

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

**Eighty-Second Session  
May 26, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 8:19 a.m. on Friday, May 26, 2023, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair  
Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow  
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters  
Assemblyman Howard Watts  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Clara Thomas, Assembly District No. 17



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Daniel L. Crossman, Legislative Auditor  
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Adam Drost, Principal Program Analyst  
Yuriy Ikovlev, Program Analyst  
Colby Nichols, Program Analyst  
Anna Freeman, Committee Secretary  
Janet Osalvo, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Cody L. Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health,  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Jacob Dalstra, representing MedX AirOne  
Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family  
Engagement, Department of Education  
Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County, Extension,  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Jennifer Lanahan, representing the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and the Las Vegas  
Paiute Tribe  
Alex Tanchek, representing the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Shoshone-Paiute Tribes  
of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the  
Duckwater Reservation  
Jennifer Willett, Nevada Senior Grassroots Manager, All Voting is Local Action  
Nevada  
Teresa Melendez, Indigenous Organizer, Sparks, Nevada  
Randi Lone Eagle, Chair, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe  
James T. Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural  
Resources  
Daniel H. Stewart, representing the Clark County Education Association  
Alexander Marks, Director of Strategy, Nevada State Education Association  
Casey Rodgers, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada  
Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services  
Mary C. Walker, representing Douglas, Lyon, and Storey Counties  
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public  
Defender's Office  
Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties  
Tom Clark, representing Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction  
John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County  
District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys  
Association

Lori Matheus, Justice of the Peace, Lyon County, and Municipal Court Judge,  
Fernley Municipal Court  
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will begin with Assembly Bill 158.

**Assembly Bill 158: Revises provisions relating to emergency medical services.  
(BDR 40-511)**

**Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40:**

Assembly Bill 158 was previously presented in the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor, where it passed with a unanimous vote. The only remaining fiscal note on this bill is \$10,000—\$5,000 per year—for the administration of the interface to the compact.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

What does that \$5,000 per year cover?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

That may best be answered by the Department of Health and Human Services, but it is my understanding that it is solely for the interface to the program, to operate the compact, paperwork, and licensing.

**Cody L. Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health,  
Department of Health and Human Services:**

Assemblyman O'Neill is completely correct. This covers the license for the interface between the two systems that would have to speak to each other.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Software?

**Cody L. Phinney:**

Correct.

**Assemblywoman Backus:**

Are there any fees to be a part of the compact system, such as annual dues?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

The compact has not done that, nor have they made any statements to that effect. The charge is strictly for the interface software.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 158?

**Jacob Dalstra, representing MedX AirOne:**

MedX AirOne is an air and ground medical transportation service based in Elko, Nevada. We are in support of this bill. Having this compact will greatly improve our ability to attract and get providers in our service to be able to provide 911 service and critical care services for Northern Nevada and throughout the entire state. We are able to draw a lot of providers from Idaho and Utah, which are part of this compact. We believe that this will help support our services, and better serve citizens of Northern Nevada. I appreciate your taking the time to consider this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 158? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 158? [There was no one.]

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

The policy has already been discussed; there was a lot of support. Thank you for your consideration of the bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

With that, we will close the hearing on A.B. 158, and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 515.

**Assembly Bill 515: Provides for the award of tuition assistance and stipends under the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching Grant Program. (BDR 34-1216)**

**Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement, Department of Education:**

Assembly Bill 515 creates the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching Grant Program. The language in this bill is required to implement the program, and was requested by the Subcommittees during budget closings for the Department of Education. The Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching Grant Program is currently utilizing Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds. It provides tuition assistance to college students in the last three semesters of the teacher preparation program, and stipends for students completing their student teaching experience. As many of you may know, students in teacher preparation programs must complete a student teaching experience—essentially an unpaid internship—for 12 to 16 weeks, which prevents students from maintaining any existing full-time employment. This can be a significant barrier; students may postpone their student teaching experience until it is financially feasible for them to take time off from work. There is a teacher shortage in the state, and offering these incentives is a way to address part of this crisis.

I will quickly provide an overview of the bill. Section 2 provides a definition of an approved traditional pathway licensure program. Section 3 establishes the program, and provides the eligibility requirements for postsecondary institutions to apply for the grant. It also provides requirements to the State Board of Education to establish the number of awards, review applications, and to prioritize the award of grants. Section 4 provides the eligibility requirements for students to receive an award from the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching

Grant Program. This includes enrollment in the students' final three semesters of a program approved traditional pathway and student teaching. It also includes the student agreements to complete the program and maintain employment as a teacher at a public school in Nevada for five years.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

During the budget closing, we appropriated \$6.8 million in each year of the biennium for this program. However, legislation is needed to go with that money.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

How will students in the student teaching process be made aware of this? Will this be done by the universities, or will this be done by the Department?

**Craig Statucki:**

Primarily, this will be done through the postsecondary institutions, because these students are already enrolled in those institutions. The Department is always willing to engage our postsecondary institutions in finding ways to help support our educators across the board—whether they are existing students or, potentially, career and technical education students who will go into those postsecondary programs—to let them know this is available, so they can plan. Student teaching is not planned the semester before; they are planning years in advance for that experience.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

How many teachers are expected to receive support with this program, and how quickly will it be off the ground?

**Craig Statucki:**

The good news is that we are already implementing this, utilizing ESSER funds. For the first portion of the first semester in the 2023-2024 school year, we can continue to utilize ESSER funds, because we have until September 30, 2023. We believe we will be able to roll that portion straight in; we already have a process in place to move forward. We are hoping it will be a smooth transition.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I hope so too. I cannot imagine having people fall off this program in October when that funding expires.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I do not have a question; I want to make a comment, because there has been a lot of discussion over the last couple of days about the Governor's proposed budget, and how the Legislature acted on that budget.

This program was in the Governor's recommended budget. Most of us in this Committee voted in favor of funding this program with approximately \$6.8 million each year of the biennium. This is the budget bill for it to be implemented. I have heard a lot of conversation

about other Governor-recommended programs in other bills in front of this Committee—namely Assembly Bill 400—which are still under consideration, but this was put in the budget, as recommended by the Governor. I believe most of us in this Legislative body agreed that this was a great program, and it should be funded.

I am delighted to see this bill, because this is going to help with our teacher pipeline. Of course, we have other bills that are going to help with that as well, but I want to thank everyone involved for getting this program up and running. Thanks to my colleagues who chose to vote in favor of funding it, so that we can get it launched.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

This is a good policy, and the money has been recommended. I will be voting in favor of this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 515?

**Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County, Extension, University of Nevada Reno:**

Thank you for bringing forth this allocation of funding for our students. Thank you to the Department of Education for creating the language to go along with it. We are facing a teacher shortage, and we have been for quite some time. This funding will help those students in those last semesters to get across the finish line to become successful teachers, which we so desperately need in our state. We support.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing the Nevada Association of School Superintendents:**

We want to thank everyone for the support that has been shown to K-12, and we are very much in support of this piece of legislation. As all of you know, we have a teacher shortage. This will help mitigate some of those issues.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 515? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 515? [There was no one.]

With that, we will close the hearing on A.B. 515. Because the rules were waved yesterday, we can now work session bills the same day that we hear the bill if the bill does not have a fiscal impact. I would accept a motion to do so.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 515.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

Again, I want to say how much this program is needed in the state. I appreciate what I believe is going to be unanimous support out of this Committee today, and hopefully on the floor, but I especially want to thank my 28 colleagues on the Assembly floor who voted to fund the program, which is important. The policy is good—I think we all agree on that—but policy without funding to execute it rings hollow in my mind. Again, I want to thank the members of the Legislature in both houses that voted to fund this program.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there any other discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Backus. We will move on to Assembly Bill 516.

**Assembly Bill 516: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Indian Commission.  
(BDR 18-1215)**

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

As you remember, during our Subcommittee and joint Committee hearings, I made a request, after having discussions with many of the members here and some of the Governor's staff, to make this change.

**Yuriy Ikovlev, Program Analyst:**

I am here as nonpartisan Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) staff, so I do not support or oppose any piece of legislation. However, I have been asked to walk through the provisions of Assembly Bill 516, which is a budget implementation bill, approved by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, to establish a standalone Nevada Indian Commission Agency.

On May 8, 2023, the Committees approved establishing the standalone agency with an effective date of July 1, 2024, to ensure the agency has sufficient time to plan for the organizational impacts of operating as a standalone agency. To assist in the transition and to expand services provided to Indian tribes, the joint Committees approved State General Fund appropriations of \$509,466 over the 2023-2025 biennium for three additional positions.

The Committees further approved General Fund appropriations of \$85,705 in fiscal year (FY) 2025 to replace room tax revenue transfers as a funding source for the Nevada Indian Commission budget.

Assembly Bill 516 creates the Department of Native American Affairs. Sections 1 through 3 of the bill remove the Nevada Indian Commission and the Chair of the Commission from the

Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. Sections 4, 5, 9, and 33 make conforming changes to transfer the administration of the Account for the Protection and Rehabilitation of the Stewart Indian School from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to the Executive Director of the new Department. The language in sections 7 through 9 make changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 233A. Section 7 declares that the new Department is not intended to infringe upon the sovereignty of Indian tribes. Section 8 formally creates the Department of Native American Affairs, consisting of the Executive Director, the Nevada Indian Commission, and the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum. Section 10 provides definitions for the Department and the Executive Director. Section 11 provides that the Nevada Indian Commission and its members are within the new Department.

Sections 12 through 14 make conforming changes to existing language related to the Executive Director. Section 15 provides new language to NRS 233A related to the duties of the Commission. Section 16 through 22 and section 28 make conforming changes to existing language to replace references of the "Commission" to the "Department," and renames the Nevada Indian Commission Gift Fund to the Department of Native American Affairs' Gift Fund, along with replacing corresponding references.

Section 23 provides that the Museum Director of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum is under the direction of the Executive Director. Sections 24 through 27 and section 29 revise existing language to indicate that the Executive Director, or their designee, shall serve on various boards. Section 30 provides language regarding the establishment of the new Department, and its impact on administrative regulations, contracts and agreements, and actions taken by an officer or agency that was transferred as a result of this bill.

Section 31 indicates the LCB shall make conforming changes to refer to the appropriate officer, agency, or other entity in reprints and supplements to NRS and *Nevada Administrative Code*. Section 32 provides that the provisions of NRS 218D, regarding the submission of reports to the Legislative Commission, do not apply to this bill. Finally, this bill becomes effective on July 1, 2024, as indicated in Section 34.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

This bill was at the request of this Committee, so this is the bill presentation and the fiscal matter presentation all in one. There is also a friendly amendment to section 9, subsection 6. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I was grateful for the opportunity in the Subcommittee to be able to ask staff to start this process. I have been working on tribal relations issues in this building for as long as I have been here. This is a huge step forward to modernizing and prioritizing our relationship between the state government and the sovereign tribal governments of the State of Nevada. I am grateful for the leadership of the office that has been willing to move this forward. It is an amazing move in our state, and I look forward to seeing how we can build on these efforts.



I want to ask about other bills and their relationship to this Department, and how they will relate. There is a requirement for state agencies to consult with tribal governments, or have a coordinator to do that. This legislative session, my colleague has a bill seeking to mandate that that be a single person in each department. How would this engage with that bill? Would this Department be the host for those efforts to coordinate and collaborate with tribal governments? I will take that offline.

**Assemblywoman Backus:**

I am excited to support A.B. 516. This is a long time coming. Our Indian Commission has done so much for our 28 tribes and 60,000 urban individuals that identify as Indian. I am excited because Nevada is such a great state that recognizes its government relationship with our tribes. To hold a Department of Native American Affairs in the Office of the Governor makes me happy. It has been a joy watching this work through the process.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

This makes me happy. This is one of the goals I wanted to get accomplished this legislative session that we have not been able to do in the past. We finally found a pathway to get it done.

Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of A.B. 516?

**Jennifer Lanahan, representing the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe:**

We, too, are excited about this bill. We are appreciative to the Committee for bringing it forward, and we look forward to its passage.

**Alex Tanchek, representing the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation:**

The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, and the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe are also here in support.

**Jennifer Willett, Nevada Senior Grassroots Manager, All Voting is Local Action Nevada:**

We are in strong support of A.B. 516. Under Stacey Montooth's leadership, the Nevada Indian Commission has consistently gone above and beyond in its public service. The possibility of a new Department of Native American Affairs is a much more appropriate and needed designation, which, among other things, will support tribal sovereignty through increased independence. Excitingly, A.B. 516 will also add three more staff, which will allow the Department to serve Nevada's tribal nations and urban Indians in an even greater capacity. In summary, A.B. 516 is a needed investment to support tribal nations in Nevada. Thank you for bringing this forward. We urge your further support.

**Teresa Melendez, Indigenous Organizer, Spark, Nevada:**

I am excited and grateful that this Committee has invested in this bill, and spent so much time and energy on it. I have a couple things to add. It is exciting to see Nevada following the trend with the rest of the country as far as social justice for Indigenous people moving along. A lot of other states have Indian Commissions or Indian Affairs Departments at the state level, so it is nice to see that Nevada is moving along and following that trend.

I worked with Executive Director Montooth for a number of years. We are grateful to have her, and lucky to have her in that position, but like a lot of our Indigenous programs, her office is understaffed and underfunded. She needs the support to be able to support 28 federally recognized tribes—that is a lot. For her and her team to do their job effectively, they need support from you; I am grateful that you recognize that.

Nevada has one of the largest native populations in the country. We have to give the Department the tools to do their work, just like we have to support our teachers and our other needs in the state. Changing the name of the Department from Indian Commission to Native American Affairs—updating the language to more appropriate terms—is important, but there are a lot of agencies in the state needing a consistent, reliable resource to work with. The Indian Commission is all we have right now; that puts a lot of work on a couple people. To co-govern the state better with the sovereign nations, we need more staffing. Assemblywoman Peters mentioned the tribal liaison bill. If that bill does not get funded, all we have is the Indian Commission. It is important that they are able to do their job effectively.

**Randi Lone Eagle, Chair, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe:**

The Summit Lake Paiute Tribe is in support of A.B. 516 and continues to work in collaboration—with us being one of the 28 tribes—with the Nevada Indian Commission. The other bill coming forward will hopefully also be something that you will support. The tribes will support that as well—to have government tribal consultation with the State of Nevada and the federally recognized tribes for our state.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 516? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 516?

**James T. Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

The Clear Creek property has been slated for sale, with the money going to help rehabilitate Stewart Indian School. There have been people on occasion, looking at the idea of leasing that property for microtransit to Tahoe—parking cars, and things of that nature. However, we are prohibited from leasing that property. As other things come up, we would like to have the opportunity to lease that property, to provide a steady income stream.

Also, we have been working for a long time with Carson City to try to change the zoning on said parcels, so that the sale price would be more reflective of its value, and to be able to provide more revenue to the Stewart Indian Colony for upkeep.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I will open the work session for A.B. 516, and I would accept a motion to amend do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 516.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters. We will move on to Assembly Bill 517.

**Assembly Bill 517: Revises provisions governing the Legislative Counsel Bureau.  
(BDR 17-447)**

**Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:**

Assembly Bill 517 did not come out of a policy committee; this is its first hearing. It came out on May 18, 2023, so it has not been around long, but we have been working on this concept for quite some time.

I presented Assembly Bill 399 (1st Reprint) to this Committee, which would create a subcommittee of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to bring school districts in front of us to answer questions. We consider A.B. 399 (R1) to be the transparency bill. I consider A.B. 517 to be the accountability education bill. We are putting historic amounts of money into our state education budget. It is still not enough, per the Commission on School Funding, even to get us to the national average, but it is a substantial increase over the past—almost 30 percent more to the K-12 education budget. With that comes accountability; we need to make sure we are getting results from that funding. I get a lot of questions from constituents about the public school system, and why outcomes have not improved. It is probably the number one thing I hear from constituents.

The state is fortunate to be in a position to finally have the revenue to make a substantial increase. With that, we need results; we need accountability. Assembly Bill 517 seeks to create a process within the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Audit Division to help with this accountability. Many of you know how good our Audit Division is. You get nice one page reports with summaries, and there is always recommendations at the bottom. The agency almost always accepts the recommendations of the Audit Division. Behind that

recommendation is a full-blown audit with lots of documentation. They are amazing at what they do. Because we are a part-time every-other-year Legislature, they make sure that the programs are working and improving. I think we lose sight of how much work they do and how much better it makes state government for the people of Nevada.

Assembly Bill 517 asks the Audit Division to do performance audits of school districts. This is a big undertaking, so there is a phased approach in this bill. The two biggest school districts in the state—the Clark County School District and the Washoe County School District—as well as the Public Charter School Authority, would be audited on a four-year cycle. We must give some time to do that. Section 5 states that the audit shall occur not later than August 31, 2026. That is essentially the date on which the first round of audits would happen for the two largest districts and the Public Charter School Authority.

I proposed an amendment to remove sections 1 through 3 of the bill; you can pretend those sections do not exist. After discussions, I do not think that is the wisest way forward on the issue of the Research Division. The bill starts with section 5, if this Committee is willing to process that amendment.

This is a performance audit. It is capturing exactly what we have been talking about as a Legislative body: How are you going to use the funds to get results and improvement in the classroom? How are you going to use the funds to ensure there is a qualified educator in every classroom? We want to make sure that the schools are abiding by the reporting requirements, ensuring that when they are contracting with the outside world they are following the rules. Those things are probably a little easier to do, but we are asking for more than that. We are asking for a performance audit.

There can be audits of other smaller school districts as well. Section 6 states that the chair of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) can request an audit for up to three additional, smaller school districts. That assures some accountability with the smaller school districts, but there is discretion. With the size of those districts, they do not need to be audited quite as much.

This would work exactly like other audit reports. The auditors would come up with reports and recommendations for corrective action. They would review those with the school districts, they would either agree to implement recommendations or not. Those reports would come back to the Legislature, allowing us to follow up on those audits.

The function of the Legislature, historically, has been to fund education by giving large amounts of money that are then funneled through a formula and goes to the school districts. Now, it is the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. Then, of course, we have a policy role to play. We enact policy on the state level for schools. Normally after that, the Legislature does not have much of a role. A lot of reporting goes to the Department of Education. We can look at that reporting, but we as a Legislative Branch do not really get involved in how the school districts are functioning.

Assembly Bill 399 (1st Reprint) allows the Legislature to look into the districts and ask questions that our constituents want to know. This bill, Assembly Bill 517, allows the LCB—more broadly, through the Audit Division—to look into the operations of the districts. This is not a scenario of wanting to come in and tell you everything you are doing wrong; that is not what this bill is about. This bill is about making sure—through performance audits—that we can make recommendations on how to do things better. If we find a school district doing something that is incredibly effective, we can recommend it to other school districts. There can be synergy; one can learn from another. This bill puts the Legislature into the process of transparency and accountability in public education. That is where we ought to have been in the past, but we were not because of the way the systems were set up. There is a fiscal note from the Clark County School District indicating they believe it would take significant effort and staff time to do this. There is no fiscal impact from the LCB perspective at this time.

**Daniel L. Crossman, Legislative Auditor:**

As LCB staff, I am nonpartisan and independent. I do not advocate for or against any legislation. However, this bill has an impact on the Audit Division, directing us to do a series of in-depth performance audits. We are happy to take that direction, and to hopefully provide the answers for which this body is looking.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

This is the policy hearing for this bill because this is a Committee-requested bill. There was a lot of conversation before this legislative session—and for years—that there was no accountability matrix in place. This legislative session, we have set up some changes not only in how we fund our K-12 education system, but also looking at where that funding is going. That started with two long, but important, days with our superintendents. There was a lot of good information. We must continue that moving forward. To do that, a number of us voted in favor of adding positions in the LCB Audit Division, to give them the tools they need to carry out the work that we are asking them to do. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I am proud to be on the Committee introducing this bill. This will be an excellent tool to utilize going forward. I have a question on the timeframes of the audits. The first audit would be received in 2026, and then not less than every four years. Would the first audit include a two-year period and a second audit would include all four years, so we can start to see trends? I am hoping the answer is yes. I want to hopefully see trends moving in the right direction with all the great changes this session for the record.

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

Yes, our intent is to be able to provide some historical trends. Section 5, subsection 3, provides latitude for us to define the scope of some of that work. There is an opportunity to show continuity of effort and to show trends and results. That is something we would strive to do. The bill does not specifically identify the number of years in which we might go back

to obtain that information. There is some latitude, so if there is a need to go back further to obtain historical information, we can include that in our audit.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

My questions have to do with the items listed on page 4, in section 5, subsection 2, paragraph (d). Would the audit go all the way down into the efficiency of a certain textbook, or would it be at a higher level? How do you envision using that?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

I would not anticipate getting to that level of a specific textbook. However, part of the process of a performance audit is to dig and to understand how deep we need to go. I would not anticipate getting to a textbook level, but we would go to the level that we feel we need to, to be able to fulfill the objective.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I appreciate the included language to increase parental involvement and family and community engagement in public schools. When parents are involved, students are much more active. However, that is not always the school districts' decision. Often, that is up to a parent. Would advertising and outreach be audited, or is there another mechanism being considered?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

I do not know at this point; we are just beginning to dig into these things. In performance audits, some areas have criteria of exactly what should be happening, while other areas—like this—are vague. We might look at best practices across the country. We might look at studies by entities that specialize in some of this information. Specifically, what we would test there, I cannot at this time tell you. We would try to find the appropriate level.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

My last question has to do with personnel. In our education world, many times we talk about how many teachers, counselors, and speech language pathologists are leaving, but we do not always talk about the other individuals necessary for a school district run. Will there be discussion about the percentage of a budget utilized for individuals away from the classroom—in particular, the administrative buildings, or the separation of those employees? Might that be decided upon by the Legislative Auditor on their own, or is that something that should be directed by the IFC?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

That is valuable information, and falls within the type of information we would gather.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

That is how these two bills work in tandem. We were careful to provide broad categories while allowing them to do the work that they do. You do not always know what you are going to get until you start digging. We want the auditors to have the latitude to do that.

Regarding Assemblywoman Anderson's question: I think that is a role the IFC would play. When we talk to school districts and learn valuable information, we start to learn about trends in districts. Those are under the provision that Mr. Crossman referenced on page 4, lines 31 through 32, regarding any other matter for which a Legislative Auditor is requested by the IFC.

My vision of that is the chair of the IFC would be able to say that we are asking questions and learning things that maybe do not concern us, but we would like to know more about how it is operating at the district level. My hope is that we will have as much of a partnership as we have ever had in this building between legislators and the work that the Audit Division is doing when it comes to school districts. They have their own audit plans, and they audit agencies. Sometimes we provide input, but a lot of that just happens, because it is the way things go. This is a new process that offers an exciting partnership between the IFC and the Audit Division—contingent on both bills passing and the Governor signing them. It allows that flexibility.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

It would not be fair to compare the Clark County School District to the Carson City School District; there is a notable size difference. Would a sampling of schools within the Clark County School District be audited, or would the district in totality be audited?

We have been asking for this in the Legislature for years, in some degree or fashion; I am excited about this. Our Governor has already asked for some of the reports. How would you look at the different school districts?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

Each of the districts are unique. There are some things that are comparable, but there are also some things that are very different. It would depend on which objectives were being audited, a districtwide administrative issue or something that would require us to dig into the school level. With the Clark County School District's decentralized structure, we would need to go to some schools on some of these objectives, to understand the implemented programs.

There are a lot of schools in Clark County, so that would require some work to understand the nature of the different schools, and maybe different categories and ways to select representative samples to understand what they are doing at the school level. Those are all items we would vet as we go through the audit process and plan how to answer these objectives.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

It will grow and mature as you delve into it, is that correct?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

Hopefully, it will mature. The idea is to focus resources where we can do the most good. I appreciate the flexibility within the bill for the Audit Division to work within the parameters laid out in this bill to define some of the work we are doing and the scope of that

work. If there are things not fully addressed, there is opportunity to go back with a different focus. This type of project could get extremely large. We have to work within our own existing resources as well as the other audits that we are performing. We have to balance that. It will grow for sure.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

Having been subject to these audits during my time as a division chief, I can say that they are extremely beneficial. I truly am excited about this. I know staff will do an excellent job. It is a herculean task because there is such diversity, and we are asking for so much.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

I cannot sing the praises enough of Mr. Crossman and the Audit Division. I chaired the Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission, and worked with him on various audits. They do amazing work. The Audit Division can handle this task, and produce great work.

The Legislative Auditor shall issue the first reports no later than August 31, 2026; they could be to us before that date. We are sending a historic amount of money to education this biennium, and we will be back here in 2025, before that 2026 deadline. Would it be possible to get some of the reports before the Legislature funds education again in 2025? We could look at what has been done with this historic amount of money. Why not require those reports by the next biennium?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

It is going to take some time. Contrary to what may be in the media and in popular belief, the Senate Majority Leader has been in discussion with the Office of the Governor, the Nevada Department of Education, and me on how to measure, and in what timeframe. Things do not turn around overnight; it is going to take some time to see the impact of these resources.

In addition to these bills, there is a wider conversation in the Legislature, the Office of the Governor, and the Department of Education about possible interim metrics. I do not mean new metrics; I mean existing metrics. We are not asking teachers to do more testing; I think we all agree we have plenty of that. There may be metrics that could give a picture of the difference that the money is making. I think we all share the goal of wanting to see progress. However, we must be realistic that progress takes time, and it is going to take further investment in education.

Without having that fully baked yet, I cannot say what it is, but there will likely be additional concepts before the end of the session regarding the interim, so that we have something to evaluate next session. If A.B. 399 (R1) passes, the IFC will have opportunities, before the next session, to bring the school districts back in front of them to ask these kinds of questions.

I will defer to Mr. Crossman about whether it is realistic for the Audit Division to provide something prior to the dates listed in the bill.



**Daniel L. Crossman:**

We have contemplated that quite a bit. It will be our intent to release reports as they are ready to be released, prior to that date. There are many objectives in here, and I do not know how many reports we would have on each district, based on similar objectives and how we are able to package those. One of the struggles is that, for a school district to take that money, to implement changes, and for those changes to have an effect, will take time. With the timing of state fiscal years and school years, it will take time for the districts to identify new programs or initiatives and put them in place, let them mature, and let them provide the effect that they are intended to. If we jump in too quickly, I am not sure we are going to be able to measure much change. In some instances, it is possible, but part of the desire to push this out was to give the districts the opportunity to put initiatives in place and let them mature.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Would these audits be subject to the same timeframes as other state audits?

**Daniel L. Crossman:**

Yes, they are subject to the same provision of our normal audits.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I appreciate this effort so much. On the campaign trail and in talking with people in my district, what we are doing about education is probably the most-asked question that I get. What can we do here to help better meet the needs of our families, kids, and teachers as they change dramatically? I appreciate that we are tying this together, working together to ensure funding when it is needed, appropriately addressing programs that need to be put into place for our students, and assisting in implementation, so that we are using the full brain power of our state to make sure our kids are taken care of, and our school districts are working.

I appreciate the effort that has gone into this package of bills, and I look forward to seeing how it rolls out in the next couple years.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of A.B. 517?

**Daniel H. Stewart, representing the Clark County Education Association:**

The Clark County Education Association (CCEA) is in strong support of this bill. Combined with A.B. 399 (R1), the transparency bill heard yesterday, this complete program will give the Legislature a snapshot into education in a way that it has never had. They were long days when the districts came and spoke to you, but the information from those meetings was incredibly helpful as we moved on in the session. Sunshine is incredibly important on these dollars; this will finally allow us to connect the dots between money spent and student outcomes, which every single person in this building has been focused on.

I do not know why we have not done this before, but it is a huge and important step forward. You deal with tough issues every session of where to spend money, where not to spend money. How can those of us in the education system come back to you every session and ask for additional money if we do not have any evidence to back up what is working? How can we go back to the parents? I am a parent too: I have three kids in the Clark County School District. The CCEA strongly supports this bill. We think this is going to be important for years, if not decades, to come.

**Alexander Marks, Director of Strategy, Nevada State Education Association:**

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is in support of A.B. 517. Transparency and accountability are always important in this field. We agree with the Speaker's comments that this is not just looking for things wrong or improper; we want to see what is working in certain districts, and then implement those practices elsewhere. Throughout the session, NSEA has defined accountability as policies and strategies that keep our schools filled with qualified educators who have the tools they need to ensure that every student has access to a high quality education. Assembly Bill 517 falls directly in line with that shared vision.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 517?

**Casey Rodgers, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada:**

I just want to say I oppose this bill. That is all.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 517? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

Often, through the legislative process, we hear a lot of conflict. However, accountability and transparency in public education are shared objectives of the Legislature, the Office of the Governor, the Executive Branch, and every Nevadan who has a stake in the outcome of our K-12 education system. This legislation works in tandem with other accountability and transparency measures proposed by the Governor. As a Legislature, we have a chance to take our rightful place at the table to ensure transparency and accountability in our K-12 education system. I urge the passage of A.B. 517, and I am happy to keep working with anyone else on the Committee as this works its way through the session.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

With that, we will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 517 and seeing that we only had \$0 fiscal notes from the school districts that submitted fiscal notes, and knowing that there is no fiscal impact to the LCB because the needed positions were included in the budget bill, we will open the work session for A.B. 517. I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 517.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. We will move on to  
Assembly Bill 518.

**Assembly Bill 518: Revises provisions relating to indigent defense. (BDR 14-1194)**

**Colby Nichols, Program Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 518 is a Committee bill draft request (BDR). In closing the Department of Indigent Defense Services budgets on April 22, 2023, a motion was made to provide General Fund appropriations to the Department for the reimbursement of county indigent defense costs in excess of a calculated maximum contribution amount. Included in that motion was a request for a Committee BDR that would clarify that maximum calculation as well as the permissible expenditures.

Fiscal staff was directed to work with the Department and the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, to determine an appropriate amount to set aside in the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) Contingency Account to address any funding concerns identified by the Davis court monitor, and include that appropriation in this bill. Accordingly, A.B. 518 establishes that formula for determining the maximum amount that a county may be required to pay for the provision of indigent defense services. The bill also prohibits the county from seeking reimbursement from the state for the cost of capital improvement projects relating to the provision of indigent defense services. In addition, the bill establishes requirements for counties to submit annual financial status reports to the Department of Indigent Defense Services unless the Department requires such reports quarterly.

Section 7 of the bill makes appropriations of approximately \$6.3 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$6.6 million in FY 2025 to the IFC for allocation to the Department of Indigent Defense Services for various purposes:

- To fund the reimbursement of counties for costs in excess of the maximum contribution amounts for the provision of indigent defense services.
- Costs of the Department related to compliance with the *Davis v. State* consent judgement.

- Costs of the Office of the State Public Defender for contracts for legal services for complex cases.
- Costs for training and pay parity for attorneys who provide indigent defense services.

I would like to provide a brief rundown of what this bill does. Section 2 of the bill establishes the maximum contribution formula as well as what is permissible. Section 3 contains the financial reporting requirements for the counties to submit to Department of Indigent Defense Services. Sections 4 through 6 make conforming changes to update existing references that currently refer to regulation, to instead refer to the provisions of this act. Section 7 contains the previously mentioned General Fund appropriations to the IFC. Section 8 establishes that this bill will be effective as of July 1, 2023.

Some revision may be necessary in section 2 to correctly align the bill with the intent of the Committee, namely, the establishment of a base amount for each county, as well as some changes to the language to correctly account for the compounding of an inflationary adjustment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any questions or comments from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I have a question regarding the fiscal aspect of the additional appropriation in Section 7. Senate Bill 504 authorized approximately \$1.95 million per year. This is asking for an additional \$6.3 million and \$6.6 million in FY 2024 and FY 2025, respectively. Could you please give some historical context of how much per year has been spent on indigent defense service?

**Colby Nichols:**

The amounts in section 7 were developed through a series of conference calls involving the agency, the LCB Fiscal Analysis Division, and the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor. There are several primary components included for the estimates. Some of this is for the cost to reimburse counties, should the cost of reimbursement exceed the \$3.5 million that was included in the budgets closed on April 22, 2023. Several other factors were identified through a review of the court monitor's reports.

The court monitor is a third party. The *Davis* consent judgement states that the court monitor shall review the state's progress and compliance with the *Davis* consent judgement. The monitor releases reports, I believe on a quarterly basis. In addition, there was a special report dedicated to budgetary matters. In reviewing those, there were several issues, particularly in the eighth court monitor report, which was published following the budget closing for the Department of Indigent Defense Services. Some of the funding included in section 7 would be additional resources to conduct oversight of the counties, additional year-round training opportunities for rural defenders, and additional funding for the State Public Defender's Office for complex litigation—typically capital cases, but not exclusively.

One of the primary components of the amounts in section 7 is compliance with a study to establish workload standards. This is a stipulation of the *Davis* consent judgement that requires a state to comply with workload standards established by a third-party study. It was communicated during the budget closing that this study was currently in the process of peer review; it did not sound like the Department of Indigent Defense Services was aware of exactly when that study would be published. However, *Davis* stipulates that the state has 12 months to get into compliance with those workload standards once the study is finalized. The Executive Budget did not contain any funding for that compliance, so that is included in the estimate here. That portion is approximately \$4.7 million in FY 2024, and approximately \$5 million in FY 2025.

The final component identified is pay parity—another stipulation of the Davis Agreement—which is easy to understand in spirit, but the mechanics get muddy. The idea is that the two attorneys—the prosecutor and the defender in any given case—are making approximately the same amount of money. It is difficult to provide an estimate for that cost because many people can be involved. They could be state prosecutors; they could be county employees; they could be contract attorneys; they could be contracted public defenders. Pay parity is included in this bill; the estimate arrived upon is approximately \$800,000 in each year. Again, it was difficult to identify a specific amount that would be sufficient.

The projected amounts for FY 2023 and the actual amounts from FY 2022 were included in the closing packet. For FY 2022, the total reimbursement amounts were approximately \$1.9 million, across both Davis and non-Davis counties. In the 2021-2023 biennium, the costs for reimbursement to the state are handled through allocations from the restricted IFC Contingency Account specifically for Davis counties. For non-Davis counties, those reimbursement requests are funded through allocations from that unrestricted IFC Contingency Account.

The total for reimbursement to the counties for costs in excess of their calculated maximum contribution is \$1.9 million in FY 2022. The projected total reimbursement for FY 2023 is \$3.7 million. Again, what is included for FY 2024 and FY 2025—per the motion made by the Full Joint Committees—is \$3.5 million. Part of the estimate in section 7 accounts for the difference between the \$3.7 million projected for FY 2023 and the \$3.5 million already appropriated to the budget as part of the closing. Approximately \$200,000 to \$400,000 in each year accounts for that difference.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Could you please walk us through the scenario in section 2 in which counties with populations less than 100,000 could subtract any expenses related to capital offenses and murder cases? What is that subtraction of capital offenses and murder cases?

**Colby Nichols:**

That language is in regulations adopted by the Board on Indigent Defense Services. I believe part of the intent of the Committee, in requesting the drafting of this, is to lift that out of regulation, to clarify and correct a few things, and then to establish it in statute. Portions of

this are directed toward counties of a certain size or smaller, while others are directed at counties above a certain population.

If a county chooses to transfer the responsibilities for indigent defense services to the State Public Defender's Office, there is a cost-sharing split. This is not new; it is taking an existing arrangement and codifying it in statute, as opposed to regulation. The language about the counties being responsible for paying 25 percent is that cost-split should a county choose to transfer the responsibility for indigent defense services to the State Public Defender's Office. Counties with populations over 100,000 tend to handle complex cases and litigation on their own, so they would not be included in that.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

The cost recovery in subsection 1 is different from the cost sharing in subsection 2. That helps to clarify.

**Assemblyman Watts:**

The most important thing here is protecting every Nevadan's Sixth Amendment rights; that is what this is all about. Additionally, with the *Davis* consent judgement, there is a court decree to which we need to remain in compliance, or face consequences associated with that. There is that additional legal compliance aspect that we need to address.

During the budget hearings, there were concerns that the Governor's recommended budget did not have some of the resources in place to ensure compliance with these various aspects. Some of these policy changes addressing the conversations we have had about contributions to two counties are beneficial—as well as this allocation of funds to the IFC, to help ensure that we can provide people with their constitutional rights, and maintain compliance with the settlement agreement. Fiscal staff and the Department worked together to ensure that we have the resources necessary, moving forward in this biennium, to meet those objectives.

**Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:**

There are some typos on page 1 of the proposed amendment from the Department of Indigent Defense Services [[Exhibit C](#)]. I ask that you cross out the last sentence about Clark County; that is not what is contained in here. The Department is looking to amend section 2 so that it is in compliance with the regulations adopted by the Board on Indigent Defense Services. The Board on Indigent Defense Services was created to provide resources to our public defenders and create minimum standards for public defense to ensure compliance with those standards.

This Legislature, knowing that compliance with those standards was going to increase costs for our rural counties, gave the authority for the Board on Indigent Defense Services to create a maximum contribution formula. We have created that formula; it is in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 180, section 16. We are requesting, in this amendment, to bring this NRS into compliance with what is in the NAC. Many of our rural counties have taken steps to address the issues they are having in indigent defense services, and that has

taken on an additional amount of funding that they are relying when they took those steps on the initial maximum contribution formula.

In the first part, we clarify that the maximum contribution formula is like two shares. The county share is like a high deductible health care plan. Once you hit the maximum for that county share, you can request reimbursement for the state share, which is anything over and above that amount. In counties with a population of less than 100,000, this is the actual cost for providing indigent defense services for FY 2021 through FY 2022 minus any state reimbursements as set forth in the list on line 22 [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)]. We are asking that FY 2024 be the base year for next year.

In the next part, we are trying to encapsulate compound interest. Every year, we take the prior year's amount, and then add the lesser of interest or 5 percent.

I have a change to our next request [page 3]. We ask that, on line 12, "in a county whose population is 100,000 or more" remain, but the remainder of line 12 through the comma on line 26 be struck so that it reads, "a county whose population is 100,000 or more may seek reimbursement as set forth below." This provides a maximum contribution for Clark and Washoe Counties. Historically, Clark and Washoe have not requested reimbursement. However, if there is some sort of change, this would allow them the ability to ask for reimbursement if it is what they spent in the prior fiscal year, plus inflation or 5 percent, whichever is lesser.

It has also been requested that we add language to subsection 4—nothing in this section limits a county from expending more than its share of indigent defense services [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)].

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Clark County and Washoe County do not come to the state to ask for reimbursement of their fees. They take care of that in their counties alone, is that correct?

**Marcie E. Ryba:**

That is correct. We require an annual report in which counties must let us know if they are intending to request reimbursement. Historically, Clark and Washoe Counties have not requested reimbursement.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

How will the removal of the language in your amendment affect the current practice?

**Marcie E. Ryba:**

The current formula is the average of what was spent in FY 2018 and FY 2019, plus inflation. With the updated formula, we look to the prior year and then add 5 percent, or that interest. The state share appears to be less than it would be under the initial regulation set forth by the Board on Indigent Defense Services. This amendment was requested by Clark and Washoe Counties.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

Given that those two counties have their own agencies funded through their counties, and budget negotiations happen all the time about proper staffing and proper resources, my concern is the volume of work in Clark and Washoe Counties can be unpredictable in terms of the type of cases. Clark County, by far, has the most death penalty cases, which can be extraordinarily expensive. Is there any way to reasonably project amounts if they were to ask for reimbursement? What kind of numbers are we talking about on the state level? In Clark County, the county funds a significant budget. I have concerns about adding that provision of the state's responsibility. Can you give any indication of the magnitude those requests could be?

**Marcie E. Ryba:**

To make the determination of what the state share would be, and to build our budgets, we asked counties to submit an annual report of their expected budgets for the next year. An issue we have had with Clark and Washoe is that we have asked public defenders do a lot of jobs; they do things that do not necessarily fall within the definition of indigent defense services as defined by this Legislature. It is basically limited to an adult charged with a criminal offense, or a child that is alleged to be delinquent or in need of supervision.

At points when public defenders are being appointed on civil cases, rural counties are not allowed to include that in what they are referring to us for indigent defense expenses because it does not fall within the definition. We would likely need to work with Clark and Washoe Counties for them to eliminate any sort of civil work being done when they are asking for reimbursement, so that we could limit it.

Historically, when building the budget, we did not request any funding on behalf of Washoe County, because their budget did not exceed the maximum as set by regulation. For Clark County, we looked at requesting approximately \$4 million in each fiscal year to be able to provide that difference. However, as this is a floating maximum contribution, there is more work to be done to get an estimate of how much the cost would be. Rural counties are required to keep track of how much time is spent on indigent defense services—rather than civil—and only report those items to us. We have not done that at the urban level. At this point, we do not have the ability to know. Note that when the Legislature told the Board to create a maximum contribution formula, there was no language saying that it was only for the rural counties. It was for all counties, so that would be a policy decision.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

In a scenario where counties ask for reimbursement because they have exceeded their maximum contribution, how does that work, functionally? Does the money go from your agency to the local government, or does it go directly to the office? I am trying to understand the county budgeting process. Where would that money go if approved?

**Marcie E. Ryba:**

Historically, we have asked each county to provide an annual report. In the annual report, in addition to the budget, they are expected to let us know anticipated amounts, and whether



they plan to request reimbursement. Clark and Washoe, historically, have not requested reimbursement. Counties choosing to request reimbursement, must provide fiscal status reports to the Department every quarter containing an outlay of how much they have spent and county budgeting.

Once a county met that maximum contribution formula, the Department did a work program to request reimbursement from IFC, because we did not historically have the funding in our budget. Moving forward, we will have the funding in our budget. There is approximately \$3.5 million for each fiscal year, so this process will be a lot faster. Once the county requests reimbursement, we pay the county; the money goes directly back to the county at this point.

Moving forward, how this will work is a work in progress. We serve as counsel administrator for a lot of the rural counties, because there is independence from the judiciary at this point. As we receive billing from appointed counsel, if a county has exceeded their maximum, the department could directly pay those bills if the funds are in our account. Those would have to be discussions with the Board on Indigent Defense Services whether we want to change. At this point, once the county hits their maximum on that quarterly report, we request reimbursement which goes directly back to the county.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

This is something that I need to think more about. Clark and Washoe Counties are different in the sense that there are agencies that employ attorneys, investigators, and social workers that are salaried. I am concerned about setting up a scenario where the state is reimbursing the county, but the people doing the work are not seeing that. It is one thing if the county is contracting an attorney for a certain amount of hours; that is a quantifiable cost. However, I am having some trouble wrapping my mind around how that would work with Clark and Washoe Counties given that they—under the statute—are required to have public defender offices of their own separate from the State Public Defender. I need to get some questions answered before I would be comfortable proposing that part of the amendment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I, too, have concerns with that. Maybe we can make an amendment to this amendment as we move this bill forward. We will move on to the amendment proposed by Mary C. Walker.

**Mary C. Walker, representing Douglas, Lyon, and Storey Counties:**

Thank you for allowing us to submit an amendment to A.B. 518 to address an important issue for the rural counties [[Exhibit D](#)]. For the past several weeks, under the leadership of Senator Scheible and Senator Harris, several people including judges, district attorneys, public defenders, the Nevada Association of Counties, and the Administrative Office of the Courts have all been working on addressing some of the unintended consequences of the implementation of Assembly Bill 424 of the 81st Session. Assembly Bill 424 of the 81st Session requires a pretrial release hearing within 48 hours of arrest. This caused our courts, judges, public defenders, and district attorneys to work 6 to 7 days a week, and on holidays. The 48-hour pretrial release hearing was difficult for the rural counties to implement.

The people who bore the brunt of the workload were the judges, public defenders, and district attorneys who had to work weekends and holidays without pay. One judge has only been able to take four days off this year because there is no one to cover for her. All the other judges are grappling with the 48-hour rule also, and they do not have an extra day to try to help another judge out. Many rural judges are also doing the work of their staff over the weekends and holidays so their staff can have weekends and holidays with their families. The human toll on these folks is enormous.

In my research, I found that 74 percent of rural justices of the peace are up for election in 2024. My greatest fear is they are not going to want to keep working without time off or pay, particularly for a six-year term. I am extremely concerned that if our good current judges decide to not file for office, we will see a severe degradation of the quality of person who would file for the office. The implementation of A.B. 424 of the 81st Session 48-hour rule, in all honesty, has been on the backs of these people. We need to make it better and more sustainable for them to continue their work fulfilling the requirements of A.B. 424 of the 81st Session. We are requesting an annual, ongoing appropriation of \$1,474,200 to cover weekend, overtime, and standby pay, or to pay for relief judges, district attorneys, and public defenders.

Senate Bill 235 (2nd Reprint), out of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, is a companion policy bill. We realize that the rural counties do not have enough professionals, whether it is doctors or lawyers. Senate Bill 235 (2nd Reprint) seeks to expand and to grow those professionals by allowing the district attorney from one county to work for another county, and a municipal judge to work for a Justice of the Peace, that type of thing. However, the problem is, without ability to pay for these relief professionals, it is not going to work. We will need to pay these people to come in and relieve these folks.

The \$1,474,200 was based on the number of judges, district attorneys, and public defenders who work in each rural county and the number of times they hold court or are on call over the weekend. For example: Elko has four courts, but is larger, and they pool their judges over the weekend. There is only one judge working a month. Because of their workload—as well as having to meet the 48-hour rule—they do have to work Saturdays and Sundays. However, if this goes through, only one court would get stipends over the weekends, not all four courts in Elko County. The judges have done a good job in trying to be as efficient as possible in implementing this 48-hour rule. Most of the other courts hold hearings on one day during the weekend, so they would only get that stipend for that one weekend day.

The pay to the judges, district attorneys, and public defenders is calculated as a stipend of \$450 per day for each professional. That is approximately \$150 per hour for three hours, which everyone felt was reasonable. The appropriation requested does not include any other staff work, for which the counties pay. I tried to craft a narrow request for appropriation. Otherwise, if you are going to look at the total cost to the rural counties, it would be several millions of dollars.

We are also stating that the funding provided should only be used to pay a \$450 per day flat rate stipend to each judge, district attorney, and public defender. It could be for standby pay, to hire a relief professional, or for working overtime. It is specifically to enact the requirements of the 48-hour pretrial release program in counties with a population of less than 100,000.

This is a flat rate. We know how many judges are working how many hours, so the dollar amount per county can be calculated and provided. Then, if they have not used that funding, any remaining funding shall be reimbursed back to the State Controller. The funding should not be used for any further staffing costs attributable to the courts, district attorneys, public defender, sheriff, or any other staffing costs. The expenditures of this money shall be subject to each entity's annual audit, and a report of the annual expenditure of the pretrial hearing supplemental compensation shall be provided to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) by each entity receiving the funding on or before October 1 for the previous fiscal year.

There is a chart of calculations by county with weekend days worked, number of courts, and the total dollar amount [page 2, [Exhibit D](#)].

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

How are people going to get reimbursed? What will they have to do to get paid the \$450 stipend per day?

**Mary C. Walker:**

Because it is a set dollar amount—we know when they are going to be working, how many people, and all of that—we wanted to stay away from a lot of administrative problems. The concept is the State Controller would provide that set dollar amount to each county, and before August 1 of each year, the county would use that to reimburse weekend work. We did not include holidays in this dollar amount. The counties would spend that, and if there are any monies left over, they would bring them back. It would be subject to their annual audit, and you would get a report back each year.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I want to thank you for working on this issue of how quickly to see a judge after arrest; it is something we have worked on for a long time. There were certain jurisdictions where people were being arrested and they were not being seen by a judge for a week or two, which violated the U.S. Constitution. Because of that, we put the 48-hour rule into statute. I understand that has had a disproportionate impact on the rural communities.

It is a question of volume. Clark and Washoe Counties have a lot of judges who can swap for each other and can fill in. We realize we have asked rural judges to do a lot of extra work. That work is important, constitutionally, to make sure that if someone is eligible to be released, they can be released as soon as 48 hours. Thank you for narrowly tailoring the request to an amount that works, and will hopefully solve some of these issues and let our rural judges know that we appreciate this work that they are doing. Asking folks to come in

on Saturdays and Sundays can be tough. It is important, and this is a narrowly tailored request. I am supportive of this amendment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Thank you to Ms. Walker and the others who have been working on this ever since A.B. 424 of the 81st Session went into effect and we started to hear of issues in the rural communities. Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee on either of these amendments? [There were none.]

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 518?

**John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:**

I support of A.B. 518, with both amendments. I want to address Assemblyman Yeager's concern. We crafted this amendment because the original language in the bill set a maximum contribution formula, which we felt would cap Clark's expenses, which is different with the number of death penalty cases. Clark County is in the top five in the nation in filing death penalty cases. Upcoming large events in Clark County will bring increased cost to the Clark County Public Defender's Office. We do not want to be caught in a max contribution formula where a county manager could say this is all we have to spend on indigent defense. We also did not want to be excluded from reimbursement, if it becomes necessary.

If we could narrowly tailor that more to the Committee's liking, we would be more than happy to do that. We are at risk of failing the *Davis* consent judgement if we do not come up with more funding for indigent defense. Carson City is failing; Nye County is close to failure. Justice should mean the same for every citizen across the state. The Sixth Amendment does not change based on where you live.

We fought for parity in Clark and Washoe. In Carson City, they do not have parity. In Nye County, caseloads are out of control. Bigger agencies can fight with the counties on a larger level for funding to provide effective assistance of counsel. The appointment of counsel means nothing if it is not effective assistance of counsel. Ms. Ryba is threading the needle and Ms. Walker is working to make sure that the rest of the state is taken care of—the people making sure we meet our burden of seeing that all Nevadans get a prompt hearing when they are arrested and still innocent.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I get what you are saying about big events coming to town. By the nature of big numbers, that means more cases for everybody. However, there is a finite number of people working at the Public Defender's Office. On a good day, you are there 8 hours; on a bad day, you are there 18 hours. How does the county go about determining extra cost? Personnel is typically a flat cost because salaries cost what salaries cost; they do not make overtime. My concern is if this is a way for the county to get more money, but it does not actually help the public defenders putting in extra work. Are they going to be able to immediately turn around and hire three or four new public defenders at a cost that was unanticipated? I want to make sure

that if we go this route, it is going to help the people who are doing the work in a tangible way, and it is not just going to be money to the county while someone is sitting there with 25 more cases.

**John J. Piro:**

That is the hope—that it would trickle down. My boss negotiates for bodies to handle the cases. Here is a perfect example: there is now a Strip corridor court that the justice court thought on its own would be a good idea. However, the caseloads coming out of the Strip have increased exponentially for the lawyers handling those cases, so we are going to have to ask for more bodies for that; that is what my supervisor would do. Then, as a union, we are the ones that negotiate for the pay. We are in a better bargaining position than most rural counties. This bill tries to strike that balance but not completely cut Clark out if we needed to come to the state needing some reimbursement for an unanticipated event.

**Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties:**

The Nevada Association of Counties represents the collective county interest for all 17 of our members. We are in support, with the amendments. I want to thank the Executive Director of the Department of Indigent Defense Services for her work on the amendment that she presented today, along with Ms. Walker and her effective work on meeting the needs of the 48-hour rule.

My comments will be specific to section 2 of the amendment that was submitted by the Department [[Exhibit C](#)]. As the bill was written, there was an unfunded mandate issue. This amendment helps satisfy both the terms of the agreement on the lawsuit where the state is responsible for a portion of indigent defense services across the state so that equal justice can be administered. But again, honoring the county partnership in that service. We agree with the bill and the amendments, as presented.

**Tom Clark, representing the Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction:**

I want to speak to the amendment regarding the 48-hour rule [[Exhibit D](#)]. The rule has been discussed and debated; we have tried to find a solution to this reality. The rural judges have done a good job of trying to implement the 48-hour rule. This amendment provides some level of relief to those counties; it is greatly appreciated. It goes to what Mr. Piro said: equal justice across county lines. We can meet that 48-hour standard with this amendment. I also want to thank Senator Scheible, Assemblyman Yeager, and all the stakeholders that participated in these conversations. This is a great solution. We urge your support.

**John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

The Nevada District Attorneys Association is also in support of the amendment proposed by Ms. Walker [[Exhibit D](#)]. I take no position on the text of the bill as currently written; I am just speaking toward that amendment. This financial outlay, coupled with some changes currently pending in S.B. 235 (R2), will provide more flexibility for rural jurisdictions in

making the 48 hours happen. It does not give every entity everything it wanted, but it is a good compromise, and we are here in support.

**Lori Matheus, Justice of the Peace, Lyon County, and Municipal Court Judge, Fernley Municipal Court:**

I support the amendment to A.B. 518 to include pretrial hearing supplemental compensation to the rural counties and the state Department of Indigent Defense Services [[Exhibit D](#)]. Lyon County has successfully established a program that ensures all defendants receive a bail hearing within 48 hours of arrest. Our county holds bail hearings 356 days per year. Implementing this program has cost Lyon County a significant amount of money in additional pretrial jail staff and software. No funding was provided to the counties to assist in implementing the system. The additional funding will assist rural counties that are struggling to recruit and retain qualified professionals, prior to the addition of weekend and holiday work. The funding will provide financial relief to the rural counties in continuing to meet the 48-hour bill requirements and retain qualified professionals.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 518? [There was no one.]  
Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony for A.B. 518?

**Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:**

Washoe County is neutral on the bill. I will not repeat what Mr. Piro said, but will speak for Washoe County to the amendment. As we discussed with the Department, it was our intent that the amendment would allow us to retain our existing ability to seek reimbursement. We were not seeking anything new. We are willing to work on tailoring that, if need be, understanding that our budget cycle and your budget cycle do not entirely align. It is not intended to give us a way to blow a hole in the budget. Washoe County is committed to working on getting us to where we need to be to allow that ability if and when we need it, without being completely eliminated in this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I look forward to seeing the amendment to the amendment so that we can move this bill forward. With that, we will close the hearing on A.B. 518 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 523.

**Assembly Bill 523: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-1219)**

**Adam Drost, Principal Program Analyst:**

I will provide an overview of Assembly Bill 523. As a reminder, LCB staff serves as nonpartisan staff, and we neither advocate for nor oppose any legislation. Assembly Bill 523 is a budget implementation bill, and revises certain provisions for the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan based on the action of the money committees. This includes items related to revenue, cash flow, inflation calculation, and changes for the Education Stabilization Account, also known as the K-12 Rainy Day Fund.

Section 1 revises *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 387.1212 to include various sources of revenue in the State Education Fund. This includes new Department of Agriculture fine revenue related to the application of pesticides as well as existing revenue for the State Education Fund.

Section 2 revises the calculation of the “rate of inflation” used when The Executive Budget is prepared to reflect a three-year average percentage increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index, as opposed to the current use of the percentage change for the immediately preceding calendar year.

Section 3 allows the State Education Fund to receive a General Fund advance for cashflow purposes if the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor (Governor's Office of Finance) determine it is needed; an advance from the Education Stabilization Account will not provide adequate funding to address the shortfall; and the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) approves such a request. If approved, these advances must be repaid by August 31 following the end of the fiscal year in which the temporary advance is made.

Section 4 revises NRS 555.470 to allow Department of Agriculture fine revenue related to the application of pesticides to be deposited in the State Education Fund, rather than distributed directly to school districts.

Section 5 revises NRS 387:

- Increasing the funding cap for the Education Stabilization Account from 15 percent to 20 percent.
- Allowing the IFC to utilize funding in the account for any decreases in non-General Fund revenue in the State Education Fund, as opposed to the current language that limits access to this funding for only decreases of 3 percent or more.
- Allowing the State Education Fund to receive an advance from the Education Stabilization Account for cash flow purposes if the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of the Governor's Office of Finance determine it is needed, and the IFC approves such a request. If approved, these advances must be repaid by August 31 following the end of the fiscal year in which the temporary advance is made.

Section 6 revises NRS and the calculation of the “rate of inflation” used when The Executive Budget is prepared to reflect a three-year average percentage increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index.

Section 7 provides the effective dates for the bill. Sections 1 through 4 and Section 6 become effective on July 1, 2023. Section 5 becomes effective on October 1, 2023.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Those of you who were here during the last legislative session know that we established this stabilization account living through a pandemic knowing that we ran through our Rainy Day Account [Account to Stabilize the Operations of State Government] because there were so many needs. We have a Rainy Day Account to address all the other needs in the state. This Education Stabilization Account will help to maintain or stabilize education if we see things that happen in a normal year, but especially things that may happen in emergency situations. This is the bill hearing for A.B. 523. Do you have any questions on the policy in this bill draft or the fiscal aspects of it?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I want to make sure I understand the parameters of this bill. I think the idea here is there may be cashflow issues with the way that funding sources come in. This bill allows the Department of Education to take advances out of this account, to be able to get folks through the up and down cycles of cash flows. Money then comes back to the Education Stabilization Account. Under this bill, that would be a permissible use of the funds in the Education Stabilization Account, correct?

**Adam Drost:**

That is correct. With this bill, the Education Stabilization Account could be used to provide cash advances as the Department of Education makes payments from the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan Account and some of the revenue is not received until months later. This provides the cash flow needed to make those payments. If the Education Stabilization Account does not have the resources available, the State General Fund would also be available as a secondary source.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

Like funds in any other interest-bearing account, when funds are taken out of the Education Stabilization Account, they are not gaining interest, correct? They need to be in the account to accrue interest.

**Adam Drost:**

That is correct. When a cash advance is out, that would affect the interest earnings on the account.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

There has been discussion recently in this Committee about other proposals on how to use this interest income. There was a proposal in Assembly Bill 400 to use interest income from this account to fund two different programs: the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program, which was funded in other ways in the budget, and the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship Program, which I believe we passed today. That is the problem with relying on interest income from this account—we cannot be assured that this money is going to sit there the whole time because of cash flow issues. We like the programs in A.B. 400, but funding them out of interest income is not a sustainable funding source because of this issue relating to cash flow. We chose—as a Committee, and as a Legislature—to be fiscally responsible in



how we are funding programs. This will also assure that our school districts have the money needed to operate in times of lower cash flow. I appreciate this bill coming forward, and appreciate Fiscal staff recognizing that, because of the way revenues come in, we may have a problem. We are able to address that problem through A.B. 523 in front of us today.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

For clarification: everything in the bill passed earlier today is in line with what Assemblyman Yeager has said, correct?

**Adam Drost:**

That is correct. To clarify: the Education Stabilization Account, as closed by the money committees, did reflect the Education Stabilization Account retaining its interest earnings, with the State Treasurer projecting interest earnings of \$25.6 million in FY 2024 and \$27.2 million dollars in FY 2025. That funding was retained by the Education Stabilization Account, as currently reflected in the NRS.

As proposed under A.B. 400, 75 percent of the interest earnings would have gone to the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program account, and 25 percent would have gone to the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship Program account. The bill heard earlier today by the Committee is related to teacher incentives, related to stipends for teachers as they move through their student teaching process.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 523?

**Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:**

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents is in support. There are some good moves in here, especially access to the Education Stabilization Account by the Department of Education when there are cashflow issues. We are in support.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to make testimony in opposition to A.B. 523?

**Alexander Marks, Director of Strategy, Nevada State Education Association:**

The Nevada State Education Association is opposed to increasing the cap of the Education Stabilization Account from 15 to 20 percent. We also oppose the change in the calculation of the rate inflation as we believe it will shortchange Nevada students in times of high inflation. You have no doubt heard us talk throughout session about the rainy day in Nevada and why it is "Time for 20," meaning a 20 percent raise, starting pay of \$20 per hour, and an average class size of 20 students. Unfortunately, we believe the 20 percent increase in the stabilization account is the wrong 20 percent; it moves us in the wrong direction. You know, when we are combining the Education Stabilization Account and the state's Rainy Day Account, reserves could approach nearly \$3 billion next biennium, which is seven times the state's previous high of \$401 million.

We believe it is fiscally irresponsible to underfund education and overfund reserves when we cannot retain our educators or fill their positions when they leave. You have heard from a parade of Nevada's incredible educators throughout this session about the hardships of working in public education with low pay and increasingly stressful working conditions. Instead of increasing reserves, we would encourage the Legislature to use this additional money to fund Time for 20. It is a rainy day in Nevada schools.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 523? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 523 and open its work session. I would accept a motion to do pass this bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 523.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I want to address some of the opposition today. I do not know what could be more important than ensuring a healthy Education Stabilization Account. We just heard about potential cashflow issues with school districts. I do not know why we would leave ourselves in a situation where we might not be able to fund K-12 education through the cash flows that are not anybody's fault, but simply a result of how revenue comes into the state. I appreciate that this bill increases the cap on the stabilization account from 15 percent to 20 percent.

Obviously, we could use that money elsewhere, but if we get into a situation where we have a downturn, I cannot think of anything more important than having money dedicated to making sure that K-12 education remains whole. We took a measured approach to go from 15 percent to 20 percent. Of course, future legislators will be able to evaluate whether that is the right amount. This is the first time in the history of the state that we have had money in an Education Stabilization Account. We have always had it in the Rainy Day Account, but this is just for education. This is us telling educators and students across the state that we have their back in case something goes wrong in the state's economy. I am supportive of this measure.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Watts.

Members, that is the last bill on our agenda, but before moving to the work session on measures that previously were considered by this Committee, we will take a five-minute recess and come right back.

[The Committee recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 11:03 a.m.]

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 469.

**Assembly Bill 469: Makes an appropriation to restore the balance in the Stale Claims Account. (BDR S-1097)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 469 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates \$4.4 million from the General Fund to restore the balance in the Stale Claims Account created through *Nevada Revised Statutes* 353.097.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 469.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN MILLER AND O'NEILL  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Backus.

**Assembly Bill 470: Makes an appropriation to the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration for professional services and filing fees related to water rights associated with the Marlette Lake Water System. (BDR S-1127)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 470 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates \$41,353 from the State General Fund to the State Public Works Division for professional services and filing fees related to water rights associated with the Marlette Lake Water System. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 470.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Hafen.

**Assembly Bill 471: Makes an appropriation to the State Public Works Division of the Department of Administration for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1136)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 471 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates \$3,158 from the State General Fund to the State Public Works Division for replacement computer hardware and associated software. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 471.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Dickman.

**Assembly Bill 472: Makes an appropriation to the Purchasing Division of the Department of Administration for the purchase of a warehouse building in Las Vegas, Nevada, to replace leased space. (BDR S-1137)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 472 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates \$7.2 million from the General Fund to the Purchasing Division for the purchase of a warehouse building in Las Vegas to replace leased space. There are no amendments recommended for this piece of legislation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 472.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Kasama.

**Assembly Bill 473: Makes an appropriation to the Fleet Services Division of the Department of Administration for the replacement and purchase of vehicles. (BDR S-1138)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 473 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates approximately \$12.8 million from the General Fund to the Fleet Services Division for replacement and purchase vehicles. There are no recommended amendments for this piece of legislation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 473.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman O'Neill.

**Assembly Bill 474: Makes an appropriation to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Commission on Ethics for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1139)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 474 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates \$3,359 from the General Fund and authorizes \$8,621, for a total of \$11,980 for the Commission on Ethics for the replacement of computer hardware and software and the authorization would be funded with county reimbursement revenue. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 474.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Miller.

**Assembly Bill 475: Makes appropriations to the Department of Administration for certain activities and technology requirements of the National Judicial College and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. (BDR S-1148)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 475 was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023, and makes the following State General Fund appropriations:

- Section 1 provides \$100,000 for the provision of education, technical assistance, research and policy development for the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court judges.
- Section 2 provides \$400,000 for the purchase of audiovisual equipment, hybrid teaching equipment, and video capturing and editing technology for the National Judicial College.

- Section 3 provides \$87,000 for the cost of a two-day meeting hosted by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges related to the development of a national judicial resource center concerning firearms.

There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 475.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Peters.

**Assembly Bill 476: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and associated software and door locks. (BDR S-1182)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 476 was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023. It makes a total General Fund appropriation of \$1.8 million, and authorizes expenditures of non-General Fund and non-Highway Fund revenues of \$411,677 for the Division of Aging and Disability Services, Department of Human Services, for various computer hardware equipment, maintenance costs, and the replacement of door locks. There are no amendments on the bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 476.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Anderson. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 477: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Department of Transportation for the replacement of the Nevada Shared Radio System. (BDR S-1168)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 477 was heard on May 16, 2023. It makes a General Fund appropriation of \$6.9 million, Highway Fund appropriations of \$22.1 million, and authorizes expenditures of \$823,272 in non-General Fund and non-Highway Fund revenue for the Department of Transportation for the continuing cost of the replacement of the Nevada Shared Radio System. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 477.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Brown-May. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 478: Makes an appropriation to the State Emergency Response Commission for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1166)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 478 was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023. It provides State Highway Fund appropriations of \$2,014 to the State Emergency Response Commission for replacement of computer hardware and associated software. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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



ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 478.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Hafen. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 479: Makes appropriations to the State Board of Parole Commissioners for the replacement of computer hardware, software and related equipment and licenses to upgrade a computer operating system. (BDR S-1158)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 479 was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023. It provides State General Fund appropriations of \$112,464 for the following: General Fund appropriations of \$66,169 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software; \$45,556 for the replacement of switches, firewalls, and router equipment; and \$739 for licenses to upgrade the Commission's computer operating system. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 479.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Dickman. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 481: Makes an appropriation to the Account for the Nevada Main Street Program. (BDR S-1149)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 481 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It provides a total of \$700,000 from the General Fund to the Nevada Main Street Program. There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 481.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Gorelow. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 485: Makes an appropriation to the Legislative Fund for capital improvement projects for facilities and information technology services projects. (BDR S-1141)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 485 was heard by the Committee on May 22, 2023. As originally introduced, the bill provided \$25.6 million in General Fund appropriations to the Legislative Fund for capital improvement projects for facilities and information technology services projects. However, an amendment was provided by the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau which revises this amount to \$3,974,486. This is primarily to support costs associated with information technology services, as well as the purchase of one passenger van and annual dues to national and regional organizations.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 485.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Watts. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 486: Makes appropriations to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and the purchase of digitization equipment and technology. (BDR S-1130)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 486 makes General Fund appropriations to the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records, Department of Administration for the following:

- \$21,142 to the Archives and Public Records budget for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$146,459 to the Archives and Public Records budget for the replacement and purchase of equipment and technology, and for the performance of a large-scale digitalization job.
- \$20,661 for the State Library budget for the replacement of computer hardware and software.

There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 486.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Backus. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 492: Makes appropriations to the Nevada System of Higher Education for certain information technology leases and equipment. (BDR S-1179)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 492 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. It appropriates State General Funds to the Nevada System of Higher Education Computing Center budget for \$3 million for the renewal of dark fiber leases for NevadaNet and \$5 million for the replacement equipment for NevadaNet. This has no recommended budget amendments.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 492.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman O'Neill. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 493: Makes an appropriation to the Nevada System of Higher Education for an interim study of the funding formula for the System. (BDR S-1178)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 493 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. It originally made State General Fund appropriations of \$5 million to the Nevada System of Higher Education for an interim study for the funding formula of the system and requires the Nevada System of Higher Education to submit a report related to the results of the study. There was an amendment proposed to reduce this request to \$2 million.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 493.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Kasama. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 495: Makes appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol Division of the Department of Public Safety for the replacement or purchase of vehicles, motorcycles, weapons and certain equipment and a staffing study. (BDR S-1163)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 495 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. It provides a number of State Highway Fund appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol Division for various replacement fleet vehicles, ballistic rifle vests, helmets, replacement tasers, mobile data, computers, replacement radar certification systems, recording devices and software, replacement equipment for vehicles, replacement computer hardware and software, the purchase of an oil filter crusher and steel shipping containers for a fabrication workspace, as well as oral fluid mobilizing testing devices and cartridges and a staffing study. I would note that there were recommendations for amendment of two sections within the bill.

There was a recommendation for the \$66,620 in Section 3 for the replacement vehicle to be adjusted to \$77,120. There was also a recommendation for a staffing study, originally \$50,000 in Section 13, to be amended to \$74,889. Those were the only two recommended changes for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 495.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman O'Neill. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 496: Makes appropriations to the Department of Public Safety for costs related to the Joint Emergency Training Institute and the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and associated software, radio equipment and certain weapons. (BDR S-1162)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 496 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. The bill provides \$2 million for costs related to the Joint Emergency Training Institution. For the Training Division, it provides State General Fund appropriations of \$29,401 and State Highway Fund appropriations of \$30,601 for the replacement of computer hardware and software. It also provides \$10,043 in General Funds and \$10,453 in Highway Funds for the purchase of radio equipment. It makes General Fund appropriations of \$8,468 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$8,812 for the replacement of tasers.

For the Nevada Office of Cyber Defense Coordination, it provides General Fund appropriations of \$5,550 for replacement computer hardware and software.

For the Dignitary Protection budget, it provides General Fund appropriations of \$9,190 for the replacement of computer hardware and software, General Fund appropriations of \$13,664 for the purchase of portable radios, and General Fund appropriations of \$12,960 for replacement tasers.

There are no amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 496.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Peters. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 500: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for an unanticipated shortfall related to costs associated with the preparation of the statewide cost allocation plan. (BDR S-1100)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 500 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. It provides a supplemental State General Fund appropriation of \$70,450 to the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, for unanticipated shortfalls related to costs associated with the preparation of the statewide cost allocation plan. There are no amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 500.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Miller. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 502: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services for an unanticipated revenue shortfall and an increase in operating costs. (BDR S-1104)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 502 was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. The bill, as originally introduced, would provide General Fund appropriations of \$589,999 to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, for an unanticipated revenue shortfall and an increase in the operating costs associated with the Lakes Crossing Center budget. During the hearing, there was testimony that the amount for the supplemental appropriation should be reduced from \$589,999 to \$471,798.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 502.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Anderson. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 504: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of Economic Development in the Office of the Governor for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and the costs of office furniture, communication services, certain staff certification and office modification. (BDR S-1140)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 504 was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. It makes appropriations and authorizations to the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor, for the following:

- State General Fund appropriations of \$12,906 to the Governor's Office of Economic Development budget account for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.
- General Fund appropriations of \$7,877 for furniture and communications services for a new office space.
- General Fund appropriations of \$12,480 for the cost of staff certifications.
- General Fund appropriations of \$2,259 and authorizations of \$4,194 for the Procurement Outreach Program budget for the replacement of computer hardware and software.
- General Fund appropriations of \$3,601 and authorizations of \$6,688 in the Procurement Outreach Program budget for the modification of office space.

There are no amendments recommended for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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



ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 504.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Brown-May. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 505: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Department of Veterans Services and the Veterans Home Account for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, the purchase of information technology peripheral devices and the performance of certain projects. (BDR S-1143)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 505 was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. It provides State General Fund appropriations and authorizations to the Department of Veterans Services for the following:

- General Fund appropriations of \$48,285 and authorizations of \$44,758 for computer hardware and software.
- General Fund appropriations of \$4,152 and authorizations for \$3,848 for the purchase of information technology peripheral devices.
- General Fund appropriations of \$148,210 to purchase information technology peripheral devices specifically for the Northern Nevada Veterans Home.
- General Fund appropriations of \$66,640 for the installation of water backflow prevention devices and the widening of an interior door for the Northern Nevada Veterans home.

Testimony provided during the hearing indicated that the department would request to remove the \$31,871 for a backflow preventer. As such, section 4 would be reduced from \$66,640 to \$34,769 with the removal of that backflow prevention device which had already been funded by the IFC. That is the only amendment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 505.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Hafen. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 508: Makes appropriations to the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, radio equipment, certain weapons and an information technology system. (BDR S-1164)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 508 was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023, and makes appropriations to the Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, for the following:

- \$325,338 for the replacement of computer hardware and software.
- \$1,748,394 for the replacement of radio equipment.
- \$225,733 for the replacement of guns and associated equipment.
- \$443,520 for the replacement of tasers.
- \$2,391,803 for the continued replacement of the offender tracking information technology system.

There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 508.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Dickman. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 509: Makes appropriations to the Investigation Division of the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of vehicles, radio equipment, cameras, computer hardware and associated software and certain weapons. (BDR S-1165)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 509 was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. It makes appropriations from the State General Fund and the State Highway Fund to the Investigation Division, Department of Public Safety, for the following:

- General Fund appropriations of \$355,728 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$33,443 for replacement vehicles.
- General Fund appropriations of \$228,634 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$15,004 for replacement radio equipment.
- General Fund appropriations of \$21,978 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$2,997 for replacement cameras.
- General Fund appropriations of \$109,368 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$3,871 for the replacement of computer hardware and software.
- General Fund appropriations of \$41,760 and Highway Fund appropriations of \$4,320 for the replacement of tasers.

There are no recommended amendments for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 509.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Gorelow. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 510: Makes appropriations to the Department of Motor Vehicles for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and software, office furniture and equipment. (BDR S-1176)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 510 was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. It provides Highway Funds to the Department of Motor Vehicles for the following:

- \$274,079 for the Automation budget for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- Approximately \$1.8 million to the Automation budget for replacement computer hardware and software, printers, network switches, and fiber connection.
- \$200,181 to the Department Transformation Effort budget for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- \$15,456 to the Department Transformation Effort budget for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$8,632 to the Motor Carrier Division for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- \$33,666 to the Motor Carrier Division for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$2,590 to the Hearing Office budget for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- \$7,568 to the Hearing Office budget for the replacement of computer hardware and software and the renewal of software licenses.
- \$475,886 to the Division of Field Services for the replacement of office furniture and equipment.
- \$719,292 to the Division of Field Services for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$190,074 to the Division of Compliance Enforcement for the replacement of office furniture and equipment.

- \$167,546 to the Division of Compliance Enforcement for the replacement of computer hardware and software.
- \$21,912 to the Division of Central Services and Records for the replacement of office furniture and equipment.
- \$294,069 to the Division of Central Services and Records for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$28,369 to the Division of Research and Project Management for the replacement of office furniture and equipment.
- \$15,978 to the Division of Research and Project Management for the replacement of computer hardware and software.
- \$6,147 to the Office of the Director for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- \$46,682 to the Office of the Director for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$167,730 to the Administrative Services Division for replacement office furniture and equipment.
- \$159,146 to the Administrative Services Division for replacement computer hardware and software.
- \$4,021 to the Administrative Services Division to purchase expedited mail equipment.

An amendment proposed by the agency recommends that:

- Section 3 be revised to \$205,610.
- Section 4 be revised to \$15,208.
- Section 12 be revised to \$168,041.
- Section 15 be revised to \$27,985.

This would revise total Highway Fund appropriations to \$4,635,173. That is the only amendment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 510.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Watts. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 511: Makes appropriations to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, the replacement of office furniture and equipment and deferred maintenance projects. (BDR S-1184)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 511 was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. It provides State General Funds to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, for the following:

- \$2,552 to the Family Planning budget for replacement computer and hardware.
- \$159,355 to the Community Health Services budget for replacement computer hardware and software.
- For the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services budget, approximately \$13.3 million for deferred maintenance, \$790,431 for the replacement of computer hardware and software, \$312,817 for replacement laboratory equipment, and \$179,035 for a replacement utility carton ice maker.
- For the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services budget, the bill recommends \$611,310 for deferred maintenance, and \$398,960 for replacement computer hardware and software.
- For the Lakes Crossing Center budget, \$88,121 for replacement computer hardware and software and \$151,500 for deferred maintenance.
- For the Rural Clinics budget, the bill recommends \$347,494 for replacement computer hardware and software, \$96,183 for replacement office furniture and equipment, and \$35,736 for the replacement of telephone equipment.

There is a proposed amendment to this bill. In Section 6, the recommendation is to change the amount from \$611,310 to \$264,870 as a result of projects that were funded in the closed budget for the Department. That is the only amendment for this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 511.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Backus. We will move on to the next bill.

**Assembly Bill 512: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services of the Department of Health and Human Services for certain information technology upgrades and projects. (BDR S-1185)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 512 was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. The bill provides appropriations from the State General Fund to the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services for the following:

- General Fund appropriations of \$551,505 and authorizations of \$1,355,426 for the Welfare Administration budget to purchase computer hardware and software.
- General Fund appropriations of \$281,644 and authorizations of \$688,879 for the Welfare Administration budget for software and upgrades to the Division's information technology systems.
- General Fund appropriations of \$825,817 and authorizations of approximately \$1.8 million in the Welfare Field Services budget for replacement computer hardware and software.
- General Fund appropriations of approximately \$16.4 million and authorizations of approximately \$31.9 million in the Child Support Enforcement Program budget for information technology modernization projects.

This bill does not have any amendments recommended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 512.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Kasama. That is the last bill for work session for our morning. We will stand in recess, and will reconvene at the call of the Chair.

[The Committee recessed at 11:56 a.m. and reconvened at 5:21 p.m.]

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I call the Committee on Ways and Means back to order. We have gathered tonight to go through a long list of work session bills, beginning with Assembly Bill 15.

**Assembly Bill 15: Prescribes the manner for increasing the base salaries of district judges. (BDR 1-430)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 15 was heard by the Committee on March 8, 2023. It provides an increase in the annual base salary of district judges every six years, based upon the cumulative percentage increase in the salaries of classified employees of the state. Existing law sets the annual base salary for district judges at \$160,000, and if a district judge serves for at least four years, they are entitled to an additional salary of 2 percent for each year of service, not to exceed 22 percent of their annual base salary. During the hearing, the administrative courts office has identified a fiscal impact beginning in FY 2027, with an annual increase of salaries of approximately \$2.5 million, and a biennial impact of \$4.3 million. There are no amendments recommended with this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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



ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 15.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN JAUREGUI, MILLER, AND  
YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Kasama. We will move on to  
Assembly Bill 16.

**Assembly Bill 16: Prescribes the manner for increasing the base salaries of justices of  
the Nevada Supreme Court and judges of the Nevada Court of Appeals.  
(BDR 1-434)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 16 was heard by the Committee on March 8, 2023. The bill provides for an increase in the annual base salary for justices of the Nevada Supreme Court and judges of the Nevada Court of Appeals every six years, based upon the cumulative percentage increase in the salaries of classified employees of the state.

The Administrative Office of the Courts has identified a fiscal impact beginning in FY 2025 for the increase in costs from salary increases for eligible judges and justices. The estimated impact in FY 2025 is \$86,113 and in future biennia is \$1,210,504. With the fiscal impact for this bill, the Committee could consider an amendment to add a State General Fund appropriation of \$86,113 in FY 2025 to the State Judicial Elected Officials budget account. The motion would be to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 16.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN JAUREGUI, MILLER, AND  
YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters. We will move on to  
Assembly Bill 46 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 46 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to historical markers.  
(BDR 33-240)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 46 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. As amended, A.B. 46 (R1) eliminates the requirement for the administrator of the Office of Historic Preservation of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to place and maintain historical markers on all public lands and private lands.

Instead, A.B. 46 (R1) requires that the administrator of the Division of State Parks of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources be responsible for the installation, interpretation, maintenance, and protection of all registered historical markers. There was one fiscal note for \$10,000 from the Department of Transportation. However, they have indicated that they can absorb that fiscal impact. As such, there is no longer a fiscal impact associated with this piece of legislation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 46 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN MILLER AND YEAGER  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller. We will move on to Assembly Bill 77 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 77 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing economic development.  
(BDR 18-711)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 77 (1st Reprint) was heard on May 17, 2023. As amended, the bill creates the Office of Entrepreneurship within the Office of Economic Development to strengthen and grow entrepreneurship in the state, provide technical support for entrepreneurs, and serve as a point of contact for businesses, which have not been in business for more than five years, in their interaction with state agencies.

Initially, the Governor's Office of Economic Development had submitted a fiscal note indicating that it required approximately \$396,000 in FY 2024 and \$355,000 in FY 2025 to

support three positions. However, during the bill hearing, the Governor's Office of Economic Development confirmed that it was able to remove the administrative assistant position, therefore reducing the fiscal impact to \$531,738 over the biennium. That would leave funding for an Administrative Services Officer position and a Management Analyst position.

If the Committee chose, the motion here would be to amend the bill to add General Fund appropriations of \$249,626 in FY 2024 and \$269,153 in FY 2025 to support the two positions and associated costs within the Governor's Office of Economic Development. The motion would be to amend and do pass, as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 77 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I love the idea of this, but there are multiple offices now for entrepreneurship. I would rather this be contained within one of those. I will be voting no.

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN, HAFEN, AND  
KASAMA VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR  
THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Anderson. We will move on to Assembly Bill 135 (1st Reprint).

[Assembly Bill 135 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to homelessness.  
(BDR 40 324)

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 135 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023. As amended, the bill requires a homeless person who wishes to obtain an official copy of a certificate of birth from a person or government organization other than the state registrar to submit a statement signed under penalty of perjury that the person is homeless, rather than a signed affidavit, and prohibits such a person or governmental entity from requiring that such a signed statement be notarized.

Existing law requires that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) waive, not more than one time, all fees and costs associated with the issuance of an original duplicate identification card to a homeless child or youth less than 25 years of age. Section 4 of this bill removes the limitation that such fees and costs may be waived only once, thus requiring the department to waive all fees and costs for the issuance of any identification cards issued to homeless children or youth less than 25 years of age.

The DMV submitted a fiscal note on the original bill of \$101,692 in FY 2024 and \$457 in FY 2025 that had to do with the implementation date of the legislation. However, the DMV confirmed that if the implementation date was moved to January 1, 2026, that would take care of the fiscal impact associated with this, since they would be able to implement these changes into their new system. The sponsor of the bill confirmed agreement with that so long as all other sections of the bill remained within an October 1, 2023, start date.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

There is another amendment to add the 9-8-8 line, correct?

**Sarah Coffman:**

Yes, that is correct. There was another amendment submitted to revise *Nevada Revised Statutes* 388.1335 to read that the board of trustees of each school district and the governing body of each charter school shall ensure that information relating to mental health resources, including, without limitation, that the number for the national suicide and crisis lifeline 9-8-8, or any successor number, appear on the back of any identification card issued to a pupil at the school within the school district or charter school.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 135 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. We will move on to Assembly Bill 140 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 140 (1st Reprint): Makes Juneteenth Day a legal holiday in this State.  
(BDR 19-63)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 140 (1st Reprint) was presented by Assemblywoman Thomas on April 20, 2023. Assembly Bill 140 (1st Reprint) makes Juneteenth Day a legal holiday in Nevada, rather than a day of observance. The measure further requires that Juneteenth Day is to be observed on June 19, or the Monday following if June 19 falls on a Sunday, or the Friday preceding if June 19 falls on a Saturday. The measure makes a conforming change to account for the closure of state, county, and city governmental offices for Juneteenth Day.

There was a fiscal impact identified by the Division of Human Resource Management of \$482,924 in each fiscal year over the 2023-2025 biennium and for the estimated cost associated with holiday premium pay for employees that may be required to work on the proposed holiday. As these costs would be incurred within the state agency budgets for these employees, they may be able to be covered under vacancy savings or other savings, so there is no amendment to address the fiscal impact. This is the first reprint; there are no additional amendments.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 140 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

Assemblywoman JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Thomas.

**Assemblywoman Clara Thomas, Assembly District No. 17:**

Thank you, Chair.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will move on to Assembly Bill 147 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 147 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to dentistry. (BDR 54-74)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 147 (1st Reprint) was heard on May 19, 2023. The measure sets forth various requirements to meet before providing services through teledentistry, including the requirements that the dentist, dental hygienists, or dental therapist who provides services via teledentistry to a patient in Nevada is located and licensed in Nevada and adhere to the applicable laws, regulations, and standards of care to the same extent as when providing services in person.

Additionally, the measure makes hospitals and issuers of plans that provide coverage to recipients of Medicaid, including managed care plans, to take certain measures to improve the access of recipients of Medicaid to teledentistry. Assembly Bill 147 (1st Reprint), as amended, provides for the issuance of special endorsement by the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada to a licensed dentist, dental hygienist, or dental therapist to administer immunizations, and sets forth certain requirements for the administration of immunizations by holders of such endorsements.

The Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada did have an original fiscal note of \$55,250 in FY 2024 and \$50,000 in FY 2025. However, upon the first reprint, the Dental Board confirmed removal of their fiscal note, so there is no fiscal impact for this bill. There are no further amendments.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 147 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Marzola. We will move on to Assembly Bill 239 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 239 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to government administration. (BDR 23-896)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 239 (1st Reprint) was presented by Assemblywoman Jauregui on May 24, 2023. The bill, as amended, creates the Merit Award Account in the State General Fund, and provides appropriations for the administration of the Merit Award Board and funding for merit awards.

The bill requires the Advisory Council for Family Engagement to submit to appointing authorities a list of persons who are qualified for membership on the Advisory Council under certain circumstances, revises the membership of the Committee for the Statewide Alert System, authorizes additional duties and authority of the Committee on Testing for Intoxication, requires the chair or commissioner of insurance to carry out certain duties of the appeals panel, revises provisions relating to the membership of the Medical Laboratory Advisory Committee, clarifies provisions relating to meetings of the Credit Union Advisory council, and eliminates the requirement that council members are entitled to receive a salary.

Section 15 appropriates \$3,000 from the State General Fund to the Merit Award Board to fund the administration of the Board. Section 16 appropriates \$25,000 from the General Fund to fund awards during the 2023-2025 biennium. There are no additional amendments to the bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 239 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Gorelow. We will move on to Assembly Bill 277 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 277 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions governing rural emergency hospitals. (BDR 40-637)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 277 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on April 20, 2023. It establishes a rural emergency hospital as a unique type of medical facility licensed and regulated by the State Board of Health and the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

The Board must adopt regulations for the licensure of rural emergency hospitals which takes into consideration the unique problems of operating such a facility in a rural area. The Department may apply for a waiver or an amendment to the state plan for Medicaid to receive federal funding to increase the reimbursement rates for rural emergency hospital services.

The bill also authorizes the Division to issue an endorsement as a crisis stabilization center to a rural emergency hospital if certain requirements are met.

The bill, as originally introduced, had a fiscal note from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy of \$71,292 in FY 2024 and \$10,852 in FY 2025. The agency testified that this amount could be absorbed with existing resources.

In addition, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health estimated that it would cost \$112,267 in FY 2024 and \$130,000 in FY 2025 to support two part-time positions, one administrative assistant and one health facility inspector for rural emergency hospital licensure duties and expectations. However, during the testimony provided in the hearing, it was confirmed that this would be a replacement of workload, rather than a new workload. Therefore, they testified that the fiscal impact to the bill could be removed.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 277 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Koenig. We will move on to Assembly Bill 299 (1st Reprint).



**Assembly Bill 299 (1st Reprint): Creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction.  
(BDR 18 780)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 299 (1st Reprint) was presented by Assemblyman Yeager on May 24, 2023. As amended, the bill creates the Nevada Medal of Distinction and the Nevada Awards and Honors Board. The Board is to be composed of five members appointed by the Governor. Its duties include establishing a suitable design for the Nevada Medal of Distinction and the requirements for determining whether a person has made a significant and lasting contribution to the state. The medal must be awarded annually to two people: one who is living, and one who is deceased—both having made a significant and lasting contribution to the state. On or before January 1 of each year, a selection committee, composed of nine members, must be appointed. Each member of the selection committee shall nominate one person who is living and one person who is deceased for the medal.

The Office of the Governor had initially indicated a fiscal impact that could not be determined relating to travel and ceremony cost and design and production cost of the medals. However, during the bill hearing, it was confirmed that the Office of the Governor had removed its fiscal impact, and that the costs could be absorbed. There were no additional amendments proposed.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 299 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman O'Neill. We will move on to Assembly Bill 328.

**Assembly Bill 328: Makes an appropriation to the Immigration Clinic at the William S. Boyd School of Law of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (BDR S-1058)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 328 was heard by the Committee on April 3, 2023. It makes State General Fund appropriations of \$500,000 in each year for a total of \$1 million over the 2023-2025 biennium to the Immigration Clinic at the William S. Boyd School of Law at the

University of Nevada, Las Vegas for the purpose of providing pro bono legal services related to immigration law.

The \$1 million appropriation is included in the bill, so there are no proposed amendments.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 328.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN, HAFEN,  
KASAMA, AND O'NEILL VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Watts. We will move on to Assembly Bill 345.

**Assembly Bill 345: Revises provisions governing the Commerce Tax. (BDR 32-783)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 345 was presented by Assemblywoman Considine on May 24, 2023. The bill removes real estate investment trusts and qualified real estate investment trust subsidiaries from the entities excluded from the definition of business entity, thus making the annual commerce tax applicable to all real estate investment trusts and qualified real estate investment trust subsidiaries whose gross revenue earned in the state during the fiscal year exceeds \$4 million.

The Department of Taxation had identified the fiscal impact of \$25,376 in FY 2024 and \$12,749 in FY 2025 due to the costs associated with their Deputy Attorney General, resulting from an increase in appeals and work related to promulgating regulations. However, during the bill hearing, the Department of Taxation clarified that the cost allocation plan is built in arrears. Therefore, costs resulting from this work would not be realized until future biennium. Therefore, there is no fiscal impact for the Committee to address through the bill, and there are no amendments on A.B. 345.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any comments or questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

In the policy committee, I was a no. Since the fiscal note has been removed, I will vote this out of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I will reserve the right to change my vote on the floor.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I will reserve also.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 345.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN O'NEILL VOTED NO.  
ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Considine. We will move on to Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing Medicaid. (BDR 38-977)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

The Committee heard Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint) on May 18, 2023. This bill requires the director of the Department of Health and Human Services to apply for a waiver of certain provisions of federal law governing Medicaid for the purposes of providing certain Medicaid coverage for incarcerated youth and incarcerated persons with certain health conditions for not more than 90 days before their scheduled release.

The Division of Health Care Finance and Policy originally identified a fiscal impact of \$982,780 in FY 2024 and \$928,463 in FY 2025. However, during the bill hearing, the Division of Health Care Finance and Policy updated its fiscal notes and identified that the amounts would be revised to a total of \$1.9 million over the biennium. The Division indicated that they could cover that cost with the federal portion of opioid funds, so the Committee would not need to provide any General Fund appropriations for this piece of legislation. There are no additional amendments recommended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 389, AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Peters. We will move on to  
Assembly Bill 399 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 399 (1st Reprint): Creates the Subcommittee on Education  
Accountability of the Interim Finance Committee. (BDR 17-1043)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 399 (1st Reprint) was presented by Assemblyman Yeager on May 25, 2023. This bill, as amended, creates the Subcommittee on Education Accountability of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC), which must meet at least once every six months to discuss, evaluate, and make recommendations relating to the accountability of public education in the state, to improve educational achievement and outcomes for pupils.

The Subcommittee may also conduct investigations in connection to its duties and compel the attendance of certain individuals at a meeting. The Subcommittee consists of five members of the Assembly and three members of the Senate to be appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and Majority Leader of the Senate. The Chair of the IFC shall appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the Subcommittee.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau has indicated there would be no fiscal impact. Initially, the Department of Education had identified fiscal impact for the cost of a part-time management analyst position. However, during the bill hearing, the Department of Education testified—and following the hearing submitted a revised fiscal note to remove those costs—indicating that they could absorb the cost associated with any work that there may be. There are no additional amendments to the bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 399 (1ST REPRINT), AS AMENDED.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement for A.B. 399 (R1). We will move on to Assembly Bill 460.

**Assembly Bill 460: Revises provisions relating to nursing pools. (BDR 40-1070)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 460 was heard on May 22, 2023, and revises the definition of the term "nursing pool" to only include a person or agency which provides—through its employees or by a contractual arrangement with other persons—infusion or private duty nursing services to a natural person.

This bill also exempts from that definition, a nursing pool providing staff for a medical facility or facilities for the dependent, a licensed private employment agency, and a licensed professional employment organization. This bill exempts such entities from licensure and regulation as medical facilities.

This is a budget implementation bill relating to the Health Care Facilities Regulation budget. Decision unit enhancement (E) 225, approved by the money committees, results in the reduction of health care facility licensure fees of \$343,048 over the 2023-2025 biennium. According to the agency, this change would reduce the entities identified as a nursing pool to only those that are critical to be regulated by health care quality and compliance.

At the hearing, a friendly amendment was requested by Ferrari Reader Public Affairs. That amendment to section 1 subsection 2 would include the following exemption: any entity working through an electronic platform of other means that facilitates the contracting or hiring of the health care worker as described in NRS 449.153, subsection 2A, with a medical facility if the health care worker is not an employee of the entity facilitating the hiring of the health care worker, and the medical facility sets the terms of hiring or hourly rates of the health care worker.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any questions or comments from the Committee?

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I was stopped in the hall earlier today about this. I want to verify that the individuals who are hired—not just the company—are licensed through the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I will remove A.B. 460 from the work session until we can get an answer on that. We will move on to Assembly Bill 461.

**Assembly Bill 461: Revises provisions relating to the Public Employees' Retirement System. (BDR 23-1075)**

**Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 461 was presented by the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) on April 20, 2023. Assembly Bill 461 creates the position of Chief Administrative Analyst as a member of the executive staff of PERS. The bill would implement the budget decision made by the money Committees on April 15, 2023, to create this new position as part of the PERS budget closing. This is a budget implementation bill to create that position. There are no amendments proposed.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 461.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Backus. We will move on to Assembly Bill 462.

**Assembly Bill 462: Revises provisions governing the State Board of Parole Commissioners. (BDR 16-1073)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 462 was heard on May 22, 2023. The bill amends *Nevada Revised Statutes*, Chapter 213 to establish the position of Executive Director within the State Board of Parole Commissioners. The Executive Director is appointed by the Chair of the Board and will be delegated authority and responsibilities the chair deems necessary for efficient conduct of the business of the Board.

With respect to the fiscal impact, there was no fiscal note included in Assembly Bill 462; however, this is a budget implementation bill. Decision unit E-380 in the Parole Board budget included the cost of the new Executive Director position, and was approved by the money committees on May 1, 2023, with General Fund appropriations of \$244,740 over the 2023-2025 biennium.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 462.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblyman Hafen. Next, we will return to A.B. 460 to answer the previous question related to the licensure of nurses.

**Assembly Bill 460: Revises provisions relating to nursing pools. (BDR 40-1070)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Fiscal staff reached out to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, which confirmed that nurses would still be licensed by the Nursing Board.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 460.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

The floor statement will go to Assemblywoman Gorelow.

That was our last work session for tonight. We will not return this evening after the floor session.

Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.]

This meeting is adjourned [at 6:15 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Anna Freeman  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

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



## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 518](#) submitted by Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Indigent Defense Services.

[Exhibit D](#) is the proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 518](#) submitted by Mary C. Walker, representing Douglas, Lyon, and Storey Counties.