

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

**Eightieth Session
May 30, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:11 a.m. on Thursday, May 30, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/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:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5
Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Senior Program Analyst

Minutes ID: 1427



Jeff A. Ferguson, Senior Program Analyst
Karen Hoppe, Senior Program Analyst
Brody Leiser, Senior Program Analyst
Kristina Shea, Program Analyst
Nancy Morris, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After Committee staff called roll, Chair Carlton stated that drafts of two of the five money bills were on Committee members' desks for their review. The corresponding bill draft requests would be reviewed and moved for introduction in the Committee.

Chair Carlton asked Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to begin the process. Ms. Jones stated that Fiscal Analysis Division staff would walk the Committee through the draft bill draft request for the Capital Improvement Bill.

BDR S-1282: Authorizes and provides funding for certain projects of capital improvement.
(Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 541](#).)

Kristina Shea, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), stated she would present Bill Draft Request (BDR) S-1282 which implemented the 2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The money committees closed the 2019 CIP on May 21, 2019, and Ms. Shea noted that a number of the projects had multiple funding sources and would be listed in multiple sections of the BDR.

Ms. Shea began her summary of the CIP BDR with page 1, section 1, which appropriated \$60,842,548 in State General Funds to provide a portion of the funding to support the 2019 CIP. On page 5, section 2 limited the authority for expenditure through June 30, 2023, and established a reversion of any remaining funds for the projects identified in section 1. Similar language was included in sections 4, 7, 9, and 24 to address reversions for the various sources of funds to support the 2019 CIP. Similar language was included throughout the BDR following each section that appropriated or authorized funding. Section 3, on page 5, appropriated State Highway Funds of \$8,841,972 to provide a portion of the funding in the 2019 CIP for 11 Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) projects and Department of Public Safety (DPS) facility projects as listed in the section. Section 5 restricted the transfer of Highway Funds for projects identified in section 3 until contract payments were required. Section 6 of the bill authorized \$186 million in general obligation bonds for projects identified in this section. This section also reallocated \$3,469,121 of bonds previously issued under prior CIP legislation for projects identified under this section. Section 6 also provided that proceeds from bonds already issued shall be spent before the proceeds for any new bond issuance pursuant to this section were used. Section 8 authorized \$5,344,346 in general obligation bonds for CIP project 19-C01, which was the Completion of the South Reno Department of Motor Vehicles Service Office. This section also established the required annual debt service payments on the bonds for the project from the Highway Fund and the Pollution Control Account. Based on estimated square-foot allocations, the Highway Fund

would be responsible for 88 percent and the Pollution Control Account would be responsible for 12 percent of the annual debt service required by this section.

Ms. Shea continued with section 10 that specified the State Board of Finance would issue general obligation bonds for the 2019 CIP when it was deemed appropriate. Subsection 2 allowed the State Controller to advance General Funds if bonds had not yet been sold to finance the projects approved in the 2019 CIP. Subsection 3 allowed the State Controller to advance Highway Fund money if bonds had not yet been sold to finance CIP project 19-C01, the completion of the South Reno DMV Service Office. If General Funds or Highway Funds were advanced, the amounts must be immediately repaid to the General Fund or Highway Fund upon the issuance of the bonds. Section 11 authorized \$38,466,528 from funding sources other than General Funds or Highway Funds for projects identified in this section. Subsection 2 required the State Public Works Division (SPWD), Department of Administration, to not execute a contract for construction of a project approved in the 2019 CIP that included authorized nonstate receipts under the SPWD until the SPWD had determined that the nonstate funding had been awarded and was available for expenditure. Section 12 of the bill required that the SPWD use only qualified personnel to execute the 2019 CIP. Section 13 required state and local government entities to cooperate with the SPWD in carrying out the provisions of the CIP.

Continuing with her overview, Ms. Shea stated that section 14 of the BDR authorized not more than \$3 million for a cultural affairs historic preservation bond program. Sections 15 and 16 authorized a combined total of \$8 million for the Tahoe Environmental Bond program. Section 15 continued the remaining authority of \$4 million as approved by Senate Bill (S.B.) 438 of the 76th Session (2011), and section 16 authorized \$4 million of the authority as proposed to be established under Assembly Bill 220 of the current Legislative Session. Ms. Shea noted that Assembly Bill 220 was approved and signed by the Governor on May 27, 2019. Section 17 authorized \$3 million for the water infrastructure bond program. Section 18 explained that the bonds issued under sections 15, 16, and 17 were exempt from the Constitutional debt limit. Section 19 approved ad valorem taxes for the Question 1 (Q1) [a 2002 ballot question approved by the voters] bond program and for general obligation debt service. For the State general obligation debt, 15.75 cents on every \$100 of assessed valuation would be used to support existing general obligation bond debt of the state for prior bond issuance and for the bonds that were sold for the CIP. An ad valorem tax of 1.25 cents for every \$100 of assessed valuation would be used to support the bonds sold for the Q1 program. The overall rate of 17 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation remained the same as approved for the current biennium.

Moving on with her presentation, Ms. Shea noted that section 20 required the State Treasurer to establish sufficient funding and determine whether the amounts existing in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption Fund were sufficient to pay the principal and interest on past CIP issuances, as well as the current issuance. If there was not enough money in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption Fund, the Treasurer could request the State Controller to reserve money in the State General Fund to pay those debts. Section 21 authorized the State Board of Finance to pay expenses related to the issuance of general

obligation bonds. Section 22 authorized \$160,416,624 for fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$159,100,201 in FY 2021 to pay for bonds in the Consolidated Bond Interest and Redemption account. Section 23 authorized the State Public Works Division (SPWD) and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), with the approval of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC), to transfer money from one project within the same agency to another. Section 24 allocated \$3,447,341 of slot tax revenue from the Special Capital Construction Fund for Higher Education to NSHE deferred maintenance project CIP 19-M08. Sections 25 through 27 revised the reversion language from prior CIP legislation to reallocate bonds issued under prior Legislative approval to the projects identified in section 6. Sections 28 through 30 further extended the reversion dates for eight project extensions from the 2015 CIP. Section 29 also revised the reversion language from the 2015 CIP legislation to allow for the reallocation of bonds for use on projects identified in section 6.

Section 31 authorized the use of any unspent and unneeded bond proceeds issued for the funding of construction of the new DMV facility in South Reno, project 17-C04, to be used for the completion of the new DMV facility in Reno in CIP 19-C01 prior to the expenditure of any proceeds authorized in section 8 of this act. The final section of the BDR, section 32, made the act effective upon passage and approval.

Chair Carlton thanked the Assembly Subcommittee on K12/Higher Education/CIP for its hard work on the CIP. She made the analogy that the five money bills were like Christmas morning in regard to months of preparation for an event that was over in 15 minutes. Seeing no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for a motion to introduce the BDR.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1282.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Benitez-Thompson, Frierson, and Hambrick were not present for the vote.)

Chair Carlton stated that Senator Woodhouse's bills would be heard next.

Senate Bill 193: Makes an appropriation for educational programs relating to history, law and civics. (BDR S-368)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 193 made a small, but important, appropriation to the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement to support the We the People: The Citizen and The Constitution programs in elementary, middle, and high schools throughout Nevada. According to the Center for Civic Education, We the People was developed in 1987 and adopted by the Commission on the Bicentennial of the *U.S. Constitution*, chaired by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, as the principal education program of the federal Constitution's bicentennial. The program's success at the Bicentennial Commission led to its continuation by Congress through the U.S. Department of Education

from 1993 to 2011 as an authorized program within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program complemented the regular school curriculum by providing students with an innovative course of instruction on the history and principles of the U.S. constitutional democracy. Since the program's inception, more than 30 million students and 75,000 educators had participated nationwide, and thousands of Nevada students and teachers had benefited from its valuable curriculum. National funding for the program had been reduced significantly since 2011, and in-state resources to make up the difference had also diminished. Senate Bill 193 made a \$175,000 appropriation in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement for the specific purpose of supporting the We the People program in Nevada's elementary, middle, and high schools. The bill assured accountability by requiring the center to, upon acceptance of the money, prepare and transmit reports to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) that described each expenditure made. If requested by the Legislative Commission, the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement would make any accounts, books, reports, vouchers, and other information available to the Legislative auditor for the purposes of conducting an audit on the use of the appropriation. The bill also specified that the money appropriated should be available in either fiscal year and could not be committed for expenditure after June 30, 2021.

As a member that had often been asked to judge We the People competitions, Senator Woodhouse relayed how exciting it was to see teams of students debate the issues of the *U.S. Constitution* and answer questions because they had been well prepared by the We the People curriculum. She thanked Committee members for hearing the bill and encouraged them to support Senate Bill 193.

Chair Carlton, hearing no questions from the Committee, invited those in support of S.B. 193 to testify.

The Honorable Elissa F. Cadish, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada, spoke in support of S.B. 193. She noted that she had spoken in support of the bill in the Senate also. She had been involved in the We the People program for almost 30 years, since she first came to Nevada when she was clerking for Federal Court Judge Philip Pro who was running the program in Nevada. She was chair of the State Bar's We the People Committee and also sat on the board for the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement. The We the People program was a wonderful tool to not only teach students to memorize dates and places and names and battles, but also taught them to think critically about the issues. Students learned about constitutional principles, important cases interpreting those provisions, and how to apply them to current events. Students suddenly kept up with current events and had intelligent conversations about the principles. The program not only taught the information, but also taught students to be active, involved citizens who would become voters and jurors, some of whom would become lawyers and officeholders in the State. The project provided a true civics education.

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association, as a board member of the Center for Civic Engagement, spoke in support of S. B. 193. He had been involved with the We the People program since he was in high school 25 years ago, first as a

participant and then as a coach and judge. The program not only instilled knowledge and passion in the *U.S. Constitution*, but also instilled knowledge, passion, and engagement in the process. He urged the Committee to support Senate Bill 193.

Seeing no one else in support, Chair Carlton invited those in opposition to and neutral on S.B. 193 to testify. Seeing no one, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 193 and stated it would not move until the School Funding Bill passed. Chair Carlton stated that the next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 402 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 402 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning educational programs relating to science, technology, engineering and mathematics and makes an appropriation. (BDR 43-887)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 402 (1st Reprint) made changes relating to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and made a related appropriation. She provided the following information from the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT), Office of the Governor:

- The growth rate for STEM jobs in Nevada would be 50 percent higher than the growth rate for non-STEM jobs between now and 2026.
- STEM jobs paid an average of \$32.68 per hour compared to \$17.77 per hour for non-STEM jobs.
- Nevada had about 78,000 fewer STEM jobs than the national average.

Senator Woodhouse stated that S.B. 402 (R1) by itself would not close the skills gap, but would help promote STEM education. Among other things, the bill provided for the issuance of STEM license plates to help fund high-quality STEM programs that would help more students, especially those in underserved groups, become aware of and prepared for the many exciting opportunities and challenges awaiting those who pursued a career in STEM.

The bill also revised several existing requirements relating to the promotion and recognition of Nevada's STEM programs by the Advisory Council on STEM. Looking more specifically at the appropriations in this bill, section 14 made a related appropriation to OSIT to fund certain STEM programs and activities. Subsection 1 appropriated \$250,000 in each year of the biennium to award grants to elementary schools to promote equitable access and increase the quality of STEM-related programs. Subsection 2 appropriated \$300,000 in each year of the biennium to award grants to fund activities and programs that increased awareness of, and promoted the benefits of STEM-related programs. The grants in this subsection would be awarded through regional advisory boards in each of the three Nevada regions. Senator Woodhouse thanked the Committee for its consideration of S.B. 402 (R1). She introduced Brian Mitchell, Director, OSIT, Office of the Governor, to talk about the bill's importance.

Brian Mitchell, Director, OSIT, stated S.B. 402 (R1) had three topic areas with the goal of boosting STEM education in Nevada: STEM license plates, statutory cleanup of the STEM council's duties to recognize students and schools, and an appropriation for two new STEM programs. Each biennium, the STEM Advisory Council was required to make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding STEM, and S.B. 402 (R1) came directly from those recommendations. In the interest of time, he submitted his entire written comments for the record ([Exhibit C](#)) and briefly walked through the bill.

Mr. Mitchell stated that section 1 of the bill provided for the creation of STEM license plates, and proceeds from issuance of the license plates would be distributed by the STEM Advisory Council to high-quality STEM programs that raised awareness and increased interest in STEM programs. The Council would target the funds especially for students who had historically been underrepresented in STEM careers and programs. Sections 2 through 12 of the bill were conforming changes to the legislation. Section 13 of the bill was some statutory cleanup regarding how OSIT and the STEM Advisory Council recognized students in schools each year through their recognition events. The statutory cleanup removed the requirement that events be held at institutions of higher education, to allow the council to hold events at STEM business locations. Section 14 included appropriations for two programs that had proven successful in other states.

Mr. Mitchell noted that OSIT was neutral on the appropriations, and he was happy to answer any questions on the bill.

Chair Carlton clarified that the proceeds from the STEM license plates would go to OSIT and the end of the bill contained two appropriations. She asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 402 (R1). Seeing no one, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 402 (1st Revision). Chair Carlton stated that because this bill contained appropriations, it would sit with others. Before proceeding with other bill hearings, Chair Carlton stated that the draft of the Authorizations Act had been received and the Committee would review it before sending it to the Senate to introduce.

BDR S-1281: Authorizes expenditures by agencies of the State Government. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 553](#).)

Cathy Crocket, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that the Authorizations Act represented authority for agencies to collect and expend non-State General Fund and non-State Highway Fund revenues, including federal funds, gifts, grants, interagency transfers, fees, and other funds. In total, over the upcoming biennium, the Authorizations Act authorized spending of \$17.7 billion. Additionally, because of specific statutory language, the Act included General Fund authority for the Gaming Control Board and the Gaming Commission in the amount of \$64.2 million. The bill also included authority for the Nevada Department of Transportation to expend Highway Funds totaling \$971 million. In total the bill included funding of \$9.3 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$9.5 billion in FY 2021. Section 1 laid out the authorizations to the budget accounts in the state. Ms. Crocket noted that several budgets were not reflected in the

Authorizations Act because they were included in the Education Funding Bill, including the Marijuana Regulation and Control Account, the Distributive School Account, Other State Education Programs, School Remediation Trust Fund, State Supplemental School Support Account, Professional Development Program, Teach Nevada Scholarship Program, Contingency Account for Special Education Services, Teachers School Supplies Reimbursement, School Safety, and the New Nevada Education Funding Plan.

Section 2 reflected carryover language from the last biennium. According to the Master Settlement Agreement for tobacco settlement funds, compliance and enforcement functions were carried out by the Office of Attorney General and the Department of Taxation. Two disbursements were laid out in section 2. Ms. Crocket noted that there were several parallel sections in this bill to account for Assembly Bill (A.B.) 535, which would replace the tobacco settlement funding with some new cigarette license fees. The bill contained two different sections to authorize funding depending on whether A.B. 535 passed or not. Section 2 would be effective if A.B. 535 passed. Section 3, the parallel section to section 2, would only be effective if A.B. 535 did not pass. Section 4 included General Fund appropriations for the Gaming Control Board. Section 5 contained General Fund appropriations for the Gaming Commission. Section 6 was a carryover from the 79th Legislative Session, which authorized funding included in various sections of this bill to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the State Budget Act described in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 353. Section 6 exempted the Legislative Department, judicial agencies, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and Public Employees' Retirement System from the State Budget Act as provided in NRS 353.246; therefore their work programs did not require Interim Finance Committee (IFC) approval. Section 7 was a parallel section to section 6 and would be effective only if A.B. 535 did not pass.

Section 8 was carryover language from the previous biennium and specified that the Chief of the Budget Division might augment or reduce any authorizations laid out in this Act through the work program revision process outlined in NRS 353.220, except for the Legislative budgets. Subsection 2 allowed the Legislative Counsel Bureau Director, with approval of the Legislative Commission, to augment authorizations. Section 9 was a parallel section to section 8 if A.B. 535 did not pass. Section 10 was carryover language from last biennium and specified that General Fund or Highway Fund appropriations must be decreased to the extent that other revenue sources exceeded the authorizations in this Act. There were exceptions to this, which included the Nevada System of Higher Education and in certain circumstances, the State Public Defender, certain expenses in the Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), and Division of Child and Family Services budgets in certain circumstances.

Ms. Crocket noted section 11 was carryover language from the last biennium that allowed Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to expend fees and tuition from registration of resident or nonresident students in designated amounts specified in the bill. Section 11 authorized NSHE to expend additional registration fees and additional nonresident tuition revenues beyond budgeted enrollments and any additional fees resulting from fee increases.

It also specified that NSHE should report to the IFC every six months regarding any additional fees and expenditures that were funded with the fees, and this section was exempt from the provisions of section 10.

Ms. Crocket stated section 12 was carryover language from last biennium and provided for the allocation of county assessments for the services of the State Public Defender. Section 12 also specified that the Public Defender may accept additional contributions from the counties with the approval of the IFC and was exempt from section 10.

Section 13 was carryover language from the previous biennium and specified that the tax on motor fuel pursuant to NRS 365.535 should be allocated equally between the Department of Wildlife and the Division of State Parks, DCNR. Section 14 was carryover language from the prior biennium and specified that money authorized for the Division of Forestry, DCNR, Forestry Conservation Camps, and the Forest Fire Suppression account, for the repair and maintenance of firefighting vehicles could be expended for these purposes and was exempt from section 10 of this act.

Section 15 stated that money authorized for the State Fire Marshal from the Contingency Account for Hazardous Materials must be expended for training programs before any General Fund was expended for training programs. Section 16 was carryover language from last biennium and authorized the Division of Forestry to balance forward funding for its incident business unit. This section was also exempt from the provisions of section 10. Section 17 was also carryover language and allowed certain money to be carried forward for the repair of firefighting and emergency response vehicles up to \$425,000 per year. This was also exempt from section 10. Section 18 was carryover language that authorized the continuation of IFC Contingency Account funding in support of the sagebrush habitat improvement projects and specified that this funding did not revert. Section 19 was carryover language from the last biennium as well and indicated the WICHE Loans and Stipends budget could balance forward funding to the next year for Health Care Access Program slots for unobligated loans, stipends, and interest repayment revenues which were received after May 15 of each fiscal year. Section 20 was carryover language from the last biennium and authorized the carry forward of unexpended balances in the Emergency Operations Center Account of the Office of the Military. Section 21 was also carryover language and allowed for additional non-General Fund revenues to be accepted by the DCFS, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), with the approval of the IFC, to augment child welfare services. This was exempt from section 10. Section 22 was carryover language from last biennium and specified that money authorized for expenditure by NSHE in section 8 that remained unexpended could be carried forward to the next fiscal year.

Ms. Crocket stated that section 23 was a new section and authorized work program revisions to be processed for the Municipal Bond Bank Revenue and Municipal Bond Bank Debt Services budgets to be processed without IFC approval. Section 24 was also a new section and authorized technology fee revenues received in FY 2019 in the DMV's System Modernization budget to be balanced forward to the System Technology Application Redesign budget in FY 2020. Section 25 was also a new section and required the Fleet

Services Division, Department of Administration, to revert proceeds from excess vehicle sales to the General Fund rather than the Fleet Services fund. Section 26 directed the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) to receive the approval of the IFC upon recommendation of the Governor before expending or obligating reserves to change the health benefit plan. Section 27 required the Governor's Office of Economic Development to revert the remaining balance of the Catalyst Account except for remaining obligated grant awards.

The final section of the bill presented by Ms. Crocket was section 28, which specified the effective dates of the bill's sections. Section 27 relating to the Catalyst Account would be effective upon passage and approval. Sections 1, 4, 5, and 10 through 26 inclusive would be effective July 1, 2019. Sections 2, 6, and 8 would be effective July 1, 2019, only if A.B. 535 was passed by the Legislature and approved by the Governor. Sections 3, 7, and 9 would be effective July 1, 2019, only if A.B. 535 was not passed by the Legislature and approved by the Governor.

Assemblywoman Neal asked what necessitated section 23 that authorized the State Treasurer to process work programs without IFC approval.

Ms. Crocket explained this language was added because of the Committee's closing of the Office of the State Treasurer's budgets, and Ms. Crocket believed it was related to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB, agreed with Ms. Crocket and explained that there was discussion during Committee meetings about providing this exemption because there was some language within the CIP that allowed for the exemption of the Municipal Bond Bank Debt Services budget account; however, the revenue portion was not exempt, so the two were not synching properly. This required one portion of it to have IFC approval while the other side did not, creating the perception that the bond payments were contingent upon the approval of the IFC.

Chair Carlton added that her understanding of section 23 was to provide the assurance that the state would repay bonds it issued, and a future IFC meeting could not change the State's commitment.

Chair Carlton reminded Committee members there would be no motion on the BDR because this was just a review and the Senate Committee on Finance would discuss and introduce the bill. The bill would return to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and would not be presented in such detail again.

Chair Carlton stated the Committee would process Assembly Bills so they could get to the Assembly floor. The first bill to be heard was Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to veterans. (BDR 37-95)

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5, expressed her gratitude for hearing Assembly Bill (A.B.) 300 (1st Reprint) and stated she would briefly cover the bill. The bill pertained to presumptive conditions for service members and veterans, which were diseases or conditions that could be acquired through service. The most common example was Agent Orange but included the effects of mustard gas and burn pit exposure. There were dozens of conditions recognized by the federal government for which veterans could receive benefits. This bill ensured everyone entitled to the benefits was treated. The older a veteran was, more conditions could be recognized as being related to time in service. The bill provided coordination and a stronger efficiency between health-care practitioners and the Department of Veterans Services and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) through continuing education, outreach, and shared public resources. Assemblywoman Miller stated that all fiscal notes attached to the bill had been removed through collaboration with DHHS and the Medical Association. She had submitted emails from the boards and commissions who were still encouraged and excited to participate and had also removed their fiscal notes.

Chair Carlton noted the wording in the current version of the bill and the nonmandatory language and clarified that the bill encouraged health-care provider education so they would discuss the issues with their patients. She asked for more detail about the continuing education courses referenced in section 9 because often the licensee would have to pay for the course.

Assemblywoman Miller stated that the training was not mandatory, and DHHS and medical associations could work together to embed the additional training into training already being provided, which would give more accessibility to health-care practitioners.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson pointed out the phrase "the director shall" in section 6, subsections 1 and 2 in reference to identifying veterans and descendants. She asked whether practitioners would keep files to document the process they had used to identify individuals.

Assemblywoman Miller stated the wording was to encourage practitioners to work with nonprofit groups and for the nonprofits to continue the outreach. The point was not the tracking and reporting of the children and grandchildren. The goal was the outreach to communicate the information that oftentimes these diseases and conditions were hereditary. She stated that with Agent Orange, conditions were passed down to children and grandchildren. The education and outreach were encouraged, not the tracking.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson clarified that the use of the word "shall" in the bill did not mean nonprofit organizations needed to maintain casefiles on veteran's descendants, and Assemblywoman Miller agreed. Assemblywoman Miller continued that the burden was actually on the Department of Veterans Services to reach out to nonprofits.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked about sections 5 and 6, which called for the development of websites and conducting public outreach programs, and asked whether this had already been built into budgets and that was why fiscal notes had been removed. Assemblywoman Miller concurred.

Seeing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton opened the meeting for those in support of A.B. 300 (R1).

Catherine O'Mara, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA), spoke in support of A.B. 300 (R1) and said most of NSMA's comments were made in the policy committee hearing. She reiterated that NSMA had worked collaboratively on the bill, and it was a great opportunity to connect the educational pieces that the Department of Veterans Affairs and DHHS would be able to provide to physicians and other health-care providers, which would trickle down to patients.

Mikey Kelly, Chair, Nevada Democratic Veterans and Military Families Caucus, testified in support of A.B. 300 (R1) and stated that the veteran community was very excited about the legislation because many veterans did not self-identify and seek out the benefits to which they were often entitled. This resulted in long-term financial problems and becoming financial burdens to family members and the State. This was an opportunity to educate veterans and encourage them to seek further benefits and receive more financial help.

Gabrielle d'Ayr, U.S. Navy Veteran, stated her support for A.B. 300 (R1). She had testified in the policy committee and understood the focus in this meeting was on the financial side. She stated that the more veterans applied for benefits, the more they would receive, which would allow Nevada to receive more federal funding to help take care of Nevada's veterans.

Seeing no one else to testify in support, Chair Carlton invited those in opposition to or neutral on A.B. 300 (R1) to testify. Seeing no one, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint). Because there were no proposed amendments to this bill, it would be on a work session in its current version. She stated the next bill to be heard was Assembly Bill 540, which was introduced the previous day.

Assembly Bill 540: Revises provisions governing the distribution of the proceeds of certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-1287)

John McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 540 was connected to the court's budget and altered the distribution percentages in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 176.059.

Todd Myler, Manager of Budgets, Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, stated that A.B. 540 changed the percentages in two areas. It changed the percentage allocated to the Office of Court Administrator for the administration of three programs from 36 percent to 46.75 percent. The programs included the operation of the administration of the courts, the development of a uniform system for judicial records, and

continuing judicial education. In addition, the amount allocated for the direct benefit of the Supreme Court budget decreased from 48 percent to 37.75 percent. This was consistent with the budget submitted and work completed by the Fiscal Analysis Division staff to implement the budget.

Chair Carlton shared her understanding that this bill was an internal shift.

Mr. McCormick stated that was correct, and the bill was a shift in how the administrative assessment revenue was used internally.

With no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on A.B. 540. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Assembly Bill 540. Senate Bill 500 (1st Reprint) would be heard next.

Senate Bill 500 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing financial support for assisted living facilities. (BDR 40-1202)

Dena Schmidt, Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), introduced Senate Bill (S.B.) 500 (1st Reprint). She stated that existing law required the DHHS to use the Fund For a Healthy Nevada (FHN) for very specific purposes. In *Nevada Revised Statutes* 439.630, there was an allocation for \$200,000 each year to finance assistance living facilities certified under NRS Chapter 319. Since the inception of the program, only one agency had used these funds. Until this year, there had been no requests for the funds since 2011. The bill accomplished the following:

1. Changed the qualifications for assisted living facilities to apply for the funds.
2. Clarified the use of the funds.
3. Provided flexibility to use the funds for other independent living programs.

This flexibility would allow the funds to be used to address waitlists in other independent living programs for seniors and individuals with disabilities. These programs provided critical services that were aimed at keeping individuals out of institutions and included home modification programs, assistive technology programs, and respite programs. One example of the benefit of the flexibility was that the average cost of an institutionalized stay when a person fell was about \$30,000. In contrast, the installation of grab bars, a service provided in the home modification program, cost about \$300. If FHN funding was used for the cost of 100 grab bars and prevented just one fall, the program would have broken even. There was no fiscal impact, and the authority already existed in the Division's budget. Senate Bill 500 (1st Reprint) added flexibility without taking away from the growth of assisted living facilities if they were eligible.

Assemblywoman Neal asked whether the Division would be advertising the availability of funding. She stated the program had good goals, but she was concerned facilities would not know they could apply for grants.

Ms. Schmidt stated that the plan was to work with the association for assisted living facilities to ensure they all received notification of the potential awards.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked how other actions taken by the legislature on assisted living would affect this bill.

Ms. Schmidt stated that S.B. 500 (R1) included clarifying language to ensure the funds helped assisted living facilities expand beds or to develop new facilities. The bill did not pay for care provided in a facility, but it helped build capacity for more beds in communities.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson agreed with the direction, but she was concerned that other bills limited the ability of individuals to actually receive care, even though more beds would be available.

Chair Carlton stated that this was a budget implementation bill and would be in the queue to move. She asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 500 (R1). Seeing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 500 (1st Reprint). Senate Bill 503 would be heard next.

Senate Bill 503: Makes an appropriation for the continuation of the Nevada Promise Scholarship Program. (BDR S-1169)

Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 503 made a State General Fund appropriation of \$4.5 million to the Nevada Promise Scholarship account, and Senate Bill 350 made updates to the Nevada Promise Scholarship Program. Senator Denis stated that the Nevada Promise Scholarship Program started two years ago and 12,000 students applied. Applicants were required to perform community service, complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), and meet with a mentor. There were a few challenges in the first program. It had very strict deadlines which caused some applicants to miss out. The updated program was a little easier, and the program would be overseen by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) instead of each community college. Senator Denis explained that the volume of students applying caused the state to move up 10 spots to 35th in the number of grants from FAFSA. In the second year of the program 14,000 students applied, and the reduced service-hour requirement in Senate Bill 350 would help more students qualify.

Chair Carlton asked whether this was a last-dollar scholarship program.

Senator Denis stated that it was, and many students ended up not needing the Nevada Promise Scholarship because when they filled out the FAFSA, they received other funding. Overall, more students attended college because they applied for the Nevada Promise Scholarship.

Assemblyman Kramer asked whether each applicant received the same scholarship amount, or if it was needs-based and varied because it was last-dollar.

Senator Denis stated that the Promise Scholarship filled the gap between any other financial assistance a student received and the individual's cost.

Assemblyman Kramer asked what the range of stipends was.

Senator Denis stated that the maximum a student could receive from this program was \$2,000 and would be much less if the student also received FAFSA.

Chair Carlton invited those in support of S.B. 503 to testify.

Mariana Kihuen, Interim Director, Government Affairs, College of Southern Nevada (CSN), stated that at CSN, the smallest Promise Scholarship received was under \$10, and the maximum received by a student at CSN was under \$2,000 per semester. She continued that the Nevada Promise scholarships were one of four priorities for CSN during the current Legislative session. She shared the following statistics about the Nevada Promise Scholarship Program at CSN:

- CSN Promise students provided over 43,000 hours of community service under the program.
- The program engaged 506 mentors.
- A total of 150 high schools participated in the program in the prior year.
- CSN received more than 9,000 applications, 2,000 of which enrolled at CSN.
- From fall 2018 to spring 2019, there was an 85 percent retention rate in Promise Scholarship students compared to 75 percent for non-Promise students.

Michael Flores, Chief of Staff, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), stated that NSHE had seen an increase in enrollment throughout the state because of the Nevada Promise Scholarship Program. He reiterated Senator Denis' comment about attracting federal dollars. The program was modeled after Tennessee's program, and Tennessee received the highest amount of federal aid in the country. Nevada was climbing up and anticipated even more federal funding in the future. He also stated that the mentor side of the program was very strong and well supported.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, stated that the Chamber supported the policy and S.B. 503 and the appropriations.

Seeing no others to testify in support, Chair Carlton invited those in opposition to or neutral on S.B. 503 to testify. Seeing no one, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 503 and stated that because it was an appropriations bill, it would be held. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 510 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 510 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation for a new business management system. (BDR S-1186)

Christopher Sewell, Chief of Operations, Legislative Liaison, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR), introduced Senate Bill (S.B.) 510 (1st Reprint). He stated that section 1 of the bill made an appropriation of \$352,000 for a new business management system for DETR's Commission on Postsecondary Education, and section 2 was the technical language on the appropriation and expenditures.

Chair Carlton questioned whether programmers charged \$100 per hour and Mr. Sewell agreed. With no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 510 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 510 (1st Reprint). She stated this bill would also not move and the next to be heard was Senate Bill 512 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 512 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Nevada Gaming Control Board for modernization of the technology system and replacement of security system equipment and extends the reversion date of a previous appropriation made to the Board for certain costs related to the Alpha Migration Project. (BDR S-1188)

Michael Morton, Senior Research Specialist, Administration Division, Nevada Gaming Control Board (GCB), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 512 (1st Reprint) was a State General Fund appropriation for an ongoing project to replace the GCB's Common Business Oriented Language (COBOL) system. This would be phase 4 of the project at a cost of \$7,218,698. The bill had been amended in the Senate to roll over approximately \$112,000 in in-state travel costs that were appropriated in the 79th Legislative Session (2017).

Chair Carlton asked whether the bill also extended the reversion date on the remaining 2017 appropriation and Mr. Morton agreed. With no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 512 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 512 (1st Reprint). Chair Carlton stated this bill would also not move.

Senate Bill 513: Makes appropriations to the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services for the Child Support Enforcement Modernization system and the replacement of computer hardware and software and office equipment and authorizes the expenditure of money for these purposes. (BDR S-1189)

Chair Carlton stated there was not enough time to cover the presentation prepared by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), but thanked the Division for being prepared.

Steve H. Fisher, Administrator, DWSS, DHHS, stated that section 1 of Senate Bill (S.B.) 513 made a State General Fund appropriation of \$16,862,690 to continue the replacement of the Child Support Enforcement Modernization system. The current system was built in the 1980s using Common Business Oriented Language (COBOL). The project was presented and approved in the 2017 Legislative Session, and the Division was requesting funding to continue the project for the next two years. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the bill funded replacement equipment following the standard replacement equipment schedule. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$319,861 in State General Funds. Section 3 appropriated \$32,891 in General Funds, and section 4 appropriated \$412,267 in General Funds. Section 5 funded new equipment with \$5,995 in General Funds.

Assemblyman Kramer asked whether the \$16,862,690 in section 1 was for the biennium. He noted section 1, subsection 2 of the bill called for an "expenditure of \$33,254,408 not appropriated from the State General Fund or the State Highway Fund" and he asked what the source of that funding was.

Mr. Fisher stated that the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) provided 66 percent of the funding for the project. The funding in subsection 2 was the allocation from the federal OCSE.

Assemblyman Kramer interjected that this was a \$50 million reprogramming effort, and Mr. Fisher stated that was correct for the next biennium.

Assemblyman Kramer asked whether the system was unique to Nevada.

Mr. Fisher stated that the recommendation from a feasibility study completed in 2016 was to transfer parts of California's child support enforcement system and customize other parts for Nevada, and that was the direction the Division was following.

Chair Carlton recalled significant discussion in the 2017 Legislative Session about the project before it started because it would be a long-term commitment for the State to make. With no other questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 513. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 513. This project was included in The Executive Budget, but because the bill included an appropriation, it would also not move.

Senate Bill 514 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Interim Finance Committee for allocation to the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History for replacement of the Nevada Criminal Justice Information System. (BDR S-1192)

Tammy Trio, Chief Fiscal Officer, Records, Communications and Compliance Division, Department of Public Safety, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 514 (1st Reprint), which made an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Interim Finance Committee for the replacement of the Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS).

Hearing no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 514 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 514 (1st Reprint). Chair Carlton stated that Senate Bill 515 would be heard next.

Senate Bill 515: Makes an appropriation to the Division of Parole and Probation for the replacement of computer equipment and the Offender Tracking Information System. (BDR S-1193)

Stephanie O'Rourke, Deputy Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety (DPS), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 515 made appropriations for the replacement of Parole and Probation's Offender Tracking Information System (OTIS) and the replacement of computer hardware and software. Section 1 of the bill appropriated \$2,711,874 from the State General Fund for the replacement of OTIS. As the Division previously testified at Interim Finance Committee (IFC) and budget hearings, the Division had changed from seeking a Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS), Department of Administration, solution to seeking a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution and should be ready to issue a request for proposal (RFP) by July 2019. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$470,322 from the State General Fund for the replacement of 261 computers.

Chair Carlton asked whether the 261 computers being replaced were all in Parole and Probation or just DPS in general.

Ms. O'Rourke stated all 261 computers were in Parole and Probation.

Chair Carlton recalled discussions about OTIS and asked when responses were expected from the COTS RFP and what the next steps would be.

Tom Lawson, DPS Captain, Division of Parole and Probation, DPS, stated that the IFC had approved entering into a contract with MPG Consultants, who was currently working with other Divisions within DPS. With the consultants, the Division refined the requirements document for OTIS to help create the RFP. That scope of work was scheduled to be completed by mid-July, and the RFP would be issued immediately. He estimated the RFP would be published for 60 days, followed by another 60 days for questions and responses, then negotiating, awarding, and signing the contract, which was estimated to consume most of fiscal year 2020. It was estimated that it would take a year to have the COTS solution up and running. This included the time to develop, implement, train, deploy, and migrate data. The best case scenario was to have the new system running by the end of the 2019-2021 biennium.

Chair Carlton asked why the deployment for a COTS solution would take so long.

Mr. Lawson stated that the COTS solution would require some customization. Most COTS systems were built for either a parole or probation environment, not both. Nevada was unique in that it did both parole and probation at the state level. This meant the COTS would

be for either parole or probation and then be modified to include the other function. Twenty years of data needed to be cleaned before it could be migrated to the new system, so the data on approximately 21,000 active offenders would not cause a disruption in supervision. In addition, the 2,000 records retained from previous offenders needed to be cleaned and moved. The new system would also include the Dangerous Offender Notification System and allow better accounting and distinction between victim and offender accounts.

Chair Carlton sought confirmation that the new system would also allow the implementation of Marsy's Law.

Mr. Lawson stated that the Division was currently implementing changes for Marsy's Law. Under statute, payments were required to victims only once per year, and the Division processed payments to victims daily. The new program would provide true fiscal accountability and audit trails, which were not provided by OTIS.

Chair Carlton stated that her question stemmed from other agency's statements about the cost of implementing Marsy's Law, and she wanted to understand the Division's perspective on implementing the new law. She was pleased that the Division was aware of upcoming changes and proactively working to include them in the new system.

Mr. Lawson stated that the new system would address queries the Division had been unable to address because of current system limitations. The new system would provide greater efficiency for processing Marsy's Law payments.

Chair Carlton asked whether other Committee members had questions. Seeing none, she asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 515. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 515. She stated that this bill would also not move, and Senate Bill 516 (1st Reprint) would be heard next.

Senate Bill 516 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the State Board of Parole Commissioners for the replacement of certain equipment. (BDR S-1195)

Christopher P. Dericco, Chairman, State Board of Parole Commissioners, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 516 (1st Reprint) incorporated Amendment No. 984 and made State General Fund appropriations to the Board of Parole Commissioners for replacement equipment. He explained that section 1 of the bill appropriated \$67,675 for the replacement of computer software and hardware, which was for 45 computers and related equipment. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$87,555 to replace video conferencing room equipment in both Las Vegas and Carson City. Section 3 appropriated \$11,380 for the replacement of 20 conference room hearing chairs in four hearing rooms.

Seeing no questions, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 516 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 516 (1st Reprint). She stated the bill would not move and Senate Bill 517 (1st Reprint) would be heard next.

Senate Bill 517 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol for replacement of computer hardware and software and mobile data computers and for portable and mobile radio equipment. (BDR S-1224)

John A. O'Rourke, Colonel, Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP), Department of Public Safety, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 517 (1st Reprint) made State Highway Fund appropriations to the NHP for replacement of computer hardware and software, mobile data computers, and portable and mobile radio equipment. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$264,871 for the replacement of 184 computers, section 3 appropriated \$620,228 for the replacement of approximately 300 mobile data computers, and section 4 appropriated \$95,715 for R8100 system analyzers, which would allow NHP to tune its radios to the proper frequency with the new radio system.

Chair Carlton summarized that the bill affected 184 computers, 300 mobile data computers, and money to tune everything.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether this bill would be treated differently than the others that were not moving, because it appropriated Highway Funds instead of State General Funds.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that because this bill contained an appropriation, it would not move until after the Education Funding Bill was approved. The different funding source did not change the treatment of the bill.

Seeing no further questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 517 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 517 (1st Reprint). She stated the next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 526 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 526 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol for the replacement of patrol vehicles and motorcycles. (BDR S-1223)

John A. O'Rourke, Colonel, Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP), Department of Public Safety, stated that section 1 of Senate Bill (S.B.) 526 (1st Reprint) made an appropriation of \$13,282,242 from the State Highway Fund to NHP for the replacement of patrol vehicles. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$256,712 in Highway Funds to replace six motorcycles.

Chair Carlton asked how many vehicles would be replaced with the bill.

Colonel O'Rourke stated the bill would replace 202 utility patrol vehicles and 23 pickup trucks for a total of 225 vehicles over the biennium.

Chair Carlton asked whether all the vehicles were on the replacement schedule, and Colonel O'Rourke stated they were.

Chair Carlton asked whether all the vehicles were marked.

Colonel O'Rourke stated that NHP had some ghost vehicles. Most were K-9 units and officers that worked in task forces. Sometimes NHP used the ghost vehicles for patrol operations when running hazardous moving enforcements. The ghost cars were marked, but subtly. Command vehicles, for captains and above, had all the functionality of a normal patrol car and were not marked.

Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 526 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 526 (1st Reprint). Chair Carlton stated this bill would not move. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 518.

Senate Bill 518: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Taxation for the needs assessment for the modernization of the Unified Tax System. (BDR S-1226)

Melanie Young, Executive Director, Department of Taxation, stated that Senate Bill 518 appropriated \$1,700,373 from the State General Fund for a needs assessment for the modernization of the Unified Tax System (UTS), which was a Common Business Oriented Language (COBOL) system. The UTS was a 25-year-old comprehensive package of software and components that the Department merged together based on an outdated programming language. The funding would create a strategic roadmap to assess current obstacles and examine business processes, program applications, and research technologies that would cater to the taxpayer. The current focus was to determine what could be consolidated into the new enterprise solution. This was the beginning of funding for a multiyear process that the Department estimated would cost about \$58.8 million over a 5-year period, depending on which technology solution was selected.

Assemblyman Kramer pointed out, as a former COBOL programmer, that the 25-year-old COBOL programming was still functional.

Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on Senate Bill 518. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 518. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 519 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 519 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Office of Finance for a Snowcat vehicle for winter access to the pump house and dam at Marlette Lake. (BDR S-1228)

Ward Patrick, Administrator, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 519 (1st Reprint) provided funding for a snowcat vehicle for access at Marlette Lake. The Marlette Lake system provided raw water to Carson City and Storey Counties. The snowcat, or snowplow with tracks, would replace the two snowmobiles currently being used, which were at the end of their lives. Access to the system was dangerous, and snowcat usage would solve access problems.

Chair Carlton clarified that the request was for one vehicle and Mr. Patrick agreed.

Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 519. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 519 and stated this bill would be held. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 525 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 525 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Division of Forestry for equipment and maintenance. (BDR S-1179)

Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF), Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 525 (1st Reprint) made State General Fund appropriations totaling \$9,447,081 to the NDF for replacement equipment and deferred maintenance. Section 1 was the replacement of a helicopter. Ms. KC explained that the Division currently operated three used Bell UH-1H helicopters primarily for initial attack response for wildland fires, but also for seeding and other natural resource missions. One was owned by the State of Nevada and two were on loan from the U.S. Forest Service. They were obtained in 1994 and had been operated by NDF for 25 years. They ranged from 48 to 52 years old and were produced for the U.S. Army between 1960 and 1980. The Army ended their use in 2005. Mechanics could support minor repairs to this equipment, but because the helicopters were rare, Redding, California was the only place for major repairs. Parts were no longer commercially available for the helicopters. The Division had stockpiled parts by buying other used pieces of equipment and estimated it had three to seven years' worth of parts if no major repairs were needed. In the last two years, NDF had two engine failures and one tail rotor failure in this equipment, which took each helicopter down for at least a portion of fire season. Ms. KC noted that the replacement airframe would also be a used helicopter, similar to that recently purchased by the Department of Wildlife (NDOW). Many replacement options were considered, and this was the least expensive both for the initial cost and long-term maintenance costs. Because NDF and NDOW were across the parking lot from each other, pilots and mechanics could be shared between the two agencies.

Ms. KC explained that section 2 of the bill funded the replacement of six woodchippers. Six small-diameter woodchippers would be replaced with three large-diameter chippers and three medium-diameter chippers appropriate for the material handled. The current equipment was between 12 and 18 years old, and three of the chippers were no longer usable. The chippers were used daily by conservation crews and foresters on natural resource projects. They were also used on wildland fires and in fire suppression tactics and rehabilitation. Section 3 of the bill funded the replacement of four agency vehicles. Two were forester 2 vehicles, located in Pioche and Ely. The primary function was fuel reduction, but the new vehicles would be equipped like a type 6 engine with a pump on the back to provide initial attack if needed. In addition, two mechanic service trucks would be replaced. There were eight mechanics around the state providing service to over 400 pieces of equipment, and two of their vehicles would be replaced. The current vehicles were 10 to 25 years old and each had almost 200,000 miles.

Continuing with section 5 of the bill, Ms. KC stated that three mobile kitchens would be replaced. The mobile kitchens provided food to firefighters and were usually used on small incidences where up to 150 personnel were fed at a time. They were also used at larger fires when national caterers were not available. The NDF received the three current kitchens as excess from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection in 1985. The kitchens were also used when crews were camped for natural resource projects because it was more cost-effective to feed them onsite than have crews travel. Section 6 of S.B. 525 (R1) funded the replacement of ten conservation crew carriers. The Division had 81 vehicles for conservation crew purposes. The vehicles being replaced were from 13 to 15 years old and had 200,000 miles on each, some with almost 300,000 miles. The vehicles were used daily on natural resource projects, as well as on wildland fire fighting suppression projects in Nevada and California. Because the projects tended to be in rural areas, the vehicles received high amounts of wear and tear.

Ms. KC noted that sections 4 and 7 of the bill funded deferred maintenance projects for forestry facilities and conservation camps across the state. She understood the bill included a large amount of money and was grateful that the Committee heard the bill. It was critically important for the Division to provide the training, life experience, equipment, and supplies for the persons performing these jobs.

Chair Carlton asked when the other 71 crew carriers would be due for replacement.

Ms. KC stated that the Division had been asking each biennium for replacements and had originally requested replacing 20 vehicles, but reduced it to 10 because of the inclusion of a new helicopter in the bill.

Chair Carlton summarized that the Division had 81 vehicles and 10 of them would be replaced. She suggested that another 10 replacement vehicles would be requested in the next Legislative Session, and she asked whether the replacement requests had been fairly staggered.

Ms. KC stated that the Division usually requested replacing 10 vehicles per biennia, but was not awarded any one-shot funding in the previous Legislative Session. That is why the original request was for 20 vehicles in this session.

Chair Carlton clarified that the request was in the budget for the upcoming biennium, and Ms. KC concurred.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the woodchippers were used in the conservation camps and asked whether the chips would be sold.

Ms. KC stated that the woodchippers were used at the conservation camps throughout the state, along with the forester 2s. The chips were usually chipped onsite and often used for erosion control. Some chips would be available for sale at the Washoe and Las Vegas nurseries.

Assemblywoman Titus asked where the proceeds from chip sales went.

Ms. KC stated that the profits went to the Forestry Nurseries budget account 4235, which was an enterprise budget account for the Division of Forestry.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the woodchippers were used to help keep roadsides clear of brush to prevent fire spread.

Ms. KC stated that the Division worked with Department of Transportation to keep roadsides and right-of-ways clear. She continued that the chippers were used for multiple purposes both on private property and state property and for fuel reduction for forest health.

Chair Carlton surmised that putting a helicopter in the request made a significant divot in the budget, but she understood the long life of a helicopter and the necessity to replace it.

Seeing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 525 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 525 (1st Reprint) and stated this bill would be held. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 527.

Senate Bill 527: Makes appropriations to the Division of Child and Family Services for deferred maintenance projects and security camera system upgrades at various facilities. (BDR S-1245)

Mandi Davis, Deputy Administrator, Administrative Services, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 527 made State General Fund appropriations to DCFS for deferred maintenance projects, replacement equipment, and security camera system upgrades at facilities throughout the state. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill included a combined total of \$341,858 for deferred maintenance projects and replacement kitchen and laundry equipment at the Caliente Youth Center. Section 3 appropriated \$780,206 for deferred maintenance projects at the Nevada Youth Training Center in Elko. Section 4 appropriated \$113,396 for security camera system upgrades at the Adolescent Treatment Center, the Family Learning Homes, and the administration building for the Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services in Reno. Section 5 appropriated \$204,240 for deferred maintenance projects throughout the Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services campus in Las Vegas. Section 6 appropriated \$308,723 for deferred maintenance projects at the Summit View Youth Center in Las Vegas.

Chair Carlton asked what the deferred maintenance was at Summit View, because it was rebuilt from the inside out prior to reopening just before the last biennium.

Ms. Davis stated there were six projects planned at Summit View:

- Upgrade the gym flooring.
- Upgrade the flooring in the two housing units.
- Update the sally port gates for the exterior.
- Upgrade the facility entrance.
- Address irrigation needs for the entire campus.
- Mend campuswide exterior fence knuckle wire.

Chair Carlton asked why exterior fencing was on the list because this was a hardened facility. She asked if the bill was just for maintenance of the fencing.

Ms. Davis concurred that these were maintenance projects and did not involve building anything.

Chair Carlton stated her understanding that before Summit View reopened, work was completed on the facility. She suspected the gym floor was just refurbished and not completely redone.

Ms. Davis understood the gym floor was redone when the facility was reopened in 2016. This project addressed ongoing maintenance for cleaning and repairs of minor damage.

Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 527. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 527 and stated this bill would be held.

Chair Carlton stated that the Fiscal Analysis Division would present the Appropriations Act bill draft request.

BDR S-1280: Makes various changes regarding state financial administration and makes appropriations for the support of the civil government of the State. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 543](#).)

Karen Hoppe, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated she would be walking the Committee through the Appropriations Act bill draft request (BDR), which implemented the decisions made by the money committees for State General Fund and State Highway Fund appropriations and specific back language to implement Committee decisions for the appropriations. Ms. Hoppe noted that the total General Fund appropriations for agency budgets in sections 1 through 30 of the bill totaled \$5.7 billion over the 2019-2021 biennium, an increase of 15 percent compared to the Appropriations from the 2017 Legislature. Section 31 of the bill enumerated Highway Fund appropriations, which totaled \$264 million over the biennium, an 8 percent decrease from the previous biennium. Ms. Hoppe noted that some budgets with appropriations were excluded from the Appropriations Act. This included 12 education budgets included in the Education Funding Bill and appropriations for the Gaming Control Board, Gaming Commission, and

Department of Transportation, which were included in the Authorizations Act because of specific statutory language. Appropriations to the Board of Examiners for any General Fund and Highway Fund salary adjustments would be included in the Pay Bill.

Ms. Hoppe walked through the back language provisions, which started with section 32 of the BDR. The back language sections were necessary to implement decisions made by the money committees. Section 32 was carryover language that provided that appropriations must be expended in accordance with the State Budget Act. Section 33 was carryover language that listed budgets that could transfer appropriations from one fiscal year to the other with Interim Finance Committee (IFC) approval. Two new budgets were added to this list for the upcoming biennium: Public Employees' Benefits Program's Non-State Retiree Rate Mitigation and Problem Gambling. Section 34 was carryover language and provided that amounts appropriated for deferred maintenance and extraordinary maintenance projects could be transferred within the same budget from one year to the other.

Sections 35 through 45, Ms. Hoppe explained, included back language that allowed appropriations for specific purposes to be transferred between fiscal years. Section 35 was carryover language from the last biennium and provided that the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT), Office of the Governor, could transfer funds between fiscal years for an information technology (IT) project. Section 36 was carryover language from the last biennium and allowed the Department of Motor Vehicles to transfer appropriations for credit card fees between fiscal years. Section 37 was carryover language that allowed the Civil Air Patrol to use appropriations between fiscal years. Section 38 was also carryover language and provided that appropriations made for the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) could be transferred between fiscal years. Section 39 was also carryover language and allowed the Department of Corrections to transfer between fiscal years contract costs associated with housing 100 inmates out of state. Section 40 was new language for the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration, to transfer between years funds approved to acquire a new grant management system. Section 41 was new language and allowed Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to transfer money between fiscal years for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) majors. Section 42 was new language that allowed the Office of the Military to transfer funds between fiscal years for facilities maintenance. Section 43 was new language that allowed the Office of the Military to transfer funds between fiscal years for the Nevada National Guard Youth Challenge program. Section 44 was new language that allowed for fund transfers between fiscal years for ongoing maintenance and repair of the South Fork Dam. Section 45 was new language that allowed for fund transfers between fiscal years for the school bus program transportation that was approved for the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

Ms. Hoppe stated that sections 46 through 48 of the BDR provided that certain appropriations did not revert to the General Fund. Section 46 was carryover language and provided that funds approved by the 2015 Legislature for the sagebrush ecosystem budget did not revert to the General Fund. Section 47 was carryover language that reinforced statutory provisions that funds within the Catalyst Account or the Knowledge Account did

not revert and must be carried forward. Section 48 was a new section related to NSHE's Education for Dependent Children budget account and per statute, also would not revert to the General Fund.

Moving on to sections 49 through 59, Ms. Hoppe stated that these sections allowed appropriation transfers between state budgets. Section 49 was carryover global language that allowed salary and payroll costs to be transferred between budgets within the same department. Section 50 was carryover language that allowed appropriation transfers between budgets of the Legislative Fund. Section 51 was carryover language and allowed transfers between the budgets within the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Section 52 was carryover language that allowed the transfer of funds between the Nevada Medicaid and Nevada Check-Up budgets. Section 53 was also carryover language that allowed appropriations transfers among the three Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) juvenile correctional facilities. Section 54 was new language, also for DCFS, and allowed transfers between the Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services and Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services budgets. Ms. Hoppe explained that section 55 was carryover language and allowed the transfer of savings from various DHHS budgets to the Upper Payment Limit Holding Account. Section 56 was carryover language and related to sums appropriated to the Division of Aging and Disability Services, DHHS, allowing transfers among the three facilities' budgets. Section 57 was carryover language that allowed transfers between the Department of Corrections budgets, with two exclusions noted in subsection 2. Section 58 was carryover language that authorized the transfer of appropriations between the budgets of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Section 59 was carryover language that allowed the transfer of appropriations between NSHE's state-supported operating budgets.

Ms. Hoppe explained that sections 60 and 61 of the bill were both provisions that stated the amounts appropriated were limits. Section 60 was carryover language and noted that for Washoe and Clark County Child Welfare budgets, the appropriations were limits because of the block grant, except for adoption subsidies, which were categorical. Section 61 was also carryover language and specified amounts appropriated to the Medicaid and Check-Up budgets were limits.

Continuing with her presentation, Ms. Hoppe stated that sections 62 through 65 were specific to NSHE budgets. Section 62 was carryover language that required NSHE to comply with any requests by the Governor to set aside money from the appropriations made by the act. Section 63 was carryover language that allowed funding within the special projects budget to be made available for an extra two years to match documented research grants. Section 64 was carryover language that allowed for the continuation of the existing performance funding policy as approved by the money committees. Section 65 was also carryover language and prohibited NSHE from using General Funds appropriated in this act for professional merit salary increases.

Sections 66 through 68 were provisions for advances from the State General Fund. Section 66 was carryover language that allowed the Division of Forestry, DCNR, to seek a temporary

advance for fire suppression costs that exceeded the amount of money available. Section 67 was carryover language that allowed the Office of the Military to request an advance from the General Fund in case of emergency or deployments. Section 68 of the bill was new language that allowed the Northern Nevada Veterans Home to request a General Fund advance to be repaid in the same year the advance was approved. Sections 69 and 70 were both amendments to 2017 Legislative Session law. Section 69 was new language that would allow one-shot funding authorized by the 2017 Legislature to be balanced forward to fund the state parks and construction and maintenance projects through completion. Section 70 allowed any remaining balance of the appropriation made to the Northern Nevada Veterans Home to be available to provide cash flow to the home during its first year of operation. Section 71 related to the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) and a policy implemented in Senate Bill (S.B.) 552 of the 79th Session (2017) for nonstate, non-Medicare retirees. The language in the BDR provided for funding on a sliding scale: 50 percent support in the first year of the biennium and 25 percent support in the second year of the biennium.

Ms. Hoppe stated that sections 72 through 79 of the bill were new appropriations. Section 72 appropriated money to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for allocation to the DPBH, DHHS, to fund new positions to meet caseload projections for the Rural Clinics budget. Section 73 was new language that appropriated General Funds to the IFC for allocation to the Department of Corrections (NDOC) for new positions requested to sustain and advance programming for reentry related to the Second Chance Act grant. Section 74 was similar language to the previous biennium, which appropriated General Funds to the Public Employees' Retirement Board to be expended for the administration of the Legislators' Retirement System. Section 75 appropriated \$3 million in General Funds to the Legislative Fund for the costs of the 80th Legislative Session. Ms. Hoppe noted this was in addition to the \$15 million appropriated through Senate Bill 1. Section 76 appropriated \$10 million in General Funds to the IFC for allocation to the Division of Forestry, DCNR, for expenses occurred in suppression of fires or responses to emergencies. Section 77 appropriated General Funds and Highway Funds to the IFC for allocation to the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, for positions to provide helpdesk support for the Silver State Modernization Approach for Resources and Technology in the 21st Century (SMART 21) project. Section 78 appropriated General Funds to the Department of Education's Educator Effectiveness budget account. This section was contingent upon passage and approval of Senate Bill 314, which provided for these programs at the Department of Education. Section 79 appropriated General Funds to the IFC for allocation to the Supreme Court for the replacement of the web-based statewide case management system of the Judicial Department. Section 80 provided that amounts could be transferred from the Nevada Medicaid and Nevada Check-Up program budgets to the Administration budget to implement the provisions of Senate Bill 378. Ms. Hoppe noted this section was contingent upon passage and approval of Senate Bill 378.

The final sections of the bill, sections 81 to 87, explained Ms. Hoppe, were general provisions to enact appropriations. Section 81 was carryover language from the prior biennium, which stated that appropriations could not be committed for expenditure after

June 30 of each year, with certain exceptions. Section 82 was carryover language that directed the State Controller to pay state claims until the last business day of August. Section 83 was carryover language that directed the State Controller to transfer amounts necessary to carry out the budget approved by the Legislature. Section 84 was also carryover language that directed the State Controller to pay the salaries of state elected officials in biweekly installments. Section 85 was carryover language that stated what actions could be taken if the projections for the ending balance of the State General Fund fell below \$120 million. Section 86 was carryover language relating to payments made by the State Controller under the Cash Management Improvement Act to the U.S. Treasury when necessary. Section 87 laid out the effective dates for each section of the bill.

Having concluded her walkthrough of the Appropriations Act, Ms. Hoppe welcomed questions.

Chair Carlton clarified to the Committee that this was the time to ask questions. Because of the number of members not present, she did not ask for a motion and stated the BDR would be set aside.

Chair Carlton stated that Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint) would be heard next.

Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint): Makes supplemental appropriations to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy for an increase in the Medicaid cost-per-eligible participant and decrease in intergovernmental transfer revenue for Fiscal Years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 and for unanticipated expenses for the Nevada Check-Up Program. (BDR S-1232)

Melissa Laufer-Lewis, Administrative Services Officer, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 532 (1st Reprint) requested supplemental appropriations for the Nevada Medicaid and Nevada Check-Up programs. Section 1 of the bill appropriated \$17,808,203 in State General Funds and authorized \$25,839,364 in federal funds for a projected shortfall in the Nevada Medicaid program because of an increased cost-per-eligible. Section 2 of the bill appropriated \$37,065 in State General Funds for a projected shortfall in the Nevada Check-Up program because of a lower Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate than originally legislatively approved.

Chair Carlton questioned whether the \$17,808,203 was needed because of the changes in Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) revenue that were made in the current legislative session.

Ms. Laufer-Lewis stated the funding was needed because of the combination of a decrease in IGT, or the state savings for the supplemental payment programs, and an increase in the cost-per-eligible for the individuals served.

Chair Carlton recalled many conversations during Health and Human Services Subcommittee meetings about the shortfalls. Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton

asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 532 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint) and stated this bill would move because it was a supplemental appropriation. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 533 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 533 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Interim Finance Committee for allocation to Nevada Museum of Art, Inc. for the statewide expansion plan for the Northern and Southern Museum of Arts. (BDR S-1167)

David B. Walker, CEO, Nevada Museum of Art, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 533 (1st Reprint) made a \$5 million State General Fund appropriation for the expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art. Mr. Walker read the following statement into record:

For the record, my name is David Walker, and I am the CEO of the statewide, nonprofit Nevada Museum of Art. I am here today on behalf of the Board of Trustees and Museum staff and volunteers to explain why the appropriation in S.B. 533 (R1) is critically important to the Museum now, more than ever.

As many of you have heard us testify before, Las Vegas is the largest metropolitan area in the country without an art museum. However, Las Vegas is now poised for a crucial step that all cities must take to achieve true greatness—to elevate the stature and quality of its artistic and cultural resources. In the near future, Las Vegas will have a new major cultural and educational asset for its citizens and the myriad tourists that visit each year.

Last session you enthusiastically helped us by passing Senate Bill (S.B.) 187 of the 79th Session (2017), Senator Tick Segerblom's bill to provide \$1 million to support expansion of the Nevada Museum of Art in both Las Vegas and Reno.

Following is a progress report. Since last session, in Las Vegas:

- We merged with the Art Museum at Symphony Park organization, combining their efforts and networks with our nearly 90 years of museum operational experience and expertise, international reputation, and American Alliance of Museums accreditation, and financial stability.
- We successfully worked with the City of Las Vegas to transfer commitments from the City to our newly merged, statewide museum. This commitment includes 1.2 acres in Symphony Park—next to the Smith Center for the Performing Arts and the Discovery Children's Museum—plus \$2 million in construction funding, and parking in a new structure currently under construction next to our parcel. We are now working with the City of Las Vegas on the final agreement to set

benchmarks for our ongoing fundraising efforts and the timeframe in which we will close escrow on the parcel currently held for us.

- We have established an administrative office in Las Vegas.
- We have significantly expanded our statewide Board of Trustees in southern Nevada. These are professionals and philanthropists with local, regional, and national interests including Quentin Abramo, Katie O'Neill, Denise Cashman, Tom Kaplan, Dana Lee, Dr. Emily Schorr, Tarissa Tiberti, Paul Stowell, George Ogilvie, Michele Quinn, Colby Williams and many more currently under consideration.
- Following a national search by an executive recruitment firm, we hired a Deputy Director, who is now fulltime and on the ground in Las Vegas. Her name is Heather Harmon. Heather is a multigenerational Las Vegas native who earned her art history degree at UNLV, but who, 20 years ago, felt she had to leave home to forge a career in the international art world—which she has accomplished in impressive fashion. We are thrilled that she has returned to Las Vegas now to lead our effort.
- We have hired a special projects manager to work alongside Heather Harmon.
- We have established an Architectural Search and Selection Committee of prominent Nevadans to conduct an international targeted competition to identify a visionary architect to design our world-class art museum in Symphony Park. We plan to select a future Pritzker Prize winner, someone who will embrace the pioneering spirit and unique history of Las Vegas and its rich cultural diversity. We all want a highly functional and accessible facility worthy of international praise.
 - The Architectural Committee members include U.S. District Judge Richard Boulware II, Tom Kaplan, Dana Lee, Phil Satre, Peter Stremmel and Roger Thomas. Our architectural consultant is renowned museum professional Richard Koshalek, who is highly regarded as an expert in formalized competitions. For instance, he led the search for Frank Gehry to design Walt Disney Concert Hall in Los Angeles and Herzog & de Meuron to design the Tate Modern in London.
 - We are also cognizant of the strict requirements of the Nevada State Board of Architecture, Interior Design, and Residential Design about licensure in Nevada and have formally engaged

Las Vegas-based Craig Galati of LGA Architecture to assist in this complex process.

- We have contracted with Jeremy Agüero of Applied Analysis to develop an economic market analysis so we can more accurately set fundraising budgets, membership goals, and other revenue projections in support of our design and construction phases, as well as the sustainable operating budget upon opening.
- Finally, in terms of costs, we have brought on a number of high-level staff members with a specific focus on Las Vegas, and we continue to incur considerable legal fees associated with the recent merger and ongoing negotiations with the City of Las Vegas and other parties.

I think it is important to restate our institutional philosophy as we establish an art museum in Las Vegas. The Nevada Museum of Art is now one, statewide legal entity, with a unified, statewide board, a shared collection, shared assets, and shared staff. Our trustees and staff are committed to realizing the long-held dream of establishing a fine arts museum in Las Vegas. We do not intend to replicate what exists in Reno, which is responsive to the northern Nevada community. Instead, following nearly 10 years of listening and learning what the Las Vegas community wants and ultimately will support, we have heard that Las Vegas wants an art museum that:

- Offers unique cultural experiences to educate, inspire, celebrate, and connect diverse peoples.
- Features world-class exhibitions by not just national and international artists, but local artists as well.
- Faithfully serves—first and foremost—the more than 2 million residents in the region, while also leveraging Las Vegas’ unique position as a global destination for more than 43 million visitors annually.

This is how the million dollars from S.B. 187 (2017) has assisted with our Las Vegas effort to date. And I should remind you that we met your one-to-one match requirement in three months’ time.

Following is what we have accomplished with S.B. 187 (2017) funds in Reno:

- Of the \$1 million appropriation, we allocated \$250,000 to support the purchase of a strategic parcel of land next door to the Nevada Museum of Art’s current site: the expansion will house additional galleries and education facilities. We purchased the parcel for

nearly \$1.8 million with most of the funds coming from a museum trustee gift. We were able to close the gap with the \$250,000 allowing us to pay cash for the property rather than take on debt. By the way, the Nevada Museum of Art has no debt.

- We are now under contract with Will Bruder, the renowned architect who designed the original facility. We are also in contract with general contractors Clark/Sullivan, construction consultant Jim Steinmann, and Lumos & Associates Engineering. The seamless expansion we are planning will be approximately 50,000 square feet, bringing our museum to a total of 120,000 square feet.

Now, what do we plan to accomplish with the appropriation in S.B. 533 (R1)?

First, we will work aggressively to match the funds quickly. Then, in Las Vegas, we will go into contract with the winning architect to develop detailed concepts, design feasibility studies, schematics, cost-modeling estimates, and so forth. We are projecting a 145,000 square-foot facility in Symphony Park. In Reno, we will do the same.

This appropriation represents a major capital investment in our statewide cultural institution. We will continue fundraising at-large so that the mission of this extraordinary institution to scale-up and serve all of Nevada becomes a reality. We fully support and see ourselves playing an even more significant role in the economic growth and diversification of our state. We are committed to education—specifically Science, Technology, Engineering, the Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) education, and of course, enhancing the quality of life in Nevada for all. As in Reno, we plan to create an urban gathering space in Las Vegas that becomes a focal point and cultural nexus—one that generates exciting new energy and creative vitality in every respect. And we look forward to further developing synergies with The Smith Center for the Performing Arts and the Discovery Children’s Museum and many other fine cultural and educational organizations in Las Vegas.

Madame Chair, and members of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, thank you for being a partner in this historic work. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Carlton clarified that the \$5 million appropriation would go to the Interim Finance Committee and would be released upon the match being met. Mr. Walker agreed.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked what funding the Nevada Museum of Art would receive if it did not raise the full \$5 million.

Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that funding would be provided at a dollar-for-dollar match.

Assemblywoman Jauregui shared her excitement about the project because she had flown from Las Vegas to Reno to see exhibits, the most recent was Raphael's "The Woman with the Veil."

Chair Carlton stated she flew to either Kansas City or St. Louis to visit art museums. She recalled growing up near the Saint Louis Art Museum, which she frequented regularly because of the free admission. She liked the way the matching funds were set up because it showed commitment from both sides.

Seeing no other questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton invited those in support of S.B. 533 (R1) to testify.

Michael D. Hillerby, Director of Legislative Affairs, Kaempfer Crowell, representing himself as a former member and chair of the Nevada Museum of Art Board of Trustees, stated that Mr. Walker excellently described the programming of the museum. He addressed the governance of the museum and stated that as the state's only accredited art museum, the quality of the governance, finance committee, management of endowments, and the audit process were very engrained in the culture of the organization. If he were in the Committee's shoes, as stewards of the taxpayers' money, he would feel very comfortable making this appropriation.

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Officer, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas, stated the City of Las Vegas was very excited about the museum coming to the downtown area, specifically the Symphony Park area, to help continue to build out that area of the city. The city was invested in the project and looked forward to continuing to welcome the art museum.

Carlos Fernandez, Policy Analyst, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, stated the Chamber was in support of S.B. 533 (R1) and felt the museum would enrich the community culturally, educationally, and economically.

Kathleen A. Conaboy, Senior Vice President, Museum Advancement, Nevada Museum of Art, stated that prior to being an employee of the Nevada Museum of Art, she spent a decade on the Board of the museum and was in full support of S.B. 533 (R1). She asked for clarification that the Museum could draw on the IFC funds as matching funds were raised and did not need to wait until the entire \$5 million in match was secured before accessing the funds.

Chair Carlton stated that was also her understanding and asked Fiscal Analysis Division staff to clarify.

Ms. Coffman stated that nothing in the bill would prohibit multiple funding requests from the Museum up to the \$5 million maximum.

Seeing no others to testify in support, Chair Carlton invited those in opposition to and neutral on S.B. 533 (R1) to testify. Seeing no one, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 533 (1st Reprint). Because this bill was an appropriation, it would wait to move until other bills moved. Chair Carlton stated the Committee would work through the next bills on the agenda before discussing and introducing the Appropriations Act.

Senate Bill 534 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Department of Transportation for the replacement of the Nevada State Radio System. (BDR S-1168)

Denise Inda, Chief Traffic Operations Engineer, Traffic Operations Division, Department of Transportation (NDOT), stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 534 (1st Reprint) made an appropriation from the State General Fund to NDOT for the replacement of the Nevada State Radio System.

Chair Carlton asked whether General Funds were paying for all of the replacement cost or whether State Highway Funds would also be used.

Ms. Inda stated that the majority of the system would be funded with Highway Funds, and the appropriation in the bill was for the portion of the cost required to be non-Highway Funds for other agencies that used the system.

Chair Carlton asked what amount the Highway Fund would pay.

Ms. Inda stated that the Highway Fund covered 69.5 percent of the radio system cost. Non-Highway fund sources would pay for the remaining 30.5 percent of the equipment cost. Highway Funds would pay for 92 percent of the cost less subscriber equipment. The non-Highway Fund was 7.9 percent.

Chair Carlton thanked Ms. Inda for providing the detail for the Committee.

Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, clarified that in the NDOT budget account decision unit Enhancement 377 included \$12.3 million in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$13.3 million in FY 2021 from Highway Funds.

Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 534 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 534 (1st Reprint) and stated this bill would not move immediately. The next bill to be heard was Senate Bill 535 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 535 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the financial support for programs for the prevention and treatment of problem gambling. (BDR 41-1200)

Paul Nicks, Deputy Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, stated that Senate Bill (S.B.) 535 (1st Reprint) addressed the declining revenue from the \$2 slot tax directed to the prevention and treatment of problem gambling. The bill placed the tax directly into the State General Fund, and funds would be appropriated into the Problem Gambling budget account.

Chair Carlton asked whether this change corresponded to the changes made by the Subcommittees to the funding of the revolving account, and Mr. Nicks agreed.

Chair Carlton explained that instead of going directly to the agency, the money would go through the General Fund. Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 535 (R1). Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 535 (1st Reprint). Because this bill was to implement policy related to a decision made earlier in the session, it could be moved. Because no one was present to present Senate Bill 549, Chair Carlton stated that Senate Bill 550 would be heard next.

Senate Bill 550: Establishes for the 2019-2021 biennium the subsidies to be paid to the Public Employees' Benefits Program for insurance for certain active and retired public officers and employees. (BDR S-1268)

Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that Senate Bill 550 was a budget implementation bill that established the state's share of the cost of monthly contributions, or premiums, for group insurance for active state officers and employees who participated in the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP). For fiscal year (FY) 2020 the monthly state contribution for active employee group insurance was \$760.79, and for FY 2021, the contribution was \$783.30 per month. Senate Bill 550 also established the state share of the cost of monthly contributions and premiums for group health insurance for retired employees' group insurance not eligible for Medicare. For FY 2020, the monthly state contribution was \$551.77 and for FY 2021, the monthly contribution was \$478.15. Ms. Coffman explained that for Medicare-eligible state retirees, Senate Bill 550 established a monthly state contribution of \$195 in each year of the biennium for state employees who retired before January 1, 1994. For those who retired on or after January 1, 1994, the state monthly contribution maximum was \$260 in the 2019-2021 biennium.

Chair Carlton clarified that this topic was also addressed in the General Government Subcommittee meetings and that the cost of healthcare for public employees was a concern, and the Committee was cognizant of the need to keep the cost consistent so employees could budget properly.

Seeing no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 550. Hearing none, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 550. Chair Carlton stated this bill would be held. Because no one was in attendance to present Senate Bill 549, the Chair stated that bill would be heard later in the day.

Chair Carlton stated that the Committee would move five bills before discussing the Appropriations Act. The bills to be work-sessioned were Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 495, Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 540, and Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint). Chair Carlton stated mocked up amendments were available for the first two bills.

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

Chair Carlton reminded the Committee that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 155 (1st Reprint) had been heard, and Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3, had provided a mock-up of proposed amendment number 6082 (Exhibit D). She asked Fiscal Analysis Division staff to walk through the bill.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that A.B. 155 (R1) was heard on May 1, 2019, and was presented by Assemblywoman Torres. The proposed amendment changed the order of priority in accessing the Silver State Opportunity Grants. Previously, students had to be taking at least 15 credits to qualify for the Grants, but the provisions in the amendment provided a priority order as described on page 3 of Exhibit D. Students who had applied and were eligible and enrolled in at least 15 credits were given first priority, and if funds remained, eligible students in their final semester were the next priority. She noted that as discussed during the bill hearing, approximately \$850,000 was reverted from this program last biennium, and the amendment would help make additional students eligible to use up the funds. The first priority to distribute the funds remained with students enrolled in at least 15 credit hours.

Chair Carlton recalled hearing that roughly \$850,000 was reverted to the State General Fund and not given in scholarships. She stated that when money was made available for scholarships, processes should be in place to ensure all money would be distributed, and this amendment seemed like a reasonable proposal to provide more access to scholarships.

Assemblywoman Titus agreed with the Chair. She had been opposed to the bill, but with the amendment (Exhibit D) and the information presented about the money not being used, she was appreciative of the bill sponsor and the amendment.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson liked the bill and recalled attempts last session for a similar bill that met strong opposition. She was surprised by the opposition, and knowing

funds had remained unexpended and a process was being proposed to ensure the money was available to those who qualified for it, she was in favor of the bill.

Seeing no other questions or comments from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 155 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The floor statement was assigned to Assemblywoman Torres, with Assemblywoman Jauregui as backup. The next bill to be moved was Assembly Bill 495.

Assembly Bill 495: Makes an appropriation to the Nevada Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs, Inc. to be used for programs provided by the Alliance throughout the State. (BDR S-1118)

Chair Carlton stated that she would address proposed amendment number 6076 ([Exhibit E](#)) to Assembly Bill 495. The amendment added an additional appropriation of \$1.8 million to the bill from the State General Fund to Nevada Partners for the construction and operation of a community learning center. Nevada Partners was an integral part of the community in West Las Vegas, and the project was 90 percent complete. The appropriation would allow Nevada Partners to complete the project. The amendment included a reporting mechanism to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) with a final report due September of 2021.

Assemblyman Kramer noted that the bill was for statewide Boys & Girls Clubs funding.

Chair Carlton stated the bill was still for the statewide Boys & Girls Clubs funding, and the amendment was for an additional appropriation.

Assemblywoman Neal appreciated adding the amendment because Nevada Partners had been a very good partner with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 354 of the 79th Session (2017) and had been consistently helping the Assemblywoman to move the needle around workforce.

Assemblywoman Swank disclosed that she had been advised by the Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, that she was not required by Assembly Standing Rule No. 23 to make an ethics disclosure regarding this item. She explained that when she was not in the Legislature, she worked in the area of historic preservation, including building rehabilitation. This was one of the reasons she did not take any chances when it came to ethics and the interactions between her job in the private sector working for a nonprofit organization and her service as a legislator. She had and would continue to ensure that as a legislator, she did

not accept any money in her nonprofit job that originated in a legislative measure that she voted on in the Legislature. She was making the disclosure and would be abstaining from the vote.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 495.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblyman Hambrick was not present for the vote. Assemblywoman Swank abstained from the vote.)

Chair Carlton stated she would do the floor statement. Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint) would be discussed next.

Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to veterans. (BDR 37-95)

Chair Carlton reminded the Committee that Assembly Bill 300 (1st Reprint) was heard earlier in the meeting and was presented by Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5. There were no proposed amendments. There was support from members of the veterans community, and there was no opposition or neutral testimony. She asked for a motion to do pass the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 300 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton stated that Assemblywoman Miller would handle the floor statement. The next bill to be moved was Assembly Bill 540.

Assembly Bill 540: Revises provisions governing the distribution of the proceeds of certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-1287)

Chair Carlton stated that this bill was an internal adjustment within the courts and did not change money going to or from the budget accounts. There were no proposed amendments nor testimony in support, opposition, or neutral on the bill. Chair Carlton asked for a motion to do pass the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 540.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The floor statement was assigned to Assemblywoman Spiegel.

Chair Carlton stated that the last bill for the work session was Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 532 (1st Reprint): Makes supplemental appropriations to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy for an increase in the Medicaid cost-per-eligible participant and decrease in intergovernmental transfer revenue for Fiscal Years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 and for unanticipated expenses for the Nevada Check-Up Program. (BDR S-1232)

Chair Carlton stated that the bill made a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, for the Medicaid cost-per-eligible and the impact on the Intergovernmental Transfer revenues for the biennium. There were no proposed amendments. Seeing no comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for a motion to do pass the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 532 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The floor statement was assigned to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

Chair Carlton checked again to see if someone was present for Senate Bill 549. Seeing no one, Chair Carlton stated that the Appropriations Bill had been walked through earlier and the Senate Finance Committee needed to review it before the Assembly Ways and Means Committee introduced it, so no action would be taken on it.

Chair Carlton opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing none, Chair Carlton recessed to the call of the chair at 12:01 p.m.

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting at 6:40 p.m. She stated that Senate Bill 549 was the first order of business.

Senate Bill 549: Revises provisions relating to allocations of money from the Account for the New Nevada Education Funding Plan. (BDR 34-1276)

Sarah Nick, Management Analyst, Office of the Superintendent, Department of Education, presented Senate Bill 549 for the New Nevada Education Funding Plan. Senate Bill 549 revised the assessment used to determine the number of pupils eligible for the New Nevada Education Funding Plan, often referred to as Senate Bill (S.B.) 178 of the 79th Session (2017), or least proficient, categorical funding. Section 1 of S.B. 549 removed the reference to a specific assessment used to determine proficiency for pupils grades kindergarten, one, two, nine, or ten and instead required the use of an assessment as implemented by the Department for these grades. This change was made to update to best practice and eliminate the single vendor reference in statute. Section 2 of S.B. 549 required an independent evaluation to be conducted biennially instead of annually to determine the effectiveness of the New Nevada Education Funding Plan. The Department did not have a fiscal note attached to the bill, nor did it anticipate that the bill would change the \$1,200 allocation projected for each student, nor the number of, or the specific students projected to receive such money for services.

Chair Carlton summarized that the bill revised the assessment from S.B. 178 (2017). Seeing no questions from Committee members, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in favor of, in opposition to, or neutral on S.B. 549. Seeing no one, she closed the hearing on Senate Bill 549. Chair Carlton stated that because the bill did not have an appropriation in it, it could be processed and moved to the floor.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated the Chair was correct because the bill was for budget implementation related to the funding for S.B. 178 (2017).

BDR S-1280: Makes various changes regarding state financial administration and makes appropriations for the support of the civil government of the State. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 543.)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that the next item to be discussed was the Appropriations Act. Fiscal Analysis Division staff had distributed a new copy of the bill with a struck section. The version that was presented by Karen Hoppe, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, included section 65, which had since been removed. Section 65 indicated that funds appropriated to the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) could not be used for professional merit increases. Striking this section would provide flexibility to NSHE to make the determination between the institutions and the Board of Regents.

Chair Carlton explained that removing the section removed the Legislature from the discussion and allowed professionals to negotiate with the regents.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson stated that the Committee had heard much about salary compression at NSHE and allowing the conversation about pay to occur between the entity and employees was the best use of the limited funds available.

Chair Carlton stated that removing section 65 returned the Appropriations Bill to the version prior to the 2015 Legislative Session when section 65 was added.

Ms. Jones clarified that the Committee would not see that a section had been struck, and the remaining sections would be renumbered.

Chair Carlton stated that because the bill draft request was still in draft form and not yet a bill, the change could be made in this manner. Chair Carlton asked for a motion to introduce BDR S-1280.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED FOR
COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1280.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Ms. Jones stated that Fiscal Analysis Division staff would present the Pay Bill.

BDR S-1283: Provides for compensation of state employees. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 542](#).)

Jeff A. Ferguson, Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), stated he would be walking the Committee through Bill Draft Request (BDR) S-1283, known as the Pay Bill. The bill established the maximum allowed salaries for certain state employees and made appropriations from the State General Fund and the State Highway Fund for increases in the salaries of certain state employees as recommended by the Governor. Section 1 set forth the maximum annual salary amounts for certain employees not in the classified service of the state. These amounts included the 3 percent Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) approved for fiscal year (FY) 2018 and the 3 percent COLA approved for FY 2019, but did not include the 3 percent COLA recommended by the Governor and approved for FY 2020. Section 2 allowed the Division of Human Resource Management, Department of Administration, to review the duties and responsibilities of a position that may have been omitted from the bill to establish the salary of that position. Section 2 also allowed for corrections to the bill for any errors determined by the Fiscal Analysis Division, with approval of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC). This section also included standard provisions regarding persons filling or vacating unclassified positions.

Mr. Ferguson explained that section 3 of the bill provided for a 3 percent COLA for state employees beginning July 1, 2019. The State General Fund portion of the COLA was

outlined in the following sections and totaled \$31.3 million in FY 2020 and \$31.6 million in FY 2021. The State Highway Fund appropriations were \$6.7 million in FY 2020 and \$6.8 million in FY 2021, which were recommended by the Governor. Section 4 authorized the State Board of Examiners to reimburse state agencies and the judicial branch from the amounts shown for the difference between the maximum salaries in section 1 and the 3 percent COLA for FY 2020 approved in section 3.

Section 5 authorized the State Board of Examiners to reimburse state agencies and the judicial branch from the amounts shown for any deficiencies created between funding appropriated to state agencies and the judicial branch and the 3 percent COLA approved for classified and nonclassified positions. Section 6 included the same provisions as section 5, except related to the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Department of Public Safety, and the Nevada Transportation Authority, which were supported by Highway Fund appropriations. Section 7 authorized the State Board of Examiners to reimburse from the amounts shown the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) for any deficiencies created between funding appropriated to NSHE and the 3 percent COLA approved for classified and professional employees of NSHE. Section 8 appropriated funds to the Legislative Fund to provide for the 3 percent COLA to be applied to employees of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and interim legislative operations.

Continuing with the bill, Mr. Ferguson stated that section 9 was standard language related to plans for on-call pay for the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Corrections for unclassified physician positions. Section 10 was standard language related to plans for credential pay for the Nevada Gaming Control Board. Section 11 was standard reversion language applicable to the previous sections. Section 12 allowed funding for the 3 percent COLA as set forth in the previous sections, to be transferred between fiscal years. Section 13 authorized the State Board of Examiners to reimburse from the amounts shown to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) for any deficiencies created between funding appropriated to TRPA and the 3 percent COLA approved for its employees conditioned upon the State of California providing the required 2-for-1 match. Section 14 listed the positions exempt from the provisions in *Nevada Revised Statutes* that required the salary of a person employed by the state not to exceed 95 percent of the salary of the Governor.

Chair Carlton questioned Mr. Ferguson's statement about the 3 percent COLA included from previous Legislative sessions and asked for an explanation.

Mr. Ferguson clarified that the amounts shown in the pay bill reflected the 3 percent COLA approved in the 2017 Legislative Session for FY 2018 and FY 2019, which was essentially current pay. The pay bill provided an additional 3 percent COLA as recommended by the Governor.

Seeing no questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1283.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

In response to Chair Carlton's question, Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, stated that the Committee had heard all money bills except the Education Funding Bill. The Fiscal Analysis Division staff was still reviewing the complicated bill, and she anticipated the Committee would hear the bill the following morning.

Chair Carlton stated that Senate Bill 549 would be moved next.

Senate Bill 549: Revises provisions relating to allocations of money from the Account for the New Nevada Education Funding Plan. (BDR 34-1276)

Seeing no questions from the Committee on Senate Bill 549, Chair Carlton asked for a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 549.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The floor statement was assigned to Assemblywoman Spiegel.

Chair Carlton stated that Fiscal staff needed additional time to work on the Education Funding Bill. The bills remaining from the first agenda of the day, plus any bills referred to the Committee that evening, would be heard in the following day's meeting, which would start at 9 a.m.

Chair Carlton opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing none, Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Morris
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is written testimony submitted by Brian Mitchell, Director, Office of Science, Innovation and Technology, Office of the Governor, for Senate Bill 402 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit D](#) is proposed amendment No. 6082 to Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint), submitted by Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3, and presented by Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is proposed amendment No. 6076 to Assembly Bill 495, presented by Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14.