

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

**Eightieth Session  
April 1, 2019**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 8:13 a.m. on Monday, April 1, 2019, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Assemblyman John Hambrick  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Sarah Coffman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Nancy Morris, Committee Secretary  
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After staff called roll, Chair Carlton explained the meeting would start with the work session and then move to the bills.



**Assembly Bill 64: Revises provisions governing the funding provided to school districts for pupils enrolled in full-time programs of distance education. (BDR 34-455)**

Chair Carlton stated that Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), would walk through the bill before questions from the Committee were heard.

Ms. Jones explained that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 64 was heard on March 25, 2019. The bill would provide charter schools with the average statewide basic support guarantee for certain school districts, for students who were enrolled in online program distance education. A proposed amendment (Exhibit C) had been received from K. Neena Laxalt that would decrease the number of school districts for which this change would apply by revising the school district size from 25,000 or fewer students to 5,000 or fewer students. This would currently affect Churchill, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Mineral, Pershing, Storey, and White Pine school districts. The proposed amendment would allow the online charter schools to continue to receive the school district's specific support for Carson City and Douglas, Elko, Lyon, Nye, and Washoe County school districts.

Ms. Jones indicated that Fiscal staff had identified three problems with the proposed amendment. First, in certain sections that would apply, staff recommended using the phrase "received educational services" in place of "from which students reside and receive educational services" because services were received online. The second change recommended by staff concerned section 1, subsection 3, of the bill. In the reference to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 387.122, staff suggested striking "and established by law for all the school districts and charter schools" because the School Funding Bill did not designate a specific amount for charter schools; they fell under the districts in which they were located. The third change recommended by staff was additional language to clarify that the basic support amount provided to online charter schools for smaller districts did include the nonguaranteed fund amounts that were in the Nevada Plan. Ms. Jones stated that staff had spoken with Ms. Laxalt and Ms. Laxalt agreed with the recommended changes. Staff would work with the LCB Legal Division to make sure the amendment met the intent of the proposal with the technical corrections identified by staff.

Chair Carlton asked the Committee whether there were any questions on A.B. 64 and the proposed amendment. There were none.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 64.

ASSEMBLYMAN KRAMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (Assemblymen Hambrick and Jauregui were not present for the vote.)

Assemblywoman Spiegel was assigned the floor statement for A.B. 64.

**Assembly Bill 88: Revises provisions relating to the reporting of average daily enrollment in public schools. (BDR 34-333)**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), stated that Assembly Bill (A.B.) 88 was heard on March 25, 2019, and the bill would provide further flexibility for school districts in reporting the average daily enrollment for the immediately preceding quarter. The Department of Education (NDE) indicated the bill was necessary to clean up some language and address reporting days that fell on weekends or holidays. Clark County School District (CCSD) had submitted and withdrawn an amendment, and a new amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) had been submitted and copies were on Committee members' desks. Ms. Jones understood NDE believed this was a friendly amendment.

Chair Carlton invited representatives from NDE and CCSD to the testimony table.

Nate Hanson, Director, District Support, NDE, concurred the amendment was friendly.

Chair Carlton asked Bradley Keating, Director of Government Relations, CCSD, to provide more detail about the proposed amendment.

Mr. Keating noted that he had asked Jason Goudie, Chief Financial Officer, CCSD, to discuss the technical elements of the amendment.

Mr. Goudie explained the primary purpose of the proposed amendment for A.B. 88 was to adjust the language that was originally included in Assembly Bill (A.B.) 469 of the 79th Session (2017), and was incorporated into *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388G.680. The amendment concerned the methodology for developing the budgets for the local school precincts, and the current NRS language required using enrollment from the prior quarter. The current language in statute indicated that information used to develop budgets would be based on actual enrollment data from a year before the actual school year. Mr. Goudie contended that using the amendment's language would provide more accurate enrollment figures, based on forecasted enrollment, resulting in a more accurate budget. He continued that when actual enrollment was available during the school year, the district trued-up all estimates to ensure that schools were funded based on actual enrollment.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson expressed her concern that the proposed language constituted a significant change because it involved using an estimate instead of actual numbers. The change in language from "enrolled" to "who will attend" also concerned her, and she asked Mr. Goudie to provide more detail.

Mr. Goudie reasoned this was not a significant shift, because A.B. 469 (2017) was enacted only recently, which was the first time the district was required to provide local school precincts with data on January 15. He understood Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's concern about using a forecasted number instead of an actual number as prescribed in NRS and cautioned that all budgets were built on forecasts to some extent. Using a forecast

allowed the district to provide more accurate data by considering the volatility of enrollment in each school, based on transiency and the growth or decline of enrollment in the school district. Using only past information could provide outdated and inaccurate results. Harnessing the district's demographics team to analyze and estimate future enrollment provided a more accurate enrollment number. He continued that the change in verb tense aligned with the change in methodology.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked whether Mr. Goudie could prove that using a previous enrollment figure resulted in an inaccurate result, and had a forecasted estimate been used, the results would have been more accurate.

Mr. Goudie clarified that using static information from the past would not provide the most accurate budget because it did not reflect a changing environment. Without considering additional factors, such as movement within a district or a new large housing development that would dramatically change how students would be allocated and enrolled at different schools, prior information would yield inaccurate results.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson asked whether the true-up to reconcile the proposed estimated figures with the actual enrollment figures would be a smooth process.

Mr. Goudie explained that school principals, who were heads of the local school precincts, received information on January 15 for enrollment as of December 15. Then the principals reviewed the data and worked with the demographics group to adjust the figures when necessary. The actual enrollment figure was calculated using a count day, similar to the state's former process, which was typically the Friday after Labor Day. This number was also used to adjust the enrollment to fund schools accordingly. He summarized it was a straightforward process.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson clarified that her concern was that using the previous quarter's number provided a concrete starting point prescribed by statute rather than an estimate. Without a clear understanding of all the factors used to calculate an estimate, the starting point appeared to be a moving target. She was concerned that a high estimate could be used from January until the count-day figure was available, and adjusting the enrollment figure down would cause conflict.

Assemblywoman Neal asked how long the true-up process lasted.

Mr. Goudie indicated the true-up process was quick. Estimated funding amounts were provided in January, which schools used to develop their budget and school operating plan. Various school staff were consulted in the development of the plan, including the school associate superintendents (SAS) and School Organizational Teams (SOT). The initial plan was approved in March. After the actual enrollment figures were provided in the fall, schools had about two weeks to adjust their plans, make changes, and complete them. And it took CCSD additional time to process all of the school information.

Assemblywoman Neal recalled there was a delay between the schools presenting their budgets and the receipt of funding, and the proposed bill would return the district to its prior process. She asked Mr. Goudie to explain the timing of funding.

Mr. Goudie explained that the numbers provided in January were estimates, and the actual enrollment figure provided was also an estimate because it assumed the enrollment at the end of the year would be the same, which it was not. At the start of the school year on July 1, 75 percent of each school's funding was provided so the school could start operating. The remaining 25 percent was held to adjust the funding based on the September count-day figure. After the enrollment true-up, the funds were released, and schools could move ahead with their operating plans.

Assemblywoman Titus stated that while she was conceptually accepting of the amendment, she was concerned whether other school districts in the state had been consulted. She had not heard from any of the rural schools in her district and questioned how much outreach had been done by CCSD.

Mr. Goudie clarified that the NRS chapter specific to A.B. 469 (2017) did not apply to any other school districts. He believed it applied only to districts with over 100,000 students, which meant only CCSD was affected. Because of the enrollment threshold, he had not reached out to other districts. He suspected other districts used a methodology similar to that proposed to allow for budget adjustments based on enrollment changes.

Chair Carlton confirmed to Assemblywoman Titus that the proposed amendment and bill were strictly in reference to the Clark County School District Reorganization bill that was addressed in NRS Chapter 388G.

Assemblyman Thompson asked whether the proposed change brought the district closer to a money-follows-the-student approach.

Mr. Goudie did not believe the changes affected the methodology. The weighted funding formula was more important to ensuring the money followed the student. This change enabled the district to have a more accurate picture of funding per student at each school.

Assemblyman Thompson understood the theory and methodology of the funding formula and clarified that his question was related to keeping funding attached to a student as the student moved among schools.

Mr. Goudie stated it did help, because it allowed the district to use its existing demographics team to predict future enrollment. He conceded that no mechanism existed to adjust to student movement after count day, but the change allowed flexibility to adjust for anticipated changes.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked what demographics were used as a basis for the estimates, and what process was used to make the estimates.

Mr. Goudie did not run the demographics group, but explained that the demographics group calculated the by-school enrollment using many resources. Not only did they look at prior enrollment, but they also looked at actual birth rates to calculate when students would start attending school, construction projects that drove higher population, and housing changes and planned housing developments. The demographics group also considered other economic indicators at both the state and federal levels and calculated a school-level enrollment figure. This analysis also drove the district's capital improvement plan in identifying where and when new schools would be needed.

Assemblywoman Spiegel asked whether the school-by-school analysis was included with the budget request so it could be reviewed. She was concerned using a vague term such as "estimate" in statute, without checks and balances, was too open-ended and could lead to very inaccurate estimates. She wondered how reasonable estimates could be ensured.

Mr. Goudie explained that a number of controls were in place with estimate development. Local school precincts received forecasted enrollment numbers from the demographics team in December and had 30 days to review them and submit questions or appeals. Schools also used their SOTs and SASs to evaluate the estimates. The third check to ensure the estimates were relevant was the adjustment to actuals when the fall enrollment was submitted. Mr. Goudie reiterated that a number of school principals and SASs, as well as the demographics team, had provided input about the best day to use for the count day. It was a delicate balance between waiting long enough to ensure the most accurate data was available and not waiting so long that it was too late to make operational changes. The LCB and NDE helped draft the language for the estimate to provide the most likely scenario possible for enrollment.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson appreciated that the district was seeking more discretion in the way funding was projected, but thought using a known formula would be better than an unknown estimate. She surmised that the district would have ongoing conversations with precincts if the estimates were significantly wrong or questioned.

Chair Carlton summarized that there had been too many questions to move A.B. 88. The bill was not exempt and if it did not move out of the Committee by the following Monday, it would die. She requested Committee members reach out to Mr. Keating and Mr. Goudie to have their questions answered so the bill could move. She reminded the Committee that the bill had no effect on State General Funds that went to the schools and was an issue only for CCSD to manage its funds. The bill would be work-sessioned again on April 8, 2019.

Chair Carlton concluded the work session and moved to bill hearings.

**Assembly Bill 136:    Makes various changes relating to public construction.  
(BDR 28-145)**

Chair Carlton opened the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 136. She invited Assemblyman Frierson to present the bill. She reminded Committee members that because bills came to the

Committee on Ways and Means from policy committees, members were to ask only about the fiscal aspects of the bill because the policy committee had already reviewed the policy of the bill.

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8, stated he was there to introduce A.B. 136 and could not provide more detail without delving into policy.

Chair Carlton asked whether the fiscal note was still in effect.

Assemblyman Frierson stated that he understood the fiscal note submitted by Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) was being removed and someone from NSHE was available to testify. Other fiscal notes submitted were to be reduced.

Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer, NSHE, testified that the fiscal note was being withdrawn. Chair Carlton confirmed the amount of the fiscal note, which was \$9.5 million in 2021, and Mr. Clinger concurred.

Chair Carlton asked for someone from the State Public Works Division (SPWD), Department of Administration, to discuss the fiscal note on the bill. She questioned the \$425,940 in FY 2020 and \$369,980 in FY 2021.

Ward D. Patrick, Administrator, SPWD, Department of Administration, clarified that the original fiscal note submitted was for approximately \$900,000 and had since been reduced. The original list included 29 projects. The revised list included 10 affected 2017 and proposed 2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. The overall fiscal note had been reduced to \$263,165, which had been submitted.

Chair Carlton noted she did not have the fiscal note and asked for clarification of the amounts. Mr. Patrick explained that FY 2020 impact was \$159,562 and the FY 2021 amount was \$103,603.

Chair Carlton thanked Mr. Patrick for the clarity and stated that local governments had submitted fiscal notes with no impact, which she would look into further.

Assemblyman Frierson stated he remained open to talking to local governments in particular and moving forward with the bill.

Assemblywoman Titus asked how the fiscal effect to rural hospitals and rural matters had been addressed.

Assemblyman Frierson expressed his intention that the state of prevailing wage return to its pre-2015 state. He recognized that some had construction before 2015 and had started to make plans, but because this had been discussed as early as 2015 and more often since 2017, it would have been prudent for those affected to have been planning for it. He felt the

10 percent difference would bring back stability and apprenticeships that had been hurt by prior changes in policy.

Seeing no other questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton opened up the floor for testimony from those in support of A.B. 136. Seeing none, she asked for anyone in opposition to A.B. 136 to testify.

Michael Pelham, Director of Government and Community Affairs, Nevada Taxpayers Association, spoke in opposition to the bill. He believed it would greatly reduce the amount of money available for school repairs and building of state buildings, along with the University System.

Chair Carlton asked whether he had any backup documentation to support his claim.

Mr. Pelham stated he did not have any with him, but would provide it to the Committee.

Chair Carlton expressed her appreciation, because it had been difficult to verify the financial effects associated with this bill, and it was important to capture any available data.

Chair Carlton asked whether anyone else was present to speak in opposition to the bill. Seeing none, she asked whether Assemblyman Frierson wished to make closing remarks and he declined. Chair Carlton closed the hearing on A.B. 136 and stated the Committee looked forward to receiving other documents before making a decision on this bill. She then moved on to Assembly Bill 44.

**Assembly Bill 44: Enacts provisions relating to the administration of the Stewart Indian School land and facilities. (BDR 18-188)**

Chair Carlton advised presenters to provide a condensed review of the bill because it had already been presented to the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs.

Sherry L. Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, presented Assembly Bill (A.B.) 44. She began with her presentation titled "Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum Introduction of A.B. 44 During 80th Legislative Session," ([Exhibit E](#)). She reminded the Committee that the Nevada Indian Commission had existed for a long time and was the liaison to the 27 tribal nations in the state. One of the Commission's highest priorities was educating the public about the state's first citizens, the American Indian Citizens. Page 3 of her presentation provided a history of the Stewart Indian School. She stated that it was the only off-reservation Indian school in Nevada and operated from 1890-1980. The school was an initiative of the federal government to remove Indian children from their homes, their homelands, and their tribes and put them in boarding schools across the nation. One of the first 25 of those schools, the Stewart Indian School, was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Nevada Indian Commission was seeking national historic landmark designation for the facility. The story of the school was not taught in schools and had been largely ignored, and the



opportunity existed to tell it. Native Americans had given up their homelands across the nation, as well as their children. Families were torn apart and children were forced to take on new identities and abandon their culture and languages. She contended that telling the truth about the history of the Stewart Indian School and experiences of school alumni were part of the healing process.

Ms. Rupert explained that during the 2015 Legislative Session, as recapped on page 4 of her presentation ([Exhibit E](#)), the Indian Commission received a small operating budget with two new positions: a museum director and a museum curator, who had since been hired. Also during that legislative session, the Commission was designated as the coordinating agency for future uses and activities at the Stewart Indian School. In addition, Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds were received to complete design and construction documents for the welcome center, along with a Stewart Indian School master plan. The master plan was completed in May of 2018 and included an interpretive plan, market study, business plan, and strategic plan. Page 6 of [Exhibit E](#) detailed activity from the 2017 Legislative Session, including the approval of \$5.7 million in CIP project funds for a new roof on the old gym and construction and exhibits for the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Welcome Center. Construction of the museum building started in August 2018 and was expected to be completed in late 2019.

Ms. Rupert then shifted to the policy side in discussing A.B. 44 on page 7 of her presentation ([Exhibit E](#)). The bill would establish the Cultural Center and Museum in statute. It authorized the museum director to operate a state museum, provided for revenue-producing activities, and established the supervision of the museum director by the executive director of the Indian Commission. The fiscal note attached to A.B. 44, detailed on page 8 of [Exhibit E](#), was critical to the success of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum. It provided two new positions: a curator and a museum attendant. The curator would be the education coordinator for the museum, charged with managing the educational programs offered by the museum and using the museum's collections for interpretation. The museum attendant would greet visitors and oversee admissions and memberships. Ms. Rupert acknowledged that volunteers could be helpful to museums, but in a limited capacity. For the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum to operate as a professional museum and meet the standards and best practices of the American Alliance of Museums, the museum needed to hire professional staff with special museum training and experience, and educational degrees related to museums. The Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum would need to demonstrate that its professional staff had the qualifications to ethically, legally, and effectively carry out the museum's mission and goals. Volunteers, especially Stewart School alumni, brought special skills and abilities and could assist museum staff, but were not trained museum professionals. Museum staff was in the process of developing a volunteer program to provide training in greeting visitors and conducting tours. All volunteers would be evaluated on an annual basis.

The fiscal note also provided an operating budget for the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum and Welcome Center. The operating budget would allow the development of three new departments within the Cultural Center and Museum: exhibits,

collections, and education. Funding was needed for supplies and materials to create new and continuing temporary exhibits at the museum and to operate the retail space in the museum where locally made Native American arts and crafts would be displayed and sold. The collections department would create a database of the museum's collections, as well as purchase archive-safe supplies and materials to preserve and store the museum's collections. Funding was needed for the education department for special projects such as educational activities, lectures, and symposiums for children and the general public. Funding needed for the two new positions was \$121,496 in FY 2020 and \$125,442 in FY 2021. The operating budget needed for the three new departments was \$140,680 in FY 2020 and \$116,846 in FY 2021.

Ms. Rupert continued that the plan to rehabilitate the historic buildings and restore Native American culture on the campus had been carefully laid out and now needed an operating budget. Without a budget, the existing museum staff could not open the doors. If the museum was not opened, the provisions of the deed to the land, which stated that buildings 1 and 3 would be set aside to display the memorabilia from the former school for public access, could not be fulfilled. Unmet deed provisions meant the entire campus, along with the water rights, would be returned to the U.S. government, which would leave state agencies homeless and state investment lost. She concluded her presentation by mentioning that there had been articles published recently about the opening of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum in the Smithsonian.com, Travel Channel, Forbes, and Frommer's. The core message she wanted all museum visitors to remember was that the Stewart Indian School changed the course of generations of American Indians. For more than 90 years, American Indian children were removed from their homelands, family, and culture with profound impacts on their lives. The Stewart Indian School Living Legacy preserved their stories and cultural legacy so they would never be forgotten.

Chair Carlton clarified that it was not typically normal for an agency to put a fiscal note on its own bill; it would normally be in the agency's budget. There had been a disconnect, and to resolve it, the Indian Commission was asked to put a fiscal note on its bill. Funding was usually discussed in the budget subcommittee. After Ms. Rupert concurred, Chair Carlton continued that the funding would become part of the agency's budget in the future, but because this was a new project with no established budget, it was being addressed through a fiscal note. Ms. Rupert shared Chair Carlton's expectation.

Assemblywoman Titus questioned whether the reason fiscal support for the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum was in the budget was because it would be a state museum as opposed to being on tribal land and federally or tribally funded.

Ms. Rupert agreed it would be a state-funded, state museum. The Nevada Indian Commission was a state agency established in 1965 and received State General Funds and room tax funds from the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

Assemblywoman Titus thanked Ms. Rupert for the clarity and was certain the state would be proud to have the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum as a state museum and not on tribal lands or a reservation.

Assemblyman Wheeler understood the need for initial funds for the museum and asked whether the Commission would be returning to the Legislature in the future to ask for more money because the museum was not profitable.

Ms. Rupert explained that the market study included with the master plan estimated that 32,000 visitors would come to the cultural center and museum in the first few years. The plan had been shared with other committees, and the Legislative Counsel Bureau and she could provide it to this Committee also. Revenue would be generated through admissions, retail sales, and memberships. To entice visitors to return and spend more time and money at Stewart Indian School, educational components and programming were needed. The revenue would assist in keeping the cultural center sustainable, but it would remain a state museum that would continue to require funding. She added that the Commission would be seeking grants and pursuing other avenues to make the programming piece sustainable.

Chair Carlton sought confirmation that this budget would reside within the Indian Commission's budget and not the Division of Museums and History budget, which Ms. Rupert confirmed. Chair Carlton then asked what discussion had occurred to put the Stewart Indian School Museum under the Indian Commission instead of under the Division of Museums and History.

Ms. Rupert stated that when this started 14 years ago, there was never discussion about it being under the Division of Museums and History. She presumed because the Stewart Indian School museum was an initiative of the Nevada Indian Commission, which was located at the Stewart Indian School, the museum would remain under the Commission.

Seeing no other questions from the Committee, Chair Carlton opened the floor for those in support of A.B. 44.

Aletha Tom, Moapa Band of Paiutes Tribe, Moapa, Nevada, spoke as an alumna of the Stewart Indian School. She started at Stewart Indian School when she was eight years old and graduated in 1965. After graduation, she went to Oakland, California as part of the relocation program. She lived in a boarding home, similar to a boarding school dormitory, and enrolled in a trade-training program. She was not given the opportunity to attend college and returned to her home. Without the operating budget, people would not be made aware of what the Stewart Indian School included. The children at the school were taken from their homes to be assimilated and learn to live a new life, whether they liked it or not. She explained that growing up at Stewart Indian School was similar to growing up in one's home, because there were good and bad times and there would be lifelong memories. Many people were unaware of Stewart and its long history, and Stewart alumni provided tours and information. Hers was but one of many alumni stories, and she contended that the state

should fund the museum because the children who attended the school did not ask to go there, and it was important to share this part of history.

Lori Pasqua, Nevada Indian Commission, Gardnerville, Nevada, spoke as a Washoe Tribe member. She worked for the Washoe Tribe for 31 years in education. She was a Welmelti from the Washoe Tribe from the Truckee area. She was currently a commissioner with the Nevada Indian Commission and was also Vice President of the Nevada Indian Commission Education Committee. In addition, she was the treasurer of the Washoe Retail Enterprise. She had not attended the Stewart Indian School, but had lived on the school grounds and rode horses in the rodeo facility until it closed in 1980. She thanked the Committee for hearing A.B. 44 and explained the funding was necessary to bring in people and tell the unique cultural side of all Native Americans. She guaranteed people from around the world would come to the museum, and it would make Nevadans proud to present Nevada in this way. Ms. Pasqua's grandparents had both attended Stewart Indian School and her grandfather had become a popular mechanic as a result. She requested the Committee consider the funding request to hire necessary staff to show this unique cultural side of Nevada.

Joe Bryan, private citizen, Carson City, Nevada, who was Hopi and Washoe, stated that both of his parents were forced to attend Indian boarding schools. His mother attended Indian University (now Bacone College) and Riverside Indian School and his father attended Stewart Indian School. Before Stewart Indian School, his father did not speak English. Speaking in a tribal language while at the school would result in physical punishment. Mr. Bryan's father became a mechanic and worked at Stewart Indian School. In 1952, Mr. Bryan and his family moved to the Stewart Indian School property and lived in Quonset huts on the south end of Stewart Street until the early 1960s. His father was a maintenance person and his mother a nurse for the school. Mr. Bryan attended Haskell Institute [now known as Haskell Indian Nations University]. The vocational training he received at Haskell led him to work on military aircraft for the Department of Defense. After working on military helicopters in Vietnam, he returned to Haskell for more education. He worked at IBM as a technician, went into engineering, new product development, and management. After returning to the area, he ran youth and sports programs, as well as the Nevada Day Pow Wows for 3 years. He had worked with both Ms. Rupert and Ms. Pasqua, and bringing more tourists to the area would benefit the entire state. He mentioned that tourists would create a snowball effect, such as that experienced when Toney Begay, a Stewart Indian School alumnus, regularly brought his Navajo family and elders to visit Stewart. Mr. Bryan supported the tribe, facilities, and what was going on around him and his home.

Meg McDonald, Washoe Tribe Member, Carson City, Nevada, stated that as a member of the Stewart Advisory Committee, she was in favor of funding the museum to tell the story of the boarding school. She recounted her experience with non-Indians who thought the Stewart Indian School was an expensive boarding school where wealthy parents sent their children. She also expressed her gratitude to Ms. Rupert and her staff for the work they did.

Herman Fillmore, Culture and Language Director, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, addressed the Committee in the Washoe language:

Miw ʔaŋáw waʔ mibiʔi  
Wašiw ʔitlu Hiliza di·gum di·ya leʔi  
Daboʔo ʔitlu Herman Fillmore di·gum di·ya leʔi  
(Translation: Welcome, it is good that you have all come here. My Washoe name is Hiliza. In English I am called Herman Fillmore.)

He acknowledged that some of the atrocities of the boarding school had been discussed in the meeting, and one of the most important aspects of the museum was the reconciliation provided for the Washoe people and Nevada Indians. Learning about the Stewart Indian School and recognizing what happened would allow healing for children and community members. He felt oftentimes the Indian culture was put on display and taken away from communities, and the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum actually recognized the atrocities and acknowledged what the Native Americans had lost. He stated that only 5 to 10 speakers of the Washoe language were left, mostly as a result of boarding schools like Stewart. He was completely in support of the project moving forward, and sharing the history was an important step for Washoe people and all Native American people across the state of Nevada.

Chair Carlton requested a written copy of Mr. Fillmore's opening comments in both Washoe and English to include in the meeting minutes. Mr. Fillmore stated he would provide it and cautioned it might sound odd that he welcomed the Committee to the Washoe people's homeland.

Mr. Bryan provided additional comments about the children who attended Stewart Indian School. He stated that children attended from New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, California, and throughout Nevada. There was a large alumni base, many of whom brought their families to visit their alma mater because they were proud of where they grew up and went to school. Those visitors would also lead to spending in local motels and restaurants, providing further benefits from the Museum and Cultural Center.

Brian Wadsworth, Commissioner, Nevada Indian Commission, greeted the Committee in his Paiute language:

Pesa awoomooa'a. Nu Brian Wadsworth menanea. Nu kooyoee tukuda.  
(Translation: Good morning. My name is Brian Wadsworth. I am from the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.)

He continued by stating he believed it was important that the Committee heard different stories about Stewart Indian School and the related connections and histories. He did not attend Stewart, but his father and aunt did. Mr. Wadsworth had heard their stories, both good and bad. He wanted to see the Museum and Cultural Center come to fruition. He understood the state had already invested \$4.5 million to reconstruct the building for the cultural center and museum and felt it would be tragic for the state and Native Americans to have spent the money and not be able to open the museum to share the story of the Stewart Indian School.

Chair Carlton requested a copy of his comments as well for the meeting's minutes.

Kelly Krolicki, Commissioner, Nevada Indian Commission, explained she was also Treasurer of the Stewart Indian School Preservation Alliance (SISPA), a nonprofit that also supported the Stewart site. She encouraged Committee members to take a tour of the Stewart property. Stewart Indian School was unique because a federal policy created the boarding schools, but the Stewart property was actually owned by the state. Other departments resided on the Stewart site, including the Department of Corrections and the Department of Public Safety. The Stewart site was the most well-preserved of the 25 early boarding schools across America, so it was one of the few opportunities for people to see the actual buildings where this history happened.

Chair Carlton saw no one else in support of the bill. She asked whether anyone was there to speak in opposition to the bill. Seeing no one, she asked whether anyone was neutral on the bill. Seeing none, she invited Ms. Rupert to make closing remarks.

Ms. Rupert thanked the Committee for its time and stressed the importance of the fiscal note attached to A.B. 44. It was critical to be able to move forward with the grand opening of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum. She reiterated the construction would be done in the summer of 2019, exhibits would be complete in November 2019, and then the facility would be ready to open.

Chair Carlton closed the hearing on Assembly Bill 44. She opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing none in Las Vegas and Carson City, she closed public comment and adjourned the meeting at 9:35 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Morris  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 64](#) submitted by K. Neena Laxalt, representing Eureka County School District, presented by Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 88](#) presented by Bradley Keating, Director of Government Relations, Clark County School District.

[Exhibit E](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum Introduction of A.B. 44 During 80th Legislative Session," presented by Sherry L. Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.