

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

**Eighty-Second Session
May 29, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 8:10 a.m. on Monday, May 29, 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.

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 Cameron (C.H.) Miller
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Fabian Doñate, Senate District No. 10
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Tyler Boyce, Committee Secretary
Janet Osalvo, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Aaron Ford, Attorney General
Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General
Beth Schmidt, Director-Police Sargeant, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Sara Ralston, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services
Kofi Hair-Ralston, Private Citizen, Baltimore, Maryland
Jordana Dibello, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Gil Hair-Ralston, Private Citizen, Baltimore, Maryland
Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress
Patrick Kelly, representing Nevada Hospital Association
Helen Foley, representing Nevada Association of Health Plans
Heather Bugg, Administrative Services Officer, Division of Child and Family
Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Ellen Crecelius, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division,
Department of Health and Human Services
Susan Fisher, representing Nevada Aviation Association
Bob Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of
Conservation and Natural Resources
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Jennifer Lanahan, representing Las Vegas Paiute Tribe; and Reno-Sparks Indian
Colony
Alex Tanchek, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of
the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the
Duckwater Reservation
Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition
Rose Wolterbeek, representing Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter
Kanani Espinoza, representing Rowe Law Group, Ltd.
Arielle Edwards, Director, Government Relations, Nevada HAND, Inc.
Mendy K. Elliott, representing Nevada Housing Coalition; and Private Citizen, Reno,
Nevada
Tom Clark, representing Nevada Society for Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery
Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs,
Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family
Engagement, Department of Education
Dawn Etcheverry, President, Nevada State Education Association
Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management Division,
Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles
Dan Musgrove, representing Nevada Donor Network

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were discussed.] We have a long calendar today, and we will be taking a few things out of order. We are going to start with Assembly Bill 50 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 50 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the prosecution of certain crimes. (BDR 15-429)

Aaron Ford, Attorney General:

I am here to request resources for the Office of the Attorney General to engage in the fight against organized retail crime. I will start with an overview of organized retail crime (ORC). I understand this is the money committee—not a policy committee—but I want to give you an understanding of what we are asking. Organized retail crime refers to criminal activity in which perpetrators target retail stores to steal massive amounts of products and then resell the items in different venues, such as on the Internet. We are not talking about shoplifters who steal items for personal use; we are talking about groups of individuals—often in organizations—who organize this retail crime and then use their efforts to resell these products over the Internet or sometimes out of warehouses.

Assembly Bill 50 (1st Reprint) seeks to provide the Office of Attorney General with jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute ORC, counterfeit goods, and fraudulent transactions. I know it is not customary for an agency to place a fiscal note on its own bill. However, conversation on this policy has evolved, and in lieu of creating a stakeholder committee as the second iteration of this bill called for, we have instead submitted an amendment requesting one senior deputy attorney general to help us prosecute organized retail crime.

With me is my chief of staff, Teresa Benitez-Thompson, who can answer any questions you may have about the fiscal component.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We are aware that this is a growing problem throughout the state. The appropriation was amended in the policy committee for the needed funding. The fiscal note you have—was that lowered from the one person down?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General:

We would like permission to be able to work with staff on the number because we started with a floor amendment that augmented to the request for one staff person. We provided preliminary numbers. Currently, there is no existing staff as we do not have jurisdictional capability to perform these services in the office. This would cover the establishment of one senior deputy attorney general position. In looking at the numbers with my fiscal staff on Friday, it looks like we might have requested a deputy attorney general instead of a senior deputy attorney general. In conversations with our Chief, the type of skill and the skill level we need would be someone who could function more autonomously since there is only one of these positions in the state now. We need to revisit the numbers one last time, but it will not be a substantial change—it will remain as one position.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members on A.B. 50 (R1)?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I do not have the fiscal note. We are only discussing the appropriation that is in the bill language without an additional fiscal note. Is that correct? Also, given the statewide vacancies, do you feel that you will be able to hire someone into this position?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson:

We do. I will feel more confident with passage of the proposed Pay Bill. Our office vacancy rate is about 14 percent, and we are enthusiastic about the considerations you have put forward.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

In section 1, subsection 5, why does it say the Attorney General may, instead of shall, investigate these cases?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson:

This provides jurisdictional ability so we may be able to prosecute immediately. These cases are also prosecuted by district attorneys at the local level. You will hear testimony that the district attorneys at the local level have more than they can handle. This will give us the ability to approach and to prosecute, but it will make sure that the sharing of that jurisdiction remains where it is now—between your local district attorney and the state.

Assemblywoman Backus:

Moving from district attorneys who currently handle many of these matters to the Office of the Attorney General with a new senior deputy attorney general position, will that be enough staff to handle this matter? It seems that person will be responsible for all levels of investigation, as well as the prosecution. Do you already have investigators available to assist the new senior deputy attorney general position?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson:

Currently, the Office of the Attorney General does not prosecute or investigate these matters. We are looking for jurisdiction to do both and then we need resources for prosecution. We looked at what the resources would mean for investigation, and it would be a big effort. At this time, we are looking for the ability to help prosecute. As we go forward and engage in this work, we would be able to return next session, talk about the work we have been able to do, and about where we might be able to grow—which would most certainly be in the investigatory area.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I know in the past, the Attorney General said that local counties must pay for the state to come in and technically handle the county's work. If we give you authority to investigate and prosecute, would that still be what happens?

Attorney General Ford:

I believe your question relates to a conversation last session that talked about us oftentimes being able to bill counties for work we needed to do. This only provides us with concurrent jurisdiction for prosecutorial purposes. Because we do not have investigators—the ones who would do primary work in that area—we will be working in tandem with local law enforcement and district attorneys to the extent there is an opportunity for joint work. This would not be in lieu of what we discussed last session, but this bill contemplates concurrent jurisdiction and working together.

Assemblyman O'Neill

For further clarification, we would not be billing counties if this bill were to pass. Is that correct?

Attorney General Ford:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 50 (R1)?

**Beth Schmidt, Director-Police Sergeant, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We support A.B. 50 (R1). The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department currently investigates most of the organized retail theft crimes in Nevada. We handle almost all the big cases and certainly everything in the southern part of Nevada. We support additional assistance working in tandem with the Office of the Attorney General.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Chamber is in support of A.B. 50 (R1). We believe this is an appropriate appropriation to help address the organized crime situation we have throughout Nevada.

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada:

I want to thank the Attorney General and his staff for working with the Retail Association for A.B. 50 (R1). Regarding fiscal concerns, I want to put it in context—as has been testified, about \$800 million in retail goods are stolen from Nevada retailers throughout the biennium. That is about \$120 million in lost sales tax at all levels of government and just shy of \$13 million in lost sales tax to the State General Fund. We believe that the money you are allocating to this position in the Office of the Attorney General will allow us to reduce that amount over time.

The appropriation in front of you is less than the amount we had originally requested to fully staff the Office of the Attorney General and make the biggest dent in ORC that we can. We believe this appropriation will allow the State General Fund to realize additional revenue and for that reason, we support this bill. The policy implications of reducing these kinds of thefts in our stores will increase worker safety and the bill includes counterfeit goods and stolen goods. Empowering the Attorney General to go after counterfeit dealers and counterfeit goods will keep consumers safer in Nevada. We urge your support of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of A.B. 50 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in neutral on A.B. 50 (R1)? [There was no one.]

Are there any closing remarks from the presenters on this bill? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 50 (R1).

Last week we had a waiver of the rules so we could work session bills on the same day that we heard the bills. I have a question for the record. Before we can work session this bill, the amount included for the appropriations was \$252,189. I believe in your presentation today, you said that the amount may be adjusted. Is that the correct amount?

Teresa Benitez-Thompson:

We need to confirm with our Chief Financial Officer what the cost is for a senior deputy attorney general position compared to the cost for a deputy attorney general. To move the bill now, we will make the existing appropriation work.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We can work session this bill. If the amount needs to be changed, you can always amend it when the bill goes to the Senate. With that information, I will accept a motion to do pass as amended.

Assembly Bill 50 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the prosecution of certain crimes. (BDR 15-429)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 50 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] I will call for a vote.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Hafen.

I will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 6, a measure which revises provisions relating to the cost of health care.

Assembly Bill 6: Revises provisions relating to the cost of health care. (BDR 40-380)

Sara Ralston, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here, not on behalf of the Patient Protection Commission, but in my own individual capacity as a commissioner and as a former executive director. I have been asked to provide a brief overview of Assembly Bill 6, and I have prepared remarks related to the intent of this legislation and, more specifically, why this investment is important for Nevada. I will read my prepared statement into the record.

This legislation is a product of the work of the Patient Protection Commission over the last several years. This proposal has been vetted through a public process and is one of three measures the Commission voted to bring forward. This measure aims to establish a health care cost benchmark in the state and seeks to serve as a crucial cost containment mechanism for our state's budget, addressing the escalating expenses associated with health care. By implementing a benchmark, the state can effectively control costs and promote fiscal responsibility while ensuring access to quality health care for all Nevadans.

In recent years, health care costs in Nevada have reached unsustainable levels. Rising insurance premiums, exorbitant drug prices, and escalating medical service expenses have burdened both individuals and the state budget. This bill asks you to proactively address these issues and to protect the financial well-being of patients and the state as a whole.

As I mentioned, the main component of this measure is to establish a health care cost benchmark. It also promotes cost transparency; specifically, the bill requires health care providers and insurance companies to report measurement against the benchmark, fostering transparency and accountability in the health care industry. This transparency will empower patients to make more informed decisions about their health care choices. Furthermore, this

measure promotes competition among health care providers by providing consumers with comparative information about health care costs. Most importantly, this measure serves as a cost-containment mechanism.

The first point I would like to make is on the budgetary control. By establishing a health care cost benchmark, A.B. 6 enables the state to control and predict health care expenditures more effectively. This will help prevent unforeseen budget shortfalls and ensure the availability of resources for other essential public services.

Regarding affordable premiums, the benchmark will provide a foundation for regulating insurance premiums by stabilizing health care costs. Insurance providers can offer more affordable plans making health care coverage accessible to a larger population.

Addressing the cost shift, currently, higher health care costs lead to cost shifting where providers compensate for lower reimbursements from public insurance programs by increasing charges to private payers. Assembly Bill 6 will help mitigate this phenomenon, ensuring fairness, equity, and health care pricing.

Lastly regarding sustainable economic growth, high health care costs hinder economic growth by placing a burden on businesses and individuals. By implementing a cost benchmark, we can attempt to alleviate this burden, fostering a business friendly environment and stimulating economic growth in Nevada.

In conclusion, A.B. 6 represents a critical step toward containing health care costs in Nevada. By establishing a health care cost benchmark, promoting transparency, and encouraging competition, we can protect the state budget and ensure access to affordable high quality health care for all Nevadans. I urge your support for this measure in recognition of the significance of improving the financial stability of our state.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There is a fiscal note on the bill, and I would invite the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, representative to address that fiscal note.

**Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services:**

We need a staff person, an economist, to help with this bill and some of the requirements.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

In looking at the fiscal note of \$152,923, only \$76,462 would be from the State General Fund. Is that correct?

Stacie Weeks:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Your division cannot absorb that amount. You will need the amendment and an appropriation for the bill. Is that correct?

Stacie Weeks:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members on this presentation?

Assemblyman Hafen:

There is another bill for the provider fee where the state would receive about 15 percent of that. Adding this proposed growth benchmark, do we know what the fiscal impact of the growth benchmark would be on the proposed provider fee?

Stacie Weeks:

My understanding is that there are no requirements around the cost growth benchmark to limit costs, so I do not think there is an impact on the provider tax.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of A.B. 6?

Kofi Hair-Ralston, Private Citizen, Baltimore, Maryland:

I am here in support of A.B. 6. As Winston Churchill once said, healthy citizens are the greatest asset any country can have. This bill would permit more citizens to have access to health care and contribute to the general body of our country. I urge your support.

Jordana Dibello, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I support A.B. 6 because I want a future where I do not have to worry about health care.

Gil Hair-Ralston, Private Citizen, Baltimore, Maryland:

I support A.B. 6, and I urge you to support this bill as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your testimony. I love to see the future being part of the process.

Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress:

We are in support of A.B. 6. Anything that helps us understand and address rising health care costs for Nevadans is good policy and a good investment for the health of Nevadans. Please support this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 6? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to this bill?

Patrick Kelly, representing Nevada Hospital Association:

We request that this bill not move forward. In the last legislative session, the Legislature created the All-Payers Claim Database which is designed to collect and store information on medical, dental, and pharmacy claims in the state. This information is needed to analyze health care costs in Nevada. Unfortunately, the database is not up and running. It is illogical to establish a health care cost growth benchmark without the information needed to set and analyze the benchmark.

We have already witnessed a benchmark failure. The first benchmark was established for 2022, and the growth rate was set at 3.19 percent. Inflation was 6.5 percent—double the amount of the benchmark. If the 2022 benchmark was enforced, there would be no new growth—only significant cuts.

Benchmarking might be useful with well-developed health care delivery systems like the systems in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware, but it is not appropriate for a state like Nevada that has millions of people living in federally designated health professional shortage areas. I remind you; Nevada is ranked among the top five states in the nation where health care is least expensive and where overall health care spending has grown the least. We do not need a benchmarking program that constricts growth; we need to expand health care.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Before we go on, do you see anything in this bill that makes this mandatory, or is this a transparency tool and an investigatory tool?

Patrick Kelly:

During the Patient Protection Commission (PPC) hearings, there was significant discussion about penalizing health care providers that did not meet the benchmarks, and that provision has been taken out.

We went to the PPC and said that inflation is running high. The Governor's Executive Order says that the PPC can adjust the benchmark to a more realistic number, but they would not do that. They left the benchmark where it was. If they are not going to take input and look at facts, then we have a concern about the benchmark.

Helen Foley, representing Nevada Association of Health Plans:

The Nevada Association of Health Plans is a 10-member trade organization for commercial insurers in Nevada. We echo the concerns of Patrick Kelly. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the supply chain was challenging, and trying to get needed supplies to hospitals was costly. If we had been restricted to artificial inflationary standards that the PPC establishes, it would have been disastrous for us to be able to supply services to individuals.

We understand that there is no penalty at this point, but when this was talked about during the interim, they talked about establishing benchmarks and then having restrictions so everyone who supplies health services would be mandated to be under that level or they would be fined. This is a stepping stone. You must be realistic. If we see what inflation was

one year ago compared to now, it would have been impossible for us to get to 3.9 percent when we were almost up to 10 percent inflation. We did have the All-Payers Claims Database that was passed last session—we would like to get that established and in working order first. We would all supply our information to the state, and hopefully that would be the right process to use.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in opposition to A.B. 6? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in neutral on this bill? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments from the presenters?

Sara Ralston:

I know this is not a policy committee, but given the opposition testimony, I would like to touch on the All-Payer Claims Database—that was an investment this body decided to make for transparency in health care and gathering data. However, that is a separate database from what we are looking at in A.B. 6. Both are equally important, but when you think about establishing a health care cost benchmark, you are correct that there is no penalty for noncompliance, and it was designed that way. The discussions the Commission had about penalties for noncompliance were only for comparing what other states have done to advance benchmark discussions and health care policy decisions.

This measure is important as I stated before for cost containment for a new dataset collection with no penalty for noncompliance because the state should have access to this set of data—so you can be more informed in making policy decisions. It is also important for patients to see another dataset on health care spending, as well as claims. Those are two different datasets that will hopefully give us a better picture of health care in Nevada. I urge you to keep patients in mind, and I wanted to provide a little clarity on the data component.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 6, and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to electronic health records. (BDR 40-381)

Senator Fabian Doñate, Senate District No. 10:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint) in my capacity as chair of the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services. This bill revises provisions related to electronic health records and was introduced by the Patient Protection Commission. The bill before you is a sister policy to the provisions of Senate Bill 419.

This bill rewrites regulations we have in place—rather than prescribing to a health information exchange, this bill looks at the exchange of health information. The fiscal note applies to section 1, subsection 3 through section 2, and it requires that health providers subscribe to an electronic health record (EHR). The rationale for this is that as we continue to adopt new technology, it is important that health care providers are connected to each

other. This will minimize the duplication of labs and exams, among other tests. In section 2.5, there is a one-time appropriation of \$3 million—to help assist smaller health care providers who may not have the capacity to subscribe to an EHR.

There are fiscal notes attached to the bill, but I believe those are from the original bill, and no longer apply to the reprint. I do not know if there is anyone from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) who could elaborate on this, but I wanted to touch on the \$3 million appropriation for the one-time use of awarding grants to local providers.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone from the Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), or Aging and Disability Services Division, DHHS, who can speak to either of the two fiscal notes?

Heather Bugg, Administrative Services Officer, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services:

We have a fiscal note on A.B. 7 (R1). Currently, the Division has an EHR system, but it does not connect to an exchange. To comply with the bill, we would need contractors to apply a bidirectional interface to connect to a health exchange.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If I read the fiscal note correctly, that would not be in fiscal year (FY) 2024 or FY 2025. That would be a future cost. Is that correct?

Heather Bugg:

That would be implemented by January 1, 2028.

Ellen Crecelius, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services:

We are in a similar situation to the Division of Child and Family Services. We would need contractors for a one-year time period for information and the data gathering process and to work with our current vendors to connect to a health information exchange.

We currently are not connected, and we have four separate systems that would need to be connected. There would be one-time costs in addition to ongoing costs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Regarding the one-time costs, would those be in this biennium or in a future biennium?

Ellen Crecelius:

This would be in a future biennium.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of or in opposition to A.B. 7 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral on A.B. 7 (R1)? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments?

Senator Doñate:

I may need some clarification. I do not see in the bill where it would require anyone to operate with the health information exchange. From my understanding, section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) strikes out "encourage the use of health information exchange by health care providers," and the bill reframes it so they have to prescribe new regulations to the exchange of health information. This bill does not require participation in a health information exchange. It does say they must comply with new regulations to help the dissemination of data from one place to another, and I believe the requirement in section 1, subsection 3 through section 2 is to have an EHR. Unless I am reading it incorrectly, you would not be required to subscribe to an exchange—it just says that you must have an EHR.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Does that clarification affect the fiscal notes as submitted? If you need more time, we can do that as well.

Ellen Crecelius:

I need more time to look at that, but I do appreciate the clarification if that is what the bill intended.

Heather Bugg:

The Division of Child and Family Services would also need more time to look at this.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There were some amendments, and this is a reprint of the original bill. If you could both look at that again and get that back to us as quickly as possible, that would be helpful.

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 7 (R1), and I look forward to receiving amended fiscal notes on this bill so we can move forward.

We will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 58, which revises provisions relating to regional commercial air service in Nevada.

Assembly Bill 58: Revises provisions relating to regional commercial air service in this State. (BDR 18-369)

Susan Fisher, representing Nevada Aviation Association:

Last week in this Committee, you heard Assembly Bill 429, which has the same provision as Assembly Bill 58. I am not speaking on behalf of the League of Cities, but early in this

session, the Nevada Aviation Association worked with Assemblyman Gurr, the Nevada Association of Counties, and the League of Cities. The Nevada Aviation Association had a bill with a \$2 million request, and the League of Cities had this bill—A.B. 58 with a \$10 million request. We took the provisions from their bill and rolled them into A.B. 429. I believe A.B. 58 can be set aside unless there is a desire to set A.B. 429 aside, in which case, A.B. 58 should go forward. You have already heard the policy provisions of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I think the only difference is that in A.B. 58, the added language specifies that monies from the State General Fund will remain and not revert. If we move A.B. 58 forward, it will be the Chair's desire to change that language so appropriations from the State General Fund would revert to the State General Fund. If A.B. 58 does get to a work session, that will be part of the amendment on this bill.

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of A.B. 58? [There was no one.] [The feed from Las Vegas was lost.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] [The feed from Las Vegas was lost.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in neutral on A.B. 58? [There was no one.] [The feed from Las Vegas was lost.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 58, and we will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint): Creates the Advisory Committee on the Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff. (BDR 34-442)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint) creates the Advisory Committee on the Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff. The presenters for A.B. 72 (R1) have not arrived, so we will roll that to later in today's agenda, and we will move on to Assembly Bill 84, which revises requirements for the instruments of certain annual permits for entering, camping, and boating in state parks and recreational areas.

Assembly Bill 84: Revises requirements for the issuance of certain annual permits for entering, camping and boating in state parks and recreational areas. (BDR 35-471)

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:

I will present Assembly Bill 84 for consideration today. This bill was recommended by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Natural Resources which I chaired during the last interim. The bill as presented sought to provide free entry, camping, and boating—to remove all fees for use of our state parks for members of tribes based in Nevada.

Since the bill was heard and moved out of the policy committee, two issues were brought forward. The first issue was that just as we are modernizing some of our systems for campsite reservations, among other things, we are trying to figure out how that will work and

make sure we have something that can be effectively implemented. The second issue is some issues raised by my colleagues that while we do have free entry, camping, and boating for disabled veterans, for veterans that do not have a service connected disability, there is currently no program to help support their entrance and usage of state parks. The National Park Service, comparatively, has free lifetime entry to national parks for all veterans and their families.

You have a conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)], and I did notice earlier that there is a typo in the amendment. What we are proposing is to remove the current text of the bill and instead add that the administrator shall establish a program for the issuance of an annual permit, free of charge. No fees will be charged to enter each state park and recreation area in this state to either a member of an Indian tribe located in whole or in part in Nevada, or a Nevada resident who has been honorably discharged from the U.S. armed services.

The typo I referred to was that the amendment text says, "for the U.S. armed services," and it should say "from the U.S. armed services."

We are narrowing the original intent, which was no fees for anything, to just free entry fees, and then we are expanding those covered from tribal members to Nevada residents who are veterans. This also changes the fiscal note, and I would like to ask someone from the Division of State Parks to speak to that updated fiscal note.

Bob Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

We do have a fiscal note for A.B. 84, as written, but with the amendment the fiscal note is changed in a couple of ways. Changing the wording to just day use means that we will recognize the loss in current day use for Native Americans and veterans—that will bring the fiscal note to roughly \$245,000 annually, based on the percentage of the population that is both Native American and veterans. That percentage of 50 percent of our day use revenue, which is paid by Nevada residents, and without the ability to collect an administrative fee, which we currently collect for both our senior permits and our disabled veteran permits—and both of which are currently charged a \$30 administrative fee—would result in a fiscal note of about \$245,000. As written, the bill would not allow us to collect the administrative fees, but if we could collect the administrative fees, the fiscal note could be removed.

Assemblyman Watts:

I appreciate Mr. Mergell providing the updated fiscal costs. I want to note for Committee member awareness that we did the Every Kid in the Park companion bill for state parks. There is a national park initiative, and this uses similar language for free entry to those parks. We need to recognize that ancestors of tribal members were displaced from lands that now make up our state parks, and we need to honor the sacrifice of veterans who have helped to protect these places.

I also want to recognize the efforts led by the Division of State Parks in increasing access and getting people more interested in visiting and supporting state parks and lands. For the Committee's consideration, recently, a program was launched to provide park passes at libraries. People can check those passes out and get free entry into state parks. From what I have heard, especially in some of our urban areas, this program has been extremely popular—there is a backlog of people waiting to get those two permits so they can visit state parks.

Of course, in some of our rural areas and tribal communities, the ability to get to a library to get those passes can be a barrier. That is another reason why this bill is being put forward. It is important to recognize that there are a few things that are decreasing fee revenue received by the Division. I feel it is important that we balance decreased fee revenue with providing access for certain communities.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Watts, you mentioned some language and policy amendments that would affect the fiscal note associated with this bill. If you could get that amended language to us along with the amended fiscal note that corresponds to that language, we can move this bill forward.

Mr. Mergell, your agency would not be able to absorb this cost. Is that correct?

Bob Mergell:

That is correct; we would not be able to absorb that cost. If I could make a brief comment on the library pass and the fourth-grader pass programs; I love those programs. Those programs are trying to reach out to people who are not already using the parks and to generate new advocates for us, if you will. There is a difference between those passes. We have veterans who are using the parks; we have Native Americans who are using the parks. It is a different approach because we are reaching out to get people who have not come to parks and for those with a financial barrier, we want to address that gap.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The bill as written has a projected loss of revenue. The other is revenue you have not been receiving. Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Hafen:

It appears we are trying to bring parity to tribal lands because there are no libraries on tribal land. Is that an accurate statement?

Assemblyman Watts:

I do not know of any of any libraries currently on tribal land. There are different scenarios, however. The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony is located in the Reno Sparks urban area, so there is access to a public library with no need for a library on tribal land. The same situation

applies to Las Vegas with the Paiute Indians. Those from the Duck Valley Indian Reservation and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribe, however, may have to travel significant distances to reach a library and obtain a pass.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Since you are going to look at the fiscal note, would you consider adding veterans with general discharge status to the bill? I think Korean War veterans had general discharges, not honorable discharges. I could be wrong.

Assemblyman Watts:

I will look into that. I believe this language was put in place to mirror the language for the National Park Service, but we will check.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 84?

Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League:

We are here in support of A.B. 84. We are big proponents of getting more people outside, and that is especially true for our tribal community members and our veterans.

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

We want to thank the bill sponsor for bringing this bill forward, and we urge your support.

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

We are also here in support of A.B. 84.

Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress:

Regardless of where you are, or where you call home in Nevada, you are on native land. This bill is a great first step in not only respecting tribal sovereignty but also in honoring the stewards and caretakers of our beautiful state. We support A.B. 84.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

We would like to thank the sponsor for introducing this bill, and we urge you to pass it.

Rose Wolterbeek, representing Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter:

I am a volunteer representing over 30,000 members in the Toiyabe chapter, and we urge your support of A.B. 84. I have submitted written testimony, and I thank you for your consideration of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of A.B. 84? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to speak in neutral on A.B. 84? [There was no one.] Would the bill sponsor like to make any closing comments? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 84 and open the hearing for Assembly Bill 130.

Assembly Bill 130: Revises provisions relating to assisted living facilities. (BDR 40-694)

Kanani Espinoza, representing Rowe Law Group, Ltd.:

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod is presenting to the Education Committee next door; she asked me to send her apologies—she has asked Arielle Edwards and me to present Assembly Bill 130. She also asked me to circle back with you and let you know that if you do get Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint) today, she will ask Assemblywoman Torres to step in.

Assembly Bill 130 has an amendment [Exhibit D] submitted on behalf of the Rowe Law Group, Ltd. The amendment can be found on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, and the amendment deletes the increase in grant allocation and restores \$200,000 previously in statute.

Arielle Edwards, Director, Government Relations, Nevada HAND, Inc.:

In the interest of time, the unamended version of A.B. 130 was drafted to address critical sustainability challenges that our assisted living facilities face. That version asked for an increase in the Fund for a Healthy Nevada grant, which is a set aside in the Department of Health and Human Services. However, great news came out of this session, in which the Joint Assembly Ways and Means and Senate Finance Subcommittees on Health and Human Services approved an increase in Medicaid rates to align with true Medicaid provider costs for provider types 57 and 59. As a result, the amendment to A.B. 130 retains the current grant amount of \$200,000 annually rather than increasing the amount. For the Committee's awareness, A.B. 130 has not received a policy hearing, which will be necessary to ensure affordability for residents' sustained quality care, ensure financial sustainability, and expand capacity for assisted living facilities in Nevada. Nevertheless, we are here to inform the Committee that the amended version does not ask for an increase from what is already allotted in the Fund for a Healthy Nevada.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There will not be any additional amounts that would need to be added to this bill, and there are no fiscal notes. Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in support of A.B. 130?

Mendy K. Elliott, representing Nevada Housing Coalition:

We support anything we can do to help with assisted living housing, and we want to thank Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod for sponsoring the bill.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

We thank the sponsor of this bill and urge you to please pass this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to provide testimony in support of A.B. 130? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in neutral on A.B. 130? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments from the presenters of this bill? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 130. With the adjusted amounts, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 130.

Assembly Bill 130: Revises provisions relating to assisted living facilities. (BDR 40-694)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 130.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion from Committee members? [There was none.] I will call for a vote.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. We will now open the hearing for Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint), which establishes provisions relating to biomarker testing.

Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to biomarker testing. (BDR 40-305)

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint) is a bill to increase access to biomarker testing for indicated treatments. Currently less than 100 biomarkers are on the market available for treatments; most of those are used to determine treatment regimens for cancer. However, there are also treatments available that are indicated by biomarkers for cardiovascular disease, gastrointestinal issues, and newer technology related to dementia and Alzheimer's disease, as well as Parkinson's disease.

The fiscal impact is related to the requirement for Medicaid to cover these services, and I believe a Medicaid representative can speak to the fiscal note from the first revision. I do want to mention that to continue to work on this fiscal note, we have been talking about limiting the required coverage to only cancer treatments. However, that does put us at a limitation for other important treatment areas. Biomarker treatments are a growing field in pharmaceutical treatments, and cost savings can be invaluable, including economic cost

savings to individuals and their families. These treatment regimens can significantly reduce the time and treatment, as well as the heartache of continuing with chemotherapy, which may, or may not work, for the specific type of disease.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The fiscal note for the original bill was quite high, but it has been adjusted. Is there someone here who can address the fiscal note?

**Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services:**

We consulted with our medical director and our actuary, and we talked with staff from other states. We have concerns that the original bill was too broad, in our opinion, and allowed for screening. We need to be able to control costs. We worked with Assemblywoman Peters, and the current bill narrows the application to help us control costs, ensures clinical medical necessity, is required by federal law, and ensures that providers can choose a more cost effective option as an alternative that is equally capable of meeting the medical needs of an individual.

The current bill has a medical spend impact of \$2,190,809 of State General Fund for the 2023-2025 biennium. We will incur system costs of \$155,680 for the 2023-2025 biennium, and we have to pay our actuary every time we adjust our capitation rates—a cost of about \$15,000 in State General Funds. For the biennium, the total cost, includes federal funds of \$6,415,270, for which the state share is \$2,361,489.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Medicaid already has an obligation to cover treatments when it is medically necessary, and there are cases where Medicaid already covers biomarkers. This bill would expand the coverage to ensure families do not have to fight as hard in the event there is a denial beyond what Medicaid has historically covered. The bigger impact is to the broader community of non-Medicaid-covered patients who require biomarker treatments. This bill will increase access for those with private or self-paid insurance where it is sometimes more difficult to overcome those burdens and barriers to get the treatment best indicated for an individual and as prescribed by a physician.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Can you repeat the cost breakdown for me please?

Stacie Weeks:

For the medical spend over the 2023-2025 biennium, the State General Fund cost will be \$2,190,809, the system cost will be \$155,680 in State General Funds, and the actuarial cost will be \$15,000 in State General Funds. These costs total \$2,361,489 in State General Funds.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblywoman Backus:

Regarding biomarkers and providing a straightforward course of treatment for those who may be diagnosed with cancer or other diseases, is there a cost savings so other treatment is not necessary, and is that included in your fiscal note?

Stacie Weeks:

We talked to our actuary who does not assume this will be a less expensive cancer treatment. There are savings associated with biomarkers, but the actuary is not sure because other services—with a cost—will have to be provided to individuals.

Assemblywoman Peters:

One of the suggestions from stakeholders, including Medicaid, was to reduce the scope of this bill down to only requiring coverage for cancer treatments, and then in the interim, have the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services conduct a study on cost savings associated with other treatments. Then we could look at expanding this to the broader sector of biomarker treatments. I do not know if there would be a fiscal note decrease if we only included cancer treatments.

Stacie Weeks:

We would consider biomarkers for cancer to be cost neutral. There may be some costs if we need to conduct a study.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I look forward to seeing that amendment so we can move this bill. Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to present testimony in support of A.B. 155 (R1)?

Tom Clark, representing Nevada Society for Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery:

We support A.B. 155 (R1). We have been working with the sponsor, and we look forward to continuing that work.

Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I support A.B. 155 (R1), and I would ask the obvious questions: What is the value of a human life? What is the value of cost-efficient treatment? Biomarker testing—if you watch television, direct to consumer ads are all about biomarker testing. Many medications being promoted have specific indications based on the presence or absence of biomarkers.

Most of these medicines are for cancer, but as we move to the future, we will be talking about Alzheimer's disease, and we will be talking about different forms of dementia and different forms of cancer. We are getting smarter, but we are talking about funding 21st century medicine with a 20th century payment model. I urge your support of A.B. 155 (R1).

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 155 (R1)?

Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:

I wanted to present in the neutral position because of testimony about a potential conceptual amendment that could limit A.B. 155 (R1) to only cancer. Currently Clark County and our self-funded health plan covers biomarker testing for cancer treatment. If that amendment moves forward, our fiscal note would be reduced if not removed, and I would like that on the record.

In the reprinted version of the bill, we have a fiscal note of about \$772,000 per year or \$1.5 million for the 2023-2025 biennium. We would love to work with the sponsor and Medicaid on a potential study as we look at expanding biomarker testing.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 155 (R1)? [There was no one.] Would the presenter like to make any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 155 (R1). We will now move back to Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint), which creates an advisory committee on the safety and well-being of public school staff.

Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint): Creates the Advisory Committee on the Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff. (BDR 34-442)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint) on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education, of which I was an alternate during the last interim. I will be honest—I was asked to present this bill this morning, but I feel that as a member of the Assembly Committee on Education, we have had policy discussions for this bill, and I have reviewed the fiscal note as well.

The bill before you is a recommendation from the Education Committee, and I would like to begin with background information that explains what led to this recommendation. School safety has been a primary concern in recent years, both in Nevada and nationally. We have heard multiple instances of teachers and school staff in Nevada being threatened and attacked in classrooms. This bill creates an Advisory Committee on the Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff.

The fiscal note is for staffing for the advisory committee, so the committee has staff to carry out its work.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there someone from the Department of Education that can speak to the fiscal note?

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

Our fiscal note is for deputy attorney general support for these meetings and for overtime support for staff. The Department of Education currently staffs approximately 20 boards, task forces, and commissions. The Nevada State Board of Education is the only board for which we have dedicated staff members. The remaining boards, task forces, and commissions are staffed with existing staff who are working on other projects and work assigned to their positions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The fiscal note is not a large fiscal note. Is this a cost that your Department could absorb through vacancy savings?

Craig Statucki:

Ideally, we would not have vacancies or vacancy savings to perform this work if we were fully staffed.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Approximately how many meetings do you anticipate for this advisory committee, or will the meetings be held as needed? Is the number of meetings specified in the policy?

Assemblywoman Torres:

The bill states that there must be one meeting, and other meetings will be at the call of the chair. I imagine this committee will be meeting as incidents occur and as the community sees fit.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The fiscal note is not to fund another hire, it is for added duties for current staff. Is that correct?

Craig Statucki:

Yes, the fiscal note would cover extra duties for existing staff—it would not create a new position.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who wishes to provide testimony in support of A.B. 72 (R1)?

Dawn Etcheverry, President, Nevada State Education Association:

I am speaking in support of A.B. 72 (R1). The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) launched its Respect Educators Act to elevate safety, well-being, and autonomy for all educators and their work. Along with needed changes to Nevada's restorative justice law,

NSEA proposed the creation of a Restorative Practice Monitoring Committee that included educators from across the state, including licensed professionals and education support professionals, legislators, and the Nevada Department of Education to gain a clear understanding of the impact of the law and to ensure consistent implementation and secure protection for all students and educators. The NSEA believes the Advisory Committee on Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff will advance this important work.

Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress:

We support A.B. 72 (R1). This bill is another way to fund our education system in Nevada by working to ensure our school staff and their well-being are addressed. We are also investing in the educational experience of our students. Please support this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in support of A.B. 72 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in neutral on A.B. 72 (R1)? Does the presenter of this bill wish to make any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 72 (R1) and open the work session on this bill.

Assembly Bill 72 (1st Reprint): Creates the Advisory Committee on the Safety and Well-Being of Public School Staff. (BDR 34-442)

I will accept a motion to do pass as amended.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 72 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] I will call for a vote.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Anderson, and I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 304, which revises provisions governing certain special license plates.

**Assembly Bill 304: Revises provisions governing certain special license plates.
(BDR 43-699)**

Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

Assembly Bill 304 changes a requirement that we show proof of membership through the Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada for renewal. Renewing online saves people from having to go inside at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). There was a fiscal note, but the DMV has removed that fiscal note.

Mendy K. Elliott, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am speaking for myself today and representing individuals who are in need of a lifesaving transplant, skin graft, or cornea. We want to thank Assemblywoman Anderson and the professional firefighters for allowing us to amend A.B. 304 with our simple amendment [[Exhibit E](#)].

I am sure that many of you are already registered with the DMV with a donor heart designation on your driver's licenses. You might wonder what happens next? Currently, revenue from the Give Life license plates—which you have probably seen—are funding the donor registry database. The DMV collects the data and passes it to the donor registry, maintained by the University of Nevada, School of Medicine.

What is the reason for the amendment? The DMV has a minimum requirement of 1,000 plates to continue making these specialty plates. Currently, there are 950 of these specialty license plate holders. I have a commitment from the Nevada Donor Network that they will be making a concerted effort to increase the number of plates, but to do that, we need a waiver so new plates can be issued. The amendment as presented and reviewed by the DMV will provide a waiver for the 1,000 plate requirement for plates issued under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482.37905.

On a personal note, my father was the eighth heart transplant recipient in 1968 at Stanford Medical Center and my late husband, Steve, was a donor. I was going to order a plate to honor them both. After one phone call, I knew the answer, but it was too late to work with a legislator to identify a bill draft request, so here we are today asking for an amendment so we can continue this lifesaving work for all Nevadans.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Your amendment adds NRS 482.37905 to the bill. Is that correct?

Mendy Elliott:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30:

The amendment does not make any change to the fiscal note, and because of that, if you would like me to present that as a personal amendment, I am happy to do so. I am sorry, I did not make that statement right away.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

That would be perfect.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I know there was discussion about this amendment in the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure, but the timing was off. I want to thank Assemblyman Watts for the work he did on this very item.

Assemblywoman Watts:

The amendment came up a little later as the bill was moving forward, and we had a mix up. The amendment was not included in the policy committee, but I want to make it clear that it has my full support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will ask the DMV, for the record, to address the fiscal note.

**Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management Division,
Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles:**

We can remove the fiscal note to A.B. 304 based on the minimum computer programming. Although we are neutral on this bill, this bill aligns with our goal of keeping people out of our offices—it is not that we do not want to see everybody, but it eases the pressure if people go online.

There is also no fiscal impact to the DMV if we exempt the donate life license plate requirement for meeting the minimum number of plates each year.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of A.B. 304?

Dan Musgrove, representing Nevada Donor Network:

The Nevada Donor Network supports the amendment to A.B. 304. Work that the University of Nevada, Reno, and the Donor Registry does cannot be stressed enough. It is so important to have this information available.

As you may or may not know, there are over 600 Nevadans waiting for the precious gift of life and over 100,000 Americans that need a donor. The work that the DMV and the Nevada Donor Network do is critical to this process of matching organs to donors. It is such important work. We want to thank the sponsors of the bills, Assemblywoman Anderson and Assemblyman Watts, whose district includes the Nevada Donor Network office, and all the legislators who support this bill. We support the amendment and ask you to support A.B. 304.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of A.B. 304? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in neutral on A.B. 304? [There was no one.] Do the presenters wish to make any closing comments? [There were none.]

We will close the hearing on A.B. 304. During testimony, there was an amendment which will now be presented as a floor amendment. We can go ahead and open the work session on A.B. 304, and I would accept a motion to do pass.

**Assembly Bill 304: Revises provisions governing certain special license plates.
(BDR 43-699)**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 304.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.] I will call for a vote.

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Anderson.

I will open the meeting for public comment. [There was no public comment.]

This meeting is adjourned [at 9:56 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Tyler Boyce
Recording Secretary

Carmen M. Neveau
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a conceptual amendment to Assembly Bill 84, proposed and presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 130, submitted by Kanani Espinoza, representing the Rowe Law Group, Ltd.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 304, submitted and presented by Mendy K. Elliott, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.