

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

**Eightieth Session  
May 25, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 9:17 a.m. on Saturday, May 25, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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/80th2019](http://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  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Assemblyman John Hambrick

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Howard Watts III, Assembly District No. 15

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Carmen M. Neveau, Committee Secretary  
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1342



After roll was called, Chair Carlton explained her intention to open a work session for four Assembly bills, and then to work through the bills shown on [Exhibit A](#).

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 92 revised provisions governing the English Mastery Council. This bill was heard on May 1, 2019, and expanded the duties of the English Mastery Council to include making recommendations to the State Board of Education to improve the academic achievement and English proficiency of pupils who did not meet the definition of English learners but scored at or below the 25th percentile for certain examinations in the English language arts. The bill extended the termination date of the Council from June 30, 2019, to June 30, 2022. A fiscal note was placed on the bill by the Department of Education indicating a need for an additional \$5,000 per year for travel and transcription services related to the duties expanded in the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 92, and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 92 WITH A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ADD STATE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS OF \$5,000 PER YEAR FOR TRAVEL AND TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 235 (1st Reprint) was presented on May 1, 2019, by the late Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson. The bill as amended changed the membership of the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. The bill eliminated requirements for the Commission to appoint a mentorship advisory council consisting of members representing organizations that provided mentorship programs and required the Commission to work in consultation with the Department of Education to provide directions

and guidance for a coordinator position. As amended, the bill included \$185,000 in expenditure authority. A proposed amendment from Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson and Assemblywoman Neal recommended the following changes to the bill:

- Section 1 of the bill revised the provisions of the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring and required the Department of Education to provide the Commission with one full-time staff member to carry out the duties of the Commission. Through collaboration with the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services, Ms. Jones said that funds had been identified to support this position.
- Section 3 of the bill provided an appropriation of \$125,000 for the purpose of starting an affiliate process to support the Nevada Advisory Commission on Mentoring. The proposed amendment decreased the appropriation to \$101,000 for that purpose, a reduction of \$24,000.
- Section 3 of the bill indicated an appropriation of \$10,000 for expenses related to planning and hosting a mentoring conference, and the proposed amendment reduced that amount to \$5,000, a reduction of \$5,000.

The net total State General Fund appropriation for this bill as reflected in the proposed amendment was \$156,000.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 235 (R1).

Assemblyman Kramer asked whether the \$25,000 appropriation in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium as proposed in the original bill was eliminated by the proposed amendment. Ms. Jones clarified that the amendment changed the funding source for a position so the fiscal note no longer was necessary for that position. However, the \$25,000 per year appropriation in section 3.8 remained in the bill.

Hearing no other questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 235 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Neal.

**Assembly Bill 264 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to relations between state agencies and Indian nations or tribes. (BDR 18-671)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 264 (1st Reprint) changed the relationship between state agencies and Indian nations or tribes. The bill would become effective on July 1, 2019. There were several fiscal notes tied to the bill; however, the amendment mockup presented by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24, eliminated the fiscal impact.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 264 (R1), and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 264 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters and asked Assemblywoman Swank to provide backup, if needed.

**Assembly Bill 271 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to call centers. (BDR 53-900)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 271 (1st Reprint) revised provisions related to call centers as presented by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24. Based on a conceptual amendment presented to Committee members during the bill hearing, the Office of Labor Commissioner's fiscal note was removed.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 271 (R1). The Chair remembered testimony in opposition to the bill, but the opposition was based on the policy of the bill.

Hearing no questions, Chair Carlton requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED WITH THE CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENT TO ASSEMBLY BILL 271 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblywoman Titus voted no. Assemblyman Hambrick was not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters and asked Assemblywoman Spiegel to provide backup, if needed.

Chair Carlton closed the work session. The Chair explained that for the next week, Committee members would be meeting each day, but the Chair would not adjourn meetings. This would allow Committee members to meet again after other committees had completed their work and allow bills to constantly move to the floor.

The Chair opened the hearing for Assembly Bill (A.B.) 104.

**Assembly Bill 104: Makes an appropriation to the Account for the Nevada Main Street Program. (BDR S-532)**

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16, introduced Assembly Bill (A.B.) 104, an appropriation for the continuation of the Nevada Main Street Program, a historic preservation and economic development program. Until 2017, Nevada was one of 5 states without a Main Street program. Main Street programs were part of the National Trust for Historic Preservation programs that provided support to local communities through Nevada's Office of Historic Preservation. Support was intended to help communities develop local identities, reduce vacancies in Main Street buildings, and create marketing strategies for towns. The goal was for every town to have a distinct identity, and businesses could be targeted to further develop a specific identity. Across the nation, Main Street programs had great successes, in some towns reducing business vacancy rates from 20 percent to 5 percent.

The Nevada Main Street Program, Assemblywoman Swank said, was started in 2017 and ten communities were now considered to be Main Street towns including Gardnerville, Wells, Ely, Winnemucca, Lovelock, Fallon, Mesquite, Tonopah, Reno, and Henderson. These communities were spread across Nevada and represented communities of many different sizes. Despite several director changes when the program started in 2017, the program now operated successfully. She acknowledged that the program had advanced quickly in two years and had provided assistance to the ten towns.

Patricia Herzog, Director, Rural Economic and Community Development, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor, explained that \$350,000 was appropriated for the Nevada Main Street Program by Assembly Bill 417 of the 79th Session (2017). A contract was executed with the National Main Street Center for

approximately \$144,000 that allowed a consultant to work one-on-one with communities. The consultant helped communities become established and built community support at a ground level. Approximately \$99,000 in grant funding was awarded to six communities. An urban program was established in Reno, and an Urban Main community project would be built in Reno. Scholarships were provided to several communities to allow attendance at a national Main Street Now conference in Seattle. There were 35 community members from Nevada at the conference. Approximately \$17,000 was spent on administrative costs for the Program, primarily for travel in Nevada as well as conferences and training opportunities.

Chair Carlton recognized that it took time for a program to be established. She asked how much money was left in the fund. Assemblywoman Swank said that there was \$40,000 that had not been allocated to communities.

Assemblywoman Titus asked about any matching federal funds that were available for this effort. Ms. Herzog said that no matching funds were used, although a recent strategic planning session looked at opportunities to use matching funds.

Assemblywoman Titus said that matching funds for this effort had to be available, and she hoped that opportunities for federal matching funds would be investigated further. Assemblywoman Swank said the Main Street Program was a national program administered by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, but the program was not part of the federal government.

Assemblyman Kramer asked for a description of successful projects from the ten towns enrolled in the program. Ms. Herzog said that \$30,000 was given to the community of Ely for wayfinding signs and a branding opportunity for the community. There will be a kiosk in a central plaza to direct tourists to the downtown area and local attractions. The Main Street Program in Winnemucca worked in concert with a museum to publish a book highlighting several of the historic buildings in the downtown area. The book would be sold in the community to raise revenue.

Assemblyman Wheeler stated that Gardnerville was one of the ten towns that benefitted from the program. He believed that although a strong economy had helped, the vacancy rate in Gardnerville had dropped substantially because of the Main Street Program, and he would support the program.

Chair Carlton opened the meeting to those who supported A.B. 104.

Mary C. Walker, President, Walker and Associates, and a paid lobbyist representing Carson City, Douglas County, Lyon County and Storey County, spoke in support of A.B. 104. This bill was an example of a successful public-private partnership. When Ms. Walker was the Carson City Finance Director for Small Communities, one of her roles in the 1990s was as the Carson City Redevelopment Director. There was an active Main Street program at that time, and she worked diligently to renovate the downtown area. At that time, there were 25 vacant buildings. The Main Street program helped Ms. Walker develop an incentive

program that allowed business owners to explain what they needed to be successful. She felt this interaction was important. Most Carson City Main Street buildings were constructed between 1860 and 1910. Older buildings did not have proper electrical wiring or earthquake hazard programs, and problems such as those were addressed under the incentive program. The Carson City Redevelopment Authority paid 20 percent of a building's rehabilitation, the owner paid 20 percent, and bank loans were secured for the remaining 60 percent—the first time in decades that bank loans were awarded for this type of work. In five years, 22 of the 25 vacant buildings were renovated. Examples of renovated buildings included the buildings that housed Garibaldi's, the St Charles Historic Hotel, and Mom and Pop's Diner, among others.

She summarized by stating that the Nevada Main Street Program required a small amount of money and provided great benefit to communities. She added that the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) wanted to go on record in support of A.B. 104, but NACO representatives were unable to attend.

David Dazlich, a paid lobbyist representing the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of A.B. 104. He noted that the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce had supported this bill in the 79th Session (2017), and the organization supported the bill now. This bill invested in unique communities across Nevada and allowed small businesses to thrive and give back to their communities.

Hearing no one else in support of A.B. 104, Chair Carlton asked for anyone in opposition to or neutral on A.B. 104. Hearing no responses, she closed the hearing on A.B. 104.

**Assembly Bill 229 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment of a technical advisory program for the protection and preservation of certain buildings and structures. (BDR 33-299)**

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16, introduced Assembly Bill (A.B.) 229 (1st Reprint) which created a technical advisory program for buildings that were over 50 years old. This bill was based on a program that currently functioned in Iowa. The program allowed anyone who owned a historic building more than 50 years old and not necessarily on a historic register to receive assistance from those with expertise in working on older buildings. She noted that building methods from 50 years ago had not been continued to the present day, and certain skills were needed when working on older buildings, especially to ensure historic integrity of buildings when lower costs were important.

This bill, Assemblywoman Swank continued, created a grant program under the Office of Historic Preservation for anyone who needed this technical advice. Through the grant program, the Office of Historic Preservation paid for travel and payroll time for an expert to visit the site, and the grantee paid for lodging and meals for that expert. She noted that the program was simple and had great results in Iowa.

Assemblywoman Swank said that the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources had submitted a revised fiscal note that eliminated the original fiscal note. What remained was a \$30,000 appropriation. Of that amount, \$10,000 was to be appropriated in fiscal year (FY) 2020 to be used by the Office of Historic Preservation for the compilation of a list of expert technical advisors. The remaining \$20,000 from the appropriation would be available in FY 2021.

Chair Carlton asked whether there were any questions from Committee members, and hearing no questions, she asked whether state government would be able to use the technical assistance for older buildings. Assemblywoman Swank said that possibility was not excluded.

Hearing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton opened the meeting for those in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 229 (R1).

Deni French, a private citizen from Carson City, stated that many buildings would be 50 years old soon, and asked whether there was an effective date for the bill. He wondered whether this was a long-range view or an immediate perspective from the effective date. Chair Carlton said that once something was in statute, it would continue until changed.

Hearing no other testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 229 (R1).

**Assembly Bill 262: Revises provisions relating to children. (BDR 11-131)**

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 262 and explained that the bill had been moved to the Ways and Means Committee with limited policy discussion. For that reason, he provided Committee members with background on the policy history. During the interim, he was involved with a friend's custody case in family court. His friend's children were articulate, well-behaved, straight-A students. During that case, the judge refused to talk to the children. Assemblyman Wheeler thought that seemed unusual because the purpose of the case was to determine what was best for the children.

The bill originally required child support for children up to 24 years of age, and Assemblyman Wheeler amended the bill to remove that requirement. That requirement was the justification for a fiscal note which had now been removed. All the amended bill required was an interview with a judge either in chambers or outside the court building, if a child was at least 11 years old. The judge would then determine whether to accept the child's testimony.

Chair Carlton asked whether amendment No. 977, Exhibit C, was the correct document for review, and Assemblyman Wheeler confirmed that was the correct amendment. The Chair added that Fiscal Analysis Division staff would need to verify the elimination of the fiscal note.



Nova Murray, Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services, said that the amendment removed the fiscal note because the note was specific to child support and not the court process.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions, and hearing no questions, she asked for anyone in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 262 to come forward. Seeing no one, she closed the hearing on A.B. 262.

**Assembly Bill 338 (1st Reprint): Revises requirements for the operation of a motor vehicle by a young driver. (BDR 43-600)**

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 338 (1st Reprint) and explained that A.B. 338 (R1) was passed unanimously with amendments from the Assembly Growth and Infrastructure Committee and he wanted to provide Ways and Means Committee members with the bill's history. This bill was requested by Youth Legislator Nathan Tea who guided the bill through the process. Because of Mr. Tea's work, this bill had more cosponsors than any other bill this session. With amendments, several fiscal notes were resolved and only one fiscal note remained. Assemblyman Wheeler believed that this bill was an important bill that needed approval.

Chair Carlton said that one fiscal note was based on a placard and Assemblyman Wheeler replied that the fiscal note for a placard had been removed. She asked what the remaining fiscal note covered. Assemblyman Wheeler said that the fiscal note covered salary and benefits of \$91,844 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$92,099 in FY 2021 for a Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) compliance officer. That funding would be appropriated from the State Highway Fund.

Jude Hurin, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs, DMV, said that an amendment removed programming for placards and minimal programming time of 130 hours would be absorbed by the DMV. Based on information from a compliance enforcement chief, there was one staff member in the Division of Compliance Enforcement who oversaw audits and course curricula for drive schools. With the addition of Mr. Tea's requirements for defensive driving schools, it would be beneficial for the DMV to have another staff member to offset work that would result from over 160 drive schools that the one staff member oversaw. The fiscal note represented the additional position and equipment associated with the new position.

Chair Carlton stated it was her understanding that this position would be funded with State Highway Funds. Mr. Hurin believed that statement to be true.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions, and hearing no questions, she asked Mr. Tea what inspired him to pursue A.B. 338 (R1). Mr. Tea said that when he first applied for the Youth Legislature, he was asked about the biggest problem that Nevada youth faced today. He responded that teenagers did not know how to drive safely or

how to get out of certain situations that could result in an accident, as evidenced by several incidents in Carson City and Reno and near his high school. He had taken several defensive driving courses and he had checked with others, and all felt that the course had saved their lives many times on the road. A course that could save lives was worthwhile for everyone, he concluded.

Mr. Hurin noted that it had been a pleasure to work with Mr. Tea on A.B. 338 (R1). From a DMV perspective, this was a great bill to add to the DMV toolbox. His daughter had taken the class, and he and his wife were more comfortable with their daughter on the road after she completed the course. The DMV, he concluded, supported this bill.

Hearing no other questions, Chair Carlton opened the meeting for those in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 338, (R1). Hearing no one, she closed the hearing on A.B. 338 (R1).

**Assembly Bill 322: Establishes provisions relating to juvenile assessment centers.  
(BDR 5-713)**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1, introduced the next bill, Assembly Bill (A.B.) 322 and explained that A.B. 322 was a bill with no policy hearing that moved directly to the Ways and Means Committee. During the interim, substantial work was undertaken by the late Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson and a large bipartisan group of individuals. The group worked on how to improve the juvenile justice system. She knew that the policy was good policy, but it came down to a problem with the large financial commitment that was needed. The strong bipartisan support spoke to the benefit provided from this bill to ensure better opportunities for youth in the juvenile justice system. The bill provided policies and practices to improve outcomes and collaborations among agencies including common screenings and assessment tools. The bill also allowed for improved county and state resources and for resources to be used in a more efficient manner. During the 79th Session (2017), the Harbor, the subject of the bill, received funding of \$1.9 million which had all been expended. The Harbor had served and worked with over 7,000 youth in the community and had partnered with local police departments and community organizations. She noted that A.B. 322 originally recommended funding of \$16 million. An amendment reduced that funding request to one-shot funding of \$1.9 million.

Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney, stated that she was the Director of the Juvenile Division, and she walked Committee members through the proposed amendment, Exhibit D, from Clark County. In the amendment, section 1 was removed in its entirety, section 2 reduced the original amount from \$16 million to \$1.9 million, and also in section 2 a definition of a juvenile assessment center from section 1 was included. When Ms. Duffy appeared before the Committee during the 79th Session (2017) to talk about a ragtag program that law enforcement personnel decided to bring to Clark County, concepts from across the country had been pieced together with no funding. The program was designed to keep youth from entering the juvenile justice system,

a unique concept for law enforcement to present to the community. The program was also designed to support schools and to keep youth engaged in schools. In 2017, with limited statistics to support the effort, Ms. Duffy assured Committee members that if she ever returned for more funding, she would have statistics to support her program.

Now, after two years, Ms. Duffy said, over 7,000 children had been helped with a 96 percent success rate. Success rates were based on recidivism or entry into the juvenile justice system. After program intervention, only 4 percent of the children entered into the juvenile justice system, a great win for Clark County. Law enforcement referrals from the Clark County School District (CCSD) from 2017 to 2018 were reduced by approximately 25 percent. Instead of sending youth to booking, detention centers, or probation officers, the assessment center was used for immediate services.

Ms. Duffy said that with the \$1.9 million from last session, the facility, the only runaway facility in Clark County, was expanded to 24-hour service. A second location was opened in the west end of Las Vegas at West Charleston Boulevard and South Jones Boulevard in a building donated by the state. The original request of \$16 million was based on the number of calls from community members, including the late Assemblyman Thompson who wanted a facility in his district. After listening to other programs that needed funding, the amendment was submitted to maintain level funding for the Harbor's juvenile assessment programs.

Ms. Duffy stated that the Harbor partnered with Nevada Homes for Youth and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services. Families who arrived with no health insurance were connected to Medicaid and other aid programs. For the CCSD, deputy district attorneys assisted law enforcement bringing children to the Harbor, where mobile mental health crisis services were available. The intent was to get children to the right place at the right time to meet the needs of youth and families. She appreciated the opportunity to make a difference in children's lives in Clark County.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for any questions.

Assemblyman Frierson had visited the Harbor, and he recognized the value the facility provided. While the success rate included youth that might have succeeded anyway, it was worth the expense to help those who would not have succeeded. At the Harbor, he had seen youth develop relations that exceeded program goals and who then returned as "big brothers" to help other youth. The collaboration between the juvenile division and juvenile justice, as well as the partnerships that had been developed, all served to benefit youth. This program changed lives. He questioned the recidivism rate and whether there was a window of time that was used for this calculation. Ms. Duffy said that her office checked every six months to see whether youths had returned to the system.

Assemblyman Frierson asked whether it was an indefinite statistic. He wondered whether a juvenile who committed a crime two years down the road would be reflected in her statistic, and Ms. Duffy said that the youth who committed a crime two years down the road

would be reflected in her statistic for recidivism. Youths who served detention were screened to see if there was a Harbor stay in their history, and for the few children for whom this happened, it was reflected in her calculation, and she used those examples to identify how the system could better serve children and youth.

Assemblyman Frierson asked about the percentage of youth who did recidivate, and he wondered whether some returned a second or third time and then never returned again. He believed there could be successes even for those youth that returned a second time. Ms. Duffy said that scenario had occurred, and she had learned that sometimes it took repeated consequences before youth understood. She often warned her own children not to make a mistake if they could not recover.

Chair Carlton asked for extrapolations about the cost savings to the county, the state, or the mental health system, from the 96 percent who did not return to the juvenile justice system. Ms. Duffy said that the effect on school districts was being reviewed, including graduation, expulsion, and suspension rates to ensure those rates were declining. She was not aware of other types of financial studies that might be occurring.

Assemblywoman Titus stated that she believed that this was a strong investment in society that saved dollars, as well as lives, down the road. She wanted to see program statistics that spoke to the cost savings.

Assemblyman Kramer had toured the Harbor facility, and he was impressed with the attitudes of staff members at the facility. He believed that everyone would want to have Harbor staff members as friends. He liked the idea that runaways could spend a night at the Harbor, receive counseling, and talk to someone who was almost a peer and who would provide guidance in a nonjudgmental way. He liked the concept of an intermediary step for law enforcement to use when a youth first took steps in the wrong direction. He did not know how many times this scenario might have happened, but he recognized the value in having a Harbor-type facility in Carson City.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno encouraged all Committee members to take a tour of the Harbor facility. The program affected not only the youth who entered the facility, but also the families of clients. Younger siblings who might be negatively affected by the actions of an older sibling were also provided guidance.

Assemblywoman Neal found the Harbor program interesting, but she had recently heard that the Harbor was accepting three- and five-year old children. She wondered whether this was an extension of the family unit that was being served by the facility, but if not, she wondered about the admission criteria used because those children were not part of a truancy program or a restorative justice program. She wondered what behaviors were seen in children that young that could result in an eligibility for service. Ms. Duffy said that the Harbor had seen children as young as three years old who were community referrals. In all situations, there were grandparents, who were overwhelmed, needed help, or may have had their own health

problems, raising children. Services were intended for grandparents who did not know how to control behaviors of their grandchildren. No one was turned away from the Harbor, but the Harbor assisted in determining what services or referrals were needed, including a social service referral, legal help for guardianship, or financial assistance.

Assemblywoman Neal asked whether the services provided by the Harbor were financial or whether there was a behavioral component. She noted that the trigger indicated "adverse experience" which was a broad term. She recognized that environments were critical in any setting, and she did not understand how an "adverse experience" moved a child from a school to the Harbor. She also did not understand how the restorative justice program overlaid on this program, and she wanted to better understand the screening process for a student who was in the restorative justice program and how many times the student met with a counselor before the student was determined to be eligible for the Harbor. Tammy Malich, Assistant Superintendent, Clark County School District (CCSD), said that the CCSD did not refer any three-year old children to the Harbor. In those cases, a guardian brought children to the Harbor. For a district referral, there were two ways to refer a child. The first way was in lieu of juvenile booking where school district police routed a child to the Harbor instead of sending a child to juvenile detention. The second way was referrals from teachers, counselors, or administrators, which was used in a preventive way when students exhibited behavior or when families were dealing with difficult circumstances that could not be managed. The student was referred to the Harbor, and the family transported the student to the Harbor. Children were not forced to go or transported to the Harbor by the CCSD, unless law enforcement was involved.

Assemblywoman Neal stated that referral for admission was a parent or guardian process, not a counselor, teacher, or principal-driven process. She asked whether a parent made the final decision for admission. Ms. Malich confirmed that a parent made the final decision.

Assemblywoman Spiegel noted that serving 7,100 youth with \$1.9 million in funding calculated to \$267.61 per client served, with great results.

Hearing no other questions from Committee members, the Chair opened the meeting for those in support of A.B. 322.

Stephen Augspurger, a paid lobbyist and Executive Director representing the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees, spoke in support of A.B. 322 and stated that he served on a School Justice Partnership Program and had visited the Harbor many times. He believed in the Harbor, and he shared the vision of multiple Harbor facilities across Las Vegas. For children who were struggling or in trouble, the facility offered children another chance for success. The organization he represented included 360 principals who were rapidly recognizing that the Harbor was a great resource, an intervention, and another tool to help put children on a path to success. As much as he loved the Harbor, he was disappointed that more funding was not available for his vision of multiple Harbor facilities. The return on investment for the Harbor was amazing.

A.J. Delap, Government Liaison, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, spoke in support of A.B. 322. As a police officer with 22 years of service, he noted that the facility was created through in-kind services of community members, and the fruit of those efforts were realized immediately. This facility was a positive partner with effective resources that provided a diversion from the pipeline leading to jail.

Paige Barnes, a paid lobbyist with Crowley & Ferrato Public Affairs, representing Communities in Schools, an evidence-based dropout program to help highest needs students in schools, spoke in support of A.B. 322. She supported the efforts of the Harbor in the community along with any funding to support the work performed at the Harbor.

Rick McCann, a paid lobbyist representing the Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers and a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition, spoke in support of A.B. 322. He represented approximately 10,000 officers across Nevada. In addition to representing many officers who encountered youth on the streets, he also represented the juvenile justice probation officers and supervisors. The Harbor program was well respected by the organizations he represented, and he fully supported A.B. 322.

Marc Ellis, a paid lobbyist representing the Communication Workers of America, spoke in support of A.B. 322. He believed the program should be a statewide program. He lived in Carson City and wanted to see facilities like the Harbor across the state, and he wished there were Harbor facilities when he was a child because it would have helped him. He supported the Harbor and A.B. 322.

Hearing no one else in Carson City in support of A.B. 322, Chair Carlton asked whether there was anyone in support of the bill in Las Vegas.

Tammy Malich, Assistant Superintendent, Clark County School District (CCSD); Chair, Executive Steering Committee, the Harbor Juvenile Assessment Center; and Educational Equity Co-Chair, Las Vegas My Brother's Keeper Alliance, spoke in support of A.B. 322. Nevada's attention and resources should be directed toward providing appropriate opportunities for youth, and A.B. 322 sought to further that trajectory for Nevada. She offered support for this bill in hopes of providing the community with the resources needed to address the needs of youth and families that would provide services to youth, rather than relying on punitive disciplinary approaches which were ineffective and did not contribute to, redirect, or change behavior. This bill provided funding for continued additional community service referrals which were important to the well-being of youth and families, especially minority and economically disadvantaged youth.

As Chair of the Harbor Juvenile Assessment Center's Executive Steering Committee, Ms. Malich highlighted the Harbor as a strong restorative justice resource in the community. The Harbor was a safe place for youth aged 17 and under, including those as young as 3 years old and their families. The facility diverted youth from the juvenile justice system by proactively connecting families to free services from partnering agencies as well as serving youth referred by community agencies in a preventive manner. These services helped youth

cope with challenging behaviors before problems escalated and became more serious. Resources included assessments, court diversion programs, substance abuse interventions, conflict management and educational supports, among other resources. Since the Harbor opened over two years ago, over 7,000 youth had been served with a 96 percent success rate, and youth were tracked from the time they arrived at the Harbor. At the last Harbor Executive Steering Committee meeting, several Harbor-served youth spoke about the effect the Harbor had on their lives and how the Harbor kept them from further contact with law enforcement and refocused them on school and earning a diploma. The Harbor-served youth who spoke at the meeting all graduated from the CCSD that week.

Ms. Malich said that the Harbor had two busy locations, with a third facility set to open when funding became available. The Harbor was led by Clark County Department of Juvenile Justice Services and had numerous invested partners including the CCSD which had referred 1,852 youth through April 2019, the City of Las Vegas, the Las Vegas My Brother's Keeper Alliance, several nonprofit organizations, and law enforcement. All partners shared the work of the Harbor, and each agency leveraged resources as well.

Ms. Malich noted that law enforcement officers, school administrators, service providers, and community members all had shared positive effects on youth and families from the Harbor. Youth needed a chance at success, and increased funding for the Harbor's Juvenile Assessment Center would provide that chance to more youth. A study was underway to track credits earned, grade point averages, attendance, and discipline for Harbor-served youth. The cost was approximately \$300 per day to serve a youth in a juvenile detention center. Compared to the Harbor and the number of youth served, the economic savings became apparent.

Hearing no others in support, Chair Carlton asked for those in opposition to or neutral on A.B. 322. Hearing no one, the Chair asked Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for closing comments.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno said the late Assemblyman Thompson's district was next to hers, and they were great friends. They did substantial work with youth in the community, and she encouraged Committee members to support A.B. 322.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 322.

**Assembly Bill 383 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to student education loans.  
(BDR 55-880)**

Assemblyman Howard Watts III, Assembly District No. 15, introduced Assembly Bill (A.B.) 383 (1st Reprint) brought forward by Assemblyman Frierson. This bill included two key components. First, the bill created a student loan ombudsman position, a consumer advocate type of position that would help student borrowers navigate problems that arose from student loan payments. The second component focused on licensing and regulating student loan servicers to ensure all actions were legal and appropriate.

Assemblyman Watts noted that A.B. 383 (R1) had moved from the policy committee and conversations were held with the Office of the State Treasurer and the Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry, to resolve financial questions for licensing and regulation of the servicers. A proposed amendment to the bill, Exhibit E, removed licensing and regulating servicers from the bill and focused on creating the ombudsmen position to advocate for and assist student borrowers in Nevada. The ombudsman position was intended to gather data and prepare reports to be used in determining oversight and regulation of servicers for the 81st Session (2021).

In summary, Assemblyman Watts said that Exhibit E deleted several sections of the bill related to licensing and oversight by the Division of Financial Institutions. The Division had provided confirmation that the amendment resolved the need for the Division's fiscal note, the only fiscal note on the bill. The proposed amendment also added a new section to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 353B.350 which allowed the Office of the State Treasurer to use the Nevada College Savings Trust Fund to fund the ombudsman position. No State General Fund appropriations would be required for the ombudsman position.

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, said that the ombudsman duties would best be handled by a management analyst position at a cost of \$82,769 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$104,797 in FY 2021, all of which would be paid from the College Savings Endowment Account.

Chair Carlton asked for verification that funding would come from the Endowment Account, and Treasurer Conine verified that funding would come from the Endowment Account.

Chair Carlton asked for questions from Committee members.

Assemblyman Kramer noted that the position would be transferred from the Department of Business and Industry (B&I) to the Office of the State Treasurer, and he asked whether there would be a corresponding decrease at B&I. Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, replied that the position was an additional position recommended for B&I. The amendment moved the position to the Office of the State Treasurer with no effect to the B&I budget. Assemblyman Watts confirmed her statement.

Hearing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked to hear from those in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 383 (R1). Hearing no one, the Chair closed the hearing on A.B. 383 (R1).



**Assembly Bill 466 (1st Reprint): Requires the creation of a pilot program to facilitate certain financial transactions relating to marijuana. (BDR 18-870)**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1, introduced Assembly Bill (A.B.) 466 (1st Reprint) which required the Office of the State Treasurer to create a pilot program for the establishment of one or more closed-loop payment processing systems to enable recreational and medical marijuana establishments, consumers, and holders of registered identification cards or letters of approval, to engage in financial transactions in a safe and efficient manner. The bill required that at least one closed-loop payment processing system established under the pilot program begin operation no later than July 1, 2020. Unique challenges were recognized in the expanding recreational and medical marijuana industries. Marijuana-related companies needed to conduct transactions with cash because of a lack of access to financial systems. Those establishments held, distributed, and transported large sums of cash which posed a risk to the safety and welfare of residents and visitors. As the bill was originally presented to the policy committee, there was a fiscal note from the Office of the State Treasurer. However, after numerous discussions and a few amendments, the fiscal note had been removed.

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, noted that his office had submitted an amended fiscal note, and pursuant to section 1, subsection 5 of the bill, fees generated by vendors or participants in the program would be sufficient to cover the Office of the State Treasurer's costs.

Melanie Young, Executive Director, Department of Taxation, stated that an undetermined fiscal note was submitted for the bill. She intended to work with the Office of the State Treasurer on the pilot project, and she would evaluate the fiscal consequences as the project advanced.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked whether a closed-loop system was similar to Venmo or Apple Cash. Treasurer Conine replied that after cash entered the system, the cash could circle around in the closed loop before leaving the system. Apple Pay would be an example if Apple Pay was used to pay a vendor, and then that vendor used Apple Pay to pay another vendor.

Assemblyman Kramer heard Treasurer Conine and Ms. Young say "system," not "systems." His understanding from previous hearings was that all systems would be evaluated, and multiple plans would be selected. Treasurer Conine explained that the solution would be a market-based system, and he expected numerous vendors, many of whom had already come forward, to provide the best solution for Nevada.

Assemblywoman Titus acknowledged the large amounts of cash that marijuana legislation created, and because marijuana was illegal under federal laws, the state needed a system

solution. She wanted to ensure that cash was accounted for and that everyone was safe. She appreciated innovative ideas.

Hearing no other questions on A.B. 466 (R1), Chair Carlton asked to hear from those in support of the bill.

Randy Soltero, a paid lobbyist representing the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, spoke in support of A.B. 466 (R1). He said that he represented workers in the marijuana industry, both in dispensaries and at grow facilities. He believed that this bill would create a way to safely pay workers in the industry.

Chair Carlton asked whether there was anyone else in support of A.B. 466 (R1), and hearing no one, she asked if anyone was in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. The Chair noted that there were no proposed amendments on this bill, but a fiscal note had been removed, and closed the hearing on A.B. 466 (R1).

**Assembly Bill 489 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment of and funds a pilot program relating to federal and nongovernmental organization grants. (BDR S-1109)**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1, introduced Assembly Bill (A.B.) 489 (1st Reprint). During the interim, she served on the Southern Nevada Forum as Vice Chair of the Good Governance Subcommittee. One finding from the Forum was that the state of Nevada failed to take advantage of financial opportunities because there was no federal grant-matching program. This bill would form a pilot program to establish a federal grant-matching program for Nevada because the state received a disproportionately low amount of federal grants both on a total and a per capita basis. She understood the financial constraints in budgeting for state government, and she recognized that funding this program would be difficult, but she wanted to ensure that enabling language was created to build a program when funding became available. There was a fiscal note submitted by the Department of Administration (DOA) for \$92,067 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$87,797 in FY 2021. This money would fund one full-time equivalent (FTE) position. She believed that the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination, and Management was understaffed, and failing to create an additional position would not be a responsible action and would not be in the best interest of her constituents. She further requested that the FTE position be assigned to southern Nevada where the larger population was located. A proposed amendment, Exhibit F, added clarifying language regarding the duties of the proposed position.

Helen Foley, a paid lobbyist and President, Public Affairs, Faiss Foley Warren, representing the Nevada Community Foundation, one of the largest charitable foundations in Nevada, spoke in support of A.B. 489 (R1). The Nevada Community Foundation served to connect philanthropic donors with nonprofit organizations to improve the quality of life and to create opportunities for Nevada. Since 2015, the Foundation had actively supported legislation focused on improving Nevada's federal grant capacity and competitiveness. Nevada was

ranked 49th for states receiving competitive federal grants. Moving from 49th position to 48th position would result in over \$250 million in additional federal funds for Nevada. Arizona had worked to improve their ranking over the last five years and had gained ten spots, so improvement was possible. Organizations, local governments, and state governments frequently did not have the matching capability, and this legislation, she noted, would give Nevada a kick start. The Nevada Grants Council and the Nevada Grant Office, also known as the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination, and Management, had studied the situation, and many individuals and organizations had worked to improve Nevada's standing, including the Ritter Charitable Trust and the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA), the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, the Council for Better Government, and many other organizations. She advised Committee members not to waste more sessions without capturing federal grants.

Mark H. Fiorentino, a paid lobbyist with Kaempfer Crowell, representing the John Ritter and the Ritter Charitable Trust, spoke in support of A.B. 489 (R1). As Nevada struggled to find ways to fund the needs of Nevada constituents, the significance of this legislation became apparent. This bill provided a framework for a powerful tool. Mr. Ritter chaired the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance since its inception. The Council was asked to look at what other states were doing and to make recommendations on how Nevada could do better. One of the primary recommendations from the Council was to create and fund a matching program. He understood funding constraints, but he urged Committee members to support A.B. 489 (R1).

Mr. Fiorentino advised Committee members that Mr. Ritter had already provided a substantial amount of volunteer time as well as the Ritter Charitable Trust's time and resources, and Mr. Ritter was willing to continue to provide that time and resources if Committee members approved the framework. If the position could not be funded, Mr. Fiorentino noted, perhaps there was a way to cobble existing state resources together.

Miles Dickson, Chief of Staff, Office of the State Treasurer, echoed comments made by others. Federal grants and matching funds had been a long-term challenge faced by the state of Nevada. Mr. Dickson recognized JoVon Sotak, a new administrator for the Nevada Grant Office. The bill, A.B. 489 (R1), contained a requirement that for every dollar of state money spent, there needed to be a \$2 return on investment. A state dollar, therefore, turned into \$3 when the funds went to the state program or project and was one of the reasons why federal grant funding was such a valuable opportunity. Many federal grants had a matching or maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement so there was a significant leverage opportunity. The first stop for the vast majority of federal grant funding, after leaving Washington D.C. or a regional federal office had to be a state government entity, which then moved the funding as subgrants to local governments, tribal nations, or nonprofit organizations. Clarifying the ability for the Nevada Grant Office to work with those groups as the program was established was critical.

Chair Carlton noted [Exhibit E](#) and wondered whether it might be better to coordinate with the Washington office instead of members of Congress. Mr. Fiorentino advised that "members

of Congress" was from existing language in statute. Chair Carlton said she would think about the best wording to ensure communication with the delegation existed.

Chair Carlton asked for any questions from Committee members.

Assemblyman Kramer believed that this bill was a good way to leverage more money for Nevada, but with a background in local government, he recognized the value in having a centralized office for this function. He wondered whether grant expertise could be offered to local governments with a fee charged for the service. Mr. Fiorentino said there was existing language in the proposed amendment that authorized the office to provide resources and grant training to local governments.

Hearing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked to hear from those in support of A.B. 489 (R1).

Susan L. Fisher, a paid lobbyist with McDonald Carano, representing the Nevada Blind Children's Foundation, spoke in support of A.B. 489 (R1). Nevada was one of seven states in the nation without a school for blind children. She noted that a group of teenage boys earlier in the session were privately funded by members of the board from the Nevada Blind Children's Foundation. The boys stayed at Lake Tahoe for a week and were able to meet legislators, Speaker Frierson, and Supreme Court Justices, and it was the trip of a lifetime for the boys. She hoped to capture funds to help blind children and their families earlier in the process. A few grant dollars helped to secure donor dollars, and she encouraged Committee members to support A.B. 489 (R1).

David Dazlich, a paid lobbyist representing the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of A.B. 489 (R1). This bill was a priority for the Southern Nevada Forum as Nevada continued to grow, and a framework for federal grants was necessary to leverage grant potential for infrastructure and economic development projects. He urged Committee members to vote yes on A.B. 489 (R1).

Hearing no one else in support of A.B. 489 (R1), Chair Carlton asked for anyone in opposition to or neutral on the bill, and hearing no one, the Chair closed the hearing on A.B. 489 (R1).

Chair Carlton opened a work session to move several bills.

**Assembly Bill 104: Makes an appropriation to the Account for the Nevada Main Street Program. (BDR S-532)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 104 made an appropriation of \$350,000 to the Account for the Nevada Main Street program as presented by Assemblywoman Swank. The effective date for the bill was July 1, 2019. The Chair asked that the bill be amended to passage and approval because it was a one-shot appropriation.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 104, and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 104 EFFECTIVE UPON PASSAGE AND APPROVAL.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Swank.

**Assembly Bill 229 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment of a technical advisory program for the protection and preservation of certain buildings and structures. (BDR 33-299)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 229 (1st Reprint) required the administrator of the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, to establish and administer a technical advisory program to provide technical services for grants and for the protection and preservation of buildings and structures in Nevada that were at least 50 years old. The request for funding was \$10,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 for organizational work and establishment of program infrastructure. The request for funding for FY 2021 was \$20,000 to be used for program grants.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 229 (R1), and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS  
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 229 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Swank.

**Assembly Bill 262: Revises provisions relating to children. (BDR 11-131)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 262 revised provisions related to children. A proposed amendment, Exhibit C, removed significant portions of the bill related to child support, and the bill now required that voices of children were heard by judges in certain judicial proceedings. The Division of Welfare and Supportive Services indicated that the fiscal note submitted by the Division no longer applied with Exhibit C. The bill was presented by Assemblyman Wheeler.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 262 and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 262.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler.

**Assembly Bill 322: Establishes provisions relating to juvenile assessment centers. (BDR 5-713)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 322 required a juvenile assessment center subject to available funding to provide comprehensive support to persons in a school district who were screened and identified as having adverse childhood experiences that warranted the need for such services. Proposed amendment, Exhibit D, reduced the appropriation to \$1.9 million for a program that currently existed in the 8th Judicial District that was established during the 2017-2019 biennium. There were no fiscal notes attached to the bill, but there would be an amendment for the appropriation amount.

Chair Carlton explained that there was a lot of discussion on this bill. Original discussions indicated that funding would be static, but because one-shot funding was available and based on conversations with Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and in honor of the late Assemblyman Thompson, the Chair believed that additional funding for this bill was appropriate. The Chair recommended funding A.B. 322 at the \$3 million level.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 322.

Ms. Jones clarified that the amendment would specify that the original \$1.9 million would be used for the existing program in the 8th Judicial District, and the additional \$1.1 million would be used in Assembly District 17. Chair Carlton did not want to restrict the \$1.1 million in additional funding to the specific district because another block outside the district may have been an appropriate location for the new center.

Assemblywoman Titus stated that she supported the bill as amended in memory of the late Assemblyman Thompson. She wondered whether the Harbor had a foundation or a mechanism to accept personal donations in memory of the late Assemblyman Thompson. Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno was not sure whether the Harbor had any mechanism, but there was a foundation being established in the late Assemblyman's name, and there was a family resource center that the late Assemblyman and the Department of Health and Human Services had been working to create in his district. Assemblywoman Titus asked for more information on the foundation as soon as it was available, and Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno said she would provide it.

Assemblyman Frierson agreed that the additional funds could only be used in Assembly District 17, but he also wanted to see flexibility for the location of the assessment center. The late Assemblyman Thompson recognized the need for and advocated for an assessment center in his zip code. Assemblyman Frierson supported the bill, and he supported providing flexibility to address a community need that Assemblyman Thompson fought to address.

Hearing no other questions, Chair Carlton requested a motion. She asked that the bill be amended to \$3 million.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 322 FOR \$3 MILLION EFFECTIVE UPON PASSAGE  
AND APPROVAL.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.



**Assembly Bill 338 (1st Reprint): Revises requirements for the operation of a motor vehicle by a young driver. (BDR 43-600)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 338 (R1) authorized the completion of a defensive driving course for any applicant for a driver's license who was under 18 years of age and required the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to approve a hands-on defensive driving course in lieu of the completion of 50 hours of supervised driving experience in areas where a course was not offered in a 30-mile radius of a person's residence. The bill was presented by Assemblyman Wheeler with Youth Legislator Nathan Tea. The DMV indicated a need for \$91,844 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$92,099 in FY 2021 for an additional position to work on the regulation of driver education courses and to facilitate the addition of this new program. Those funds would come from the State Highway Fund.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 338 (R1).

Assemblywoman Titus explained that when she was first approached about this bill, she had concerns about accessibility and the potential cost of the classes in rural areas, but she now supported the bill.

Hearing no other questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND  
DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 338 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler.

**Assembly Bill 383 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to student education loans. (BDR 55-880)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 383 (R1) revised provisions related to student loans. The bill as amended established a new chapter governing the license and regulation of student loan services by the Office of the State Treasurer and designated a student loan ombudsman in the Office of the State Treasurer. The Office of the State Treasurer submitted an unsolicited fiscal note for an additional classified management analyst position to act as the ombudsman in the amount of \$82,769 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$104,797 in FY 2021.



Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 383 (R1), and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 383 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblyman Howard Watts III, Assembly District No. 15.

**Assembly Bill 466 (1st Reprint): Requires the creation of a pilot program to facilitate certain financial transactions relating to marijuana. (BDR 18-870)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 466 (R1) created a pilot program to facilitate certain financial transactions relating to marijuana, also known as the closed-loop system bill. The bill required the State Treasurer to create a pilot program for the establishment of one or more closed-loop payment processing systems to enable certain persons to engage in financial transactions related to marijuana instead of the existing cash basis. The Office of the State Treasurer would work with private loop vendors on this system; however, there was an indication that an amendment to add funding to the bill was not required. The cost of the system(s) would be funded through user fees from vendors and participants using the system. The fiscal note was removed from the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 466 (R1), and hearing no questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 466 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

**Assembly Bill 489 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment of and funds a pilot program relating to federal and nongovernmental organization grants. (BDR S-1109)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 489 (R1) required the establishment of funds for a pilot program related to grants and nongovernmental organizations. The bill as amended would create a grant matching fund in the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, which would allow state agencies, local governments, tribal governments, and nonprofit organizations to request funds to be used to satisfy a matching grant. During the hearing, it was indicated that the request would remove the appropriation from the bill and establish infrastructure. An amendment specifying "to the extent funds were available" would be needed. The Nevada Grant Office had indicated a need for an additional position for the Office in Las Vegas at a cost of \$92,067 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$87,797 in FY 2021. Ms. Jones noted that a mockup of the bill clarified the responsibilities of the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management.

Chair Carlton asked whether Committee members had any questions on A.B. 489 (R1).

Assemblywoman Spiegel stated that during the interim, she served on the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance, and she saw firsthand how important the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management and the position in southern Nevada were. She saw the potential from this bill, and she encouraged Committee members to support A.B. 489 (R1).

Chair Carlton noted that Committee members supported this bill, and she believed it was appropriate to move the bill forward. In the future, she hoped to commit funds for this effort, but she did not want to delay the bill that established the framework at this time.

Hearing no other questions, the Chair requested a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 489 (R1) TO REMOVE THE ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION, INCORPORATE FUNDING OF \$92,067 IN FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2020 AND \$87,797 IN FY 2021, AND INDICATE "TO THE EXTENT FUNDS WERE AVAILABLE."

ASSEMBLYMAN KRAMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Carlton asked Committee members for questions or comments on the motion, and hearing no questions or comments, the Chair called for a vote.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

Chair Carlton asked for public comment, and hearing no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Carmen M. Neveau  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is proposed amendment No. 977 to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 262 presented by Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 322 from Clark County presented by Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 383 presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts III, Assembly District No. 15.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 489 presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1.