

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eightieth Session
March 25, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:10 a.m. on Monday, March 25, 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 Chris Brooks
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senatorial District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Tom Weber, Committee Secretary
Jennifer McEntee, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michaela Tonking, Educate Nevada Now

Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Kathleen Dickinson, Coordinator, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement
Ariel Anderson, West Preparatory Academy, Clark County School District
Frank R. Perez, West Preparatory Academy, Clark County School District
Avery Clark, Jesse Hall Elementary School, Washoe County School District
Adriane Casolari, Teacher, Clark County School District
Richard Clark, Teacher, Social Studies Department Chair and WTP Coordinator,
Reno High School, Washoe County School District
Marc Picker, Co-President, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement; Cochair State
Bar of Nevada's We the People Committee
The Honorable Elissa Cadish, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court; Cochair State Bar
of Nevada's We the People Committee; Board Member, Nevada Center
for Civic Engagement
Peter Grema
Lauren Anten, West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School
District
Blake Eecklor, Anthony Saville Middle School, Clark County School District
Makayla Wong, Anthony Saville Middle School, Clark County School District
Elisa Martinez, Ralph Cadwalledar Middle School, Clark County School District
Ian Sturtz, Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School District
Mandy Mackenzie, Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School
District
Ariadna Carmona, Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School
District
Milton Hyams, Incline High School, Washoe County School District
Doug Goodman, Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform
Paul Matteoni, Incoming President, State Bar of Nevada
Andy MacKay
Beau Oster, Reno High School, Washoe County School District
Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association
Mira Khosla
Mackayla Shultz
Julie Cardinali, Reno High School, Washoe County School District
Reilly Hogan, Reno High School, Washoe County School District
Adam Esrig, West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District
Parker Samuelson, West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School
District
Saha Salahi
Georgia Leeland, Reno High School, Washoe County School District

Arsenio Escudero, Director, Nevada State Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Anthony A. Marnel III, Chair, Nevada State Athletic Commission

Bob Bennett, Executive Director, Nevada State Athletic Commission, Nevada Department of Business and Industry

Helen Foley, President, Public Affairs, Faiss Foley Warren; Nevada Community Foundation

JoVon Sotak, Executive Grant Analyst, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Nevada Department of Administration

John Ritter, Chair, Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance

Jonas Peterson, Chief Executive Officer, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance

Maureen Shafer, Executive Director, Council for a Better Nevada

Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce

Miles Dickson, Chief of Staff, Nevada State Treasurer's Office

Doug Martin, Second Vice President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts; Vice Chair, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District

Ernie Adler, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe

Tim Rubald, Rubald and Associates; Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

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

Julia Peek, Deputy Director, Programs, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services

Jenni Cartwright, Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Nevada Department of Administration

Dena Schmidt, Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services

Michelle Johnson, Executive Director, Financial Guidance Center, Money Management International

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The first bill to be heard this morning is Senate Bill (S.B.) 227.

SENATE BILL 227: Requires certain information to be reported concerning public school expenditures. (BDR 34-825)

SENATOR MOISES DENIS (Senatorial District No. 2):

I am here to present S.B. 227. Written testimony has been submitted for the record with detailed background information (Exhibit C). This bill provides a

mechanism to collect data about expenditures by public schools. That information can be used to make a determination of the personnel and services that Nevada's Department of Education (NDE) reasonably believes an average elementary, middle school and high school could support on the basis of the money budgeted or appropriated for public education in Nevada when combined with all local and federal money available for public education.

Section 1, subsection 3 requires each public school to annually publish a description of the personnel employed and services provided by the school during the immediately preceding academic year and any anticipated changes to such resources during the current academic year. A written copy of this report must be provided to each student's parent or legal guardian and posted to the schools' website.

Section 1, subsection 4 requires NDE to establish regulations prescribing the format and content of the information contained in the report by each school district including the average class size; teacher professional development opportunities; the amount of money per pupil spent on supplies, materials, equipment and textbooks; and the student category for which the school receives additional funding—which would include students with disabilities, English learners, at-risk students, and gifted and talented students.

I urge your support of S.B. 227 which will provide us, for the first time, the means to understand the personnel and services that our education budgets can support.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

When discussing all other federal and local money, this report will show all other funding available. Does this mean at some point the report could be used to redistribute the funds?

SENATOR DENIS:

This is only a reporting mechanism. When we talk about transparency in education, it is currently difficult to know what each school is spending funding on. It will give information that could be used later to decide how they distribute that money.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I do not see any mechanism that would actually look at the redistribution until the report is in place. Any redistribution would require other legislation. My concern is any time you discuss the Local School Support Tax, once you get the 50 cents that is not dedicated to the Distributive School Account, it becomes a fine line if you are shifting revenues from one local jurisdiction to another. I do not know the legalities around that. We went through that years ago with the Elko County School District and Eureka County School District and created a general improvement district to redistribute those funds. It can be sticky when it comes to local dollars, but this report is just the data and the reporting mechanism.

EDUCATION

K-12 EDUCATION

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

SENATOR DENIS:

Yes. This bill will require a report that shows exactly how we are spending money on education.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I have been using the SchoolNomics In\$ite analysis provided by EdGate Holdings, Inc. for a couple of years to look at granular data at the school level. In talking with parents, principals and teachers within the schools, one of the things that I find the most useful is how each individual school deviates from average. For example, Depoali Middle School in Washoe County receives about 13.2 percent less on a per pupil basis than other middle schools. That type of granular data is helpful when we discuss with parents what is happening at the school. We can see what schools are spending on curriculum development, in-service training, transportation, food service and other categories. Is there anything in the bill that requires or would look at how an individual school relates to other schools in the district or would it be incumbent upon parents to try to cross-reference the data?

SENATOR DENIS:

Section 1, subsections 1 and 2 require NDE to furnish a report. The intent is to be able to look at individual schools as well as the districts and the State as a whole. If the individual data is available, I do not know why NDE could not publish all of it.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The individual schools are responsible for compiling the school-level data, correct?

SENATOR DENIS:

They are responsible for having it reported. I believe that some of this information is already available to NDE for them to assist the schools and districts to accomplish this. Obviously the schools know exactly what reporting they need to do. It is different than how we have done it, so it will require a change in how we are doing the reporting.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Will the first individual school reports be published in October 2019?

SENATOR DENIS:

That is correct. It seems that in an earlier meeting, NDE testified that the Every Student Succeeds Act now requires this type of information.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one to speak in support or opposition, is there anyone to testify in neutral to the bill?

MICHAELA TONKING (Educate Nevada Now):

We are testifying neutral on S.B. 227. We want to make it clear that in this report the dollars spent, for example federal dollars, are classified on exactly what restrictions are required of those dollars. This will allow for taxpayers and stakeholders to understand that these dollars are not necessarily meant for explicit uses within our school systems. We have to make sure that is clear. We also think this bill is a good idea because it shows where our old formula is putting dollars and how underfunded our system could be.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

We are in the neutral position on [S.B. 227](#). We know it will require some additional data collection on the part of school staff. We look forward to working with NDE to come up with the most simple data collection method that we can. We know the data is necessary information.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one else to speak on [S.B. 227](#), we will be closing the hearing. I will now turn the chair over to Vice Chair Parks, and we will go to [S.B. 193](#).

[SENATE BILL 193](#): Makes an appropriation for educational programs relating to history, law and civics. (BDR S-368)

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing on [S.B. 193](#) which makes an appropriation for educational programs relating to history, law and civics.

SENATOR JOYCE WOODHOUSE (Senatorial District No. 5):

The bill before you today makes a small, but very important, appropriation to the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement to support the We the People (WTP): The Citizen and the Constitution program in elementary, middle and high schools throughout Nevada. Written testimony has been submitted that provides an overview of the program ([Exhibit D](#)). There are many supporters here to share with you why it is important that this program be funded.

KATHLEEN DICKINSON (Coordinator, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement):

I am the WTP State coordinator. Today I am speaking in favor of [S.B. 193](#) and have provided testimony of my remarks ([Exhibit E](#)). I have additionally submitted a letter of support and testimonials ([Exhibit F](#)) and reference documents ([Exhibit G](#)).

ARIEL ANDERSON (West Preparatory Academy, Clark County School District):

As Nevadans, it is imperative that we learn to exercise the rights provided to us within the *United States Constitution*. This school year, our advanced placement government teacher, Mr. Averill Kelley, introduced my classmates and me to WTP curriculum.

FRANK R. PEREZ (West Preparatory Academy, Clark County School District):
From our experience with the WTP program, we are able to gain more depth of understanding about our government and the complexities of our political system along with functions and fluidity of the Constitution.

MS. ANDERSON:

This program helped to shed light on the grayest areas of the government, the areas where we as students of color are often uninformed. Not only are we able to understand our unalienable rights, we were taught when and how to exercise them and the limitations to our rights as American citizens.

MR. PEREZ:

Often the stereotype behind this program is that it is a program for white students only. While participating in the program, I was able to witness firsthand the inclusivity of all students in Nevada and felt well represented within my district.

MS. ANDERSON:

As students of color, we are very proud of participating in WTP. Our involvement in the program allowed us to break down the stereotypes of students of color being involved in WTP. We were able to prove that the program is for all students.

MR. PEREZ:

If the State funds the WTP program, we believe it will help with the comfortability and will provoke reassurance within students of color.

MS. ANDERSON:

It will enlighten students' perspectives and breakdown whitewashing stereotypes of government participation and allow us to represent ourselves by participating.

MR. PEREZ:

Along with that, it will help minorities become more civically engaged.

MS. ANDERSON:

It will help to provoke young students to become change makers in this world.

AVERY CLARK (Jesse Hall Elementary School, Washoe County School District):
I am a fifth grade student here to endorse S.B. 193 and I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

ADRIANE CASOLARI (Teacher, Clark County School District):
I am currently a U.S. Government and WTP teacher. I have submitted written testimony in support of S.B. 193 ([Exhibit I](#)).

RICHARD CLARK (Teacher, Social Studies Department Chair and WTP Coordinator, Reno High School, Washoe County School District):
It is my great honor and pleasure to endorse S.B. 193. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)). By providing training and resources, more teachers and more students—especially in the rural areas—will be able to experience this incredible program.

MARC PICKER (Co-President, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement; Cochair State Bar of Nevada's We the People Committee):
I am here in support of S.B. 193 and have provided written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).

THE HONORABLE ELISSA CADISH (Justice, Nevada Supreme Court; Cochair State Bar of Nevada's We the People Committee; Board Member, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement):
I am here to speak in support of S.B. 193. I have also been authorized by my colleagues, Chief Justice Mark Gibbons and Justice James Hardesty, to express their support for the bill as well. I have been involved with WTP for nearly 30 years since I first volunteered to judge in 1989. It is an amazing program for government and civics education. Rather than teaching the students to memorize facts and dates, the curriculum focuses on the thinking and principles behind the Constitution, so the students actually understand why and how this came to be our governing document. They learn to apply those principles to modern-day issues and current events. They learn to think critically about these issues, develop their own informed opinions based on principles and evidence, and express differences of opinion in a constructive way. Many of these students go on to pursue careers in law or government. More importantly, each and every one of them leaves as an informed citizen with the skills and enthusiasm to be educated voters, jurors and members of our community.

With the elimination of federal funding for the program in 2011 and the State Bar's reduction of its financial support, we have been working hard to find alternative sources of reliable funding to ensure WTP continues. The funding called for in this bill would enable us to continue successfully running this program over the next biennium and ensure that this program continues to create an educated citizenry for the State of Nevada.

SENATOR DENIS:

How many schools will be able to participate with the financial support proposed?

MR. PICKER:

Currently, we have more than 50 high schools throughout the State. We also have approximately 75 elementary schools in Washoe County, Clark County and the rural counties. There are only about 15 middle schools at this point. Those numbers are Statewide. We also have participating schools in Churchill County, Lyon County and Nye County. The funding would allow us to maintain the program at the current level and reinvigorate subsidizing travel for those school competitions that are held in either Las Vegas or Reno. We have trained teachers in Elko that are unable to participate in the program because of the long distance.

SENATOR DENIS:

Does this give the opportunity to expand the program to schools that do not currently have it?

MR. PICKER:

It does. It will allow us to keep the current level, that has actually dropped some, and expand WTP to more of the State.

PETER GREMA:

I am an alumnus of WTP. Three weeks ago, our Nation celebrated 230 years since the beginning of our constitutional government's operation. Since 1987, more than 30 million students have participated in the WTP program which brings to life the Constitution in an interactive course designed for elementary, middle and high school students.

I am here to share my support of S.B. 193 which seeks to provide \$175,000 over the next two years. As an alumnus of the program, I have

unique insight. I can describe both its immediate benefits and how it has helped me thus far as a first-year student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Last year, I participated in the WTP program at West Career and Technical Academy (WCTA). Not only did the program teach me about the foundations of our government and prepare me for competition, but I was also more prepared for the advanced placement government exam and saw a notable improvement in the quality of my writing. I also developed research and team working skills and discovered a newfound sense of patriotism. Today, as a UNLV student, my experience with WTP has helped me excel in public speaking classes and transition to public policy research even though I am a business student. Without WTP, I would not have the courage to stand before you and testify today.

In closing, WTP provides an amazing experience, and I feel that it has prepared me for more than just an exam. It has prepared me for a life of civic engagement. With the passage of S.B. 193, WTP will continue to prepare Nevada students for the challenges and opportunities in preserving our Constitution.

LAUREN ANTEN (West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District):

I support S.B. 193 because doing so supports the future of active civic engagement in our community. This program has taught me many things; the most important being how to argue academically and hold my own in a conversation amongst adults. I feel truly intelligent about my Country and its political issues because of WTP. This program has even inspired my career choice, as I will be pursuing a political science major when I begin college this fall. Defunding this program would be detrimental in inspiring future generations to participate in our government which is an issue we cannot afford to risk.

BLAKE EECKLOR (Anthony Saville Middle School, Clark County School District):

I am here in support of S.B. 193. In this program, we learned about the various types of freedom: religion, speech and the press. We also learned different aspects of government.

MAKAYLA WONG (Anthony Saville Middle School, Clark County School District):

In addition to learning about the U.S. government and Constitution, we learned teamwork building skills. Any program or presentation can provide these skills to

students, but the WTP program specifically gives life scenarios that all students can benefit from.

MS. EECKLOR:

Building upon Ms. Wong's statement about teamwork, my team learned that if one or two people did not fully fulfill their portion of their presentation or slacked off, the entire assignment fell apart or was not as good as it could have been. Through the WTP program, my team learned that teamwork is everything. It is a valuable skill to have in the future.

MS. WONG:

Thanks to the program, students will be able to carry on long into the future about U.S. history. Any student, like Ms. Eecklor or myself, may be able to be President of the U.S. due to this program.

ELISA MARTINEZ (Ralph Cadwallader Middle School, Clark County School District):
I am an eighth grader at Ralph Cadwallader Middle School. Before I go to school today, I am here to testify in full support of S.B. 193 on behalf of my friends and future leaders of this Country. In 2015, I met Senator Yvanna Cancela and shared my wish for more civic engagement classes in my school. She advised me to talk to my principal. Thanks to her advice, I spoke to my principal and my school added WTP as an elective.

It was a dream come true for me and many friends. This class provides an opportunity to learn about our government laws. The WTP class also provides a space for many others like me that dream of becoming senators like Senator Cancela to bring change and represent our communities. Due to budget reductions, our class was cut just a few weeks later. We never got the chance to visit City Hall or offices of elected officials like we had planned in our class. Our teacher encouraged us to never give up.

My classmates and I felt left out, because despite meeting with the principal and collecting signatures from classmates, we were not able to save our class. My friends come to me when they want to start a petition or complaint about the school. They recently cut our choir program in the middle of the school year. They see me as a leader because of my mom; she is the Director of Mi Familia Vota. I have access to meet elected officials.

All students should be leaders. Classes like WTP allow us become them. It is important that students learn the importance of being civically engaged as you are educating voters and bettering citizens and future leaders. One day, I will become the President of the U.S. and I will make sure learning about the government, laws and history is not an option for students. In the meantime, the future lies in your hands. Please support S.B. 193.

IAN STURTZ (Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School District):
I am in support of S.B. 193. To differ from some of my colleagues, I wish to demonstrate why this class is helpful by telling a quick story. About a year ago, I was invited on a trip coordinated by my school to become part of an exchange program with a high school in Austria. I was fortunate enough to be paired with a very intelligent girl. In one of our first conversations, she asked me about my Country. I knew what I had learned in history class: topics like the Revolutionary War, Westward Expansion, Land of the Free and Home of the Brave. Although I had gone through over a decade of education including several honor and advanced placement classes, I was unable to answer some of the specific questions that she asked. Even some of the broad questions about how our government worked, I could not answer. Most Americans do not know the answer to that question.

Almost no one knows about the 9th Amendment to the Constitution which literally gives access to an uncountable number of rights; these are rights not explicitly listed in the Constitution. This is why we need classes like WTP, classes in which the curriculum does not just come out of a textbook. Programs that involve group discussions, fun and engaging competitions and things that will make even the most obscure parts of the government memorable and practical. I believe this class is worth the investment because these are things that everyone in our Country—especially the youth that have the power to perfect it—needs to know. Because of these reasons, I urge your support for S.B. 193.

MANDY MACKKENZIE (Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School District):
I am in favor of S.B. 193. Not only does this class go into depth regarding the Constitution and how and why our government works, it is also an inspiration to many students to be involved in their government. It gives them a voice. Within our class setting, there is a safe space to share your opinion and your voice with other students in a civil manner. You are able to learn different ways to

express your ideas and opinions. We are able to be involved in our community. We are working on an informed action project within our class right now where we go out into our community, and we make a difference. This inspires many students. This program has inspired me to be involved with my community and my government and to pursue law. Without this class, I would not have had this opportunity to sit before you today requesting your support to fund this program.

ARIADNA CARMONA (Robert McQueen High School, Washoe County School District):

I am in support of S.B. 193. The WTP program is not your traditional government class where you show up to class, take notes, go home, read a chapter out of the textbook and get ready for a quiz based on what you read the night before. This class allows you to understand what you are learning in class and apply it to real-life situations. This class allows interactions with my classmates and my community that I have never had in any other high school class. Of course, you get to have some debates with classmates who have completely opposite opinions and views. We listen to each other and our different viewpoints. We have learned about landmark court cases such as *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), where the Supreme Court discussed the constitutionality of laws that made it harder to get abortions. With this being such a small class, it is much easier to understand and follow along with exactly what is being taught. It does not matter how you learn, because this class ensures that your learning needs are met to further understand the supreme law of the land.

Whether you learn by reading in your textbook—which is yours to keep and you can write and take all the notes you want in it—or in class discussions where everyone participates and shares their views on controversial topics, you are always learning. For me, social studies has always been a difficult subject. The way this class is taught allows me to understand the Country, how it is run, who is in charge and where it all came from. It is all making sense. I want those kids that struggle like me to understand what the Constitution is really about and to start understanding more about the Country that we live in.

MILTON HYAMS (Incline High School, Washoe County School District):

I am a teacher at Incline High School, and I have taught the WTP program for 23 years. I am also an alumnus of the WTP program. To expedite the speakers, I would like to point out those individuals that are here and letters of support

have been submitted ([Exhibit L](#)). Everyone that is an alumni of the WTP program, please stand up. Please stand up if you are a current student of the WTP program. Finally, please indicate if you are here for additional support for the WTP program. (Numerous individuals in each category indicated their presence). Having taught the program for 23 years and being impacted by it personally in 1987, there is not a better use of our funds to support students.

DOUG GOODMAN (Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform): You have seen and heard the reasons and benefits for this program. This is a small appropriation that has major benefits not only for our State but for our cities, counties and Nation. I hope you will agree.

PAUL MATTEONI (Incoming President, State Bar of Nevada):

I come before you as the incoming president of the State Bar of Nevada. Our Executive Committee and the Board of Governors, along with the Supreme Court as discussed by Justice Cadish, have been long-time supporters of the WTP program. Justice Cadish and Mr. Picker sit as cochairs for the WTP program for the State Bar of Nevada. We will continue to support that program. Through our many meetings leading up to this hearing, we have talked about our ongoing ability to support advertising, the need for judges for the WTP competition and to provide State Bar staffing to assist their program. On behalf of the State Bar of Nevada, it is very important that the Committee realize we are 100 percent behind S.B. 193 and we ask for your support.

ANDY MACKAY:

I am here as an individual and proud alumnus of the WTP program. I am also a volunteer judge and a board member of the Center for Civic Engagement. I wholeheartedly respectfully request that the Committee consider and approve this bill. As you can tell from the young individuals that have presented here in Carson City and in Las Vegas, this program is literally life changing. This will enable us to not only maintain but expand the program.

BEAU OSTER (Reno High School, Washoe County School District):

I am currently in the WTP program, and on behalf of the program, I would like to share how it has impacted me personally. When I began this program, my understanding about the importance of issues surrounding our government was dismal. This program has taught me the importance of traditional and institutional disputes and their effects on our democratic republic. It gave me the tools to understand and make deeper connections between the

consequences and effects of major issues in our Country. Without this program, I would not be able to fully understand today's political climate and, more importantly, my role as a citizen in society. Funding towards this program will ensure the youth of tomorrow understand their civic duties.

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association):

I am here in support of this very important bill. Senate Bill 193 will provide an investment in professional development that is always appreciated. All of the positives have already been celebrated by our students, and I will give the time to the students to continue that celebration.

MIRA KHOSLA:

I am a current member of the WTP program. I have always had strong views in regard to politics and social issues. Through WTP, I have a deeper understanding of many of today's issues. I have gained many invaluable skills, like researching issues and realizing that there are multiple sides to every story. I can also discuss issues of today with those that have differing views and backgrounds. The most important lesson that I have learned is that every person has their own opinions and views, but that is what makes our government and Country so amazing. It does not have to be what keeps us so divided.

MACKAYLA SHULTZ:

I am a participant in WTP. There is a necessity for civic classes that inform and teach each generation. My background would make me an unlikely person to be speaking here today; I took seven years of speech therapy and felt the weight of a silenced voice. Now this class has given me the ability to use my voice to engage in civic discourse. The WTP program has individuals from different walks of life, listening to each other and finding the best solutions for issues. The next generation must be educated in civic discourse, and WTP provides a voice to everyone.

JULIE CARDINALI (Reno High School, Washoe County School District):

I am a senior at Reno High School in support of S.B. 193. In less than a year, WTP has taught me more than any other class. The program taught me how to be quick on my feet, truly work with a team and speak publically. Most importantly, WTP has shown me how much one average citizen can impact legislation. Before WTP, I would never have thought of this building as "the people's building." Understanding government is the key to a successful

republic. Civic education breeds civic engagement. Without WTP, I would not have achieved any of this.

REILLY HOGAN (Reno High School, Washoe County School District):

I am in support of S.B. 193. The WTP program has caused me to fall in love with Congress and the legislative process. Before I entered this class, I had absolutely no idea how our laws were created and enforced. In speaking to you today and participating in this process, I have never felt more connected to our government. When I am of age, I plan to run for the Nevada State Assembly and eventually compete for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. The program has shown me the importance of lawmakers who actually care about and work toward making comprehensive legislation, and I want to be a legislator.

ADAM ESRIG (West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District):

I am a senior at WCTA in the WTP program. As we have seen today, there are unlimited benefits to this program. From personal experience, I met 2 individuals in WTP that were in unit 3 with me, and we discussed the fundamentals of change within American government. We came from different religious and ethical backgrounds, and the program has contributed to an immense respect for not only the people of our Nation but our government leaders. It is essential that this program is funded; it provides an educated body of students and incoming members of society essential to the Nation's continuation. I fully support S.B. 193.

PARKER SAMUELSON (West Career and Technical Academy, Clark County School District):

I am a current WTP student. I support S.B. 193, because WTP supports the culture and retention of our youth in Nevada. We often contemplate the lack of students that stay in Nevada, and this is a program that will bring us our next senators, mayors, activists and Congress people. We must not cut the funding on something so vital to the future of Nevada. If we want to keep our youth, we must provide them with the resources they desire.

SAHA SALAH:

I am in favor of S.B. 193. I have grown up as a Muslim-American. I was always told to keep my head down because of the danger of peoples' views that were

against my beliefs. This class has given me a sense of identity and understanding of my equal opportunities. I would not change that for the world.

GEORGIA LEELAND (Reno High School, Washoe County School District):

I am a senior at Reno High School currently participating in the WTP program. I walked into the class not knowing much about our government. A side of me that I was previously oblivious to has been awakened. I have become passionate about things that I did not even know about six months ago. It is so meaningful; we do not just learn, we use that knowledge. Raising nearly \$80,000 in two months is nearly impossible. Our teacher already sacrifices enough just preparing us. Please fund S.B. 193, because it is important to our future.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

I do not see anyone else coming forward for support. There is no one present to testify in opposition or neutral. Senator Woodhouse may provide concluding remarks.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I encourage your support of S.B. 193. There are not any remarks I can provide at this point that can measure against what our students and teachers have said today. They have truly told you the story of why WTP is important. This is an opportunity for the State of Nevada to support our young people as informed and educated citizens. They have shown that to you today and there are scores of other students that could not be here that would tell you the same thing. Additional letters of support have been submitted ([Exhibit M](#)).

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 193 and open the hearing on S.B. 102 which provides an appropriation for funding the participation of certain students who participate through the Western Regional Education Compact.

SENATE BILL 102: Makes an appropriation for funding the participation of certain students who participate through the Western Regional Education Compact. (BDR S-98)

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I am representing Senate District 5 in Clark County, and I am here to present S.B. 102. As a member of the Senate Health and Human Services Committee

during the 2013 and 2015 Sessions, I participated in discussions related to Alzheimer's disease as well as other forms of dementia. I realized that this was an issue requiring much deeper analysis. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit N](#)) describing S.B. 102. I have included background information on S.B. No. 121 of the 2017 Session and the resulting interim study that influenced S.B. 102.

Former Senator Valerie Weiner was one of the individuals that spoke to our study committee. Her testimony will be read into the record by Senator Denis. The "January 2019 Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease Annual Report" ([Exhibit O](#)) has been submitted for the record.

SENATOR DENIS:

As mentioned, I will be reading former Senator Valier Weiner's written testimony. She has also submitted the "2019 State Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease" ([Exhibit P](#)).

Mr. Vice Chair and members of the Senate Committee, for the record I am Senator Valerie Wiener, retired. I appear before you today as chair of our State's Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, that I will refer to as TFAD, in support of S.B. 102. With permission of the Vice Chair, I would like to explain TFAD's history in supporting the training of APRNs which was advanced practice registered nurses in the treatment and understanding of the special needs of elderly persons. TFAD's particular focus relating to APRNs involves the care of those persons who 1.) have been diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or another form of dementia and 2.) live in rural or frontier Nevada.

To add a bit of perspective to the impact of Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia, I would like to share a few statistics. Approximately 50 forms of dementia have been identified. Alzheimer's disease is just one form of dementia and comprises about 70 percent of all dementia diagnoses. Currently, 1 in 9 people over the age of 65 has Alzheimer's disease; in Nevada, this translates to about 45,000 people. The number of people diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or another form of dementia has increased 130 percent since 2000.

According to current trends, with the nearly 20 percent anticipated growth in the next 5 years, and 56 percent growth in the next 10 years, the Nevada numbers will climb to 64,000 people by 2025. Nationally, Nevada has the second highest rate of growth for this disease, at 64 percent. Since the formation of the original ACR10 Task Force in 2012, TFAD has made a commitment to surpass the requirements of statute by meeting 6 times each year, not 4, and to update the State's plan every 2 years, not just as needed which is the statutory requirement. The recommendation in the State Plan comprises four categorical areas: access to services, quality of care, quality of life and public awareness.

In each State Plan to address Alzheimer's disease—in 2013, 2015, 2017 and 2019—TFAD has included important recommendations about access to services. The "2019 State Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease," which Governor Steve Sisolak and Legislators received on February 1st, includes a new recommendation that complements the intention and substance of S.B. 102. Recommendation No. 6 also supports the highest level of implementation.

Members of the Committee, you have been provided with a copy of the 2019 State Plan to address Alzheimer's disease. At this time, I would invite you to turn to the Access to Services Section, Recommendation No. 6 starting on page 7. In the background subsection, you will see that in its first State Plan in 2013, TFAD was committed to expanding APRN services, particularly as such care relates to persons with Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia in rural and frontier Nevada. In 2013, the Legislature passed the law to define and increase opportunities for APRNs.

With this new law, TFAD retired its recommendation to the appendix in 2015's State Plan. However, though Nevada's APRN licenses have grown substantially, the rural and frontiers of our State continue to experience substantial shortages in this kind of essential care. Therefore, TFAD determines that a new incentive to respond to this particular APRN shortage could address this need.

Recommendation No. 6 of the 2019 State Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease supports the establishment of a State match program between the State Department of Health and Human Services collaborating with the State Board of Nursing and federal partners. This match program would address the State's health provider shortage in rural and frontier communities. Match money, which could be offered as loans or scholarship, could be made available to APRNs who commit to the specified loan or scholarship terms and required service provisions as they relate to Nevada health care services to underserved rural and frontier areas in Nevada.

Again, TFAD's intention is to expand APRNs professional service to the neediest senior population, particularly those persons with Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia, who cannot access care in rural and frontier Nevada. TFAD strongly believes, as included in this recommendation, that persons with Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia, should have access to effective and essential healthcare and not be deprived of such care because they live in rural and frontier Nevada. Mr. Vice Chair and members of the Committee, thank you for allowing me to testify today. I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to explain TDAD's work and its ongoing commitment to the people of Nevada. We are proud and privileged to shine a light on how all of us can serve the needs of those in our State who are directly or indirectly effected by Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia. Thank you.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Where in the educational lifecycle would a nurse move into one of these programs? Are they already at a registered nurse (RN) stage, and then they would go into an advanced practice program outside of the State? Do they specialize in geriatrics, or is it a general program?

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I have family experience with this. My sister was a RN and she later obtained her Master's degree and became an APRN. In this instance, these additional ten positions would be for APRNs to enter the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) program.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are the advanced practice programs, the Master's programs, specifically tailored to areas of practice? Would someone specialize in pediatrics, geriatrics or something along those lines? The bill states it has to be in this specific area, but I do not know what the programs are like.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

I do not have an answer, but I will find out. My experience with my sister was a number of years ago, so we will double check with our schools of medicine and WICHE.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

It appears WICHE is in the audience. Please come forward for the question.

ARSENIO ESCUDERO (Director, Nevada State Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education):

I can assist with the RN to APRN program. The APRN does specialize in various fields, but it has not been narrowed down to this specific criteria. We would have to look at it differently when we review applications.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How many eligible programs do you think would be available within the WICHE network?

MR. ESCUDERO:

Currently, we have 17 slots that are filled. Nine of them are for new students, and eight are for continuing students.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How many programs in other States would meet the criteria of having the specialty on geriatrics?

MR. ESCUDERO:

I do not have that information.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do we know if there is capacity? If we fund the slots, will we actually be able to get people into the programs?

MR. ESCUDERO:

I would think so, because there are many participating schools that offer the program.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are the programs specific to geriatrics, though?

MR. ESCUDERO:

I will have to get more information and get back to you.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

That is the information that we need to know. Our programs are at capacity. Are other State's geriatric programs also at capacity? Will we actually be able to place people?

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

Seeing no one wishing to speak in support, opposition or neutral for S.B. 102, we will go to closing remarks.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

Thank you to the Committee to Study the Needs Related to the Behavioral and Cognitive Care of Older Persons (Interim Studies Committee), including Senator Goicoechea. We found a lot of information from people who testified before us about the extreme needs that Nevada has, especially in terms of our elderly population, dealing with these kind of behavioral and cognitive issues. The time is now to start addressing the issue. This bill addresses the concerns of the caregivers and those individuals that are suffering from some of these disorders.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

We will close the hearing for S.B. 102, and Chair Woodhouse will resume the meeting.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The next bill is S.B. 29 which makes changes to unarmed combat.

SENATE BILL 29: Makes various changes relating to unarmed combat.
(BDR 41-363)

ANTHONY A. MARNEL III (Chair, Nevada State Athletic Commission, Nevada Department of Business and Industry):

Senate Bill 29 is essentially a cleanup bill from prior legislative periods focusing on three main subjects: regulation flexibility within different disciplines of unarmed combat, to ensure health and safety of the fighters as the sport has evolved and continues to evolve; confidentiality around the drug program and to better the program put in place approximately three years ago; reimbursement for different Athletic Commission expenses.

A document titled the "SB29 Section-by-Section Outline" has been provided ([Exhibit Q](#)). Sections 3, 8, 11, 13 and 14 are the primary areas of focus. Currently, the Nevada State Athletic Commission (NSAC) is a self-funded agency. Through ticket revenue and the tax on ticket revenue, we generate \$4 million to \$6 million annually to the General Fund. None of the changes proposed in this bill will have any effect on the General Fund. The mechanisms for reimbursement for different types of events are the main topic. It will allow us to recapture some of the expenses that we have to outlay for different types of events in the evolution of disciplines of unarmed combat.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Can you explain the exemption of the transfer of funds to the General Fund, such as investigatory fees, in section 3? Also, please provide the mechanism by which you get reimbursement. Are the funds deposited into the General Fund?

BOB BENNETT (Executive Director, Nevada State Athletic Commission, Nevada Department of Business and Industry):

Section 3 is basically a comprehensive overview of the specific sections—those being sections 8, 9, 13 and 14. It specifically states in section 8 that if an applicant organization is to perform drug testing which the NSAC must investigate, then we would be able to be reimbursed for those costs. Those costs are currently paid out of our current budget which is 2 percent of the sales tax of the tickets.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Payments that you currently collect from the licensees are deposited into the General Fund and then you apply for reimbursement? Is that how it works?

MR. BENNETT:

No. Currently, it comes strictly from our budget which is derived from 2 percent of the sales tax on tickets which has no effect on the General Fund. The General Fund receives 6 percent. In other words, the 8 percent tax is split with 25 percent to the NSAC and 75 percent to the General Fund.

For example, if Dana White had a Tuesday Night Fight and there were no tickets sold, then there would be no revenue from the sales tax on tickets. However, the State would still receive the license fees. In a Dana White Tuesday Night Fight, there may be 5 fights—10 fighters, 3 corners per fighter—which would be 40 license fees and the permit fee of \$100. We would like to receive reimbursement for staff costs and other certain costs that we incur. Approval of this bill would result in the General Fund still receiving those funds, and we would begin receiving reimbursement to fund our efforts toward the events.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

That is just one example. There are other fees that you charge. Are they newly authorized within this bill? Section 3 has many cross-referenced sections, investigatory work for licensees for example. Is that a new fee, or is it an existing fee?

MR. MARNEL:

There is not currently a method for reimbursement. We incur the cost, but we are unable to be reimbursed. That is the general overview of all of the different fees that we are incurring to either investigate or to put on Dana White Tuesday Night Fights. It is a neutral event for us with this new bill to be able to pass the cost on to the promoter or the fighters, similar to the Nevada Gaming Control Board.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Ultimately, you are already doing this work and funding it out of your current budget. This allows you to collect fees on top of it. Do you have a revenue projection?

MR. MARNEL:

It is not fees; it is a mechanism to get reimbursed that currently does not exist.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:
You will bill them for actual costs accrued?

MR. MARNEL:
Yes.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:
You are already doing the work out of your general operating budget currently. Do you have an estimate as to how much additional revenue you would bring in based on the reimbursement for these different exemptions?

MR. BENNETT:
We are basically putting on an event that is three quarters of a normal event and which would normally be paid for. Thus, we are incurring costs that are after the normal working hours. Tuesday Night Fights for the Ultimate Fighting Championship would run anywhere from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Thus, there is a litany of administrative requirements requested of us to prepare for this event. In essence, we would be receiving 2 percent of those ticket sales. However, we are not because there are not tickets sold, and we are unable to recover those costs. The total would be approximately \$300 per night; 5 ballots on the card would generate \$3,000.

MR. MARNEL:
We cannot give you an estimate, because we do not know how many of these will come our way on an annual basis. The total reimbursement would be based on the number of fights and is likely to be under \$50,000 per year. The evolution of the industry is such that more closed filmed events for later broadcasting are occurring. Therefore, there is no ticket revenue, but regulation is still required. Depending on the number of ballots per event, it costs us about \$300 per ballot. As it pertains to the reimbursement for drug testing, it would depend on how many fights will happen and how many bout agreements there are. There is really no true way to estimate it. Every reimbursable drug testing program that we put forward is different; some are local, others are international or used by different agencies to do the testing and the collection. It is a strict cost reimbursement.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:
Each of these exemptions, aside from the drug testing, is specifically for these bouts that are nonticketed?

MR. MARNEL:

Yes. That is correct.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one coming forward for support, opposition or neutral to the bill, we will close the hearing on S.B. 29 and open the hearing on S.B. 205.

SENATE BILL 205: Requires the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management of the Department of Administration to create a pilot program to award grants of money to certain governmental and nonprofit organizations. (BDR S-807)

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

This Legislative Session, I have introduced two measures—S.B. 205 and S.B. 206—that will assist Nevada in obtaining much needed federal grants as well as make the grant acceptance process much more efficient. Senate Bill 205 creates a pilot program to award grants of money to certain entities to be used to provide matching funds that are required as a condition of a federal grant and is presented today. My written testimony has been submitted ([Exhibit R](#)). I also have Helen Foley here to provide additional information.

SENATE BILL 206: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (BDR 31-806)

HELEN FOLEY (President, Public Affairs, Faiss Foley Warren; Nevada Community Foundation):

Since 2015, the Nevada Community Foundation has been actively supporting legislation focused on improving Nevada's federal grant capacity and competitiveness. Former Senator Harry Reid has been talking for years about what is wrong with Nevada that we cannot receive federal grants. There is a package of bills this Session that go together to work on this. Hats off to the Nevada Grants Council and the recommendations provided in the "Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance 2018 Annual Report" ([Exhibit S](#)).

Currently, we are in 49th place; we were in 51st place, even behind Guam. If we could move up just 1 more point, to 48th place, we could obtain approximately \$250 million from the federal government and reap benefits like Arizona has done by increasing their state by 10 points. Obtaining these federal grants is a mixture of many items: cooperation with the Legislative Counsel

Bureau, the Governor's Office of Finance and all of the Nevada State agencies. The agencies have to all understand how to prepare good grant applications.

The Nevada Department of Administration, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management (Nevada Grants Office) does a great job, but they have some staffing challenges to be filled and additional staff would be preferred, including in southern Nevada. That request will come later in the Session. If we corrected these problems, we could get much needed programs in the areas of education, workforce development, affordable housing, healthcare, transportation, income security, community development and environmental protection. If we do nothing, we will maintain our current situation.

One additional challenge is a rule that states that any funding that is received must result in a reduction of General Fund appropriations. We need to ensure that we do not lose out on additional dollars; it is a disincentive for State agencies to apply for grants if they know the funding will be eliminated. This is probably more of a case-by-case basis as I understand it from conversations with Mark Krmpotic.

Senate Bill 205 is a good opportunity for State agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations and others to apply for these grants and work more closely with the Nevada Grants Office. They will not get the funding if they do not get the grant, but oftentimes a good return is generated. For example, a federal grant may provide \$100,000, but the grantee must contribute \$25,000; that is a good investment.

This is a pilot program and it expires in September 2021. We will have an opportunity to see how it works and move on from there. This legislation for a small amount of money can make a large difference with Nevada's ability to obtain federal grants. Additional information is provided with my written testimony ([Exhibit T](#)).

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Many federal grants are on a multiyear cycle, and this appropriation is for two years only. Does it prohibit any agency from applying for a multiyear grant if they are going to use this for match since they will not be able to have it for out years?

JoVON SOTAK (Executive Grant Analyst, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management, Nevada Department of Administration):

I do not see that as being prohibitive for a grant. The way most grants work is during the application process, the applicant must ascertain and provide assurances of where the grant is coming from. As a condition of award for that grant, the match is provided upfront.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If the match requirement is each year for five years, they would not be able to expend those General Fund dollars for years three, four and five.

Ms. SOTAK:

That is correct. We would have to look at each on a case-by-case basis, especially for long-term awards. One of the considerations is that the funds must be expended by September 2021. Even for a shorter-term grant that was awarded in March 2021, we would have to ensure that we could process the match prior to September 2021. It actually is a smaller period of time than a calendar year or biennium would suggest.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I appreciate that. It was going to be my next question as State and federal years do not always match up. The process for receiving funds may be difficult in the second year of the biennium.

Would local governments be able to use this to replace existing matching funds for federal grants? For example, public safety agencies often struggle to find local matching funds. If they are using some local funds now, would the bill allow them to supplant those dollars to leverage existing grants?

Ms. SOTAK:

I will be discussing this topic as part of my presentation "SB205: Federal Grant Matching Funds Pilot Program" ([Exhibit U](#)). One of the additional criterion is limiting the awards to discretionary funding rather than formula funding. Discretionary dollars are the smaller pool of federal grants that are competitive rather than mandatory funding such as formula grants. By limiting this program to discretionary funding, it will allow local governments to apply specifically for discretionary grants but not to replace the match funds that they may be using for formula dollars. If we were to match the formula dollar mandatory matching funds, we actually would not increase the number of grant dollars in the State.

By limiting this program to discretionary funding, it goes with the Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance's (Grants Council) recommendation to actually increase grant funding in Nevada.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is this discretionary funding that they are not already receiving?

Ms. SOTAK:

Yes. That is correct.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

In each year of the biennium, you have identified \$2.5 million. What did you base those amounts on?

Ms. FOLEY:

The Grants Council had extensive meetings to determine that number. When Mr. John Ritter speaks, he will be able to address that.

Ms. SOTAK:

I appreciate the opportunity to make this presentation and share a bit of information about federal grants, describe how the Nevada Grants Office fits in the mix and share some information about S.B. 205—the pilot program for federal matching funds. Surveyed grant professionals reported that the fund would need to be large enough to have an impact for some of those larger grants; that is where the \$5 million—\$2.5 million per year—figures were derived. An additional proposal, S.B. 96, creates a matching funds grant program to secure federal grants specifically related to public lands. My written testimony has been provided ([Exhibit V](#)).

SENATE BILL 96: Creates a grant program to award grants of money to certain organizations applying for federal funds to finance certain projects related to public lands. (BDR 26-510)

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

We have received the letter of support from Shelley Hendren, Administrator, Rehabilitation Division of the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation ([Exhibit W](#)) about its prospect of leveraging the Vocational Rehabilitation program. Was there any consideration given to the opportunity to

draw down new grants? Would you be interested in restricting this to new programs rather than doing more of what we are already doing?

Ms. SOTAK:

We did not have that specific conversation during committee meetings. In terms of the priority areas, that is somewhat reflected. The first one is expanding services to constituents. The second piece is that if an organization was already applying for a matching grant, or already receiving a grant that required matching funds, the requirement that all other possible sources of match be unavailable would be considered. That would likely lead to conversations about why this pool of funds would need to be used.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

If it is a pilot program, do you expect to hire a contract employee for your office?

Ms. SOTAK:

The S.B. 205 fiscal note identifies one management analyst position that would likely be an unclassified position within State service. We did not speak specifically about it being a contractor. We would need someone with experience setting up and executing a program, as this is a function that our office currently does not do.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Will you be informing candidates that if we do not extend the pilot program, the position could be eliminated in two years?

Ms. SOTAK:

That is correct.

JOHN RITTER (Chair, Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance):

My journey started 10 years ago because Nevada was 51st out of 50 States, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, in federal grant competitiveness. The Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance has worked with stakeholders and collaboratively implemented structural elements of states that did well securing federal grants. These included establishing the Nevada Grants Office and receiving additional funding in the last two sessions, funding a grants and management system and establishing the Grants Council. My written testimony has been submitted ([Exhibit X](#)).

JONAS PETERSON (Chief Executive Officer, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):
Our organization is in support of S.B. 205. As a State, it is no secret that we lag behind other states in terms of getting our fair share of federal grants. One of the common obstacles for nonprofit organizations is the inability to provide matching funds. This pilot program would help overcome this obstacle and build capacity for more nonprofit agencies to pursue and receive federal funding. We encourage your support.

MAUREEN SHAFER (Executive Director, Council for a Better Nevada):
I am testifying on behalf of the Council for a Better Nevada in support of S.B. 205. I represent chief executive officers and leaders from the private, labor and philanthropic sectors who focus their attention on issues that will impact a higher quality of life for all Nevadans. Improving Nevada's federal grant revenue is a key strategy to funding programs and services that benefit all Nevadans.

It is also a powerful strategy in returning Nevadan's federal tax dollars to the State for local use and improvements. Sadly, Nevada does not receive its fair share of federal grant funds and has not for decades. The result is that the hundreds of millions of tax dollars paid by Nevadans every year to the federal government receive a disproportionately low benefit compared with residents of virtually every other state in the Country.

Fortunately, Nevada has been making slow but steady progress since 2011 when the Legislature and Governor Brian Sandoval created the Nevada Grants Office. The bill before you today builds on that progress by addressing a very specific barrier: the availability of matching funds required by some federal grants. This bill will give State agencies a much-needed tool to secure additional grant funding for the State and will result in each dollar invested by the State to be a significant multiplier for federal dollars.

The Council for a Better Nevada has been supporting legislation like this and budget enhancements targeted at increasing Nevada's federal grant funding since we learned about this crisis nearly a decade ago. In that time, we applaud the progressive steps the Legislature has taken to build a sustainable grant funding system. We urge your support for S.B. 205.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

How did you determine the amount of \$2.5 million for each year of the biennium?

MR. RITTER:

We need to accomplish this pilot program. We have been working on it for a couple of sessions. Nevada is always short on funds. One of the reasons is because the State does not do well securing federal grants. We considered many ideas concerning the amount of the matching funds. Many states put hundreds of millions of dollars into their matching funds. We decided that \$2.5 million per year would be enough to prove that we could generate a multiple return on that investment and that this amount was likely the most that we would be able to accomplish.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce):

The Chamber would like to offer support for S.B. 205. We are in agreement of the program as proposed in section 1. The Chamber has been supportive of these efforts though the 2015 and 2017 Sessions. It was also a priority that came out of the southern Nevada forum; our community is engaged on this issue. We believe that the more dollars that can be captured from the federal government to Nevada is a good thing for all Nevada residents.

MILES DICKSON (Chief of Staff, Nevada State Treasurer's Office):

We like the straightforwardness of S.B. 205. It provides an opportunity for the State, local governments and nonprofit entities to directly deal with one of the biggest reported barriers in a way that clearly will have a return on investment and transparency. From the State's perspective, if we put \$5 million in, we will have a track record of what \$5 million gets out. It becomes a really good opportunity to prove that this thing that is so often reported as a barrier is the barrier, and this is a way to solve it.

For 40 years, Nevada has been near the last of the pack. The result is that we have less funding to pay for programs, projects and services that can create opportunity and improve quality of life. Meanwhile, we are all still paying our federal taxes. We get a disproportionately low benefit as Nevada taxpayers and as residents of this State in the federal programs. We appreciate the Nevada Grants Office and the Grants Council's work in getting to the data side of this issue. Lots of surveying has been conducted, including a January forum hosted for several hundred grant professionals across the State. The specific data and

recommendations are appreciated for an issue that has plagued our State for a long time.

DOUG MARTIN (Second Vice President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts; Vice Chair, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District):

Conservation districts are experts in procuring grants and returning up to \$30 to \$1 with our grants. I have heard several times today that this is to apply to local government and nonprofit organizations. One of the items that I see is that S.B. 205 specifically applies to an agency, a county, a city or a town. I would suggest that "a conservation district as defined by NRS 548.032" be added or other wording to accomplish incorporating local governments. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit Y](#)). The Conservation Districts, the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District and I support the intent of this bill.

ERNIE ADLER (Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):

We have a similar comment to the last testifier. We strongly believe that federally recognized Indian tribes, bands, colonies or tribal organizations should be included in this process. Many times they are offered grants, and they do not have matching funds available. The grants could be for health care devices and the like which would serve the entire community. They do fit the criteria in that this is targeted as one of its goals to the rural communities and underserved communities. Many Indian tribes are underserved and in very rural communities. It would be appropriate to include them.

TIM RUBALD (Rubald and Associates; Nevada Association of Conservation Districts):

Today I am representing the Nevada Association of Conservation Districts, a group of all 28 conservation districts in Nevada. One conservation district or another covers every inch of the State. We are definitely in favor of the bill. We have kept our eyes on this issue for some time and worked to develop matching funds in various ways for federal grants. Many of the conservation districts do receive federal grants through a variety of federal entities. Since conservation districts are locally elected government, we would certainly request that we be added to that list.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I do not see anyone else to speak in support of S.B. 205 or in opposition. We will now hear anyone wishing to speak in neutral for S.B. 205.

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

Senate Bill 205 would potentially provide the Division's Vocational Rehabilitation program with matching funds for pilot projects to draw down federal Rehabilitation Act grant funds that would otherwise be unmatched and therefore reallocated to other states. As mentioned by Senator Kieckhefer, my written testimony, [Exhibit W](#), has been submitted for the record.

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

I am here to provide information on how the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) evaluates grant opportunities. As new grants come open, the first thing that we look at is whether or not it has a match requirement. Typically, at least on the public health side, we are predominately federally funded and we typically cannot apply. We were lucky in applying for a Nurse-Family Partnership Foundation grant, because we thought that it provided an in-kind opportunity for match. We were awarded the \$6 million grant which required a 66 percent match of which our county partner had come up with. Unfortunately, the grantor excluded the match because it was in-kind, and we had to return the bulk of the grant and could not have the ability to offer it. This Nurse-Family Partnership was a three-year award, and we may have been able to build it into our budget request for the next biennium. If the pilot was ongoing, we could ask for more years. It is really an opportunity to see if it makes us more successful going forward.

Another great opportunity that is ending shortly is the Health Information Technology (HIT) projects provided by for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. These grants are a 90/10 match. We have previously presented information about this to the Interim Finance Committee. This is a great opportunity for a short-term investment, and it is time ending, so it would not be a long-term commitment. We have passed on prior projects with HIT funding because we could not come up with the 10 percent match. These information technology (IT) investments are often a very large dollar amount for an initial infrastructure investment. For a \$1 million project, the State would only have to come up with \$100,000 of match.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Do we have anyone present from the Nevada Department of Administration to address the fiscal note? Can you address the costs that you identified in addition to the appropriation?

JENNI CARTWRIGHT (Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Nevada Department of Administration):

The fiscal note initially had the \$2.5 million General Fund appropriation per year that is already appropriated in the bill; it has been removed and the corrected version has been submitted. The revised amount on the fiscal note contains the cost for a management analyst I position and related expenditures. It is likely that the position will be unclassified as mentioned earlier; the cost of the unclassified role should be comparable to the management analyst I identified.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

I am hopeful that with the presentation and the information you have received, we can help Nevada access these much needed federal grants.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 205 and begin the hearing on S.B. 269 which makes a General Fund appropriation to expand the Statewide information and referral system concerning health, welfare, and human and social services provided in the State.

SENATE BILL 269: Makes an appropriation to expand the statewide information and referral system concerning health, welfare, human and social services provided in this State. (BDR S-109)

DENA SCHMIDT (Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):

During the interim, the DHHS Aging and Disability Services (ADSD) and Nevada 2-1-1 presented to the Interim Studies Committee described by Senator Woodhouse to study the needs related to behavioral and cognitive issues for older persons. One of the topics of interest that was also heard in public comment is that the community struggles to find information. When a person's family member or loved one is in need of long-term and support services, they do not know where to go until it is too late. They are in crisis mode before they reach out and then they do not know who to call. There is a struggle to get the information through a single point of entry.

The "No Wrong Door" concept is aimed at ensuring individuals and their families can make informed decisions about their long-term support needs and services. It is about transforming the system to help individuals explore the options available for their long-term support needs. Learning how to navigate programs and services as well as facilitating access to the public service programs when people are appropriately eligible for those is also a consideration.

Senate Bill 269 aims to support the efforts to create a single entry point using Nevada 2-1-1. This service provides information and referral to services. Nevada 2-1-1 connects individuals to service providers and our Nevada Care Connection Resource Centers (NCCRCs) when appropriate. The NCCRCs are supported through support individuals and their family members and caregivers through a person-centered process which is intended to be much broader than a formal assessment. This broad needs assessment is tied specifically to the individual person. The process results in a person-centered plan that includes strategies for the family and their caretakers to address the goals of the family.

Section 1 appropriates funding for the "No Wrong Door" initiatives and includes costs related to developing and implementing a coordinated IT infrastructure for easier access and the ability for agencies to share information across programs. It also reduces the burden on individuals accessing public service programs.

Appropriations are included to work with Nevada 2-1-1 to increase their referral and resource services and navigation. The IT infrastructure will include a "warm handoff." The current Nevada 2-1-1 does not have the capability to transfer a call, and this IT infrastructure will allow the individual calling to be transferred to another agency, keeping that person connected.

Staff to develop, monitor and implement training and a certification process for resource navigation is included with the appropriation. Finally, the increased demand for the resource centers is addressed with the appropriation. The bill is intended to fund these various infrastructure costs.

A lot of the Nevada 2-1-1 programs as well as the ADSD resource programs have had limited funding for years. While the concept has been there, and there has been support, there often has not been financial support to expand those opportunities and to improve the technology between the two systems. This is an effort to support those programs and improve both systems to improve access to information and referrals for long-term and support services.

Lastly, we are excited about the Navigator Program for certifying and training individuals to navigate the long-term support systems. Many of us who have been in this industry for an extended period of time have bits and pieces and know the system. If you have not been involved, there are so many complex programs and eligibility rules. A navigator certification program allows us to train a group of individuals to have all of that information. When people call, they will get the right information the first time and be referred to the right place at the right time for the right services.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone here in support of S.B. 269?

MICHELLE JOHNSON (Executive Director, Financial Guidance Center, Money Management International):

Our agency administers the Nevada 2-1-1 program. I would like to fully endorse the conversation that you just heard. The facts are many, and they all conclude that the appropriation has incredible benefit to promote health, welfare and human and social services. We urge approval.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one to testify in opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on S.B. 269. Our next order of business is committee organization. Mark Krmpotic will review the budget work session process, the budget Subcommittees and joint full Committees closing processes.

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

This presentation will reorient the members to the processes coming up in the next two months. We begin closing budgets in the General Government Subcommittees on March 28, 2019. Throughout the month of April and a good portion of May, the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Ways and Means Committee (money committees) will be conducting hearings to close budgets.

Thus far, there are four select work sessions that have been thus far identified to be conducted in April. The Subcommittees previously heard the DHHS Division of Child and Family Services budget with respect to the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. This will be heard as will the staffing identified with the DHHS Division of Health Care Finance and Policy to address fiscal issues

specific to the Medicaid program. The other work sessions are for the Department of Corrections population and housing projections along with increased staffing and capital improvement program projects with respect to the inflation factor included in the cost of projects for the upcoming biennium.

Normally, work sessions are scheduled for larger complex budget accounts that cannot be adequately reviewed in a single budget hearing. They focus on larger issues, and the items I previously mentioned are somewhat larger issues for the money committees to grapple with. The work sessions also provide direction to staff and provide further discussion by the subcommittees so if they wish to pursue different options, staff would be advised and allowed time to develop those options for closing.

The closing process will be the bulk of the process that the money committees will be involved with in the months of April and May. The Committee was provided a list at the first Senate Committee on Finance meeting on February 5, 2019, of budget accounts identified for a budget hearing or a staff closing. All budget accounts heard by the subcommittees or the full committee or identified for staff closing will be closed by the money committees in the upcoming months.

An example of a closing document from May 5, 2017, is provided from a General Government Subcommittees closing for the Department of Business and Industry budgets. The example is typical of what the committee members would see in closing budgets at the subcommittees. An example of a staff closing is also identified. Staff would have presented to the money committees last Session, and the overview will state that the subcommittees have not previously heard this budget followed by the budget account.

We identify major issues for the money committee members to make decisions on. Those major issues largely overlap with major issues identified during the hearings. There are also technical adjustments that Fiscal Division staff make, typically minor adjustments that include adjustments to quantity and prices, adjustments to cost allocations and corrections to budgets that do not include a policy decision or a significant funding decision. Subsequently, Fiscal staff seeks authority from the money committees to make technical adjustments to agency or budget account specific items such as cost allocations that involve a department cost allocation, not something that is undertaken on a Statewide basis.

This process begins on March 28, 2019, with some budget closings before the General Government Subcommittees and the full Committee closings begin on April 2, 2019. This is the date identified for the money committees to begin closing budgets on the 120-Day Legislative Calendar. We have beat that date by a few days.

The Fiscal staff develops the closing sheets and presents them to the joint subcommittee members. Subcommittee actions are normally considered one motion. However, the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means subcommittees may decide to close the budgets with different recommendations, and those recommendations are subsequently reconciled at a later date when the money committees meet in joint full Committee to resolve those differences.

As a reminder, subcommittee actions are considered a recommendation to the full committee. The full committee's action is considered the final action on the budget closing. Subcommittees may wish to issue letters of intent (LOI) to serve two purposes. First, to identify issues that the money committees may wish to receive reports on during the interim. Those reports are submitted to the Interim Finance Committee for review by the members. The LOI also provide guidance to agencies as to the intent of the money committees, with respect to funding or particular recommendation or issues that the money committees wish to see pursued through the appropriations that are approved during the Legislative Session.

Once the money committees act, the closing recommendations are final. The closing process culminates around the 18th of May. Subsequent to that date, once the budgets are closed, Fiscal staff begin preparing the major money bills to fund the operations of State government for the next two years. These bills include the Appropriations Act, Authorizations Act, Capital Improvement Project Bill, Education Funding Bill and Pay Bill.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no questions on the closing process, please proceed to the technical adjustments.

MR. KRMPOTIC:

I will read this verbatim and request that the Committee make a motion to provide this authority to Staff:

Certain items pertaining to global closing issues will not be decided until later in the closing process. In each of the budget accounts throughout State government, there are decision units that cannot be closed until the Committee closes certain budget accounts that allocate costs. This includes the decision unit M-100 Statewide Inflation that changes various rates to internal service agencies such as the Attorney General, the Division of Fleet Services within the Department of Administration, the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division, the State Public Works Division, the Division of Human Resource Management, vehicle insurance, purchasing assessment, property and contents insurance, employee bond and Statewide cost allocation.

Generally, these issues will be decided once the Committee closes certain budget accounts that allocate these costs. Further, global decision units that are impacted in this way include: decision units M-300 and M-106 which is a methodology change for information technology service rates and cost pools.

Therefore, Senate Fiscal staff requests the Committee grant staff authority to make technical adjustments to these line items in the budget accounts as they are closed. Staff generally requests the same authority to make adjustments to the payroll and personnel assessments, EITS allocations, purchasing assessments, Attorney General allocations, building rents, vehicle insurance, property and contents insurance and the Statewide cost allocation once they are finalized.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are the payroll adjustments specific to payroll, adjusting cost allocations, insurance rates and similar items or is it changes based on potential salary enhancements and cost-of-living adjustments (COLA)?

MR. KRMPOTIC:

In the case of COLAs, and with respect to the Governor's recommendation of the 3 percent COLA, those monies are appropriated to the salary adjustment accounts. Those salary adjustment accounts are subsequently allocated during the interim by the Board of Examiners assuming that the Legislature approves that funding. When the Pay Bill is drafted, there is transitory language included

that allows for the salaries of the unclassified positions to be increased based on whatever COLA the Legislature approves. There may be adjustments to salaries in the Pay Bill that are not tied to the COLA that would be an independent decision by the money committees.

There are various decision units and budget accounts that call for individual salary increases beyond what the Governor recommends for the COLA increase. Depending on what the money committees decide, staff would make those adjustments in those budget accounts since the salary adjustment funds are not intended to cover that.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will take a motion for Staff to make technical adjustments as necessary.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO ALLOW FISCAL STAFF TO MAKE
TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS REQUESTED BY MARK KRMPOTIC.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR
THE VOTE).

* * * * *

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The Chair wishes to initiate a bill draft request (BDR) for a General Fund appropriation in the amount of \$2 million to the Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for research, clinical studies, operations and education programs. (Later assigned as BDR S-1260.)

This appropriation is similar to the General Fund appropriation approved through S.B. No. 543 of the 79th Session. The BDR would also include General Fund appropriations of \$542,343 in fiscal year (FY) 2020 and \$542,343 in FY 2021 to the Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health for operations and educational programs to restore funding previously received by the Center for this person from the University of Nevada Reno School of Medicine.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO INITIATE A BDR TO MAKE APPROPRIATIONS FROM THE STATE GENERAL FUND FOR THE CLEVELAND CLINIC LOU RUVO CENTER FOR BRAIN HEALTH.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

We have four BDRs that require Committee introduction. The first is BDR S-728 which is an appropriation for \$1.5 million for the Home Delivered Meals Program within ASD.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-728: Revises provisions relating to certain programs of public assistance. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 443).

The appropriation is intended to establish rates of reimbursement of \$3.20 for congregate meals and home delivered meals. This is a Committee BDR.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-728.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

Next is BDR S-729. It includes appropriations of \$12 million in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to increase enrollment for the prekindergarten program by 1,500 pupils in each year of the biennium.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-729: Revises provisions relating to prekindergarten education programs. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 444).

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-729.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

Bill Draft Request 40-1205 relates to hazardous waste. It provides that permits for hazardous waste facilities may be issued for any period of not more than ten years and providing other matters properly relating thereto. This was identified as a budget implementation BDR.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 40-1205: Revises provisions relating to the renewal of permits for hazardous waste facilities. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 442).

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 40-1205.

SENATOR BROOKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

MR. KRMPOTIC:

Lastly, BDR 34-392 relates to education revising provisions relating to programs of distance education, establishing provisions relating to charter schools for distance education and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 34-392: Provides for the separate regulation of online charter schools. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 441).

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 34-392.

SENATOR GOICHOCHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED (SENATOR SETTELMAYER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

Remainder of page left intentionally blank. Signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 25, 2019
Page 46

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 10:54 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jennifer McEntee,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	10		Attendance Roster
S.B. 227	C	3	Senator Moises Denis	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	D	3	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	E	1	Kathleen Dickinson / Nevada Center for Civic Engagement	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	F	16	Kathleen Dickinson / Nevada Center for Civic Engagement	Letter of Support and Testimonials
S.B. 193	G	22	Kathleen Dickinson / Nevada Center for Civic Engagement	Reference Documents
S.B. 193	H	1	Avery Clark / Jesse Hall Elementary School	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	I	1	Adriane Casolari / Clark County School District	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	J	2	Richard Clark / Reno High School	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	K	4	Marc Picker / Nevada Center of Civic Engagement / State Bar of Nevada's We the People	Written Testimony
S.B. 193	L	12	Milton Hyams / Incline High School	Letters of Support
S.B. 193	M	8	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Letters of Support
S.B. 102	N	5	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Written Testimony
S.B. 102	O	8	Senator Joyce Woodhouse	Taskforce on Alzheimer's Disease Annual Report
S.B. 102	P	24	Senator Moises Denis	Nevada State Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease January 2019
S.B. 29	Q	2	Anthony A. Marnel III / Nevada State Athletic Commission	SB29 Section-by-Section Outline

S.B. 205	R	3	Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop	Written Testimony
S.B. 205	S	32	Helen Foley / Nevada Community Foundation	Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance 2018 Annual Report
S.B. 205	T	2	Helen Foley / Nevada Community Foundation	Written Testimony
S.B. 205	U	10	JoVon Sotak / Nevada Grants Office	SB 205: Federal Grant Matching Funds Pilot Program Presentation
S.B. 205	V	4	JoVon Sotak / Nevada Grants Office	Written Testimony
S.B. 205	W	1	Shelley Hendren / Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation	Written Testimony
S.B. 205	X	2	John Ritter / Nevada Advisory Council on Federal Assistance	Written Testimony
S.B. 205	Y	1	Doug Martin / Nevada Association of Conservation Districts	Written Testimony