

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Eightieth Session
May 1, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 6:18 p.m. on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Assemblyman John Hambrick

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Assembly District No. 6
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles, Assembly District No. 25
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Anne Bowen, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1112



After call of the roll, Chair Carlton opened the hearing regarding Assembly Bill (A.B.) 157 (1st Reprint) and reminded the audience to silence telephones and electronic devices. She commented that two persons would be testifying by telephone regarding A.B. 157 (R1) and Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92. Because this was the first time testimony had been taken by telephone, Chair Carlton cautioned everyone that the Committee on Ways and Means was not a policy committee, and questions and comments would be limited to the fiscal note on each bill.

Assembly Bill 157 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to certain services for and resources concerning victims of human trafficking. (BDR 18-141)

Assemblyman John Hambrick, Assembly District No. 2, testifying via telephone from Las Vegas, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 157 (1st Reprint).

Assemblyman Hambrick stated he would be presenting A.B. 157 (R1) for the Committee's consideration. As the policy itself had passed, as amended, in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, Assemblyman Hambrick said this bill would provide additional guidance to law enforcement, the district attorney's office, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education. He said A.B. 157 (R1) would assist the victims of the terrible scourge of human trafficking by getting additional information to the public about this situation. He noted that when the bill was amended, the Department of Business and Industry's fiscal note should have been deleted.

To get into the fiscal details of A.B. 157 (R1), Assemblyman Hambrick introduced James L. Dold, the CEO and founder of Human Rights for Kids. Mr. Dold authored the original version of this bill and had worked tirelessly to help trafficking victims nationwide.

James L. Dold, CEO and Founder, Human Rights for Kids said he represented Human Rights for Kids, which was a Washington D.C.-based organization that advocated and promoted human rights for children across the country, and he was here today to testify in support of A.B. 157 (R1). Mr. Dold said he and his organization had worked on similar legislation all around the country, and other states had implemented similar reforms that had a zero fiscal impact. Other states had the ability to subsume the program into existing duties within the department of education and department of human services. Those states included Virginia, Maryland, Arkansas, and Georgia, and their reforms used very similar language that had a tremendous effect on getting prevention information and services to the most needy and vulnerable people in society.

Mr. Dold shared that the state of Georgia provided in-service training for teachers and administrators and had a hotline poster contest with a \$1,000 prize to students who developed the best poster to raise awareness about human trafficking. He maintained those materials were lifesaving, because they placed information into the hands of administrators, teachers, and parents about strategies for prevention of human trafficking, which saved the lives of children.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions for the witness.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said section 3 of A.B. 157 (R1) talked about this language being drafted into Chapter 232 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. She was aware that later in the bill, in section 4, it referenced specifically the Department of Health and Human Services, but wondered whether there was another department in mind.

Mr. Dold said the Department of Health and Human Services was the department envisioned to handle the duties because it seemed the best suited for the plan.

Chair Carlton said she had a question for the Department of Education if someone was available, because the Department put a fiscal note on the bill. The fiscal note from the Department of Education was \$12,000, and it still applied even after the amendment. The fiscal note was for funding of informational materials related to the bill, and the estimate was based on the Safe Voice campaign. Chair Carlton said her question was whether the Department of Education could possibly use other existing budget resources to fund this bill.

Amber Reid, Education Program Professional, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment, Department of Education, explained that her office was tasked with preparing and distributing the pamphlets indicated in Chapter 388 of NRS. It was her understanding the fiscal note could be removed if the Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment was able to alternate existing annual funding between the distribution of bullying pamphlets with the pamphlets and materials on human trafficking.

Chair Carlton said she was not sure there would be lot of support for that because the bullying issue was important, and one informational pamphlet should not be sacrificed for another. She asked whether it would be possible to fund the program through the educational trust fund, because there appeared to be \$490,000 in that account.

Ms. Reid asked to clarify her comment about the bullying pamphlets. She said one of the reasons for the suggestion was that the bullying laws and the requirements of the bullying pamphlets only changed during the legislative session, and in the school year immediately following session, there could be some changes to those pamphlets; however, the following school year there would be no changes. She noted that she did not have authority concerning the use of the Trust Fund and would defer to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Jonathan P. Moore, Ed.D., Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, said the Department would consider the suggestion to use the Education Trust Account. He said he was not able to state the exact expenditures of the account, but he would inquire and inform Fiscal Analysis Division staff.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson noted that section 3 and section 5 of the bill seemed very similar but asked two different departments to prepare and disseminate educational materials to increase awareness about human trafficking. She wondered if what the Department of Health and Human Services was planning was different in content from what

the Department of Education was putting together. If so, she asked whether one department could prepare the information and then ensure it was available to any other department that might request it.

Chair Carlton asked for Assemblyman Hambrick's thoughts, and he said he hoped that the Department of Education could use its procurement abilities to get the best price for the materials. If the Committee, through continued testimony, heard any other ideas, he would not be adverse to any amendment. He said it was important that this information was distributed to help kids and law enforcement.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson told Assemblyman Hambrick that she could follow up with him, but she would be more than happy to work with the departments to help land in a place where everyone felt comfortable.

Assemblyman Hambrick said the bill needed to go forward, and he would be happy with any help.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of A.B. 157 (R1) and, seeing none, called for anyone who wanted to testify in opposition or neutral on the bill. Seeing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing. She thanked Assemblyman Hambrick for testifying and said she hoped to see him soon.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 157 (R1) and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92.

**Assembly Bill 92: Revises provisions governing the English Mastery Council.
(BDR 34-393)**

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District 17, Clark County, testified in support of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92.

Assemblyman Thompson stated that A.B. 92, which made changes to the English Mastery Council, was due to sunset, but there had been a lot of great work accomplished, and it needed to continue. He wanted to share some of the work that the Council was responsible for, such as recommending criteria for teaching English learners. School districts developed policies that reflected this criteria and also made recommendations about proper licensing for teachers around English as a second language. According to Assemblyman Thompson, the English Mastery Council also worked on changes to the coursework for those seeking higher education. He said an addition to the bill was extending the work to improve English proficiency for all low-performing student groups.

Assemblyman Thompson said he would defer to Karl Wilson from the Department of Education, who was on the telephone to discuss the \$10,000 fiscal note.

Karl Wilson, Education Programs Supervisor, Department of Education, testified by telephone from Las Vegas. He said he had been asked to share some of the information related to the fiscal note attached to A.B. 92. The first question the Department was asked to address was the costs associated with the English Mastery Council. He said it was his understanding in looking at budgets for the English Mastery Council that in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and FY 2019, there had been funding of \$4,981 in each of those years to support the Council. In FY 2018, \$2,730 was used by the English Mastery Council, and approximately \$1,300 of that amount was for contracts. The primary contract expenditure was to provide for the transcription of minutes for the English Mastery Council meetings and the subcommittee meetings. The other \$1,400 was spent on nonemployee, in-state travel for members of the English Mastery Council. Mr. Wilson said the expenditures to date for FY 2019, had been approximately \$2,000, with approximately \$1,800 of the funding used for transcription services and approximately \$200 for in-state travel for members of the English Mastery Council.

Mr. Wilson estimated that the total expenditures for the year would be comparable to expenditures made in FY 2018. Mr. Wilson stated the Department had been asked to address the increase: the \$5,000 recommendation per fiscal year would help to ensure there was adequate funding for the travel reimbursement for members of the English Mastery Council and the subcommittees, and for transcriptions services related to the meeting minutes for each of the full committee meetings and the subcommittee meetings. He said there were approximately 13 to 15 meetings annually. Four meetings, as required by statute, were held by the full English Mastery Council, and approximately three subcommittee meetings were held each year by the three subcommittees that served in support of the English Mastery Council.

Mr. Wilson explained that part of the Department's need for approximately \$5,000 per year resulted from the provisions included in Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92. As outlined by Assemblyman Thompson, A.B. 92 increased the responsibilities or the scope of the English Mastery Council to include making recommendations to the State Board of Education in an area that had not been a part of the previous responsibility of the English Mastery Council. The new responsibility was to research and make recommendations around low-performing students in the state who were not English learners. Mr. Wilson anticipated that would have an effect on the subcommittees and the work of the English Mastery Council because of increased costs associated with research, meeting time and travel reimbursement, and the meeting transcriptions related to that new responsibility. Mr. Wilson remarked that Assemblyman Thompson had done a good job of highlighting some of the accomplishments of the English Mastery Council by providing recommendations to the State Board of Education, the Commission on Professional Standards, and the Board of Regents, reflective of the needs of English learners regarding teacher preparation, district policies, standards, curriculum, and assessment related to effective instruction for English learners.

Chair Carlton stated that the fiscal note requested \$3,000 in each year of the biennium for travel expenses and Fiscal Analysis Division staff pointed out that in 2018 only \$1,425 was used for travel expenditures. She also noted that \$2,000 in transcription services were requested, but previously only \$600 was allocated for recording Council minutes. Chair Carlton questioned the need for the additional funds to support the English Mastery Council beyond what it currently received in the base budget for travel and transcription expenditures. She said she could not see why the funding request would more than double with one extra duty that had been added to A.B. 92.

Mr. Wilson replied it was anticipated that with the new responsibility the English Mastery Council would undertake, it might require hiring consultants to work with the Council in understanding the issues related to underperformance for students who were not English learners. This was an area that was new to the English Mastery Council, and when the Council was first established in 2013, there were a number of similar expenditures for consulting experts who assisted the Council in developing recommendations. There were no similar expenditures in the last two years because most of that work was performed during the first two years of the English Mastery Council.

Chair Carlton said section 1 of A.B. 92 stated the Council would make recommendations "to improve the academic achievement and English proficiency of pupils who do not fall within the definition of English learners but have scored at or below the 25th percentile." She asked Mr. Wilson whether she was misreading that passage.

Mr. Wilson said that was what subsection 7 stated, and the English Mastery Council historically had the primary role of understanding and working with the needs of English learners. The bill would extend the responsibility to provide recommendations for students who were not English learners, and Mr. Wilson said it was a new set of students for researching and providing recommendations to the State Board of Education.

Assemblywoman Neal said that, clearly, there was already a need to do a comparison between individuals who spoke English and individuals who were learning English, so she was confused about the extra duty that was being described when the Trustees were already supposed to be doing an in-depth analysis.

Mr. Wilson referred to the responsibilities outlined in section 2, which related to NRS 388.407 that required each school district to develop a policy for serving English learners and address the gap in the performance between the general population and English learners. The local policy had focused on how to close the gap for English learners, but it did not focus on closing the gap for other students who were not English learners. Each district had developed its policy in accordance with the guidelines that the State Board approved in relation to NRS 388.407.

Chair Carlton believed that earlier Mr. Wilson had mentioned having to contract with a consultant, but she did not see that listed specifically in the fiscal note.

Mr. Wilson said he was anticipating that there could be costs associated with travel to engage experts to work with the English Mastery Council in understanding the issues around low performance for students who were not English learners. The Department had not estimated the cost for contracting for those consultants but had anticipated some costs.

Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Wilson, but said the Committee would need more detail because a budget could not be built on speculation. She requested that Mr. Wilson provide Assemblyman Thompson with more detail within the next 48 hours.

Mr. Wilson said he would provide that information to Assemblyman Thompson within the next two days.

Chair Carlton asked whether there was anyone wishing to testify in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 92. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 92 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 235 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 235 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. (BDR 34-149)

Chair Carlton stated that Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson was here to testify regarding Assembly Bill (A.B.) 235 (1st Reprint), which revised the provisions governing the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. A fiscal note had been received on the bill, and Assemblyman Thompson would be providing an overview of the bill, and then the Committee could discuss the fiscal note.

Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No 17, Clark County, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 235 (1st Reprint) continued to build upon Assembly Bill 144 of the 79th Session (2017) that created the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. In working during the interim with the Commission, a chair person and a vice chair had been established, and the Commission had come up with a proposed investment that it would like to submit to the Committee for consideration. [Exhibit C](#), a document titled "Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring," was submitted by Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, District No. 17, supporting the value of mentoring. Assemblyman Thompson said that the Nevada Advisory Committee on Mentoring was working with evidence-based groups and specifically with a group called Mentor, a national group that valued mentoring. He said Nevada had a delegation of about 20 members who gave a presentation on collective impact and how to work with communities around mentoring.

Assemblyman Thompson said the newly established Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring would like to become a National Mentoring affiliate, which would require an investment of \$125,000. Also, because there were so many mentoring groups that were grass roots, the Commission needed to ensure they were safe and secure for children and that mentor matching was appropriate. Additionally, the Commission would like to produce an inaugural statewide mentoring conference. Assemblyman Thompson wanted to state for the

record that he would like to publically thank the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for its help.

Sarah Nick, Management Analyst, Office of the Superintendent, Department of Education, submitted [Exhibit D](#), a document titled "Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring Fiscal Note Request from the Department." She submitted the fiscal note to provide for a full-time-equivalent (FTE) position for many of the reasons that Assemblyman Thompson previously stated. This bill called for a full-time coordinator to do this work, and mentorship required a different level of investment and time that necessitated a full-time position to grow and nurture those relationships. She also believed that a full-time position was necessary to realize the vision of both Assemblyman Thompson and the Commission on Mentoring. Ms. Nick said that after the Department of Education staff discussed the matter with Assemblyman Thompson, it was believed that employing a full-time mentoring coordinator was the only way to accomplish those objectives set forth by the Commission, which included robust coordination of meetings, a full-time mentoring presence in the Committee, and assurance that students received what was needed for graduation and relationship development.

The Department of Education was also grateful to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for supporting that initial coordination of the part-time position. This position would be a management analyst, and it would cost \$77,732 in the first year of the biennium and \$99,045 every year thereafter. Ms. Nick said as justification of the \$77,732 in the first year, the Department anticipated the position might not be brought on board in the first quarter of the fiscal year, and it was the protocol of the state to budget positions at about a 75 percent billing rate in the first year of a new position.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson wondered about section 3.3 of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 235 (1st Reprint) concerning the affiliate process. The cost would be \$125,000, but she had never seen a department or board wanting an affiliate process. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked for specifics about legislative intent regarding the appropriation of \$125,000.

Assemblyman Thompson stated there was a specific budget designed for Nevada. Technically, it was far more of an investment than \$125,000, but the Commission wanted to get launched. The first phase started with \$125,000, year two doubled that amount, and year four was even more expensive as the Commission continued to build stakeholders.

Chair Carlton referred to the fiscal note ([Exhibit D](#)) requesting one management analyst position. The fiscal note was associated with the increase in responsibilities, and she asked whether those responsibilities were delineated in the first version of the bill.

Assemblyman Thompson said it had been a continuation of building on Assembly Bill 144 of the 79th Session (2017). The bill outlined the duties, but trying to work together had its challenges. That was why Assemblyman Thompson said Health and Human Services had graciously stepped in to fund the position.

Chair Carlton asked for clarification, because the Department of Health and Human Services had offered to fund this position, but there was a fiscal note submitted by the Department of Education to pay for the position.

Assemblyman Thompson said that was a development that occurred today.

Chair Carlton said she believed the Committee was going to need to reconcile what needed to be done between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education. One Department might not know that the other was covering that position, and Chair Carlton thought everyone needed to go into the hallway whenever there was an opportunity and make sure everyone was on the same page so the Committee had a correct fiscal note.

Assemblyman Thompson wanted to clarify that he had both departments at the table before Christmas to talk about the need, and that was when both departments knew the need and the problems. He said DHHS was able to identify money to fund the position for a year, with the hope that the Department of Education or the Commission could find the dollars to continue the funding for the position.

Chair Carlton said she believed A.B. 235 (R1) should be set aside because the more she learned, the worse it became. The fact that the conversations happened a long time ago and the Committee had just received the fiscal note made it hard to get the job done. She told Assemblyman Thompson she would leave it to him to help straighten out the fiscal note and, when he had some good answers, bring them to the Committee.

Chair Carlton asked whether there was anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 235.

Colleen Lawrence, Founder and President, Moxy Up Mentoring, testified in support of A.B. 235 (R1) and the importance of mentoring.

Chair Carlton called for anyone wishing to testify in opposition to or neutral on A.B. 235 (R1) and, hearing none, closed the hearing on A.B. 235 and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 80 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 80 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the Nevada Sentencing Commission. (BDR 14-469)

The Honorable James W. Hardesty, Associate Justice, Supreme Court, testified in support of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 80 (1st Reprint) and read the following statement into the record:

I appear on this bill as chairperson of the Sentencing Commission, a legislatively created commission during the 2017 Legislative Session that was designed to study sentencing practices in the state of Nevada. The Sentencing Commission consists of 25 members and took substantial testimony in a number of presentations from sentencing commissions

throughout the country, including the executive director of the National Sentencing Commission. Those presentations convinced a unanimous commission to recommend to the Legislature this year that you adopt a staff to support the Sentencing Commission to effectuate a number of the functions that are done by sentencing commissions throughout the United States.

As you may know, there was a written report filed with the Legislature concerning the Sentencing Commission's activities, and this bill comes to you as a result of a unanimous vote by the Judiciary Committee to support the Sentencing Commission and A.B. 80 (R1). I have reviewed your public hearings on March 18, 2019, where Ms. Moore made a presentation to you regarding the fiscal impact associated with the Sentencing Commission as well as your hearing on April 22, 2019, where your fiscal analyst also made a presentation concerning the budget and your vote of the joint Assembly Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees in support thereof.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, presented Exhibit E, "Proposed Amendment 5818 to Assembly Bill 80 (1st Reprint)."

As indicated, A.B. 80 (R1) created the Office of the Sentencing Commission, originally intended to be under the Office of the Governor. However, the Office was now intended to be a separate stand-alone agency. Ms. Jones said the budget for the Office of the Sentencing Commission, as indicated by Justice Hardesty, was closed before the full Committees on April 22, 2019, and the money committees confirmed that it was their intent and the intent of the Governor to operate this as a stand-alone agency. Further, the money committees concurred that the bureau chief staff attorney should be in the unclassified service, as included in the budget, with the administrative assistant position in the classified service.

Section 5, even after amended, indicated that the executive director would not be in the classified or unclassified service, and section 7 provided that the research analyst and secretaries would also be in the nonclassified service. Fiscal Analysis Division staff would recommend a technical correction to the bill to align the bill with the budget.

Ms. Jones said the other item that Fiscal staff noted was that the effective date of the bill indicated it was upon passage and approval for the purpose of establishing the Office of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. Section 5 included appointing the executive director of the office and performing other preliminary administrative tasks; however, there was a misalignment with the budget in that the budget for the Sentencing Commission had the positions starting on October 1, 2019, which was normal for new positions. Ms. Jones said the Committee might consider requesting that the start date for the positions be aligned with the budget in a proposed amendment.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked for clarification. If the start date was moved to October 1, she wondered whether there would still be time to interview and work on hiring for the position beforehand, but just not have it start until October 1.

Ms. Jones said that was normal practice and the standard budget of the state was to start new positions on October 1, for that purpose, so that agencies could get everything prepared to begin a position on the first day of October. The current bill established this position, but it would be left unfunded for the first quarter, based on how the budget was included in The Executive Budget and closed by the Committees.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 80 (R1) and seeing none, closed the hearing.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 81 (2nd Reprint).

Assembly Bill 81 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the oversight and provision of legal representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases. (BDR 14-436)

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27, thanked the Committee for hearing Assembly Bill (A.B.) 81 (2nd Reprint) and presented Exhibit F, a chart titled "Projected State Contribution to Indigent Defense." She said the projections were specific to the portion of the bill that would authorize a General Fund appropriation of \$15 million so that the new Commission on Indigent Defense would have grant dollars to make Nevada compliant.

The calculations used to inform the requested appropriations were based on a review of the publically available Nevada County Ledger documents indicating indigent defense expenses. The fiscal year (FY) 2017 numbers were congruous with the county budgets amount identified in Exhibit G, a report entitled "Right to Counsel in Rural Nevada Evaluation of Indigent Defense Services" produced by the Sixth Amendment Center. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said that at the time the report was commissioned, it was not known what the true number would be for 2018.

The projections for fiscal years beyond FY 2017 were based upon the International Monetary Fund's projected inflation rate for the United States. The estimated 15 percent state contribution was based on a number of factors. While it was admittedly difficult to make presumptions of what any future standards for indigent defense would require in additional resources and expenditures, the Sixth Amendment Center indicated that in light of the reforms of other states, 15 percent was a reasonable number to begin with in funding the reforms.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said a review of the case of *Tucker, et al. v. State of Idaho, et al.*, decided by the Idaho Supreme Court in 2017, showed a number of constitutional inadequacies remained in the Idaho indigent defense system. The initial

reform measure included a monetary contribution to Idaho's counties that the court indicated was not sufficient. As the Idaho indigent defense system was similar to what was contemplated in A.B. 81 (R2), the Nevada contribution was set higher than in Idaho to mitigate the risk of insufficiency. National experts, single scholars, and case law were clear that the Sixth Amendment guarantee of assistance of counsel was a state responsibility as indicated in *Gideon v. Wainwright* and that delegating those responsibilities to a state political subdivision without adequate funding or oversight did not meet the state's overarching responsibility.

Under the reforms begun by A.B. 81 (R2), Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson hoped that Nevada's system could be improved to avoid the fate of Montana, Michigan, and other states where changes had been compelled by either a state or federal court.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson pointed out that the 15 percent figure discussed was broad and a general estimate; however, in actuality some counties could require a 100 percent increase to satisfy any new delivery standards. For example, Lander County currently had one attorney under contract to provide indigent defense services. Potentially, any standard promulgated by the Office of Indigent Defense could require more be done than one attorney could handle, thereby requiring a doubling of the expenditures. She noted that Lander County was spending just under \$45,000 per year for indigent counsel, and if it had to hire an additional lawyer, it would cost approximately \$90,000.

Chair Carlton stated the original bill included the Department of Indigent Defense Services and some positions, and subsequently, a budget amendment submitted by the Office of the Governor recommended four more positions. It was her understanding that the appropriation in the bill was added through the amendment process in the Committee on the Judiciary. She asked whether she had the timeline correct.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson replied that Chair Carlton was correct. Initially, when the bill was drafted it was set up as a stand-alone office under the Governor, and then with additional thinking, it was decided it would probably be better as a department instead of within the Office of the Governor.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated an Executive Branch amendment was submitted that indicated the seven positions previously recommended as nonclassified in the bill, but unclassified in the budget, would be changed to three in the classified service and four under the unclassified service. However, the proposal differed from the provisions of the bill where section 9 indicated the executive director was in the nonclassified service. Section 11 of the bill indicated the deputy directors would also be in the nonclassified service. Sections 17 and 18 would remove the State Public Defender and other employees of that office and transfer them to this organization and place them in the nonclassified service as well. Ms. Jones said that was different from how the budget was approved by the money committees on April 22, 2019. There was a similar disconnect between when the new positions were included in the budget that were indicated for October 1, 2019; however, the bill indicated that the appointing of the

executive director would be made upon passage and approval of the bill and that the members of the board could be appointed upon passage and approval. Again, there could be a situation where there would be an opportunity to appoint an executive director who was not yet funded in the budget. Ms. Jones said if it was the Committee's desire, Fiscal Analysis Division staff would work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau Legal Division to align the start date of the new organization and the position types with the budget as approved.

Assemblywoman Titus commented that indigent defense funds and reforms were a concern, especially in the rural areas, but costs were an even bigger concern. She appreciated the indication that the state was going to form this program and fund it, but wondered whether this would become an ongoing program funded on an annual basis or ultimately the burden and the cost would shift to the counties.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she believed that the policy piece of A.B. 81 (R2) had set up a structure by which this Commission and this Department would have to act like every other department, and every two years it would form a budget to make a case for its needs and bring those needs before the Legislature. She said that procedure did not currently exist, and the financial burden rested upon the counties, and the least desirable solution was the status quo. If the appropriation moved forward, it would create money for grants so that as the Commission was set up and started putting standards in place, there would be dollars for those counties that needed funding to become compliant. After two years, it would be up to the Board to make sure they were advocating for its budget and its needs.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether a path was being established for future funding.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson replied that like every other department in the state, the Department would have to come forward and make its case for funding.

Assemblyman Kramer said his concern was somewhat the same as Assemblywoman Titus. Carson City and Storey County already used the State Public Defender, and that service was paid by the counties for the most part. As the office became bigger, he wondered whether there would be a demand for an unfunded mandate to the counties for part of this oversight. While oversight might well be needed in some counties, Assemblyman Kramer said he did not want to get in the position where the one source that Carson City used for indigent defense was now going to be a larger department, and some of the costs for that department would be passed down to the counties and would not be state-funded.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she appreciated Assemblyman Kramer's thoughts being put on the record. She said the bulk of the conversation for the past year had been about ensuring costs were mitigated and contained, but ultimately there was a constitutional obligation to provide those services. There was empirical evidence that Nevada was not in compliance, and Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said Nevada had to move forward and, just like obligations to fund education, fight for the funding for indigent services every two years. She believed a good process had been set up within A.B. 81 (R2), and additionally,

the Board composition had county representatives on it, which would provide protections and strike a decent balance between the state and the counties.

Chair Carlton asked whether the \$15 million appropriation in this bill was in the Executive Budget, and Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson replied that it was not.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, opposition to or neutral on A.B. 81 (R2) and, seeing none, closed the hearing.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 96 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 96 (1st Reprint): Requires the creation of the Historic Sites Passport Program as a pilot program. (BDR 33-505)

Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Assembly District 6, Clark County, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 96 (1st Reprint).

Assemblyman McCurdy introduced Rebecca Lynn Palmer, Administrator, State Historic Preservation Office, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, and stated he was addressing A.B. 96 (R1), which would essentially create the Historic Sites Passport Program as a pilot program.

Ms. Palmer read the following statement into the record:

Assembly Bill 96 in its first reprint directs the State Historic Preservation Office to create a Historic Sites Passport Pilot program over the next biennium. This pilot program, based on conversations with the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs and an existing passport program in State Parks, would cost approximately \$50,000 to establish. The Office completed a quick review of the state register and has identified 29 publically owned resources that are also accessible on a regular basis for stamp placement and possible passport distribution. The Office would consult with the land managers and property owners of those identified resources for initial program participation. The pilot program would also allow for private owners of listed resources to voluntarily participate. With the support and consent of the public and private property owners of the listed resources and in consultation with the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, the Office would develop, design, and distribute a Historic Sites Passport for Nevadans and other tourists to use when traveling around the state and learning about cultural resources.

Chair Carlton remarked that the notes she had showed that the Department submitted an unsolicited fiscal note subsequent to the amendment and referral to Ways and Means, which basically changed the fiscal note to zero.

Ms. Palmer stated that was correct.

Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 96 (R1) and, hearing none, closed the hearing on A.B. 96 (R1) and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 216 (2nd Reprint).

Assembly Bill 216 (2nd Reprint): Requires the establishment of a database of information relating to funding opportunities for higher education. (BDR 18-858)

Assemblywoman Jill Tolles, Assembly District 25, Washoe County, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 216 (2nd Reprint). Assemblywoman Tolles said this bill required the Office of the State Treasurer to establish a searchable, public, online database of information relating to scholarships, grants, and any other sources of funding for individuals to seek higher education. The bill also required the Attorney General to establish a program to connect victims of certain crimes with the database.

Assemblywoman Tolles said she was aware that this was not a policy discussion, but she wanted to clarify for the Committee's benefit that this bill would establish a database open to the public to search for available scholarships. While this information was available on many different campus websites across the state, A.B. 216 (R2) would create just one database, which was basically a one-stop shop. She introduced Zach Conine, State Treasurer, to speak to the resources available within the Office of the Treasurer that allowed the process to be done without a fiscal note and Nicole O'Banion, Ombudsman, Office of the Attorney General, to talk about the existing programs in her office and resources that were available to perform outreach to certain individuals to connect them with the information in the proposed database. J. Kyle Dalpe from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) was present to help answer any questions about working with the interested parties to get the information to populate the searchable database.

Chair Carlton commented that when looking for scholarships, she did not think of going to the State Treasurer's Office to search a database because it was more business-oriented. She said she was curious about how it was determined to locate the database in the Office of the State Treasurer.

Assemblywoman Tolles said it began with a conversation with the State Treasurer about distributing information across the state about the scholarships that were available. She said Treasurer Conine indicated he shared a similar vision, and it tied very well into the savings plans and the other information currently housed in the Treasurer's Office.

Chair Carlton noted that Treasurer Conine had stated that the Office of the Treasurer could fund the implementation of this new database and provide staff to answer the calls. She asked him to discuss how he planned on accomplishing that because agencies usually did not receive extra money in budgets, and she wanted to ascertain how the Office of the Treasurer would handle the funding. Chair Carlton said there was always a lot of technology and programming hours associated with a database and asked the State Treasurer to address those concerns.

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, said what was being proposed was simply a website that listed all of the different scholarships that were available and provided links to the original source. The Office of the Treasurer fielded hundreds of calls on a monthly basis about college affordability, and those calls asked questions about the Millennium Scholarship, about 529 college savings programs, and questions about how the callers could pay for college. Treasurer Conine said those callers were currently directed to outside resources, but the goal was to create one centralized website where an individual could simply click and say he or she was interested in scholarship programs, was located in Pershing County, and see what was available. The Office currently had information technology (IT) resources in-house that performed all website development, and hundreds of calls were fielded on a monthly basis, but it was not expected that any additional staff would be needed. Treasurer Conine stated a toll-free number already existed, the Office was already paying for the hosting of the website, and the website had already been created.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson referred to section 1, subsection 3(c) that said "may employ such staff as the State Treasurer deems necessary to maintain, support, and promote the use of the database." She wondered whether Mr. Conine envisioned the need of additional staff, whether this was already being contemplated within the State Treasurer's budget, or whether he was considering contract employees over the interim.

Treasurer Conine replied that no additional staff or contract employees were anticipated. He commented that this was a website that he, without additional technological knowledge, could create in about three hours and update in the span of moments. He added that this project was not a big lift for the Treasurer's Office.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson related that in 2013 the Legislature created a toll-free number for state employees to report fraud, and this session the department was requesting more employees because so many calls were being received. She maintained that in one way it was good because the calls were coming in and the program was working, but she never would have guessed that additional staff would be needed to manage those calls.

Assemblywoman Tolles said she appreciated that possibility, but part of the thinking was that by having a database that was on the website and available, the volume of calls could be reduced because individuals could enter into the search engine and receive the information and the links to pursue that information. The idea was it could help to reduce staff hours and free up time. Finally, she wanted to note that there were private databases where one could search for scholarships and grants; however, those databases were driven by advertising dollars. The benefit of having a program in a centralized place in the Office of the Treasurer was that it was available to anyone who was interested, it was free, and it would be an unbiased source.

Chair Carlton said she had heard different names for the program and requested clarification concerning whether the proposal was for a search engine, a database, or a webpage.

Treasurer Conine explained that it was a list on a website, and through rudimentary website technology each of the individual scholarships would be tagged when they were first listed, including for instance, a scholarship that was for a student currently in high school or a scholarship for someone else or a scholarship that was available in all counties or a scholarship that was available only in certain counties. A user, through a series of dropdowns, could narrow the field of requirements to the specific scholarships to fit his or her needs. The website simply displayed those items and hid the other ones in the back.

Treasurer Conine said it was not a robust, structured query language (SQL) database, it was simply a website.

Chair Carlton believed there needed to be clarification between what the bill actually said concerning a database and what that definition would be and what the State Treasurer just described as a webpage.

Assemblywoman Tolles said she always appreciated an opportunity to clarify. The State Treasurer's Office already had a webpage, so in the same way that the Department of Education could add a tab for bullying so that someone could go to that website and learn more, this would be through the existing State Treasurer's webpage. There would be no additional funds for a new webpage because it would provide a link to that searchable function within that webpage.

Assemblyman Wheeler said he wanted to thank Assemblywoman Tolles and the State Treasurer for bringing this bill before the Committee because as a grandfather with seven grandchildren just about to graduate, it could be very helpful. He said he had been through the process of looking for scholarships, and they were very hard to find. He wanted to clarify with Treasurer Conine that the Office of the Treasurer was going to be able to use existing staff to build a new website so that interested parties could find information about scholarships, which should bring down the volume of calls.

Treasurer Conine explained that, specifically, it would be a new page on the website as opposed to a new website. He further stated that the goal was if interested parties could be directed to the website as opposed to walking them through the information on the phone, it would of course save costs over time.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked how many scholarships the Office of the State Treasurer anticipated being listed on the website.

Treasurer Conine said that the seed list came from existing websites that University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) maintained as well as existing programs in the Office of the Treasurer. The Office of the Treasurer would be receptive to additional scholarships to add to the list as they were suggested. He said there are not as many people applying for the scholarships as were eligible because of lack of knowledge. The sponsors of those scholarships were always looking for additional places to advertise and inform the public. Treasurer Conine said the Treasurer's website received a fair

amount of traffic because of unclaimed property, and the hope was it would spread knowledge about scholarships.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson referred to section 1, subsection 4 of A.B. 216 (R2), which referred to the Office of the Attorney General. The Office already housed a portal for victims that was being compiled around legislation passed last session. She believed this proposal fit perfectly into that segment with the work the Attorney General's office was performing.

Nicole O'Banion, Ombudsman, Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, and Human Trafficking Division, Office of the Attorney General, stated Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was correct: the sexual assault portal was up and running and had been finalized. That was one piece of the many pieces the Office of the Attorney General handled, which was domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking. The Office already did a tremendous amount of education outreach with the Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) system on statewide resources that were available in each one of those areas. Ms. O'Banion said the Office of the Attorney General already had a system in place for getting information out to the general public and service providers, along with directly assisting victims. The scholarship list would be a program that would fold into what was already being done as far as getting the information distributed for that population.

Chair Carlton requested testimony in support of A.B. 216 (R2).

J. Kyle Dalpe, Ph.D., Interim Executive Director of Legislative Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), stated NSHE had supported this bill earlier and continued to support it as a way to point students to resources to help access higher education.

Chair Carlton asked for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 216 (R2), and, seeing none, closed the hearing and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 155 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the eligibility requirements for grants awarded under the Silver State Opportunity Grant Program. (BDR 34-674)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District 3, Clark County, stated she was here to present Assembly Bill (A.B.) 155 (1st Reprint). While she said she wanted to keep the presentation as brief as possible, she also wanted to provide some background information. The Silver State Opportunity Grant Program, which she referred to as SSOG, was passed in 2015 with the goal of helping provide students with the means they needed to graduate. When the bill passed, it required recipients to be taking 15 credits to receive the grant, and this bill would change the credit requirement to 12 credits, which was the federal standard for full-time students. At this time, Assemblywoman Torres said she would also like to introduce a conceptual amendment that proposed those students who were taking 15 credits be funded first, and any remaining funds that were left over from the amount allotted be used

for students taking 12 credits or for those who demonstrated financial need and completed the alternative needs-based assessment. Assemblywoman Torres introduced J. Kyle Dalpe, who was representing the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to discuss the fiscal note.

J. Kyle Dalpe, Ph.D., Interim Executive Director of Legislative Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), stated that the fiscal note on A.B. 155 (R1) that was submitted originally had a range from \$8 million to \$14.7 million. Students at the four community colleges and the state college currently taking 12 credits, would cost \$8 million. Mr. Dalpe said that looking at student behavior patterns, which was very tricky, if the minimum was changed to 12 credits, students who were taking 9 credits would have an incentive to add one more class, bumping them from 9 credits to 12 credits. That change would add an additional \$6.7 million to the budget, which brought the high end to \$14.7 million. Those were the numbers shown in the fiscal note as presented with the original draft of this legislation, making \$8 million the additional amount and \$14.7 million the higher appropriation if students taking 9 credits jumped to 12 credits.

Chair Carlton said she was confused because currently \$5 million was appropriated each year toward the SSOG, and when that \$5 million was expended for that year, there was no more. She wondered how a fiscal note was submitted on something that had a limited appropriation.

Mr. Dalpe explained that students in the community colleges and the state college who were currently enrolled at fifteen credits would qualify for SSOG under the existing funding. If that funding was expanded to students taking 12 credits, in addition to the ones taking 15 credits, the projection indicated it would cost an additional \$8 million.

Chair Carlton noted that with an appropriation of \$5 million, SSOG would spend the \$5 million and then it would be gone.

Mr. Dalpe stated that was correct; however, at 12 credits that new group of students would then qualify for SSOG, and that would be the additional cost in the fiscal note. The fiscal note was presented before the conceptual amendment that was added tonight.

Assemblywoman Torres said the conceptual amendment allowed for two things. One, if the pot of money remained the same, it allowed for continued funding for SSOG and for the students taking 15 credits to continue to receive that scholarship at the amount currently funded. However, any remaining funds would allow for those individuals taking 12 credits to be eligible for SSOG. She said her understanding was that there has been some money remaining from the amount allocated for SSOG. While it was not a significant amount of money, it would allow for those students taking 12 credits to receive funding. Assemblywoman Torres remarked that more money going into the scholarship program would be greatly appreciated, but if the amount of funding remained the same, this piece of legislation could still take effect.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson stated she was reading section 2 of the bill that provided any money remaining would not revert and would remain in the account and be carried forward. She commented that was not typical. Usually when departments or agencies did not use budgeted dollars, those dollars reverted to the General Fund. She wondered what the thinking was for not allowing those reversions.

Assemblywoman Torres said that would allow for that money to continue to be granted toward this particular scholarship. In this instance, if this piece of legislation with the conceptual amendment were to pass, it would allow for that money to be used. Although, she imagined that if SSOG continued to be funded at the same amount, the entire pot of money would be used, unless it was significantly increased.

Chair Carlton said she understood, but typically any leftover money reverted to the General Fund. But she believed what would end up happening was that there would be no money left because there would be plenty of students looking for those dollars.

Assemblywoman Titus said she had the same questions as Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson about that money rolling over and stated it was not a typical pattern. However, the conceptual amendment to this bill only related to lowering the requirement to 12 units. If the monies were not fully allocated to students taking 15 credits, then that money would be spent down and there would be none to rollover. Assemblywoman Titus believed that was what Assemblywoman Torres was trying to get at, but it was not a typical financial pattern. In the conceptual amendment, Assemblywoman Titus wondered whether the SSOG program was going to keep a waiting list and asked whether there was a mechanism in place to determine the estimated number of applicants.

Assemblywoman Torres said to the first point, she completely agreed that all of the money would be used because there were definitely enough students who were taking 12 credits that could demonstrate financial need. Once again, unless funding was doubled, she could not see a reversion taking place, and she would be amenable to changing that section in the bill because it was not the standard. Addressing the second point, there was currently a mechanism for the SSOG because it was a first-come first-served scholarship, and once that money had been used, a student was no longer eligible. The conceptual amendment would allow for those individuals taking 15 credits to take priority, and anything left over could be distributed.

Chair Carlton stated that Fiscal Analysis Division staff had informed her that \$852,000 was reverted to the General Fund in FY 2018.

Chair called for testimony in support of A.B. 155 (R1).

J. Kyle Dalpe, Ph.D., Interim Executive Director of Legislative Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education, and representing the four community colleges and the state college, testified in support of A.B. 155 (R1) to improve access for students.

Alexander Marks, representing the Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of A.B. 155 (R1).

Chair Carlton asked for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 155 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing and opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 234 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 234 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the Program for Child Care and Development. (BDR 38-305)

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1, Clark County, presented Assembly (A.B.) Bill 234 (1st Reprint). The measure would include increasing availability of child care for children with disabilities and would also reimburse a portion of the cost of child care provided to children with certain eligible parents who were enrolled in vocational education programs. Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno said that since the original hearing of this bill, a lot of work had been done with the stakeholders and the Department of Health and Human Services. She presented Exhibit H, a mock-up of proposed amendment 5828 to A.B. 234 (R1), which removed the fiscal note.

Chair Carlton requested information about the section in Exhibit H that removed the fiscal note.

Nova Murray, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that the original language indicated the agency would increase the rate to pay 100 percent for families with children in foster care and would additionally pay an increased rate for children with disabilities. It did not provide a limit and paid 100 percent for foster children. The fiscal note contained programming to cause the system to pay for children instead of paying to facilities. Ms. Murray said that the fiscal note had been completely changed in the new mock-up so that the foster piece was completely taken out and the piece regarding children with disabilities moved toward a process to increase access for those children to child care.

Chair Carlton asked with the amendment whether the Department still needed to do the administrative tasks and develop the regulations. Without the fiscal note, Chair Carlton was not sure what would need developing.

Ms. Murray stated the regulations and spot updates needed for the Department to carry out the provisions of this bill did not carry a fiscal note. It was regular work that staff handled in the process.

Chair Carlton said the question was whether that work still needed to be done since the bill was being amended, and Ms. Murray replied that the Department still needed to do the work.

Assemblyman Kramer asked how the fiscal note was removed when the mock-up of the proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) increased the rate of reimbursement for child care in section 1, subsection 1(a)(1).

Ms. Murray replied that in the original bill, the agency was required to reimburse at a higher rate. In the current version it may increase the rate of reimbursement or use an economic incentive or wraparound service for the purpose of increasing access. Ms. Murray said the agency would like to move forward with wraparound services to increase access, and in that process, it was normal business for the agency.

Chair Carlton asked for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on [A.B. 234 \(R1\)](#) and, seeing none, closed the hearing and opened the hearing on [Assembly Bill \(A.B.\) 290 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Assembly Bill 290 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to occupational safety and health. (BDR 53-286)

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41, Clark County, presented [Assembly \(A.B.\) Bill 290 \(1st Reprint\)](#). She said this bill would create an Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) registry within the state of Nevada, which would be a place where OSHA trainers could submit a list of trainees who had successfully completed their OSHA-10 and OSHA-30 courses and where an employer could verify that an OSHA card was legitimate. Assemblywoman Jauregui wanted to highlight section 6, subsection 1(c) of the bill because it was important to protect hard-working Nevadans. She was clear that the cost of creating the registry could not be borne by the workers, so there was a fiscal note. She said she envisioned a registry living within the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry, so there was a small fiscal note on it for the creation of the website.

Chair Carlton noted a cost of \$76,971 in fiscal year (FY) 2020, \$61,061 in FY 2021, and approximately \$122,122 in subsequent biennia.

Assemblywoman Jauregui stated she had worked with the Department of Business and Industry to amend the bill and a second fiscal note had been submitted. The only fiscal note remaining would be for the creation of the website, and the Division was available to speak to that.

Chair Carlton commented that currently the agency was requesting a reduced amount of approximately \$30,000 in FY 2020 for creation of the website, and Assemblywoman Jauregui said that was correct.

Michael Brown, Director, Department of Business and Industry, said Assemblywoman Jauregui had brought the matter to his attention because of concern about possible counterfeit OSHA cards being used in the Las Vegas Valley. He said his colleague, Ray Fierro, could speak to what could be done to ensure that was not occurring.

Ray Fierro, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations (DIR), Department of Business and Industry, said the question was what do you get for \$30,000 and could a registry be created for that amount. There was already a registry in the Safety Consultation and Training section of DIR where the trainers, who had OSHA 500 certification, could sign onto the registry right now. It was a voluntary registry, and the agency was expanding that registry so those trainers could list students who received the OSHA-10 and OSHA-30 cards on the registry, allowing an employer to put in a number and check on a name for verification.

Chair Carlton asked for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 290 (R1) and, seeing none, closed the hearing.

Chair Carlton noted the Committee had one bill draft request introduction to address.

BDR 34-1214 – Revises provisions relating to the Commission on Postsecondary Education.
(Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 526](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED FOR COMMITTEE APPROVAL
TO REQUEST BDR 34-1214 BE INTRODUCED.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblyman Hambrick was not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton opened the meeting for public comment, and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Bowen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a document titled "Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring," regarding Assembly Bill 235 (R1), presented by Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring Fiscal Note Request from the Department," presented by Sarah Nick, Management Analyst, Office of the Superintendent, Department of Education.

[Exhibit E](#) is "Proposed Amendment 5818 to Assembly Bill 80 (1st Reprint)," dated April 29, 2019, presented by Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is a document titled "Projected State Contribution to Indigent Defense," presented by Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27.

[Exhibit G](#) is a document titled "The Right to Counsel in Rural Nevada Evaluation of Indigent Defense Services," produced by the Sixth Amendment Center, dated September 2018, and presented by Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27.

[Exhibit H](#), is a mock-up of proposed amendment 5828 to Assembly Bill No. 234 (1st Reprint), dated May 1, 2019, and presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1.