

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

**Eighty-First Session
April 26, 2021**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 6:02 p.m. on Monday, April 26, 2021, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, and Online. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Assembly District No. 11



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Mary O'Hair, Committee Manager
Kareen Prentice, Committee Secretary
Bet Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark Krueger, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection,
Office of the Attorney General
Sarah Nick, Management Analyst 3, Department of Education
Steve Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Dora Martinez, representing the Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition
Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada
Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Elliot Malin, representing the Anti-Defamation League
Christopher Daly, representing the Nevada State Education Association
Shirley Cyrus, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Maya Holmes, Healthcare Research Manager, Culinary Health Fund
Erin Williams, Information Technology Manager 3, Division of Public and
Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Chauncey Chau-Duong, representing the Southern Nevada Water Authority
David Dazlich, Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Christi Cabrera, Policy and Advocacy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Kyle Roerink, Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network
Tyler Klimas, Executive Director, Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board
Will Adler, representing Scientists for Consumer Safety
Anthony J. Ruiz, Senior Advisor of Government Relations and Community Affairs,
Nevada State College
Julia Teska, Budget Director, Nevada System of Higher Education
Lauren Porter, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Brenda Pearson, representing the Clark County Education Association
Sandy Ruybalid, Chief IT Manager, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen

Chair Carlton:

[Roll was called, and Committee protocol was explained.] We have several bills in front of us this evening but also, we have bill draft introductions. Our first item will be Bill Draft Request S-1060.

BDR S-1060—Makes an appropriation to the Office of the Attorney General for the cost of replacing standard glass windows and doors with ballistic glass and frames at the Carson City office. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 461](#).)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Bill Draft Request (BDR) S-1060 makes an appropriation to the Office of the Attorney General for the cost of replacing standard glass windows and doors with ballistic glass and frame at the Carson City Office, and provides other matters properly related thereto.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] This is a bill draft introduction, it does not mean you support or oppose the bill, you are just voting to introduce the bill. I will accept a motion on this BDR.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED FOR
COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1060.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED.

The next item is BDR S-1126.

BDR S-1126—Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for an upgrade to and reintegration of certain management systems and for replacement cameras, storage area networks and ovens. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 462](#).)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Bill Draft Request (BDR) S-1126 makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for an upgrade to and reintegration of certain management systems, the replacement of cameras, storage area networks and ovens, and provides other matters properly related thereto.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions or comments from Committee members? [There were none.] I will accept a motion on BDR S-1126.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED FOR
COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1126.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED.

The next item is BDR S-1058.

BDR S-1058—Makes a supplemental appropriation to the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for an unanticipated shortfall in the Forest Fire Suppression budget account. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 463](#).)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Bill Draft Request S-1058 makes a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for an unanticipated shortfall in the Forest Fire Suppression budget account and provides other matters properly related thereto

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will accept a motion on BDR S-1058.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED FOR
COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1058.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.] I will call for a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED.

Chair Carlton:

I will open the hearing for our first bill of the night, [Assembly Bill 61 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

For the public's clarification, [Assembly Bill 435](#) was withdrawn from the Ways and Means Committee at this morning's Floor Session. That bill is no longer within our jurisdiction and has been removed from the agenda.

Next is the Office of the Attorney General and [A.B. 61 \(R1\)](#).

[Assembly Bill 61 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to trade practices. (BDR 52-424)

Mark Krueger, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General:

[Assembly Bill 61 \(R1\)](#) seeks to amend the Deceptive Trade Practices Act and provides certain consumer protections for the benefit of individuals and businesses in this state. The amendment seeks to establish a price gouging prohibition during times of emergency, harmonize certain criminal penalties without general fraud, revise provisions related to

administrative hearings, and modify the statute of limitations for certain violations of the Deceptive Trade Practice Act. The amendment also increases penalties for robocalling and provides others matters properly related thereto.

I would like to note that I had a discussion with Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, regarding her fiscal concerns and why A.B. 61 (R1) ended up before this Committee. We believe we have a solution. We would move at this time to amend A.B. 61 (R1) to delete Sections 17.3, 17.6, and 17.9. By removing these provisions, the fiscal concerns raised by Ms. Coffman will be addressed.

Chair Carlton:

I am going to turn it over to Ms. Coffman for a walk through of the bill. Then we will discuss that option and move on from there.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Sections 17.3 through 17.9 would transfer the authority of the registration and regulation of credit servicing organizations from the Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of Business and Industry, to the Consumer Affairs Division. It is unclear if the transfer of these responsibilities from the Division of Mortgage Lending to the Consumer Affairs Division would create any additional duties related to the Consumer Affairs Division, which is a State General Fund budget account.

Chair Carlton:

By deleting those sections, we would be transferring the duties back to where they came from. Is that correct?

Sarah Coffman:

By deleting those sections, the duties would be retained within the Division of Mortgage Lending and there would be no fiscal impact.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions from Committee members regarding his proposed amendment? [There were none.] This is the hearing on A.B. 61 (R1). Mr. Krueger, did you have anyone else that you would like to speak on this bill at this time?

Mark Krueger:

No.

Chair Carlton:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 61 (R1). Is there anyone in support, opposition, or neutral on A.B. 61 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 61 (R1).

The next bills are Assembly Bill 149 (1st Reprint) and Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint). Assemblywoman Peters would like to roll A.B. 149 (R1) to the end of this meeting and

Assemblyman Leavitt would like to roll A.B. 167 (R1) to the end of the meeting as well. The next bill will be Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the suspension and expulsion of pupils. (BDR 34-176)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing suspension and expulsion of students. Schools have a responsibility to provide students with due process. Education is a right afforded to Nevadans. The United States Supreme Court case, *Goss v. Lopez*, indicates that the right to a free and public education cannot be withdrawn on grounds of misconduct, absent fundamentally fair procedures to determine whether misconduct had occurred.

Nevada students do not shed their constitutional rights at the doors of our schools. Education is a property and liberty interest. Both *Goss v. Lopez* and *Brown v. Board of Education*, establish that students have the due process under the 14th Amendment, no matter how arbitrary the incident.

This Legislative body has a responsibility to ensure that due process is clear in statute and in regulation. The legislation does not seek to outline what due process will look like in Nevada schools, rather the legislation seeks to require that the Nevada Department of Education releases guidance on what the appeals process should look like, and what the timeline should look like.

I believe the fiscal note is about Section 7 of the bill on page 9. The Committee will note that the language requires the Department of Education to provide guidance to school districts regarding the appeals process in as many languages as possible. My understanding from conversations with the Department of Education is that this fiscal note is intended to ensure that the Department has funds available to translate this document into as many languages as possible. I am open to any questions.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

The Department of Education provided a fiscal note of \$31,214 in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and \$578 in FY 2023, which primarily consists of translations services of \$27,200 and staff time to develop and conduct public workshops, which is approximately \$4,000 in FY 2022 and \$578 in FY 2023.

Chair Carlton:

Assemblywoman Torres, did you have any further conversations with the Department of Education about their fiscal note?

Assemblywoman Torres:

Yes, I did. They said it was just pertaining to the translation services. I will note to the Committee that the language in the legislation as is, is permissive language, it is not compulsive or requiring them to provide it in every single language. But my understanding

from the Department of Education is that they would like to, and that is why the fiscal note is there.

Chair Carlton:

Was there any conversation, as far as you know, with the new Office of New Americans to determine if that office could help with translation services, to help alleviate some of the costs?

Assemblywoman Torres:

That is my understanding.

Chair Carlton:

Alright. Is someone from the Department of Education available?

Sarah Nick, Management Analyst 3, Department of Education:

I am here on behalf of the Department of Education. The fiscal note is accurate regarding Sections 7 and 8. The Department feels these services are very important and necessary and should be translated into as many languages as possible.

Chair Carlton:

How do you currently handle translations in other areas?

Sarah Nick:

The Department of Education to date has not had a translation request of this size. For example, the reports that would be translated, we are estimating at 2,000 words. Typically, if we do use any translation services, it is a paragraph or less than a page.

Chair Carlton:

This is good information to have. Would the Department consider partnering with the Office of New Americans to possibly be able to lower the cost of these translation services since we do have that new department available to all other departments in the state?

Sarah Nick:

Yes, we will reach out to the Office of New Americans to make sure that we are looking at any cost reductions available. I will note that our fiscal note used \$0.17 a word and I believe that is the rate negotiated by the Office of New Americans.

Chair Carlton:

Great answer. Are there any other questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

We know that some federal funds we have received included funds for translations. We are desperate for translation services funds and we have been enthusiastic about getting as much as we can translated using these funds. As we look toward ensuring documents are translated, I know that you are focused on forward-facing documents. Do these forward-facing documents meet the criteria to be included in the plan for translation? Or do

you already have specific documents in the queue for translation services and these would not qualify?

Sarah Nick:

Yes, the Department looked at what potential funds could be available. It is important to note that federal relief funding would be related to COVID-19 forward-facing documents. As the Department of Education reads A. B. 194 (R1), this bill is related to discipline and restorative justice, which is very important and needs to be funded for translation. In terms of making sure that going forward, we are supplying more translation services, I think this is a great bill to start with.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

As I understand it, the grants are going to be specifically for COVID-19 documents. I think that is helpful to hear because I did not pick up on that fact when we were reviewing those funds when talking about translation services and forward-facing documents specific to COVID-19. I think we were all hoping that so much more could be translated. I will temper my expectations.

Chair Carlton:

That was one of things that I was looking at too. I was under the impression that ESSER [Elementary and Secondary Schools Emergency Relief] dollars might be able to be used for this. So, I think that is something we should keep in the backs of our minds as we move forward and do more investigation.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I just remembered the other day hearing in our K-12/Higher Education/CIP Subcommittee that we were allocating a certain amount of CARES [Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security] Act funds to translations, and I was hoping we would be able to leverage some of those funds to offset the fiscal note that the Department of Education has added to this bill. Hopefully, we can apply some of those funds to this endeavor.

Chair Carlton:

We are all thinking along the same line. Are there any other questions for Ms. Torres or the Department of Education?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I have a comment related to the expectation of increased delinquency and behavioral issues that may come from students being out of the classroom for so long. I would argue that these are COVID-19 related issues and if this funding can be directed toward those students and particularly their families who may be home and have language barriers, I would be inclined to say that it does fit that model.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Is there any language in the bill that says you can accept gifts or grants to fulfill the requirements of this legislation? I wonder if we could work with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), for example, and foreign language departments, to assist with translations?

Assemblywoman Torres:

My understanding is that the Department of Education has the ability to accept gifts or grants. I would be more than happy to add that language to the bill if necessary. There is nothing in this legislation that hinders the ability of the Department of Education to create partnerships with the Office of New Americans or NSHE or other existing offices. We should prioritize the most predominant languages in our state, which other than English, are Spanish and Tagalog.

I think it is great that the Department of Education is starting to look at how we can ensure language access for every Nevadan.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions or comments from Committee members? [There were none.]

This is the hearing on A.B. 194 (R1). Is there anyone in support of A.B. 194 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 194 (R1)?

Steve Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

The nature of my opposition is spending money on translations versus training that is specific to the population of students with disabilities. I love the due process piece from a policy perspective. I just cannot get there in terms of prior authorization.

Dora Martinez, representing the Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I would like to echo Steven Cohen's testimony.

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone else testifying in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone testifying in a neutral position on A.B. 194 (R1)? [There was no one.]

Assemblywoman Torres:

Chair, I believe Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers, would like to testify on ZOOM, in support of A.B. 194 (R1).

Chair Carlton:

I apologize that we missed you, Ms. Bortolin. Please go ahead.

Bailey Bortolin, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:

We want to thank Assemblywoman Torres for working with us on A.B. 194 (R1). We emphasize the importance we see in this bill, and we hope to see it move out of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee with support of this Committee. The bill has critical pieces for kids that are struggling now, as Assemblywoman Peters pointed out. What we think is critical is that as children transition and get in trouble at school for various issues and reasons behind that, this bill will ensure that they continue to receive as much education as possible and that they are not out of classroom and missing instruction when kids have already missed so much instruction this year. For that reason, we encourage you to support this bill as well, and we hope to continue working on it.

Chair Carlton:

I will invite Assemblywoman Torres back to give closing statements.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I just want to stress the importance of this legislation. Currently we have several counties that have no appeals process for suspensions and expulsions. It is a requirement for federal law to ensure that the State of Nevada is upholding the rights of Nevada students and providing due process. It is imperative to pass AB 194 (R1). I urge your support.

Chair Carlton:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 194 (R1). Next, I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint). I will invite Assemblywoman Cohen to present A.B. 231 (R1).

Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing education on the Holocaust and other genocides. (BDR 34-97)

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29:

Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint) requires the State Board of Education (Board) to create a subcommittee to review and make recommendations on age appropriate and historically accurate instruction about the Holocaust and other genocides. This is including, but not limited to, Armenian, Cambodian, Darfurian, Guatemalan, and Rwandan genocides. As part of this effort, for instance, there will be an inventory done of the available classroom materials for educators and a review of professional development and where it will be necessary.

The Board will then report its findings and any other recommendations, including the subcommittee's recommendations, to the Legislative Committee on Education and that will happen in even years. In odd years, the Legislative Committee on Education will consider the report and provide its own recommendations to the Legislature along with any recommendations to ensure the instruction required in the bill is included in the curricula for relevant courses.

Chair Carlton:

Ms. Coffman would you discuss the bill?

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

According to the Nevada Department of Education, as amended, the bill would cost the Department approximately \$4,000 over the biennium to provide technical support to the subcommittee.

Chair Carlton:

I believe we would want to clarify that those are technical support dollars and that the subcommittee members would not be compensated. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Yes. According to the Department of Education, that cost is for staff hours.

Chair Carlton:

I just want to make sure we create the appropriate record. Would the Department of Education provide a brief overview of the fiscal note?

Sarah Nick, Management Analyst 3, Department of Education:

We were able to reduce the original fiscal note for the bill as introduced. As the Assemblywoman correctly noted, the fiscal note is reflective of staff time. The content and intent of A.B. 231 (R1) is very important to the Department, and we want to be able to come back in the 2023 Legislative Session with a successful implementation of this bill. To do that, staff would need to be compensated for carrying out the duties of the subcommittee and various reporting requirements as well.

Chair Carlton:

The fiscal note is now approximately \$4,000 over the biennium. Assemblywoman Cohen, do you have anyone else you would like to present?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

No.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? [There was none.] I will open the hearing for A. B. 231 (R1). Is there anyone here in support of A.B. 231 (R1)?

Elliot Malin, representing the Anti-Defamation League:

I wanted the Anti-Defamation League on the record in support of A.B. 231 (R1). We appreciate Assemblywoman Cohen for bringing this bill forward.

Chair Carlton:

Thank you for the brevity. Is there anyone else in support of A. B. 231 (R1)?

Christopher Daly, representing the Nevada State Education Association:

The Nevada State Education Association has been the voice of Nevada educators for over 120 years. We supported the policy behind A.B. 231 (R1) in the Senate Education

Committee. We think the fiscal note is de minimis. The importance of education on the Holocaust and other genocides is significant, and we think this is a de minimis fiscal note and the Committee should approve the bill.

Shirley Cyrus, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I support this bill. I think it is important to learn about the history of not only America, but of the world. I am in 8th grade, and I attend a Washoe County School District public school. We have never really learned about this, and I am really interested in it. I must learn about it on my own, but I would think my classmates and my peers would also enjoy learning about this as well, and we would also benefit from this information.

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone testifying in opposition or in neutral to A.B. 231 (R1)? [There was none.] Assemblywoman Cohen did you have any closing comments on A.B. 231 (R1)?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

No.

Chair Carlton:

I will close the Hearing on A.B. 231 (R1). I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint): Provides for the collection of certain information from physicians. (BDR 54-771)

Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Assembly District No. 11:

Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint) requires a physician to complete a request for certain data when renewing his or her license with the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine. The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) must develop the data request. The confidential information obtained by the licensing board must be sent to DHHS which will collect and maintain the information. Assembly Bill 278 (R1) is an initial effort to monitor health care consolidation and protect competition between health care facilities.

A fiscal note was submitted on March 31, 2021 by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), DHHS, but with the amendment, the fiscal note has since been removed. The DHHS can identify existing staff to meet the annual reporting requirement and DHHS no longer needs the fiscal note.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

That is correct. There was an unsolicited fiscal note that indicated the amended bill no longer has a fiscal impact.

Chair Carlton:

Do Committee members have any questions now that the fiscal note has been removed?
[There were none.]

Chair Carlton:

I will open the hearing for A.B. 278 (R1). Is there anyone that would like to testify in support of A.B. 278 (R1)?

Maya Holmes, Healthcare Research Manager, Culinary Health Fund:

The Culinary Health Fund is in support of A.B. 278 (R1).

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone testifying in opposition? [There was none.] Is there anyone testifying in a neutral position for A.B. 278 (R1)?

Erin Williams, Information Technology Manager 3, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am Erin Williams, with the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. As indicated, we have removed our fiscal note based upon the amendment. The DPBH has determined that the fiscal impact submitted previously to develop a REDcap solution is no longer needed. Instead, DPBH was able to develop a survey using an existing system to meet the requirements of this bill. Additionally, DPBH has identified the use of existing staff to meet the annual reporting requirement. Therefore, the fiscal impact for this bill can be removed.

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in neutral to A.B. 278, (R1)? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 278 (R1).

Because I will be presenting Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint), we will skip that bill for now. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the conservation of water. (BDR S-1090)

Assemblyman Watts, Assembly District No. 15:

Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint) does two things. It requires after January 1, 2027, that the waters of the Colorado River which are distributed by the Southern Nevada Water Authority may not be used to irrigate nonfunctional turf on any property that is not zoned exclusively for a single-family residence.

Additionally, it tasks the Interim Committee on Public Lands to conduct, as part of its normal course of business, a study on matters of water conservation during the next interim. I know there were fiscal notes submitted by the Division of Water Resources. The bill as amended no longer applies to the Division. We have a representative from the Southern Nevada Water

Authority available by Zoom to answer any questions about the impact to their agency. I can speak to the intention with relation to the Interim Public Lands Committee.

Chair Carlton:

We will go to Ms. Coffman first.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

This bill does contain an interim study. The Legislative Counsel Bureau testified at their hearing that they do not have funds for interim studies in their budgets so any additional interim studies would be considered as additional expenses to their budget account.

Chair Carlton:

Assemblyman Watts, would you clarify the record on the study?

Assemblyman Watts:

The intent is that this investigation would take place within the Interim Committee on Public Lands as part of their normal course of business. This would be a matter to be discussed during the normal meeting schedule of that committee and would not require any additional meetings or workload to accomplish what is intended in the language of the bill.

Chair Carlton:

The term "study," I believe, is what is confusing in the bill. Would it be better if a letter of intent was issued with guidance to the Public Lands Committee to ensure it is clear that there are no funds associated with getting this work done, and it would be done within their current budget allotment?

Assemblyman Watts:

Yes. I am amenable to any solution that clarifies the intent of the bill.

Chair Carlton:

I just want to ensure everyone is on the same page. Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I think we have been using the term "study" when we want a board to deliberate and discuss a specific matter. Perhaps we can get into a habit of making that distinction.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone else that wants to present on A.B. 356 (R1)?

Assemblyman Watts:

Yes. Chaunsey Chau-Duong from the Southern Nevada Water Authority is here if Committee members have questions for the Water Authority.

Chair Carlton:

Do any Committee members have questions for the Southern Nevada Water Authority?

Assemblywoman Peters:

For the record, will this action result in any rate increase or cost to consumers who are part of your jurisdiction?

Chauncey Chau-Duong, representing the Southern Nevada Water Authority:

There is no anticipation of any rate increase under this provision.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open the hearing on A.B. 356 (R1). Is there anyone in support of A.B. 356 (R1)?

David Dazlich, Director of Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Vegas Chamber supports A.B. 356 (R1) and believes this bill is an important measure for conservation, especially given the current water situation.

Christi Cabrera, Policy and Advocacy Director, Nevada Conservation League:

The Nevada Conservation League supports A.B. 356 (R1). As the driest state in the nation, our state's water resources are precious and should not be wasted. Water conservation is huge, and this bill will save billions of gallons of water every year. We urge the Committee's support of A.B. 356 (R1).

Kyle Roerink, Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network:

The Great Basin Water Network supports A.B. 356 (R1) and for good reason. Our Colorado River allocation is set to take several cuts in coming years. To put things in perspective, the amount of water that the Southern Nevada Water Authority will save because of A.B. 356 (R1) is tantamount to the cuts that we are going to take in the coming years. I have heard folks say this is a negligible amount of water, but I cannot stress enough that no drop of water on the Colorado River is too small. The amount of water that this bill will save is tantamount to the amount of water that Lake Mead lost to evaporation in the month of March. It is also the amount that can serve tens of thousands of residents in southern Nevada, especially if those residents are water smart. This bill will not cost the state a cent but doing nothing could be costly. Assembly Bill 356 (R1) demonstrates that Nevada is setting the example on the Colorado River. This is truly a watershed opportunity.

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone testifying in opposition or in neutral to A.B. 356 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 356 (R1) and I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 149 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 149 (1st Reprint): Requires the Cannabis Compliance Board to create an electronic database containing certain information relating to testing conducted by cannabis independent testing laboratories. (BDR 56-693)

Assemblywoman Peters:

Assembly Bill 149 (1st Reprint) is related to cannabis industry laboratory data, public transparency, and reporting. The purpose of this bill is to increase transparency for consumers of cannabis products in Nevada. The Cannabis Compliance Board has authority to develop and publish data collected via the seed-to-sale program, known as Metre.

Laboratory data is one of the most important subsets of data available through the Metre program. Laboratory data tells us the level of THC in each batch of tested product as well as any potential contaminants such as mold or toxins and is used to ensure consumer safety.

Section 1 of A.B. 149 (R1) proposes a database be developed that contains all laboratory information related to cannabis products sold in Nevada. The amendment revised this section to ensure that database of laboratory data is available to the public in a readily accessible format and requires that a biennial report be submitted to the Legislature describing the laboratory data and any pertinent analysis that was conducted on the data and how it was used by the Cannabis Compliance Board or the public.

The Cannabis Compliance Board has determined that the development of the database system that would meet these requirements under the bill language would cost \$178,800 in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and \$63,200 in FY 2023.

Chair Carlton:

We will go to Ms. Coffman next.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

The Cannabis Compliance Board submitted a fiscal note of \$178,800 in FY 2022 and \$63,200 in FY 2023. The fiscal note relates to Section 3 of the bill which requires the Board to implement and maintain an electronic database containing the information related to testing conducted on cannabis products by independent testing laboratories. The bill also provides that this information be accessible to licensees.

Chair Carlton:

This would be funded with State General Fund dollars and not through reserves from the Cannabis Compliance Board. Is that correct?

Sarah Coffman:

The Cannabis Compliance Board is funded through the marijuana retail tax. However, any funds not used by the Cannabis Compliance Board are transferred to the Distributive School Account (DSA), either the pupil-centered funding plan or the education fund, going forward into next biennium.

Chair Carlton:

It is my understanding that these funds can be used for this, it would just have an impact on the downstream effect. There is a percentage that goes to law enforcement, and there is a percentage that goes to whatever funding formula evolves for K-12 funding. Is that correct?

Sarah Coffman:

That is correct.

Chair Carlton:

It would not necessarily need to come out of the K-12 funding portion of it, it could come out of the law enforcement funding. It would just have an impact downstream.

Sarah Coffman:

I believe the \$5 million that is for law enforcement is in statute, but I would need to double-check.

Chair Carlton:

I think we need to investigate. I want to make sure everyone realizes that this does not necessarily have to be State General Funds. There are other funds that could possibly be available. Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I like the transparency piece of this bill. The labs are collecting this data and getting better at collecting it. We know from the Cannabis Compliance Board's testimony that there were issues from an audit last session about the amount of data being entered into the seed-to-sale system, but it seems like we have resolved that matter now.

The data from labs exists. Does the onus have to be on the Cannabis Compliance Board for that data? What has been the conversation with labs about the data they have and whether it is a transparent process? Is it proprietary?

Assemblywoman Peters:

Not at all. The database buildout is the front-end for user access to the data. Right now, you can pull data from the Metre program, but it is messy, and it does not tell you a lot, and it is not aggregated in any way. It is not useful if you are looking at trends, or if you are trying to assess who has the most consistent THC in their product, or whatever it is you may be looking to find.

Under this budget, the Cannabis Compliance Board is proposing to develop a user-friendly front-end that takes that Metre data and translates it into something that is usable and exportable by the user of the data. Any person in the state can use that data for their own edification, or for complaints, or for other issues.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

The Cannabis Compliance Board will create a dashboard. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman Peters:

Yes.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

A piece of the fiscal note has been addressed through the amendment. This fiscal note is the cost of upgrading the software to create a dashboard. If this cost were a one-time upgrade to take the data and turn it into a dashboard, I am wondering why it would continue to cost more money down the road.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I would appreciate a response from the Cannabis Compliance Board, but I would also like to say that this work has not been put out to bid yet. This is a not-to-exceed estimate related to the expectation of what we could develop with known players already under contract with the Cannabis Compliance Board. Depending on what is put out to bid, the estimate could change for future biennia.

Chair Carlton:

I will go next to Mr. Klimas.

Tyler Klimas, Executive Director, Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board:

To answer the question, yes, this money would be to create a dashboard that does not exist now.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Is \$63,000 the estimated cost for the software, and is this cost a one-time expense or an ongoing expense?

Tyler Klimas:

There is an initial build-out fee and then ongoing costs, not only for data storage given the massive amounts of data that we need to store on the dashboard, but also for continued maintenance. For the ongoing cost of \$63,200 that you see in future fiscal years, the larger chunk of that amount is the original build out of the dashboard.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? The original fiscal note of \$178,800 is for the build-out and the \$63,200 is for the ongoing maintenance costs. Is that correct?

Tyler Klimas:

Yes. That is correct.

Chair Carlton:

I wanted to ensure we had a correct record. Are there any other questions?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Because the marijuana industry is essentially a program that pays for itself, have we asked labs if they could be a part of the solution? I imagine no one would willingly say yes, but I think it is fair to ask because it is its own enterprise fund that pays for itself.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I want to address your point about how this can create cost savings, or how this could be absorbed by the Cannabis Compliance Board. One of the issues with the current way the Metre system produces data is that it requires a lot of staff time sifting through that data and pulling the data out to do the trend analysis to see if there are problems. Then the identified problems need to be pursued depending on how many audits can be performed each year and how many cases can be investigated and followed through.

Creating this dashboard also would provide a quicker way for staff to access that trend analysis and the data that would help staff pursue problems in a more efficient way.

Chair Carlton:

Being able to track problems more quickly is something I had not considered in this software proposal. I first thought about getting the data and putting the data out there, but the suggestion that this would make it easier for the Cannabis Compliance Board staff to identify problems more quickly, I believe, is an important conversation. Are there other questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Do any other states have a dashboard like what you are proposing that we could borrow from and use for the build-out?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I do not know the answer to that question. I will ask the Board to respond if they know.

Tyler Klimas:

Yes. Other jurisdictions and other regulatory agencies utilize dashboards for different purposes. For example, Oregon and Massachusetts both have an ongoing contract in excess of \$100,000 with a data service to provide data, not only for labs, but in all aspects of the industry. The dashboard is used differently in different jurisdictions.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open the hearing on A.B. 149 (R1). Is there anyone testifying in support of A.B. 149 (R1)?

Will Adler, representing Scientists for Consumer Safety:

Scientists for Consumer Safety is one of the original supporters of this bill. We are a group of lab testers in Nevada who do the testing of cannabis from the early days of medical marijuana testing when the first lab regulations were being developed. As this program is developed and has grown, we are now on the Metre seed-to-sale software in that data stream.

To be clear this data is already collected. The data is taken in and we have a process for data and we already produce the data in real time. The data is put in a databank that only we can see. However, the data we can see is the data that we personally have produced in the Metre databank.

The ideal would be just to publish that Metre data in a public databank. Nobody would need to manipulate or do much more than that, but just take that Metre data and put it in a public databank. Whatever form it happens in would be a boon to transparency in Nevada. That is the one message I would like to get across. The more transparency the better. Labs can call out cheaters who use the lab process to manipulate lab test scores or going from lab-to-lab shopping to find the best score. The public could then call out badly tested products. They could simply look up the test score and say, "did I happen to get a test score that was good or did I get a bad one because it is matching the moldy product that I am looking at here?" Just some sort of way you could double-check the system that is already being done behind the scenes. We look for support on A.B. 149 (R1).

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone else testifying in support of A.B. 149 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone testifying in opposition or neutral on A.B. 149 (R1)? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I wanted to point out that Mr. Adler is correct. We could give the public access to Metre data as it comes out of the Metre system. It is not easy to use and people would have to find a way to manipulate the data. It would increase transparency with laboratory data that we are looking for from this bill. The dashboard is really an extension of that effort to make the data more user-friendly and easier to manipulate.

Chair Carlton:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 149 (R1) and I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-749)

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint) requires public and charter K-12 schools, as well as the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) universities, to print the telephone number and text message option for the National Suicide Prevention Hotline, or its successor organization, on any newly printed or reprinted student identification cards.

I believe the fiscal note has been removed. It was removed because the amendment clarified that schools which do not currently have student identification cards are not required to start printing student identification cards. The amendment also removed the requirement that information be printed on the back of the student identification cards. This amendment was

needed because of the fiscal note submitted by the College of Southern Nevada (CSN). The CSN has an antiquated system for printing identification cards and CSN is the only institution in the state that cannot print on the back of their identification cards. We amended the bill so that the information could be printed on the front of the student identification cards until their system is updated.

Chair Carlton:

We will go next to Ms. Coffman.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

The bill, as originally introduced, had a fiscal impact from NSHE of \$843,383 in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and \$10,263 in FY 2023 related to the requirement that all student identification cards had to have this information printed on the back of the identification cards. As amended, NSHE provided us with a revised estimate of \$26,263 in FY 2022. However, we just received an email prior to the start of this meeting from NSHE indicating that there is no fiscal impact.

Chair Carlton:

Please ensure that the email from NSHE is part of the record [[Exhibit C](#)]. The NSHE fiscal note has been removed because NSHE has indicated they can do this with no fiscal impact. Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open the hearing on A.B. 167 (R1). Is there anyone testifying in support of A.B. 167 (R1)?

Anthony J. Ruiz, Senior Advisor of Government Relations and Community Affairs, Nevada State College:

The Nevada State College supports A. B. 167 (R1), as amended. Nevada State College affirms there will not be a fiscal impact to add the information required by the bill.

Julia Teska, Budget Director, Nevada System of Higher Education:

The NSHE supports A.B. 167 (R1). I am confirming that we have clarified some points of the bill and have been able to remove the fiscal impact.

Lauren Porter, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I am a student at Nevada State College, and I am in support of A. B. 167 (R1). Nevada State College has taken steps to put the Suicide Prevention Lifeline information on the back of all newly printed faculty and staff cards, and it was an easy change. I submit my support for this bill.

Brenda Pearson, representing the Clark County Education Association:

Clark County Education Association is in support of A.B. 167 (R1), and we ask that this be the version enacted. There is a similar clause in Senate Bill 249, but Clark County Education Association favors the prescriptive nature of A.B. 167 (R1) in which the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, or its successor organization, is specified.

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the mental health crisis our students face every day. It is about time, we as Nevadans, stand together and give our students the resources they need, should students require crisis support in times of suicidal ideation. By ensuring information to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline is readily accessible on the back of every student identification card, students will be given one more resource that will help promote the destigmatization of mental illness and stimulate discussion of the subject matter.

One of the most crucial clauses of this bill is the availability of information for texting. Many of our students that are connected in the digital age are more comfortable with texting than phone calls. If the difference between saving a child's life is a text or a phone call, then why not make sure there is every option available? Regardless of the fiscal note, this is not an expense we can be stingy on, this is an expense that would be wonderful to utilize COVID-19 extra funds on until we can designate a revenue source to bring our education funding back to our early 2000 standards when we were in line with the nation.

Clark County Education Association respectfully asks this Committee to help our educators by ensuring that every resource possible is available to our students.

Chair Carlton:

Is there anyone else testifying in support, opposition or neutral on A.B. 167 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 167 (R1). I will now present Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint) to the Committee. [Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno assumed the Chair.]

Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Patient Protection Commission. (BDR 40-497)

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint).

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Assembly Bill 348 (R1) transfers the Patient Protection Commission from the Office of the Governor to the Office of the Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). This is a budget item and is in conflict with how the Governor's budget is currently proposed, but there have been numerous discussions with DHHS about whether the Commission belongs in the Division of Aging and Disability Services or in the Director's Office. This item will be closed in a subcommittee hearing in the very near future. I would not expect this bill to move until that decision has been made. Once that decision has been made this could be considered a budget implementation bill.

There are other provisions in the bill that address the makeup of the Patient Protection Commission which are more policy oriented. I believe as the bill is currently drafted, the fiscal notes and identified costs have been removed as amended, but I would be happy to let Fiscal Analysis Division staff confirm that, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will go to Ms. Coffman.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

This bill has been identified as a budget implementation bill. There have been no actual fiscal impacts or dollars that have been identified for this bill. However, it does implement a budget decision that is going to be considered by the Subcommittee on Human Services on Wednesday.

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Tolles:

The fiscal note of approximately \$2.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and \$3.6 million in FY 2023 is being removed. On Wednesday, we will be considering a zero fiscal note for budget implementation. Is that correct?

Sarah Coffman:

Yes. That is correct. The DHHS provided a fiscal note. As amended, that fiscal note was removed. The concern that Fiscal staff expressed on this bill was related to Rule No. 14.6 which identifies any bills that may be considered budget implementation bills should be targeted as bills that are either exempt or eligible for exemption. That is why this bill was identified by Fiscal staff.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

When this bill was amended in the Subcommittee on Health and Human Services, the all-payer claims database was removed from the bill. There was a miscommunication with legal staff. The all-payer claims database is a proposal from the Patient Protection Commission, so it was originally included in A.B. 348 (R1). It was never intended to be in this bill, so it was removed by amendment. Therefore, the fiscal note was addressed.

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Roberts:

We will hear this as a budget item separate from the bill in our budget closings. Is this correct?

Sarah Coffman:

Yes. That is correct. If the Subcommittee, and then subsequently after that the full Committees, choose to move the Patient Protection Commission to the Director's Office, this would then become a budget implementation bill, and that would have to be passed in order to effectuate the decisions that are being made by the recommendation of the Subcommittee and then the full Committees.

Assemblyman Roberts:

Will we take no action on this bill here before us today?

Sarah Coffman:

That would be up to Assemblywoman Carlton to determine when she would like to move this bill.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

It will be treated the same way as other budget implementation bills. Once we make the decision in Subcommittee and that bill moves to the full Committees, this bill will start making its way so both bills will move at the same time. We do not want to have one bill get too far ahead of the other. We want them to stay close to each other as we move forward. That is typically how we would handle a budget implementation bill. Knowing that the bills are tied together and if one bill fails the other bill fails, we do need to move both bills along the same path at roughly the same time.

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any testimony in support of, or in opposition to, A.B. 358 (R1)? [There was none.]
Is there anyone testifying in neutral on this bill?

**Sandy Ruybalid, Chief IT Manager, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services:**

I am testifying in neutral on A. B. 348 (R1), and I am confirming that the fiscal note has been removed.

Vice Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else that would like to testify in neutral on A.B. 348 (R1)? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Carlton, do you have any closing comments? [She did not.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 348 (R1).

[Assemblywoman Carlton reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Carlton:

We have heard the bills that were on our agenda for this evening. It is the Chair's intent to go ahead and move some of the bills since we will not be having another meeting this week, and we do not want to slow the process down. I have been given permission by Speaker Frierson to move bills as we deem appropriate when necessary.

It would be the Chair's intent to move Assembly Bill 61 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint), Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint), and Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint).

I will ask Ms. Coffman to walk us through each bill. Please begin with Assembly Bill 61 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 61 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to trade practices. (BDR 52-424)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 61 (1st Reprint) primarily revises provisions relating to trade practices. However, it also transfers authority for the registration and regulation of credit service organizations from the Division of Mortgage Lending to the Consumer Affairs Division.

Mark Krueger, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General, testified that he suggested a conceptual amendment to eliminate Sections 17.3 through 17.9, which would eliminate the fiscal impact by removing the provision that would provide that transfer of authority from the Division of Mortgage Lending to the Consumer Affairs Division for the credit service organizations.

There were no individuals that testified in support, opposition, or neutral on this bill.

Chair Carlton:

With those three sections being removed there will be no fiscal note. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO AMEND AND
DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 61 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments from Committee members on this bill?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Because the fiscal note was removed, is that what we are voting on?

Chair Carlton:

Our jurisdiction covers the fiscal note, it is not necessarily a policy vote. The bill came out of the policy committee. After we clear the fiscal note, we are going to send it back to the Assembly Floor and that is where final passage on the bill will occur.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

We can disagree with the policy and be okay with the fact that it does not have a fiscal note?

Chair Carlton:

If you would like to, and if you are going to vote no on it on the floor, please let me know. If you are in opposition in general, it is fine to be in opposition. Our job is to address and/or clear and have full conversation about the fiscal notes. Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will call for a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS VOTED NO.)

I will ask Assemblywoman Jauregui to handle the floor statement on this bill. We will move on to Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-749)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint) requires the Board of Trustees of a school district, the governing body of a charter school, a university, a state college, and a community college to include certain information on identification cards issued to people or students, as applicable. There was originally a fiscal note provided by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), however, several individuals from NSHE testified that the amendment removed the fiscal impact. There were four individuals in support of this bill which was presented by Assemblyman Leavitt.

Chair Carlton:

The fiscal note has been removed on A.B. 167 (R1). Are there any other questions on this bill? [There were none.] I will accept a motion on A.B. 167 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 167 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED.

Assemblyman Leavitt will handle the floor statement for this bill.

We will move to Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the suspension and expulsion of pupils. (BDR 34-176)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 194 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing the suspension and expulsion of pupils and provides in Section 7 of the bill, that the Department of Education, to the extent practicable, shall provide guidance to the Board of Trustees of each school district on the appeal policy adopted by the Board of Trustees of such school districts pursuant to Section 5 of this Act in as many languages as possible for the benefit of pupils and parents or legal guardians of pupils.

The individual who presented this bill was Assemblywoman Torres. The Department of Education provided a fiscal note of \$31,214 in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and \$578 in FY 2023,

primarily for translation services. There was some discussion related to the requirement for translation services because the bill does specify "to the extent practicable." There was also further discussion related to the usage of federal funds to cover these expenditures.

Chair Carlton:

We did have a conversation and it was brought up that there are translation funds encapsulated in the budget as it is moving forward. It is centered around the pupil-centered funding formula and all other education items that budget subcommittees are going through. Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 194 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 194, (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.] I will call for a vote.

THE MOTION PASSED.

I will assign the floor statement for this bill to Assemblywoman Torres. Next, we will move to Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing education on the Holocaust and other genocides. (BDR 34-97)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing education on the Holocaust and other genocides. Section 1 of the bill creates a subcommittee to review and make recommendations on the matter in which to provide instruction about the Holocaust and other genocides. The bill further indicates the subcommittee shall link current standards with community resources that may assist in the instruction and review of the way the current standard supports comprehensive education regarding the Holocaust.

The original bill had four fiscal notes submitted, with local governments and the Nevada Department of Education identifying fiscal impacts. As amended, it appears the fiscal impacts for local governments have been addressed. However, according to the Nevada Department of Education, as amended the bill would still cost the Department approximately \$4,000 over the biennium to provide technical support to the subcommittee.

Assemblywoman Cohen testified on this bill. There were three individuals who testified in support of this bill.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions or comments from Committee members? [There were none.] I will accept a motion for Assembly Bill 231 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 231 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED.

I will assign the floor statement for this bill to Assemblywoman Cohen. Next, we will move to Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint): Provides for the collection of certain information from physicians. (BDR 54-771)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 278 (1st Reprint) requires the Department of Health and Human Services to develop and make available to the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine a data request to be administered to applicants for the renewal of a license for biennial registration.

The Division of Public and Behavioral Health had a fiscal note. However, they confirmed on the record that with the amendment there was no fiscal impact. Assemblywoman Duran presented this bill. There were two individuals who testified in support of this bill and one individual who testified in the neutral position on this bill.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions or comments from Committee members? [There were none.] I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 278 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement for this bill to Assemblywoman Duran. Now, we will move to Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the conservation of water. (BDR S-1090)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 356 (1st Reprint) relates to water. It prohibits, with certain exceptions, the use of water from the Colorado River to irrigate nonfunctional turf on certain properties, and requires the Board of Directors of Southern Nevada Water Authority to develop a plan for the removal of nonfunctional turf on certain properties. It creates and sets forth the duties of a Nonfunctional Turf Removal Advisory Committee. It requires the Legislative Committee on Public Lands to conduct a study concerning water conservation and providing other matters related thereto.

Assemblyman Watts presented this bill. The fiscal impact was related to determination as to whether the Legislative Counsel Bureau needed to fund a study. During the testimony it was indicated that this would be part of the normal duties of the Committee.

There were three individuals who testified in support of this bill and no one testified in opposition or neutral on this bill.

Chair Carlton:

Discussion with Assemblyman Watts focused on whether a letter of intent from the Ways and Means Committee should be sent to the Committee on Public Lands or whether we feel that there is sufficient record specifying that the Committee on Public Lands will address this issue within their workload during the next interim?

Assemblyman Watts:

I would defer to others. The intent is clear that this is to be conducted in the normal course of the interim Committee on Public Lands' meetings and responsibilities. If other members believe a letter of intent is required in addition to the record set today, I am more than open to that.

Chair Carlton:

It states at the beginning of Section 42 that the Committee on Public Lands will conduct a study. I think it is clear. If we feel we need to make another adjustment in the other house, we can always address it there. I do not believe there will be any proposed amendments or letters of intent.

Are there any questions or comments from Committee members on A.B. 356 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 356 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Watts. I believe that leaves two bills. For Assembly Bill 149 (1st Reprint) we will continue to work with Assemblywoman Peters and for Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint) when it is the appropriate time, we will put that bill on its path. I do not believe we have any other business this evening. I will open the meeting for public comment.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen:

Let me just point out that a lot of great bills have been passed. It is great to see that there is unanimous approval. I have thought about one idea or possible bill that would really fix a lot of the problems, not just in the state, but perhaps this country and around the world.

Former comedian, and he passed away several years ago, Robin Williams, mentioned it very well. Politicians should wear sponsor jackets like NASCAR drivers and then we know who owns them. I think if we were to pass this policy here in Nevada, this would be a wonderful, revolutionary, game changer for our state. I think it would be great to see if a candidate is getting some amount of donor money from special interest groups that exceeds a very high amount that those logos of those political action committees (PACS), corporations, and special interest groups should be labeled on the outfits that they are wearing so we can see who they work for. This will encourage folks not to get a lot of dark money and we make sure that we have a government that works for the people, by the people, and not just a handful of billionaires, special interest groups, and corporations. I am going to be working very hard to spread this idea to make sure that we get true representation.

Chair Carlton:

Is there any other public comment? [There was none.] We are adjourned [at 7:53 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kareen Prentice
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is an email from Julia Teska, Budget Director, Nevada System of Higher Education addressing Assembly Bill 167 (1st Reprint).