

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
Eightieth Session
June 3, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:40 a.m. on Monday, June 3, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
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 Joseph P. Hardy, Senate District No. 12
Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13
Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1
Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21
Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6
Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2
Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8

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. Chair Carlton said the Committee needed to process various bills, hold a hearing on the Authorizations Act, and keep bills moving to the Assembly floor. Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint) would be added to the agenda. It was her intention that after the Committee heard the Authorizations Act, the Committee would process Senate Bill 553, Senate Bill 448 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 507 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 535 (1st Reprint), and Senate Bill 548.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 553.

Senate Bill 553: Authorizes expenditures by agencies of the State Government for the 2019-2021 biennium. (BDR S-1281)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill (S.B.) 553 was one of the five big money bills to be presented. The Fiscal Analysis Division staff previously explained all the sections when the bill was still in draft form. The large money bills worked in reverse order to the normal process. Senate Bill 553 provided authority for state agencies to collect and expend money including federal funds, gifts, grants, interagency transfers, service fees, and other funds that totaled \$17.743 billion over the 2019-2021 biennium. Additionally, because of specific statutory language for certain state agencies, the bill included authority for the Nevada Gaming Control Board and the Nevada Gaming Commission to expend \$64.2 million of State General Funds over the 2019-2021 biennium. The bill also provided authority for the Department of Transportation to expend \$971 million from the State Highway Fund over the 2019-2021 biennium.

There being no questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on S.B. 553 and opened a work session.

Chair Carlton called for a motion on Senate Bill 553.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 553.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 448 (1st Reprint): Provides for transferable tax credits for affordable housing in the State. (BDR 32-381)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 448 (1st Reprint) provided \$10 million of affordable housing tax

credits in the second year of the 2019-2021 biennium. The amount of those tax credits was included in The Executive Budget.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 448 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 507 (1st Reprint) made an appropriation of \$200,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2019 to the State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, for support of the Marlette Lake Water System. The amount was not a loan, but it was authorized as an appropriation for an anticipated shortfall in funding for operating costs in FY 2019.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 507 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 535 (1st Reprint) was a bill from the Senate Committee on Finance to align statutes with the budget. The problem gambling program had previously been funded with a slot tax distribution. However, that tax was being changed. The problem gambling program would now be funded directly with State General Funds, and those slot taxes would be deposited into the General Fund. The bill broke the traditional earmark and aligned the statutes with the money committees' actions in closing that budget.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 535 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

**Senate Bill 548: Makes an appropriation to the Millennium Scholarship Trust Fund.
(BDR S-1275)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 548 made a State General Fund appropriation of \$33 million to the Millennium Scholarship Trust Fund to ensure its solvency through the 2019-2021 biennium. The bill was heard by the Committee on May 31, 2019. The bill became effective upon passage and approval. The bill was presented by Susan Brown, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, and supported by J. Kyle Dalpe, Interim Executive Director of Legislative Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 548.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

**Senate Bill 544 (1st Reprint): Creates the Patient Protection Commission.
(BDR 40-1221)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 544 (1st Reprint) created the Patient Protection Commission. The Commission was composed of 11 voting members and staff for the new agency including an Executive Director, a management analyst, and an executive assistant. The bill was heard by the Committee on May 29, 2019, and was presented by Allison Combs, Policy Director, Office of the Governor, and Susan Brown, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor. Testimony in support was received from a number of advocates for health-care systems and plans.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 544 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton said those bills approved by the Committee would go to the Assembly floor to be processed. She would have all the floor statements delivered to her desk. Should any member have an interest in a specific bill, she asked them to come to her desk and ask for the floor statement. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations relating to certain nonprofit corporations. (BDR S-1164)

Chair Carlton said Senate Bill (S.B.) 501 (1st Reprint) started out as the National Atomic Testing Museum bill. Typically, near the end of a legislative session, the Committee heard a number of different requests that failed to fit into a specific category. She usually bundled those together into a bill to move them from one house to the other. That was the most expeditious way to deal with those requests. Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint) would be amended by the Committee. Chair Carlton had worked on the bill with Senator Woodhouse, and both were aware of every component in the bill. The bill had been discussed with a couple of the members of the Committee. Various projects were included in the bill.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that S.B. 501 (R1) made appropriations related to certain nonprofit corporations. She presented mock-up amendment 6108 to S.B. 501 (R1) as Exhibit C. The bill as introduced included an appropriation of \$1 million from the State General Fund to a nonprofit corporation to relocate the National Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas. There had been additional sections added to the bill by the amendment 6108 (Exhibit C). Section 2 of the amendment appropriated \$1 million from the General Fund to the Reno Rodeo Association for advance planning and schematic design phases of a master plan to rehabilitate, repair, renovate, and improve the Reno-Sparks Livestock Events Center. Section 3 appropriated \$500,000 from the General Fund to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for allocation to the International Gaming Institute of the William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for the Leaderverse Initiative. Those funds would be distributed from IFC to the Gaming Institute upon demonstration of matching funds. Section 4 of the amendment appropriated \$3 million from the General Fund to the Nevada State Museum to provide a grant of money to the Springs Preserve Foundation. The Foundation would use not more than \$1 million of the grant provided for the renovation of the Sustainability Gallery to relocate the Nature Gallery and develop classroom and indoor play spaces for children. In addition, \$2 million of the grant would be used for the design of the Science and Sustainability Center to expand exhibit space and construct a large classroom facility. Section 5 of the amendment appropriated \$709,150 from the General Fund for the production of episodes and

related curriculum for the Outdoor Nevada television series. Those were the projects added to S.B. 501 (R1) by mock-up amendment 6108.

Chair Carlton said she was familiar with each group that advocated for the appropriations mentioned in mock-up amendment 6108.

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

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 501 (1ST REPRINT) WITH MOCK-UP
AMENDMENT 6108.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Brian McAnallen, Vice President of Government Affairs, Porter Group, testified on behalf of the National Atomic Testing Museum. He presented a written statement titled, "Testimony for Public Hearing Assembly Committee on Ways and Means," dated May 31, 2019, as [Exhibit D](#). He appreciated the Committee hearing the bill and was happy to accommodate any items that needed to be added. He said several of his board members came to the Legislature numerous times including Linda Rakow, Board Secretary and Executive Committee Member, National Test Site Historical Foundation, and Linda Smith, President, National Test Site Historical Foundation. He asked them to keep returning to demonstrate the commitment of the Board. He thanked Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, for her support.

Chair Carlton said today was the last day of the 80th Session (2019), and the Committee had failed to hold an official hearing on S.B. 501 (R1). She asked Assemblyman Wheeler to please withdraw his previous motion because the Committee never held an official public hearing on the bill. She asked Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno to withdraw her second on the motion. Assemblyman Wheeler and Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno agreed to withdraw the motion and the second.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 501 (1st Reprint). She welcomed Mr. McAnallen to the hearing on S.B. 501 (R1).

Brian McAnallen, Vice President of Government Affairs, Porter Group, testified on behalf of the National Atomic Testing Museum. He said S.B. 501 (R1) was originally a \$1 million appropriation to the National Atomic Testing Museum. The bill required continuous interaction with IFC. The Board of the Museum was required to appear before IFC to verify matching dollars had been obtained before it was allowed to draw the state funds. He looked forward to conversations throughout the 2019-2021 Interim and agreed that those reporting requirements were important. The Board had started a capital campaign to generate contributions for matching funds and sought federal dollars for support. Mr. McAnallen said Congresswoman Dina Titus had been a true champion for the Museum for a number of years, and was interested in the progress of the Museum.

Mr. McAnallen explained why the Museum sought to relocate. The Museum enjoyed a great landlord in the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) and Desert Research Institute (DRI) campuses. The Rogers Building had housed the Museum for the last 15 years. No opportunity existed to expand the Museum there. The lack of space restricted the number of new exhibits that could be added. It was time to grow the Museum, and the Board needed to look at all options.

Mr. McAnallen said the Department of Defense through the National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Department of Energy (DOE), had funded and subsidized the Museum for a number of years, but the subsidy was set to expire. The Board was working on that matter in Washington, D.C. If the subsidy was reauthorized, it would expedite the need for the Museum to move. That window was about three years, and that was why he approached the Legislature at this particular time. The Board considered moving to downtown Las Vegas and had been asked by the Mayor to consider that. The Mayor included that matter in her State of the City address and expressed her support. The consideration of a move was triggered by the DOE relationship and the lease subsidy. He clarified that NSHE and DRI did not require the Museum to move. But it was important for the Board to explore all of the options. The Museum would leverage all federal and philanthropic opportunities as it moved forward.

Mr. McAnallen said the Museum presented a number of education programs that attracted many school children. The Museum space was near capacity for those programs and needed more opportunity for classroom event space to accommodate the programs. The Museum also offered a teacher program where teachers could earn certification for additional learning experiences in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The Board appreciated any state support.

Mike Torvinen, President, Reno Rodeo Association, stated that he was humbled and thankful for the support of the Committee. The Reno-Sparks Livestock Events Center happened to host a rodeo, but the Center was conceived to be used by everyone in northern Nevada as a benefit for the entire community. He thought the amendment might require matching money, and those funds were in the bank. The Association would work tirelessly to ensure the Committee did not regret the appropriation.

Bruno Bowles, Manager, Springs Preserve, Las Vegas Valley Water District, thanked the Committee for its hard work and dedication to the young children in the state. The appropriation would help many children grow up with opportunities that they might otherwise lack.

Speaking as neutral on the bill, Tracy L. Bower, Director of External Affairs, Desert Research Institute (DRI), indicated that the Desert Research Institute welcomed the National Atomic Testing Museum as a partner and a tenant at DRI's Southern Nevada campus. Ms. Bower noted that the DRI did not have an immediate need for the space that the Museum occupied and was not encouraging the Museum to move to a new location. That said, Ms. Bower noted DRI recognized that the Museum must look to the future and determine what is best for the

Museum's future growth. The DRI appreciated the partnership with the Museum, especially in the area of STEM education, and looked forward to continuing that partnership

Ms. Bower continued that DRI was proud of the role in helping the Museum to establish itself and to serve the Southern Nevada community. The DRI looked forward to the Museum's continued success whether it was located at DRI or elsewhere in the community.

Chair Carlton said she looked forward to DRI's ingenuity on how it would use that space in the future.

Chair Carlton called for further testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on S.B. 501 (R1). She opened a work session and said she would accept a motion to Amend and Do Pass S. B. 501 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 501 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 500 (1st Reprint) revised provisions governing financial support for assisted living facilities and revised the manner in which the annual allocation of \$200,000 from the Healthy Nevada Fund was used to pay for assisted-living facilities. The purpose of the Fund was to award competitive grants to finance the establishment and expansion of assisted living facilities that provided services pursuant to the provisions of the home and community-based services waiver under Medicaid. After the grants were awarded, any remaining funds had to be reallocated to eligible applicants. Dena Schmidt, Administrator, Aging and Disabilities Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, provided testimony on the bill. The goal was to help assisted living facilities expand beds to build capacity in the community. There was no other testimony on the bill that addressed the distribution of a certain piece of the tobacco settlement funds.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE
COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 500 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton said that appeared to be all the bills that the Committee could process at this time. There were some proposed changes to several bills, but she would wait to see those changes. She wanted to ensure that the Committee had everything needed before processing the other bills.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 289 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 289 (2nd Reprint): Makes an appropriation for health services in underserved areas. (BDR S-610)

Senator Joseph P. Hardy, Senate District No. 12, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 289 (2nd Reprint). Nevada had a shortage of physicians and many other types of health practitioners particularly in federally qualified health centers. The bill addressed one of the tools to offer a loan repayment program. The concept would apply to everybody who was a health practitioner including doctors, dentists, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, social workers, registered nurses, nurse midwives, and pharmacists. Those were the individuals who had already participated in the Nevada Health Service Corps (NHSC). But S.B. 289 (R2) would add a loan repayment program. For every \$25,000 that was provided as a loan repayment program, the federal government matched the amount. That resulted in \$50,000 of tax free money for up to six years. That incentive would attract health practitioners to Nevada and benefit many underserved areas of the state. He would appreciate the support of the Committee.

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

Gerald Ackerman, Assistant Dean, Rural Health Statewide Initiatives, University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine, testified in support of S. B. 289 (R2). The NHSC was a state loan program administered by the Nevada State Office of Rural Health, University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine. The NHSC was established by the Legislature in 1989 to designate areas of underservice within the state of Nevada to attract practitioners to those areas of need. A practitioner might participate in the NHSC by engaging in full-time clinical practice in an assigned community in exchange for loan repayment funds. The NHSC received a federal award of \$500,000 and a current state appropriation of \$250,000. The reason for the bill was to increase the state amount for a 50:50 match for the federal funds. All providers had to accept Medicaid and Medicare and offer a sliding-fee scale for their practice. The program served rural areas and urban areas. Currently, a number of the participants were located in Clark County. The contractual obligation required two years of full-time service in a Health Professional Shortage Area (HPSA). [A HPSA was a designated area having shortages of primary care, dental care, or mental health providers.] After two years of service, the participants were eligible for loan repayment benefits until the loan was repaid. Since its inception, the NHSC had placed 155 participants around the state.

Joan Hall, President, Nevada Rural Hospital Partners, testified in support of S.B. 289 (R2). The Legislature recognized the problem in 1989 and created the NHSC. Every dollar was used

every year since then for loan repayments for health providers. Currently, eight behavioral health providers, five pharmacists, and eight physician assistants received loan repayment benefits. That was important because Nevada had a shortage of those specialties. Loan repayments were the best recruitment tool for rural and underserved areas. Those providers had to accept Medicaid and offer a sliding-fee scale. The program benefited the underserved in the communities. She asked for support of the \$500,000 appropriation.

Sarah Adler, representing the National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada, testified in support of S.B. 289 (R2). The Alliance appreciated the Committee's support of the bill. Access to behavioral health providers in rural Nevada was challenging, and the bill would offer assistance.

Joanna Jacob, Executive Vice President, Ferrari Public Affairs, representing Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican Hospital, testified in support of S.B. 289 (R2).

Michael Hackett, representing the Nevada Academy of Physician Assistants, Nevada Public Health Association, and Nevada Primary Care Association, testified in support of S.B. 289 (R2).

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 289 (R2) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 293 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 293 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to children who were victims of commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 38-517)

Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 293 (2nd Reprint). Nevada had a significant challenge with the problem of children who were recruited into the prostitution industry. The bill addressed that problem. It was her personal belief that Nevada should lead the nation in how to treat those children as victims rather than criminals. The bill, as originally presented, provided that Nevada would no longer put children who were found participating in prostitution into the juvenile justice system. Instead, those children should be placed in the child welfare system where they were cared for. There had been significant work done in the interim, but more work was required. Hardworking stakeholders tried to put the best interests of the children first. The challenge was to care for the child's best interests and eliminate the risk of the child running away from a specialized foster care home or recruiting other children. She recognized that Nevada lacked the systems and infrastructure for a hybrid model that was not a juvenile justice model.

Senator Ratti said the bill set a date of July 1, 2022, at which time Nevada would no longer arrest a child and put the child in the juvenile justice system. The state should have a contract position to work with stakeholders including counties, legal aid, nonprofits, and others working specifically to serve that population. That working group would study and develop a hybrid system to present to the Legislature during the 81st Session (2021). The required resources would be identified, and recommendations would be made regarding moving some existing resources to a child welfare-driven model that might occasionally use a juvenile justice tool

for those young children. Senator Ratti said the original request included a full-time staff position. She now believed that a contract position could work with the enthusiastic stakeholders.

There being no questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called 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 Service Providers, representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada and Washoe Legal Services, testified in support of S.B. 293 (R2). She said it was a rare time when so many stakeholders were in agreement and excited to work on the matter. The stakeholders included district attorneys, public defenders, and social services from all over the state and in every county. Everyone agreed that Nevada needed a better plan than taking child victims and putting them in the detention punishment model system. Nevada currently lacked any other place to house those children. That was the specific problem that needed a solution. She believed that the plan, position, and coordination would create a solution and find a place for those girls to live and receive services. The girls could work with the community and receive appropriate wraparound services in a model other than the juvenile punishment-based detention centers. The current process had strengthened the narrative of the individuals exploiting the children who told them they would get in trouble for their actions. That message hurt the credibility when efforts were made to provide services to the victims. It made those girls feel as though they had done something wrong. A large contingency of stakeholders looked forward to working on the solution. The Honorable William O. Voy, Judge, Family Division, Department A, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, had been working for a long time to help victims affected by minor sex-trafficking. He sought funding and housing to create a model that did not put girls in detention facilities. That was what she hoped to work toward.

Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, testified in support of S.B. 293 (R2). He stated that other successful legislation had developed the legal framework for agency response to the minor sex-trafficking population. The bill would ensure that the appropriate services followed the legal response. The contract position would help lay a foundation for a successful future, but the problem would not be solved in two years. He thanked Senator Ratti for creating the opportunity to have thoughtful next steps in the system and Assemblyman Hambrick for fighting for this population for many years.

Assemblywoman Titus asked about the estimated number of individuals and the capacity that would be helped by this bill.

Senator Ratti asked whether the question related to the number of victims or the number of stakeholders.

Assemblywoman Titus clarified that she asked about the number of victims.

Ms. Bortolin responded that the most recent numbers for Washoe County was about 30 victims were in the child-welfare system and 3 or 4 victims were in the juvenile-justice system. Clark County had about 150 arrests per year, and about 60 of those arrests were in the child-welfare system, about 56 were in the juvenile-justice system, and about 25 were housed in detention facilities. In the rural counties, about 15 victims were housed at the Caliente Youth Center.

Sarah Adler, Silver State Government Relations, representing the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, testified in support of S.B. 293 (R2).

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 293 (R2) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 93 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 93 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired. (BDR 38-449)

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1, presented Senate Bill 93 (1st Reprint). She said the bill was a continuation of the discussion about Senate Bill 481 of the 79th Session (2017). Senate Bill 481 of the 79th Session (2017) created the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired. Her request was to ensure the Commission had a full-time Executive Director. An Executive Director was needed to oversee the tenets and ensure individuals in the deaf community had an advocate and a spokesperson. The fiscal note was removed because the Governor's budget provided \$25,000. The remaining \$25,000 needed would come from Telephone Device for the Deaf (TDD) funds. The account had \$4.2 million in TDD funds now. There was no question about whether the Commission could afford an Executive Director. The bill provided an opportunity for members of the deaf community to receive advocacy and support in a more coordinated and organized manner.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said there had been substantial history and legislative conversations about the use of TDD funds. Legal problems arose, and a lawsuit challenged the use of the TDD funds. Careful work over the years ensured that a rate was negotiated, and those funds were never endangered. It was important to hold the line on the use of the TDD funds. Other legislation authorized the use of TDD funds for hearing aids, but that use would quickly deplete the balance. An increase in the number of Board members and their costs would reduce the balance. A decision would have to be made about whether to increase the Board and its expenses or increase the services to the deaf and hard-of-hearing resource centers. The money committees appropriated extra money to the deaf and hard-of-hearing resource centers to reduce the waitlists of about 48 or 50 individuals per month who were not receiving services. The priority of the Legislature was to expand services. The inability to serve the existing waitlist required a new strategic plan for the use of existing resources to meet the demand.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson suggested that thought be given to the limited pool of funds and the best way to use those dollars judiciously. There were many good causes, but the Board and the Legislature would need to decide whether to fund expenses for the Board or

expenses for services. A cap was negotiated four years ago, and the Legislature anticipated that costs would not get close to that cap for a decade. Currently, the costs were only a couple of cents shy of the cap. When the cap was reached, another big ugly fight would occur in the Legislature about that rate. The Legislature might not be successful in the fight. She thought the Legislature was at a crossroads now. She needed the Board and the hard-of-hearing community to think about the needs of the 2019-2021 biennium and its intentions for the future.

Senator Spearman responded that she was cognizant of the limited funds and had several conversations about how the Executive Director position would be funded. She did not anticipate that the Board would grow in a manner that would require more funds. She worked on legislation for the hard-of-hearing community, and there had been a lag and lapse with the uses of the funds. Senate Bill 203 (2nd Reprint) provided funding from the TDD account for hearing aids. The Department of Health and Human Services supported another bill to allow it to buy hearing aids in bulk to drive the cost down and would seek additional funding through grants and other sources. The primary target during the 80th Session (2019) was the provision of benefits for children to ensure they had the type of foundation needed to be successful in school. The Board considered the needs of the deaf community and was charged with assessing the needs to let the Legislature know what worked and what did not work. She did not anticipate the Board growing in a manner that would be so exponential that it would be fiscally impossible to support.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said originally the Board had no staff, then some paid staff, and now a full-time Executive Director. She expressed concern that the TDD funds were being used for administration rather than services. That was always the conversation when there was a finite amount of money. She knew it was a fight to grow that TDD fund and did not want to have that fight for decades. She asked that the Board consider that concern during the interim.

Senator Spearman replied that she considered it her charge to caution the Board about spending and ensure the necessary reporting to justify the requests before the 81st Session (2021). Additional information about what worked well and what needed to be fixed would be provided.

Chair Carlton said the cap was 8 cents and currently the rate was 6 cents. Everyone should be mindful of that. There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator, Aging, Physical Disabilities, and Children's Services, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), Department of Health and Human Services, testified as neutral on S.B. 93 (R1). The Executive Director position would help the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired to ensure they followed the strategic plan put in place in the past two years. The Executive Director would ensure that budgetary services were appropriate for the community throughout the state as well as ensure there was future funding for direct services. Hearing aids were only provided up to the amount of funds available, and there was no set amount. The restrictions helped guide the

Commission. It was the Division's intent to support the Board, grow the services, and support the deaf and hard-of-hearing community throughout the state. She had a discussion with the Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau related to the additional appropriation of \$25,000 per year for the 2019-2021 biennium. The Division received \$25,000 per year in The Executive Budget. She asked whether there was a way to not receive the additional appropriation. She had agreed to the Executive Director title change. Those were two things that the Division was asked to remain flexible on, and she had agreed to do so.

Chair Carlton asked whether she requested an amendment. The bill before her was the 1st Reprint. The \$25,000 appropriation had been approved in the budget. There was a mixed message.

Ms. Robb apologized and said to remove her previous requests from consideration.

Senator Spearman said what happened early on was that the Executive Director position was going to be housed in the Office of the Governor. The Division asked that it be housed in ADSD, and the position was moved along with the funding.

Chair Carlton thought that had been adjusted in the budget process. She would ask the Fiscal Analysis Division staff to confirm that information. She recalled something about a title change.

Senator Spearman said during the 79th Session (2017), the Legislature changed the original subcommittee to a Commission.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the Legislature had already approved \$25,000 a year for the activity during the 79th Session (2017). Those funds were included in the base budget. The 1st Reprint transferred the Commission from the Office of the Governor to ADSD. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill changed the name of the Commission to the Nevada Commission For Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired and revised the existing membership. There were no funds in the bill, but The Executive Budget included a \$25,000 appropriation every year. The bill also required the compensation of the other expenses of the Executive Director to be paid from the TDD surcharge.

Chair Carlton said that eliminated the confusion. There was no reason to propose an amendment, and everything had been addressed. She closed the hearing on S.B. 93 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 216 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 216 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to autism spectrum disorders. (BDR 38-33)

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 216 (1st Reprint). During the 2007-2008 Interim, he was selected by then-Assembly Speaker Barbara Buckley to serve on the Autism Task Force. He learned a lot

about passion from parents who wanted to see positive changes for their children. Some great things came out of that group of individuals. Tremendous changes happened in a little over a decade in Nevada for children on the spectrum that he attributed to the passion of those members and their work. The Autism Task Force only lasted that interim, and its successor organization had been a creature of executive order. The Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders still continued to do great work with passionate parents and providers. Senate Bill 216 (1st Reprint) sought to take the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders from being a creature that depended on an executive order that had to be renewed to becoming a creature of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to continue its important work advocating for individuals on the autism spectrum. He had Commissioner Julie Ostrovsky in Las Vegas waiting patiently to testify.

Julie Ostrovsky, Commissioner, Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders, testified from Las Vegas. She was the parent of a wonderful 21-year old man with autism. She thanked the Committee for hearing the bill. The Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders voted unanimously to support S.B. 216 (R1). The bill would formally establish the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders in NRS. The Commission had worked under the Executive Order for 11 years. The Commission reviewed data, information, and advised the Governor regarding the needs of individuals and families with autism spectrum disorders. For years, the Commission survived because Governors Guinn and Sandoval saw the importance of the Commission and issued Executive Orders to retain the Commission. It was time that the important Commission that monitored budgets, autism services, the Autism Treatment Assistance Program (ATAP), Medicaid, and early intervention government programs be put into NRS. The Commission was successful and important. The bill would also expand the Commission to ensure all stakeholders were represented. The stakeholders throughout the state included rural representatives, school districts, parents, and providers. Ms. Ostrovsky said S.B. 216 (R1) did not ask for any money. No Commissioner was paid or received per diem, travel expenses, or paid time off work, but they served because they understood the importance of the Commission. She asked for the Committee's support of S.B. 216 (R1) to allow the Commission to keep doing its important work for Nevada. The fiscal note included staffing for the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services. The Commission complied with the open meeting laws and maintained a high level of participation and communication with all the stakeholders throughout the state.

Senator Ohrenschall said that without the support and guidance of Chair Carlton in the 75th Session (2009), many children with autism spectrum disorders would not have received insurance coverage or applied behavioral analysis therapy. He recalled that during the 2007-2008 Interim, the Task Force considered mandating insurance coverage for those children. One of his colleagues said it was a great idea, but it would never happen. But somehow the Legislature during the 75th Session (2019) approved the bill, and many children's lives had been changed. More needed to be done, but the Commission was helpful.

Assemblywoman Titus thanked Senator Ohrenschall for being so consistently passionate and maintaining that banner. She asked about the line in section 10, subsection 3, paragraph (b), subparagraph (2) regarding measures to ensure that a person would receive appropriate

services from another entity after the person reached 21 years old. She thought that was a critical component because lives did not change suddenly when someone had a birthday. The state needed to be aware of that to ensure that the individuals were handed over to another agency and received their therapy. The bill added a good step in the process.

Senator Ohrenschall responded that there was a lot of activity in southern Nevada to improve the transition services for children becoming adults. He appreciated the potential of the bill to improve the process.

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

Jennifer Jeans, Child Advocacy Attorney, representing Washoe Legal Services and Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, testified in support of S.B. 216 (R1). She echoed the comments of Senator Ohrenschall. She reiterated how essential the functions of the Commission were and how great its work was. The Commission would provide an even more vital role as more children were diagnosed with autism, particularly problems related to access to services faced by families. She submitted that the small expenditure now would return the state a lot of money in dividends.

Susan L. Fisher, Vice President, McDonald Carano, Government Affairs and Advocacy Group, representing Nevada Blind Children's Foundation, testified in support of S.B. 216 (R1). She said at least 25 percent of the blind children at the Foundation had been diagnosed with autism spectrum disorders. She thought the number was probably much higher than that. Finding the providers to make the diagnosis, seeking access to treatment, and getting those children services were problems. Spending a little money now would save the state a lot of money in Medicaid dollars in the future.

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 216 (R1) and opened the hearing on Senate Bill 211 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 211 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for operating expenses of the Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs. (BDR S-587)

Senator Dallas Harris, Senate District No. 11, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 211 (1st Reprint). The bill was all money with no policy. The Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs requested \$15,126 for fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$9,109 for FY 2021. The Commission planned to use those funds for operating expenses, outreach efforts, and travel expenses for the members of the Commission and the management analyst. The Commission was so fiscally strained that one of the members had to hitch a ride for free to come to the Legislature to speak to Senator Harris about the bill because the Commission lacked any funds for travel. Senator Harris said the bill was a small thing the Legislature could do to help the Commission. She said the Legislature would need to fund the Commission fully to avoid similar situations in the future. The Commission had lagged in the past, and she hoped that would change in the future.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she was concerned that a Commission member had to hitchhike to get to the Legislature. She asked whether Senator Harris would be opposed to having the appropriation for FY 2021 be increased to the same amount as the appropriation for FY 2020. She could not imagine that Senator Harris would object. It would be a quick amendment. She knew that she and Assemblywoman Neal had talked about funding the Commission over the years. She thought that increasing the amount for FY 2021 and keeping it consistent in both years would be reasonable.

Senator Harris confirmed that was agreeable. The Commission had more work to do. She was confident the Commission would make good use of the additional funds.

Chair Carlton said she reviewed the Commission's budget. Everything was the same for travel to Reno, northern and southern Nevada meetings, outreach events, and the website costs. She thought the difference in FY 2020 was materials and a laptop and netbook. She believed that adjusting the appropriation to make it equal in both years of the 2019-2021 biennium did not cause a problem. That way, when other costs occurred, those dollars would be available, and the Committee would not need to delineate any more specificity. She suggested making the amounts consistent for both years of the 2019-2021 biennium. The appropriation for FY 2020 would remain \$15,126, and the funding for FY 2021 would be increased to \$15,126.

Assemblywoman Neal said she appreciated the increased funds because the Minority Commission had been one of her main agenda items and was shared with Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District 17, Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, and Attorney General Aaron Ford. She was pleased Senator Harris would now be the advocate for the Commission.

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

Michael Brown, Director, Department of Business and Industry, testified that the Commission was nested in the Department. He appreciated the vote of confidence from the Committee and Senator Harris. He would endeavor to come up with a plan and bring it to the Legislature during the 81st Session (2021).

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 211 (R1) and opened a work session.

Senate Bill 93 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf, Hard of Hearing or Speech Impaired. (BDR 38-449)

Chair Carlton said the bill was heard earlier, and the Committee had no questions or comments on the bill. She would accept a motion to Do Pass Senate Bill 93 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 93 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senate Bill 211 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for operating expenses of the Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs. (BDR S-587)

Chair Carlton said the bill was heard earlier, and the Committee had no questions or comments on the bill. She would accept a motion to Amend and Do Pass Senate Bill 211 (1st Reprint) to increase the appropriation in fiscal year 2021 to \$15,126 for operating expenses, making the appropriation the same for each year of the 2019-2021 biennium.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 211 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senate Bill 216 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to autism spectrum disorders. (BDR 38-33)

Chair Carlton said the bill was heard earlier, and the Committee had no questions or comments on the bill. She would accept a motion to Do Pass Senate Bill 216 (1st Reprint)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 216 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senate Bill 289 (2nd Reprint): Makes an appropriation for health services in underserved areas. (BDR S-610)

Chair Carlton said the bill was heard earlier, and the Committee had no questions or comments on the bill. She would accept a motion to Do Pass Senate Bill 289 (2nd Reprint)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 289 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senate Bill 293 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to children who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 38-517)

Chair Carlton said the bill was heard earlier, and the Committee had no questions or comments on the bill. She would accept a motion to Do Pass Senate Bill 293 (2nd Reprint)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 293 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton said she was still waiting on final information about Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint).

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 193 made an appropriation of \$175,000 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to the Nevada Center for Civil Engagement to support We the People, a citizen and constitution program in Nevada elementary, middle, and high schools. The bill also required expenditure reports to be submitted to the Interim Finance Committee. The bill would provide funds for grants to schools for the program. The bill was presented by Senator Woodhouse, and there were no proposed amendments.

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 193.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Chair Carlton asked the Committee to consider Senate Bill (S.B.) 402 (1st Reprint) that was sponsored by Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5. The bill promoted educational programs related to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and a license plate was incorporated in the bill.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that S.B. 402 (R1) as amended made various changes concerning educational programs relating to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and included an appropriation in the bill. The bill required the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to design, prepare, and issue a special license plate indicating support for STEM. The bill required DMV to deposit the \$25 issuance fee and the \$20 renewal fee generated per license plate to the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology, Office of the Governor, to encourage the study of STEM by pupils of the state. The bill also included appropriations of \$250,000 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology to award grants to elementary schools in the state to promote equitable access and increase the quality of programs designed to introduce and teach STEM. The bill provided State General Fund appropriations of \$300,000 each year of the 2019-2021 biennium for a grant program for regional advisory boards to fund activities and programs designed to promote the benefits of STEM curriculums and carry out programs that reinforced STEM education. The Committee heard the bill on May 30, 2019, and the bill was presented by Senator Woodhouse.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 402 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton said that completed all the bills that the Committee could process now. When the Committee returned, it was her intention to process Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint).

Chair Carlton opened public comment. There was none. Chair Carlton recessed the meeting [at 10:17 a.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting [at 5:06 p.m.].

Chair Carlton said there were a couple of budget implementation bills to hear and then a couple of other bills to process in work session. She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 467 (3rd Reprint).

Senate Bill 467 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR S-820)

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 467 (3rd Reprint). She said everyone was familiar with Zoom and Victory school programs. The bill extended those programs. She referred to amendment 1099 approved by the Senate to increase the salary of the new chief strategy officer position. The position was approved in the budget at a specific salary. When the unclassified Pay Bill was introduced, the salary was decreased. She asked that the salary be increased to the amount that was approved in the budget closing.

Chair Carlton said she was confused. She believed that salary was changed during a discussion that was held by the subcommittee about changing the salary of the chief strategy officer.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the requested salaries for all unclassified positions were noted as the budgets were closed. However, when budgets were closed, staff indicated that the amount of the unclassified salaries would be determined in conjunction with the Pay Bill. The chief strategy officer salary was determined based on an examination of the salaries of similar positions and that salary was listed in the Pay Bill.

Chair Carlton said she and Senator Woodhouse worked with the Fiscal Analysis Division staff on the Pay Bill and made a salary adjustment for the chief strategy officer position. Apparently that adjustment was not satisfactory to those who requested the salary so they got it changed.

Ms. Ebert responded that Chair Carlton was correct.

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

Autumn Tampa, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3). She was proud to be a Zoom tutor, and she had been working in the Zoom tutoring program for several years. She had been an employee of the Clark County School District (CCSD) in various positions for about 21 years. She had the opportunity to work in many schools with many grade levels and had seen a tremendous amount of success academically and in the confidence levels of the children. Students who were shy and timid about reading received individualized instruction. The Zoom program made them more confident about reading. Students started to enjoy reading and writing, and their test scores improved. It was a positive program, and she hoped the Committee would support it.

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director of Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3). He said the NSEA Zoom and Victory schools were symbols of what was going right in Nevada's public schools. Zoom and Victory schools addressed a real education equity problem for English learners and at-risk students.

Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs, Washoe County School District, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3). She supported the continuation of the 24 Zoom schools and the 4 Victory schools in Washoe County.

Jessica Ferrato, Principal, Crowley and Ferrato, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3).

Paige Barnes, Crowley and Ferrato, representing Communities in Schools, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3).

Sylvia R. Lazos, Law Professor, representing the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3). The bill was one of the priorities of the Coalition because Zoom and Victory schools worked and were successful for working families.

Jared Busker, Associate Director, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3).

Sarah M. Adler, Principal, Silver State Government Relations, representing the Charter School Association Nevada, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3).

Leonardo Benavides, Coordinator, Government Relations, Community Engagement Unit, Clark County School District, testified in support of S. B. 467 (R3).

Assemblywoman Titus asked about the logistics of the bill. Section 5 of the bill stated that sections 1, 2, and 4 expired on June 30, 2021. Section 3 was deleted by a previous amendment. Sections 3.5 and 3.7 remained, but some of the provisions went away when the other section did. She asked about the chief strategy officer position and whether that position stayed in place if the Committee did not approve the cost in 2021.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the chief strategy officer was approved in the budget as a continuing position.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the chief strategy officer position would remain regardless of the continuation of the Zoom and Victory school programs.

Ms. Jones replied that the new chief strategy officer position would remain to assist the new Superintendent of Public Instruction with the administration of the Department.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether that new chief strategy officer position would remain if the Zoom or Victory school programs did not continue.

Ms. Jones said the new chief strategy officer position was a continuing position approved in the budget, the unclassified Pay Bill, and the Appropriations Act. The amendment changed the salary from what was listed in the Pay Bill to the salary that was requested by the Superintendent.

Chair Carlton said that the chief strategy officer was associated with the Department in general and not just with the Zoom and Victory school programs.

There being no further testimony on the bill, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 467 (R3) and said the next hearing would be on Senate Bill 443.

[Chair Carlton left the meeting briefly, and Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson opened the hearing on Senate Bill 443.

Senate Bill 443: Appropriates money to increase rates of reimbursement for certain meal programs. (BDR S-728)

Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 443. The bill provided a \$1 increase to the senior congregate meal programs that were on the fixed fee reimbursement of \$2.20 per meal to \$3.20 per meal. Additionally, the bill set aside \$300,000 for the duration of the 2019-2021 biennium for start-up funds to expand the congregate senior meal programs.

Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson asked the members to refer to Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) to review the bill. The members had conversations about the bill previously. There were two different categories of meals, and the bill specifically helped a certain set of providers with the reimbursement rates.

Mr. Piccinini responded that Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson was correct. The two different categories were the fixed fee and the categorical programs that were typically in the rural areas and were reimbursed at a higher rate. The categorical programs would not be receiving the increased fee. It was only for the fixed-fee sites.

Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson asked about what the change would mean. She asked whether more or better meals or capacity would be improved six months after the bill was enacted.

Mr. Piccinini responded that the bill would help stabilize the congregate meal sites financially so that they could continue to operate. The \$300,000 would allow the program to find more program sponsors to help meet the need. One of the biggest problems with the senior congregate meal sites was that there were few across the state and the need was high. They were trying to catch up with the need and ensure that the current sponsors would be able to maintain the programs as sustainable. Some sponsors were county operated, but a number of them were nonprofit operated. The \$2.20 reimbursement was not much money for a meal. The extra money would allow the Food Bank to grow the program and to find other places and other nonprofits that would be willing to take on the additional meal sites as the Nevada senior population continued to grow.

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, said she appreciated the Committee hearing the bill. The idea was brought to her by Mr. Piccinini and Jodi Tyson. She had worked over the last several legislative sessions to increase the allotment for Meals on Wheels programs. She determined that the Legislature needed to address congregate meals as well. There were many senior citizens who went to facilities for meals and stayed for the day. Inflation had increased the cost of meals. The bill was just one small step for the Legislature to address the fact that those individuals needed the support. It was important that the Legislature pick up the slack and take a step forward to assist them.

Mr. Piccinini added that the congregate meal sites were often the only places where senior citizens had any daily interaction with other individuals, and that was important for their mental health. The Governor's Council on Food Security spent over one year working on the problem, and that was how the bill was initiated.

Assemblywoman Titus wanted to acknowledge all the time and effort on the bill. She emphasized that Meals on Wheels programs took food into the home. But the key component was the congregate eating areas where seniors gathered and broke bread together. The mental health and the overall health of those individuals who went there was improved. Those kind of programs were important to allow individuals to remain independent in their homes and stay in the community where they had social interactions. She thanked Mr. Piccinini for being so passionate.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Sarah M. Adler, Principal, Silver State Government Relations, testified in support of S. B. 443. She was a member of the Governor's Council on Food Security. The Council had worked a great deal on the problem of elder hunger. The problem of isolation in the urban and rural senior populations was significant. She was in Gabbs recently doing some work and was invited to the senior center for lunch. There she was presented with a tuna sandwich with hardly any tuna on it and a few potato chips. The Gabbs senior center was not a sponsored program, and the seniors provided food for each other. The hunger need was present throughout rural Nevada. She appreciated support for the bill.

Judy Stokey, Board Member for Three Square, testified in support of S. B. 443. She said NV Energy was supportive of Three Square and a huge sponsor of the program.

There being no further testimony, Vice Chair Benitez-Thompson closed the hearing on S.B. 443 and opened a work session on the bill. [Assemblywoman Carlton entered the room.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 443.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

[Assemblywoman Carlton reassumed the Chair.]

Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 31-479)

Zach Conine, State Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 82 (2nd Reprint). He presented Exhibit E, a document titled, "Senate Bill 82, Nevada's College Savings Programs: Prepaid Tuition, College Savings Plans, and College Kickstart," dated June 3, 2019. The bill made various changes to the administration of Nevada's college savings programs including Prepaid Tuition, College Savings Plans, and the Nevada College Kick Start Program. He believed the bill would collectively enable the Office to more effectively administer the programs and increase educational opportunities for all Nevadans by increasing usage and usefulness of the programs. The Office was responsible for administering several 529 programs to help Nevadans save for college and postsecondary education including the College Savings Plans, Nevada College Kick Start Program, and Prepaid Tuition. [A 529 plan is a tax-advantaged savings plan designed to encourage saving for future education costs. The 529 plans, legally known as "qualified tuition plans," are sponsored by states, state agencies, or educational institutions and are authorized by Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code, and the earnings are exempt from federal income tax.] Those programs were overseen by the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada and governed by *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 353B. The programs were funded completely by fee revenue paid by the 529 college savings partners, not from State General Funds. Those revenues covered all costs associated with administering and marketing those programs, funding College Kick Start scholarships, and covering costs for administration of the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship.

Mr. Conine referred to pages 2 and 3 of Exhibit E that provided additional summary information of the programs. Assembly Bill 475 of the 79th Session (2017) approved by the Legislature made various changes to the programs including removing the State Treasurer as a voting member of the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada, adjusting the process by which the Chair of the Board would be selected, and capping marketing expenses at 3 percent of the revenues of the preceding year. Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint) proposed several improvements to the college savings programs and the administration. The bill reinstated the State Treasurer as a voting member of the Board, allowed the Board to choose an appropriate accounting method for the Nevada College Kick Start Program, and increased and defined marketing expenses that was the primary fiscal matter of the bill. Section 6 increased the marketing cap for the programs from 3 percent to 10 percent of the revenues received from partner fees for the Endowment Account in the first year of the immediately preceding biennium. That would raise the marketing budget in fiscal year (FY) 2020 from \$153,443 to \$511,475. To put that in context, in FY 2014 the total marketing spend was \$664,576. Following the application of A.B. 475 of the 79th Session (2017) and the 3 percent marketing cap, the total marketing spend in FY 2018 was \$177,396, a decrease of

approximately 73 percent. The drastic decrease in funds had undermined the Office's ability to effectively promote those programs that were proven to help families and students save for and access college and other career-training programs. An amendment adopted by the Senate added section 1 to the bill that helped the Office define marketing activities to be applied to the chapter and the cap. He wanted the Office and the Legislature to be on the same page with expectations moving forward. The bill was a result of the budget closing of the college savings budgets. A conversation was held about a navigator initiative being funded under the marketing cap.

Mr. Conine explained that the definition of marketing was based on industry standards, and was noted on page 7 of [Exhibit E](#). It included direct marketing expenses such as market research and paid advertisements. It also included a percentage of personnel time spent on direct-marketing-related activities as a collateral piece. The proposed change from 3 percent to 10 percent, and the broad inclusion of activities and personnel costs that would be counted as marketing against the cap, would result in an additional net of \$189,000 a year to spend on marketing activities. While modest, he believed the increase was critically needed to reach Nevada's nearly 500,000 public school students and their families to promote those valuable college savings programs. Looking to the future, the Office would track and measure the effects of the marketing dollars spent in regard to increased program usage and usefulness. For usage, he would look at new enrollments and add existing account behaviors including frequency of deposit, use of auto deposits, amount of total contributions, and number of accounts per household. For usefulness, he would aim to maximize match-fund opportunities, enroll participants at a younger age, and integrate the programs with other college savings and scholarships such as the Silver State Opportunity Grants. The priority of the navigator initiative was to reach and engage historically underserved communities including minority and low-income households. Nevada currently had the third lowest annual student loan debt in the nation, partly because of the college savings programs. Marketing those programs and ensuring that the communities that needed them the most actually knew about the programs was essential to the continued success. He thanked the Committee for its time to hear the bill.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson referred to page 4 of [Exhibit E](#) and explained that the decrease in marketing dollars caused her great consternation. She asked about the change in section 4 and whether the Office paid for the employees out of the Trust Fund for the Prepaid Tuition or accounted for those positions in the General Fund and how that affected the Prepaid Tuition program. The program had been over-performing at about 140 percent. She asked about the balance if additional costs were funded by the Trust Fund.

Tara R. Hagan, Chief Deputy Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, responded that section 4 was actually clean-up language. Several years ago the Interim Finance Committee made a change to pay employees from the Prepaid Tuition Trust Fund. Section 4 language would eliminate the requirement to pay employees out of the assets of the Trust Fund.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson understood that there would be no change. She asked about section 6, subsection 5, paragraph (d) and the language that allowed marketing costs to

increase from 3 percent to 10 percent. She saw the chart showing the reduction of marketing funds, but asked how the increased cap would work.

Mr. Conine replied that the intention was to increase the marketing cap from 3 percent to 10 percent. That change would mechanically increase the dollars spent on marketing by \$189,000 after the addition of the clean-up language including all personnel-related expenses. Historically there had been confusion between the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, the Fiscal Analysis Division staff, and the Office of the State Treasurer about whether or not personnel should be included in the costs. He tried to holistically include all personnel-related costs and all marketing related personnel costs into the number so that the cap was truly a cap on the marketing done by the Office.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she thought an increase from 3 percent to 10 percent would increase the funds spent on marketing. She asked why 10 percent was requested rather than 6 percent that was more in line with the costs of staff. She thought 6 percent would be better than 10 percent.

Mr. Conine responded that the intent of increasing the cap was to do two things. He wanted to allow the Office to include personnel costs in the marketing expenses and increase the dollars that the Office could spend on marketing. The new positions such as the navigator position should be included in marketing costs. More marketing or advertising would reach more of the 500,000 families.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said page 4 of [Exhibit E](#) listed a marketing budget that was three times more than the salaries and benefits. The 2018 numbers were on par and marketing was slightly less than the salaries and benefits. She asked why that was not good policy and why it would be good policy to spend more on marketing than on salaries and benefits.

Mr. Conine replied that the marketing dollars allowed the Office to most effectively use staff time and reach out to communities with materials translated from English to Spanish. That had not happened and should. A marketing department would be a tiny fraction of the marketing dollars spent. After the change, the marketing costs would be about two times the staff costs of the entire department. He thought that was well in line and put the Office closer to where it needed to be to reach out to 500,000 students.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked when the Legislature approved the marketing cap during the 79th Session (2017) whether the program had a decrease in the number of accounts.

Mr. Conine replied that the Office saw a decrease in the number of Prepaid Tuition enrollments from FY 2014 to FY 2018 by about 39 percent. Page 5 of [Exhibit E](#) indicated the change and was partially correlated to the decrease in marketing since the Legislative change for 2018.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson thought that some of that decrease could be because the children who enrolled in 2011 were hitting their age marks and graduating out of the program.

She saw a steady decline since 2015, but according to Mr. Conine, his best estimate was that the decline between 2017 and 2018 was all related to the capped percent of marketing.

Mr. Conine responded that it was difficult to say that one thing caused a decrease in the programs. What he had seen was a difficulty of the Office to reach all the families with students. One of his commitments to everyone when he came into the Office was he wanted to ensure that the marketing reached the communities where those individuals lived. He believed that the marketing decrease related, but there were other things that the Office needed to do. His commitment to the Legislature was that the money would be spent responsibly. He would return to the Legislature and explain what occurred. In the past, there had been a level of opaqueness coming from the Office, and he assured the Committee his doors and windows were open.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she wanted him to consider that the 10 percent cap could be 6 percent. She said she had a great discomfort with section 6, subsection 5, paragraph (f) that stated, "Any other costs that assist the residents of this State to attain postsecondary education which have been approved by the Board." She thought there was a lot of legislative history and interaction with the Board. She felt less comfortable with that catchall phrase that seemed broad. She was unsure whether that was his intent or whether he needed something specific. She asked for the language to be more tailored and specific.

Mr. Conine responded that the non-General Fund dollars that were coming in from the 529 partners were broadly set for increasing education for Nevadans. That was catchall language, and there was no specific intent or program that he addressed.

Assemblyman Kramer asked where the money came from to support the Endowment Fund. The 10 percent of the Endowment Fund came from someplace.

Mr. Conine replied the dollars that came in to the Fund totaled a little more than \$5 million per year from the 529 plans. Nevada backed about \$24.5 billion of college savings assets. Those were not the assets of Nevadans. Nevada was paid for the privilege of being involved and for the state to be involved in administering the programs. That money that was paid for by non-Nevadans and non-General Funds was used to promote those programs and support things such as the College Kick Start Program that helped individuals go to college.

Assemblyman Kramer said the \$5 million was roughly 20 basis points of the earnings of the fund that otherwise would go to the beneficiaries of the 529 plans as increased interest in their accounts. The amount was a small portion of what was in the 529 plans for the administration of not only 529 plans but also those other plans, and that was how the Office used those funds.

Mr. Conine responded that those 529 college savings plans typically charged the participants and those fees were retained by the companies that administered the plans including State Street Global Advisors (SSGA), which then remitted part of the fees to the Office. He had the desire to continue getting a little bit more for the Office.

Assemblywoman Spiegel said she was curious about the move from 3 percent to 10 percent. She asked about the context and for Mr. Conine to let the Committee know what allocation of marketing expenses was used in other states. She asked whether other states were closer to 3 percent or 1 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent. She asked how he arrived at 10 percent.

Mr. Conine replied that he did not want to speak offhand about what other states had as a percentage for marketing expenses. He was unaware of the cap in other states but was sure one existed in some states. He said he figured what the Office needed to effectively reach out to individuals and effectively market the programs. Knowing the history of the account and the problems it had in the past with rampant, less than intentional spending, he wanted to request a percentage that was reasonable. He would explain his use of the dollars after they were spent. He requested a change to include all personnel costs in the marketing dollars that was not included in the bill when originally drafted. What effectively happened was the Office would go from 3 percent to about 6.2 percent for marketing and then the remainder of that money would be absorbed into personnel costs except for the navigator position or other personnel who were currently in the Office.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S.B. 82 (R2) and opened a work session.

Senate Bill 458 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for the creation and maintenance of school gardens for certain Title I schools. (BDR S-580)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill (S.B.) 458 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 31, 2019. The bill made appropriations from the State General Fund to the Other State Education Programs Account in the amounts of \$410,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$205,000 in FY 2021 for the cost of creating and maintaining programs for school gardens for Title I schools. The money would be allocated to nonprofit organizations to create those programs including hydroponic gardens for Title I schools. The bill was effective on July 1, 2019.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 458 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 421 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment and carrying out of a program relating to certain unmanned aircraft systems. (BDR 18-31)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 421 (1st Reprint) required the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor, to the extent that funds were available, to carry out a program to facilitate the growth and integration of small unmanned aerial aircraft systems in Nevada. The bill included an appropriation from the State General Fund of \$1 million to carry out the program. Any unspent amounts would revert to the General Fund at the end of the 2019-2021 biennium. The bill was effective on July 1, 2019. Those funds would be used to bring down matching funds on at least a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Assemblywoman Titus appreciated drones and the industry, but she thought the industry had been well-funded. She believed there were better places to use those funds effectively. She would vote no on the bill.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 421 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Hambrick, Kramer, Titus, and Wheeler voted no. Assemblyman Frierson was not present for the vote.)

Senate Bill 198 (2nd Reprint): Requires analysis and reporting concerning the eligibility of children for Medicaid. (BDR S-744)

Chair Carlton said a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) was presented by Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9. The bill required collecting data and adjusting the eligibility dates.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 198 (2nd Reprint) related to Medicaid and required the collection of data with the intent of determining why children left the program. An amendment was proposed by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services, and it was posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. The amendment changed certain dates to align the ability to collect data with when the reports were due. Under the previous process, it was not feasible to collect the data at that time and have any useful data to report. Section 3 of the amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) changed the date for the collection to be no later than July 1, 2020, and ending on September 1, 2020, and to the extent the information was available, before July 1, 2020.

Assemblywoman Titus asked for clarification. She understood the concept about the data, but she wanted to ensure that the emphasis of the bill was to allow a child to be enrolled for 12 months and not just at the date of data collection. Individuals heard about data collection and got anxious about that. The bill really helped protect children and gave them a year of Medicaid services.

Chair Carlton said the term she learned while working through those matters was "churn," and the children would churn through the process. She wanted to stop the churning and ensure the children received care while the data was being obtained.

Assemblyman Kramer said it seemed to him that one of the major purposes of the bill was to determine the reasons why some children stopped receiving Medicaid services, but Medicaid failed to hear about them anymore. The program lacked the ability to follow up and find out what happened. It would be good to have accountability about whether the activities were helpful or whether children moved away to get better help. He asked whether the purpose was to add accountability.

Chair Carlton responded that Senator Scheible wanted to understand what was happening and why enrollment numbers changed to address the problems that occurred. The data would be helpful.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion for Amend and Do Pass Senate Bill 198 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 198 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Senate Bill 467 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR S-820)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 467 (3rd Reprint) reauthorized the Zoom and Victory school programs that sunsetted each biennium. Two amendments had been proposed in the Senate. One was to add \$900,000 related to computer programs, software, and information technology equipment. In addition, a change was made to the salary of the chief strategy officer position to an amount that differed from the amount that was approved in the Pay Bill by the Committee in the last couple of days.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO PASS SENATE BILL 467 (3RD REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (BDR 32-1286)

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 551 (1st Reprint). She called the bill the safe and supportive schools act. One of the most important goals during the 120 days of the Legislature had been to fund schools and support the students and teachers, and that had become a true reality. The Legislature needed to show children that their futures were important, show teachers that they were respected, and honor the incredible work that teachers did every single day. In Nevada, funding education appropriately was a perpetual struggle, and she had no doubt that the struggle would continue well beyond tonight as the Legislature finished up the last little bit of work. She was optimistic that bills such as S. B. 551 (R1) and other education reform measures that had been approved had made real meaningful improvements in the education system. The legislators had kept their promise to children and teachers by paying more than lip service to their needs. The Legislature had successfully put more money into education during the 80th Session (2019) than in a very long time.

Senator Cannizzaro knew that the Committee was very aware of the funding. Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint) added an additional \$9.49 million over the 2019-2021 biennium for the Nevada Opportunity Scholarship Program. The additional funds would not provide for any additional growth. The intent was to allow the students who were currently in those programs to continue to remain in those programs. Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint) added an additional \$16.7 million for facility enhancements in ways that would improve school safety. The bill added an additional \$72 million over the 2019-2021 biennium to fund much deserved teacher pay raises across the state and allow greater flexibility for school districts to provide for the needs of students.

Senator Cannizzaro said she would explain the provisions of S. B. 551 (R1) that was before the Committee. Section 39 repealed the provisions in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 360.203 that required the Department of Taxation to reduce the tax rates of the modified business tax when actual collections from that tax in conjunction with collections from the branch bank excise tax and commerce tax and all applicable tax credits exceeded 104 percent of the revenue projected from those revenue sources by the Economic Forum in an even-numbered fiscal year. The section was originally added by the Legislature in Senate Bill 483 of the 78th Session (2015) that established the commerce tax and contained other provisions designed to provide

revenue dedicated to the State General Fund. Section 37 prohibited the Department of Taxation from applying any determination made under the mechanism in NRS 360.203 to reduce the rates of the modified business tax for any fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 2015. Sections 2 and 3 made conforming changes to NRS Chapters 363A and 363B by eliminating references to NRS 360.203. Under sections 37 and 39, the modified business tax rates that were scheduled to decrease to 1.853 percent of all taxable wages for financial institutions and money companies and 1.378 percent of taxable wages in excess of \$50,000 per quarter for all other businesses effective July 1, 2019, would remain at their current rates of 2 percent and 1.475 respectively on and after that date.

Senator Cannizzaro said S. B. 551 (R1) made a number of appropriations that she mentioned earlier. The \$16.7 million from the General Fund would go to the school safety account, and the Department had to transfer the funds from the appropriation to provide grants for school safety facility improvements. Those grants were based on a demonstrated need to help schools and charter schools statewide. Section 36.5 appropriated money from the General Fund for the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation in the amounts of approximately \$35 million in FY 2020 and \$37 million in FY 2021 for a total of approximately \$72 million over the 2019-2021 biennium. The money would then be transferred as block grants for the purposes of providing supplemental support to the operation of the school districts. Provisions of S. B. 551 (R1) also eliminated the statutory framework for education savings accounts. The bill provided for an ongoing revenue source that was dedicated to education. Education had to be a priority, and S. B. 551 (R1) did that.

Assemblywoman Titus thanked Senator Cannizzaro for presenting the bill in a clear manner. Similar legislation was enacted during the 78th Session (2015) to raise revenue for schools. She asked whether S. B. 551 (R1) raised more revenue than what was raised in 2015.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that the provisions of S. B. 551 (R1) and the sunset provisions of the modified business tax were placed into statute again in 2015. The Legislature had previously discussed the idea of removing the sunsets for that particular type of tax. The amount of money raised was dependent upon the formula for how those taxes were calculated for each of the businesses. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the projected revenue was slightly less than \$100 million for schools.

Assemblywoman Neal asked whether S. B. 551 (R1) would provide \$100 million of new revenue.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that the buy-down of the modified business tax would allow the state to take in revenue amounting to slightly less than \$100 million over the 2019-2021 biennium.

Assemblywoman Neal asked whether that \$100 million was minus what was occurring in section 3.5 with the tax credits.

Senator Cannizzaro replied that slightly less than \$100 million would be received by the state in the form of revenue pursuant to the buy-down of the modified business tax in S. B. 551 (R1) as appropriated and designated in S. B. 551 (R1). The tax credits would be credited against that amount. The remainder of the money would go to block grants for schools and for the school safety projects. Senate Bill 551 (1st Reprint) was not only to buy-down the modified business tax but to also serve as a road map of the uses of that money.

Assemblywoman Neal said the Legislature had already funded a lot for school safety that was laid out a few days ago. She asked about the total amount for school safety when S. B. 551 (R1) funds and all the others were added together.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that the Legislature had added a lot of money toward school safety, but she knew that there was still more that could be done. She thought S. B. 551 (R1) was an effort to find additional revenue. She believed that the total for the 2019-2021 biennium was about \$45 million that had been appropriated to school safety improvements, and S. B. 551 (R1) would add another approximately \$16.7 million.

Chair Carlton said she needed to clarify a couple of things. Senator Cannizzaro referred to about \$16.7 million in the school safety account that was outside the Distributive School Account (DSA) and would be in addition to the DSA. She believed S. B. 551 (R1) provided funds that school districts could request in the future. It would be difficult in the next six hours for the Legislature to develop a fair and adequate distribution plan for those dollars. She suggested that the funds be available after school districts used the current money that they had. Then school districts could approach the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) and explain that there were more projects to do. The funds could be requested from the Department of Education, and the Department could approach IFC to get those dollars. That was her thought process.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that S. B. 551 (R1) was structured to provide block grants based on the needs of the districts. She would defer to whatever process was best for that. The funds would not go directly to the schools in a way that would require the Legislature to restructure a plan in the next few hours. The funds would be designated for block grants for school districts based on need.

Chair Carlton said the second portion of those dollars that Senator Cannizzaro mentioned was \$72 million that was separate from the \$16.7 million and those block grants would be apportioned to the school districts at specific amounts.

Senator Cannizzaro replied that there was a breakdown for where the additional \$72 million money would go in section 36.5 of S. B. 551 (R1). The breakdown listed what each school district would receive.

Chair Carlton said the distribution was listed, and the Department of Education would transfer the sums of money identified in section 36.5 from the Account for Programs for Innovation and the Prevention of Remediation. Those funds were outside of the DSA calculation. She

thought those amounts would not be incorporated into the base in the future and would be off to the side.

Senator Cannizzaro confirmed that Chair Carlton was correct.

Chair Carlton said she was mistaken, and the amounts would be included in the base for the purposes of providing supplemental support for operations. Funds that went to the operations of a school district would probably go into the base.

Assemblyman Wheeler asked about section 30.75 and whether any new students would be added to those scholarship programs or whether scholarship programs would be losing students.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that S. B. 551 (R1) did not provide for any additional students to be added to the scholarship programs. It would allow for students who were currently receiving those scholarship funds to remain in the program and continue to receive those funds.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called 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. 551 (R1). There were two reasons for the support. First, she supported section 31 and supported safe schools because the working conditions were the students' learning conditions. She wanted the students to be as safe as possible, but that was not always the same for every district or every school. Second, she supported section 36 and the supplemental support for the operation of the school districts for each of the classrooms. She thanked Senator Cannizzaro for her insight and work on bringing forward the important legislation.

Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association, testified in support of S. B. 551 (R1). He thanked Senator Cannizzaro for bringing the bill forward. The salary increases in the bill were an investment in the teachers and support professionals. When he said teachers he also meant support professionals, and many tended to not mention them and assume that they were included. They were the backbone of what teachers did in the classrooms.

Jared Busker, Associate Director, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance, testified in support of S. B. 551 (R1). He was disappointed that the early childhood education portion was deleted.

Sylvia Lazos, Law Professor, representing the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, testified in support of S. B. 551 (R1). She was disappointed that the Zoom and Victory school program funding had been removed from S. B. 551 (R1). She supported the bill because it redirected funds to education. She was involved in earlier litigation that challenged education savings accounts. She presented [Exhibit G](#), a letter to Chair Carlton and Committee Members dated June 3, 2019,

in support of the bill. The bill removed the statutory provision authorizing education savings accounts. The establishment of an uncapped voucher program paid for by public school funds had been deemed unconstitutional by the Nevada Supreme Court. There had been much confusion about the holding of that case, and she provided that clarification.

Autumn Tampa, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, testified in support of S. B. 551 (R1). She said she was an education support professional and worked in the Clark County School District for 21 years. Over the last nine or ten years, many of her colleagues had been disappointed and felt there was not a lot of hope for education. Education staff had to do more with less. Teachers had to fill in and cover the work of others and make do with fewer supplies. She was excited and hopeful about the bill and any other education bill that would improve schools for children. Many others were also excited and hopeful about the bill.

Sarah Adler, Silver State Government Relations representing Charter School Association of Nevada, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). She supported the bill and the infusion of additional dollars into public education. Charter schools were part of public education as well. Section 36.5 did not include a grant to the state public charter school authority. The state public charter school authority was included in Assembly Bill 309 (1st Reprint) as amended in the block grant portion of that bill. It was inconsistent that the state public charter school authority was included in one bill and not the other. She said it was important to point that out on the record. Of the \$35 million for FY 2020, about \$2.87 million should be attributed to the charter school students being educated in Washoe and Clark County School Districts. They had diverse needs, teachers, and support professionals.

Brian Reeder, Ferrari Public Affairs, represented AAA Scholarship Foundation, which was one of the scholarship granting organizations for the Opportunity Scholarships. The AAA served about 1,000 students in the program in Nevada. A majority of the families served were at 185 percent or below the federal poverty level. He wanted to testify today to ensure the Committee was aware of the effects of the bill as amended on the scholarship grantees. He thanked the bill's sponsor for including additional program capacity over the 2019-2021 biennium. However, he testified in opposition of S. B. 551 (R1). Section 30.75, subsection 6 would prevent any new students from being accepted into the scholarship program. The AAA had a waitlist of about 450 students. That section of the bill was particularly challenging for families who currently had a son or daughter in the program and would like to have their sibling participate and attend the same school. The bill would not allow for that to happen. The AAA sent out letters to some of those siblings and families on the waitlist to let them know they were being accepted. The AAA was unsure how to deal with those students if the bill passed. The AAA appreciated the added capacity but objected to not allowing any new students to backfill the capacity when capacity became available because students graduated and moved out of the area or no longer qualified because of income increases. That was something that he hoped the Committee would be willing to remove from the bill.

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). The Association believed that the bill should be approved by a two-thirds majority vote. The bill had a long and deep effect on tax policy going forward. It was the

Association's hope that it could be returned to the Senate. After the Senate floor session he was confused about the process and how it worked. He clarified that the modified business tax was paid by corporations and almost every business in Nevada. Of the 8,600 retail businesses in Nevada, 6,600 of those paid the modified business tax, and 7,200 of those businesses had fewer than 20 employees. The modified business tax was a tax that was paid by every size of business in Nevada. He sought clarification about the statement that the bill would provide a dedicated revenue stream toward education going forward. The way he read the bill was that the revenue stream would continue to be deposited into the General Fund, and then the second half of the bill contained an appropriation from the General Fund. He asked for clarification whether the revenue was being deposited directly in education as a dedicated revenue stream or whether it was a General Fund activity.

Chair Carlton said the state funded education from the General Fund.

Mendy Elliott, Capitol Partners, Community and Government Relations, representing the Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). On behalf of the Chamber and its 1,700 business members, she confirmed the opposition to the bill and the unintended consequences of the legislation. Mr. Wachter described some of the problems with the bill. She foresaw litigation because the bill essentially overrode the checks and balances system that was essential to transparent and accountable government. The unintended consequences could result in costly litigation for years to come. The Chamber came to the 80th Session (2019) hoping for both sales and property tax reform discussions. The Chamber was disappointed to have this discussion today. The Chamber still hoped for fruitful discussions during the Interim.

Paul J. Enos, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Nevada Trucking Association, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). The opposition was because S. B. 551 (R1) did not have the two-thirds vote requirement. The Association's Board of Directors and members appreciated having that checks and balances system. That was something that the Association had been on different sides of with various degrees of success over a number of years.

Michael Pelham, MBA, Director of Government and Community Affairs, Nevada Taxpayers Association, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). He believed the bill increased public revenue and should therefore require a two-thirds majority vote. He stood in opposition to the bill for that reason.

Randi Thompson, Nevada State Director, National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). The Federation represented over 1,800 small businesses statewide. Well over 20,000 businesses paid the tax, and a majority of those were small businesses. The Federation believed that the bill broke the promise that was made just four years ago by the Legislature when it passed the largest business tax increase in history. Part of that legislation was that when the tax revenues increased by more than 4 percent, then there would be a reduction in the payroll tax to those businesses who were very generous with their revenues. The minimum wage bill had a fiscal note from the Department of Taxation when it first came out, and it would add revenue of \$1.5 million immediately and have a long-term future effect of roughly \$6.6 million. The Legislature was not only breaking the

promise that was made to small business four years ago, but there would be a tremendous increase in the state coffers because of the minimum wage increase. For those reasons, the Federation opposed the bill.

Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchise Auto Dealers Association, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). He rose in opposition to the bill and echoed the statements of the previous speakers. The bill was not subject to the two-thirds majority vote. It had been a long standing practice of the Legislature that the two-thirds vote would be part of any tax increases. The Association testified on the bill Thursday morning with the same opposition.

Marcos Lopez, Field Director, Americans for Prosperity, testified in opposition to S. B. 551 (R1). For the same reasons previously stated, he opposed the bill.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the block grant calculations for each school district in section 36.5 were based on the enrollment for 2018 including district-sponsored charter schools. However, the appropriation did not include charter schools that were sponsored by the state public charter school authority.

Senator Cannizzaro clarified one thing. She had discussions about funding in the state and the idea of dedicated funding. She thought revenues would continue to come in over future bienniums to the General Fund, and the General Fund was the source of funding for education. The bill provided dedicated funding that would be available in future bienniums. No one who spoke in opposition to the bill disagreed with the idea that the Legislature needed to look at funding. That was not a concept that was foregone by the bill. The Legislature was making the choice today to put that funding in the 2019-2021 biennium toward education. The body would remain dedicated to ensuring that education was funded in the state. With respect to the idea that the bill should require a two-thirds majority vote, she noted that the Senate did attempt to bridge that gap and offer that two-thirds pathway to passage of the bill. Unfortunately that was not met, so she presented the bill to the Committee today. She said there were some comments made that the Legislature should address property and sales tax increases, but she noted that there was no opposition to the idea that the tax was being paid. The opposition was largely centered on the idea that there was no two-thirds majority vote required stamped on the bill. She thought the bill did a lot of good things to put education first, and she urged support for the bill.

There being no further testimony on the bill, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on S. B. 551 (R1) and opened a work session. She asked for comments from the Committee.

Assemblywoman Titus said she would not support S. B. 551 (R1).

Assemblyman Kramer said that when the Legislature increased taxes and said it would require a two-thirds majority vote on tax increases, but then ignored that requirement, the Legislature stepped on the trust of the public. That sounded as though the Legislature could do what it wanted and disregard the public's opinion. He thought that was an arrogance that Legislators could not afford, and he would not support the bill.

Chair Carlton said she had served in the Legislature a long time. Sometimes a person might think they were going to do something and had a plan for the Legislature and it would work for the next four to six years. And then something happened such as the economic downturn. No one would have ever guessed what the Legislature had to do in those horrible eight years by cutting employees' pay, adding furloughs, and having difficult conversations about budget cuts. Nevada was on its way back to recovery, but had been bumping along at the bottom for a number of years. The state was just now getting to the point where things were starting to level off. This year, the Legislature was proud to be able to put money into education. She believed everyone was doing their level best to put money into education and to look for stable funding streams to provide some consistency and plan for the state's future. She understood Assemblyman Kramer's concerns. She had watched things evolve in the Legislature, and it was never static. The Legislature was constantly changing, and one Legislature could not bind the hands of a future Legislature. All legislators were elected to represent their constituents at that moment in time that they were sitting in these seats.

Assemblyman Frierson said it was interesting to talk about the promises that were made and kept. Legislators promised to make policy that applied to that biennium but were unable to promise that an economic downturn would not occur or that adjustments would be made to address the downturn. Legislators promised to take care of the children, and they could not be selective in how to keep those promises. He said every two years we do what we think is right and ensure that it reflects the priorities of the state. He thought the Legislature during the 80th Session (2019) had shown a willingness to do that. He thought no one questioned the likelihood of an economic downturn coming sometime soon, and the state had to be prepared for that. We would not stop needing classrooms, and children would not stop needing teachers. Legislators cannot be selective in keeping those promises and were responsible for what they did every biennium. He supported the bill and was willing to make a motion.

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

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 551 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Hambrick, Kramer, Titus, and
Wheeler voted no.)

Chair Carlton said the Committee members needed to go to the Assembly floor to work on bills and would return later to process more bills in the evening. She recessed the meeting [at 6:38 p.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting [at 9:44 p.m.].

Chair Carlton opened a work session.

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

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill (S.B.) 528 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on June 1, 2019. Since that time, proposed amendment 6128 [also identified on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) as amendment 1131] was posted on NELIS. Section 1 of the bill as discussed during the original hearing appropriated \$2 million of State General Funds to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health. Section 1.5 also appropriated \$542,343 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$542,343 in FY 2021 for operations and educational programs to restore funding previously received by the Center.

Ms. Jones explained the new sections of the amendment. Section 3 of the amendment contained a \$5 million appropriation from the General Fund to White Pine County to assist with the construction of a new courthouse. Section 4 included an appropriation of \$649,300 from the State Highway Fund for the cost of computer programming related to legislation approved by the Legislature during the 80th Session (2019). The collective amounts from all the fiscal notes were collected from the bills that included programming hours for various projects and provided in one appropriation rather than attached to each of the various bills. The workload exceeded the programming resources available at the Department of Motor Vehicles. Section 5 included a State General Fund appropriation of \$1 million to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for allocation to the State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, or other appropriate entity to provide office and related space for state agencies potentially displaced as a result of public works project 19-PO1 Advance Planning: Grant Sawyer State Office Building remodel. Section 6 included a \$1 million appropriation from the General Fund to the IFC for allocation to the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Department of Administration, for the pilot program created by section 2 of Assembly Bill 489 (3rd Reprint). Section 7 included an appropriation from the General Fund of \$3,111,192 in FY 2020 and \$6,464,376 in FY 2021 to Nevada Medicaid in the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, for costs related to increasing the acute care per-diem reimbursement rates, excluding per-diem rates for neonatal and pediatric intensive care units, by a total of 2.5 percent effective January 1, 2020. Also included in section 7 were appropriations from the General Fund of \$1,386 in FY 2020 and \$5,869 in FY 2021 for the Nevada Check-Up Program of the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, to increase the acute care per-diem reimbursement rates, excluding per-diem rates for neonatal and pediatric intensive care units, by a total of 2.5 percent effective January 1, 2020. Also included in section 7 were authorizations related to the federal funds that would be drawn down as a result of those increased rates. The previous amounts were General Funds, and the other amounts included in section 7, subsections 5 and 6 included amounts that would be drawn down from the federal government.

Ms. Jones continued that section 8 of the amendment included a \$20 million General Fund appropriation to the State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, to support

the Division in carrying out project 19-C30, Construction of a University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) College of Engineering, Academic and Research Building for the state portion of the first phase of the building. Section 9 included a General Fund appropriation of \$458,193 to the State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, for project 19-P70, planning for the Great Basin College Welding Lab Expansion. Section 10 included a \$105,000 appropriation from the General Fund to the State Public Works Division, Department of Administration, for project 19-P71, planning for the Western Nevada College Marlette Hall refurbishment. Section 11 appropriated \$1,358,455 from the General Fund in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to the School Safety Account for block grants to school districts and charter schools for contracts or employee social workers or other licensed mental health workers in schools with identified needs. Section 12 appropriated \$2.75 million from the General Fund in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to the School Safety Account to employ and equip school resource officers or school police officers in schools with identified needs determined on the basis of data related to school discipline, violence, climate, vulnerability, and the ability of the public schools to hire school resource officers or school police officers. Section 13 appropriated General Funds to the school safety account in the amounts of \$2.35 million in FY 2020 and \$2.35 million in FY 2021 to create a program of social, emotional, and academic development throughout the public schools of the state. Section 14 appropriated \$1 million from the General Fund to the Nevada Blind Children's Foundation for children to attend after-school programs offered by the Foundation. Section 15 discussed the effective dates of the previous provisions.

Chair Carlton said a number of discussions had been held with the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance about the amendment. There were some adjustments earlier during the session when they were trying to ensure that everything was appropriately taken care of. Commitments were made to individuals that if dollars were available at the end of the session, the Legislature would do everything within its power to replace some of the dollars. The Committee heard loud and clear that school safety was important. She thanked Senator Woodhouse for her work on the amendment that included a wide variety of projects and touched all different areas of the state.

Assemblywoman Titus acknowledged the appropriation for the White Pine County Courthouse project. White Pine County came forward with matching funds. The old courthouse had been a public health safety problem for a number of years. The prison in White Pine County housed the inmates for the rest of the state, and the community was at high risk. She appreciated the Committee's support.

Chair Carlton said White Pine County had requested assistance many times and provided matching funds. The Legislature appreciated the County's efforts and needed to follow through on its side of the bargain.

Assemblyman Wheeler was sure that everything in the amendment had been presented during the hearings, and the bill and amendment just put things together.

Chair Carlton said that was not necessarily true. The Committee had not held a full hearing on the Engineering Building, the welding component, or the classroom at Western Nevada College. Those were projects that were brought to Senator Woodhouse and Chair Carlton and other members of the Committees for consideration if funds were available. No hearings were scheduled on some requests because the Committee never knew whether funds would be available. But the members were convinced they were worthy projects.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Amend and Do Pass Senate Bill 528 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 528 (1ST REPRINT) WITH AMENDMENT 6128.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 31-479)

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint) was heard earlier today. The bill was a request from the Office of the State Treasurer to adjust the percentage of Endowment Account funds that could be used for marketing purposes. After some discussion with the Committee, a conceptual amendment was discussed to change section 6, subsection 5, paragraph (d) to reduce the proposed percentage cap on marketing expenditures from 10 percent proposed in the bill to 7 percent. The current percentage cap was 3 percent. Paragraph (f) was struck in its entirety which was language to allow the use of funds for other costs approved by the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada.

Chair Carlton said Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson had discussed the amendment with the State Treasurer. There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 82 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the funding of public schools.
(BDR 34-1263)

Chair Carlton said Senate Bill (S.B.) 543 (1st Reprint) had been heard at a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. She asked for a presentation on the changes.

Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, presented the bill. She said she was proud to return to Nevada and proud of what had been accomplished through the last day of the 80th Session (2109), specifically as it related to education funding for the students. She saw a promising future. She, along with her staff, looked forward to working with each legislator during the 2019-2021 biennium to create teacher working conditions and student learning experiences worthy of the state. She knew that the collaboration she witnessed related to S.B. 543 (R1) was only the tip of the iceberg to improve per-pupil funding. The bill was the fruit of many years of thoughtful consideration motivated by legislators, districts, parents, and the state, to ensure all Nevada students were college or career-ready upon graduation. Specifically, she recognized the leadership of Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, and Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2. They had worked many decades on the project most intensively during the last 18 months with school finance experts, district superintendents, and chief financial officers. They led the charge in the Legislature to ensure the funding pie was most equitably allocated. She had witnessed several bills that sealed Nevada's recognition that schools had to be funded differently to ensure positive student outcomes. Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint) was an opportunity for Nevada to lead the nation in how states funded education. The weights would be reflective of the services students deserved and the teaching conditions worthy of the educators. She expressed her gratitude to Senator Denis and Senator Woodhouse for boldly leading on behalf of students and teachers and to all the legislators for representing their districts and answering a higher call by modeling for other state legislatures that Nevada was dedicated to ensuring all students regardless of zip code received a high-quality education because their Legislature and Governor willed it so.

Ms. Ebert presented Exhibit H, a mock-up proposed amendment 6122 to S.B. 543 (R1), dated June 3, 2019 [also identified as proposed amendment 1135]. She also presented Exhibit I, a one-page diagram of the school funding change proposed in S.B. 543 (R1) compared to the school funding of The Nevada Plan. The primary change in the amendment was the role of the Department of Education, specifically the determination of adjustments under the formula. The amendment shifted the responsibility to the Department of Education for establishing the adjustments to the per-pupil amounts under section 5 through section 7. The amendment allowed those adjustments to be established under the Department's standard regulatory process. The Commission on School Funding retained a critical role in section 11 by providing guidance and monitoring the development of the new Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. The Department instead of the Commission would also establish by regulation the amounts for school districts' administrative expenses under section 8. The Department would provide the necessary staffing and work with the Commission to develop those adjustments that would be presented to the Legislative Committee on Education. The amendment retained the Legislative Committee on Education's responsibility to review and provide input on the adjustments

recommended by the Department and the established regulations under sections 5 through 7 as well as receive the recommendations from the Commission regarding the enactment of the new funding plan under section 11 of the bill. The amendment also addressed the concern about the Legislative Counsel Bureau staffing a nonlegislative commission. Under section 10 of the amendment, the primary responsibility for staffing the Commission shifted to the Department of Education and the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, which would jointly provide the Commission with staff services.

Ms. Ebert said the second major change was the flexibility. Language was added broadly under sections 4 and 9 related to the establishment of per-pupil amounts and the requirements for building The Executive Budget before the 81st Session (2021). She recognized that the monumental shift to a new funding formula would have road bumps to smooth out. The language provided the Department the flexibility to make adjustments as needed for successful enactment of the new funding formula.

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senate District No. 5, shared her thoughts on the amendment. She and Senator Denis had worked on the funding formula since 2014. During the last year, it had been a daily effort to bring a funding formula to the Legislature that really addressed the needs of students across the state. She had taught 1st grade in the past, and her classroom then was different from current classroom conditions. The funding formula would reflect what the student population looked like now. The major tenet within the amendment was that the Department of Education, the Fiscal Analysis Division staff, and the Office of the Governor would all continue to center on the guiding principles that the new funding formula would be transparent. Everyone would know how the money got to the classroom and that those funds followed the students to the classroom. The funding formula would do that. The other considerations included the geographic diversity, ethnicity of the students in Nevada, and economic diversity of the students. Those were the kinds of things that needed to be addressed in the new funding formula, and she thought the formula did that. The amendment kept all of those pieces in play.

Senator Woodhouse said the fourth principle was the hold harmless or "true up," and that was something that would be worked on during the interim. The Nevada Plan would continue to distribute funds to the school districts over the next two years. The new formula would run parallel to The Nevada Plan, and the Legislature would have the opportunity to see how it worked and make any changes that might arise. The formula was student-centered and classroom-focused. The funds would get to the classroom and the teachers to deliver the curriculum to those students and meet the needs in the classrooms. She was happy after all of those months to be able to present S.B. 543 (R1) with the amendment, and she urged the Committee's support.

Senator Moises Denis, Senate District No. 2, spoke about how the procedural part of the amendment worked. Funding still continued to be one pot of money, and the money went in and flowed out like a waterfall. That funding process continued in the amendment. The state administrative oversight programs came first, and then funds went through the base funding, then the weighted funding, and finally the excess allocation continued to go up through the

education pot of money. Senator Woodhouse was a 1st-grade teacher and he was a 1st-grade student when The Nevada Plan was first developed. The state had more students today than there were individuals that lived in Nevada in 1967. He said it was time to adopt a funding formula that would help children today and also provide for a way to move forward and make adjustments. Some of the tenets in the amendment actually made it stronger by working with the Department of Education. If this had been an easy thing to do, it would have been done a long time ago. One of the things he learned was that this was not an easy thing to do: it was hard. He thought everyone knew that we had to work together to do what was best for the children.

Chair Carlton thanked them and reminded the members that the Committee had a long hearing that evening with a lot of questions that were asked and answered. Previously, the Committee held hours of public testimony during a joint meeting on education funding. In consideration of that meeting, the Committee would not receive public testimony tonight. When she got to that point, she would ask those in support of the bill to stand and be counted, and later those in opposition would be asked to stand. She would proceed that way because the Committee needed to return to the Assembly floor to finish its business.

Assemblywoman Neal asked about section 76 of S.B. 543 (R1). The language indicated that the Commission would examine the projections and compare those to The Nevada Plan amounts. She asked where in the process the Boards of Trustees of the various school districts would make their recommendations about the budgets. Typically, the school district might review the budget or might be a part of the budget process. She asked whether the Boards were left out of the process and the budget would be reviewed by the Commission.

Ms. Ebert responded that the Boards of Trustees within each of the school districts would still be heavily involved in the budget. Each Board would provide the current expenditures before the formula process began, and the Boards' input working with the school districts would still continue.

Assemblywoman Neal said she was trying to understand how mechanically the process would work. In Clark County, the schools projected the budgets, and the principal was responsible for the budget. The proposed funding plan would have the Commission make all the budget decisions and projections. She asked where the school principals fit into the process because the projections were for a biennium and not necessarily year to year. She asked about the mechanics of the process and how schools functioned with year-to-year enrollment within the process listed in section 76 of the bill.

Ms. Ebert responded that section 76 did not specifically address Assemblywoman Neal's question because section 76 was part of the budget process within each school district. The funding that was made available to the school districts then flowed down to the school level. Those individual funds were spent at the school level and involved the principal. The process took into consideration the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). [SWOT analysis was a strategic planning technique used to help an organization identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to business competition or project

planning.] The level of detail that Assemblywoman Neal asked about was not specifically in the bill, but it was in how school districts operated with the legislation that had been passed during the 79th Session (2017).

Assemblyman Frierson said section 76 related to how much funding was moved down to the schools. The SWOT matter addressed how the pot of money was divided among the schools, and that was a separate problem that occurred after the allocation.

Assemblyman Kramer read thorough the amendment and supported several of the aspects including the phrase "to the extent practical." Schools knew the ethnicity of some of the students and made allowances for English learners and provided extra help to those classrooms to achieve the goals. School districts addressed income levels when dealing with at-risk children. The area that troubled him was pupils with disabilities. Some school districts had gone to great efforts to do a really good job providing services to students with disabilities. But he knew there was not just one level of disability but a spectrum. At one end of the spectrum was one student assigned one aide all day long. Others students might be a step away from being fully adaptable and ready students. The other end of the spectrum might have students with severe physical, mental, or anger management types of disabilities. He hoped that a discussion about funds would include a designation to those different levels. There might be a way to value those disabilities maybe on a scale of one to seven or something such as that with different amounts for each level. He found that a school that did a good job providing different levels of care would attract students from other school districts. One school might have a good program that challenged severely disabled students, and that school might spend its funds more quickly than other schools. Then the chance of having a school district held harmless based on one of the concepts of the new funding plan with designated funds became a real problem. He asked whether there was any appetite now or in the future to look at how students with disabilities were funded and perhaps create a spectrum for different amounts and different levels after an appraisal was done.

Senator Denis responded that what the new formula did was it provided an opportunity to have that discussion. A Commission was established to look at that problem. One of the things that he looked at was not only the different levels in special education, but that there were students who might be in all three levels. The Nevada Plan currently treated that student with the highest level or weight. Those were the things that could be looked at as the plan moved forward. That was the beauty of the new plan in that it had that flexibility to be able to study problems as we moved forward and make those decisions and changes.

Assemblyman Kramer asked where he would find language in the bill about the Commission making those decisions.

Ms. Ebert replied that those considerations were in sections 5 through 8 and section 11 where the Commission was specifically designated.

Assemblywoman Titus said she appreciated the opportunity to ask a couple of questions about the amended version that dramatically affected every student in the state. She appreciated all

the work and effort that was put into the bill and the dedication to the solution. She agreed that funding had to be studied. The Committee passed a bill recently regarding funding for pupils who were placed in out-of-state hospitals. She noticed there had been some changes in the wording of section 18. She wanted to ensure S.B. 543 (R1) did not conflict with the bill the Committee just passed last week regarding funding for students who were in hospitals outside the state. She was uncertain about the number of that bill but needed to know about any potential conflict.

Senator Woodhouse replied that bill number was Senate Bill (S.B.) 485 (2nd Reprint).

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the amendment to S.B. 543 (1st Reprint) was compatible with S.B. 485 (2nd Reprint). She wanted to ensure that the Committee had not suddenly done something that then conflicted with what was just passed and that everything worked together. One of the reasons was the students in out-of-state hospitals had to be enrolled in school and registered for several days. There was a question about whether it was the district that they were in, and S.B. 485 (2nd Reprint) was trying to clarify some of that confusion.

Ms. Ebert responded that the adjusted base specifically addressed the Distributive School Account (DSA) on the statewide basis, and the weighted funding that you see was changed so it would not conflict with S.B. 485 (2nd Reprint).

Assemblywoman Titus wanted to ask a quick question to make sure it had not changed. The big concern for many of the school districts was that money should follow the students. She appreciated that the new funding plan mirrored The Nevada Plan for now so that there were no dramatic changes for the next couple of years, and we could see how the new plan worked. Her concern was everyone kept saying they wanted the money to follow the student, and she absolutely appreciated that. But then when she asked several of the school districts about their funding, it appeared that some districts would receive increased funds and some would receive reduced funds. Her concern was that to catch up and make every district whole, some districts would not receive any increase in funding until the other districts caught up. She understood that concept, but her concern was if a community grew, the school district would not receive any additional funding even at that lower rate for those new students that might come in to the district. She just wanted confirmation because that was her concern that then the money would not follow those particular students if they happened to move into that community.

Ms. Ebert replied that the students who entered a school district would be accounted for in the formula. Any additional students that entered the district would be counted and funded from the plan.

Assemblywoman Titus said what she saw was that there was a fixed amount of money per school district, and funding depended on where the district was in the formula and whether or not the district needed to catch up. When a new student came to the school, the budget had a set amount for each existing student. She cited an example. A school had 2,000 students but the budget was capped at 2,000 students. Then 200 more students enrolled, but the school would not receive 200 times the \$5,000 additional amount per student.

Ms. Ebert responded that was a misconception shared by many that as the formula ran, the amount that was allocated for the students would hold at what it was currently. But when a district had additional students entering the school district, those students would be accounted for and funded.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the district would get additional funding.

Ms. Ebert replied that more funds would be provided for every student who entered the school district.

Chair Carlton said the Committee had discussed the amendment thoroughly. She thanked the presenters. She asked for all those present who supported the amendment to please stand. [About ten individuals stood up in support of the amendment.] Chair Carlton then asked for all those present who opposed the amendment to please stand. [About an equal number of individuals stood up in opposition to the amendment.] Chair Carlton then asked for all those present who were neutral on the amendment to please stand. [There were none.] Chair Carlton closed the hearing on the bill and opened a work session.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Carlton called for a motion to Amend and Do Pass Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint) with Proposed Amendment 6122.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE
AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 543 (1ST REPRINT) WITH
PROPOSED AMENDMENT 6122.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE
MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblymen Titus and Wheeler voted no.)

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Senate Bill 324 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 324 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-683)

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 324 (1st Reprint). The bill created a Teachers' School Supplies Assistance Account in the State General Fund. A teacher could receive reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with purchasing necessary school supplies for their classrooms up to a maximum of \$250 each year. The program required each school district or charter school to establish a special revenue fund that was funded by the Department through the Assistance Account. The amount of funding each school district received was based upon the number of teachers of the school district or charter school. A teacher might be reimbursed up to \$250 per year. Any money remaining at the end of the fiscal year had to revert to the state's Assistance Account. A total of 19,725 teachers in 2017-2018 received funding from the Assistance Account, and that represented 78 percent of eligible teachers. Clark County School District

reported a 95 percent rate with \$127 as the average reimbursement rate. The measure would authorize money in the special revenue fund that the school districts or charter schools could disburse to a teacher in multiple ways. Those ways included depositing money directly in the account of the teacher maintained at a financial institution, providing a check written to a teacher, or providing a credit purchasing or debit card issued by the school to the teacher. The amount that had been allocated was roughly \$180 per teacher, but a teacher could receive up to \$250 if other teachers failed to use the funds. That was a quick overview of the amendment. She had worked with Allison Combs, Policy Director, Office of the Governor, as well as the Department of Education. She would appreciate the support of the Committee.

Chair Carlton asked whether the Committee should be working from the 1st Reprint of the bill with no proposed amendments.

Senator Dondero Loop responded that proposed amendment 5650 was the current amendment.

Chair Carlton asked whether the amendment was in addition to the 1st Reprint.

Senator Dondero Loop said the mock-up amendment that she had was amendment 5650.

Chair Carlton asked whether anyone had the amendment and whether it was provided to the Committee.

Senator Dondero Loop said she was unable to answer that question. She apologized that she was unsure whether the amendment had been provided to the Committee. The amendment was 5650 dated May 28, 2019.

Senator Dondero Loop said in the amendment she had renamed the Account to the Teacher's School Supplies Assistance Account, and her other change was to disburse to the teachers in additional ways that she just explained.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said the amendment was located on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) under Exhibits but not under Amendments.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that the mock-up amendment 5650 was posted on NELIS under the Senate Committee on Finance meeting from May 28, 2019.

Chair Carlton asked whether the amendment was incorporated into the 1st Reprint. [No audible answer was heard to that question.] She wanted to make sure all the information was on the record so when the Committee moved forward it would be clear.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said she knew of a school district that followed a reimbursement practice. She asked for information about school districts that did not follow that practice. She thought back to a problem about six years ago when school districts used electronic benefit cards (EBT). The recipients of the EBT cards had to pay for the cost of

having those cards and the fees associated with the cards. She imagined that if the school districts had a template somewhere already there would be a way to manage and navigate that reimbursement. She wanted to make sure we did not end up with a surprise, and the dollars would get eaten up by fees or result in any other unintended consequences.

Senator Dondero Loop responded that the funds would be disbursed to the teachers in additional ways. She described the ways that included depositing money directly in the account of the teacher maintained at a financial institution, providing a check written to the teacher, or providing a credit, purchasing, or debit card issued by a school to a teacher. The Clark County School District (CCSD) had a 95 percent teacher participation rate. She believed CCSD's rate was high because the internal process authorized teachers to use the purchasing card. The school districts with the lowest participation rates were Elko, Nye, Washoe, and White Pine County School Districts. She hoped that the disbursement and reimbursement process would be a better way for teachers to acquire those funds.

Chair Carlton said she would ask the Fiscal Analysis Division staff to clarify the matter relative to the amendment. She believed the Committee was working from the 1st Reprint. The amendment Senator Dondero Loop referenced included the changes in the 1st Reprint. The Committee should review the 1st Reprint.

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that mock-up amendment 5650 was provided to the Senate Committee on Finance for its meeting on May 28, 2019. The Finance Committee approved amendment 1025 that was adopted on May 29, 2019. It appeared that the Ways and Means Committee had the most recent version of the bill that included the mock-up amendment that was posted on NELIS for the Senate Finance meeting.

Chair Carlton said that the amendment number was different than the amendment cited by Senator Dondero Loop.

Senator Dondero Loop said she believed that the 1st Reprint had incorporated her mock-up amendment.

Chair Carlton confirmed that all the provisions the Committee addressed were in the 1st Reprint. There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill.

Natha C. Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association, testified in support of S.B. 324 (R1).

Bradley Keating, Director of Government Relations, Community Engagement Unit, Clark County School District and representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified in support of S.B. 324 (R1).

Peggy Lear Bowen, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, testified that reimbursement for teachers should not be considered taxable income to the teachers because it lessened the strength of the amount of money going to the teacher. The bill should not require the teachers to pay taxes on the sum and deplete the amount of money intended for them. The bill needed to be worded in such a way that it was not considered income to be reported on their income tax through the federal government.

There being no further testimony, Chair Carlton closed the hearing on the bill and opened a work session.

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

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE DO
PASS SENATE BILL 324 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

She opened the hearing on Senate Bill 557.

Senate Bill 557: Revises provisions relating to campaign practices. (BDR 24-1272)

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6, presented Senate Bill (S.B.) 557. The bill sought to strengthen Nevada's campaign finance laws. The Legislature approved Assembly Bill 45 of the 79th Session (2017) that created much more transparency in campaign finance reporting by requiring more regular reporting and the inclusion of an ending fund balance on a campaign finance report. Senate Bill 557 tightened up the definition of personal use of campaign contributions and created a reporting requirement for organizations that contributed \$10,000 or more in aggregate to a candidate during the course of a year. It also prohibited candidates from paying themselves a salary with campaign funds. The bill included details in each section, but in the interest of time she would answer any questions.

Assemblyman Frierson asked about section 4 and how out-of-state entities that had no other ties to Nevada would know about the reporting requirement. An out-of-state entity might decide to support a Nevada candidate. That entity would be unaware of the need to file a report with the Office of the Secretary of State.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that the provisions of S.B. 557 did not provide for that situation. She thought that was a valid concern for out-of-state entities, but the bill did not address that problem.

Assemblyman Frierson thought the out-of-state entity would not be bound by the bill.

Senator Cannizzaro replied that any out-of-state entity that donated to a Nevada candidate might need to file a report, but that was not covered in the provisions of the bill.

Assemblyman Kramer said he thought the bill addressed organizations. When he looked at the disclosure screen and clicked on a contributor, the screen showed everyone that received a contribution during that session from that contributor. He sensed that there was a redundancy with the bill. He said at times multiple locations of the same company appeared when he entered the local office of the contributor. Some entities had multiple addresses. An organization might report for each address. He asked whether a requirement existed to file a report when the reports of all the aggregate addresses reached the \$10,000 mark. He knew some aggregating was done, and some companies had multiple Limited Liability Company (LLC) names. He thought the process was set up for abuse from the start, but there might be a way to add what the bill intended for the organization part. He agreed with the rest of the bill.

Senator Cannizzaro replied that there might be some level of redundancy in how an individual used the current system. What the bill sought to do was to provide those reports independently by the organization if they had a different LLC or entity that would be under the same umbrella. She thought it would operate the same way that it currently did with a different reporting structure for each one.

Assemblywoman Swank asked for clarification on section 4. Section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (a) said that each contribution in excess of \$100 made to a candidate during the previous year had to be reported. She asked whether that only applied to an entity that contributed in excess of \$10,000 in one year. She thought paragraph (a) and (b) applied if subsection 1 applied.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that Assemblywoman Swank was correct. It would be each of those, but in the aggregate of \$10,000.

Assemblywoman Swank said if her neighbor contributed \$200, that neighbor would not suddenly have to file a report.

Senator Cannizzaro responded that Assemblywoman Swank was correct.

There being no further questions or comments from the Committee, Chair Carlton called for testimony in support of, in opposition to, or neutral on the bill. There was none. She closed the hearing on S.B. 557.

Chair Carlton said the members needed to go to the Assembly floor immediately to complete their work. She recessed the meeting [at 10:48 p.m.].

Chair Carlton reconvened the meeting behind the bar of the Assembly floor [at 10:58].

Chair Carlton explained that the Committee needed to consider Senate Bill 557. The Committee had just heard the bill that was presented by Senator Cannizzaro. She said that the

reporting requirements in section 4 of the bill did not work correctly, and section 4 of the bill should be deleted. She stated that a conceptual amendment was being drafted and would be delivered to the floor soon. She asked for any questions or comments on the bill, and there were none.

Chair Carlton called for a motion to Amend and Do Pass Senate Bill 557.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE
AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 557.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Carlton recessed the meeting behind the bar [at 11 p.m.].

The following bills were not heard.

Assembly Bill 545: Revises provisions governing money obtained from certain settlements and judgments. (BDR 31-1293)

Senate Bill 303 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation for incentives for teachers who had received a national board certification and were employed to teach at certain Title I schools. (BDR S-1070)

Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to pay certain costs relating to smoke alarms and home fire safety. (BDR S-1134)

Senate Bill 472 (2nd Reprint): Establishes a database of information concerning health insurance claims in the State. (BDR 40-1145)

Senate Bill 546: Revises provisions governing the collection of certain fuel taxes by the Department of Motor Vehicles. (BDR 32-1212)

Because of time constraints, the meeting was not reconvened. The 80th Session (2019) of the Nevada Legislature adjourned *sine die* on June 4, 2019.

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 amendment 6108 to Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint) presented by Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is a written statement titled, "Testimony for Public Hearing Assembly Committee on Ways and Means," dated May 31, 2019, presented by Brian McAnallen, representing the Porter Group, testifying on behalf of the National Atomic Testing Museum in support of Senate Bill 501 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit E](#) is a document titled, "Senate Bill 82, Nevada's College Savings Programs: Prepaid Tuition, College Savings Plans, and College Kickstart," dated June 3, 2019, presented by Zach Conine, State Treasurer, Office of the State Treasurer, in support of Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint).

[Exhibit F](#) is a conceptual amendment to Senate Bill 198 (2nd Reprint) presented by Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter to Chair Carlton and Committee Members dated June 3, 2019, from Sylvia R. Lazos, Law Professor, representing the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, in support of S. B. 551 (R1).

[Exhibit H](#) is mock-up proposed amendment 6122 to Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint), dated June 3, 2019, [also identified as Proposed Amendment 1135], presented by Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education.

[Exhibit I](#) is a one-page diagram of the school funding change proposed in Senate Bill 543 (1st Reprint), compared to the school funding of The Nevada Plan, presented by Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education.