

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

**Eightieth Session
June 1, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:09 a.m. on Saturday, June 1, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblyman John Hambrick
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

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8
Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13
Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Senate District No. 10

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Janice Wright, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After a call of the roll, Chair Carlton reminded those in attendance to silence electronic devices, and then she reviewed the rules of the Committee. She asked how many individuals were present in Las Vegas to testify on Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint). She explained that the

Minutes ID: 1447



bill would not be heard until much later in the day, and she excused them. She would ensure the representative in Carson City would let them know when the bill would be heard later tonight. The Committee would be meeting all day and tonight. She said today would be a constant rotation, bills would come and go, and the Committee would recess several times during the day. She asked the members to remain close in case she needed to reconvene the meeting quickly. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-1063)

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8, presented Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint). She said the bill proposed a series of steps to address a serious personnel situation in public schools. The personnel to whom she referred were the behavioral and mental health professionals who worked in the schools, including school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers. Those professionals brought years of education and training to the profession. They were dedicated to ensuring that all students in Nevada had access to quality education and the support needed to grow, learn, and feel safe. The working conditions often limited the opportunity to provide services to Nevada's public school children.

Senator Dondero Loop explained that school counselors were trained to assist students with academic and career planning and personal and social development. However, their duties were often dictated by school principals who assigned them to other duties including administering standardized tests, counting test booklets, proctoring test administrations, supervising lunch rooms and bathrooms, covering classes when no substitute teachers were available, and making attendance phone calls. School psychologists were experts in education and psychology, and those qualified mental health professionals could work with students in crisis. The professionals had training to improve the school climate as a prevention measure and understood child development and adolescent psychology. Best practices in school psychology recommended that those professionals develop prevention strategies for mental health substance abuse, bullying, and delinquency. However, they were most often assigned to test and assess children for special education services and develop Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

Senator Dondero Loop stated that school social workers were licensed by the Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers. School social workers were trained to develop small group intervention strategies and identify more intensive interventions for individual students. The social workers targeted multiple-risk factors in homes, schools, and community settings and identified warning signs of violent behavior. They worked to provide support after a crisis.

Senator Dondero Loop said school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers had in common that they were qualified mental health professionals who were underused in the public schools. In addition, Nevada's public schools were understaffed in those professions. Even the U.S. Department of Education listed all three areas as experiencing personnel shortages. Ratios of those professionals to students were not mandated. The American School Counselor Association recommended a ratio of

250 students to 1 counselor. In recent school years, the Association reported 517 students per counselor on average in Nevada. In 2017, the Nevada Association of School Psychologists reported to the Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada that the national recommendation was 500 to 700 students per psychologist. In the Clark County School District and Washoe County School District, the average was 2,000 to 2,500 students per psychologist. Some rural school districts reported one psychologist for all schools in the county. In 2018, the National Association of Social Workers recommended a ratio of 250 students per social worker. The student well-being workgroup last year estimated that the current ratio in Nevada was 1 school social worker to 1,500 students. All of the Nevada ratios of school-based mental health professionals were four to five times greater than the national recommended ratios.

Senator Dondero Loop presented S.B. 319 (R1) to address those concerns. Sections 3, 4, and 5 established in statute the duties of a counselor, psychologist, and social worker employed by a school district. Her purpose was to create an environment in which those professionals spent most of their time on services to students. She hoped they would no longer be diverted to lunch duty or supervising playgrounds. To the extent that money was available, each public school including charter schools had to employ a school counselor on a full-time basis and provide a comprehensive school counseling program.

Senator Dondero Loop added that section 6 provided that any of those professionals who presented satisfactory evidence of national certification would be eligible for a 5 percent increase in salary. She submitted Exhibit C that was a mock-up of proposed amendment 6092 to Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint) to remove that 5 percent salary raise. Senator Dondero Loop said it saddened her to present that amendment to delete the 5 percent salary raise for school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors, who had a high degree of training, and many of them were nationally board-certified. [National Board Certification was a voluntary, advanced teaching credential that went beyond state licensure. The National Board had national standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do. The National Board certified teachers who successfully completed its rigorous certification process.] Board-certified teachers received the 5 percent salary raise in Nevada. Senator Dondero Loop was willing to remove the 5 percent salary raise for school mental health professionals after conversations with stakeholders in school districts in Clark County, Washoe County, and throughout the state. She would rather see mental health professionals have some criteria that defined their jobs. She hoped the 5 percent salary raise could be approved at another time. It was important that school mental health professionals had specific criteria describing their jobs to allow them to do what they needed in the most vulnerable time in the schools.

Senator Dondero Loop thought it was time to recognize that kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students faced many social, emotional, and situational pressures that affected school performance. Unfortunately, actual violence had also increased in the schools in the past decade. Nevada had available, or should have available in the schools, mental health professionals who could work individually and collectively to create school environments that encouraged growth and enabled children to feel that school was a safe place for them.

Working conditions and salary were two aspects that the Legislature could act upon to foster that environment both for children and professionals that the schools needed. She asked for support for S.B. 319 (R1).

Chair Carlton said the proposed amendment would remove the 5 percent salary raise. She asked whether the Committee members had any questions.

Assemblyman Kramer said he talked with some teachers and remembered making a statement that the Legislature had taken action to remove the pressures from teachers by assigning social workers to schools to allow teachers to concentrate on teaching and not worry so much about the family life of some students. The counter argument that he heard was that the social workers assigned to the schools spent 100 percent of their time behind a desk reviewing files and never met with students. He asked how the Legislature could ensure that social workers actually did the job as expected. He was unable to speak about the other professionals because the comments he received related to social workers. He understood the advantage of a social worker when a teacher had 27 students in the class and was unable to be deeply involved in the lives of 4 or 5 students who had horrible home lives. That was the benefit of a social worker to remove that burden from the teacher. He asked whether the Legislature could make the social workers interact with students when that failed to occur.

Senator Dondero Loop responded that she could not speak to the specific personnel situation to which Assemblyman Kramer referred. Her experience as a teacher for 30 years was she had seen counselors and social workers who worked hard. She recalled an instance when she had a second grade student in her class whose family had been killed. The fifth grade student who was not killed was in her daughter's class. She relied on the support of the school social worker as did the families and other students to make it through that day. She could only speak to how hard those individuals worked, and most of those professionals had been teachers before going into those mental health professions. The problem cited by Assemblyman Kramer might be a specific personnel problem. But she had watched school counselors, social workers, and psychologists help students with problems related to being a Child Protective Services (CPS) child, a parent being killed, a student feeling as though they might harm themselves, or just coming home and not finding anybody there. Planning lifelong dreams with a counselor to ensure the student had the right classes was a crucial part of high school. Mental health professionals were needed in schools now to navigate the difficult world encountered by students.

Assemblyman Kramer said maybe he heard a complaint about one social worker at a school where no troubling things had occurred.

Chair Carlton said the bill would need to be amended to remove the 5 percent salary raise.

Senator Dondero Loop thought there might be someone in Las Vegas to testify on the bill.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Kristin Barnson, President, Nevada School Counselor Association, testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). She thanked Senator Dondero Loop for her support in being a champion for all mental health providers. The Association was saddened that the 5 percent salary raise was amended out of the bill. Doing the paperwork had become part of the job of school mental health professionals. A reduction of the mental health professional to student ratio would help mental health professionals focus on working with students. School counselors wanted to spend 80 percent of their time providing direct and indirect services to students. School counselors could work on student achievement, attendance, and discipline matters to allow all students in Nevada to achieve. Unfortunately, sometimes other assigned duties made it difficult for the master's level professionals to be able to work with students. She appreciated the support and believed the bill would be a huge step in the right direction for students in schools.

Kirsten Searer, Chief Communications and Community Engagement Officer, Community Engagement Unit, Clark County School District (CCSD), testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). The District was saddened to see the amendment to the bill. The CCSD had a record of 128 national board-certified teachers in school year 2018-2019. Out of 154 new national board-certified teachers in Nevada, 128 were employed in the CCSD. The District was proud of that. A few individuals in CCSD did not qualify for that 5 percent salary raise but still worked to become national board-certified because they were committed to children. Those were individuals on the front lines. The children were increasingly faced with adult problems. The CCSD had seen increases in suicide ideations and poverty, 17 guns were confiscated from students on campuses last year, and 46 students were arrested for making terrorist threats against the schools. There was an increasing need for mental health and social services for students. The CCSD strongly supported the definitions outlined in the bill and hoped that in the future additional funding would be provided for national board certification.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, also represented the Nevada State Education Association, and testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). Washoe County School District had negotiated to provide counselors a 5 percent salary raise as an incentive to earn the national board certification. It was a shared priority of the Washoe County School District in the negotiated contract. The Association had bargained for the 5 percent salary raise and decided that it was a priority. She understood Senator Dondero Loop's position. The amendment saddened her because she would like to see the raise for all of the mental health professionals across the state. She supported the bill because of section 3. School counselors might be assigned bathroom monitor duties for a day during testing time even though they were national board-certified. When a crisis occurred, sometimes not all of the counselors were available because of other assigned duties not related to students. That was not the fault of the administration but because of time elements. Having 80 percent of their time devoted to student services would make a big difference and help counselors do what was needed. The social workers, counselors, and

school psychologists often worked behind the scenes. The public might think that a teacher's work was finished at 3:15 p.m. because the students went home. Much work was done beyond what the students saw, and sometimes the public was unaware of how much work went unseen. Ms. Anderson thought that could be one thing to consider related to the work done by social workers at 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. when they were doing home visits or working on a safety problem at 5:30 a.m. She wanted to clarify that aspect. Sometimes the work that was done in mental health areas was not something that a classroom teacher would see.

Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, Washoe County School District, testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). She said school counselors and mental health professionals from the Washoe County School District participated in developing the definitions in the bill. She thought that was important work. She was disappointed to see the amendment removing the 5 percent salary raise. Those professionals had done so much, and she often had to explain that school counselors were not necessarily mental health professionals, but their jobs were academic counselors. Mental health professionals on school campuses helped wrap those services around those students to allow everyone to focus on their specific roles.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Foster Consulting, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). The Association supported the bill in the policy committees and the money committees. She was a former school counselor and thought the bill was a good piece of legislation.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of Senate Bill 319 (R1). He was disappointed that the amendment removed the 5 percent salary raise but understood the funding problem. He said the focus on counselors, social workers, and psychologists was positive, and progress was being made through Senate Bill 89 (2nd Reprint), the omnibus school safety bill, and Senate Bill 551, the funding bill that addressed many problems. He would continue to support the importance of those licensed professionals in the schools.

Brenda Pearson, Director, Professional Learning, Clark County Education Association, testified as neutral on Senate Bill 319 (R1). She thanked Senator Dondero Loop for bringing the bill forward. She understood the important role that psychologists, counselors, and social workers played within the schools. They directly affected student's well-being and mental health that related to how students performed academically, their outcomes, and success at the end of the year. She was speaking as neutral because the Association was disappointed in the removal of the 5 percent salary increase. The salary increase would have recognized the level of expertise and knowledge that those social workers brought to the schools.

Chair Carlton said if Ms. Pearson was testifying against the amendment then she would be categorized as opposed to the bill. Chair Carlton understood the argument. There was nothing in the bill that prohibited the Association from negotiating a 5 percent salary raise. The bill would have made the 5 percent salary raise automatic. There was nothing in the bill that prohibited the raise during bargaining negotiations for those members.

Ms. Pearson agreed that there was nothing that prohibited bargaining for the 5 percent salary raise, but the bill ensured that there was a consistent recognition of the level of expertise that those individuals brought to the schools. There was nothing that prohibited that raise, but the school districts would have been legislatively bound to provide the raise, and the raise would have supported teachers, school psychologists, counselors, and social workers.

Senator Dondero Loop clarified that CCSD had 128 teachers who earned the national board certification that was intensive training at a high level. The CCSD ranked number two in the nation for teachers who achieved that accreditation. Those teachers received the 5 percent salary raise through a state appropriation, and it was not a negotiated bargained item. The bill would have provided the 5 percent salary raise to school mental health professionals. She appreciated the Committee's time and urged its support of the bill.

There being no further testimony on the bill, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 319 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 378 (2nd Reprint). Realizing Senator Cancela was not available to present the bill as yet, Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 507 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 507 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration for the support of the Marlette Lake Water System. (BDR S-1176)

Ward D. Patrick, P.E., Administrator, State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, presented Senate Bill 507 (1st Reprint). The bill was a request for an appropriation for the Marlette Lake Water System. Water sales problems had been prevalent over the past year. The agency was in negotiations with current and potential customers to create a balanced budget going forward. The water system was a 24-hour, 7-day a week operation with on-call water operators. Much of the work was on the side of the mountain west of Washoe Lake. The Department had contracts in place to get operations on track for the funding request.

There being no questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She said there were no amendments on the bill and closed the hearing on S.B. 507 (R1). She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for research, clinical studies, operations and educational programs. (BDR S-1260)

Jim Penrose, Director of Public Policy, R&R Partners, represented the Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. The Center opened in 2009 and provided clinical care, research, and education for patients and families dealing with the effects of Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and Huntington's diseases, multiple sclerosis, and various forms of dementia. In addition to the clinical care, the Center conducted research. Its clinical trials program for

Alzheimer's disease was among the largest in the country. In 2015, the Center received a grant of approximately \$11 million from the National Institute of Health that was used over a five-year period to fund research related to Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases. The Center had conducted over 70 clinical trials during its existence. The education component of the Center's mission involved patient and family social services and increased knowledge about those diseases, bolstered coping skills for patients and the families, and gave patients and families a sense of well-being in dealing with those devastating conditions. The services provided by the Center were not available elsewhere in Nevada. The need continued to grow with the aging of the population of the state. The appropriation would be invaluable and enable the Center to continue its work.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the Center was a nonprofit agency.

Mr. Penrose responded that he believed it was a nonprofit center.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the Center included graduate medical students, interns, and residents in the rotations at the Center. She thought that was appropriate because the Center requested state dollars to support its research.

Mr. Penrose replied that he was substituting for someone else in his office but believed the Center's staff included 13 physicians of various kinds. In 2018, approximately 30 individuals acted as rotating residents and fellows. The Center had a cooperative program with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) School of Medicine that allowed medical students to work with patients.

Assemblywoman Titus said the UNLV School of Medicine tried to champion the experience of students and residents and expand various programs. She thought the Center's programs were a good place for neurology rotations, and she wanted to ensure that connection occurred.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. She said the Center had been helpful when she had dealt with health problems in her family. Her mother used to say you could fix almost everything except your brain. It was important to be able to figure out what was going on in the brain. There was no further testimony, and Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint). She understood that Senator Ratti would be available at 9 a.m. to present Senate Bill 380 (1st Reprint) and recessed the Committee briefly at [8:44 a.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting [at 9:05 a.m.]. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 380 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 380 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Small Business Enterprise Loan Account. (BDR S-922)

Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 380 (1st Reprint) on behalf of Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6, who was required to remain in the Senate Committee on Judiciary. Senate Bill 380 (R1) was a bill that many members would be familiar with from the 79th Session (2017). The bill was about economic gardening, a concept that was being used successfully throughout the United States to help existing small or disadvantaged businesses grow and benefit and strengthen the local economy. Often discussions about economic development focused on attracting new businesses to Nevada, but more needed to be done to help existing businesses in the state. Senate Bill 380 (R1) built on the successful effort from the 79th Session (2017). The bill made an appropriation of \$1 million to the Small Business Enterprise Loan Account. The loans were made to businesses that were certified as an eligible business enterprise by an agency approved by the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor. The businesses were operated for profit in the state, maintained the principal place of business in Nevada, complied with all licensing and registration requirements, and included minority and women-owned businesses. Minority and women-owned businesses made up about 25 percent of the businesses in Clark County and represented one of the fastest growing segments in the nation. Small businesses with 100 or fewer employees represented nearly 30 percent of the workforce. There was some overlap in those statistics, but small businesses were an important and significant segment of the economy.

Chair Carlton said the Committee had discussed the program many times, and it had been successful and affected individuals on the front lines.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Vice President, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, testified in support of S.B. 380 (R1). The bill benefited small business owners and minority and women-owned businesses.

There being no further testimony on the bill, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 380 (R1) and opened a work session.

Senate Bill 166 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to employment. (BDR 18-5)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained Senate Bill (S.B.) 166 (2nd Reprint). The bill was presented by Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1, and revised provisions related to employment concerning the filing of complaints alleging a practice of unlawful discrimination and compensation. The bill authorized the Nevada Equal Rights Commission, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, to order a civil penalty for unlawful employment practices. The bill became effective upon passage and approval for adopting regulations and preparatory tasks. The provisions of the bill regarding the regulatory portions became effective on January 1, 2020. Kara Jenkins, Administrator, Nevada Equal Rights Commission, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, indicated there would

be a fiscal note. The Commission currently had ten full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions and a backlog of cases. However, the new caseload associated with the bill was unknown. The Committee had two options. The fiscal note included the addition of two FTE positions that would cost approximately \$112,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$209,000 in FY 2021. The options would be to amend those amounts into the bill or approve the bill as it was and require the agency to come to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to request the positions when the need for additional positions was experienced and more fully vetted and determined.

Chair Carlton suggested that the Committee approve the bill and let the agency return to IFC to request the needed personnel. The IFC could hold discussions about the policy as it evolved and approve the proper number of staff positions.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Do Pass S.B. 166 (R2).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS AS AMENDED SENATE BILL 166 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton said she would present the floor statement.

Assembly Bill 196: Makes appropriations for incentives for employing teachers at Title I schools and underperforming schools. (BDR S-144)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained Assembly Bill 196. The bill made appropriations for incentives to employ teachers at Title 1 and underperforming schools. The \$10 million appropriation from the State General Fund to the Department of Education would provide incentives to new teachers to teach at Title 1 and underperforming schools. The bill also appropriated \$10 million to the Department of Education to provide incentives for teachers who were currently employed to teach and decided to transfer to Title 1 or underperforming schools. She noted that the money committees approved the continuation of \$2.5 million to provide incentives to new teachers to teach at Title 1 schools and underperforming schools and \$2.5 million to provide incentives to teachers who transferred to Title 1 and underperforming schools. Those appropriations were already included in the budget and in the kindergarten to grade 12 (K-12) bill. Incentives existed for new teachers and teachers transferring into Title 1 schools but not for existing teachers.

Chair Carlton said she heard yesterday during discussions on the Distributive School Account (DSA) about the \$2.5 million incentives for new teachers and \$2.5 million for teachers transferring to Title 1 and underperforming schools. However, the existing teachers

who taught at those schools and had been doing the work were not eligible for those incentives. She proposed that the bill be amended to provide incentives in the sum of \$5 million to teachers currently teaching at Title 1 or underperforming schools pursuant to the Statewide System of Accountability of Public Schools. Assemblyman Frierson understood that the money committees had limited resources. This would be a new program to provide incentives for existing teachers, and regulations would need to be developed.

Assemblywoman Titus supported the concept but wanted to ensure it was in parity with other incentives and the K-12 bill. She asked whether the \$5 million meant \$2.5 million per year for a total of \$5 million or whether there were more incentives in the budget for the other two categories for new and transferring teachers.

Chair Carlton responded that the other incentives totaled \$2.5 million in each category for the 2019-2021 biennium. Assembly Bill 196 would recognize the existing teachers who taught at Title 1 and underperforming schools. There were probably more existing teachers than new or transferring teachers, and she expressed concerns that \$2.5 million would be insufficient to address the need. The funds could be used throughout the entire 2019-2021 biennium. If the full amount was not expended, the Legislature would know how much was needed in the future. She wanted to be cautious, but ensure sufficient funds for existing teachers.

Assemblyman Frierson said A.B. 196 was an extension of a program that was originally \$10 million but was cut to \$2.5 million and replenished by the Legislature during the 79th Session (2017). Morale of existing teachers suffered during the roll out of the incentive program. Assembly Bill 196 was an attempt to acknowledge those teachers who stuck it out with no acknowledgement until now. He thought it proportionately made sense as a reflection of how the policy had gotten the way it was today.

Chair Carlton thanked Assemblyman Frierson for allowing the Committee to proceed with the bill.

Ms. Jones added that the Department of Education submitted a fiscal note on the bill as introduced indicating an additional education professional would be needed. But the Department already had education professionals who oversaw those programs, and perhaps the need was because the amount was increased to \$20 million. She did not know what the fiscal costs would be for the \$5 million program. The Fiscal Analysis Division staff suggested that the Department of Education should approach the Interim Finance Committee and request additional resources that would be determined later. Insufficient time remained to get a revised fiscal note.

Chair Carlton thought the additional resources would not be needed, and the program should be easy to administer for the agency.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Amend and Do Pass A.B. 196 with the discussion points from earlier for currently employed teachers and with a \$5 million appropriation.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 196.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Chair Carlton closed the work session and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 378 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 378 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to prescription drugs. (BDR 18-574)

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Senate District No. 10, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 378 (2nd Reprint). The bill did three things that she would outline. The bill dealt with drug purchasing within Medicaid. First, it gave Medicaid greater control of the pharmacy benefit. The benefit was carved out so Medicaid could manage it itself, and cost could be a consideration as part of the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee (P&T) discussions after clinical discussions had occurred. The P&T helped make decisions about the drugs entered into the preferred drug list (PDL) within Medicaid. Medicaid had to cover all drugs that were U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved, and the agency participated in the federal drug rebate program.

According to Senator Cancela, the second thing the bill did was create transparency for drug purchasing by mandating that the Department of Health and Human Services create reports of savings published online that reflected parts of audits of pharmacy benefits management contracts. The third thing the bill did was create the Silver State Scripts Board and a purchasing program that allowed Medicaid to join with other nonprofit and public health plans for greater purchasing power with drug manufacturers. It was estimated that those changes would save the state about \$3,256,830 in State General Funds over the course of the 2019-2021 biennium. Those savings could be used to pay for the additional staff necessary to carry out the program.

Chair Carlton asked whether the fiscal note included additional staff.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, said an unsolicited fiscal note was received from the Department of Health and Human Services. The note indicated a need for additional staff, but it also showed a savings of about \$25 million in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$20 million in FY 2021. The net effect

would be approximately \$45 million over the 2019-2021 biennium and \$3.3 million of that amount would be General Fund savings. In the scope of the entire Medicaid program, it was a small savings, and but there might be a need for the agency to request the positions from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to enact the program. The long-term effect was a General Fund savings for the Medicaid program.

Senator Cancela added that she believed an updated fiscal note increased the General Fund savings to \$3,256,830. She concurred with the other comments of the Fiscal Analysis Division staff.

Assemblywoman Titus said she was curious about a statement made a moment ago that Medicaid had to cover all FDA-approved medications. She asked whether that statement was accurate. She thought that Medicaid had a formulary and a PDL for the prescription drug program. It had not been her experience that Medicaid covered all FDA-approved medications.

Senator Cancela responded that the statement was accurate, and caveats existed in how the pharmacy benefit was managed.

Suzanne Bierman, J.D., M.P.H., Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, testified from Las Vegas. She confirmed that Medicaid covered all FDA-approved drugs. However, Medicaid had preferred and nonpreferred drugs. Within those parameters, all drugs were covered, but some drugs required prior authorization and other utilization management activities associated with them.

Assemblywoman Titus said at times she ordered medication that was denied. Even when she tried to get it authorized, it had been denied in the past. The medication might be covered, but Medicaid still had an avenue to deny that prescription.

Ms. Bierman responded that the preferred versus nonpreferred distinction was relevant. Even nonpreferred drugs were available under certain circumstances, and there was a process for accessing those drugs. In general practice, preferred drugs were authorized without the additional steps required for nonpreferred drugs.

Assemblywoman Titus said that information was good to know, and she would keep fighting longer for the drug next time.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said in regard to process, section 31.15 addressed the Department's process of directly managing and coordinating all the payments and rebates. Those who joined the purchasing agreement completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). She asked about the MOU in regard to cash-flow transfers. She asked whether the individual entities paid for their own items or whether there was an understanding on the back side about how the billing piece worked.

Senator Cancela responded that much was done contractually, and the entities negotiated the process. Section 31.15 was specific to the Medicaid preferred drug list management. Section 31.55 addressed the Silver State Scripts Board and purchasing program. The bill did not prescribe how entities could work together within the purchasing program. The bill left it open to allow Medicaid to direct how other groups should join and work together. The bill prescribed that an entity must follow the Medicaid PDL to join the purchasing program.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she had thought about the enactment piece of the program. She did not know whether the Department had a process, but the bill said the Department should directly manage, direct, and coordinate the payments and rebates. She assumed that some kind of MOU existed similar to an MOU of a governing body of a county or school district. She asked whether an entity could join the purchasing program and the rebates would flow directly to that entity or whether those rebates would flow to the Department first and then flow to the entity. She thought there might be a bypass but that was more technical, and she did not understand whether that was the intent of the sponsor or whether the parties could figure it out on the back end.

Senator Cancela replied there were different kinds of drug rebates. An individual might access some rebates, but federal rebates went directly to Medicaid. Her intent was that the Department would work with any entities that joined the purchasing program to figure out a process through contracts and regulations.

Assemblywoman Neal asked about section 31.15, subsection 4 and the process for the Department to follow. She had not looked at the cost associated with the program in the fiscal note. The bill required the pharmacy benefit manager to collect the funds. She asked about rebates for the purchase of prescription drugs by an entity other than the Department. She asked about what the Department was required to do, the cost to the Department, and who the other entity was.

Senator Cancela responded that the Department could contract with other entities for drug purchases namely pharmacy benefit managers. Rebates were paid to the pharmacy benefits manager (PBM) and passed on to the state. Section 31.15, subsection 4 stated that if the pharmacy benefits manager had contracted with a third-party to administer the account, the administrator of the drug purchasing program or the third-party entity would also be required to pass on the rebates to the Department.

Assemblywoman Neal said section 31.15, subsection 4 also stated that the Department would adopt policies that prescribed the maximum amount of the administrative fee. She asked how the fee would be renegotiated and about the purpose of that provision relative to the recalculation or renegotiation.

Senator Cancela replied that the PBM negotiated the benefit, and the managed care organization (MCO) managed that part of the plan related to passing on the rebates. The way that the two entities interacted with the Department was largely outlined in contracts, and within those contracts was the authority to set a fee when there was a requirement or a need

for an administrative fee associated with passing through those rebates. It was no different than administrative fees attached to banking. Administrative fees might be needed because of all the financial transactions that would happen to get the rebates to the state.

Assemblywoman Neal said section 31.2, subsection 1 referred to the contract between the Department and the PBM or the MCO. A requirement existed for the PBM to obtain an independent audit at the expense of the PBM or MCO. She asked about the cost of the audit. She understood that the assumption was that no existing independent audit functioned to meet the needs of the bill. She asked about the need for an independent audit related to the financial transactions.

Senator Cancela responded that the intention of that section was to ensure that the state received the maximum rebates. Making that audit public was important to enhance transparency, and that was the intention behind that section.

Assemblywoman Neal asked whether the cost of the audit was supposed to be a part of the administrative fee or whether the cost of the audit was in addition to the administrative fee.

Senator Cancela replied that contract would specify the cost, the administrative fee, and how the parties would interact with each other. The two entities would come to an agreement on how they would work together as part of the contract between the PBM and the state.

Assemblywoman Neal said she heard a lot about contracts with the Department in the Committee. Sometimes what she believed should be the contracting authority on the state side might not necessarily manifest itself in the contract terms. She asked about the catchall in the bill that prevented an overextension of power on one side versus the state. She understood the goal. But the bill made the parties' relationship dependent upon the contract terms that were negotiated to achieve the goal of the bill.

Senator Cancela responded that was why in the beginning of section 31.15, language authorized the state to control the pharmacy benefit so the state had the authority to contract in a different way than it did currently. Today, the pharmacy benefit was managed by the different entities that provided Medicaid services. The state lacked authority to manage the pharmacy benefit itself and take into consideration what occurred with the PDL. Changing that dynamic put the state on better footing to leverage that power within negotiations and ensure maximum savings for the state.

Chair Carlton asked for any other questions from the Committee. She said the fiscal note made it difficult to determine what personnel would be needed. She was apprehensive about attempting to develop an accurate number right now. The process would be an evolution, and personnel might be needed.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, said she was pleased the Administrator was present to speak to the fiscal note on S.B. 378 (R2). The fiscal note indicated costs for positions and associated expenses would

total approximately \$625,000 over the 2019-2021 biennium. Fiscal agent claims processing expense was about \$5.2 million, capitation rate update would cost \$52,000, and actuarial services would cost about \$300,000. However, the Check Up program would see savings of about \$32 million, and additional drug rebates would save about \$20 million. If the bill was approved, she would expect to see a work program or a series of work programs to request the additional staffing with an offset of General Fund savings on amounts that were already appropriated to the agency in the budget closings. She thought the Committee would see the savings total more than the costs. She would rely on the Administrator to elaborate on the matter.

Ms. Bierman said the fiscal note contemplated additional staffing for a total of five new positions, a social services chief 1, a social services program specialist 3, two social services program specialists, and an administrative assistant. The cost for those positions and the associated costs related to those positions for the upcoming 2019-2021 biennium was \$624,697. That expense would receive a 50 percent administrative match that resulted in a total State General Fund cost of \$312,349 over the 2019-2021 biennium.

Ms. Jones said the Fiscal Analysis Division staff lacked all the backup documents to determine the appropriate calculation of all the items indicated for the 50:50 split. The Fiscal Analysis Division staff recommendation was to have the agency come to IFC with all the appropriate backup documentation. During the budget process, a decision unit would normally be prepared with all the backup information. The fiscal note process was a short five-day turnaround, and agencies lacked the ability to create the backup that the Fiscal Analysis Division staff would normally vet. She thought the IFC process was the appropriate way to handle the costs should the bill pass. She was unable to confidently verify those numbers without the opportunity to review and vet the calculations.

Chair Carlton said she did not doubt the numbers, but wanted the Fiscal Analysis Division staff to review the details and confirm some matters. She asked whether that was satisfactory to the agency.

Ms. Bierman confirmed that the agency would proceed as suggested.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Chelsea Capurro, Griffin Company, representing the Health Services Coalition, testified in support of Senate Bill 378 (R2).

Jeanette Belz, J.K. Belz and Associates, representing the Nevada Psychiatric Association, testified in support of Senate Bill 378 (R2). The Association wanted to point out several items that were not mentioned in much detail. Section 31.4, subsection 2 related to atypical and typical antipsychotic medications and anticonvulsants that would no longer have the opportunity to be on the excluded drug list or excluded from any restrictions. Normally under other conditions, the Association would like to see those drugs have the opportunity

for exclusions, but she understood the fiscal concerns. The bill would actually take the pharmacy benefit for those atypical and typical antipsychotic medications and anticonvulsants and other drugs and move them to the fee-for-service programs so that the drug benefit would no longer be managed by the three other managed care organizations. The benefit for mental health patients was that they would have one consistent drug list across all of those MCOs regardless of enrollment in a specific MCO or fee-for-service program. The PDL would be the same for any organization. That was a benefit developed in the public process through the Drug Utilization Review (DUR) Board and P&Ts. [Drug Utilization Reviews were defined as an authorized, structured, ongoing review of healthcare provider prescribing, pharmacist dispensing, and patient use of medication.] The bill was a good trade-off to eliminate inconsistencies for mental health patients. She thanked the Department for all its work and the public nature of the reports. The Silver State Scripts Board program would allow other entities to join the preferred drug list. She suggested that the members of the new committee be appointed by the Governor. The new committee would have broader authority, and other entities might consider joining it.

Chair Carlton said there were a number of discussions about previous bills that addressed this matter. She wanted to ensure that S.B. 378 (R2) addressed the problems in a more consistent way than the previous bills did with biennial sunsets.

Ms. Belz replied that S.B. 378 (R2) took the state farther into the future and made some positive changes. It was the opinion of the Association that S.B. 378 (R2) was preferable to the other bills.

Chair Carlton said the drug program was confusing, and the Legislature had tried to navigate it for years with the constant change in healthcare and drugs. She was pleased that patients would be treated similarly to fee-for-service customers.

Ms. Belz said she hoped that some of the savings could be directed to the Medicaid program.

Assemblywoman Neal said section 31.4, subsection 5 addressed reports of agreements and contracts negotiated between the parties. The information had to include the financial effects of obtaining prescriptions through those agreements and contracts in total, aggregated, and separately. Assemblywoman Neal asked whether Ms. Belz supported that provision. She had not seen specificity regarding what information would be confidential or public on the website.

Ms. Belz responded that she did not represent the individuals who would create the reports. She represented the Nevada Psychiatric Association. The Association appreciated the transparency that would be created and had asked that reports be posted on the website.

Chair Carlton asked for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on Senate Bill 378 (2nd Reprint) and opened a work session on Senate Bill 378 (2nd Reprint).

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 378 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Spiegel.

Chair Carlton said other bills would be coming to the Committee after the Assembly completed some floor work. She said the members should expect to continue the Committee meeting after the floor session unless something occurred that needed immediate attention.

Chair Carlton recessed the meeting [at 9:53 a.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting at [6.34 p.m.].

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint). The sponsor was not available so she would hold that bill until later. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing producers of insurance and other persons regulated by the Commissioner of Insurance. (BDR 57-220)

Nick J. Stosic, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, read prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)) from Barbara Richardson, Commissioner of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, related to Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint). He submitted [Exhibit E](#), a document titled "Section By Section Explanation for S.B. 88 – Licensing 2019 Legislative Session."

Mr. Stosic read Ms. Richardson's testimony.

Good Afternoon Chairwoman Carlton, Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson, and members of the Committee. I am Barbara Richardson, the Insurance Commissioner for the State of Nevada, and I am here today to present Senate Bill 88 (R1), which is a bill that is intended to clean-up some statutes related to insurance licensing. We have provided you with a document ([Exhibit E](#)) that includes a detailed section by section summary of the changes proposed in this bill, along with the reason each change is being sought.

The original language of the bill changed the length of most licenses issued by the Division of Insurance from three years to two years to bring Nevada into

uniformity with most all other states and match the language in the NAIC [National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC)] Uniform Producer Model. The license fees were set at roughly 2/3 of the existing fees to maintain a cost-neutrality for our roughly 169,000 licensees and the state.

Due to the timing of the enactment in the bill's original language, the transition to 2-year licenses would have reduced the licensing fees revenue to the General Fund to 2/3rds of the current fees during the upcoming biennium, as evidenced by the bill's original language fiscal note. To avoid any loss of General Fund revenue, the decision was made to keep all licenses at their current length, and all language related to 2-year licenses was removed from this bill by amendment in the Senate. The current version of the bill has no fiscal impact to the Division or the State.

There are several licenses and one fee being removed from the bill, but their elimination will not create a fiscal impact. Licenses for fraternal organizations are being removed, as the law requires them to be licensed as producers pursuant to NRS 683A. This bill also eliminates licenses for Associate Adjusters licenses, as they will be licensed as Adjusters going forward, and removes Fixed Annuities as a limited lines license, as they are not issued as limited lines by the Division.

The Exchange Enrollment Facilitator's license change fee is being eliminated. These licenses are not able to be changed, so this fee is never actually charged. None of these license changes that remain in the bill will have a fiscal impact to the licensees or the state.

Other changes made in the current version of the bill are eliminating license applicants providing prelicensing education verification to the Division prior to sitting for their licensing examination. The applicants will instead attest to attendance at the time of the test, making this more efficient for the applicant and the Division. The bill also removes a licensed business organization's requirement to submit a list of each producer authorized to transact business, as it is not information the Division collects or would use unless there is an enforcement action.

Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint) removes the requirement that nonresident adjusters maintain a place of business in this state. This does not change the in-state office requirements placed on insurers or third-party administrators adjusting worker's compensation claims in Nevada under NRS 616B.027.

Section 16 provides for a request for a waiver if an adjuster is unable to comply with the license renewal requirements because of military service, long-term medical disability, or some other extenuating circumstance. It also requires the adjuster to inform the Commissioner of any address change

within 30 days of the change and allows the Commissioner to contract with nongovernmental entities to perform any ministerial function, including, without limitation, the collection of fees and data related to licensing that the Commissioner may deem appropriate.

This concludes my introduction of S.B. 88 (R1), and I am happy to answer your questions.

Mr. Stosic stated that currently the Division had a couple of organizations that participated and produced the licensing, and the National Insurance Producer Registry was one of those. The bill allowed licensees to handle licensing in any of the 50 states to create an efficiency for licensees.

Assemblyman Kramer asked whether there were 69,000 insurance licensees in Nevada.

Mr. Stosic responded that there were 169,000 licensees with the Division of Insurance. There were 172,000 if actual company licenses were included. An insurance agent also owned an agency license. The Division had 172,000 licenses but 169,000 different licensees.

Assemblyman Kramer thought Nevada had a lot of licensees in the real estate industry when it was 45,000, and now there were significantly more.

Mr. Stosic responded that the interesting thing was that of that 169,000 licensees, approximately 17,000 were Nevada residents and the rest were out-of-state licensees.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on S.B. 88 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint): Establishes a program to award grants to support prekindergarten programs. (BDR 34-338)

Johnathan P. Moore, Ed.D., Deputy Superintendent of Student Achievement, Department of Education, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 84 (1st Reprint). The bill sought to establish a program to award grants to support prekindergarten programs. Research indicated that significant gains were realized through improved outcomes in education, health, social behaviors, and employment when vulnerable children had access to comprehensive, high-quality early childhood programs starting from birth. In Nevada, approximately 11 percent of the eligible four-year-olds whose family incomes were less than 200 percent of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) were served in prekindergarten classrooms. Historically \$3.4 million in General Funds for state prekindergarten had been included in the funding bills. In 2016, the Department received the federal Preschool Development Grant (PDG) and was able to expand state prekindergarten seats from half-day to full-day and add new full-day seats statewide. [The Preschool Development Grants competition supported states to (1) build or enhance a preschool program infrastructure that would enable the delivery of

high-quality preschool services to children and (2) expand high-quality preschool programs in targeted communities that would serve as models for expanding preschool to all four-year-olds from low- and moderate-income families.]

Mr. Moore continued that currently, funding streams that were braided to support state prekindergarten included state funds from Victory and Zoom schools, federal funds from Head Start, title funds in special education, and private education funds. The PDG expired in December 2018, and the Department received a no-cost extension through June 2019 to finish the current school year. There were no federal funds available to continue seats in the 2019-2020 school year. Senate Bill 84 (R1) would reduce fragmentation by establishing and defining the quality components of prekindergarten into law.

Mr. Moore said the bill [Note: Some of the following remarks relate to the bill before its Senate amendment.] established a program to award grants to school districts, charter schools, and nonprofit organizations to support prekindergarten programs. Section 2 of the bill created the Prekindergarten Account in the State General Fund. Section 3 required the Department to expend the money in the account to award grants to school districts, charter schools, and nonprofit organizations to support prekindergarten programs. Section 4 of the bill prescribed the authorized uses for the grant. Section 5 of the bill required the State Board of Education to adopt regulations to carry out the grant. Section 7 of the bill involved the submission of reports for compliance to the Legislature and provided that the Legislature would review and make recommendations as necessary. Section 8 of the bill indicated that the bill became effective upon passage and approval.

Chair Carlton said the bill was a budget implementation bill that went along with the discussion of the Committee about the budget. She thought some extra seats had been added to the prekindergarten program.

Mr. Moore responded that his understanding was that the bill would support continuing 3,023 seats in prekindergarten programs.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association and representing the Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 84 (R1). The bill was supported in the policy committee, and the Association continued to support the bill. The 11 percent that was served was alarming to her, because she hoped more students would be served. There was no question that the earlier students started in education the better the outcome. More seats would be helpful. She asked for the Committee's support of the bill.

Jared Busker, Associate Director, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance, testified in support of S.B. 84 (R1). The Alliance would support anything to bring prekindergarten programs to every single child in Nevada. He supported it in the policy committee and in the Committee.

Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, Washoe County School District testified in opposition to S.B. 84 (R1). She said the District was in support of the prekindergarten programs and the large appropriation to replace the expired federal grant. The bill did not have a hearing before a policy committee, thus she was unable to have the policy discussion. She opposed the bill in the hearing before the Senate Committee on Finance. She referred to section 3, subsection (1), paragraphs (b) and (h). She provided practical reasons why the bill was problematic for the Washoe County School District in neighborhood schools. Federal law required students be qualified at 200 percent of federal poverty level (FPL). Paragraph (h), for example, required that the mix of students reflect the special education percentages of the whole. Students did not come in nice little packages of perfect percentages of students at the individual school level. The District had experienced 20 seats in a neighborhood school but could only find 18 students who met the criteria outlined in the legislation. Two seats went unfilled because students might be at 250 percent of the FPL and failed to meet the requirements. Those students were poor but not poor enough to qualify for the program. The position of the District was it wanted to fill those seats and meet the needs of those students who were at 200 percent of FPL. If there was an opportunity to fill those seats with students who did not meet the 200 percent FPL, the District would still want to fill those seats instead of having empty seats. The District had the teacher, the staff, and the classroom and wanted to fill those seats at 100 percent capacity.

Ms. Anderson said the same argument held true for the special education requirement. While the District might end up being one or two students short of meeting the national or district level percentage for special education students, it would hate to turn away any students. It would hate to turn families away that wanted to have students attend prekindergarten at the neighborhood-zoned school. But for whatever reason, the District could not meet that percentage of special education students in that classroom. The District wanted to prioritize those seats and then fill available seats with students at a different level of poverty or special education as an ideal situation from a prekindergarten perspective. The District supported prekindergarten services, but the practical reality of the grant was that it had left seats unfilled in the neighborhood schools because of the rigidity of the regulations outlined in the bill.

Chair Carlton asked whether those were the federal requirements.

Ms. Anderson responded that the bill's requirements mirrored the federal program of the grant that expired. There was the prospect that the District might receive that federal grant again, but during the gap period, the idea was to mirror the federal requirements in the state law. She submitted that the Legislature had the opportunity to be more flexible with the state dollars than it could be with the federal dollars at least in the short term.

Chair Carlton said the school districts would not receive those federal dollars because the grant had expired. She asked whether lack of adherence to the federal guidelines would inhibit the ability to receive a future grant.

Ms. Anderson responded that she could not speak to that, and she was not an expert on the federal grant. She understood that could be a risk, and the District did not want to jeopardize any dollars it might receive in the future. The District did not want to leave seats unfilled in the interim.

Chair Carlton asked whether a student had to meet both criteria and be at 200 percent FPL and be a student with a disability or whether those were two different sets of students.

Ms. Anderson replied that she understood that a student had to meet the overall requirements, not every student had to be a special education student, but every classroom had to serve pupils with disabilities at a rate not less than the percentage of pupils in the state or the United States who were special education students. Not every student, but the classroom had to be representative of either the state or the federal distribution of special education.

Chair Carlton asked whether all students had to qualify as special education or whether the 200 percent FPL could possibly be the determinant of whether the student could be in that classroom or not.

Ms. Anderson replied that the student had to be at 200 percent of FPL, and the classroom had to include a representative proportion of special education students that mirrored the district or the federal percentage, whichever was greater.

Chair Carlton understood it was a two-pronged criteria.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked whether seats were left open currently in the prekindergarten classrooms when the District had exhausted the number of students who fit the criteria. She asked about other students in that school who did not fit the criteria but might fill the seats in that classroom. She asked whether a school district would leave those seats empty or allow other children to fill those seats who might not fit the criteria.

Ms. Anderson responded that she wished there was a simple answer. It depended on how the District "braided" [intermingled] the funds. In some cases, the District used Zoom dollars in addition to federal dollars, but the funding depended on the school and the setting. To the extent possible, the District tried to fill those seats. But when students did not fit the criteria, then the District was not reimbursed for those seats.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno said a school principal might know there were five seats available that the school was unable to fill under the criteria. The principal might decide that the five seats were open to the next five students no matter where the families ranked in regard to economic status. She asked whether that principal could make that decision.

Ms. Anderson responded that she thought that was the goal but was not allowed under the bill's restrictions. In some instances, seats were going unfilled in certain schools depending on the funding source for prekindergarten programs at that school, and that was the concern

with section 3 of the bill. The District would be turning families away or taking students but not receiving any funding for those students.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked whether a caring and compassionate principal, who knew that there was an educator in the classroom who was willing to accept those five students, could agree to include those five students.

Ms. Anderson replied that she could not speak to what occurred at every single school site. She thought it was much easier for principals to do that when the school used other sources of funds besides the grant. When the District used prekindergarten funds exclusively to fund the prekindergarten program under the existing criteria, seats were going unfilled because they did not meet the criteria of section 3 of the bill, in her understanding. If for some reason the school used Zoom funds or there were other funds used, and there was wiggle room with more flexibility of accepting students who did not meet those criteria, then students could be accepted. But in instances where prekindergarten funds were the only sources of funding, the language was clear that the students would not be eligible to attend that classroom or be reimbursed.

Chair Carlton asked about the income level to qualify for 200 percent of FPL.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Foster Consulting, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified that Ms. Anderson outlined clearly what the problems were. The schools needed more flexibility with the state money to assist them. The Association was supportive of the prekindergarten programs and appreciated that the state supported the program in the absence of the federal grant.

Chair Carlton said a family of four persons earned \$50,200 at 200 percent FPL.

Bradley Keating, Director of Government Relations, Community Engagement Unit, Clark County School District (CCSD), echoed the sentiments of his colleagues. It did not bring him pleasure to oppose the bill because CCSD cared about prekindergarten students and programs. They did amazing things on a daily basis. The reason for his opposition was the same reason expressed by Ms. Anderson. He sought flexibility from the rigid rules of the federal grant related to FPL and special education categories. The federal grant expired, and he sought flexibility with the state dollars to ensure that every seat was taken. That flexibility would be a great help to the District. He suggested creation of a type of waiver system that the Department of Education could approve. Thus when the federal government decided to reauthorize the PDG, the Department could deny the waiver and the school districts could adhere to the guidelines set forth by the federal grant. The federal government funded 3,023 seats, and CCSD looked forward to continuing those seats. He had been told by the Department that the amount allocated by the Legislature was insufficient to continue those seats. The top priority of the Clark County School District was to ensure that those seats were fully funded and that no student lost a seat moving forward. Any clarification the Committee could provide would be helpful.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked about Mr. Keating's comment that he wanted to ensure that no student lost a seat moving forward. She asked whether he referred to prekindergarten programs and the eligibility criteria for a student in a given school or the number of students in a school or the quantified number of eligible seats available.

Mr. Keating responded that the CCSD wanted to ensure that the 3,023 seats previously available remained available in the future. The Department told CCSD that there was a \$7 million shortfall between the cost and the funding.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked about the number of students now, and the difference between the status quo and the bill.

Mr. Keating responded that the Department would need to answer that. The cost was \$8,000 per child.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she heard there were 3,023 seats and that was the number of children and spots and seats. She asked whether the District anticipated a reduction in the number of seats if the bill was approved. She said he could follow up with that information, but she was just trying to quantify the outcome in her mind.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno said as she read the bill, the percentage would be for the district as a whole and not for individual schools. She thought the percentage for children with disabilities and children at the 200 percent of FPL used in the district was an average as the qualifying factor and was not for each individual school. That was how she interpreted the bill.

Ms. Anderson responded that her understanding was that the federal requirements were to serve students with disabilities at that rate and interpreted by the federal government at the classroom level. If that was not the intent or if the intent was to be able to use the district average around prekindergarten, then that goal was more achievable than being interpreted at the individual classroom level. Any clarification the Committee could add would be appreciated by the school districts.

Chair Carlton said the bill never had a hearing before a policy committee. She asked whether Ms. Anderson's concerns were shared with the Senate Committee on Finance.

Ms. Anderson replied yes: she was in the same unfortunate circumstance of sharing those concerns with the Senate Committee on Finance. She was present and explained her objections. There was an amendment, and she thought that the first reprint was better than the original bill. There was a change made to the language around competitive grants, and the word competitive was removed to be able to ensure that school districts funded the existing seats not on a competitive basis, and the districts were appreciative of that consideration. But the concerns around the requirements of the program were not resolved by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Chair Carlton said she had to respect Senate Finance's work on the bill as a courtesy that was provided to each committee. She understood that those concerns were brought to the attention of that committee but were not addressed. She asked whether those concerns were brought before or after the subcommittees closed the budgets.

Ms. Anderson responded that there were two different problems. The per-pupil funds that were approved and closed in the subcommittees had been separate from the policy conversation about the prekindergarten programs. The original idea was that the money that was in the Governor's recommended budget would be appropriated through a lens and not appropriated to the existing seats. Senator Woodhouse met with a working group and articulated that her intent was to fund the existing seats and any money left over after that would go through the competitive processes outlined in S.B. 84 (R1). Her understanding was that after the budget closing, there was no extra money to go through the competitive process. She thought Chair Carlton was articulating the confusion between the policy framework outlined in the bill and the budget closing and appropriation included in the budget bills.

Chair Carlton asked whether Ms. Anderson's opposition was with the policy or the fiscal aspects of the bill.

Ms. Anderson replied that her opposition was with both aspects of the bill.

Chair Carlton said that the members on the subcommittees had a deeper understanding of the problem. She wanted the full Committee to be aware of what the subcommittees did on the matter.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, responded that she would do her best to encapsulate what the closing motion was. The subcommittees, and then the full Committees, approved a state prekindergarten program funded with State General Fund appropriations of \$35.9 million over the 2019-2021 biennium inclusive of the transfer of \$3.3 million in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium from the early childhood education program and the other state education program budgets to the budget account to fund 1,081 full-day prekindergarten seats at an average cost of \$8,000 per seat, 1,942 half-day prekindergarten seats at an average cost of \$4,000 per seat, and the remaining half-day seats with braided funding for a total of 3,023 prekindergarten seats with the technical adjustments noted by the Fiscal Analysis Division staff. That action maintained the existing level of funding provided by the state using braided funding to cover the remaining \$4,000 to retain 3,023 existing prekindergarten seats. That option reduced General Fund appropriations by \$8,900,000 over the 2019-2021 biennium. In addition, the subcommittees approved the prekindergarten program but reduced the average seat cost from \$8,000 to \$7,825 by excluding funding for indirect costs for transportation and used General Fund appropriations to link \$775,750 over the 2019-2021 biennium for approximately 48 additional prekindergarten seats in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium. That was how the Committees closed the budget, but it was complicated

Chair Carlton said the Committee did not convert to total General Funds and retained the braided funding. The closing motion backed out the indirect costs and transportation costs that had generated some concerns.

Ms. Jones responded that the cost per seat was reduced, but additional seats were added to break even.

Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, confirmed that information was correct. The actual cost of \$8,000 per seat was reduced to \$7,875; however, the resulting savings were then used to fund 48 additional seats.

Jessica Ferrato, representing the Nevada Nurses Association, testified in opposition to the bill. She echoed the comments made by the representatives of the Washoe County and Clark County School Districts. She testified in opposition not based on the policy but on the specific concerns about the flexibility of funding and students. The Association wanted to have the seats filled, but the districts were not allowed to do so.

Chair Carlton said there was no further testimony in opposition or neutral on the bill. She asked for the concerns to be addressed by the Department of Education. She knew the bill had not been heard at a policy committee hearing, but the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance was well-versed in education matters.

Mr. Moore commented that only 11 percent of the eligible students were being served. That meant 89 percent of the eligible students lacked access or were not participating in quality prekindergarten education and thus not getting kindergarten ready. That failure jeopardized the remainder of the K-12 pipeline. He heard calls for flexibility, and the question had to be posed whether the state did all it could to serve the students who needed the programming the most. He argued that a population of one out of ten students served did not indicate that the state did what it could to serve the students who needed the program the most.

Mr. Moore said the confusion around the inclusion rate was another matter. The inclusion rate was determined based on the subgrantee level not the classroom level. What you heard during testimony was partially accurate in the sense that the percentage of special needs students should mirror the composition of the subgrantee as a whole, not at the classroom level. That requirement would ensure that multi-integral students had access to quality prekindergarten education. A correct concern was expressed about the alignment to federal programming. While the PDG funding had expired, he anticipated that Nevada would be the recipient of a planning grant to develop a needs assessment and strategic plan that would propel the state forward with a new application for PDG when it was released. The state had to align its requirements at the state level to the federal level or potentially risk not being eligible for the grant. If another federal grant was awarded, the state would risk being in a position of functioning under two different requirements. Recipients of state funds might not even be eligible to receive federal funds depending on what those requirements were, which in a sense created confusion. The problem lent itself to the idea that Nevada served

11 percent of the neediest children in the state. Flexibility would increase the students served because currently roughly 8 out of 11 children lacked access or were not currently participating in prekindergarten programs. He agreed with the comments of the Fiscal Analysis Division staff regarding the costs of the seats.

Chair Carlton asked Mr. Moore to put on the record that those conversations had been held with the school districts before tonight, and the concerns had been shared with the Department previously.

Mr. Moore responded that the Department held a stakeholder's meeting on Tuesday and invited a group of stakeholders some of whom testified today. The concerns were first expressed during that meeting.

Assemblywoman Jauregui wanted to clarify some matters. She heard the opposition say that the criteria was too narrow and that there could be times when five seats might go unfilled in a school. Mr. Moore said only 11 percent of the total population was being served, and there was no reason those seats should not be filled. She said there were enough students to fill those seats, with 89 percent of the eligible population remaining who also could be served.

Mr. Moore replied that Assemblywoman Jauregui was correct. One of the partners in Clark County, United Way, petitioned the Department when it originally had a competitive grant for additional seats. United Way requested about 140 seats because those were families identified that United Way believed could be served. The Department stood ready to provide any technical assistance whether it was related to how to remove barriers for families, connect with families, relocate centers to areas of need, or better connect with community partners to leverage district resources. The Department would provide that support.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked why seats were left unfilled. She asked whether more outreach was needed or information needed to be disseminated to the community that funding was available. She was uncertain why the schools had money to fill a classroom but had unfilled seats.

Mr. Moore responded that a number of factors could contribute to the problem and each was unique depending on the district. There could be barriers related to communication with parents, outreach, accessibility, or other barriers. The Department was ready to troubleshoot to remove those barriers, whether it was the application, native languages, the location of centers, or how to locate centers in an area that was more accessible. He said that a family of four whose income was \$50,000 possibly lacked transportation. A center had to be accessible to that family. A family might have language barriers. The school district needed to ensure that no barrier to communication existed to improve access and receive awareness about the programming. The barriers might be systemic problems related to how to enact prekindergarten programming and leverage it across other program areas to better support the children who needed it. The Department was ready to help develop solutions.

Chair Carlton understood that there were many moving parts to the problem. She wanted to serve as many children as possible. She believed that the subcommittees' closing addressed many of the problems. She knew the stakeholders worked together to find solutions. She would be uncomfortable changing anything in the bill especially because there was a possibility of a planning grant. She would not want to give the wrong indication to the federal government on that particular grant. She was inclined to leave S.B. 84 (1st Reprint) as it was and let it move forward and hold future discussions. The Legislature wanted more students in those seats. If Nevada was unable to receive the next federal grant, she thought a discussion about a higher level of the FPL might ensure that more students qualified. The income level for 200 percent of FPL was low, and there were many other problems at that income level.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 84 (1st Reprint) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 530 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 530 (1st Reprint): Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Nevada Supreme Court for a projected shortfall related to judicial selection processes. (BDR S-1250)

Robin L. Sweet, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 530 (1st Reprint). She said the normal process for budgeting for judicial selection included three judicial selections per year. In the current year, six judicial selections were completed, and the Office was working on the seventh judicial selection. The Office had no way of knowing three years in advance how many judges might retire, pass away, or be removed from office. The Judicial Selection Commission was busy.

Chair Carlton said the supplemental appropriation was for \$6,000. There being no questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on S.B. 530 (R1).

Chair Carlton thought that the Committee would meet later this evening after the Senate finished its floor session and processed some bills to the Committee. She believed the Committee would post Assembly Bill 19 (1st Reprint) for this evening's meeting. She opened public comment. She saw a person was present in Las Vegas and asked what bill was of interest to that person.

Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for research, clinical studies, operations and educational programs. (BDR S-1260)

Patti Jesinosky, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, stated she was interested in Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint). That bill was last on the agenda that she saw. She asked whether that bill had been heard.

Chair Carlton said S.B. 528 (R1) was heard during the morning agenda. The Committee held conversations on the bill. The bill had appropriations involved, and the Committee was unable to process the bill until the education bill was approved. The bill had been heard, but Chair Carlton said she could allow public comments on that bill.

Ms. Jesinosky stated that she had been a pharmacist in Nevada since 2000. She visited the Cleveland Clinic. She was familiar with some of the funding that was paid by pharmaceutical industries for Alzheimer's medications that were expensive. The Cleveland Clinic was part of a for-profit entity. The pharmaceutical companies provided those drugs so that they were used at test clinics on Alzheimer's patients. Ms. Jesinosky attended a meeting about that study. The meeting made individuals more anxious because they might not qualify for the study. The drug company pharmacist failed to inform the subjects about the results and adverse effects of the drugs. When Ms. Jesinosky confronted the pharmacist afterward, she complained that the effects of the drugs had been skimmed over during the presentation. The drug could make the subjects strip off their clothes and run around nude anywhere and anytime. Ms. Jesinosky thought patients and caregivers should have been advised of the side effects of the drugs during the meeting. Mayo Clinic in 2015 received \$26 million from different pharmaceutical companies for various types of studies on their drugs. The funds that the Legislature considered appropriating to the Cleveland Clinic would be better spent on serving the homeless and their medical needs. That would help the underserved in Nevada. She hoped that would be considered instead of funding a for-profit organization.

Chair Carlton thanked her for the public comments and opened a work session.

Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint): Establishes a program to award grants to support prekindergarten programs. (BDR 34-338)

Chair Carlton said a request for a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 84 (1st Reprint) was made, but no amendments were presented for the program for prekindergarten.

There being no questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Do Pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 84 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Jauregui.

Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing producers of insurance and other persons regulated by the Commissioner of Insurance. (BDR 57-220)

Chair Carlton said Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint) could be processed because the fiscal note was removed on May 29, 2019. The bill was submitted by the Commissioner of Insurance.

There being no questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Do Pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 88 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblywoman Spiegel.

Senate Bill 530 (1st Reprint): Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Nevada Supreme Court for a projected shortfall related to judicial selection processes. (BDR S-1250)

Chair Carlton said Senate Bill 530 (1st Reprint) included a supplemental appropriation of \$6,000 to the Nevada Supreme Court.

There being no questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Do Pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 530 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton assigned the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler.

Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-1063)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the Committee heard Senate Bill (S.B.) 319 (1st Reprint) this morning. She referred to Exhibit C that was mock-up amendment 6092 to S.B. 319 (R1). The bill was presented by Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8. The amendment removed the 5 percent salary increase for school counselors, school psychologists, and social workers. The bill remained a policy bill and established certain standards for those who served in mental health occupations in the school districts. If the Committee wanted to process the bill, the motion would be an Amend and Do Pass with mock-up amendment 6092.

Chair Carlton said the bill was one of the first bills heard by the Committee earlier this morning. [Exhibit C](#) was the mock-up amendment 6092 to S.B. 319 (R1) that removed the 5 percent salary increase that was in the original bill.

There being no questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Amend and Do Pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE
AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 319 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Chair Carlton said some other bills would come to the Committee later. She intended to put Assembly Bill 19 (1st Reprint) on an agenda later this evening. She had already received a text on that bill. She would reconvene the continuation of this meeting after the floor session.

Chair Carlton recessed the meeting [at 7:35 p.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting [at 9:38 p.m.].

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 19 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 19 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to certain temporary and extended orders for protection. (BDR 3-417)

Aaron Ford, Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, presented Assembly Bill 19 (1st Reprint). There were no amendments to be considered, and he would discuss the fiscal note on A.B. 19 (R1). He introduced Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General.

Jessica Adair, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General, stated that the bill did several things all related to strengthening temporary and extended protective orders. There was only one aspect of the bill that caused the fiscal note. A cost would result from the requirement to retain expired temporary and extended protective orders in the central repository for view by law enforcement personnel. The retention was requested by law enforcement and victim advocates in the interest of public safety. She could explain why the bill supported public safety if the Committee had any questions, but, in the interest of time, she would discuss the fiscal note.

Ms. Adair said in 2018, ex-Attorney General Adam Paul Laxalt received a \$1.1 million settlement from Uber. About one-half of that settlement would be distributed to those who should receive restitution from Uber. The only reason that money had not been distributed as yet was because the multistate claims administrator had not provided the contact information for those individuals. The Office of the Attorney General (Office) knew the number of recipients but waited for the mailing addresses to send them a check. The other half of that settlement money was about \$500,000 and was promised by ex-Attorney General Laxalt to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) for the purpose of strengthening the central repository. In drafting the bill, the Office met with the Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court; Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, Department of Administration; and the central repository staff to discuss how best to use that funding to enact the bill. The central repository staff was excited about A.B. 19 (R1) and believed it would strengthen the system. Everyone agreed that a good use of the settlement money would be to enact A.B. 19 (R1) to ease access and store the protective orders. The documents would only be viewed by law enforcement officers for the purposes of public safety.

Chair Carlton read the fiscal note from DPS and saw needed equipment listed. She thought the zeros meant that the equipment costs would be funded with settlement dollars.

Ms. Adair confirmed that Chair Carlton was correct.

Chair Carlton said that the fiscal note from the Administrative Office of the Courts listed a cost of \$126,945. The DPS fiscal note had a lot of explanation, but the cost was zero because of the settlement dollars. She wanted to ensure that the record reflected the costs would be paid with settlement dollars that were available of \$500,000.

Ms. Adair responded that the Office was waiting for the final amount dependent on the number of drivers who should receive restitution.

Chair Carlton said ten new subtypes would be created, and considerable work was involved in conjunction with other bills that had been passed related to domestic violence and temporary restraining orders. She asked whether A.B. 19 (R1) was complementary to the other bills approved.

Ms. Adair confirmed the bill was complementary.

Chair Carlton said she did not want to process anything contradictory right now. She believed that the confusion resulted from the costs being paid with settlement dollars. She asked whether the Administrative Office of the Courts costs of \$126,945 would be paid with settlement dollars also.

Ms. Adair responded yes. In conversations held about the fiscal note, the Administrative Office of the Courts was unaware that a new system was being developed by the central repository to significantly ease the ability to transmit protective orders. She believed that the

actual cost would be much less than reflected on the fiscal note. She confirmed that the costs would be paid with settlement dollars.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton asked for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Services Providers, representing Washoe Legal Services and Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, testified in support of Assembly Bill 19 (R1). The domestic violence attorneys believed that the bill was important and a worthwhile investment.

Sarah Adler, representing the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, testified in support of Assembly Bill 19 (R1). The Coalition believed the bill was an important initiative and appreciated the Committee's support.

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 19 (R1) and opened a work session.

Chair Carlton called for a motion to Do Pass A.B. 19 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 19 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Frierson and Titus were not present for the vote.)

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

Chair Carlton opened Public Comment. There was none.

The following bills listed on the agenda were not heard and were rescheduled.

Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the relocation of the National Atomic Testing Museum. (BDR S-1164)

Senate Bill 540 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to vulnerable persons. (BDR 14-1201)

There being no further business before the Committee, Chair Carlton adjourned the meeting [at 9:49 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janice Wright
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is mock-up proposed amendment 6092 to Senate Bill 319 (1st Reprint) presented by Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony provided by Barbara Richardson, Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry describing Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint) presented by Nick J. Stosic, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry.

[Exhibit E](#) is a document titled "Section By Section Explanation for S.B. 88 – Licensing 2019 Legislative Session" submitted by Nick J. Stosic, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry.