 miles," but this is already existing law, so we may be working with the bill's sponsors to bring forward some concepts for those rural hospitals to increase that from 5 miles to maybe 15 miles. However, without a consensus at this point, we do not have a formal amendment, but we are here with a neutral perspective on this particular piece of legislation.

Joseph P. Iser, M.D., Dr.P.H., M.Sc., Chief Health Officer, Southern Nevada Health District:

We are officially neutral on this. We appreciate our amendment that has been brought forward from the Southern Nevada Health District clarifying the 0.7 percent of the population. We are the regulatory agency, not the state or Clark County. However, we here locally have been successful in working with our fire districts and fire department to create regulations that everyone has followed up to this point. I am here more because of our role overseeing the regulatory issues related to this bill. We are happy to answer questions from anyone on the Committee.

Louis Mendiola, A.E.M.T., Wellness Coordinator, Humboldt General Hospital, Winnemucca, Nevada:

I want to provide some additional clarification for some of the comments that were made in regard to which jurisdictions this current law has overreached. It has been said that it does not apply to rural areas. It is our opinion, after reading the current law, that if the event is over 50,000 participants, it does indeed apply to the events in all counties and in all areas. Keeping that in mind, our hospital does provide special event medical services throughout the state, in the areas of Nye County, Lyon County, Humboldt County, and Pershing County, on a number of different-sized events, from 3,000 upwards of 80,000. We are neutral on this, and we have proposed a number of amendments ([Exhibit R](#)), one being the change in percentage as noted by Washoe County. The other one we are going to ask for is some language cleanup as it relates to licensure and certification of health care professionals, emergency medical technicians,

and paramedics. We have found that there is some ambiguity with regard to who is providing these services at special events, and it is a simple clean-up. Finally, we would like to see the removal of the events over 50,000 and make those events in the rural areas and throughout the state be required to furnish some medical services. Our concern is that in the rural areas an event coming to town does not disadvantage the small community which has a lot fewer resources than Washoe County or Clark County and really has no statutory protection for public safety to make sure that there is some type of medical services provided. Once again, we offer these friendly amendments and look forward to working with all the key stakeholders and the legislators that have sponsored this bill. I am open for questions.

Lisa Foster:

I am understanding that what we need to do is specifically read the amendment that the Boulder City Chamber has offered, regarding adding the professional fire agency and special service emergency medical plan into the record ([Exhibit O](#)). Mr. Fraser, are you able to do that?

David Fraser:

The following is the amendment offered by the Boulder City Chamber:

Existing law requires the host organization of certain special events to provide particular types of emergency medical services at the special event based on the size of the event and the population of the county in which the special event is held (NRS 450B.650-450B.700). This bill exempts from these provisions a special event held within the boundaries of the city, (town or township) whose population is less than 25,000 **with a professional/career fire-fighting agency and special event emergency medical service plan for events.**

Chair Oscarson:

Ms. Foster, my suggestion would be that you work with Mr. Beaman, Clark County, Humboldt General Hospital, and all the other folks to make sure that their concerns are addressed and answered. You have a very little amount of time in which to do that, but I think you can certainly accomplish it. Perhaps you can meet after this meeting with the folks that are present and who have traveled long distances to be here. There are certainly some opportunities here, but as you have heard from the Committee, they are not convinced that it is the state's place to be engaged in this as a local community thing. You can work

with them and see what you can figure out, and come back to us with an answer.

Lisa Foster:

I will be happy to do that.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Seeing no further testimony, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 308. Is there any public comment here or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] This meeting is adjourned [at 4:05 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Buck
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Oscarson, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Committee Name: <u>Committee on Health and Human Services</u>			
Date: <u>April 6, 2015</u>		Time of Meeting: <u>2:05 p.m.</u>	
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 152	C	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 152	D	Southern Nevada Health District	Written Testimony
A.B. 200	E	Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 200	F	Gary W. Olsen, Nevada Association of the Deaf	Written Testimony
A.B. 298	G	Assemblyman Richard Carrillo	Written Testimony
A.B. 298	H	Mandi Lindsay, Mechanical Contractors Association of Las Vegas and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern Nevada	Uniform Plumbing Code Adoption Presentation
A.B. 298	I	Mandi Lindsay, Mechanical Contractors Association of Las Vegas and Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association of Southern Nevada	Written Testimony
A.B. 298	J	Thomas Gugino, Private Citizen	Written Testimony
A.B. 298	K	Wade Mohr, UA Local 525	Written Testimony
A.B. 298	L	Gustavo Nuñez, State Public Works Division	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 298	M	David Nichols, International Code Council	Written Testimony

A.B. 308	N	Alex Ortiz, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 308	O	Jill Lagan, Boulder City Chamber of Commerce	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 308	P	Jill Lagan, Boulder City Chamber of Commerce	Written Testimony
A.B. 308	Q	Kevin Dick, Washoe County Health District	Written Testimony
A.B. 308	R	Louis Mendiola, Humboldt General Hospital	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 308	S	Dan Musgrove, Southern Nevada Health District	Proposed Amendment