

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eightieth Session  
April 11, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 8:13 a.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2019, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert, Senatorial District No. 15

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Leannandra Copeland, Program Analyst  
Jenn McEntee, Committee Secretary  
Tom Weber, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Steve L. Dobrescu, District Judge, Department 1, Seventh Judicial District Court  
Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director, White Pine County  
Marty Harpster, Senior Preconstruction Manager, CORE Construction

Senate Committee on Finance  
April 11, 2019  
Page 2

Gary D. Fairman, District Judge, Department 2, Seventh Judicial District Court  
Mike Rebaleati, Chief Operations Officer, Nevada Public Agency Insurance  
Pool/Public Agency Compensation Trust  
Vinson Guthreau, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties  
Ben Graham, Esq., Supreme Court of Nevada  
Paul Moradkhan, Vice President of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro  
Chamber of Commerce  
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District  
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of  
Education  
Patti Oya, Education Programs Director, Office of Early Learning and  
Development, Nevada Department of Education  
Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative  
Services, City of Las Vegas  
Valerie Padovani, Sierra Nevada Achievers for Community Service, Sierra  
Nevada Academy Charter School  
David Dazlich, Director of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of  
Commerce  
Hawah Ahmad, Charter School Association of Nevada  
Ruben Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association  
Shelby Henderson, School Readiness Policy Manager, Children's Advocacy  
Alliance  
Brad Keating, Clark County School District; Nevada Association of School  
Superintendents  
C.T. Wang  
Chris Daly, Deputy Executive Director, Government Relations, Nevada State  
Education Association  
Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

This Committee will start by hearing Senate Bill (S.B.) 101.

**SENATE BILL 101**: Revises provisions relating to the adoption of the equity  
allocation model used to calculate a basic support guarantee for each  
school district. (BDR 34-387)

SENATOR MOISES DENIS (Senatorial District No. 2):

I support S.B. 101 which revises the date by which the equity allocation  
model (EAM) is presented to the Nevada Legislature and Legislative Committee

on Education with review and revisions. Senate Bill No. 101 of the 78th Legislative Session S.B. 101 was enacted, with its various changes including a provision requiring the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and Superintendent of Public Instruction to review and if necessary revise the factors used for the EAM during the 2017-2019 biennium. The Education Committee provides its recommendations and input regarding the EAM during the presentation.

The intent of revising the date by which the EAM is presented was to inject more transparency into the method for calculating the basic support guarantee and give the Legislature a way to conduct oversight of changes to the EAM. Currently, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 387.122 states the Superintendent's presentation of the EAM should occur no later than July 1 of each even-numbered year. On July 28, 2016, the EAM was presented to the Education Committee during its final meeting and work session. During the June 21, 2018, presentation, the Superintendent indicated that the revisions to the EAM would be implemented on August 1, 2018, with the Education Committee being scheduled to meet again on August 9, 2018.

Due to the EAM presentation occurring later, the Education Committee members did not have sufficient time to thoroughly review the Superintendent's proposed changes. As a result, the Education Committee voted to request S.B. 101 in order to change the date by which the Superintendent is required to present any changes to the EAM and changes the date to May 1 of every even-numbered year. In order to provide the Education Committee with the opportunity to make recommendations, section 1 of S.B. 101 prohibits the NDE from adopting revisions to the EAM prior to July 1 of the year the EAM was presented.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

An appropriation to assist with the construction of a new courthouse in White Pine County is contained in S.B. 149.

**SENATE BILL 149**: Makes an appropriation to assist with the construction of a new courthouse in White Pine County. (BDR S-151)

SENATOR PETE GOICOECHEA (Senatorial District No. 19):

A request for \$10 million to build a new White Pine County Courthouse is contained in S.B. 149. In the past, Nevada started moving its prison systems into rural areas to assist in economic development, resulting in the Nevada

Department of Corrections (DOC) Lovelock Correctional Center and Ely State Prison (ESP). This resulted in some unintended consequences at the maximum security ESP in White Pine County which was established in 1989 and holds some of the worst-of-the-worst criminals.

Hearings and arraignments for ESP inmates are held at the Courthouse. It has been said that prisoners cannot receive a fair hearing if the proceedings are conducted in a prison with the inmate wearing prison clothes. As a result, inmates are required to be moved to the Courthouse for hearings and arraignments.

The Courthouse was built in 1908 to handle frontier-type justice where everyone had a gun and does not allow for the amount of security needed to contain today's hardened criminals. The facilities in the Courthouse are so antiquated and unfit that often times the witness, judge and defendant are all riding in the same elevator simultaneously with or without security.

In an earlier Nevada Legislature, Senate Committee on Government Affairs meeting this Session, we saw testimony from an ESP guard who had just been to the hospital to treat injuries from an attack he suffered in the ESP. If we cannot even protect the ESP guards, how can we protect the public and workers when dangerous ESP inmates have hearings in the obsolete Courthouse? Additionally, the inadequately secured Courthouse is located in downtown Ely 500 feet from the White Pine Middle School.

We are not going to ask the State to start building jails for counties, as this would be unacceptable. Even though the majority of inmates at ESP are from Clark County, the State could never afford to build a new prison there. A new prison is being built in White Pine County with some of the funds from this project being used to help build a new Courthouse. White Pine County cannot afford to build an appropriate Courthouse on its own, and it asking for \$10 million to help augment their project. Any unused portion of the \$10 million will revert back into the State General Fund.

STEVE L. DOBRESU (District Judge, Department 1, Seventh Judicial District Court):

I have been serving as a White Pine County district court judge in Ely for about 18 years, and I have been practicing law out there since 1986. A picture of Ely

the year the Courthouse was built between 1906 and 1908 is shown on page 2 of White Pine County Courthouse S.B. 149 presentation ([Exhibit C](#)).

Additional pictures of the Courthouse with surrounding trees having barely grown are shown on page 3 of [Exhibit C](#).

The location of the Courthouse is about 50 feet from the White Pine County Library as shown on page 4 of [Exhibit C](#).

The Courthouse is across the street from the Middle School and the White Pine County Park where students eat lunch and play at recess; students also take breaks on the Courthouse lawn. An image looking at the Courthouse from the Middle School grounds is shown on page 5 of [Exhibit C](#). When prisoners and officers from ESP travel to the Courthouse, they are driven straight through the middle of Ely.

An image looking at the Middle School from the Courthouse steps is shown on page 6 of [Exhibit C](#).

Images of the Courthouse and its close proximity to the Library are shown on page 7 of [Exhibit C](#).

Images of the Courthouse sally port are shown on page 8 and page 19 of [Exhibit C](#). The open-air sally port is comprised of flimsy plywood, razor wire and chain-link fence. Plywood was added to the sally port to act as a barrier to stop inmates from yelling obscenities at nearby citizens.

In 2003, the Supreme Court of Nevada and the Legislature created the Nevada Commission on Rural Courts which identified the Courthouse and its connection to the ESP as having the highest security concerns among all Nevada courts.

An image of the inside of the Courtroom where jury trials are conducted is shown on page 10 of [Exhibit C](#). The witness chair sits dangerously close to the jury box.

Another courtroom was built in the Courthouse to accommodate additional cases. It is not suitable for a jury trial as it does not hold more than 40 people. An image of this additional courtroom is shown on page 11 of [Exhibit C](#).

The ESP is a welcomed economic anchor for White Pine County providing a lot of jobs to residents in the area. However, the inmates at ESP are becoming more and more dangerous resulting in an overwhelming security threat every time an inmate is transferred to the antiquated Courthouse to stand trial. Of all the inmates housed at ESP, 75 percent are from Clark County with 17 percent coming from Washoe County. We feel the State is obligated to ensure the inmates and citizens are safeguarded. This is no other situation in the State that can compare to what is happening with the ESP and the Courthouse.

Statistics regarding where ESP inmates originated from are shown on page 13 of [Exhibit C](#).

Only 11 murder prosecutions were filed in White Pine County since 2000 with 6 of these murders occurring at ESP. There have been 19 attempted murder prosecutions filed in White Pine County since 2000 with 11 of these occurring at ESP. When ESP desires, it refers cases to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) for prosecution. This results in a fluctuation of crime statistics, as some of these cases are not put into the system by ESP and become harder to track.

Information regarding civil lawsuits is shown on page 17 of [Exhibit C](#). When ESP inmates file suit in the White Pine County Seventh Judicial District, they will usually have to be transferred to the Courthouse to appear. The Seventh Judicial District Justice of the Peace travels to the ESP every other month for small claims actions; these proceedings take place in an incredibly small courtroom.

There is no holding cell inside the Courthouse, resulting in fabricated metal cages located in the staff break room to hold inmates who are pending trial. Inmates change out of their garbs prior to standing trial in these cages. An image of the metal cages is shown on page 20 of [Exhibit C](#).

The Courthouse men's bathroom is shown on page 21 of [Exhibit C](#). There is barely enough room to supervise an inmate when he is using the restroom. This restroom is shared by the public, the jury and judges.

We are two-thirds of the way through the Courthouse project, which is described in detail on page 23 of [Exhibit C](#). Mr. Gus Nunez formerly with the

Nevada Department of Administration State Public Works Division has been brought in to be the project's in-house expert.

Floor plans for the new Courthouse are shown on pages 24 through 27 of [Exhibit C](#). To ensure success, we have cut the project back to not even include two full courtrooms for the district court judges; this is unheard of in Nevada. One courtroom will involve jury selection with this jury being able to securely travel to the other courtroom when need be.

ELIZABETH FRANCES (Finance Director, White Pine County):  
Construction costs associated with building the new Courthouse are shown on page 29 of [Exhibit C](#).

Projections regarding the availability of funding for the Courthouse are shown on page 30 of [Exhibit C](#). White Pine County has secured loans through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to cover 45 percent of total project costs. The remaining 55 percent of funding will come from White Pine County local option capital asset lending (LOCAL) funding. An important piece to this project involves S.B. No. 74 of the 74th Session which allowed White Pine County to charge a .0025 cent sales tax to be used for public safety and judicial infrastructure. Shortly after the 74th Legislative Session, White Pine County passed Ordinance No. 403 to impose this tax resulting in revenue to be used in the initial costs of the Courthouse project and to pay down the project's proposed debt amounts. Appropriations from [S.B. 149](#) will help cover the rest of the costs associated with the project.

Additional information regarding debt service estimates for the Courthouse project is described on page 31 of [Exhibit C](#). The first USDA loan White Pine County has acquired is for 30 years at 3.38 percent and is locked in as long as the project continues moving forward.

The second USDA loan is described on page 32 of [Exhibit C](#) and comes from the USDA Rural Economic Development Loan and Grant Program (REDGrant).

Total annual debt service payments required for the USDA loans are described on page 33 of [Exhibit C](#).

Fluctuating revenue estimates generated from S.B. No. 74 of the 74th Session are shown on page 32 of [Exhibit C](#) and are adequate to repay the project's

debt. We need to have a safety net when repaying the debt, but I feel comfortable with the project's current debt service levels.

The total amount being funded by White Pine County with long-term debt service payments is described on page 35 of [Exhibit C](#). Sixty four percent of funds will come from LOCAL funds, and 36 percent will come from S.B. 149.

Why this project needs the full \$10 million appropriation provided by S.B. 149 is described on page 36 of [Exhibit C](#). White Pine County strives to get the Courthouse project down to its bare minimum in order to conduct work as efficiently as possible. For every \$1 million that the total S.B. 149 appropriations decrease by, the project is delayed for a year and a half. This is how long it would take White Pine County to collect additional project revenue through other means.

Operations and maintenance costs of the Courthouse project are described on page 37 and page 38 of [Exhibit C](#) and were included to show to the Committee that White Pine County can afford the facility on an ongoing basis after it is completed.

Outcomes regarding the request for appropriations contained in S.B. 149 are described on page 39 of [Exhibit C](#). The new Courthouse will be collocated with the existing White Pine County Public Safety Building providing for an expedited response time in case of incidents. Buses transporting ESP inmates will be able to drive into a larger more secure and enclosed sally port enabling inmates to be securely moved into holding cells without crossing through public and staff walkways.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Does the \$22 million budget cover 100 percent of the project's construction costs?

MS. FRANCES:

Correct.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Who generated the construction budget for the Courthouse project?



MS. FRANCES:

The project's construction budget was generated by CORE Construction, the construction manager at-risk for this project.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Is the \$22 million a guaranteed price regarding the Courthouse project? What is the contracting methodology White Pine County plans on using for this project?

MS. FRANCES:

The guaranteed maximum price given to us by CORE Construction is \$22 million.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Due to errors and inflation, this Committee has seen a couple of wildly inaccurate estimates for construction projects based on when requests were made and when projects were finished. If S.B. 149 appropriations are approved, when do you anticipate the Courthouse project will be completed?

MS. FRANCES:

We estimate construction documents will be completed by September 2019. Based upon weather, we anticipate the project will begin in the fall of 2019 or spring of 2020.

SENATOR BROOKS:

When will the project be completed?

MS. FRANCES:

There is a 16 to 18 month construction window for this project, and it will be completed sometime between September and December of 2021.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Has construction cost inflation been taken into account when projecting this project's timeline?

MS. FRANCES:

Yes, construction cost inflation was considered.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Due to White Pine County being relatively small, how much revenue do you foresee the .0025 cent sales tax will generate on an annual basis? It will take quite a while for this tax to generate helpful revenue, which further shows how important S.B. 149 funding will be for this project.

MS. FRANCES:

At a low point, the .0025 cent sales tax generated \$430,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2010. At its high point in FY 2011, the .0025 cent sales tax generated \$772,000. The 10-year average of the .0025 cent sales tax is \$628,000.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

The population of White Pine County is around 9,682 people with ESP prisoners accounting for a portion of this. How many total prisoners are in ESP?

MS. FRANCES:

There are approximately 1,000 prisoners in ESP.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

So 1 in 10 people within White Pine County are prisoners at ESP.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

What percentage of Courthouse hearings are related to inmates versus other proceedings?

JUDGE DOBRESCU:

There is an average of 5 to 10 inmate trials at the Courthouse annually. However, the intensity of every inmate trial blows the doors off when compared to a regular case; one single inmate trial can become overwhelming to the Courthouse. A warden at ESP complained to me in the past that the OAG was only able to prosecute about 10 percent of these intensely violent cases. The number of inmate trials at the Courthouse fluctuates on how aggressive the prison and OAG are in prosecuting cases.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is the inmate caseload at the Courthouse directly related to incidents occurring inside ESP, rather than appellate proceedings? I know appellate proceedings are

handled in intermediate appellate courts or the Supreme Court. Are all incidents occurring within ESP handled in the Courthouse?

JUDGE DOBRESCU:

That is correct. If a writ is challenging a disciplinary hearing or a case involves civil rights actions, these cases come to the Courthouse as well.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

There are administrative proceedings which occur at the Courthouse.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Were construction inflation costs and price risks factored into the overall budget for the Courthouse project? In addition to when funding requests were made, did calculating the project's end date take these factors into account?

MARTY HARPSTER (Senior Preconstruction Manager, CORE Construction):

All estimates for the Courthouse project have reflected appropriate escalation costs for the northeastern Nevada construction market. CORE Construction regularly works in rural Nevada and is very familiar with construction costs in these areas. The budget we have prepared for construction costs is all-inclusive. As we have reduced the scope of work to make the project more efficient, costs have decreased. We are confident the calculated budgetary figures are accurate and can be improved upon.

SENATOR DENIS:

Are you going to build the Courthouse on the site where it currently is located?

MS. FRANCES:

The new Courthouse will be collocated with the existing Public Safety Building. The old Courthouse will no longer be utilized for court services, as we plan to turn this building into administrative offices.

SENATOR DENIS:

Will the new Courthouse still be located next to the Middle School?

MS. FRANCES:

The new Courthouse will be collocated with the Public Safety Building where the White Pine County Sheriff's Office is located on the south end of Ely.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

I have been to Ely many times, but I am still vague on the exact location of where the new Courthouse will be located. Will it be located in downtown Ely?

JUDGE DOBRESCU:

The new Courthouse will be located on South Pioche Highway heading south out of town. There is a lot of undeveloped land in this area.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Is the rehabilitation of the old Courthouse contained in the project's construction budget?

MS. FRANCES:

The rehabilitation of the existing Courthouse is not contained in the budget. We will close down the existing White Pine County Administrative Building and move these offices into the old Courthouse. The revenue generated from the sale or lease of the old Administrative Building will help with the renovation of the historic Courthouse.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Will any historical preservation be conducted during the rehabilitation of the old, beautiful Courthouse, or is everything a functional consideration?

MS. FRANCES:

Our intent is to maintain the historic essence of the old Courthouse, as it is a core piece to downtown Ely. The citizens and County Commission believe it is essential to maintain the historic element of the Courthouse.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

Will the administrative offices projected to be moved into the old Courthouse be for White Pine County use alone, or can Ely use the building for administrative purposes as well?

MS. FRANCES:

Ely will continue using the historic Ely Administrative Building for operations, and the Courthouse will be an administrative office for White Pine County only.

GARY D. FAIRMAN (District Judge, Department 2, Seventh Judicial District Court): I have been in Ely for over 40 years, first practicing as an attorney and now as a district court judge. I am very familiar with the Courthouse, as I spend more time in my office there than I do at home. It is appropriate for the Legislature to aid in partial funding of the Courthouse, as this is a unique request and the ESP impacts the Courthouse greatly. The ESP is a State facility imposing a security risk to the White Pine County-owned Courthouse, but we are not asking the State to start building county buildings.

The ESP houses the most violent offenders in Nevada, 75 percent of whom come from Clark County. These offenders commit crimes inside ESP and are not the "normal" types of criminal appearing in our courtroom.

Ely has no gangs and experiences about one murder every five years. There are very few sexual assaults in Ely and even fewer armed robberies.

All defendants, even the most violent repeat offenders at ESP, are entitled to access the same fair and impartial justice system as you and I. Men and women in the legal system, the jury as well as the ESP defendants are likewise entitled to be safe before, during and after each court appearance and jury trial. Access to justice includes a safe and impartial trial, free of bias and prejudice.

Although many ESP trials have been held in the Courthouse since it opened in 1989, it would be naïve to think that the presence of an armed security team with assault rifles and shotguns does not influence prejudice against inmates. Armed security is outside the four corners and entrance to the Courthouse, the lobby area outside and in the courtroom itself and creates a prejudicial impression in the minds of jurors. This prejudicial impression adversely impacts the presumption of innocence and the ESP inmates' right to a fair trial even if a juror is unwilling to admit this impact. There would be no necessity for the public, including jurors, to experience an armed team of six or more men or women at every ESP trial occurring at the new Courthouse.

Security issues are present when ESP inmates travel to and from the current Courthouse with escape always a possibility. Many inmates are serving long sentences giving them incentive to attempt an escape, and many are associated with violent gangs both inside and outside the ESP. These inmates are from a different culture and world.

If an escape attempt took place at the current Courthouse, many citizens, including children, are exposed to immediate harm. The Library is 50 feet away from the Courthouse, and the Park is 150 feet away. The Park is used by the Middle School students for lunch breaks, physical education classes and as a hangout before school starts. The White Pine County High School is only 500 feet from the Courthouse. The threats to the public caused by these risks are unacceptable.

These concerns were not considered by the State or the community prior to ESP being built in 1986 and 1987. No one realized these issues impact an ESP inmate's right to safe and impartial access to justice. The citizens who serve in the criminal justice system also have a right to be safe.

The matters I have testified about are unique to ESP and the Courthouse and are not similar to other issues throughout Nevada. Because White Pine County has funding for 2/3 of the project's cost, S.B. 149 merits your consideration and support.

JUDGE DOBRESCU:

In 1991, a 20-year-old prior felon held up a cab in Reno. He jumped in the back seat and requested to be driven to Stead. After the cab driver requested money for the ride, the felon shot him in the head. The felon was then sentenced to life-in-prison at ESP and was nicknamed "Money". In 1998, this felon was convicted of battery by another prisoner with the crime occurring in ESP. In 2000, the felon was again convicted of another felony battery charge against another prisoner at ESP. In 2004, this felon attacked and killed an inmate at ESP by stabbing him in the neck with a prison shank. This felon is the type of inmate transferred from ESP to the Courthouse.

Around this same time, a man from West Virginia with prior felony convictions, killed a man in Las Vegas by shooting him in the face three times. After killing the man, this felon beat the victim's face in with an iron rod. In order to conceal the victim's identity, the felon attempted to remove the victim's teeth and cut the victim's hands off. This is the type of inmate at ESP and is the type of inmate visiting the Courthouse.

The inmates at ESP are not people with simple drug possession charges, driving under the influence charges, theft charges or fraud charges. The inmates at

ESP are very serious, very violent and very dangerous coming mostly from Clark County and Washoe County.

To deal with the dangerous inmates, White Pine County has DOC correctional emergency response team (CERT) officers who wear black fatigues and boots, and carry shotguns and automatic rifles. If someone goes to the Courthouse to pay their taxes, vote, record a document or get a marriage license, they will see the facilities with inmates in a courtroom and CERT officers outside. If someone travels to the Library to read, they will see CERT officers with guns outside the Courthouse.

Jurors in the courtroom see inmates in civilian clothes with no restraints. Inmates in the courtroom have CERT officers sitting next to and behind them. There will probably also be two to four CERT officers carrying shotguns in the courtroom and hallway creating a very scary, indescribable and dangerous environment.

After every trial, I meet with all the jurors and talk with them off the record about their experiences. After one particular trial, a juror told me she was too scared to even look at an inmate who testified and that she did not hear a single word the inmate said; she was so terrified that she almost ran out of the courtroom. Jurors have requested that Plexiglas be placed around the juror box, but this is not feasible. Jurors constantly ask why the inmates are not in restraints, and I have to tell them the inmates cannot be shackled as this will interfere with their important presumption of innocence.

The high level of security required at the Courthouse quantifies the prejudicial impact that the inmates may be suffering. The passage of S.B. 149 would address this serious public safety issue and help White Pine County assist the State by handling its criminals. The rights of inmates will also be protected by passing S.B. 149. We have been lucky so far, as no juror or member of the public has ever been physically hurt during an inmate trial.

We have only had one inmate hurt with the injury occurring when two inmates were placed in the holding cage at the same time. We did not know the two inmates were rival gang members, and after they assaulted each other one inmate almost had their ear ripped off. Other than these instances, the Courthouse has remained relatively safe over the years. However, with each

new case that comes along and a transport order is issued, I feel like I am gambling on whether or not an inmate or the public will be harmed.

MIKE REBALEATI (Chief Operations Officer, Nevada Public Agency Insurance Pool/Public Agency Compensation Trust):

My company POOL/PACT ensures that the Courthouse is insured and handles liability concerns. We have been aware of the security risks and potential liability concerns surrounding the Courthouse for quite some time. I am in favor of S.B. 149 and encourage its passing.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties):

The Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) represents all 17 Nevada counties, and we support S.B. 149. The NACO Board of Directors unanimously approved S.B. 149 for all of the reasons mentioned during this hearing.

BEN GRAHAM, ESQ. (Supreme Court of Nevada):

The security issues surrounding the Courthouse can infringe on the Constitutional rights of prisoners due to unintended bias and prejudice. The Courthouse is the only facility requesting help of this kind with White Pine County and Ely working on this issue for quite some time. Property from White Pine County and Ely have been combined to provide a suitable area closer to the Public Safety Building. The Supreme Court supports this project and S.B. 149 to protect the rights and safety of the public and inmates and has sent in a resolution to prove this, entitled The State of Nevada Resolution ([Exhibit D](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This is the fourth time S.B. 149 has been brought forward in some form. This issue was contained in the 2005 Executive Budget; I have brought it forward before as has Senator Dean A. Rhoads. This issue has been occurring since the ESP opened and gained more momentum after it was determined ESP prisoners have the right to a fair trial. We have been lucky so far, but there are issues with the availability of ESP staffing. It is not if an issue will occur but when. I know S.B. 149 requests a lot of money, and we might be able to work with other agencies constructing State office buildings, but it is imperative White Pine County gets the support it needs to build the new Courthouse.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

This Committee will now hear S.B. 183.



**SENATE BILL 183**: Makes various changes relating to governmental administration. (BDR 19-537)

SENATOR HEIDI SEEVERS GANSERT (Senatorial District No. 15):

A fiscal note is attached to S.B. 183 from the Department of Health and Human Services, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) requiring the bill to be heard by this Committee. The fiscal note was withdrawn by ADSD on March 29, 2019. Additionally, Washoe County School District (WCSD) might also have a fiscal note attached to S.B. 183 that they are willing to withdraw.

To increase transparency around the Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML) set forth by NRS 244.020, S.B. 183 is being introduced. Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (d), subparagraph (8) of S.B. 183 states that if an agenda is revised in any way after it is posted, provided or delivered, there needs to be a clear indication of this occurring. The revisions need to be easily identifiable, and the date on which the agenda was revised needs to be provided.

Page 2 of S.B. 183 Presentation by Senator Gansert ([Exhibit E](#)) shows a revised agenda that was posted multiple times without any information regarding the revisions or changes to dates. Page 3 of [Exhibit E](#) shows a clearly edited agenda with strikethrough revisions and dates, distinctly showing the changes that were made. This eliminates guesswork and increases transparency.

Section 1, subsection 8 of S.B. 183 states that information supporting a revised agenda item needs to be available to readers via the internet; this is required for agendas put forth by counties with a population over 45,000. Pages 5 and 6 of [Exhibit E](#) show the types of detailed documents available on <[www.leg.state.nv.us](http://www.leg.state.nv.us)> providing examples of revised agendas that are available over the internet and are easily accessible to readers.

Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (c) of S.B. 183 states that a detailed summary of changes to an agenda need to be provided. This is in stark contrast to agendas that provide little information making it hard for interested parties to know what occurred during the meeting. We need to have discretion when deciding the details that need to be included in a revised agenda, so readers will know what transpired during the meeting.

For certain proposed regulations, there is a survey sent to small businesses with a timeframe of five days by which the survey needs to be returned. If a holiday

falls within this five-day timeframe, businesses may only have a couple days to return and respond. Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a) of S.B. 183 expands this timeframe to 10 days. It should be noted that this is not requiring a survey to be provided. An example of a small-business survey resulting from proposed regulations is shown on page 7 of [Exhibit E](#).

PAUL MORADKHAN (Vice President of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):  
The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce (LVMCC) supports S.B. 183.

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District):  
After clarifying Senator Heidi Seevers-Gansert's intent regarding the details of S.B. 183, we provided examples of the 17 WCSD committees subject to the OML. We verified the minutes from WCSD committee meetings are detailed enough, and the fact that we provide audio-video recordings of our meetings keeps us in compliance with OML. After our discussions, WCSD decided to remove its fiscal note.

SENATOR PARKS:  
I noticed there were multiple entities who submitted fiscal notes for S.B. 183. One of these fiscal notes was removed, but four remain. Has there been correspondence from these entities regarding the remaining fiscal notes, and are they still relevant?

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:  
I am not aware of additional fiscal notes pertaining to S.B. 183. What other agencies submitted them?

SENATOR PARKS:  
White Pine County, Douglas County and Churchill County School District also submitted fiscal notes for S.B. 183.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:  
I will talk with these entities, as they were excluded from OML regulations because there are under 45,000 people in these counties.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Please get back to us with this information, so we can continue moving forward with this measure.

This Committee will now hear S.B. 84.

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

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

Filed on behalf of NDE, the intent of S.B. 84 is to establish a program to support prekindergarten (Pre-K) programs across the State. The quality components of a Pre-K program will be defined and put into law by S.B. 84. Defining quality components supports Governor Sisolak's vision that all students, regardless of zip code, will have access to a high-quality education system. This legislation also establishes Pre-K programs as a State education priority. If funding is continued at the current levels recommended in the Executive Budget, approximately 3,023 students will be served in high-quality Pre-K programs Statewide.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

This Committee is glad to see Jhone Ebert is onboard with the NDE.

PATTI OYA (Education Programs Director, Office of Early Learning and Development, Nevada Department of Education):

The benefits of high-quality Pre-K programs are important and well documented in reducing the costs of remedial services. As a result of Pre-K programs, young children receive social and emotional health benefits and achieve higher graduation rates. For approximately 10 years, State Pre-K programs in Nevada received about \$3.4 million in flat funding from State funding bills. The NDE previously utilized a well-established half day Pre-K program that served a few hundred children per year.

In 2016, the NDE received a U.S. Department of Education, Preschool Development Grant (PDG) allowing us to expand Pre-K seats from half day to full day. As a result, Pre-K seats are now offered for 5 hours a day, or 25 hours per week; this is shorter than a full day in a kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) class. The PDG allowed the NDE to offer and expand Pre-K seats in

different counties. We are very happy we were able to receive PDG funding to build infrastructure, but this grant ended in December 2018. The NDE received a no-cost extension through June 2019 to finish the current school year. Moving forward, the NDE Pre-K program would be State funded.

By moving S.B. 84 forward, the NDE sought to bring Pre-K programs into legislative measures and reduce fragmentation across funding. This will result in less confusion regarding how the NDE allocates Pre-K funding and how school districts and programs compete for funding. Most of the PDG requirements and regulations are continued and followed in S.B. 84, because we feel these standards are of a high quality and should be maintained.

Section 2 of S.B. 84 creates the Pre-K account within the State General Fund. The new Pre-K account would pull in the existing \$3.4 million the NDE already receives and any additional General Fund appropriations that we would need to move forward.

Section 3, subsection 1 of S.B. 84 describes the school districts, charter schools and nonprofit organizations who could compete for NDE grants. The NDE works with nonprofit organizations to help them include childcare centers; childcare centers are not the same as private schools. The NDE wants to allow childcare centers to apply for grants because they often have enough space for children and can benefit from having the quality of their services improved. This was something we added on with PDG funding, and it was successful in finding us additional seats.

Section 3 of S.B. 84 also requires a Pre-K program that is supported by NDE grants to meet certain requirements prescribing the required contents of a grant application. Eligibility requirements for NDE grants continue to be similar to those of PDG grants and includes 4 year olds whose families are under 200 percent of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, federal poverty level (FPL). The NDE feels it is important to leave this piece within S.B. 84, as we are currently serving only about 11 percent of eligible 4 year olds. We do not want to expand the services until we know that the majority of eligible four year olds can access them; we know how beneficial Pre-K programs can be for low-income disadvantaged populations.

Program requirements within S.B. 84 state one teacher per early childhood development classroom must have a bachelor's degree, and these teachers

must be offered the same pay as teachers in regular school districts. Other requirements state that Pre-K classes will be offered for 5 hours a day with aligned curriculum among classes, and class size must be maintained at less than 20 pupils with 10 pupils for each teacher. Programs must participate in the NDE Nevada School Performance Framework system and have their students evaluated by the NDE Brigance Screening Assessment.

Parent engagement and parent participation in the evaluation of their engagement is mandated by section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (g) of S.B. 84. We know parent involvement especially at a young age is extremely important.

Programs eligible for funding through the NDE, Prekindergarten Account established by S.B. 84 must be all-inclusive and provide services to pupils with special needs. Additionally, these Pre-K programs must provide comprehensive wrap-around services to families. We know at this age group families have young children and when dealing with stressors such as finding jobs, finding housing and acquiring food, they need additional support. Consequently, Pre-K learning can be a priority for their children.

The NDE has been asked about why these requirements are necessary and if any of them could be removed. Because of the wide variability when trying to offer a quality program, these services must be offered hand-in-hand as a package. A highly qualified teacher with a bachelor's degree will become less and less effective in reaching students when classroom sizes increase to 30 kids. If there are 20 kids and no materials in a classroom, the best teacher in the world will still be ineffective.

Recent studies have looked at 15 different elements finding full day Pre-K classes with 17 or less pupils, a teacher with a master's degree, task-oriented instructions and an integrated systems approach had the largest impact on child outcome. This shows that packaging the NDE grant requirements together results in the highest success rates.

Section 3, subsection 1 of S.B. 84 states the funding in the Pre-K Account must be awarded competitively to applicants. Traditionally, the State used a competitive grant application for Pre-K programs. When moving forward with and expanding PDG funding, grants began to not be awarded competitively. The NDE wrote predetermined school districts and counties with classroom sizes into our application for PDG funding. In moving forward with establishing one

Pre-K program with one set of requirements, we are making the grant application process competitive again.

We know it is difficult for school districts, counties and applicants to work under a competitive grant cycle due to timelines and quick turnaround. They work on their application, and we review it in May of that year while determining available funding; money is then awarded. In a very short time, the programs who applied for funding have to turn around, rehire teachers, get classrooms setup and put together, start enrolling children and start moving forward by July 1 of that year. This is a tight timeline, and we are looking at establishing a formula-based application system. This has not been determined yet, as we are unsure of a final funding source. Traditionally, the second year of a biennium is easier on school districts because they can start enrolling students and are aware of available funding options. We are still looking into how the competitive grant system will work. We are familiar in this area, as it is how we have traditionally moved forward.

Section 4 of S.B. 84 describes the authorized uses of funding coming from the Pre-K Account, stating these funds must be used to establish or expand a Pre-K program. The Pre-K funding must be used to supplement not supplant an entity's existing funds. The money must also be used for the major expense of paying teacher and support staff salaries as they relate to Pre-K instruction. Classrooms or playgrounds may be retrofitted with this funding, as 4-year-old children have different needs than K-12 students; they need smaller tables, toilets, bathrooms and playground equipment.

Section 5 of S.B. 84 requires the NDE, State Board of Education to adopt regulations; this was not required previously.

Section 6 of S.B. 84 requires the NDE to submit a biennial report; this is already done for State funded Pre-K programs and would expand the current report. Section 7 of S.B. 84 exempts the biennial report in section 6 from counting towards the report that the NDE is required to send to the Legislature. Section 8 of S.B. 84 states January 1, 2020, will be the date by which S.B. 84 requirements will become effective. A proposed amendment submitted by the NDE requests to change this date to July 1, 2019, as the NDE does not want to wait until 2020 to start moving forward with this initiative.

The NDE has proposed small amendments to S.B. 84. Because as we have worked with our community partners and school districts to receive feedback, we wanted to clarify some of the wording contained in the bill. One of the proposed amendments deals with charter schools; a subgrantee working with childcare centers. As a result of this proposed amendment, any language within S.B. 84 referring to a charter school will be changed to "sponsor of each charter school". Similarly, nonprofit organizations are referred to as "sponsor of each nonprofit organization".

The Nevada State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), WCSD and Clark County School District (CCSD) would each work with their charter schools to apply for State Pre-K funding. There are charter schools in Nevada who are already serving Pre-K children quite successfully, but we want to clarify that each of these charter schools will not be individually applying for funding separately.

Another NDE-proposed amendment for S.B. 84 is shown on page 2 of Presentation Patti Oya and NDE Superintendent Jhone Ebert's S.B. 84 ([Exhibit F](#)). There was concern with the way section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of S.B. 84 was originally written, as it previously said all teachers within a classroom would have to be highly qualified and licensed. It would increase costs if two teachers in a classroom were required to be highly licensed. This language has been changed to read that only one teacher per classroom must be qualified with a bachelor's degree in early childhood education or hold a birth-through-second-grade license.

A proposed amendment regarding section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (e) of S.B. 84 is shown on page 2 of [Exhibit F](#). If there are two teachers in a classroom, one will be highly qualified or certified, and the second teacher could be an aid or support staff.

The NDE did not submit an amendment regarding competitive funding, as it is difficult to consider moving forward with a formula-based application process when enough funding does not exist for all applicants. We are still working with school districts regarding this issue.

Anticipated outcomes regarding S.B. 84 are shown on page 3 of [Exhibit F](#), focusing on improving the quality of and access to Pre-K programs. Included from FY 2018 are pre-and post-Brigance Screenings of the growth made by

4-year-old children attending State Pre-K programs. The NDE is beginning to collect this information from its childcare centers from family, friend and neighbor childcare providers and from childcare subsidy programs. By using the Brigance Screening tool to collect this data, we are trying to show which Pre-K programs are best preparing students for kindergarten; the State Pre-K programs did quite well in this regard.

The NDE is looking at increasing the number of credentialed teachers holding a bachelor's degree and who have experience in early childhood education; we offer scholarships to help in these areas. The NDE looks at the percentage of children included in general education programs with the baseline from 2015 to 2016 being at 30 percent. We are now close to 40 percent since including this measure in Pre-K development grants. The national average is approximately 45 percent, and our goal is to exceed this. We are very proud of the fact that our Pre-K programs are on their way to exceed this number. It is very beneficial for children and those with special needs to be able to access general education programs.

There is not a fiscal component contained in S.B. 84. The associated costs to administer high-quality Pre-K programs are described on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#).

Due to State Pre-K programs originally being offered at half day, these programs would receive \$3,900 in NDE funding for half-day seats. We knew this would not be enough to fund a full-day seat, so when the NDE received PDG funding, we increased the amount given to programs to \$9,000 per seat. School districts did not spend all of this funding so the NDE decreased it, striving to be as accountable as possible. As a result, the NDE has determined that \$8,000 per full-day seat is appropriate.

Responses from school districts indicated the \$8,000 was not enough funding, so we came up with supplemental funds that school districts and programs could apply for. This supplemental funding can be used to help schools set up new classrooms; new Pre-K classrooms include toys, materials, rugs and special chairs that K-12 classrooms do not require. The NDE has grantees and childcare programs that can provide year-round services benefitting families who work. Additional NDE funding is provided for small world school districts, childcare centers and administrative support.



The NDE has allotted \$4,000 per seat if each Pre-K grant application is braided with other funding. The difficulty with counting on braided funding is that the NDE does not know until after July 1 how much money school districts will have available to braid funding with or if the money they have is allowed to be used in braid funding. The allocation of Zoom school and Victory school funding is very different than Pre-K funding making it even more difficult to braid funding. To avoid making the funding process more difficult, some school districts have already told us they are going to move forward by just asking the NDE for \$8,000 per full-day seat so that they can continue offering their Pre-K services uninterrupted.

Braiding funding can allow NDE funding to go further and increase the number of Pre-K seats available. Nonprofit childcare centers are not eligible for additional State funding or U.S. Department of Education Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act funding or special education funding. Nonprofit childcare centers do not have the opportunity to braid funding. The NDE budgets for \$8,000 per seat for these nonprofit organizations and we are happy if we can expand further, but this is generally not the case. The \$8,000 per seat is more expensive than the rate offered through the NDE, Distributive School Account B/A 101-2610. We just tell people that funding for a group of 20 students, a teacher, a teacher's aide, materials and equipment is more expensive, and that is why grants offered through the Pre-K program are more expensive.

## EDUCATION

### K-12 EDUCATION

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

A percentage of costs set aside for NDE quality initiatives and administration is described on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#).

Resources describing the benefits of high-quality Pre-K programs are described on page 4 of [Exhibit F](#).

How to access high-quality Pre-K programs and receive justice in doing so are described on page 4 and page 5 of [Exhibit F](#).

Reports on the importance of building an aligned early childhood education system to achieve a lifetime of health is provided on page 4 and page 5 of [Exhibit F](#).

The components of a quality Pre-K system are described on page 6 of [Exhibit F](#). The number of seats that are provided to students is not the only thing that matters, the high quality of the programs matters as well.

Information on the NDE, Nevada Silver State Stars Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is provided on page 6 of [Exhibit F](#). The NDE uses a five-star system and monitors childcare centers, family home providers and NDE school district Pre-K programs. The NDE school district Pre-K programs were added on as part of the PDG; not all Pre-K programs are currently rated due to funding fragmentation. The NDE will be getting in more results pertaining to these programs later this year. The QRIS is very intense in the support it provides to Pre-K programs and is different than the framework the NDE uses to rate K-12 schools; additional coaches and grants are included as part of the QRIS.

The NDE, Teacher Education and Compensation Helps Early Childhood Nevada Scholarships (T.E.A.C.H.) are described on page 7 of [Exhibit F](#). The scholarships offered through T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood Nevada are different than the T.E.A.C.H. scholarships offered in K-12, as the early childhood scholarships are offered specifically to people working in Pre-K or childcare centers. The NDE was fortunate enough to receive W.K. Kellogg Foundation grant funding to help include school district Pre-K programs before PDG funding came in. Before Kellogg funding, the NDE was only funding childcare centers through the NDE, Childcare and Development Fund.

The NDE is striving to increase teacher's access to these services. The nice thing about T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood Nevada scholarships is that they have a commitment period requiring teachers to stay in their place of employment and not leave the minute they get a degree. These scholarships also include a wage increase which helps combat the wage disparity often existing in childcare centers. Wages are often lower in childcare centers making it more difficult for these teachers to make a decent living.

The Children's Cabinet Pre-K Wraparound program provides PDG childhood services to grant extra support to families allowing them to prioritize sending

their children to Pre-K schools. A family sending their children to a quality Pre-K program often becomes a secondary issue when a family member is looking for a job, food or housing. The Children's Cabinet has achieved good results regarding these measures.

At the department level, the NDE strives to offer high-quality comprehensive professional development. It is important teachers have access to quality professional development services, especially in regards to children transitioning to kindergarten from Pre-K. High-quality Pre-K services provide long-term benefits, but these benefits can be impacted by what is occurring in kindergarten through third grade; if quality is not continued as a child progresses through a school system then benefits might not last.

SENATOR DENIS:

Regarding the funding provided by S.B. 84, does the language in the bill impact other Pre-K programs not receiving NDE grant funding? You mentioned earlier you would like to expand Pre-K services Statewide, but there are other schools offering Pre-K services that are not considered childcare centers.

Ms. OYA:

The language in S.B. 84 does not impact Pre-K programs who do not receive NDE funding. The private schools who are separate from childcare centers but still offer Pre-K services and the childcare centers who do not work with nonprofit organizations to apply for funding are not impacted by this bill. The language within S.B. 84 only applies to schools receiving competitive State funding from the Pre-K Account.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Will the funding structure created by S.B. 84 be used to allocate the existing NDE Office of Early Learning and Development appropriation recommendation contained in the Executive Budget?

Ms. OYA:

Yes it will.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

It will take the NDE a year to get this Pre-K system up and running. How will you allocate Pre-K funding during this time?

Ms. OYA:

The regulations within section 8 of S.B. 84 deal with setting up the Pre-K Account. The other components of funding allocation are already in place, as this is what was used when the NDE ended PDG funding for State Pre-K programs. These components have been included in the competitive grant application already released. The NDE will release the competitive grant application and receive the applications back; the NDE Review Team will then look the applications over. Once the NDE is approved to receive funding, we allot available money to each approved applicant cutting or adding funding when necessary. The process of negotiation will then end, and programs will begin providing Pre-K services on July 1 of the same year.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Has the NDE used a competitive application process for Pre-K funding up to this point, or will the NDE start offering a competitive grant process after S.B. 84 is passed?

Ms. OYA:

The \$3.4 million in General Fund appropriations for State Pre-K programs has always been awarded competitively by the NDE but funding through the PDG was not.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Will the NDE award S.B. 84 funding to subgrantees using the same funding structure that it uses to award PDG funding?

Ms. OYA:

You are correct in terms of regulation requirements.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is this correct regarding the scope of work as well? Because, ultimately the number of seats recommended in the Executive Budget are the number of seats that will be funded through the Pre-K Account.

Ms. OYA:

We are not 100 percent clear on the amount of seats recommended to be funded in the proposed Executive Budget, but you are correct in that the number of seats will be the same.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The NDE has currently been funding 3,084 seats through the noncompetitive PDG process. If the grant process used for the S.B. 84 Pre-K Account becomes competitive, is there a risk that some kids will lose seats and some programs will lose funding? How will continuity be ensured when funding becomes competitive?

Ms. OYA:

Current subgrantees who were written into the NDE's application to receive funding through the PDG will still have to apply for funding offered from the Pre-K Account, and we believe most of them will. It is possible these subgrantees will not receive the same level of funding that they received from the PDG; this will be contingent on the amount of funding NDE receives. The NDE will strive to maintain the number of seats previously established, but this is what makes a competitive application difficult. On the other hand, if you use the same formula-based structure that K-12 funding is awarded by, there might not be enough money for all applicants to receive funding. This is where the NDE is trying to figure out how a modified formula-based funding structure will work, but we have not gotten there yet. It is also unknown if nonprofit childcare centers will qualify for State formula-based funding.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

As you know, we have had problems with the competitive grant process within school districts in the past. Regarding your proposed amendment in S.B. 84 to refer to charter schools as "sponsor of each charter school", are you intending to make clear which charter schools are sponsored by the State or universities?

Ms. OYA:

We do not want each charter school to have to apply separately for funding from the Pre-K Account. Through this proposed S.B. 84 amendment, charter schools will apply for funding through their school districts or the SPCSA; this is how it is currently set up through the PDG.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

What is this amendment's purpose in changing the S.B. 84 language to read "district-sponsored charter school"?

Ms. OYA:

The NDE wants to clarify charter schools are applying for funding through a sponsor, and not doing so individually on their own. We heard this differentiation was not clear as S.B. 84 was originally written, appearing to read that charter schools could apply for funding on their own not going through a school district or through the SPSCA.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I am not convinced the language in S.B. 84 will be made any clearer through this proposed amendment, but at least now the NDE's intent is on the record. Do individual schools currently go through the QRIS, as I was not aware that they did?

Ms. OYA:

The way in which the NDE selected school district Pre-K programs to be rated was based on the way these programs received funding. If Pre-K programs receive PDG funding, they automatically have to be rated with the QRIS. If there is only one out of four classrooms at a school receiving PDG funding, we rate the entire school based on an average of all four classrooms; we never rate a school based on one classroom. If a school receives Zoom, Victory or special education funding but does not receive PDG funding, it will not be included in the QRIS; there is not enough funding for the NDE to rate these schools in the QRIS. The only reason the NDE was able to rate schools receiving the PDG was due to Kellogg funding.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are there any barriers regarding schools getting through the QRIS process that could potentially make them ineligible to receive funding? We have heard from childcare centers that getting through the QRIS process can be difficult and that a backlog of schools waiting to be rated exists.

Ms. OYA:

The NDE has mostly eliminated the QRIS waiting list. However, we do have some large chains of childcare centers especially in southern Nevada where all centers in the chain could not be rated. In terms of difficulty, I agree getting through the QRIS process can be difficult for some schools, but there is nothing preventing a school from doing well and getting through it. The NDE has shown it has achieved good success rates with the QRIS. I just received notice that a

couple more schools from CCSD received a four- and five-star QRIS rating this year. Achieving quality results can be difficult and expensive, but it is worth it.

KELLY CROMPTON (Government Affairs Manager, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas has declared high-quality early childhood education as a priority and works with partners to close the achievement gap in the urban core and other targeted Las Vegas zip codes. We are committed to giving children a strong start regarding Pre-K education in order to increase kindergarten readiness and close achievement gaps. The long-term outcome is to significantly increase the number of students who graduate from high school.

Las Vegas has opened three Strong Start Academies in partnership with Acelero Learning Clark County to increase opportunities for children ages six weeks through five years of age to attend a quality early education program. Currently, 6 classrooms at Lorenzi-Strong Start Center and 2 classrooms at Alta-Strong Start Center are funded through State General Fund appropriations providing seats for 144 children. The continuation of this funding is a critical piece to ensuring Strong Start Academies can operate in Las Vegas.

VALERIE PADOVANI (Sierra Nevada Achievers for Community Service, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School):

The Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School (SNACS) has submitted a proposed amendment and is very excited to support S.B. 84. We have a couple of issues regarding the way S.B. 84 was originally worded with some of our issues being addressed by Patti Oya. We also want to change the S.B. 84 language to read "district-sponsored charter schools" within section 3, subsection 1.

We want to add teachers who have received licensure through Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) programs to section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of S.B. 84.

The SNACS proposed amendment makes changes to the student-teacher ratios mentioned in section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (e) of S.B. 84. We would like this paragraph to be changed to 20 pupils or less and include a professional or paraprofessional teacher.

To accommodate students with nontraditional situations, we want to add "family" to the list of people schools will engage with; this is contained in section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (g) of S.B. 84.

The SNACS would like to propose a change regarding section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (j) of S.B. 84. If prekindergarten programs in this paragraph do not receive funding under the U.S. Department of Education, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the NDE shall provide funds for appropriate individualized accommodations and support pupils with disabilities.

The SNACS has submitted these amendments to the Legislature, and we are happy to work with S.B. 84 sponsors to determine how to best incorporate our requests. We support S.B. 84 and its intent.

DAVID DAZLICH (Director of Government Affairs, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

It is a priority of the LVMCC, Southern Nevada Forum to see S.B. 84 passed, as it provides many benefits.

HAWAH AHMAD (Charter School Association of Nevada):

Given the importance of early childhood learning, child development and educational success, we support S.B. 84. The Charter School Association of Nevada also supports the adjustments contained in NDE's proposed amendments as well as the adjustments proposed by SNACS. We support adding teachers who have received their teaching credentials through ARL programs to the list of professionals that can be helped by S.B. 84. We support paraprofessionals being recognized in the adult-to-pupil ratio contained in S.B. 84.

RUBEN MURILLO, JR. (President, Nevada State Education Association):

I am president of the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA). I am a special education teacher and proud member of the Nevada Education Association of Southern Nevada (NEASN). The NSEA is neutral on S.B. 84 due to technical issues that we will address.

A letter of support for S.B. 84 from NEASN member Jany Ortiz has been submitted for the record ([Exhibit G](#)).



SHELBY HENDERSON (School Readiness Policy Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance):

The Children's Advocacy Alliance (CAA) supports S.B. 84 because it will help families access Pre-K programs. Due to the way funds are distributed, S.B. 84 will help to ensure access to quality programs for Nevada's children and families. Nevada has made great strides in increasing access to high-quality early-learning programs. By establishing the Pre-K Account within the State General Fund, we can continue this trajectory. With the grant system being set up for the distribution of these funds, Nevadans will be assured State money is going only to programs with policies and procedures in place that have been shown to create quality early-learning environments and produce quality results.

Additionally, the NDE will be required to monitor these programs to ensure effectiveness of services and that children receive the quality early-learning they deserve. Access to high-quality early-learning for Nevada's most at-risk children can help to reduce a child's chance of needing costly services including extra years of schooling, welfare assistance or a jail bed. Children who attend preschool are more likely to be employed and have higher salaries as adults enabling them to contribute greater earnings to their community. Creating the Pre-K Account and allocating the funds to it, does not constitute a cost but is an investment in our youth and State.

Ms. ANDERSON:

The WCSD is opposed to S.B. 84 but for reasons we can overcome. As the mother of a four-year-old child, I know how important access to Pre-K programs can be. The WCSD has a couple of concerns regarding how S.B. 84 is drafted. Moving from a federal formula-based grant to a State competitive grant is opposite of the direction we are going in many other cases. The WCSD is moving towards a student-centered funding model and moving away from a competitive grant application process. We understand the merits of a competitive grant process, but we have concerns regarding timelines. Issues arise when an organization does not know what the policies will be and how much money they will get until June especially when the school year starts between August 6 and 10 of the same year.

The WCSD is concerned we will be funding the same number of seats but not the same seats themselves that were previously funded. This can become problematic if we are trying to provide consistency in State Pre-K programs. It is

also awkward to be awarding preliminary grants before policy bills are passed and become law.

There are additional concerns regarding the 200 percent FPL requirement and the special education percentage contained in S.B. 84. There are particular concerns with neighborhood schools hosting these programs, as it is very awkward for us to turn away families who do not meet the income requirements or are not willing to complete income-verification paperwork. Turning away students is always a challenge for us and feels opposite to what our mission should be.

The same situation applies to special education students as well. We want to serve these students, but if we do not meet the average numbers regarding student ratios, we will not be in compliance with S.B. 84. We can try to adjust the number of students in certain classrooms, but it is a challenge for us to meet requirements within each individual school location.

I testified earlier this Session regarding the importance of early literacy as it relates to NDE's Read by Grade 3 Program contained in S.B. No. 391 of the 78th Session. There are about 1,000 students within WCSD that could potentially be held back a grade once adjustments are made for good cause exemptions. One of the best interventions WCSD can provide these students is access to early childhood programs and Pre-K programs. We know where the students who need access to early childhood programs are located, as this is primarily within three zip codes. We want to be good stewards of funding and remain accountable; hopefully the issues that WCSD has can be resolved.

BRAD KEATING (Clark County School District; Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

I have the same concerns regarding S.B. 84 as Lindsay Anderson and WCSD. We appreciate that the NDE wants to move from a competitive grant cycle to a formula-based student centered model.

C.T. WANG:

I know this Committee and its partners have put a lot of work into S.B. 84, but I have some concerns regarding the quality of services. The bureaucracy that will result from the passing of S.B. 84 will be enormous. The \$4 million should be put into an education savings account and offered to the public for use in the schools they see fit. I do not have any insight into quality Pre-K programs, but I

am somewhat familiar with Head Start programs and their neutral or negative effects. We cannot start another program in Nevada that will fail and that will not adequately prepare students for college. I oppose S.B. 84.

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

The NSEA has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 100 years, and would excitedly support S.B. 84, if the competitive grant cycle was changed to a formula-based grant cycle. A formula-based grant cycle would ensure continuity of childhood development services. The childhood development that occurs in Pre-K programs is the most influential part of a child's life; many foundational aspects are learned during this time. The NSEA would eventually like to support S.B. 84, but until it is amended to include formula-based funding, we will remain neutral.

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association):

The Washoe Education Association (WEA) is neutral regarding S.B. 84, but we do think it is important. We are seeking an amendment to allow for formula-based funding instead of the competitive grant cycle. The WEA is concerned that the fiscal impact of new classrooms will affect existing classrooms; we are worried we will lose existing Pre-K classrooms. We do not want to potentially lose classroom assistance as well as educators.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

This Committee will now hear S.B. 444.

**SENATE BILL 444**: Makes an appropriation for certain costs associated with enrollment in prekindergarten education programs. (BDR S-729)

SENATOR JOYCE WOODHOUSE (Senatorial District No. 5):

An increase in funding for Nevada Pre-K education programs is contained in S.B. 444. Children are impacted greatly by Pre-K programs with findings showing that children who attend high-quality Pre-K programs enter K-12 schools with better prereading skills, richer vocabularies and stronger basic math skills than children who do not.

Nevada received State-matching funds for FY 2013 and FY 2014 from the PDG program whose goal was to allow selected states to implement interventions aimed at building or enhancing their Pre-K program infrastructure.

In Nevada, State and federal grant funding has assisted in expanding high-quality Pre-K programs to four-year-old children from low- to moderate-income families; federal funding for these programs has recently ended.

Currently, funding for Pre-K programs in Nevada supports over 3,000 Pre-K seats at a cost of approximately \$8,000 per seat; much of this information is also contained in S.B. 84. For the 2019-2021 biennium, the Governor recommends a General Fund appropriation of nearly \$45 million to continue Pre-K programs at the same level. It is estimated there are as many as 85,000 children between the ages of 3- and 4-years old in Nevada showing the need to expand Pre-K programs in the State.

An appropriation of \$12 million for each FY of the 2019-2021 biennium is contained in S.B. 444. This money will be used to support an additional 1,500 Pre-K seats at a cost of \$8,000 per seat. I urge your support of this important Legislation which increases funding for Nevada Pre-K education programs. I had the opportunity to visit 2 Pre-K programs within Senate District No. 5. Having been a Pre-K teacher for a long time, it was such a rewarding experience to see the children who qualify for this program to have this opportunity.

Many of the experiences those young children are experiencing are things that used to be taught in kindergarten and first grade. Our children are ready for these experiences. When we do not provide them, they are behind when they start attending class in kindergarten and first grade. It is incumbent upon us to remove these barriers, and I feel very strongly that Nevada needs to support Pre-K programs through S.B. 444.

Ms. OYA:

The NDE supports S.B. 444. When the State is only serving 11 percent of eligible 4 year olds, there is plenty of room to grow regarding Pre-K programs; we should be serving additional children. This is especially relevant regarding four-year-old children who should be provided with the highest services before attending kindergarten. We would like to serve every 3 and-4-year-old child meeting eligibility requirements, but at this point we are just trying to serve as many 4-year-old children under 200 percent of the FPL as possible.

The language within S.B. 444 aligns with the work of the NDE and aligns with the language contained in S.B. 84. If you visit a kindergarten class and speak with its teachers, the teachers will tell you that they can tell exactly which students came from a quality Pre-K program versus those children who did not. These teachers will also tell you how difficult it is to provide curriculum for children who vary regarding their level of development, knowledge and readiness for kindergarten. The NDE supports S.B. 444.

MS. HENDERSON:

The CAA supports S.B. 444 as this will help Nevada continue to expand access to high-quality Pre-K programs for the State's most at-risk youth. While Nevada has made progress in expanding access to Pre-K programs over the past two years, there is still much work to be done to ensure our children are provided with a strong learning foundation preparing them for kindergarten and beyond. Despite our improvements, Nevada still ranks 48th in the Nation for preschool enrollment, and 41st in per-capita spending among states who offer Pre-K programs.

Without additional funding, Nevada will continue to rank at the bottom and receive an "F" grade in school readiness for the CAA 2020 Nevada Children's Report Card. Outside of the rank among our peers, it is critical Nevada provide funding through S.B. 444 so an additional 1,500 children can have access to high-quality early learning. This will allow Nevada children to have a strong start in life as well as when they begin attending K-12 schools.

As a former Pre-K teacher working with at-risk youth in low-income environments, I can personally attest to the need for young children to have access to early learning opportunities. These opportunities have so much value for children and their parents.

MR. WANG:

I am opposed to S.B. 444 for the same reasons that I am opposed to S.B. 84. There will be an incredible bureaucracy regarding the distribution of funds contained in S.B. 444 preventing them from being used by the public as intended. Through a screening process, we need to make these funds available to the public for use as they see fit; families who want their children to succeed will reach out and use the funds appropriately. Every time the government gets involved in a project, the project fails.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

The need is great among young children to be able to access quality Pre-K programs. Last summer, I was provided with a request to fund an additional 1,500 Pre-K seats; this is the reason I decided to move this measure forward. Hopefully, this Committee can iron out any concerns it may have regarding S.B. 84. We need the appropriations contained in S.B. 84 to continue funding the 3,000 Pre-K seats. I know it will be difficult for us to add the additional seats requested by S.B. 444, but I strongly believe our children need access to these opportunities in order to further their education.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

The hearing on S.B. 444 is now closed.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

This Committee will now move onto the Nevada Gaming Control Board (NGCB) budget closings described in the April 11, 2019, Senate Committee on Finance Closing List #1 ([Exhibit H](#)). The NGCB budgets to be closed are budget account (B/A) 101-4061, B/A 101-4067 and B/A 244-4063.

## COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

### GAMING

GCB - Gaming Control Board — Budget Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-7  
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-4061

GCB - Gaming Commission — Budget Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-14  
(Volume I)

Budget Account 101-4067

GCB - Gaming Control Board Investigation Fund — Budget Page GAMING  
CONTROL BOARD-18 (Volume I)

Budget Account 244-4063

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

There are 3 major closing issues within B/A 101-4061 beginning on page 4 of [Exhibit H](#). The first issue deals with the Governor's recommendation to eliminate

one unclassified investigations supervisor within the NGCB Investigations Division. The NGCB has experienced a steady decrease in its gaming applications, eliminating 10 investigative positions during the 2015-2017 biennium and 7 investigative positions in the 2017-2019 biennium. The elimination of one unclassified investigations supervisor contained in decision unit E-225 would realign the ratios within the Investigations Division.

E-225 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-9

The investigative process has been streamlined due to a downturn in gaming applications and an improvement in applicant quality. During the February 25, 2019, joint budget hearing, the NGCB was asked if it had sufficient positions to accomplish its statutory duties if the investigation supervisor position were eliminated. The NGCB indicated they are comfortable with staffing levels even with the proposed position elimination.

Does the Committee wish to approve the Governor's recommendation to eliminate an unclassified investigations supervisor in the Investigations Division, which would result in a decrease in investigative fees transferred from B/A 244-4063 of \$126,311 in FY 2020 and \$126,782 in FY 2021?

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION TO ELIMINATE THE UNCLASSIFIED INVESTIGATIONS SUPERVISOR POSITION CONTAINED IN E-225 FROM B/A 101-4061.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

Major closing issue 2 discussed on page 5 of [Exhibit H](#) is a reclassification of an unclassified executive assistant to a classified administrative assistant. At the February 25, 2019, joint budget hearing of the Nevada Legislature Senate Committee on Finance and Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, the NGCB requested the elimination of E-805.

E-805 Classified Position Changes — Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-11

Upon further consideration, the NGCB indicated that its executive office requires flexibility and has specific needs such as working after hours and corresponding with top gaming industry professionals. The higher classification and unclassified status would help ensure the executive assistant exercises sound judgement regarding dissemination of information and would allow the flexibility of working after hours and on the weekends, if necessary. Furthermore, the existing unclassified position is currently filled. The Governor's Office of Finance (GFO) submitted Budget Amendment No. A192754061 ([Exhibit I](#)) to eliminate E-805 and increase General Fund appropriations by \$19,397 in FY 2020 and \$16,954 in FY 2021 in B/A 101-4061.

Does the Committee wish to approve Budget Amendment No. A192754061 which would retain the unclassified executive assistant position rather than reclassify it to a classified administrative assistant position resulting in a restoration of General Fund appropriations of \$19,397 in FY 2020 and \$16,954 in FY 2021?

SENATOR CANCELA MOVED TO APPROVE BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. A192754061 FOR B/A 101-4061.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

Major closing issue 3 beginning on page 5 of [Exhibit H](#) deals with Budget Amendment No. A192794061 ([Exhibit J](#)) which was submitted by the GFO on March 14, 2019. Budget Amendment No. A192794061 would provide General Fund appropriations of \$15,000 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium for additional in-State travel to perform out-of-town audits.

The NGCB has a 2 1/2-year audit cycle, with some years requiring less out-of-town travel than others. In FY 2018, the NGCB indicated they did not complete any out-of-town audits. During the 2019-2021 biennium, the



Senate Committee on Finance  
April 11, 2019  
Page 41

NGCB anticipates to perform 28 out-of-town audits which will help ensure out-of-town casinos are audited in the same frequency as in-town casinos.

Does the Committee wish to approve Budget Amendment No. A192794061 for B/A 101-4061 to provide \$15,000 in General Fund appropriations in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium to fund the Audit Division to perform more out-of-town audits?

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO APPROVE BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. A192794061 FOR B/A 101-4061.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division staff recommends approval of other closing items 1 through 6 as recommended by the Governor shown on page 6 of [Exhibit H](#). With the noted technical adjustments, closing item 7 on page 7 of [Exhibit H](#) appears reasonable to Fiscal staff. Fiscal staff requests authority to make other technical adjustments as necessary.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO APPROVE OTHER CLOSING ITEMS 1 THROUGH 6 FOR B/A 101-4061 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH THE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS NOTED IN OTHER CLOSING ITEM 7 AND ALLOW FISCAL STAFF TO MAKE OTHER TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS NECESSARY.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
BUDGET CLOSED.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

There is one major closing issue regarding B/A 101-4067, beginning on page 9 of [Exhibit H](#). The major closing issue pertains to additional out-of-State and in-State travel funding contained in E-225. This recommendation would provide General Fund appropriations of \$21,620 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium.

E-225 Efficient and Responsive State Government — Page GAMING CONTROL BOARD-15

Regarding out-of-State travel, the Governor recommends General Fund appropriations of \$11,806 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium for the Nevada Gaming Commission Chairman and 3 commissioners to each travel annually on 1 trip. The Governor's recommendation would bring the total costs associated with out-of-State travel to \$14,133. The NGCB indicates attendance to conferences and meetings are necessary for Commission members to remain knowledgeable on evolving issues.

The Governor recommends General Fund appropriations of \$9,814 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium for in-State travel for 5 commissioners and 1 senior research specialist. This would allow the NGCB to hold two meetings in Carson City and attend other meetings such as the NGCB, Gaming Policy Committee meetings.

Does the Committee wish to approve the Governor's recommendation to fund additional in-State and out-of-State travel funded with General Fund appropriations of \$21,620 in each year of the 2019-2021 biennium?

SENATOR CANCELA MOVED TO APPROVE E-225 IN B/A 101-4067.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

Fiscal staff recommends approval of other closing items 1, 2, and 3 as recommended by the Governor, shown on page 11 of [Exhibit H](#) with the

technical adjustment noted in other closing item 4. Fiscal staff requests authority to make technical adjustments to B/A 101-4067 as necessary.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO APPROVE OTHER CLOSING ITEMS 1, 2, AND 3 FOR B/A 101-4067 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH THE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENT NOTED IN OTHER CLOSING ITEM 4 AND ALLOW FOR FISCAL STAFF TO MAKE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS NECESSARY.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET CLOSED.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. COPELAND:

There are no major closing issues within B/A 244-4063. Fiscal staff recommends B/A 244-4063 be closed as recommended by the Governor with authority to make any necessary adjustments resulting from the Committee's closing actions on B/A 101-4061. Fiscal staff requests authority to make other technical adjustments as necessary.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO CLOSE B/A 244-4063 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR WITH AUTHORITY TO MAKE ANY NECESSARY ADJUSTMENTS RESULTING FROM THE COMMITTEE'S CLOSING ACTIONS ON B/A 101-4061 AND ALLOW FISCAL STAFF AUTHORITY TO MAKE OTHER TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS NECESSARY.  
SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET CLOSED.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

The Committee will now move on to a work session and discuss S.B. 233.

**SENATE BILL 233**: Revises provisions relating to capital improvement funds.  
(BDR 34-152)

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

The Senate Committee on Finance heard S.B. 233 on March 4, 2019. As introduced, S.B. 233 amends NRS 387.3335 to change the type of qualifying emergency conditions that would enable a board of trustees from a school district to apply to the GFO Director for a grant from the Fund to Assist School Districts in Financing Capital Improvement Projects. Senator Goicoechea and chief financial officer Paul Johnson of White Pine County School District introduced S.B. 233.

At present, Fiscal staff would note there is no funding from the Fund to Assist School Districts referenced within S.B. 233. The Fund to Assist School Districts would also need to be reestablished in the Nevada State Controller's Office Accounting System for money to become available. Fiscal staff is not aware of any amendments pertaining to S.B. 233, nor are there any fiscal notes effective upon passage and approval.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 233.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

Senate Committee on Finance  
April 11, 2019  
Page 45

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no further questions, this meeting is adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Tom Weber,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	8		Attendance Roster
S.B. 149	C	43	Senator Pete Goicoechea / Senatorial District No. 19	Presentation
S.B. 149	D	2	Ben Graham / Judicial Court of the State of Nevada	Resolution
S.B. 183	E	7	Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert / Senatorial District No. 15	Presentation
S.B. 84	F	8	Patti Oya and Jhone Ebert / Nevada Department of Education	Presentation
S.B. 84	G	1	Jany Ortiz / Nevada Education Association of Southern Nevada	Testimony
	H	14	Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division	Closing Packet
	I	6	Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division	Budget Amendment
	J	6	Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division	Budget Amendment