

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eightieth Session
May 27, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:27 a.m. on Monday, May 27, 2019, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator David R. Parks, Vice Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Yvanna D. Cancela
Senator Chris Brooks
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senatorial District No. 8
Senator Dallas Harris, Senatorial District No. 11
Senator James Ohrenschall, Senatorial District No. 21
Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Leannandra Copeland, Program Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Senior Program Analyst
James Malone, Program Analyst
Jaimarie Ortega, Program Analyst
Julie Waller, Senior Program Analyst
Felicia Archer, Committee Secretary

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 2

Christine Miner, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division,
Department of Health and Human Services

DuAne Young, Deputy Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and
Policy, Department of Health and Human Services

Steven Cohen

Shelley Hendren, Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, Department of
Employment, Training and Rehabilitation

Bradley Keating, Clark County School District

Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; Nevada State
Education Association

Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District

Paige Barnes, Nevada Association of School Boards

Sarah Nick, Management Analyst, Legislative Liaison, Department of Education

Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School
Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees

Matt Walker, Clark County Association of School Administrators and
Professional-Technical Employees

Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State
Education Association

Rusty McAllister, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO

Tom Dunn, Northern District Vice President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada

Mary Walker, Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County

Carter Bundy, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

Drake Ridge, Las Vegas City Employees Association

Michael Ramirez, Las Vegas Police Protective Association

Marlene Lockard, Service Employees International Union Local 1107; Las Vegas
Police Protective Association Civilian Employees

Scott Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers Association; Nevada Law
Enforcement Coalition

Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce

Bryan Wachter, Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada

Rick McCann, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers

Kent Ervin, Nevada Faculty Alliance

John Vellardita, Executive Director, Clark County Education Association

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 3

Matthew Sharp, Nevada Justice Association
Alan McMahon
Steven Conger, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Dylan Shaver, City of Reno
Gwynne Partos, Vice Chairwoman, Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders
Julie Ostrovsky, Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders
Ken Evans
Jennifer Jeans, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; Washoe Legal Services
Herb Santos, Jr., Nevada Justice Association
Jason Mills, Nevada Justice Association
Misty Grimmer, Nevada Resort Association; SilverSummit Healthplan
Ray Fierro, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry
Helen Foley, American Association of Payers, Administrators and Networks
Jeanette Belz, American Property and Casualty Insurance Association
Kelly Crompton, City of Las Vegas
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, City of Henderson
Leonardo Benavides, Clark County School District
Julia Peek, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services
Damon Haycock, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program
Tom Clark, Nevada Association of Health Plans
Deni French
Stephanie Woodard, Senior Advisor, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Paul Young, Cleveland Clinic Nevada Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health
Bobby Ernaut, Cleveland Clinic Nevada Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health
Deonne Contine, Director, Department of Administration
Daniel Honchariw, Senior Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will not hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 340 or S.B. 493 at this time.

SENATE BILL 340 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public works.
(BDR 28-808)

SENATE BILL 493 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to misclassification of employees. (BDR 53-1087)

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 202.

SENATE BILL 202: Revises provisions relating to persons with disabilities. (BDR 38-685)

SENATOR MARILYN DONDERO LOOP (Senatorial District No. 8):

I will present S.B. 202. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

I will read the conceptual amendment to S.B. 202 ([Exhibit D](#)) which removes sections 2 through 5, 7, 8 and 9 from the bill. In 1(c) of the amendment the word "receive" is changed to a referral rather than receiving for all services. New sections 7 and 9.5 are added to the bill by the amendment. I will read these sections from [Exhibit D](#). The fiscal note is removed by the conceptual amendment.

RIQUE ROBB (Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services):

The Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) has removed the fiscal note after reviewing the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit D](#). The Division looks forward to working with all agencies associated with S.B. 202 to ensure support for individuals with autism.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In section 1, subsection 1 of S.B. 202, the evaluation conducted by a school pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 388.449 seems to be an initial evaluation once a student has already been diagnosed. Does the diagnosis make someone eligible for Medicaid, or are there still existing financial thresholds that must be met for Medicaid eligibility?

MS. ROBB:

There are still two diagnoses for autism. The medical diagnosis is for Medicaid eligibility, and the educational diagnosis is what the Department of Education (NDE) and school districts utilize.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 5

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Will the educational diagnosis be what triggers someone's eligibility for Medicaid?

MS. ROBB:

No, the medical diagnosis allows for eligibility for Medicaid.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Section 1, subsection 1 states:

... the State Board of Education to ensure that, to the extent practicable, the process for determining the eligibility of a child for service provided under the Medicaid program for children with autism spectrum disorders allows such eligibility to be determined through one evaluation conducted pursuant to NRS 388.449; ...

I do not understand where the gap is.

DUANE YOUNG (Deputy Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services):

The school diagnosis does not count for Medicaid eligibility. Medical necessity is the qualifying point for Medicaid eligibility. However, the financial threshold has to be met. If a person is not at the income level for Medicaid eligibility, the person will not qualify for Medicaid.

The Division is neutral on S.B. 202, and the proposed conceptual amendment removes the fiscal note by the DHHS.

STEVEN COHEN:

I have submitted a conceptual amendment on section 7 of S.B. 202 ([Exhibit E](#)). I am one of the people for whom that section was written, so I want to get clarification on its changes.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I would suggest you reach out to Senator Dondero Loop.

SHELLEY HENDREN (Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation):

The Rehabilitation Division is neutral on section 7, subsection 9 of S.B. 202. The conceptual amendment removes this subsection. However, if the subsection remains in its original form, the additional requirement for appointing authorities under the 700-hour program is potentially over-burdensome to agencies. The agency would be required to provide disabled individuals with performance evaluations at least once per month for their probationary periods. It is a disincentive for employers to hire from the 700-hour lists.

The Division contends the subsection treats individuals with disabilities differently than other probationary employees. It would require appointing authorities to inform the person at least once per month if the authority anticipates appointing the person to a permanent position. This defeats the purpose of a probationary period. It seems contrary to State personnel statutes, including NRS 284.290 that outlines the process for probationary employees to attain permanent status.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

The conceptual amendment, [Exhibit D](#), removes the requirement for which the Rehabilitation Division expressed concern. I will confirm this with the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Legal Division.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 202 and open the hearing on S.B. 80.

SENATE BILL 80 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to providing a safe and respectful learning environment. (BDR 34-502)

BRADLEY KEATING (Clark County School District):

One of the first initiatives of Clark County School District (CCSD) deals with school safety. Senate Bill 80 allows law enforcement to notify a school with the name of a student who experiences a traumatic situation outside of the school environment, depending on the situation. Schools will be given the opportunity to understand the student's challenges when at school.

The fiscal note proposed by NDE has been removed with the CCSD proposed amendment ([Exhibit F](#)). The amendment changes the word "report" to "notification."

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 7

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association; Nevada State Education Association):

The Washoe Education Association and the Nevada State Education Association support S.B. 80.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports S.B. 80.

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District supports S.B. 80 to build on efforts happening in the District.

PAIGE BARNES (Nevada Association of School Boards):

The Nevada Association of School Boards supports S.B. 80.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Did NDE remove its fiscal note?

SARAH NICK (Management Analyst, Legislative Liaison, Department of Education):

The NDE is removing its fiscal note from S.B. 80. With the amendment, NDE will no longer need an additional software system to create the notifications. It will use SafeVoice instead.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 80 and open the hearing on S.B. 111.

SENATE BILL 111 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing collective bargaining by local government employers. (BDR 31-651)

SENATOR DAVID R. PARKS (Senatorial District No. 7):

Senate Bill 111 reduces from 25 percent to 16.67 percent the budgeted ending fund balance (EFB) amounts that must be excluded from collective bargaining negotiations of local government employers other than school districts. The EFB cannot be considered by a factfinder or arbitrator in determining the local government employer's ability to pay compensation and monetary benefits.

Twenty-five percent is approximately equivalent to 3 months of regular General Fund operating expenditures; 16.67 percent is equivalent to 2 months of regular General Fund operating expenditures. Senate Bill No. 469 of the 79th Session was vetoed by then-Governor Brian Sandoval on June 1, 2017. Poor communication was the cause of the veto. Things had been worked out with all stakeholders.

The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) in its rulings and recommendations states that a two-month reserve is considered highly credit positive by various rating agencies. Generally accepted accounting principles and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) agree that a two-month reserve is more than sufficient in this matter.

STEPHEN AUGSPURGER (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

Clark County School District has attached a fiscal note to S.B. 111. It references language in section 1.2, subsection 4 and section 1.6, subsection 7, paragraph (a) stating "If the local government employer is a school district, any money appropriated by the State to carry out increases in salaries or benefits for the employees of the school district is subject to negotiations with an employee organization."

Historically, the Nevada Legislature has provided a 2 percent rollup to school districts for employee health benefits. The sums in the rollup provisions and health benefits are significant. Pages 136 and 137 of the Nevada Legislative Appropriations Report ([Exhibit G](#)) show there is no ambiguity about what the rollup funds and health benefit funds are intended for. They are for the specific purpose of normal movement on the salary schedule and rewarding employees for additional educational earnings for step increases.

The Department of Education Distributive School Account (DSA) Budget Account (B/A) 101-2610 in [Exhibit G](#) illustrates these funds represent the 2 percent rollup each year to cover merit increases for attaining additional education and years of service.

EDUCATION

K-12 EDUCATION

NDE - Distributive School Account — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-17
(Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2610

Despite it being an annual allocation, CCSD has chosen not to use these funds for the authorized purpose. The funds have been diverted to other uses. This process became effective in the 2015 school year after the passage of S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session.

The fiscal note attached by CCSD is specific to the \$36 million that would be equivalent to the cost of a 2 percent rollup for employees. Money has been allocated by the Legislature to CCSD for a specific purpose—normal movement on the salary schedule. The CCSD has diverted that money for other purposes and then put a fiscal note on S.B. 111.

We propose there is no fiscal cost to S.B. 111. The money has been provided to CCSD by the Legislature. The money should be spent for the purpose of normal movement on the salary schedule. It is disingenuous to state there is a fiscal note on S.B. 111.

MATT WALKER (Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

Senate Bill 111 is appropriate at this time. In 2017, the Legislative Commission approved an 8.7 percent EFB through the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC). The new funding formula is considered a 16.67 percent EFB.

The Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees wants to be sure that when an arbitrator considers whether or not the District has the ability to pay, for example if CCSD has a 4.5 percent EFB, the money specifically appropriated for career progression for education professionals should be considered by the arbitrator as ability to repay. That is the intent of S.B. 111.

CHRIS DALY (Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State Education Association):

The Nevada State Education Association supports S.B. 111. The CCSD placed a \$36 million per biennium fiscal note on S.B. 111. Section 1.2, subsection 4, the bill language in question, states "If the local government employer is a school district, any money appropriated by the State to carry out increases in salaries

or benefits for the employees of the school district is subject to negotiations with an employee organization."

The Legislature appropriates money specifically to increase salaries or benefits. A school district cannot use that money for other purposes, add it to the EFB and claim it is not subject to collective bargaining. The language in S.B. 111 clarifies that an appropriation takes precedent over a school district attempting to put the money away. The discussion about educator salaries has been a major issue of the 80th Legislative Session. It is important to ensure efforts to secure resources for both the 3 percent cost of living allowance and the 2 percent rollups are not lost through a budgeting maneuver by a school district.

RUSTY McALLISTER (Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO):
The Nevada State AFL-CIO supports S.B. 111. This policy has been worked on since 2015, in an attempt to bring the budgeted EFB number from 25 percent to a more reasonable number of 16.67 percent. There are no fiscal notes from any of the local governments.

TOM DUNN (Northern District Vice President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada):
The Professional Firefighters of Nevada supports S.B. 111. The 16.67 percentage rate has been worked on since 2015. It is recommended by GASB, the GFOA and Nevada's Committee on Local Government Finance. Since the budget process started for local governments in northern Nevada, the City of Reno and Washoe County have had ending fund balances between 16.67 percent and 17 percent. It is the targeted and accepted number.

There seems to be a weaponization of fiscal notes. One local government has decided to put 2 fiscal notes on the record totaling \$144 million over 2 years. If a testifier does not provide truthful testimony, the testifier is subject to admonishment by the LCB and potential criminal penalty as a misdemeanor for providing false testimony. Despite this, some of the fiscal notes not based in reality or fact often get a pass at the table.

MARY WALKER (Carson City; Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County):
Carson City, Douglas, Lyon and Storey Counties support S.B. 111. They agree with the minimum GFOA guidelines of 2 months of regular General Fund operating expenditures in fund balances which are not subject to negotiations. It is still a credit-positive fiscal policy. It is sound fiscal policy and S.B. 111 will provide local governments' financial stability in times of recession. It will help

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 11

minimize layoffs during cutbacks since local government expenditures are largely for personnel. A sound fund balance could enable a local government to ride out every season with minimum layoffs. The Counties do not have fiscal notes on the bill.

I am a 20-year member of the Committee on Local Government Finance. One of the most prominent reasons local governments are put under fiscal watch is a low EFB level. Senate Bill 111 will help stabilize local governments in Nevada.

CARTER BUNDY (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees):
The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees supports S.B. 111.

DRAKE RIDGE (Las Vegas City Employees Association):
The Las Vegas City Employees Association supports S.B. 111 and urges the support of the Senate Committee on Finance.

MICHAEL RAMIREZ (Las Vegas Police Protective Association):
The Las Vegas Police Protective Association supports S.B. 111.

MARLENE LOCKARD (Service Employees International Union Local 1107; Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees):
The Service Employees International Union Local 1107 and Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees support S.B. 111.

SCOTT EDWARDS (President, Las Vegas Peace Officers Association; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition):
The Las Vegas Peace Officers Association represents the corrections officers at the City of Las Vegas Detention Center, and I am a proud member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. The Las Vegas Peace Officers Association and the Coalition support S.B. 111.

MR. KEATING:
The CCSD opposes S.B. 111. When this bill was introduced, it had nothing to do with school districts. An amendment added the school district language to the work session documents. This is the reason for the unsolicited fiscal note by CCSD.

It is not my concern if counties and cities have an EFB. I am here about the additional language added requiring school districts to provide dollars to school employees. The funding formula of 16 percent has not been approved. As was mentioned, NAC provides 8.3 percent for school districts. In an arbitration, CCSD lost the decision, and the arbitrator ruled that NAC did not hold the same weight as NRS. Those same individuals who opposed the school district having an 8.3 percent EFB are here saying NAC holds weight. They were willing to kill the 8.3 percent EFB bill but happy to attach the school district amendment on a bill that deals with local government finance.

There was mention of a 4.5 percent ending fund balance; CCSD wishes that was the case. The CCSD holds less than one week of reserves in its EFB. When addressing the diversion of money away from educators, the increased costs of special education and more students in special education should be considered; it costs \$18 million. New school costs are not figured into the funding formula; there are rollups figured in. On Saturday, at the Joint Meeting of the Senate Committee on Finance and Assembly Committee on Ways and Means it was stated that meeting was the first time since 2007 wherein the Committees were provided information on inflationary dollars. It needs to be noted here. This is a collective bargaining issue and should be dealt with at the school district level; not at the State level.

The \$36 million fiscal note is a true note on the S.B. 111 and CCSD wants it to be recognized. The documents submitted at this meeting, [Exhibit G](#), are not broken down by school districts. The documents only contain the State numbers. When dollars go into the formula, they do not come out to the same amount. Nothing is broken down by line item. How can a district give guaranteed raises to its employees without knowing how much the district will actually receive?

I implore the supporters of the bill to show where the dollars start and end. They will not be able to do that, and we should not be requiring the school districts to uphold the collective bargaining by the State Legislature.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce agrees with Mr. Keating of the CCSD regarding the added amendment to S.B. 111.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 13

BRYAN WACHTER (Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada):
The Retail Association of Nevada echoes the comments of the CCSD and the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce on S.B. 111.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 111 and open the hearing on S.B. 153.

SENATE BILL 153 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to collective bargaining. (BDR 23-405)

SENATOR PARKS:
Senate Bill 153 restores statutes that were in place prior to the 2015 Legislative Session regarding collective bargaining. The provisions prior to 2015 worked very well. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)) on the five major changes being made by S.B. 153.

MR. MCALLISTER:
Senate Bill 153 has been worked on for an extended period of time. It closely mirrors a bill passed last Session and vetoed by former Governor Sandoval. Several fiscal notes have been attached to S.B. 153.

Parts of the fiscal notes discuss the cost of union business leave. The provision of union business leave was put into place in 2015 to require an entity which awards business leave to a union to negotiate the leave through a concession or pay it in some way. Nevada State AFL-CIO contends the leave has been paid for. During negotiations, local governments know the costs of union business leave. It can be pulled up on the computer. In order to get union business leave, a concession that equals the value has to be agreed to. There are some fiscal notes from local governments regarding the costs of union business leave. This law has been in statute for four years; all of the contracts have come and gone. I assume they would have negotiated union business leave during the last four years. If they have not, they could have but chose not to.

The other provisions with a fiscal note attached relate to the "evergreen clause" in statute prior to the change in the law which occurred in 2015. It was believed that removing the evergreen clause would help because the employee organizations were thought to be holding up negotiations. That was not accurate. Employee organizations will meet at any time. Local government employers have typically had scheduling issues with negotiation meetings. In

crunch time, meetings take place whenever and for however long it takes to get things done. It was sold that removing the evergreen clause would speed up negotiations; it has not.

Some local governments have slowed down negotiations. Without the evergreen clause, when the contract expires there are no increases in salaries or anything else that an employee would normally receive. Once the contract is settled, the employee is not made whole. Every day the employer delays past the end of the contract is money in the bank. There is no incentive to negotiate in a timely manner. Every day of delay saves the employer money.

Returning to the provisions in place prior to 2015 will speed up negotiations, make things smoother and allow contracts to be settled in a timely manner.

MR. AUGSPURGER:

As a representative of the Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional Technical Employees (CCASAPE), I am speaking specifically on the \$3 million fiscal note placed on S.B. 153 by CCSD.

The passage of S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session has slowed down negotiations rather than speeding them up as was intended. I will refer to the CCASAPE/CCSD bargaining timeline ([Exhibit I](#)). As a bargaining organization, CCASAPE has participated in collective bargaining since 1971. It had its first arbitration in 45 years in 2015 after passage of S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session.

Prior to declaring impasse in June 2016, CCASAPE had 16 bargaining sessions with CCSD. It went to arbitration and a favorable decision was received on May 27, 2015. We opened 2017-2019 negotiations with CCSD simultaneously. The contract expires on June 30, 2019, and we do not have a new one. We have had 27 bargaining sessions since April 2017. It is clear negotiations have not sped up. There have been no settlements through normal channels since the passage of S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session.

The CCSD fiscal note is tied to the cost of rollups on the salary schedule. [Exhibit G](#) clearly spells out where the money goes. The same information is available on the DSA budget published by NDE. The District has received the money every year since 2015, and has not spent it for the purpose for which it is intended.

Contrary testimony has been provided, but what has happened cannot be altered or disputed. The funds are provided by the State for the normal movement on the salary schedule as an incentive for employees to get additional educational credits, become more proficient in their work and stay employed by the CCSD. It is possible the practice of diverting these funds has resulted in 1,000 teachers each year not working for CCSD. These are existing vacancies. If CCSD used the funds for growth on the salary schedule and employee health benefits, it would provide a nicer incentive package for individuals. We have determined that CCSD is the only district in the State using the funds for other purposes.

MR. DALY:

The Nevada State Education Association supports S.B. 153 for many of its bargaining units in particular the smaller rural units. Since passage of the bill in the 2015 Session, provisions are cumbersome and unworkable.

I will comment on the various school district fiscal notes. Churchill County School District put a fiscal note of \$900,000 per year arguing it would be more likely to have to pay 6 months of retroactive increases at 3 percent plus additional costs. This is subject to bargaining. It is more likely contracts will come in on time with the evergreen clause put back in statute. The payout for the school districts is subject to negotiations.

The Douglas County School District has a small fiscal note dealing with leave time, and we associate our comments with Mr. McAllister's comments that the dollars have already been bargained.

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) has a fiscal note because each of its 5 bargaining units are more likely to have arbitration, and arbitration costs are \$25,000 per unit. In some cases, the Washoe Education Association went to arbitration under current rules. Under the previous rules to which we want to return in S.B. 153, contracts tended to be settled without arbitration. This fiscal note is not real in terms of how this would play out for WCSD.

MR. DUNN:

The Professional Firefighters of Nevada supports S.B. 153. Local government is capitalizing on the evergreen provision. One bargaining unit I represent has had six meetings with its employer based on the requirement of State law. However, impasse cannot be declared until 20 days after this Session ends. Fact finding

has been ordered in an attempt to try to speed up the process and will not be available until August, 2019. The employer states arbitration cannot start until December 2019.

Another local government employer has chosen to open all 11 of its bargaining unit contracts in the same year. The employer has hired an outside negotiator with no basis for negotiating contracts in Nevada. One of the bargaining units opened up its contract negotiations in January, and the local government employer did not meet with it for the first negotiation session until April. The final 6 sessions are not scheduled to conclude until June 4, and impasse cannot be declared until 20 days after this Legislative Session concludes.

In the same local government, the law enforcement association has only had two negotiation sessions since April. In the long term, it will cost local governments and bargaining units both time and money. The process will get dragged out further than it was prior to 2015. Harm will come to local government employees because every day the process drags out results in a decreased benefit or retirement contribution and a budget savings for local governments.

RICK MCCANN (Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers):

I am also a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. The 20 law enforcement groups of the Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers support S.B. 153 and oppose the fiscal impacts placed by employers. In the past decade, there has been no necessity for arbitration. In the last four years, arbitration has come close. We work well with our employer partners and want to continue to do so; S.B. 153 will aid in this. It reestablishes what the parties had in 2015. We have dealt with the problems created by the new law of 2015 and need it to be fixed.

MS. LOCKARD:

The 20,000 members of the Service Employees International Union Local 1107 and the 1,500 members of the Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees support S.B. 153. It has been difficult since 2015, and it is important for S.B. 153 to correct the detrimental impact of S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session.

MR. RIDGE:

The Las Vegas City Employees Association supports S.B. 153.

MR. EDWARDS:

The Las Vegas Peace Officers Association supports S.B. 153.

MR. RAMIREZ:

The Las Vegas Police Protective Association supports S.B. 153.

MR. BUNDY:

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees supports S.B. 153.

KENT ERVIN (Nevada Faculty Alliance):

Nevada Faculty Alliance representing faculty at all 8 Nevada System of Higher Education institutions and the collective bargaining units at the College of Southern Nevada, Western Nevada College and Truckee Meadows College supports S.B. 153 and stands in solidarity with its public employee partners. There is no fiscal impact should the policy go forward.

JOHN VELLARDITA (Executive Director, Clark County Education Association):

Senate Bill 153 fixes S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session which was a compromise in 2015. Clark County Education Association has had three arbitrations with CCSD in the last seven years. Two of those arbitrations occurred before S.B. No. 241 of the 78th Session and 1 after its passage. The first two were lengthy processes with the evergreen provision in them. In many cases, the process took nine months and in some cases it took almost a year.

I just completed an arbitration a little over a year ago. The arbitration process took well over a year and cost \$850,000. In the end, all that could be proved was that CCSD had \$13 million out of a \$2.4 billion budget. The difference between now and then was the lack of funding going into the school district. It comes down to whether or not school districts have additional dollars to meet their obligations to human capital, whether in collective bargaining or not. Clark County Education Association supports S.B. 153. The only section we do not support is section 4.

SENATOR PARKS:

As a budget director and chief financial officer for two decades, I have sat on the management side of the negotiating table. What you have heard today is correct. The removal of the evergreen clause was very short-sighted and demoralizing, and if that is the intent of management, so be it.

There has always been an attempt to renegotiate business leave time. The calculations are done for one year; if there is a change in a subsequent year, it is handled as a modification. The bargaining unit representatives have paid for time off to represent their bargaining units. To use a 3 percent raise as an example, the negotiation process is calculated and a 2.9 percent raise is placed for the population of the contract. Management seems to be trying to renegotiate it each time.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 153 and open the hearing on S.B. 245.

SENATE BILL 245 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to civil actions.
(BDR 3-965)

MATTHEW SHARP (Nevada Justice Association):

The goal of S.B. 245 is to increase the cap for tort claims against a governmental entity. Under common law, there was a rule that a government could not be sued. Over time, that rule has been abdicated, and a government can be sued for the same things for which an individual can be sued.

Nevada has had caps beginning at \$25,000, increased to \$50,000 and then to \$100,000. It is one of the lowest caps in the Country. The goal is to provide an increased level of fairness to people who have been catastrophically injured. In the course of making our proposals, we realize the county governments want a staged process to deal with the issues from a budget perspective. The bill in front of you would increase the cap to \$250,000 for all damages.

In negotiations with various counties and other entities, primarily Warren Hardy from the Nevada League of Cities and municipalities, a staged process was requested. The Nevada Justice Association has agreed to increase the cap to \$150,000 effective July 2020. In July 2022, the cap will increase to \$200,000. The intention is to get information on how the increases affect local governments and consider if there should be another increase in the 2023 Legislative Session.

SENATOR JAMES OHRENSCHALL (Senatorial District No. 21):

I am very proud of S.B. 245. I appreciate the stakeholders, plaintiff attorneys and local governments working together to create a solution. When someone is injured through no fault of their own, there is a duty to try to provide restitution

to the injured individual. It is the intent of this bill to help individuals confronted with unforeseen injuries.

SENATOR KEICKHEFER:

Has an amendment about the staging provision been proposed?

MR. SHARP:

The amendment has not been formally crafted. We will be working on a conceptual amendment.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Amendment No. 380 was adopted by the Senate on April 18, 2019. Could you address this in addition to the cap information provided by Mr. Sharp?

MR. SHARP:

The previous amendment was the result of discussions with some of the county governments. The proposal today will supersede the previous amendment.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will need to see the new amendment today. Any further testimony should address the version of S.B. 245 presented today.

ALAN MCMAHON:

I support S.B. 245. I have felt the full impact of what this bill addresses because I lost my leg in an accident. Gradual staging does not address what I have gone through. The \$250,000 cap is not even close. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

On my way to work as a carpenter last winter on Mt. Rose Highway, a Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) snow plow driver hit me head-on. The driver was high on methamphetamines. The incident totaled my truck and took my leg.

The driver was found guilty of a felony DUI with bodily injury and awaits sentencing of 2 to 20 years. I did not receive a big settlement due the \$100,000 cap. Surrounding states have no caps. The driver states that NDOT hired him without requiring a background check or drug testing. He would not have been hired had NDOT done this testing. The driver had just gotten fired for

drugs from a Washoe County job. The safety director at NDOT, Oscar Fuentes, had never heard of this incident when I spoke with him a year later.

This low existing cap on liability promotes a lax environment and recklessness. Nevada has the lowest cap of all 50 states.

STEVEN CONGER (Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

The Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities is neutral on S.B. 245 contingent on reading the proposed amendment. The effect of the amendment would include the effect of the previously adopted amendment which is no longer being considered.

DYLAN SHAVER (City of Reno):

The City of Reno is neutral on S.B. 245. The quandary local governments often experience is not having the option to seek new funding. The authority flows through the Legislature. It will lead to costs for the City but in a manageable and predictable fashion.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Senate Bill 245 was adopted with the previous amendment to help individuals injured through no fault their own. I stand by the previous amendment. It was part of an earlier compromise.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 245 and open the hearing on S.B. 216.

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

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

I became acquainted with the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders during the 2007-2009 Interim. I was serving on a committee dealing with the issue of autism and the struggles so many face when attempting to secure services. I became aware of what the Commission does. The Commission was created by Executive Order in 2008. Senate Bill 216 seeks to establish the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorder in statute.

GWYNNE PARTOS (Vice Chairwoman, Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders):

I serve as the vice chairwoman on the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders. The members of the Commission volunteer to serve. The members are aware of the complex needs of the autism community and how much work needs to be done. Senator Dondero Loop discussed the increased prevalence of autism and the needs of this community. I have submitted my written statement ([Exhibit K](#)). It is important for the Nevadans with autism to receive the services needed to become successful, independent and functioning members of the community.

JULIE OSTROVSKY (Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)) in support of S.B. 216. The Commission is successful because it builds partnerships and coalitions. The bill expands the Commission to reach more parts of the State. There are currently five Commissioners; the bill requests seven.

The fiscal note attached to the bill is from DHHS to post the Commission meetings, take minutes and keep the Commission in compliance with open meeting laws.

MR. COHEN:

I support S.B. 216 and agree with the previous testifiers on this bill.

Ms. ROBB:

The Aging and Disability Services Division of DHHS supports S.B. 216.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

There is a \$130,000 fiscal note by DHHS for the upcoming biennium. Has the amendment changed that?

Ms. ROBB:

The amendment does not change the fiscal note which is for support of the Commission's duties.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

What are the requirements for that support?

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 22

Ms. ROBB:

Should S.B. 202, heard in this Committee today, pass, the funds will help the Commission complete the activities written in S.B. 202 and the daily activities needed for meetings, postings and general support. There is some overlap with the Autism Treatment Assistance Program that will support that position's duties as well.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there one position in the Autism Treatment Assistance Program associated with the fiscal note?

Ms. ROBB:

The position to support the Commission would be housed within the Autism Treatment Assistance Program.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is it still in the Aging and Disability Services Division?

Ms. ROBB:

Yes.

KEN EVANS:

I will speak as a private citizen in support of S.B. 216. I am the uncle of an autistic nephew, and I know others with autistic children. I support the further stabilization and expansion of this Commission to ensure resources are provided to that segment of the population.

JENNIFER JEANS (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; Washoe Legal Services):

The Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada and the Washoe Legal Services support S.B. 216 and the work of the Commission and urge the support of this modest investment for continued operations of the Commission.

HERB SANTOS, JR.:

I am here as a private citizen in support of S.B. 216. I sit on the Board of Directors for the Sierra Kids Foundation. The Sierra Kids Foundation assists families with children with autism.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

The members of the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders are dedicated parents, providers and activists who want to see kids and adults with autism spectrum disorders live lives to their fullest potential. I urge your support of S.B. 216.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 216 and open the hearing on S.B. 381.

SENATE BILL 381 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to workers' compensation. (BDR 53-1157)

HERB SANTOS, JR. (Nevada Justice Association):

Senate Bill 381 will accomplish some of the most important goals for the workers' compensation system: ensuring injured workers receive timely treatment, have adequate choice of health-care providers and receive quality health care. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 616B.5273 covers the adequacy of medical- and health-care services and choice of providers of health care for injured workers. The statute requires an organization's provider list to accomplish adequate treatment, adequate choice and quality of care. Choice has been determined to be two doctors and a specialty. Some lists do not have two choices for injured workers. Senate Bill 381 will require 12 doctors in 12 specialties and 8 doctors in all other specialties. If there are not enough doctors on the Department of Business and Industry Division of Industrial Relations (DIR) list to meet the minimum requirements in the area, then the doctors listed are all that is required.

The minimum requirements in the bill were consented to as a result of numerous meetings with stakeholders wherein various concerns and options were discussed and negotiated in good faith. The diligent work of stakeholders to reach a consensus will provide injured workers with adequate treatment, adequate choice and quality of care. It will provide insurers the ability to negotiate fees with the providers in good faith. This will result in savings for the employer both in premiums and in employment costs by getting injured workers back to work quicker.

This bill will not allow workers to seek treatment out of network. Workers will be required to use the managed care list of the insurer. If the doctor panel does not meet the minimum requirements, then those injured workers will still be

required to use a doctor on the DIR list, and those doctors are contracted to accept the Nevada fee schedule. This is why S.B. 381 is so important. We have a system of little or no true choice and all parties suffer. By providing more choices, the patient doctor relationship will improve. When this relationship is positive and healthy, the patient gets better quicker, has a full recovery and returns to work.

The Nevada Resort Association, which represents the most influential industry in the State, supports S.B. 381. The support of the Nevada Retail Association, other insurers and self-insured employers means that the majority of insured and self-insured employers in the State agree with S.B. 381. Their support of the bill confirms S.B. 381 will not result in unreasonable increases in costs, premium rates or the inability to contract with providers. Nevada is ranked as the forty-fourth lowest state for premium rates in the U.S., and there is no evidence this bill will change that statistic.

Providing injured workers with a reasonable choice for doctors will not raise costs. The Oregon annual study on workers' compensation premiums in the U.S. concluded the true way to reduce costs is through accident prevention, safety training and helping injured workers return to work quickly. Workers return quickly to work when they receive good and timely medical care.

Senate Bill 381 will benefit all interested parties, injured workers, Nevada employers, healthcare providers and insurers.

JASON MILLS (Nevada Justice Association):

Some State agencies have submitted fiscal notes on S.B. 381 indicating there would be increased costs associated with their ability to contract with health care providers. The Nevada Justice Association does not agree with this concern and not to the extent set forth in the fiscal notes.

In the opinion of the agencies, if S.B. 381 becomes law, the loss of the ability to contract with doctors will result in the loss of the ability to reap the benefits of the contracts. The Justice Association worked with large employers and providers in Nevada including the Nevada Resort Association, Nevada Self-Insurers Association, several key third-party administrators and organized labor. A concern was advanced to us based on the original draft of the bill. When consensus on the bill was reached, the number of physicians required satisfactorily resolved concerns on this issue. If private stakeholders no longer

have concerns and there are reasonable negotiated rates below the Nevada fee schedule, then State and local governments should have no concerns. There are more than 8,800 licensed medical doctors in Nevada, 1,200 osteopaths and 1,200 chiropractors. Contracting with 12 doctors in 18 practice areas and 8 doctors in other practice areas should not pose the problems set forth by State and local agencies.

The DIR fiscal note directs its concerns on managing this list to the required costs, time and effort. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 616C.090 compels the DIR to establish the panel of physicians and chiropractors. That statutory mandate means DIR is already budgeted by its line items to cover the manpower to comply with this statute. Six days ago, the DIR updated its list on its website.

If DIR needs help to ensure Nevada injured workers receive timely and adequate treatment and quality of care, then the reasonable costs associated with providing additional manpower may be worthwhile of their investment which will benefit Nevada employers, insurers and injured workers alike. The bill will benefit all interested parties, injured workers, Nevada employers, health care providers and insurers.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is the proposed amendment yours?

MR. MILLS:

Yes, the Proposed Amendment No. 5932 to S.B. 381 ([Exhibit M](#)) is from the Nevada Justice Association. The original draft of the bill used the phrase "health care providers" to alter and amend the phrase "physician and chiropractors" throughout the entire act resulting in more than 50 pages of changes. Since physical therapists and psychologists were removed from our negotiations, we can go back to "physicians and chiropractors" and remove the language in the original bill drafts.

MISTY GRIMMER (Nevada Resort Association):

The Nevada Resort Association has worked closely with the Nevada Justice Association to come to the bill you see today. The Nevada Resort Association supports S.B. 381 with the proposed amendment, [Exhibit M](#).

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In section 2, subsection 2 regarding the different specialists for orthopedics, would a single practice be able to provide the 12 individual physicians for all of the specialties if the physicians have cross-training?

MR. MILLS:

Yes, that is correct. It is not based on the practice, but the individual doctors. There are several large practices in northern and southern Nevada where insurers could contract with multiple members of any practice to achieve the goal standards set forth in S.B. 381.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Contracting with doctors in the urban areas is not a problem; the rural areas may be more problematic. Are there geography limitations over the network being offered to employers?

MR. MILLS:

In current law, there is no provider panel list that is just for the south, the north or the rural areas. It often involves transport from the rural areas to urban ones if the doctors are not located in the rural communities.

Minimum numbers are set forth for counties with populations above 100,000 people. This currently applies to Washoe and Clark Counties.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We have fiscal notes on S.B. 381 and Proposed Amendment No. 5932, [Exhibit M](#). Are there representatives from those organizations here to address the notes? Do the notes stand, or are they reduced or eliminated?

RAY FIERRO (Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry):

The fiscal note issued by the DIR stands.

MR. DUNN:

Senate Bill 381 is an investment in the people who serve the communities and businesses of Nevada. The intent is to provide workers with proper diagnoses and treatments in order to return to work in a timely manner. One of the fiscal notes claims that the bill "restricts workers' compensation insurance carriers' ability to fully control its panel of medical providers." The current problem is

with restriction. Insurers are restricting the number of panel members they contract with which restricts the employee's ability to access timely diagnoses and treatments. A delay in diagnosis and treatment is in effect a denial of the claim based on statutory limits and lack of providers.

In 2017, a member of Professional Firefighters of Nevada had a skin cancer claim diagnosed by a private doctor. The individual went to the managed care organization, filed the paper work and the claim was denied. It was denied because the insurers claimed the individual failed to get a diagnosis from a doctor on the provider panel. There is no dermatologist on the northern Nevada provider panel for that insurer.

In 2018, an anomaly appeared on a member's heart and lung physical. The person filed a claim with the managed care organization; the claim was denied within 14 days. He did not receive proper diagnosis or treatment. He asked for a cardiologist provider list from the panel. He was given a list of four doctors, two of whom no longer practice medicine in Nevada. The one doctor able to see him could not until six months from the injury date.

There is an emotional, physical and fiscal impact on employees when they are not provided proper treatment. The workers' compensation system is antagonistic, and a denial of a claim has a large impact on an employee. There is a fiscal impact on local government employers when someone else has to take up the workload, whether it is police, fire or public works.

MR. MCALLISTER:

The Nevada State AFL-CIO supports S.B. 381 for the reasons stated by the Nevada Justice Association.

MR. EDWARDS:

The Las Vegas Peace Officers Association supports S.B. 381.

HELEN FOLEY (American Association of Payers Administrators and Networks):

There are many things that need to be done to ensure there is a reliable panel of doctors available to take care of injured workers. The American Association of Payers Administrators and Networks (AAPAN) has issues with the list of specialties on page 3 of S.B. 381. Insurers and networks do not credential orthopedic surgeons for anatomical specializations. It is difficult to find these people unless they self-report the specialties. If they do self-report, we might

have a list of orthopedic surgeons which appears to include six doctors, but it is the same person. The surgeon might have a specialty in hand, foot, elbow or whatever. It is going to take some coordination and work with DIR to resolve this issue. For that reason, AAPAN wants to delay the effective date and suggests January 1, 2021. The lists appear to be difficult to understand. It should be easy for injured workers to identify the best person available. If the credentialing processes are not in place, it will be difficult.

As an example, section 8, subsection 1, paragraph (f) of S.B. 381 states "Every discipline and specialization practiced by the health care provider." The AAPAN prefers it to state "If and when reported by the health care provider." Paragraph (g) of the same subsection states "Every condition and part of the body which the health care provider will treat." We do not know that, so it should state "if and when the health care provider provided the information." The AAPAN is working with the trial lawyers and pledges to continue to work on this because these are not fiscal issues. There is concern with the high fiscal notes, not just from Clark and many other counties, but from DIR itself.

JEANETTE BELZ (American Property and Casualty Insurance Association):
The American Property and Casualty Insurance Association had proposed an amendment ([Exhibit N](#)), but after reviewing Proposed Amendment No. 5932, [Exhibit M](#), the proposal made for section 37 of S.B. 381 was accepted.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 381 and open the hearing on S.B. 388.

SENATE BILL 388 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public records.
(BDR 19-827)

SENATOR MOISES DENIS (Senatorial District No. 2):

I will present S.B. 388 and read from my written testimony ([Exhibit O](#)). I want to be clear the intent is to protect metadata, especially when it comes to the "Smart Cities" initiative. This bill will ultimately protect Nevada citizens.

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

During the policy hearing on S.B. 388, an amendment from the school districts added the words "automated means over the Internet or other digital network by a governmental entity." This change was sufficient to eliminate their fiscal notes.

We contacted many of the State agencies and boards which had placed fiscal notes on the original version of the bill and explained the intent of the bill. We explained that the bill deals with Smart City technology and metadata. After resolving the misunderstanding, many of the fiscal notes have been removed.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I maintain serious concerns over the government deciding what is embarrassing for people. What is the full scope of what is collected, and what is captured under this proposed bill? Is it video data from traffic cameras?

MS. CROMPTON:

It is not actual video footage, it is the information that is remitted from a sensor on a light pole. Sensors might track data on how people are going through an intersection. For example, a sensor in a car could talk to a sensor on a light pole giving information about a pothole in the road; because 50 people have braked at that intersection, a problem needs to be fixed.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How would video footage from traffic cameras not be captured if it is a record collected by an automated means as part of an electronic collection of information for the general public?

MS. CROMPTON:

It is data talking to two pieces of technology. The video footage is a public record. The metadata translates between technologies. There could be vehicle identification numbers for a car, not the actual vehicle identification number used by the Department of Motor Vehicles, but an identification number connected to the vehicle being captured.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I understand the intent of S.B. 388, but the bill is not capturing it. I do not understand how a government decides whether something is embarrassing for someone.

MS. CROMPTON:

This was discussed in the policy committee, and there is an amendment coming forth from the Nevada Association of County Clerks and Election Officers. The language in the bill was taken from federal legislation, and the piece that Senator Kieckhefer is referencing can be stricken from the bill.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 30

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is the unsolicited fiscal note from the Department of Corrections removed?

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The Department of Corrections submitted a fiscal note on the first reprint, and it brought the fiscal impact to zero.

MIKE CATHCART (Business Operations Manager, City of Henderson):

The City of Henderson supports S.B. 388 and considers it important legislation as we move into the "Smart Cities" space.

LEONARDO BENAVIDES (Clark County School District):

The CCSD worked with the City of Las Vegas on the amendment to S.B. 388 to clarify that this bill does not affect CCSD. The CCSD has removed its fiscal note.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 388 and open the hearing on S.B. 472.

SENATE BILL 472: Establishes a database of information concerning health insurance claims in this State. (BDR 40-1145)

SENATOR PAT SPEARMAN (Senatorial District No. 1):

The intent of S.B. 472 is to establish a database to allow DHHS to monitor and take into consideration all of the things that happen with health care. A similar program was implemented in 2014 in the state of Washington. It has proven to be successful. I learned of it from a Republican colleague from Washington. There is a fiscal note on the bill, but it also includes a 90 percent match.

JULIA PEEK (Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services):

A visual presentation on the implementation of S.B. 472 is available online. The presentation was given during the April 10, 2019, hearing in the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services. This bill specifically looks at patient protections, the Patient Protection Commission and balanced billing. We have reduced the fiscal note based on a more reasonable implementation schedule.

A 90-10 funding opportunity with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ends in the next couple of years, which makes this a timely bill.

MR. YOUNG:

The new fiscal note deals solely with the implementation of the system and staffing for such. There will be no costs other than for regulation in the first year of the biennium. In the second year of the biennium, the total will be \$2.4 million and subject to a 90 percent match. The State share will be \$409,194 over the complete biennium. The majority of that amount will be in the second year of the biennium.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

After the mentioned \$2.4 million, what was the next number you mentioned?

MR. YOUNG:

The State General Fund obligation for the biennium will be \$409,194.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is this mandatory on all insurance plans that are regulated by the Division of Insurance in the Department of Business and Industry or by public plans? Have you started looking at the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) plans to see how many would be willing to participate?

MS. PEEK:

Yes, we have talked to the ERISA plan providers, and they are exempt based on federal requirements. There is a push on the federal level for them to report to a state all-claims database. There is interest, but it will not be mandated as part of S.B. 472.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do you know how many lives are ERISA insured in Nevada?

MS. PEEK:

It is about one-third of the lives.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

All bills related to insurance use the federal exemption for all of the ERISA plans, so those plans are not captured in any insurance bills.

DAMON HAYCOCK (Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program):
The Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP) put a \$100,000 fiscal note on S.B. 472 when it was first introduced. It was assumed reprogramming would be required to ensure data is sent in the form accepted by DHHS.

The PEBP has options to absorb the fiscal note. One may require assistance by the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) and the other can be absorbed internally with PEBP current funding. Contracts with PEBP's third-party administrators who perform this work include the authority to utilize special project funding. The fiscal note could be absorbed as a standard cost to the organization and eventually built into administrative costs and turned into rates. The \$100,000 cost would not dramatically alter any rate on the PEBP's half-a-billion-dollar budget. Normally, PEBP would use excess reserves billed in excess of the \$100,000. However, its budget has been approved for the next biennium which requires it to go to the IFC for approval to spend excess reserves.

TOM CLARK (Nevada Association of Health Plans):
The Nevada Association of Health Plans opposes S.B. 472. The \$409,194 borne by the State is new information. The insurers look at how much the costs will be to collect the data, transmit it and put it into the fields required by DHHS. Even with the federal match, the program has proven to be very costly to the insurers and the 19 states in which these programs have been implemented. There is much conversation at the federal level about implementing a national program such as this.

We recognize spending for the first year is just on regulations, and the second year begins the implementation process. It is suggested in the bill that an advisory committee may be established to assist DHHS. That is an important element for looking at what the actual costs are to the State and to each insurer. It is not advisable to increase health insurance costs when implementing these kinds of database programs.

Although in opposition to the bill, the Association will work with DHHS as it studies the program to determine if the data is important and beneficial to the State.

MISTY GRIMMER (SilverSummit Healthplan):

SilverSummit Healthplan is opposed to S.B. 472. There may be some legitimate and good reasons to collect the information, but SilverSummit would like to work with DHHS in developing the plan. A policy may be made based on the data collected, but if it does not include the data from the ERISA plans, then it does not portray a complete picture of the Nevada health care landscape.

DENI FRENCH:

I am addressing all of the bills regarding data gathering, saving and protecting. Baltimore is dealing with a situation about ransom concerns. Any of the bills which consider keeping, storing and maintaining data should also include funding for protective considerations.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Senate Bill 472 is an attempt to modernize the way data is collected by the State and drive down overall costs. I look at the bill as an investment. Every state able to do this has been able to drive down Medicare costs and use the information to promote healthy choices for plan members.

MS. PEEK:

The DHHS is happy to work with concerned stakeholders to develop an advisory group and discuss the variables. It is not intended to be a burdensome or expensive item for them.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 472 and open the hearing on S.B. 483.

SENATE BILL 483: Revises provisions governing the Statewide Program for Suicide Prevention. (BDR 40-1163)

SENATOR DALLAS HARRIS (Senatorial District No. 11):

I will present S.B. 483 which allows for the free training of family members of those at risk for suicide in Nevada. Suicide is a large problem, and this is one small piece to address and tackle this issue. It is the intention to receive a little assistance to ensure we can offer this for free for everyone all of the time. This service is used frequently by members of the veteran community who are dealing with family issues because of their service. It is not exclusively for them.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Senate Bill 483 includes family members of veterans, members of the military and others who are at risk. It is serendipitous we are here on this bill on Memorial Day because we know 22 veteran suicides occur every day. Some surmise the number to be greater as some deaths are not recorded as suicides.

Family members, especially children, who lose loved ones in war and are not able to reach closure, become at risk for suicide. It is important to focus on family members of veterans and active duty military personnel. Many family members of those who are in the U.S. National Guard or Reserve forces not called up under Title 10 USC, which means the military member is not on active duty, do not know they can access the same resources as active duty military personnel.

Senate Bill 483 adds another safety net to provide resources to those who need them and to let them know someone cares.

STEPHANIE WOODARD (Senior Advisor, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services):

On behalf of the Office of Suicide Prevention, I worked very closely with the authors of the bill to better understand the intent and what the Office of Suicide Prevention is already doing. By codifying this in statute, it will ensure the fiscal resources are available to support the expansion of services and training across Nevada.

The fiscal note has been reduced from \$241,600 over the biennium to \$101,680. This equals \$50,840 per year. This investment will ensure training is provided at no cost to family members.

MR. FRENCH:

I was recently given the opportunity to attend a program sponsored by the Department of Veterans Services. Part of the discussion was over the staggering number of suicide deaths of veterans and homeless individuals. I support any bill which assists those who have lost family members and friends. I lost two close friends and appreciate the education I received. I appreciate how this will help others in need.

TOM DUNN:

I am representing myself and support S.B. 483. Suicide has touched my life personally. My 14-year-old niece committed suicide. Less than a year later, a good friend of mine committed suicide. Those two deaths have had a tremendous impact on my friends and family. As a professional firefighter and a former member of the U.S. Army, suicide is taking more firefighters each year than line-of-duty deaths. Assembly Bill (A.B.) 492 was brought forth by the professional firefighters to help our public employees facing stress and other mental health issues.

ASSEMBLY BILL 492 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions governing industrial insurance benefits. (BDR 53-709)

MR. EDWARDS:

The Las Vegas Peace Officers Association and the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition support S.B. 483. As a former veteran, I support anything that helps my former colleagues.

MR. EVANS:

I am a retired veteran of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. As one who knows the importance of this legislation, I am a supporter of S.B. 483.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Will you address the proposed amendment?

SENATOR HARRIS:

Proposed Amendment No. 5959 to S.B. 483 (Exhibit P) was prepared in the event we needed to find an avenue to get the fiscal note to zero. Exhibit P would limit services to just veterans. All contingencies are planned for. We first wanted to reduce the fiscal note, which is reflected in the bill we are currently presenting. The second avenue is to reduce the fiscal note to zero by means of the amendment proposed in Exhibit P.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

So, Exhibit P is your backup position.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Page 1 of S.B. 483 in the Legislative Counsel's Digest states: "This bill includes family members of veterans, members of the military and other persons at risk

of suicide ..." and the next paragraph states "This bill additionally requires the Coordinator to provide suicide prevention training for family members of veterans, members of the military and other persons at risk."

Grants are available to help us reach out to veterans, active duty military members and their families.

MS. WOODARD:

The Office of Suicide Prevention has been the recipient of a very generous grant through the Nevada Department of Veterans Services. That information is included in the calculations of the existing fiscal note.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 483 and open the hearing on S.B. 528.

SENATE BILL 528: Makes appropriations to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for research, clinical studies, operations and educational programs.
(BDR S-1260)

PAUL YOUNG (Cleveland Clinic Nevada Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health):

The Cleveland Clinic Nevada Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health continues to fill a tremendous need in Nevada. The numbers of Alzheimer's and dementia patients are increasing in Nevada and nationally due to the aging population and baby boomers entering their senior years. There is no cure yet for the disease and its costs for patients, their families and the Nation's health care system. Alzheimer's disease and dementia are the top looming public health threats to the Nation's healthcare system and to the economy.

Nevada is fortunate to have one of the Nation's premiere centers dealing with memory disorders. The Lou Ruvo Center treats brain diseases with a combination of clinical care, research and education. Clinical care at the Lou Ruvo Center takes a holistic approach which includes imaging, medication, counseling and therapy. Research at the Center includes numerous clinical trials on drugs to determine their effectiveness in treating certain diseases. The Center partners with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, on some of the research. The Lou Ruvo Center has a large education component. It educates patients, their families and the community and provides resources and education for the caregivers of the patients.

Many of the Lou Ruvo Center's services are not available elsewhere in Nevada. The appropriation granted in the 2017 Legislative Session allowed the Center to hire additional staff to meet the needs of Nevadans. The appropriation dollars enabled the Center to serve 30,000 Nevadans each year. Patient referrals each month are greater than available slots. We ask the Committee to support S.B. 528 and allow the Lou Ruvo Center to continue its very important mission.

BOBBY ERNAUT (Cleveland Clinic Nevada Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health):
In July 2009, the Cleveland Clinic in Las Vegas opened a new center to specialize in the treatment and research of various brain diseases. The Center has made countless strides acting as the vanguard for many of the great advancements in treatment of brain diseases.

Today, the Center has established itself as one of the greatest assets in the fight against brain disease in this State and the Nation. The Center was ranked second in the 2016 U.S. News and World Report listing of the Nation's top hospitals; ranking sixth in neurology and neurosurgery and first in cardiovascular care. More recently, the Center was welcomed to the prestigious Parkinson's Foundation Center of Excellence Network, which consists of several hospitals on the forefront of the latest medications, therapies and innovations in Parkinson's disease. The Center is widely recognized for its "patient first" approach which provides patients with traditional and nontraditional care. This includes diagnostic procedures, extensive consultation and direct family services. The patients' families are kept up to date and at ease with the healing process of their loved ones.

The existence of this Center in Nevada provides deep solace to my family. Our relief and our hope are derived from both the function of the treatment facility and the concept of the Center's goal of finding a cure. Alzheimer's has struck my family recently in the diagnosis of my Grandma Nancy. Without the telemedicine program provided by the Center, it would have been difficult to provide treatment for my Grandma because she lives in Elko.

The Center strives to excel in its field and its mindfulness toward treating people in every corner of Nevada. This makes the Center special and wholly Nevadan. Please support S.B. 528.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 38

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Section 1, subsection 2, states S.B. 528 is replacing funds previously granted by the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), School of Medicine. What is going on with that?

MR. YOUNG:

In 2017, the funds were directed through UNR to the Cleveland Clinic via a memorandum of understanding. Senate Bill 528 requests the funds go directly to the Cleveland Clinic.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 528. When we were hearing S.B. 381, there was a question on the fiscal note. A representative of the Department of Administration is now here to answer our questions.

DEONNE CONTINE (Director, Department of Administration):

An additional amendment to S.B. 381 delays the effective date. In discussions and prior discussions on the first reprint with the Agency, it was my understanding the Agency would not be adjusting the fiscal note. The delay in implementation will lead to half of the funds in the first year because it is not effective for the full fiscal year. I will verify this and notify staff of any changes.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will go to public comment.

DANIEL HONCHARIW (Senior Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit Q](#)) regarding S.B. 287 which addresses transparency in government.

SENATE BILL 287: Revises provisions governing public records. (BDR 19-648)

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will open the work session on S.B. 380.

SENATE BILL 380: Makes an appropriation to the Small Business Enterprise Loan Account. (BDR S-922)

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 39

LEANN DRA COPELAND (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Senate Bill 380 makes an appropriation of \$1 million to the Small Business Enterprise Loan Account. The bill was introduced by Senator Cannizzaro. A representative from an organization testified in favor of the bill. There was no testimony against the bill or in neutral. There are no amendments proposed or fiscal notes attached to the bill. Senate Bill 380 currently has an effective date of July 1, 2019. Staff recommends the bill become effective upon passage and approval. If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the correct action would be amend and do pass.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Small Business Enterprise Loan — Budget Page GOED-5 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-1524

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is it a one-shot appropriation out of the current fiscal year that can be used over the next biennium?

Ms. COPELAND:
That is correct.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will accept a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 380.

SENATOR CANCELA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 380.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 69.

SENATE BILL 69 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to emergencies and cybersecurity. (BDR 19-350)

JAMES MALONE (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Senate Bill 69 was last heard May 1, 2019, presented by Caleb Cage, Chief of the Department of Public Safety (DPS), Division of Emergency Management (DEM). This bill would designate October as Cybersecurity Awareness Month and would require the Governor to issue annually a proclamation encouraging the observance. The bill would require each city or county to adopt and maintain a cybersecurity incident response plan to be filed with the DEM's Nevada Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (NOCDC).

Senate Bill 69 would standardize the requirements for certain persons or entities in developing emergency response plans for a school, city or county, resort hotel and utility. The act would require the DEM to develop a written guide to developing an emergency response plan and provide the guide to certain persons or governmental entities which are required to submit plans.

At the May 1 2019, Senate Finance hearing, Fiscal staff acknowledged a concern regarding the expansion of duties for the DEM and NOCDC. The Agency clarified for the DEM the duties were already being performed and would not have an additional fiscal impact. The statutory mandate would ensure coordination between stakeholders and would ultimately streamline processes. In regard to the statutory duties of the NOCDC, the Agency indicated it had similar concerns and provided a conceptual amendment that would align the statutory duties with the available resources approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means during budget closings.

The mockup document provided today ([Exhibit R](#)) was developed based on the conceptual amendment provided by the DEM and the NOCDC. Most of the changes are shown on page 20, section 11. The conceptual amendment eliminates duplicative statutory provisions such as the periodic review of information systems and the development of cyber security training which is authority already provided to the Department of Administration's Enterprise Information Technology Services, Office of Information Security. In addition, [Exhibit R](#) provides clarifying language for the coordination of information and dissemination to stakeholders, allows for cyber security incident response teams

to include an investigator from the DPS's Investigation Division and provides protections against publicly sharing information that may identify specific vulnerabilities. Fiscal staff would note this conceptual amendment would appear to align the statutory duties with the funding approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means in the NOCDC's budget and would have no additional fiscal impact.

If approved, S.B. 69 would be effective upon passage and approval.

Three fiscal notes were submitted for the original version of the bill; two have been removed. The remaining fiscal note is from the Nevada Board of Examiners for Social Workers which indicated a fiscal impact of \$579 per year for webinar and training.

The appropriate action for approval is amend and do pass. There was no testimony in support, opposition or neutral.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 69.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 501.

SENATE BILL 501: Makes an appropriation for the relocation of the National Atomic Testing Museum. (BDR S-1164)

MR. MALONE:
Senate Bill 501 makes a \$1 million State General Fund appropriation to the IFC to relocate the National Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas. The bill was heard May 21, 2019, and presented by Brian McAnallen from the Porter Group

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 42

and two representatives from the National Atomic Testing Museum Foundation. The current location is too small and unable to add additional exhibits.

Fiscal staff recommends a change to section 4 to make the bill effective upon passage and approval to utilize funds in the current fiscal year.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B.501.

SENATOR BROOKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, KEICKHEFER AND
SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 84.

SENATE BILL 84: Establishes a program to award grants to support
prekindergarten programs. (BDR 34-338)

JAIMARIE ORTEGA (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel
Bureau):

Senate Bill 84 was heard by the Committee on April 11, 2019. The bill was
presented by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the education
programs director of the Office of Early Learning Development in the
Department of Education (NDE).

Senate Bill 84 establishes a state prekindergarten (pre-K) program and requires
the NDE to expend the money to award competitive grants to school districts,
charter schools, and nonprofit organizations to support the pre-K programs. The
bill requires the NDE to submit a biennial report concerning the effectiveness of
the pre-K programs supported by the grants. The bill further prescribes the
requirements of the program and the authorized uses of the grant and requires

the State Board of Education to adopt regulations to carry out the grant program.

In closing the Office of Early Learning and Development budget, B/A 101-2709 the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means approved General Fund appropriations totaling \$41.6 million over the 2019-2021 biennium for a State pre-K program. The amount is projected to fund approximately 3,071 pre-K seats.

EDUCATION

K-12 EDUCATION

NDE - Office of Early Learning and Development — Budget Page K-12
EDUCATION-104 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2709

Five individuals testified in support of S.B. 84. Three individuals testified in opposition of the bill and two individuals testified in neutral.

The NDE submitted a conceptual amendment during the bill hearing as part of the NDE presentation ([Exhibit S](#)). The conceptual amendment, [Exhibit S](#), amends section 3 to employ at least one teacher per classroom who has a bachelor's degree or higher in early childhood education. [Exhibit S](#) amends section 3 to maintain the size of each class to no more than 20 pupils in a ratio of not more than 10 pupils for each adult. The proposed amendment also revises the effective date from January 1, 2020, to July 1, 2019.

The NDE further proposed to change any language that refers to "charter schools" to "sponsor of each charter school." This will clarify that charter schools must go through the State Public Charter School Authority or the school district to implement a pre-K program.

The bill is effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations and establishing the Prekindergarten Account pursuant to section 2 of the bill and performing any other preparatory administrative tasks that are necessary to carry out the provisions of S.B. 84. This bill is effective on January 1, 2020, for all other purposes. However, the conceptual amendment revises the effective date from January 1, 2020, to July 1, 2019.

During the closing of the Office of Early Learning Development B/A 101-2709 the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means approved to continue funding the existing pre-K seats that had been funded in the 2017-2019 biennium rather than funding pre-K seats through a competitive process. To be consistent with the Committees' budget closing actions, Fiscal staff recommends amending section 3.1 to eliminate the requirement to award competitive grants of money to school districts, charter schools and nonprofit organizations. Additionally, since the Committees approved all funding in the Office of Early Learning Development B/A 101-2709, Fiscal staff recommends eliminating section 2 which establishes a separate account for the pre-K program.

If the Committee wishes to consider the conceptual amendment and Fiscal staff's recommendations, the proper action would be amend and do pass as amended.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is the amendment found on page 2 of the presentation by the NDE, [Exhibit S](#)?

MS. ORTEGA:

Yes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is the language about competitive grants versus maintaining the existing schools contained in the proposed amendment by the NDE, or is that a suggestion made by Fiscal staff?

MS. ORTEGA:

It is not included in the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit S](#); it is a Fiscal staff recommendation.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 84.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 313.

SENATE BILL 313 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to computer literacy and computer science education. (BDR 34-731)

MS. ORTEGA:
Senate Bill 313 was heard by the Committee on May 3, 2019. The bill was presented by Chair Woodhouse.

Senate Bill 313 creates the Account for Computer Education and Technology, provides appropriations and establishes the requirements for the use of money in the Account. The bill further requires a regional training program to provide training on methods to teach computer literacy or computer science and authorizes the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada to apply for a grant of money from the Account to develop the curriculum and standards required to educate and train a person who is studying to become a teacher in computer literacy and computer science. Senate Bill 313 requires the NDE to develop an Internet repository of resources for providing instruction in computer science to pupils in all grades and assist public schools to establish program of instruction in computer science.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive and section 7 of the bill become effective on July 1, 2019. Section 6.5 of the bill becomes effective on July 1, 2022.

Section 7 of S.B. 313 provides General Fund appropriations totaling \$1.6 million over the 2019-2021 biennium to the NDE to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Five individuals testified in support of the bill. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral.

To be consistent with the appropriations provided to school districts in section 7, Fiscal staff recommends eliminating the phrase "award grants on a competitive basis to school districts" in section 3.5.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 46

If the committee wishes to consider this bill, the proper action would be amend and do pass as amended.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 313.

SENATOR CANCELA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 402.

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)

Ms. ORTEGA:
Senate Bill 402 was presented by Chair Woodhouse and Brian Mitchell, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT).

Senate Bill 402 requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to design, prepare and issue special license plates indicating support for science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The bill requires the DMV to deposit the \$25 issuance fee and the \$20 renewal fee generated by the special license plates to OSIT to encourage the study of STEM by pupils in Nevada. The bill also revises provisions related to the promotion and recognition of education programs related to STEM. The bill becomes effective on October 1, 2019.

Senate Bill 402 provides General Fund appropriations of \$250,000 in each year of the biennium to OSIT 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 also provides General Fund appropriations of \$300,000 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to OSIT for a grant program

awarded through regional advisory boards to fund activities and programs designed to promote the benefits of STEM and carry out programs that reinforce education in STEM.

During the bill hearing, Senator Woodhouse testified section 14 of the bill could be eliminated, which would remove the General Fund appropriations totaling \$1.1 million over the 2019-2021 biennium.

There was no testimony in support or opposition to S.B. 402. The DMV testified in neutral. If the Committee wishes to act on the bill, the correct motion would be amend and do pass as amended.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I reluctantly discussed removing the appropriation when I testified on this bill. I have reconsidered and ask the Committee provide S.B. 402 with a do pass motion which leaves the appropriation in the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 402.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will move to S.B. 378.

SENATE BILL 378 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the pricing of prescription drugs. (BDR 40-574)

CATHY CROCKET (Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Proposed Amendment No. 5969 ([Exhibit T](#)) to S.B. 378 was presented by Senator Cancela on May 23 when this bill was heard before this Committee. The proposed amendment will authorize the DHHS Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP) to provide carve-out pharmacy benefits for managed care. This will allow DHCFP to manage pharmacy benefits directly. [Exhibit T](#) includes provisions to increase program transparency by specifying

that certain pharmaceutical-related contracts would require the contractors to submit to annual audits and obtain an annual internal control audit.

Senate Bill 378 would create the Silver Scripts Purchasing Program which would authorize group purchasing by governmental and nonprofit health plans through the Medicaid and Nevada Check Up programs. The bill would also remove certain categories of drugs including atypical and typical antipsychotic, anticonvulsants and antidiabetics medications from being excluded from the preferred drug list.

It was noted that in addition to the mock-up language, section 31.4 should also be amended to include a provision for reports produced by DHHS to be posted on its website.

Senate Bill 378 is effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations and performing other preparatory and administrative tasks. The bill is effective on January 1, 2020, for all other purposes.

The fiscal impact is based on the pharmacy carve-out. There will be administrative costs for positions and reporting requirements. In the DHCFP administration budget, five positions including a social services program chief, three social service program specialists and an administrative assistant would be required in addition to actuarial costs and fiscal agent costs. The total impact on the administration budget will be a cost increase of \$6.2 million including \$1,784,369 in General Fund appropriations.

Within the Medicaid and Nevada Check Up budgets, DHCFP is projecting savings totaling \$51.6 million over the biennium including \$3.3 million in General Fund savings. If the Committee wishes to amend and do pass the bill to support the operation costs in the administration budget, it may wish to consider appropriating funds and authorizing federal funds within the administration budget. Alternatively, the Committee may choose to authorize a transfer of General Fund money from the Medicaid and Nevada Check Up budgets to the administration budget during the upcoming biennium upon recommendation of the Governor with approval by the IFC only for the purposes of implementing the operational costs of this Legislation.

One individual presented testimony in support and one testified in neutral.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are we able to budget the projected savings from S.B. 378 when we allocate money for the administrative costs?

MS. CROCKET:

The Medicaid budget has already been closed, so we cannot retract out of it. The proposal I presented for consideration regarding transferring savings to the administration budget would allow the savings to be used to cover the administrative costs.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

What will the total necessary appropriation be to cover the costs?

MS. CROCKET:

The General Fund impact in the administration budget would be about a \$1.8 million General Fund increase. The projected General Fund savings in the Medicaid and Nevada Check Up budgets totals \$3.3 million. Based on the Agency's estimate, there would be sufficient savings to cover the projected administrative costs.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I will support S.B. 378 at this time. I will be speaking with some who had concerns with the bill and may change my vote on the Senate Floor.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will entertain a motion to approve the bill with the recommendations made by the Fiscal staff.

MS. CROCKETT:

To clarify, this vote would be to authorize the transfer of savings from the Medicaid budget to the administration budget.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 378 WITH RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE FISCAL DIVISION.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 472.

MS. CROCKET:

Senate Bill 472 was heard in this Committee today. The bill requires DHHS to establish an all-payer claims database of information relating to medical, dental and pharmacy benefits provided in Nevada. Public and private insurers which provide health benefits and are regulated by State law must submit data to the database. Certain insurers regulated by federal law may opt to submit data to the database. The bill provides for data confidentiality, authorizes requests for data from the database and prohibits certain uses and disclosures of the data. The DHHS must use the data from the database to publish an annual report concerning the quality, efficiency and costs of health care in Nevada and submit reports to the Legislature.

This bill becomes effective upon passage and approval for the purposes of adopting regulations and performing preparatory tasks and on January 1, 2020, for all other purposes.

The DHCFF discussed a revised fiscal impact based on an updated implementation timeframe. In fiscal year (FY) 2020, the total cost would be \$2,810 including \$1,405 in General Fund appropriations for developing regulations. In FY 2021, a total cost of \$2.5 million including \$429,707 General Fund dollars would be necessary. The FY 2021 cost includes \$2 million for costs associated with developing the database to administer the provisions of S.B. 472. A cost of \$500,000 will support staff necessary to implement the provisions of the bill including 2 biostatisticians, 2 economists, 1 management analyst and 1 business process analyst.

The PEBP indicated there would be a fiscal impact of \$100,000 associated with connecting to the database. The PEBP indicated it may be able to absorb the costs internally or utilize excess reserves to support the costs.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 51

The bill was introduced by Senator Spearman and the DHHS Director's office. Two individuals testified in opposition and one in neutral. There are no amendments.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Since there are some fiscal ramifications on this bill, we would like Staff to direct us on how we can handle that.

Ms. CROCKET:

With this legislation, there are no projected savings. It might be appropriate to appropriate the General Fund monies associated with this in the bill.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

What is the total appropriated amount?

Ms. CROCKET:

The General Fund appropriation in 2020 would be \$1,405, and in 2021 it would be \$429,707.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 472 with the appropriation amounts identified by Ms. Crocket.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 472 WITH THE IDENTIFIED APPROPRIATIONS.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I worry about gathering this much data especially on a person's confidential medical information. I will not support this at this time.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOCHEA, KIECKHEFER AND
SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will move to S.B. 89.

SENATE BILL 89 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to education.
(BDR 34-331)

JULIE WALLER (Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Senate Bill 89 was heard in this Committee on May 22, 2019. The bill requires the Governor to appoint a committee on Statewide school safety to make recommendations related to school safety and the well-being of students. Additionally, the bill revises provisions concerning emergency response plans including their development, content, approval and usage during an emergency. The Division of Emergency Management of the Department of Public Safety must report related information to the Legislature and must conduct random audits of the plans.

Senate Bill 89 establishes school police officers as category I peace officers with unrestricted duties and revises provisions relating to the jurisdiction and training of school police officers. The board of trustees employing school police officers is deemed a law enforcement agency for purposes of requiring officers to wear portable event recording devices while on duty. Private schools may enter into a contract to provide school police officers.

Senate Bill 89 requires school climate information to be included in the annual accountability reports for public schools and the plan to improve the achievement of pupils enrolled in a public school. The bill provides for restorative discipline practices.

Senate Bill 89 requires each school district and charter school to designate a school safety specialist to oversee functions related to school safety. The State Board of Education must develop nonbinding recommendations for the ratio of pupils to specialized instructional support personnel. Such specialized instructional support personnel employed by a school includes, without limitation, school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, school nurses, speech-language pathologists, school library media specialists and any other qualified professionals. Each district's board of trustees is required to develop a 15-year strategic plan to achieve these ratios. Additional methods related to student well-being must be included in the Statewide framework for integrated student supports.

Senate Bill 89 changes the name of the Safe-to-Tell Program to the SafeVoice Program and makes changes concerning reporting and information disclosure related to the program.

The bill was introduced by State Superintendent Jhone Ebert and Kristy McGill of NDE. There were five speakers in support of the bill and no testimony in opposition or neutral.

A conceptual amendment was proposed by Mary Pierczynski on behalf of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents. As currently written, section 7.5 of S.B. 89 requires school safety specialists to be administrative employees. The proposed amendment would change the administrative employee to a district level employee. Ms. Pierczynski indicated that several school safety specialists are not licensed school administrators but are experts in school safety. The Association proposes to let the Superintendent appoint any qualified employee.

Fiscal notes indicating a fiscal impact of S.B. 89 as introduced were submitted by several school districts and the Division of Emergency Management. The Division removed its fiscal note after discussions with the NDE's Office of Safe and Respectful Learning.

This act would become effective on July 1, 2019.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 89.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 133.

SENATE BILL 133: Makes an appropriation for educational leadership training programs. (BDR S-107)

MS. WALLER:

Senate Bill 133 was heard on March 4, 2019. The bill makes an appropriation of \$1 million in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium from the State General Fund to the NDE to contract with the Clark County Public Education Foundation for the implementation and operation of educational leadership training programs. The bill requires a 1-to-1 match of the appropriations. Senate Bill No. 155 of the 79th Session appropriated \$500,000 in each year of the 2017-2019 biennium for this same purpose. Staff notes the budget approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means for the 2019-2021 biennium continues the \$500,000 annual appropriation for the educational leadership programs.

Senate Bill 133 was presented by Senator Woodhouse and three representatives of the Clark County Education Foundation. Lindsay Anderson, representing the Washoe County School District and the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, testified in support of the bill. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral to S.B. 133. No amendments to the bill were proposed. Senate Bill 133 includes an appropriation of \$1 million in each year of the biennium. This appropriation is not included in the Executive Budget.

The bill has an effective date of July 1, 2019.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I propose we amend and do pass S.B. 133, cutting the appropriation in half to \$500,000 per year of the biennium.

MS. WALLER:

Will that be the appropriation in the bill cut to half? A \$500,000 appropriation for the 2019-2021 biennium is already in the budget and approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Based on Ms. Waller's clarification, we instead need to amend the bill to remove the appropriation because it is already in the budget.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 133.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I will support S.B. 133 at this time. I am concerned some of the counties may have supplanted that money, meaning they took the money from the State and instead did not put in their own money. This is a question I have had on S.B. 133. I will do some further research.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will move to S.B. 458.

SENATE BILL 458: Makes an appropriation for the creation and maintenance of school gardens. (BDR S-580)

MS. WALLER:

Senate Bill 458 was heard on April 15, 2019. The bill contains an appropriation not included in the Executive Budget. Senate Bill 458 appropriates \$410,000 in FY 2020 and \$205,000 in FY 2021 from the State General Fund to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of creating and maintaining programs that provide school gardens for Title I schools which meet certain requirements. The Legislature passed S.B. No. 167 of the 79th Session to encourage schools to establish and participate in a school garden program to promote the consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables by children.

The money allocated by S.B. 458 may be used to provide professional development, pay for any travel expenses associated with the attendance of a teacher at any training or conference relating to school gardens and pay for the cost of conferences regarding school gardens held in the State.

Senate Bill 458 was presented by Chair Woodhouse and Ciara Byrne, Co-CEO of the nonprofit organization Green Our Planet. Chair Woodhouse and Ms. Byrne were joined by Matt Walker on behalf of Green Our Planet. Senator Woodhouse testified that five school districts this biennium have participated in the program and that there is a waiting list for additional schools to participate. Ms. Byrne

testified that 48 schools were served in FY 2018, and 40 schools have been served in FY 2019.

Nine individuals testified in support of S.B. 458. There was no testimony in opposition and one individual testified in neutral.

There is one proposed amendment to S.B. 458. Proposed Amendment 5626 ([Exhibit U](#)) removes the Department of Agriculture and instead appropriates the funding to the NDE's Other State Education Programs account B/A 101-2699.

NDE - Other State Education Programs — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-22
(Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2699

[Exhibit U](#) directs NDE to allocate the funding directly to qualifying nonprofit organizations instead of the nonprofit organizations applying to individual schools. A qualifying nonprofit organization must have a curriculum that includes a comprehensive STEM school garden program. Such a program must include, without limitation, a STEM curriculum for outdoor gardens including hydroponic gardens for pupils in kindergarten through Grade 5 that is grade appropriate.

[Exhibit U](#) specifies certain requirements for the provision of professional development, including training teachers who provide special education in STEM to pupils with disabilities and vocational training to create a career path in horticulture for pupils. [Exhibit U](#) specifies the nonprofit may provide professional development to train a group of teachers or individual teachers how to establish and maintain school gardens to increase the time teachers allocate to teaching STEM.

[Exhibit U](#) clarifies that school gardens may include hydroponic gardens.

[Exhibit U](#) removes language that a school may not receive an allocation of funding that exceeds \$10,000 in FY 2020 and \$5,000 in FY 2021. Fiscal staff notes [Exhibit U](#) does not currently provide a reporting requirement related to how the funds are expended each year, but one could be added.

Senate Bill 458 contains an appropriation not included in the Executive Budget. The bill has an effective date of July 1, 2019.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 57

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

This motion would be to amend and do pass S.B. 458 and include the reporting requirements in the amendment.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 458 AND INCLUDE THE SUGGESTED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IN THE AMENDMENT.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, KIECKHEFER AND SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will move to S.B. 505.

SENATE BILL 505: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Finance for an adjustment to school districts affected by the district of residence issue. (BDR S-1173)

MS. WALLER:

Senate Bill 505 appropriates \$8.6 million from the General Fund to the Office of Finance for an adjustment to school districts affected by the district of residence issue during the 2017-2019 biennium. The appropriation is included in the Executive Budget.

The bill was heard on May 23, 2019, and presented by State Superintendent Ebert and Deputy Superintendent Heidi Haartz. Two individuals from Washoe County testified in support of S.B. 505. No testimony was provided in opposition or neutral to the bill.

The NDE proposed a conceptual amendment to reduce the appropriation contained in S.B. 505 from \$8.6 million to \$8,177,059. The appropriation for the amendment has been further revised to \$8,184,670 in FY 2019. The bill will become effective upon passage and approval.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 505.

SENATOR BROOKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 98.

SENATE BILL 98: Revises provisions governing the practice of homeopathic medicine. (BDR 54-519)

ALEX HAARTZ (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Senate Bill 98 was heard on May 1, 2019. There is a conceptual amendment by Senator Settlemeyer on behalf of the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission ([Exhibit V](#)). As introduced, S.B. 98 transfers the responsibility for regulating the practice of homeopathic medicine to the State Board of Health (SBH). This bill authorized the SBH to establish a homeopathic advisory group to provide the SBH with expertise and assistance in regulating the practice of homeopathic medicine. It also authorized the SBH to contract for professional, technical, clerical and operational personnel as necessary to assume the regulatory authority over homeopathic medicine.

Senate Bill 98 was introduced by Senator Settlemeyer and Danny Thompson representing the Homeopathic Board. Senator Settlemeyer presented a conceptual amendment to the bill which has been formalized as [Exhibit V](#).

Two individuals testified in favor of the bill based on the amendment; there was no opposition testimony or testimony in neutral.

The proposed amendment, [Exhibit V](#), makes several changes. It removes the proposal to transfer the Board to the SBH and instead reconstitutes the existing State Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners as the Nevada Board of Homeopathic and Integrated Medicine Examiners under NRS 638. The

amendment proposes to expire the terms of the current Board members on June 30, 2019.

The proposed amendment, [Exhibit V](#), requires the Governor to appoint eight new members, an increase of one member over the current Board membership, and creates two staggered term periods. [Exhibit V](#) proposes to revise the existing fee structure by increasing the current schedule of fees contained in NRS 638.330. [Exhibit V](#) requires the new Board to report on its progress in improving the function of the Board and compliance in its duties to the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission during the 2019-2021 Interim. The proposed amendment, [Exhibit V](#), requires two-thirds of the new Board to accept any of the existing Board's obligations.

Two fiscal notes were submitted on the original bill. One was from the DHHS Division of Public and Behavioral Health with regard to the SBH assuming oversight of the Board. Notice was received May 6, 2019, indicating the conceptual amendment removed the fiscal impact.

The second fiscal note was submitted by the existing Homeopathic Medical Board. The fiscal note claims the ability to repay the Office of the Attorney General would be impaired if the Board was eliminated.

The original version of S.B. 98 was effective on passage and approval for purposes of administrative tasks and January 1, 2020, for all other purposes. If adopted, the proposed amendment, [Exhibit V](#), changes the effective date to July 1, 2019.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 98.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:
We will move to S.B. 528.

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Senate Bill 528 was heard in the Committee this morning. The bill makes appropriations to the Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health and includes \$2 million for research, clinical studies, operations and educational programs. Section 1, subsection 2 includes appropriations of \$542,343 in each year of the biennium to restore funding previously received by the Center from the University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine for this same purpose.

Testimony was provided by representatives from R&R Partners and the act becomes effective on July 1, 2019. Staff suggests the \$2 million appropriation for research and clinical studies be made effective on passage and approval and the appropriations of \$542,343 each year remain as constituted in the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 528.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.
THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA AND SETTELMAYER
VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 549.

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

JHONE EBERT (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

I will present S.B. 549. The NDE determines the number of pupils who are English-language learners or are eligible for free-or reduced-priced lunch and who have scored below the twenty-fifth percentile of an assessment, are not enrolled in a Zoom or Victory School and do not have individualized education plans. The NDE allocates funding to serve such identified students.

Section 1 of S.B. 549 removes references to specific assessments and instead requires the use of an assessment as implemented by the NDE for Grades 1, 2, 9 and 10. Section 2 of the bill changes the reporting requirements. An

independent evaluator will measure effectiveness during each even-numbered year, and the evaluation is provided to the Legislative Counsel Bureau before February of each odd-numbered year.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is there a reason for striking the math test in Grades 1 and 2 and the tests in other grades? Are these tests not utilized across the State?

MS. EBERT:

Current law identifies one specific assessment. Other assessments are available, and NDE will go through the request for proposal (RFP) process to identify the best tool for our students.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is another test going to be purchased?

MS. EBERT:

At this time, NDE is looking at all of the assessments it provides and working with the purchasing department. The purchasing department has asked us to come into compliance with all of the other purchasing done across the State in a five-year cycle. There are no plans at the moment, but NDE is looking at how to come in compliance with purchasing requirements.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is S.B. 549 attempting to solve a purchasing problem or an education problem? It changes the game, some children will be eligible who were not, and some will not be eligible who previously were. Money will be moving around to different children and different schools. What is the problem that needs solving?

MS. EBERT:

Senate Bill 549 removes the specification of a single test within the law. In identifying assessments, NDE determines what the benchmarks, goals and standards are for the students. In writing an RFP, we will ensure any assessment is in alignment with the standard and goal expectations for students.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 549 and open the hearing on S.B. 550.

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

MR. HAARTZ:

Senate Bill 550 is the budget implementation bill that implements the State's contribution for the upcoming biennium for participants in the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP).

Section 1 of S.B. 550 provides the State's contribution which is a composite amount based on which plan and tier an active participant enrolls in. For FY 2020, the amount is \$760.79 per month. In FY 2021, it is \$783.30 per month.

Section 2 provides the base State contribution for State retirees who participate in the program and are not Medicare eligible. The base contribution is \$551.77 per month in FY 2020 and \$478.15 per month in FY 2021.

Section 2, subsection 2 provides the monthly contribution for retirees who participate through the Medicare exchange sponsored by PEBP. The contribution is \$195 per month for retirees who retired before January 1, 1994. The contribution for those who retired after January 1, 1994, is based on \$13 per month. The Governor's recommended budget contained an increase of \$1, up from the previous \$12 base. There is a maximum of \$260 per month for retirees who retired after January 1, 1994. These amounts remain the same in each fiscal year.

Section 3 is language carried over from the current biennium and the PEBP rates bill approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

Section 4, subsection 1 indicates section 3 of the act become effective upon passage and approval. That is in the event a fiscal note needs to be processed if S.B. 550 were to be amended.

Sections 1 and 2 of this act become effective on July 1, 2019.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 550 and return to the work session. We will begin with S.B. 549.

MS. WALLER:

Senate Bill 549 was heard in this Committee today. The bill revises a provision relating to the allocations of money from the Account for the New Nevada Education Funding Plan B/A 101-2677. This a budget implementation bill. It revises the assessments utilized to determine the lowest profile of students who would be eligible for the funding from this budget account. The change is to remove the specific name of an examination from statute and use a general assessment as determined by NDE. Senate Bill 549 also revises a provision for an annual external evaluation and changes that to one evaluation in the odd year of the biennium. It is consistent with the budget as closed for the external evaluation funding approved by the Committee.

NDE - New Nevada Education Funding Plan — Budget Page K-12 EDUCATION-
14 (Volume I)
Budget Account 101-2677

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

My question is regarding section 1, subsection 1 where it strikes out the exact exams. I remember a discussion over those higher grade exams regarding math and science; there was a differentiation. I do not remember a discussion about replacing the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test for kindergarten through Grade 2.

MS. WALLER:

The reason for the change in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) is that a specific examination is not typically named in statute. The change is to utilize an assessment as approved by NDE. There is no immediate plan to change the MAP testing, the language in S.B. 549 is more of a cleanup of the statute.

Assembly Bill No. 7 of the 79th Session eliminated the requirement that end-of-course examinations for mathematics be a State examination. In order to implement this budget, the NDE needs to change the assessment to the high school science assessment.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 64

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I remember that discussion for the higher grades, but not for the lower grades.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 549.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will move to S.B. 550.

MR. HAARTZ:

Senate Bill 550 was heard this evening. It is a budget implementation bill. The bill establishes the State contribution for active and retired employees for the upcoming biennium. Senate Bill 550 becomes effective on July 1, 2019.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 550.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 27, 2019
Page 65

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Having no further business, we will adjourn this meeting at 8:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Christine Miner,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	15		Attendance Roster
S.B. 202	C	2	Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop	Written Testimony
S.B. 202	D	2	Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 202	E	1	Steven Cohen	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 80	F	2	Bradley Keating / Clark County School District	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 111	G	3	Stephen Augspurger / Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees	Nevada Legislative Appropriations Report
S.B. 153	H	1	Senator David R. Parks	Written Testimony
S.B. 153	I	2	Stephen Augspurger / Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees	CCASAPE / CCSD Bargaining Timeline
S.B. 245	J	1	Alan McMahon	Written Testimony
S.B. 216	K	1	Gwynne Partos	Written Testimony
S.B. 216	L	1	Julie Ostrovsky	Written Testimony
S.B. 381	M	39	Jason Mills / Nevada Justice Association	Proposed Amendment 5932
S.B. 381	N	1	Jeanette Belz / American Property and Casualty Insurance Association	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 388	O	3	Senator Moises Denis	Written Testimony
S.B. 483	P	3	Senator Dallas Harris	Proposed Amendment 5959

S.B. 287	Q	1	Daniel Honchariw / Nevada Policy Research Institute	Written Testimony
S.B. 69	R	25	James Malone / Legislative Counsel Bureau	Mockup Amendment
S.B. 84	S	8	Department of Education	Proposed Amendment in Presentation
S.B. 378	T	35	Cathy Crocket / Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment 5969
S.B. 458	U	3	Julie Waller / Legislative Counsel Bureau	Proposed Amendment 5626
S.B. 98	V	8	Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission	Proposed Amendment