

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

**Eighty-Second Session  
May 30, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 8:15 a.m. on Tuesday, May 30, 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 Cameron (C.H.) Miller  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters  
Assemblyman Howard Watts

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District No. 27  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong, Assembly District No. 6  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28  
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby, Assembly District No. 10



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Cynthia Ihejirika, Committee Secretary  
Betnimra Torres, Committee Assistant  
Janet Osalvo, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kelly Cantrelle, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Jonathan Lopez, Finance and Research Officer, Silver State Health Insurance  
Exchange  
Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada; and representing Asian  
Community Development Council  
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices  
Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Jaa Dieloguna, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Craig Valdez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition; and Nevada  
Council of the Blind  
Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Lea Case, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance; Nevada Primary Care  
Association; American Property Casualty Insurance Association; and National  
Alliance on Mental Illness, Nevada Chapter  
Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Unidentified Caller  
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County  
Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator, Aging, Physical Disabilities, and Children's  
Services, Aging and Disabilities Services Division, Department of Health and  
Human Services  
Cody L. Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health,  
Department of Health and Human Services  
Helen Foley, representing Health Plan of Nevada; Silver Summit Healthplan; Molina  
Healthcare; and Anthem Blue Cross Nevada Elevance Health  
Susan L. Fisher, representing Northern Nevada HOPES  
Joan Hall, representing Nevada Rural Hospital Partners  
Adam Porath, representing Nevada Society of Health System Pharmacists  
Sarah Adler, representing FirstMed Health and Wellness  
Myron Freedman, Administrator, Division of Museums and History, Department of  
Tourism and Cultural Affairs  
Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on  
Developmental Disabilities

Kierra Capurro, representing Nevada Blind Children's Foundation; and Ovation Development Corp  
Melanie Young, Deputy Administrator, 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  
Jennifer Frischmann, Quality Assurance Manager, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services  
Daniel H. Stewart, representing State of Nevada Association of Providers; and Clark County Education Association  
Mary Pierczynski, representing State of Nevada Association of Providers; and Nevada Association of School Superintendents  
Ashlee Cooper, Manager of Advocacy and Government Affairs, Opportunity Village  
Jollina Simpson, representing Make It Work Nevada  
Paige Barnes, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; and Advanced Energy United  
Ednalyna Martin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Claire Murdoch, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Emily Barney, Executive Director, Doula Co-Op  
Andrea Koell, Private Citizen, Northern Nevada  
Samantha DeAndrea, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Tiara Flynn, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Sue Foltz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Natalie Doyen, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada  
Teresa Banks, Public Health Diversity Advisor, Larsen Institute, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno  
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association  
Brenda Pearson, representing Clark County Education Association  
Tess Opferman, representing Washoe County School District  
Patricia Haddad, Director of Government Relations, Clark County School District  
Chris Brooks, representing Arevia Power  
Kyle Davis, representing Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife  
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League  
Jaina Moan, External Affairs Director, The Nature Conservancy  
Alan Jenne, Director, Department of Wildlife  
Jermareon Williams, Government Affairs Manager, Western Resource Advocates  
Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition  
Mendy K. Elliott, representing Reno Housing Authority; Nevada Rural Housing Authority; and Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority  
Jessica Ferrato, representing Solar Energy Industries Association  
Tracey Smith, representing Faith Organizing Alliance  
Mary L. House, President and CEO, CHR, Inc.  
Emily Woodall, Campaign Manager, Dream.org  
Stephen Lassiter, Sunrun

Bari Levinson, Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club  
Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association  
John Knobel, Director, Government and Regulatory Affairs, Employers  
Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration  
Dalton Hooks, representing Nevada Self Insurers Association  
Charles Nort, President, Nevada Alternative Solutions  
Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer, Division of Health Care Financing  
and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services  
Jeffrey Mitchell, Deputy Director, Local Government Services, Department of  
Taxation  
Jeanette K. Belz, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

[Roll was called, and the Committee rules and protocols were explained.] We have a long agenda today and will be coming back later for a work session, so we will not be adjourning this morning but recessing and reconvening several times today. We will be taking some bills out of order today so the members can attend their other committee meetings. We are going to start with a bill draft request introduction. I will remind the members that your vote in the affirmative for this bill draft request introduction does not mean you will support the measure once it becomes a bill. Your vote is just to move it along in the process.

**BDR S-1225**—Makes appropriations for various purposes relating to health, education and employment. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 525](#).)

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Bill Draft Request S-1225 makes appropriations for various purposes relating to health, education, and employment. Is there any discussion on the item? [There was none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED FOR COMMITTEE  
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1225.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

As I stated, we will be going out of order with a few of the bills. I will open the hearing on [Assembly Bill 139](#).

**Assembly Bill 139: Revises provisions governing certain demographic information collected by governmental agencies. (BDR 19-122)**

**Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 139. Assembly Bill 139 requires governmental agencies that already collect demographic information to include a category for the MENA distinction. MENA stands for Middle Eastern or North African. I know we are in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, and there is a huge agenda today, so I will be brief. Basically, the Arab world covers 22 countries that are part of the Arab League that stretches from Morocco through the Middle East. The Middle East is generally a geographic distinction that includes Egypt to Pakistan.

We had a census here in this country recently. The way the states receive funding and support from the federal government for things like education, housing, language access, financial aid, research, and other things is through these census numbers. What happens to people of MENA descent is we are often diluted or absorbed into other categories. For instance, if you are Arab, you may be from Egypt. If you are from Egypt and you are filling out these census forms, because Egypt is in Africa, you check African American, which then by data makes you represented as what people assume is a Black American. If you are also an Arab, you may be from Lebanon like my family is, but you have been legally distinguished as white. Even for this last census, I checked Black and then had to go to the white category where there was a drop-down category for Lebanese. The point is the census included me as white. The assumption is white European. Lebanon is in Asia. We are Asian. What happens is many Arabs are either being classified as African, Asian, or white, which does not reflect the actual numbers or provide the ability, collectively as a community, to go for the resources or provide the ability to drive policy or offer the ability to be recognized even on a personal level and acknowledged for who you are.

The reason we say Middle East and North African is Arabs are the largest group in the MENA category. While Arabs are the largest group, not everyone in the Middle East is Arab. This would include Persians, Kurdmen, Chaldeans, Assyrians, Armenians, Berbers, Turks, and Israelis. We are all in this MENA category. To give you an idea of numbers, the last census estimated that there were 2.1 million Arabs in the United States. Again, we do not know specifically because many are trapped between either African, white, or Asian. When the Arab American Institute did a community survey, the number almost doubled to 3.7 million Arabs. It is estimated that within this entire MENA category, there could be up to 7 million Arabs. Here in Nevada alone, we have data that says there are 17,000 Arabs. What is unique about that number? That is a 42 percent increase between 2000 and 2017, making Nevada one of the fastest growing Arab communities in the country. But again, we are not collecting data on all of our other groups in this MENA category. We do know Nevada is the third most diverse state. We are positioned to be the leader in this nationally. There are only one or two other states that are doing this or even attempting this at this time.

We know our Clark County School District students represent over 100 countries, and they speak over 100 languages. We as Nevadans, with our rich and robust diversity, should be on

the front lines of this movement. I also would like to remind people on a personal level how important it is for people and communities to be accurately identified, recognized, accurately counted, and included as to how they identify themselves.

I am happy to answer any questions, but I would briefly refer to the actual fiscal notes. As you see, there is an amendment on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit C](#)] and one fiscal note. The one amendment I submitted would allow the bill to be permissive. I changed the language to "may" for all of our justice entities that would include law enforcement, the courts, and corrections. The reason was because some of our entities like the Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety, and the Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety, did not submit a fiscal note, but others within law enforcement and the courts did because this is a systems update that has to be done. We know we are in different places with our leases for our computer systems. We always want to use the numbers and the data within our justice system to see if there are any inequities, but the goal of this bill is first to be counted. I am comfortable with allowing those entities that are able to participate now to do so and inform everyone else that this is something we will be moving toward. That amendment alone resulted in a \$600,000 reduction in fiscal notes.

The other major reduction we see is from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). A representative from DHHS is at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building today to testify that their original note for \$829,000 for the next two years has been reduced to \$140,400 for just this first year. There are still a few other fiscal notes remaining, and some are as small as \$200 from Lyon County. Only the Carson City School District and the City of Reno have asked for fiscal notes. Ultimately, that is the bill, and I ask for your support for Assembly Bill 139. I am open to any questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Let us go through the fiscal notes. What is still there? What is not there? What has been reduced?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Starting with the reductions, DHHS reduced its fiscal note from \$829,000 for the next two years over the biennium to \$140,400 just for this first year, Reno is still asking for—

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Excuse me for one moment. Is there someone from DHHS here who could speak about their fiscal note?

**Kelly Cantrelle, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,  
Department of Health and Human Services:**

We reduced our fiscal note from \$829,000 to \$140,400 for a one-time fee.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Will your agency be able to absorb the cost of the one-time fee, or will you need an appropriation to cover those expenses?

**Kelly Cantrelle:**

We would need an appropriation to cover those costs.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

What is your next fiscal note?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

The next major reduction would be approximately \$600,000 collectively from our justice entities. There would be a \$300,000 reduction from the Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court, because the courts have been amended out.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Has the other \$300,000 gone away or is it still there?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

It is still there. I had asked people and there were groups who told me they could not resubmit fiscal notes, but they would be here to testify.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there someone from the courts who can speak to their fiscal note, and whether that \$300,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 for the systems programming cost is still applicable? [There was no one.] We can move to the next fiscal note.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

The next fiscal note would be from the Records, Communications and Compliance Division, Department of Public Safety. That would be Erica Souza Llamas, Administrator, Records, Communications and Compliance Division, Department of Public Safety. The fiscal note was \$294,207 and was reduced because they have been amended out. Those were the two major fiscal notes from law enforcement.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there someone from the Records, Communications and Compliance Division who can speak to the fiscal note for the \$294,207 for FY 2024? [There was no one.] Has that been amended now to \$0 or reduced? Not seeing anyone, we can go ahead and move on.

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

Those are the major reductions. The one that still remains is a \$15,000 fiscal note from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, DHHS. I have reached out to all of these entities. There is a \$2,083 one-time expense for the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. Carson City School District is asking for \$20,000. Lyon County is asking for \$200. I appreciate that fiscal note. The City of Reno is asking for \$14,500 over the

biennium. The Silver State Health Insurance Exchange is asking for \$50,000. Mr. Lopez is also on the line calling in or available today as well. Those would be the actual fiscal notes.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Mr. Lopez, by chance, are you with us by phone this morning?

**Jonathan Lopez, Finance and Research Officer, Silver State Health Insurance Exchange:**

Yes, we do have a fiscal note for \$50,000. That would be a one-time cost in FY 2024.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

My question for you on the \$50,000 in FY 2024 is will your agency be able to absorb that cost?

**Jonathan Lopez:**

Yes, we will.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Assemblywoman Miller, the conceptual amendment was helpful in addressing some of the fiscal notes. That is why they were able to be reduced. We will have to amend the bill in this Committee before this can go to a work session. If we can get confirmation from the other entities that were not here today as to what the fiscal notes are, then we will do that before moving forward. Members, do you have any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 139?

**Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada; and representing Asian Community Development Council:**

Last month, both One APIA Nevada and the Asian Community Development Council sent in public comment for the federal side on proposals of updating the U.S. Office of Management and Budget's race, ethnicity, and statistical standards, including the MENA category for Middle Eastern and North African. Today we are here for the same principle—the principle of self-identification and the principle of disaggregated data—to hear and advocate for our community in order for the data to properly reflect our state's population. It is essential for individuals to have choices that allow them to input and have a clear opportunity to express their self-identity as accurately and completely as possible. Broad racial ethnicity categories do not allow for a full understanding of our population. The aggregated data disguises underlying trends that can illuminate needed policy remedies and show where progress is occurring.

As a community organizer and advocate that is doing the groundwork on direct services grant-writing policy recommendations, One APIA Nevada knows that without accurate and timely disaggregated data, this population will not receive its fair share of benefits and services. Today, in solidarity with the Middle Eastern and North African communities in our great state, I hereby come and urge your support.



**Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices:**

One thing about the Committee hearing that was apparent is that data is important. There were lots of conversations yesterday about numbers. One thing that is important about numbers is not only do they tell us about the price tag or impact, but they tell us the stories of people, the stories of our communities, and we are talking about a specific group, the Middle Eastern and North African community that is growing within the state of Nevada.

We want to be able to accurately know how many of these individuals are here, and what is the impact of their particular community, so we are able to serve them accordingly. As a civic engagement organization, everything we do is data centered. We have been able to knock on many doors and create strategies for lots of different civic engagement matters. We always have to look at the data. If we do not have the data, then we do not know that we are executing our strategies, whether it is a Get Out The Vote program or voter registration program, in the best way possible. We urge your support.

**Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

As an unintended medical implication of this legislation, I want you to know medication decision-making often reflects ethnicity. That may surprise you. We know in the Middle East there are many carriers of what is called an allele, a gene specific for drug metabolism through a pathway called cytochrome P450 2D6 (CYP2D6). I am not going to try to teach that to you in two minutes, but the implication is they are hyper metabolizers. They can go from a benign precursor medication to a toxic ultimate medication; codeine going to morphine; hydrocodone going to hydromorphone. Knowing how many people have this variant will have implications for the cost of health care. An unintended benefit is we will know who is more likely to have a drug interaction or an adverse drug effect. I urge you to look at this critically and support A.B. 139.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of this bill?

**Jaa Dieloguna, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I grew up in Las Vegas, and I now live in Reno. I support A.B. 139. As someone who is Filipino and Mexican American, I understand why it is important to have the terms of Asian, Pacific Islander, and Latino. I grew up around Lebanese family and friends and have been able to work with the Afghan refugees who now call Nevada home after the fall of Kabul. Having MENA represented in our state will make the people I love be able to be seen and heard in our state. It is important that people are not overlooked, and it is a simple thing we can do for the MENA community.

**Craig Valdez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a community organizer in the Asian American and Pacific Islander community in southern Nevada and also a member of the Asian Pacific Islander Democratic Caucus of Nevada. I am calling in support of A.B. 139 because while it is estimated there are over 30,000 Nevadans of MENA descent and approximately 300 Nevada business owners of MENA descent, we do not know the full picture because of the lack of properly aggregated

data. One of the vitally important issues in our community is that we are not a monolith. We are a diverse group of individuals who speak different languages, eat different food, celebrate different holidays, and are all affected by different issues. Assembly Bill 139 will allow members of the MENA community to feel seen and heard as a result of properly aggregated data.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

I ditto the prior callers' comments. As a Japanese descendant, this is important to be included. Thank you to the sponsor, Assemblywoman Miller.

**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 testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the sponsor have any closing remarks?

**Assemblywoman Miller:**

I received a message that one person was disconnected on the phone lines, but that is fine. I want to make two points in my closing remarks. To follow up with what the doctor, Barry Cole, said, there were two national research studies that were done or attempted last year. One was on the effects of Alzheimer's disease on the Arab community, and one was about COVID-19 and its impact on the Arab community. Both of those studies found it challenging because they did not have accurate statistical data. I would also say something that pleases all of us Nevadans. We all want to be part of the presidential primaries and position ourselves as one of the primary states. This would help us in recognizing our diversity. This is one more reason why every presidential candidate should be visiting Nevada. I will get those emails or something to you today regarding the fiscal notes.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 139. Members, we will go back to the top of our agenda and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint). This bill is on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services.

**Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. (BDR 40-327)**

**Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:**

I had the privilege of being the Chair of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services this last interim. Today I will present Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint), which is a bill related to fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. Initially, this bill was designed to redefine fetal alcohol syndrome to mirror the federal designation of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders, which broadens the support services for those individuals who are impacted.

Regarding the fiscal notes, we ended up revising the bill in the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services to ensure that it captured the types of expanded services that

people who are diagnosed with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder would require. This is what resulted in the fiscal notes. I believe there is a fiscal note from Medicaid due to the expansion of services. In conversations with individuals from Medicaid, this is a result of the requirement to cover expanded services for individuals who may or may not have received those services in other areas. I believe representatives from Medicaid are in the room if you would be interested in talking to them about their revised fiscal note.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

If there is someone from Medicaid who can speak to the fiscal note, I invite you to join Assemblywoman Peters at the table.

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

Yes, we do have a fiscal note on this bill. This bill specifically would be implementing a new Medicaid benefit that is used in other states but has not been used in Nevada. The costs would be funded with a federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) of 90 percent with a 10 percent state match and draws down quite a bit of federal share, so it is a good program. That share is in place for about eight quarters, so for the first two years it is a reduced cost to the state. This program allows us to cover a lot of services we do not cover now for providers who try to wrap around services for this population and try to help this population and their families keep their children and adults in their homes. It covers things like comprehensive care, management care, coordination, health promotion, transitional care services, patient and family support to individuals with fetal alcohol syndrome, and referrals to community and social support. It integrates primary care and behavioral health services in the home setting and helps the multidisciplinary team come together to support the family and the individual.

We believe the cost of this program for fiscal year 2025 in terms of the medical spend would be a total of \$304,367. We assumed some savings for residential stays and a reduction in the cost of residential treatment services by keeping families in their homes. The State General Fund cost is \$29,937 in the first two years.

This program would also require additional staffing for the agency. Under federal law, it requires us to do a great deal of evaluation and quality metrics for these families who are served and the providers serving them, which is a good thing, but we do need some staffing to do the work and to set up this new program. We are asking for three positions for a total of \$452,033. We are able to draw down FMAP for those positions, and the state's share of the cost is \$226,016. The total computable federal and state share for the program is \$825,840. The state share cost is \$290,674. I will stop there for questions. I apologize if I went fast.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Would the total state share be \$290,674?

**Stacie Weeks:**

Yes, \$290,674.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions for the presenter or Ms. Weeks? [There were none.] Would your Division be able to absorb this cost, or would you need a General Fund appropriation to cover that?

**Stacie Weeks:**

We would need the state share appropriation so we could draw down the federal funds.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 137 (R1)?

**Lea Case, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance:**

This was a bill we worked on in the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services with Assemblywoman Peters. We are thrilled to see the amended version that includes the services. Initially, we thought it would just be the definition change with the hope that in the future we might be able to start drawing down some of those federal funds. Having the ability to do that now will provide more care to the people who need it in our state, help prevent longer term costs, and provide education in the criminal justice agencies. These are the things that we do not see in these fiscal notes because fiscal notes only talk about one budget account. Consider when you are looking at this investment of \$290,674, that it will positively impact some of our other accounts.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto.

**Unidentified Caller:**

I am a birth and postpartum doula serving the Reno, Carson City, and Lake Tahoe area. I am currently in the process of enrolling as a Medicaid provider. It is a lengthy process that has taken a total of five months now. I am persevering in my enrollment because it is important to me to serve the disadvantaged community that desperately needs the support of doulas.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

We thank the sponsor of this bill, and please pass it.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill?

**Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:**

You may see we had a narrative and a fiscal note that we put in the system. Many of these children who are going to be served by this bill are in foster care in Clark County Child Welfare Services. The county works with the state. We are assessed for services on behalf of children who are also served by the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services. We think this is a positive step. There may be impacts to our assessments for the children who are served, but it will help additional families get care. We can see this as a benefit, especially as we get our heads around this concept of fetal alcohol syndrome. I know this is something that has been discussed by the people working on the children's behavioral health crisis in southern Nevada. We appreciate Medicaid's work, the work of Assemblywoman Peters, and everybody who is involved. We will work with the state on this. It is a positive step. We are neutral because it may hit our assessments but will help families get care. We will continue to work with the state agencies on this.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] We will ask the presenter if you have any closing comments. [There were none.] Members, we will work session this bill later today. We will close the hearing on A.B. 137 (R1), stay on the same subject matter, and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. (BDR S-774)**

**Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Assembly District No. 35:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint). The bill has seen some changes, and I know there are some people on this Committee who saw the original policy. I want to speak about the original concept because the original bill was wonderful. I heard a lot of positive feedback, but the reality was we were already doing it as a state. I spoke to the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, and we came up with this plan in the new amendment [[Exhibit D](#)] that, to the extent money is available, the Division will do an evidence-based program that will support services for children diagnosed with fetal alcohol syndrome. The program will include training for providers to increase our capacity and build workforce development for these children. I talked to the state about the changes, to the extent money is available, because I believe there is federal funding available, and our fiscal note should be removed. I will invite the state to come up to talk about the fiscal note.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We have a fiscal note that was submitted by the Aging and Disability Services Division. If you are in the room, please speak to that.

**Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator, Aging, Physical Disabilities, and Children's Services, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services:**

With this proposed amendment, we will be able to remove our fiscal note in the hopes of finding additional funding to be able to provide the pilot program.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Would the fiscal note go to \$0?

**Rique Robb:**

Yes.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any questions for the presenter or for the representative from DHHS? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 422 (R1)?

**Lea Case, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance:**

We are in support of A.B. 422 (R1). We realized there may not be money available yet for this pilot program, but like our support for Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint), this is a necessary step in providing the needed care in Nevada to children born with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. There is a huge gap in care for this population, and anything we can do to bridge the gap is important.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 422 (R1)?

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

Many thanks to the sponsor of the bill. We urge you all to please pass this commonsense bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Do we have anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 422 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 422 (R1)? [There was no one.] We will ask the presenter if you have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 422 (R1). Members, we will work session this bill later today. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing prescription drugs.  
(BDR 57-652)**

**Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District No. 27:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint) and explain what the bill does [[Exhibit E](#)]. There are community health centers that we all have in our communities, primarily in Clark County and Washoe County. There are a few others, and they are known as federally qualified health centers (FQHCs). They can get a large discount because of the 340B Drug Pricing Program on prescription drugs. They can get reimbursed from insurance companies at the retail rate. These FQHCs use the savings to provide health care services and other medical needs for more of the underserved community. The savings are used to fund those other programs.

Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint) prohibits insurers and pharmacy benefit providers from keeping some of those savings and not passing them on. That is what this bill is all about. The status quo is that the savings gets passed on, but there have been some complications of late of those third parties keeping the money. We want to make sure the savings continue to get passed along to those FQHCs.

The fiscal note was added after the policy hearing on April 12, 2023, to cover a potential fiscal impact to Medicaid. Since then, an amendment, which is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System and you should all have that before you, has been submitted [[Exhibit F](#)]. The amendment removed the potential impact, and Medicaid has since removed its fiscal note. Stacie Weeks is here from Medicaid, and she is able to answer any questions regarding the fiscal note. Steve Messinger is here from the Nevada Primary Care Association to walk you through the bill if you desire or answer any other questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

No, we will not need to walk through the bill. The bill was not amended in the policy hearing. It is going to be amended here, and that has a direct effect on the fiscal note. I will ask Ms. Weeks to testify on the fiscal note.

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

Yes, this amendment does address our fiscal note so we can reduce it to \$0.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We love zeros. Members, are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Would someone come forward from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services? The fiscal note that was submitted from you said you could not determine the fiscal impact. Can you add anything to that?

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

Yes, we did have a fiscal note that indicated \$0, but the cost could not be determined because of the complicated mechanism by which some of this money gets passed around. It is possible we could quantify that better in a future legislative session, but at this time we do not have concerns.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 434 (R1)?

**Helen Foley, representing Health Plan of Nevada; Silver Summit Healthplan;  
Molina Healthcare; and Anthem Blue Cross Nevada Elevance Health:**

I am representing Medicaid managed care organizations in Nevada, which are Health Plan of Nevada, Silver Summit Healthplan, Molina Healthcare, and Anthem Blue Cross Nevada Elevance Health. As a result of the amendment that came forward from Assemblywoman Taylor, the work of the Nevada Primary Care Association, and Stacie Weeks, we are happy to lend our support to this legislation. We think it will work well for us but also with our relationship with the FQHCs in Nevada.

**Susan L. Fisher, representing Northern Nevada HOPES:**

I am representing Northern Nevada HOPES, a nonprofit clinic in Reno that serves the underserved population. This bill will go a long way in ensuring they are able to continue to receive the pharmaceutical rebates to help them serve the community in Reno.

**Joan Hall, representing Nevada Rural Hospital Partners:**

Our critical access hospitals and our rural health centers also benefit from this program. We are in support.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 434 (R1)?

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

I am a constituent of Assemblywoman Taylor, and we appreciate this bill. Some of my members go to the Northern Nevada Health Clinic, one of the excellent clinics in the state. We urge you to support the bill.

**Adam Porath, representing Nevada Society of Health System Pharmacists:**

I work at a disproportionate share hospital that would benefit from this. We will continue to provide access to our patients. We are strongly supportive of this bill.

**Sarah Adler, representing FirstMed Health and Wellness:**

FirstMed Health and Wellness is an FQHC with three locations in Clark County. They utilize these rebate funds to fill gaps and extend services to homeless individuals, foster youth, and many more.



**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 testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments? [There were none.] Members, this is another bill that we will work session later today. We will close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint). We will invite Assemblywoman Cohen to the table, and she has two bills before us this morning. Members, after hearing this bill, we will hear Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 33-150)**

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

Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint) has to do with making our state museums more accessible for disabled Nevadans and visitors. The section where the fiscal note comes in is section 3, subsection 2, which has to do with remediating the websites for the museums. I had hoped that the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, Department of Administration, could help with that. From what I have been told, they cannot because the websites were done by a third-party vendor. We are at the point where the fiscal cost is \$25,000 to get those websites up to date. It has been more than 30 years since the Americans With Disabilities Act was passed. We should have those websites accessible to everyone, and if they are not, we risk lawsuits. It is something that should have been completed. It is the right thing to do, but it is also the fiscally responsible thing to do to get this issue resolved so everyone can take advantage of the websites and our museums in the state. I am available for questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Before we go to questions from the members, is there someone here from the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs who can speak to the fiscal note? I see it is a one-time cost that would be needed in fiscal year (FY) 2024. I understand that almost every website plus software needs to be updated in the state of Nevada. How long would it take to get the process completed?

**Myron Freedman, Administrator, Division of Museums and History, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs:**

I do not have a solid time frame for you. I can get that information. We do work with a contractor. The contractor is currently on board so we will not waste any time having to find one, so I could probably get an answer to you within a few days.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

The appropriation that would be needed is \$25,000, correct?

**Myron Freedman:**

Yes.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions for the presenter or for the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

We have seen a lot of matters going on in this building in the last couple of weeks. I may not be remembering this correctly. We talked about language access planning, and I believe we funded a bill on language access planning. In the bill, does your Department have a language access plan to incorporate language access for the blind and deaf?

**Myron Freedman:**

That would be part of the study we would be conducting as the bill points out, and we do not have that currently. We would be talking with committees and getting the input we need to determine exactly what we need to do.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Is your office already covered under the language access work that has been done at the executive level?

**Myron Freedman:**

Not to my knowledge.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 252 (R1)?

**Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities:**

We have sent in comments, but I want to reiterate we would like to work with the bill sponsor, the Division of Museums and History, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, and everyone who is responsible for these websites to ensure they are accessible and running as appropriate. We want to highlight the fact that a lawsuit for not having an accessible website would create a bigger fiscal impact on these agencies than the \$25,000 to update the website. The main thing is to make the changes now and ensure that going forward, whatever you put on the website is accessible. We made a commitment to work with these agencies to ensure that happens regardless.

**Kierra Capurro, representing Nevada Blind Children's Foundation:**

We support the bill.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto [[Exhibit G](#)].

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition; and Nevada Council of the Blind:**

I would like to thank Assemblywoman Cohen for sponsoring this bill. It is long overdue. This will benefit all of everybody's needs and especially the K-12 students. I remember taking my daughter when she was six to the museum, and she ended up explaining things. I felt discouraged, and I hope you pass this bill. We are willing to work and look forward to working with the Administrator, Mr. Freedman. Hopefully, he will keep that in mind when he is building the Boulder City Museum to be more accessible and have a universal design in mind.

**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 testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments? [There were none.] We are going to do more research into the \$25,000. If we can get our questions answered, we will work session the bill later today. We will close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing adoption. (BDR 11-658)**

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

I am here to present Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint) and provide some basic information about the adoption assistance program, which is the subject of A.B. 255 (R1). The adoption assistance program was enacted in accordance with the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980. The subsidy encourages and supports families in adopting children with special needs from foster care by enabling families to adopt without placing an undue financial burden on the families. It provides a subsidy based on the child's special needs rather than the adoptive family's income for a child who is in the custody of a child welfare agency or Nevada licensed child placement agency through termination of parental rights and/or relinquishment for six months, and there was an effort made to locate an adoptive family who could adopt without the subsidy assistance. The child must meet the following requirements: not yet 18, cannot or should not be returned to the birth parents, and meets one of the criteria for special needs. The monthly adoption assistance payments may be negotiated up to but not to exceed the monthly foster care maintenance rates.

What the bill does is simple. Currently, an agency that provides child welfare services may provide financial assistance to a family who adopts a child with special needs until the child attains the age of majority, becomes self-sustaining, is emancipated, or dies, whichever occurs first. This bill would allow the subsidy to continue until the child reaches 18 years of age if the child is not enrolled in school, or 19 years of age if the child is enrolled in school; graduates from high school if the child is at least 18 years of age; becomes self-supporting; is emancipated; or dies.

What we are doing is extending this out. Instead of cutting the subsidy off when the child turns 18, we are allowing the child to graduate from high school, hopefully, and at least assist them in adoption until they are 19 years old if they have not already graduated from high school. The language mirrors the language of our child support statute. In my practice as a family law attorney, I have always assumed that the child support language was this way because we acknowledge that a high school student who turns 18 is not automatically self-supporting when the student is still living at home and going to school. That is why child support continues generally until they graduate.

At the policy hearing, we heard testimony about the importance of getting these children through high school. If the subsidy cuts off before graduation, some of these families may be looking to the child to go to work to help supplement the income for the family. But for these families and for these children who have special needs, just graduating is what is most important. We need to get them through graduation. We need to be clear about the subsidy. Once these children are fully adopted, their parents have the rights and responsibilities of parents the same as all parents have raising their children. But at the same time, we should not forget that at some time in these children's lives, these children were the responsibility of the state. These adoptive families made their families whole by adopting these children. These families also took on a financial responsibility that the state would have otherwise been required to bear and took the responsibility on for the family. I am available for questions.

I am not sure if anyone is here from the agency or from the state, but it is hard to understand the fiscal impact because each year it is going to fluctuate because we have a different number of children, and some are going to graduate or some are going to turn 18 at different times during the year. My understanding is the fiscal note is based on this next year as an estimation. We do not know whether the children are going to move or that sort of thing. The fiscal note is based on the next upcoming biennium based on the birthdays of the children and the estimated graduation dates of the children who are currently in the program. I am available for questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I do have a question. This bill was amended in the policy committee, and I am looking at the amendment and it simply added cosponsors. Were there any other amendments to the actual policy part of the bill?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Not that I recall. I believe we just added cosponsors, but I can double check that while you are going through support and opposition testimony. I will double check.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Then I will ask the Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, to address their fiscal note. A fiscal note was submitted on March 22, 2023, that had a cost of \$136,954 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$161,747 in FY 2025. Then that was amended on April 24, 2023, with the reprint that added a huge amount. If there were only

cosponsors added with the amendment, could you explain why the fiscal note increased so much? It is now at \$1,750,997 in FY 2024 and \$1,978,568 in FY 2025.

**Melanie Young, Deputy Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services,  
Department of Health and Human Services:**

When we originally submitted the fiscal note, we submitted it only for the rural regions. In reviewing the bill later on during the session, we realized that Washoe County and Clark County also have adoptive youth through their child welfare agencies. Their fiscal notes referred back to the state's responsibility for the adoption. We amended the fiscal note to be accurate to the fiscal impact.

The fiscal impact in FY 2024 is anticipated to be \$1,750,997, and of that, \$733,450 is State General Fund. In fiscal year 2025, the fiscal impact is expected to be \$1,978,568, with the General Fund impact being \$855,187. The rest of it is funded with federal Title IV-E Foster Care funds. When the state expends General Fund dollars, we earn Title IV-E dollars. We would have to spend the General Funds to earn that.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

That explains a lot. Would you give me the numbers again for FY 2024? Is it \$733,450?

**Melanie Young:**

Yes, \$733,450.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of this bill?

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto.

**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 testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill?

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

I was trying to call in support but was not in time. Please move my testimony to support. We wholeheartedly support this commonsense bill, and we thank the sponsor for introducing it.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will move your testimony to support. Is there anyone else to testify in the neutral position on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Thank you for hearing both of my bills today. I will reiterate what Ms. Martinez said, this is a commonsense bill. It is the duty of the state to care for these children. The families took these children in with the state saying we would help to continue to support these children because of their special needs. We all know you do not turn 18 when you are in the middle of your senior year of high school and all of a sudden you are self-supportive. We want to keep these children in high school and allow them to graduate so they can go on to have productive adult lives. But these children are in the gray area where they are still children, they are still in our homes, they are still our children. We do need to continue to support them, and I will leave it at that.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, with the clarifications on the fiscal notes associated with this bill, we will be able to work session this bill later today. With that, we will close the hearing on A.B. 255 (R1). We will go to the top of our agenda and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to planning for the provision of behavioral health care. (BDR 39-325)**

**Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:**

I am presenting Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint), which is another bill from the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services. Briefly, this bill asks to quantify and report on spending and savings in the children's behavioral health system of care. It also requires presentation and reporting of findings to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services and the final report of its findings to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means prior to the next legislative session. It also defines the children's behavioral health system of care and establishes the statewide mental health consortium and membership of the subcommittee on children's behavioral health of the Commission on Behavioral Health. I believe all fiscal notes have been removed. If there are any questions, I will stand for them.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There were quite a few fiscal notes, and I am trying to get all the original fiscal notes sorted with the ones that have been removed. I am not sure how you did that, but you got them all down to \$0. Since we do have it all in writing, I will not need the agency to come up and testify to the fiscal notes because we do have them here. Members, are there any questions for the presenter on this piece of legislation?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Does this remove the two-thirds majority vote requirement as well?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

On the 1st Reprint, there is no two-thirds majority vote requirement. I am not sure I clarified this. The intent of this bill is to be able to quantify where cost savings are found due to our investment in the children's behavioral health system of care and be able to justify

reinvesting so we create a model where all those cost savings go back into matching dollars or to support systems that we know work and can quantify those systems that work. This is a project that these agencies should be doing anyway when they are seeing how those investment models work and when they are looking at what is of value to the populations they serve. That is why we were able to get those fiscal notes down to \$0.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of this bill?

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

We would like to thank the sponsor of this commonsense bill, and we urge your support.

**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 testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.]  
Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.]  
Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments? [There were none.]

We will be able to work session this bill later today, and we will close the hearing on A.B. 201 (R1) and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing wages for persons with disabilities. (BDR 39-13)**

**Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42:**

This bill is an excellent policy. It is the result of a lot of dedicated work throughout the interim and during the last ten years. It transitions people with developmental disabilities away from earning less than the state minimum wage. It ceases the subminimum wage certificates from being recognized in the state of Nevada. It moves people with disabilities into benefits planning to help them consider competitive integrated employment where they can earn a competitive wage and receive benefits. Those individuals are currently served under the Medicaid Waiver for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities and Related Conditions (ID Waiver) and who are in sheltered workshops, day rehabilitation settings, and not currently considering employment.

The fiscal note on this bill is specific to a new service being added to the Medicaid ID Waiver, which helps individuals with disabilities consider competitive, integrated employment. That is where the fiscal note comes from. It is not a service that is provided in our Medicaid ID Waiver currently. It is a federal/state match. The fiscal note was identified by the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, and we have an awesome dream team here from the Aging and Disability Services Division to talk through the fiscal note. The data I received from the Division identified that currently

there are 2,221 people on the ID Waiver who would be eligible for this service. For it to be included in the waiver, it has to include everyone. Everyone on the waiver would have access to this support service. The total cost is \$1,066,080. The State General Fund match for the total of 2,221 people is \$395,729. That is beginning this January 1, 2025, as written in the bill. If we start this service in the waiver effective January 1, 2025, the General Fund portion would be \$395,729 to serve all 2,221 people.

There are a couple of considerations there. We do not currently have capacity in the state to do benefits planning. We do not have providers to deliver the service. The dollar implication would not be at 100 percent of the appropriation requested by the state. We would need time to ramp up to the 100 percent capacity. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, noted in their budget closing that they are launching a benefits-planning website, which could also provide assistance to this population if they have an open vocational rehabilitation case. There is some duplicative effort that could be there, which would additionally decrease the actual cost associated with this service. I am happy to stand for questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I would ask the Aging and Disability Services Division to confirm the dollar amount. We have your fiscal note in front of us and in the testimony, Assemblywoman Brown-May spoke about the federal match. Could you let us know what the federal dollars and the State General Fund dollars would be?

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

The General Fund portion would be \$395,729. I did not do the math to subtract that from the total.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Was the total \$1,066,080?

**Ellen Crecelius:**

Yes, \$1,066,080.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is your Division able to absorb those dollars or would you need the General Fund appropriation?

**Jennifer Frischmann, Quality Assurance Manager, Aging and Disability Services  
Division, Department of Health and Human Services:**

We would need the General Fund appropriation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions for Assemblywoman Brown-May or the agency? [There were none.] Thank you for the clarification on the General Fund dollars that would be



needed to stand up this program. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of this bill?

**Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities:**

I would argue this is probably one of the most important bills that I will be testifying on this session. Working-age people with developmental and other disabilities are among the most unemployed and underemployed segments of our society. Too often, unemployment is accepted as an inevitable result of living with a significant developmental disability. Employment is the avenue to independence and increased socialization for individuals with developmental disabilities, and all people, including those with disabilities, have a right to be in competitive employment and in an integrated workforce.

Our Council believes individuals with intellectual disabilities who can and want to work should have access to the resources and support necessary to gain and maintain meaningful community-based employment and being paid above minimum wage. In Nevada, we have at least 2,221 people who are eligible who are paid subminimum wage. When we talk about subminimum wage, we are talking pennies, pennies for the same work that people without disabilities would be paid at least minimum wage to do.

The Association for Persons in Supported Employment has determined that while subminimum wage may have at one time been a valid and effective strategy for enhancing the employment of people with disabilities, the evolution and the disability rights and community employment make the minimum wage no longer necessary or acceptable. We understand the work it takes to eliminate subminimum wage is a huge lift and a huge ask, but it is necessary. Phase-out of the subminimum wage needs to occur over a period of time, as identified in the bill language, to ensure we do not eliminate options and choice for those with disabilities who are currently employed. Nevada must join a national effort to improve the overall quality of community employment outcomes, both in terms of individual outcomes, wages, hours, diversity of employment, and systems outcomes. We greatly thank the bill sponsor for her work.

**Daniel H. Stewart, representing State of Nevada Association of Providers:**

I am representing the State of Nevada Association of Providers, otherwise known as SNAP. Currently, I believe SNAP is the largest coalition of groups and providers providing services to adults and children with disabilities and is in strong support of this bill. We would like to thank the sponsor. One of the real benefits of a citizen Legislature is you get people with real subject matter expertise, and SNAP has worked with the sponsor probably over a decade now to develop policy. We urge your support.

**Mary Pierczynski, representing State of Nevada Association of Providers:**

In talking with several of the members of SNAP, they are in support of this. I wanted to reiterate that this morning.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**  
Ditto.

**Ashlee Cooper, Manager of Advocacy and Government Affairs, Opportunity Village:**  
Opportunity Village is also a member of SNAP. We are a Nevada nonprofit that employs, empowers, and serves people with disabilities. We are pleased to support this thoughtful bill to provide better options and outcomes for people with disabilities and also thank the sponsor.

**Jollina Simpson, representing Make It Work Nevada:**  
Make it Work Nevada is a nonprofit that works on the pocketbook issues of Black families in southern Nevada. We wholeheartedly support this bill as it leads to a path of independence and autonomy.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**  
There are no additional callers wishing to testify in support, so we will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 259 (R1)?

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**  
I am sorry, I just called. I want to proceed with my support testimony. We thank the sponsor of the bill. This is about time. This happened in the 1930s during the Roosevelt era and now it is 2023. Home means Nevada is home for all. I know we all want to be included. Please support this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**  
Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the sponsor have any closing remarks? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 259 (R1) and work session this bill later today. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 283 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 283 (1st Reprint): Makes changes relating to doula services.**  
**(BDR 38-844)**

**Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong, Assembly District No. 6:**  
I am grateful that you are making time today to hear what I believe is an important bill. Last session, we brought a community-based bill with Make It Work Nevada and the doulas of northern and southern Nevada to bring doula services within the realm of services available for birthing families. We know doula services help reduce the rates of maternal mortality and illness with newborn babies by no less than 4 percent. This session, I am back with the same group of supporters to talk to you about how we can better induce doulas to sign up with equitable pay.

We know most of these doulas are women; quite a few of them are women of color, and this work is critical to our communities for our health purposes. We know Black women have

some of the highest rates of maternal mortality throughout the nation no matter what your income, your socioeconomic status, or your education. We believe doula services help improve the outcomes and after the birth of a child, that mom will come home with that baby. With me today is Jollina Simpson from Make it Work Nevada. I am going to turn this presentation over to her, and she is going to give you a short presentation. Thank you for your indulgence.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Thank you for joining us. We will not need the PowerPoint, but please present the highlights and address the fiscal notes.

**Jollina Simpson, representing Make it Work Nevada:**

The highlights for this bill are related to the second fiscal note. It is important to incentivize doulas to be able to come onto the rolls. Doulas are trained and recognized for the physiological process of pregnancy, labor and birth, and the postpartum period. Under current Medicaid laws, doulas are able to support their clients for 2 or 3 prenatal visits, continuous labor support during birth, which on average is about 17 hours of straight work, and 2 to 3 postpartum visits. Currently, the total reimbursement for those services is \$450 [page 3, [Exhibit H](#)]. Across the nation, legislation has been passed to bring doulas up to a living wage, and the average is approximately \$1,200.

We modeled our bill after Rhode Island because of the similar populations who are on Medicaid. We came up with the increased wage of \$1,500 with an additional 10 percent for doulas serving in rural environments because of the specific needs of rural communities, including medical deserts and distances to drive to get additional care. Currently, doulas can reduce the amount of Cesareans, and the cost difference between a Cesarean and a vaginal birth is about \$3,000 to \$5,000 [page 4]. That is a big win for doula support in the cost window.

One more thing I would like to say is since we started the initiation of bringing this reimbursement bill to the front, we have had more doulas finish in the pipeline than when we started. At the beginning of this process, we had three. Now we have six, knowing that it takes doulas three to six months to get through this process. We are pleased with how the pipeline is now filling up, since doulas know they will be able to hone their craft and work in the communities that they live in and serve the communities that reach out to us all the time with needs. Now we are able not only to feed our families but feed our communities with our support.

Finally, since our illustrious sponsor brought up our Nevada statistics, I want to throw out a few things that are important to understand. In the rural regions, only about 6 percent of obstetricians serve those regions. That means there are a lot of families out there who need access to resources and support that doulas can help provide. Large portions of rural Nevada are designated as maternity care deserts. This is another place where doulas' resources and commitment to their communities help them thrive.

The fiscal note currently after the 1st Reprint came down a bit, but I am sure that other individuals will be able to explain it. Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, will be able to explain that a lot better than I. What it means to Nevadans and doulas is we can do the work we love and that we were called for and not have to sacrifice our families and our lives. We might even be able to get off of Medicaid ourselves if we are able to earn a living wage.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there someone from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, in the room? There was a fiscal note that was submitted on April 5, 2023, but there was a revision on May 8, 2023. It looks like the fiscal note was reduced in one area but increased in another area. Would you address this fiscal note?

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

Yes, the revised bill did a couple of things. It created a cost-based rate, so it allows us to pay closer to costs for doulas. This bill is a good example of where more investments are needed to better pay providers, and this is one example. It also adds an incentive payment for doulas to try to encourage them to serve the rural regions where we have gaps in services. Currently, we only have ten doulas enrolled in our program. That is a good example of where funding is necessary to support these programs so we can adequately pay providers. The total based on these changes for the State General Fund for the state's share for both systems and services is \$371,406. That is for the biennium. Then the total computable, which includes the federal funds, and the state share is you will be investing about \$1,050,541 into rate increases.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Would you state those amounts one more time? They were different than what we had calculated.

**Stacie Weeks:**

We add up the medical services total for state funds. For any Medicaid services, we draw down the federal share and you add that to the state share of the actuarial system costs related to these changes. The total is \$371,406 for the biennium. It is approximately \$700,000 for the federal funds that we will be able to draw down.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there any testimony in support of this bill?

**Paige Barnes, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists:**

We appreciate Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong's work with us in the policy committee, and we are here to express support today in the money committee for A.B. 283 (R1).

**Joan Hall, representing Nevada Rural Hospital Partners:**

My members have those maternity deserts. We need all the help we can get, and we support this bill.

**Ednalyna Martin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am one of the Medicaid providers under doulas here in Las Vegas. I have recently enrolled as a provider with Medicaid in the hopes of offering my services to those who are deserving of the support but previously have been unable to access or afford a doula in the private sector. Even though it has been a long and lengthy process, I was motivated to continue, not only for the purpose of ensuring access to care for these families, but by the support of my fellow Doula Co-Op members. My family grew up poor, and one of my biggest dreams is to support families like my own to receive the care they most deserve.

The difference between working for \$450 versus \$1,500 per client is this will allow me to offer intentional authentic care and provide families with the time and focus that they deserve. If I could earn a living wage for my work and provide for my family, then I will be able to focus on doula work without having to pick up small jobs to make ends meet and additionally ensuring care for my babies while I care for my clients. I truly believe, and I respect what Jollina said, that doulas facilitate positive outcomes for mothers, especially concerning mental health. There are countless dynamics to consider for birthing parents navigating the transition to parenthood, especially for the first time. Knowing that many Medicaid families come from low-income communities, they must work harder to ensure food and shelter are secure. This means they do not afford any time, money, or attention to their own physical, mental, and emotional health during pregnancy and afterward. I have also seen such a positive impact on families from viewing or experiencing their birth even afterwards from a place of informed consent, bodily autonomy, and safety as a result of educating themselves and choosing supportive care providers like doulas. I am in full support of A.B. 283 (R1).

**Claire Murdoch, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a birth and postpartum doula serving the Reno, Carson City, and Lake Tahoe area. I have become an approved Medicaid provider because it is important to me that I am able to serve the disadvantaged community that desperately needs the support of doulas. However, if A.B. 283 (R1) is not passed, I would be unable to serve Medicaid clients because it would not be financially feasible for me. I am a working mother and need to be able to support my family. Being reimbursed only \$450 for Medicaid clients is not a livable income. The work that doulas do for the disadvantaged community is vital. I want to financially be able to support this demographic and will not be able to do so if A.B. 283 (R1) is not passed.

**Emily Barney, Executive Director, Doula Co-Op:**

The Doula Co-Op is a new Nevada nonprofit organization that was started in the wake of the last session and the Medicaid bill passing, allowing doulas to work with Medicaid clients. My organization has been working toward enrolling doulas as Medicaid providers since its inception last July. We are thrilled to have ten doulas, all members of the Doula Co-Op, as part of the Medicaid program. We have nine more doulas who are working through the

pipeline right now. It is between a three- to six-month process, most likely a six-month process for most doulas as we are doing the billing and the enrolling ourselves. We urge you to pass this bill and support the doulas and the families that we will support in turn.

**Andrea Koell, Private Citizen, Northern Nevada:**

I am a birth and postpartum doula in northern Nevada. My loved ones were my motivation for becoming a doula in the first place, and they are primarily in the Medicaid demographic. Being able to serve everyone who would benefit from a doula who would otherwise not be able to access us is vitally important to me. It is unfortunately not an option to support my family and support this demographic without the implementation of a living wage. I am calling in support of A.B. 283 (R1).

**Samantha DeAndrea, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am calling in support of A.B. 283 (R1). I am a single mother and a doula in northern Nevada as well as another cofounder of the Doula Co-Op. I am also a Medicaid recipient as well as a Medicaid enrolled provider, finally, after a pretty intense process to become enrolled. The point I hope to sharpen in everyone's understanding is that I am a Medicaid recipient serving Medicaid recipients, as are many of the other doulas in the Doula Co-Op whom we have enrolled and recruited to do so. To make this sustainable, I need to be paid equitably as do all other doulas. I urge you to support this bill.

**Tiara Flynn, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a Las Vegas native and a small business owner here in southern Nevada for the past 12 years. I am also an Air Force veteran and a recent full spectrum doula. I have been a birth worker for the past five years, and I recently launched my full spectrum doula practice in August of 2021. What led me down the path to becoming a doula in the first place were my own experiences with birth and postpartum. Through my personal experiences in training to become a doula, I learned about the incredible lack of access and support for mothers and families through the entire reproduction spectrum, in addition to birth and postpartum, fertility, law, abortion, surrogacy, and adoption. This challenge is elevated for underserved and underrepresented communities, for example, the Medicaid community. I was extremely hopeful when I first learned that doulas can now apply to become Medicaid providers in Nevada. However, as you have heard a couple of times now, currently there is some concern within the Medicaid population and the doula community when it comes to the reimbursement rates. The rates are simply not sustainable for doulas' livelihood or for doulas to scale and grow their businesses.

As I stated previously, I have been a business owner now for 12 years. I understand the burnout rate when it comes to small business owners. Several barriers make it challenging for us to have and achieve long-term sustainability. Most of us are forced to seek private clients who can likely afford doulas' services over Medicaid clients because of that. Ultimately, my concern is that as doulas, we are not reaching the population who need our support the most due to those financial barriers.

The primary objectives of A.B. 283 (R1) can potentially resolve some of the barriers and challenges if doulas can achieve sustainability in our practices and our businesses; we would be available to the populations who desperately need our services. This will ultimately solve some of the country's top challenges related to maternal mental health, postpartum depression, postpartum overdose and suicide, maternal and early childhood morbidity, and much more. This morning, I thank you for hearing my testimony, and I urge you to support this bill.

**Sue Foltz, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a doula and retired from a 30-year career in laboratory diagnostic medicine. I knew after attending my first birth as a doula for a homeless pregnant teenager on Medicaid, how vital it was to support these vulnerable women in this population. This bill, A.B. 283 (R1), will not only support a living wage for doulas, but will save the state of Nevada in downstream health care costs for Medicaid and shared birth. Doula care has been researched thoroughly, and it is proven that doula care throughout the pregnancy, labor, and birth will decrease the number of medical interventions during the birth, leading to healthier outcomes for mother and baby. I strongly support A.B. 283 (R1). I am confident and hopeful that this Legislative Committee will see not only the health and well-being benefits for the Medicaid population and the cost savings to the state but will also respect the work of doulas and reimburse their work at a living wage.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There are no additional callers to testify in support. Do we have anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 283 (R1)?

**Natalie Doyen, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada:**

I am in support, not in opposition, to A.B. 283 (R1). I am a birth and postpartum doula. I serve our rural communities in the desert at Fallon, Nevada. I belong to the Doula Co-Op of Reno as well. I am also going through the process to become a Medicaid provider. I wanted to make it known how important it is that we are supporting these families and women who require extra assistance not only through birth but financially. We are not only birthing women but are women who support them, such as the doulas. I am a military spouse and mother of three, and I take care of my family. Based on this income, the \$450 is not a sustainable living wage for the services we provide and the care and emotion that go into our families. I wanted to make my vote known. I am in support of A.B. 283 (R1).

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 283 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on this bill?

**Teresa Banks, Public Health Diversity Advisor, Larsen Institute, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno:**

For my neutral testimony, I want to share what research has shown. Studies have demonstrated the impact that doulas have on birth outcomes and the cost savings associated with their intervention. Women on Medicaid with doulas have 22 percent lower odds of

delivering preterm, which may lower neonatal intensive care unit admissions. Many studies including a 2013 [unintelligible] study reported doula-supported births had near universal breastfeeding initiations compared with the general Medicaid population. Among African American women, 92 percent of those with doula support initiated breastfeeding compared with 70 percent of the general Medicaid population. I want to reiterate that increasing Medicaid reimbursement rates can serve as an incentive for more doulas to become Medicaid providers.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any others who would like to testify in neutral on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the sponsor have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 283 (R1) and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing instructional time in public schools. (BDR 34-607)**

**Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28:**

Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint) addresses the issue of standardized test creep in our schools. I know the issue has been thoroughly vetted by many different interests that had a stake in this. We have come up with the final language here, including an amendment that we just introduced last night, and you should have a copy [[Exhibit I](#)]. This bill would now cap standardized testing and certain tests in our schools statewide at about 2 percent. We received some guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, both from the Obama administration as well as the Trump administration, which have both supported this. We seek to bring this policy recommendation to Nevada. I have Mr. Daniel Stewart here to address the fiscal concerns, and we also have Dr. Pearson standing by in Las Vegas to address any technical questions. I will turn the presentation over to Mr. Stewart.

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

I am testifying on behalf of the Clark County Education Association. I want to talk about the history of the fiscal notes and their status. I believe we are at a point now where the fiscal notes are all at \$0, even one that has not been introduced officially or posted yet. With the 1st Reprint, White Pine County reduced their \$25,000 fiscal note to \$0. They even submitted that on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, and there may be somebody here from White Pine County to confirm that if you need it. Washoe County also committed to removing their note. I believe one of the representatives may have reached out to the Chair and some of the members of the Committee directly to let them know that with the 1st Reprint, they are removing their fiscal note. Yesterday upon the notice of this hearing, we were contacted by the Department of Education, indicating that they would have an additional fiscal note. We worked with them and that is where this amendment came from.

I will walk through the amendment [[Exhibit I](#)]. It has been fortuitous. This amendment not only will reduce the fiscal notes to \$0 but will ease some of the policy concerns that may have lingered on with this bill even in its 1st Reprint. This conceptual amendment only makes one language change, but it is substantive when it comes to the change of what we are



doing. Section 1.5 of the bill currently reads that the Department shall provide assistance to schools that violate the limitations described in paragraph (a). It also says that they need to come up with a corrective action plan. This amendment tells the Department of Education that all they have to do between now and July 1, 2025, is develop a plan on how it will provide assistance to schools and what a plan of corrective action will be. I believe the Superintendent of Public Instruction is here, and she can speak about the amendment that would remove whatever note they have.

I want to mention the policy implications of this too. I know there has been some fear from some of the school districts that they were immediately going to be under the thumb of the Department of Education (NDE) for something that was a relatively new program. They were not going to know how to count it or how to deal with it. All of a sudden, the NDE becomes the enforcement arm. The amendment strips the enforcement authority from the NDE unless this Legislature chooses to give them authority in the next legislative session. All their role is now is to provide a plan. The NDE does not have to provide assistance. They do not have to issue plans of corrective action. They just have to tell this body about the data they receive from the school districts and what it would look like if the NDE were to help these school districts limit their testing and significantly increase their instructional time. I am hoping that eases some of the last lingering policy concerns about having the NDE being the police. The amendment does reduce the fiscal notes to \$0.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We had a significant and large fiscal note from the NDE. Would you come up and put on the record that your fiscal note is reduced to \$0?

**Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education:**

As described in the bill and working with Assemblyman D'Silva, removing the requirement to have the NDE work with over 750 schools within the state on how much time they spend on testing does remove the fiscal note. We will be able to work on the plans that are now proposed in this amendment.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I want to make sure I have the right amendment. Is it this amendment?

**Assemblyman D'Silva:**

That is correct.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We also had another conceptual amendment. Are we doing anything with this one?

**Daniel H. Stewart:**

I am glad you mentioned that. I was going to do that ahead of time. That amendment [\[Exhibit J\]](#) was what we were working on with White Pine County and Washoe County. It was put in at the last minute, and we did not know if it was going to make it into the

1st Reprint, but all of it ended up making it into the 1st Reprint. That second amendment has been included in the bill in front of you.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions for any of the presenters? [There were none.] We will move to support. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of this bill?

**Calen Evans, President, Washoe Education Association:**

The Washoe Education Association represents certified professionals in the Washoe County School District. I want to thank Assemblyman D'Silva for this legislation. The over-assessing of our students is a critical issue in schools, not only to address the loss of instructional time that it creates but also the loss of fun and learning that a lot of our students are experiencing. The saddest time in school, if you go to a school, is during SBAC [Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium] testing week. I know that is separate from what we can require. Any opportunities that we can use to limit the amount of testing and increase instructional time will have a great benefit for our students.

**Brenda Pearson, representing Clark County Education Association:**

This bill specifically increases the amount of instructional time that students will be having within the school day. This is going to reduce the number of assessments that are required. We think this is going to bridge the gap of the learning loss that occurred over the COVID-19 pandemic. We stand in support.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There are no others wishing to testify in support, so we will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to this bill?

**Tess Opferman, representing Washoe County School District:**

I want to thank the sponsor. He has worked with us significantly on this bill. We have been able to remove our fiscal note, and we appreciate the steps in that direction. However, we still have concerns with the content of the bill itself. We know the state and federal testing is the primary burden on teachers and students. We feel this bill does not do anything to directly address this. It does not give any power to NDE to limit testing. It just gives them the ability to look at testing and try to create a plan. We are still in opposition to the policy itself but have removed our fiscal note.

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

We want to thank the sponsor for eliminating some of the draconian penalties in the first bill. We appreciate that the financial implications have been removed. We are still in opposition to the bill because of the parameters of trying to carry this out and having teachers try to monitor their time. Time is money. How much time are they spending on testing? It seems unrealistic. Different tests take different time periods to prepare children for the exams. We are still in opposition to the bill.

**Patricia Haddad, Director of Government Relations, Clark County School District:**

We are in opposition to the bill, although we support the spirit of it and are grateful to Assemblyman D'Silva. This has come a long way from its initial printing. There are a couple of things to note about reporting and aggregate. The districts will report in aggregate, but the burden still falls on the individual educators to be able to track the time it would take in preparation and the time that students are taking the tests.

The other thing is the Legislature approved Senate Bill 353 of the 81st Session. That bill was a holistic look at assessments across the state and has involved a number of stakeholders including the Clark County School District. A number of our individuals have been involved as well as people from other districts, the regional professional development entities, and NDE to look at what this specific number should be. The 2 percent testing cap is indicated in the bill. It is important that work is ongoing and can be honored. We do not want to take a step back from the hard and important work that has been done up to this point by moving quicker than our state and our stakeholders have in identifying what that most appropriate number would be.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments?

**Assemblyman D'Silva:**

I want to thank all the stakeholders who have been working on this piece of legislation. A wide and diverse array of individuals have come together to create a bill that is not perfect but a step in the right direction. I know there were some concerns about the tracking, reporting, and the time allotment to those tests. We have significant safeguards in the legislation to deal with this moving forward. We look to some important work at hand on the over-testing of our students, which is a significant issue and something about which parents constantly complain. Teachers have issues with the loss of instruction time. Students will tell you that we test too much. This bill is an appropriate and moderate step in the right direction. I am looking forward to continuing to work with the stakeholders to address the issues that they may have moving forward.

**Daniel H. Stewart:**

I will address some of the comments made in the opposing testimony. I appreciate the opportunity to work with the districts on this. They have been good partners. I appreciate their concerns for what burdens it might have on teachers. Between the Clark County Education Association and the Washoe Education Association, you probably have 95 percent of the teachers represented, and they are both in support of this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

With that, we will close the hearing on A.B. 296 (R1) and with the fiscal notes being addressed, we will be able to work session the bill later today. We will open the hearing on the next bill on our agenda, Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint): Establishes the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program. (BDR 45-912)**

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

I am happy to present to you Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint), which establishes the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program. The bill has already been vetted by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources and approved unanimously, so I will not go through the policy itself but will talk about the money. I do have an amendment to the bill. The fiscal notes have all been removed and should be showing \$0 on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

I have a friendly amendment I would like to propose [[Exhibit K](#)]. I had originally talked about only having three members on the Board of the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program. However, in conversation with various stakeholders, there is an amendment on NELIS. I have a proposed amendment that will expand the Board from three members to six members. The Board will consist of the following members: one member appointed by the Governor; one member from a nongovernmental conservation organization in Nevada appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate; one member from the mining industry appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate; one member who is an attorney with legal expertise in real estate or personal estate planning appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly; and one member representing an energy corporation that operates in Nevada appointed by the Minority Leader of the Assembly. The Director of the Department of Wildlife is the ex-officio member. That should deal with the amendment, and I am open for any questions or discussions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Does the amendment have any effect on the fiscal impact on the bill?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

No.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

You will propose that as a floor amendment. I did notice one thing in the amendment that is a policy matter. I know that we have always kept a balance in those who are appointing members to a committee. Could you explain why the Majority Leader of the Senate has an appointment, the Minority Leader of the Senate has an appointment, the Minority Leader of the Assembly has an appointment, but it does not include the Speaker of the Assembly? Wait, we did find it on line 22. We found the Speaker on line 22. My other question for you is there does not seem to be an appropriation for the Wildlife Account. Is this bill just setting up the enabling language for future legislative bodies?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

There are no appropriations. It is setting up the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program Account to receive donations from various entities to work on the issues.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We have one question for you.

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I wanted to note that this is an idea that came up for which I did not have room. I appreciate the Minority Leader bringing this forward. This is going to have a significant benefit for wildlife. I know we were trying to have some conversations about how to get the balance in the appointments to make sure that there is some equal footing between different stakeholders. This is a good way to do that both in the mix of who is making the appointments and the different sectors that are represented that are likely to make contributions for the benefit of our wildlife. Even though this does not relate to the fiscal aspect, I appreciate the work that has been done on this by Assemblyman O'Neill and other stakeholders.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I have you on the record that donations, contributions, and grants will fund this but no appropriations this session, and you will not come back next session to ask for more money.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I will say donations, contributions, and grants will fund this, and I will not be asking for appropriations this session or next session. Then we will discuss the future later.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Sounds good. Members, are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of A.B. 349 (R1)?

**Chris Brooks, representing Arevia Power:**

Arevia Power is a renewable energy developer in the state of Nevada and across the West. This is a great thing for the state of Nevada so industries including mining companies can make meaningful contributions to Nevada's wildlife and the conservation of wildlife.

**Kyle Davis, representing Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife:**

We are in support of this bill and supported it in the policy committee as well. This is going to be a great avenue, especially in cases where we might have situations where it is an emergency, and we need to take care of wildlife in a quick fashion. This will allow for that flexibility.

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

We are here in strong support. Our wildlife and open spaces make Nevada unique and make it a great place to call home for both wildlife and animals. We think this will be an important tool to help conserve our wildlife, and we urge the Committee's support.

**Jaina Moan, External Affairs Director, The Nature Conservancy:**

The Nature Conservancy in Nevada supports A.B. 349 (R1) to create a Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program and Wildlife Account [[Exhibit L](#)]. Nevada is one of the few western

states that lack dedicated conservation funding to support wildlife and wildlife habitat. The creation of such an account is a good first step in meeting the conservation needs of our state. Healthy ecosystems contribute to cleaner air and water. Nevada is fortunate to have rich biodiversity across our state. Restoring and maintaining habitat for Nevada's incredible wildlife is a good investment for our future.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There is no one else to testify in support, so we will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 349 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on this bill?

**Alan Jenne, Director, Department of Wildlife:**

I am here to testify in the neutral position on behalf of the Department of Wildlife. While the Department does have the ability to collect donations through the Wildlife Trust, large amounts of money such as these that are intended for broad purposes to implement multiple projects over multiple years would be handled more efficiently through this conservation program in this bill. This proposed program is organized exclusively for charitable donations and endowments. The existing Wildlife Trust Fund is used for specific dedicated purposes where the contributor will define specific projects. This proposed program will allow a donor to donate funds to the account for the broad purposes of preserving, protecting, managing, and restoring wildlife and wildlife habitats. The Board of the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program will then decide the purpose of the funding that is granted to the Department of Wildlife. Having the Board allocate the funding separate from the agency will help bring diverse perspectives and management over funding.

This bill has been amended to diversify and broaden the membership of the Board after many discussions with invested stakeholders. This program will be a charitable account administered by an organization such as the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada, exempt from taxation purposes, which is able to receive anonymous donations and is organized and provides support to the Department in its efforts to preserve, protect, manage, and restore natural resources in Nevada.

The Department has longstanding working relationships with the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada through the Dream Tag program. Grants to the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program that are distributed to the Department will enhance its ability to timelier react to threats or impacts to natural resources while also providing the required match for grant funding. The Department sees this program as being able to provide a steady source of nonfederal funding to the agency over time. Other states that have used such programs as this achieve their conservation objectives while providing their match requirement. Novel revenue sources such as these proposed in this bill help the Department keep license fees for hunting, fishing, and boating affordable so families can easily enjoy Nevada's outdoors. I would like to thank Assemblyman O'Neill and the stakeholders who invested the time in developing this concept.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Do we have anyone else who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 349 (R1). This is another bill that we will have a work session on later today. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint):   Revises provisions governing net metering.  
(BDR 58-1036)**

**Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:**

It is my pleasure to present Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) for your consideration today. This bill looks to establish a net metering program for affordable housing developments in the state of Nevada. It supports the requirements for those developments to align with new federal incentives that would help cover 50 percent of those solar project costs. That is what the bill seeks to do. Members, you have a proposed amendment [[Exhibit M](#)] looking to tune up some of the provisions of the bill developed in conversations with different stakeholders. However, it is a policy amendment. I would be glad to propose that on the floor or bring it for consideration in the other house as it does not affect the fiscal note.

I will get right to the fiscal note. I was notified by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN), which had submitted a fiscal note on the bill, that they have now determined there will not be a cost to the agency, and they have removed their fiscal note. I provided that in writing to the Chair and to Fiscal staff this morning. Unfortunately, I do not think the representative from the PUCN was able to join us in person. That concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

No, I do not have the updated fiscal note in my file. I get my files together the night before the hearing so I can take them home and look them over. I do not have it, but it is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). The conceptual amendment is this one that only relates to policy issues and has nothing that would affect the fiscal note, correct?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

Yes, that is correct.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We ask that you present that as a floor amendment. I do not see anyone here from the PUCN to address the fiscal note, but we have it on NELIS, so are there any questions for the presenter?

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I have had some people come and talk to me over the last two days about some issues. They are mostly policy issues. May I talk to you offline later today about it?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

Glad to do that.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any other questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of this bill?

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

I am here in support of A.B. 425 (R1). All Nevadans should be included in the transition to a cleaner, healthier future. This bill makes strides to do that and will also help us better allocate and leverage funds from the Inflation Reduction Act. We urge the Committee's support.

**Kierra Capurro, representing Ovation Development Corp:**

Ovation Development Corp and the Molasky family are committed to providing high-quality affordable housing for individuals in southern Nevada and are also committed to lowering the carbon footprint and providing clean energy resources for the residents of their thousands of units. Ovation Development Corp believes all residents, regardless of socioeconomic status, deserve a quality home that helps to strengthen individual lives, families, and communities. Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) furthers that goal. Ovation Development Corp urges support of A.B. 425 (R1), and we thank this Committee for bringing it forward.

**Jaina Moan, External Affairs Director, The Nature Conservancy:**

The Nature Conservancy in Nevada supports A.B. 425 (R1) to allow shared net metering at low-income housing [[Exhibit L](#)]. Climate change is one of the biggest threats to our mission, and we support policies that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) will expand the opportunity for more Nevadans to benefit from renewable energy generation where they live. We support this bill because it promotes the equitable distribution of climate mitigation opportunities and outcomes, including for those in low-income housing.

**Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada:**

I am here on behalf of One APIA Nevada. One APIA Nevada is the advocate for the fast-growing Asian and Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander communities here in the state. Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) addresses two of the most pressing issues we have in our state: first, housing, by lowering utility bills for affordable housing and allowing tenants to participate in net metering; and second, confronting climate change by creating more solar energy. Our organization has advocated for the federal Inflation Reduction Act and all its tax savings. We would love to see state changes to take advantage of federal incentives, and we urge the Committee to pass A.B. 425 (R1), because Nevada still leaves savings on the table.

**Jermareon Williams, Government Affairs Manager, Western Resource Advocates:**

Western Resource Advocates supports A.B. 425 (R1). Everyone in Nevada deserves to benefit from solar energy, and low-income renters stand to benefit the most from utility bill savings. There are also new federal tax incentives that were created in the Inflation



Reduction Act that will be awarded and available for solar projects installed on federally available affordable housing. Without A.B. 425 (R1), most solar projects on affordable housing will not be viable, and we will not begin to benefit from the federal funding. Western Resource Advocates would like to urge your support of this bill.

**Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition:**

We support A.B. 425 (R1) and thank Assemblyman Watts for bringing this important bill forward. Utility costs are real. When we consider all of our renters who are paying more than half of their income for their rent costs, any savings is particularly important. It is a personal favorite of mine when I think about my Nevada neighbors who are living paycheck to paycheck, what a small savings could be. I consider this a renter-equity bill and also an opportunity for Nevada to be more competitive to go after those federal funds.

**Mendy K. Elliott, representing Reno Housing Authority; Nevada Rural Housing Authority; and Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority:**

We want to thank Assemblyman Watts for this bill. This is an innovative solution as we look to build affordable housing in our state. This is just one opportunity that will benefit all Nevadans.

**Jessica Ferrato, representing Solar Energy Industries Association:**

We are here in support of the bill. We want to thank Assemblyman Watts for all the work that he has done on it. We supported this bill in the policy committee and continue to support it here.

**Paige Barnes, representing Advanced Energy United:**

We supported this bill in the policy committee and are here to support it as well.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

Ditto, and we urge you to pass this bill, and thank you to the sponsor.

**Tracey Smith, representing Faith Organizing Alliance:**

Faith Organizing Alliance is in strong support of expanding clean energy opportunities for families and affordable housing. We supported this bill in the policy committee and gave more expansive comments there.

**Mary L. House, President and CEO, CHR, Inc.:**

I am the President and CEO of CHR, Inc., which stands for caring, helping and restoring lives, and the First Lady of Mountaintop Faith Ministries. I want to thank Assemblyman Watts for this bill and let you know that CHR, Inc., is in strong support of A.B. 425 (R1). This bill expands solar access to the people who need it the most by lowering the utility bills, which have skyrocketed this year due to the high cost of volatile and out-of-state methane gas.

This bill will make it possible for renters of low-income multifamily housing to benefit from stable and affordable solar energy while taking advantage of federal and state incentives.

I ask you to help reduce the energy burden for low-income households by supporting this bill.

**Emily Woodall, Campaign Manager, Dream.org:**

We work at the intersection of environmental and economic justice. We work to ensure that states are able to take full advantage of federal funding from the Inflation Reduction Act. We want to echo the statements in support of A.B. 425 (R1). We want to thank the sponsor and the Committee for your time.

**Stephen Lassiter, Sunrun:**

Sunrun is the largest rooftop solar provider in the United States. Unfortunately, there is next to no solar on affordable housing in Nevada today because the economics are too difficult. We support this legislation because it will help change that by allowing Nevada to apply for the new federal Inflation Reduction Act tax credits that are designed specifically for solar on affordable housing. Where there is solar on affordable housing in neighboring states, it is saving building owners thousands of dollars on their utility bills each year, and it is saving low-income tenants an average of \$44 a month on their utility bills. The solar industry is ready to bring these benefits to Nevada. We appreciate the work of the sponsor to bring this legislation forward.

**Bari Levinson, Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:**

I am a volunteer member of the Sierra Club's Legislative Committee. On behalf of the Club, there are more than 30,000 members and supporters. I am speaking in support of A.B. 425 (R1). Reno and Las Vegas are two of the fastest-warming cities in the country. Low-income residents bear the brunt of these effects on their health and well-being due to the high cost of cooling their homes. These residents spend a much higher percentage of their incomes on utilities, meaning they have a higher energy burden.

Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) will provide net metered solar on low-income housing allowing the residents and building owners to partake in the benefits of solar energy at a reasonable price. This will help shelter them from the inevitable increases in the price of electric power from our utility companies and reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel power plants. Assembly Bill 425 (1st Reprint) will help low-income Nevadans reduce their energy burden and participate in our clean energy future while helping our state meet its greenhouse gas reduction goals. For these reasons we urge you to support this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There are no additional callers to testify in support, so we will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 425 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance.  
(BDR 53-1002)**

**Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association:**

With me today is Mr. John Knobel. I want to report to you that we do have an amendment [\[Exhibit N\]](#) that has to do with the policy that is before you that came about by way of meeting about the fiscal notes with the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry. They pointed out some policy issues that were in error in the original draft, and we addressed those with the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor. We worked diligently with the stakeholders, including gaming, insurers, employers, Nevada self-insured employers, organized labor, and trial lawyers whom I represent. That bill passed out of that policy committee unanimously. The amendment we have today on the policy issue is to address a couple of errors that were left out. I am happy to go over those if you would like me to, and I did present them.

I am also here to speak on behalf of the fiscal notes we received on this particular bill. We were unable to get the agencies to remove the fiscal notes, but I would like to make a few comments as to why we believe the fiscal notes may not be as significant as indicated in the reporting. The underlying nature of this bill and where the fiscal notes are being generated are from three different aspects. The fiscal notes reflect a need for additional staffing to address the increased number of permanent partial disability (PPD) evaluations that this change in the law would bring. That is number one. Second, there is an increased number of investigators needed to run benefit penalties as a result of a change in the jurisdictional language in this particular bill. Lastly, software updates are needed to address what is called their Claims and Regulatory Data System (CARDS). That is the Division of Industrial Relations (DIR), Department of Business and Industry system that is used to assign these PPD evaluation physicians.

With regard to those three points, I have noted that many of the fiscal notes that are attached from the local and state agencies indicate an increase in the number of PPD evaluations in the order of 25 percent to 50 percent more PPD examinations that will take place as a result of this change. However, I have been practicing in this field for more than 23 years, and I helped bring about [Assembly Bill 458 of the 79th Session](#) that allowed for this independent medical examination to exist. The independent medical examination has been used for the last five years to get these additional PPD examinations. Prior to the change in 2017, there were approximately 5,000 average PPD examinations per year happening. After we got the change in 2017, the average number is 5,380 PPD examinations per year. That is an increase of less than 400 PPDs per year, and that does not account for a population increase. That is just raw numbers.

Since those changes in the statute resulted in less than an 8 percent increase in the number of PPD examinations, we cannot begin to understand how we could see an increase of nearly 2,000 additional PPD examinations per year. The self-insured employers, insurers, gaming, and individuals who pay for PPD examinations do not believe they are going to be hit with these dramatic increases. We do not think additional staffing would necessarily be required

as a result of this bill. We always support any additional staffing that DIR needs to help the Nevada injured workers and employers move these cases along.

With regard to the fiscal note for the additional investigators, the change in the statute in this particular bill only indicates that the jurisdiction for DIR to continue to administer an investigation on these claims extinguishes after 90 days. That is important because currently after 90 days, it is already deemed denied, meaning if we make a request to DIR to do a benefit penalty assessment or investigation and they fail to do that in 90 days, then that is deemed a denial by existing law. That exists now as a matter of law that the matter has been denied, and then the parties can litigate it going forward. The DIR has 120 to 130 of these complaints that they currently can clear per year. However, they receive more than 230 per year right now. They already have an existing need for more investigators to deal with the existing loads.

Lastly, with regard to the software updates, it is my understanding that this Committee has already allotted somewhere on the order of \$2 million to \$2.1 million to DIR for an upgrade of their CARDS system. The fiscal note that is attached to this bill seems to us to address changes that DIR is making for other updates which you have funded, and this bill's changes could be done at the same time. I do not have anything further other than any comments by Mr. Knobel. I am free for any questions from your Committee.

**John Knobel, Director, Government and Regulatory Affairs, Employers:**

Mr. Mills has walked through the majority of the sections of this bill. I will finish briefly with those sections important to employers. A section in the proposed amendment references the physical location of insurance adjusters who adjust workers' compensation changes. This is an outgrowth of the changes we have all experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic as businesses were more easily able to operate virtually across state lines, and the insurance industry is no different here. That section would allow certain licensed adjusters to adjust claims out of state. This legislation also includes important safeguards by requiring representatives to be available to Nevada employees during Nevada business hours. The bill still requires adjusters working on behalf of the self-insured to be located within the state. Finally, any out-of-state adjuster would still be required to be licensed pursuant to Nevada law. These are high-demand jobs, and what we are doing here is providing flexibility to expand services in Nevada.

Next, section 6.3 and section 6.7 in the bill modify Assembly Bill 370 of the 80th Session. What that bill did was put in a 2.3 percent cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for workers injured prior to that date. In Nevada, we have a lifetime reopening of claims. There are still thousands of claims on the books that date back as far as the 1950s that need to be administered. The majority of these claims are administered by Employers Insurance Company, which used to be the State Industrial Insurance System before Nevada privatized workers' compensation in the late 1990s. When the Legislature approved Assembly Bill 370 of the 80th Session, employers were responsible for providing the vast majority of those COLAs. Assembly Bill 370 of the 80th Session requires insurers to pay those COLA adjustments to the claimants, which are then submitted to DIR for verification and

reimbursement via assessments on all insurers. However, A.B. 370 of the 80th Session lacked a mechanism to handle COLA reimbursement payments to the insurers in a timely manner. All this section is trying to do is create the mechanism by establishing definitive timelines for determinations and payments and then also clarifying the dispute resolution process should one arise.

We had a repealed section in the bill drafted in section 10 on page 27. That section is no longer being repealed because after some discussions with the Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, we do not think the language is ready for prime time yet. We will be working on that in another session. To echo Mr. Mills, when we reviewed this language, we did not see that there would be a drastic increase in PPD claims. I am happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

What is the amendment that you are referencing? There was an amendment presented in the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor that is in the 1st Reprint. Is there an additional amendment that has been submitted?

**Jason Mills:**

Yes, that is correct [[Exhibit O](#)].

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I am unsure whether any of the members have that amendment. That did not make it to my file. I am having a copy brought to me. Would the Department of Business and Industry and the Department of Administration step up to speak to their fiscal notes?

**Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration:**

I can speak about the risk management fiscal note because the Risk Management Division is part of the Department of Administration. We looked at the bill impacting us in managing risk management and the workers' compensation program for the state as an employer. That is what we oversee at the Department of Administration. Section 6 would expand coverage for accepted claims to request a second permanent partial disability evaluation. Our estimate would be these could increase by 25 percent and cost roughly \$41,000 per fiscal year. The result of these claims or the second evaluations could result in an increase of approximately 10 percent in what we distribute for workers' compensation claims. That is how we get to our approximate total of \$600,000 per fiscal year to impact the risk management workers' compensation fund. I am available for any questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

You heard the presentation from the presenters with the numbers that they had. They have determined that the increase would not align with your calculations, but these are your calculations. My question for you is this is not a State General Fund account because this is fee funded; will you be able to absorb these costs?

**Matthew Tuma:**

We have pursued work programs in previous fiscal years and in the current fiscal year for increases in our workers' compensation liability. Many of the members who serve on the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) will probably remember we submitted a work program this fiscal year to increase our workers' compensation payments expenditure authority by over \$6 million at the January IFC meeting. We could tap into reserves that are collected. During our current biennium, we stretched those reserves to a minimum. Those should be replenished with the revising of rates and with the increasing of these rates for agencies as we head into the next biennium, but we did reach dangerously low levels in our reserves for risk management and contemplated having to increase rates midbiennium. That is always one of the evaluations we would do. If we do not have reserves sufficient to meet the liability for the state's obligations, then we would look at raising rates midbiennium.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

With the amendment that was presented this morning [[Exhibit O](#)], would that have any effect on the numbers or the totals included in your fiscal note?

**Matthew Tuma:**

It is our belief it would not impact our fiscal note for this legislation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Thank you for your comments on the fiscal note. You were just speaking for the Department of Administration, but you are not referencing the Department of Business and Industry's fiscal note, correct?

**Matthew Tuma:**

I am here solely to represent the Department of Administration's fiscal note, not any of the information for any of the other departments.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone here from DIR? Unfortunately, they are not here in the audience to address any questions we have on their fiscal note. Members, do you have any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] We will reach out to DIR to have a conversation with them about their fiscal note. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint)?

**Lea Case, representing American Property Casualty Insurance Association:**

The American Property Casualty Insurance Association is in support of A.B. 441 (R1) and appreciates the modernization efforts.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 441 (R1)?

**Dalton Hooks, representing Nevada Self Insurers Association:**

I am calling in support. We have supported this bill in the policy hearing. There have been some amendments, and I am here to offer a couple of clarifications. With respect to the increase in the number of PPD examinations, the members of the Nevada Self Insurers Association have worked with the sponsor on this bill and reached an amicable solution, but the bill by its nature is going to increase the number of PPDs. It expands the pool of people who are available to have PPDs paid for by the insurers of a third-party administrator. I believe there will be an increase in terms of the number that is to be determined.

With respect to section 10, which concerns the licensing of adjusters, we are still working with the sponsors regarding that language. The language we are working with now would allow out-of-state adjusters not to have to sit for a Nevada test while those in the state would. That is a simple clarification. With those clarifications, I yield.

**Charles Nort, President, Nevada Alternative Solutions:**

We are a third-party administrator (TPA) in Las Vegas. We believe if this bill passes, there will be jobs lost from Nevadans, and it is a bad bill for Nevada. The reason why we say this is there has been a bricks-and-mortar statute in Nevada for decades. There are a number of other jurisdictions that have similar statutes, including Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Montana, New Mexico, and Nevada. Nevada is a unique jurisdiction for workers' compensation. If this bill passes and allows out-of-state adjusters as the new language is implemented, I believe I will lose between five and eight employees. At the other Assembly policy hearing, there were many adjusters who testified in opposition to this bill simply for the fact that they will lose their jobs as well. Many of those have 20 years of experience or are single mothers, as well as in my particular TPA, staff have 20 years and 15 years of experience.

Section 3 contains no requirement for any experience to adjust claims out of state. Yes, they have to be licensed adjusters. However, the problem with that is who is going to ensure that they have any experience in adjusting claims in Nevada or any experience with Nevada law. Additionally, there is a program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) that requires the participants to go for risk management. Now, if out-of-state adjusting is allowed, local programs at UNLV and the University of Nevada, Reno, specifically the law school and this particular risk management, I believe they will be impacted by that as well simply because of the fact that who is going to be able to use a license here if they have to go out of state to use it. Many of the carriers that do business require a specific individual assigned to their accounts as well. I am concerned about having no experience, no supervision, and also impacting DIR with respect to their enforcement and accountability. I would leave it at that.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There are no additional callers choosing to testify in opposition, so we will move to the neutral position. Does anyone want to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 441 (R1)? [There was no one.] We will ask the presenters if you have any closing comments?

**John Knobel:**

I have one point about the opposition testimony. Nevada is only one of eight states that still have the bricks-and-mortar requirement. Most states have already moved to allowing out-of-state adjusting. If you are licensed within Nevada, there are 26 states that adopt us with reciprocity. This is a high-demand career. Right now, what we are looking at is more of a lack of adjusters than anything else, which is why we are looking for this type of flexibility.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 441 (R1) and open the hearing on the last bill on our agenda, which will be Assembly Bill 445.

**Assembly Bill 445: Revises provisions relating to the mental health of children.  
(BDR 32-1004)**

**Assemblywoman Sabra Newby, Assembly District No. 10:**

The impetus for Assembly Bill 445 was an October 2022 report from the U.S. Department of Justice on the state of mental health services for children in Nevada. The report found that Nevada lacks community-based mental health services for children. As a result, Nevada institutionalizes children at a much higher rate than we should or is allowable under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Even in those institutions or in those situations where institutionalizing or putting children into institutions is appropriate, we still lack those resources in Nevada. Oftentimes those children are sent hundreds or thousands of miles away.

I began to consider how we could think differently about this problem and bring additional tools to bear. I was reminded of the Ani DiFranco song and a line in it that says every tool is a weapon if you hold it right. Assembly Bill 445 is bringing to bear a number of different economic and incentivizing tools that Nevada uses on a regular basis to incentivize other businesses to come to the state. This bill takes those tools and applies them to the provision of children's mental health, with the idea that we would be able to recruit more service providers or encourage current service providers to expand their services to our children in this state.

This is not the policy committee, this is the money committee, so I will dive right into those fiscal notes. There are two fiscal notes. One is from the Department of Taxation and that stems from the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED) tool. What I did in the bill is adapt the GOED process to children's mental health services. It allows new or expanded service providers to apply for tax incentives through a modified GOED process. The Department of Taxation is seeking new personnel to take in those applications, manage them, and make sure that adequate tax breaks are given to those companies. The second fiscal note is from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services.



But back to the Department of Taxation; there is a large fiscal note on that. The \$5 million cost comes from the modified business tax. That is another tool, and you may recognize it from a certain scholarship program that we have in our state. What I have done is take the front part of that system and the incentive for the donations for corporations to get the tax credit on their modified business tax. I apply it to children's mental health services and the rates on the back end. You will see that also on the Department of Taxation fiscal note because it is negative revenue.

Going back to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), after the first year in which one of these providers is providing services to our children in Nevada, they may apply for cost-based reimbursement. This is a tool that we currently use elsewhere in DHHS. It is used in the Nevada Certified Community Behavioral Health Centers. Moving from regular Medicaid rates to the cost-based rates that these providers could apply for is the genesis of the fiscal note from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy. This morning, the Division told me there was an error in that fiscal note, and it is reduced to \$4.2 million in the fiscal year. I believe the revision was provided to staff, and I also provided a copy to the Chair this morning. I understand the Division is here to speak to that.

Members of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means will know about the federal matching dollars that we can draw down. You will see in the DHHS fiscal note that we do have some federal dollars. My intent was to structure the modified business tax credit program to then take those funds and match them to federal funds and then use those in those rates for children's mental health. I believe the Division of Child and Family Services, DHHS, can speak to that. That is an overview of the bill and the fiscal notes. I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

My first question would be, did you work with the Department of Health and Human Services in the drafting of the language to get to where we are today?

**Assemblywoman Newby:**

Yes, we did meet early on in the session and have had ongoing email conversations since.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

I will invite those who have fiscal notes on the bill to speak. We have the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy and the Department of Taxation. Those are the only two. Please speak in response to the fiscal notes and how this will impact your agencies if this legislation becomes law.

**Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services:**

The Division would like to reduce our fiscal note based on the reduction in the vendor support costs, which was originally \$1,585,724 to \$845,469. That would be a total cost for the biennium with those changes of \$4,246,378, including \$1,681,412 in State General Fund.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

The General Fund portion is \$1,681,412?

**Lynnette Aaron:**

Yes, \$1,681,412.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

For the Department of Taxation, it looks like there are some big losses here.

**Jeffrey Mitchell, Deputy Director, Local Government Services, Department of Taxation:**

As mentioned in the presentation, there are certain abatements that are offered through GOED, as well as within this bill there is a credit program for those who make a donation to a specified account. The account is to improve mental health services for children. The fiscal note that we have provided is for personnel to help administer the credit program to make sure that it is tracked correctly and applied to the appropriate accounts and for correspondence to and from taxpayers and to the different divisions with which we need to coordinate.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

On your fiscal note, you show a loss of \$5,142,803 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and an additional loss of \$5,175,117 in FY 2025, correct?

**Jeffrey Mitchell:**

That is correct, \$5 million is for the credits that are being offered as negative revenue, and the difference between that and the total is the personnel costs for the two positions that we are requesting.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

During this legislative session, we have heard a lot about compensation packages and benefits like that for our state employees. Do you believe you will be able to fill those positions moving forward?

**Jeffrey Mitchell:**

Yes.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We hate to set up a new program and then not have the personnel to make sure those programs are successful. Members, are there any questions now? There are some individuals hastily looking through the bill. Are there any questions for the presenter or on the fiscal notes that have been presented? I am not hearing any. They may have a question after we get through testimony, so stay tuned. This is an innovative idea.

**Assemblywoman Newby:**

I neglected to mention that the Division of Child and Family Services, DHHS, does not have a fiscal note on this bill. I do have an amendment that is a policy amendment for some processes for GOED, but it does not affect the money aspect of the bill. I will propose that amendment on the floor.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We will move to testimony in support of A.B. 445.

**Lea Case, representing National Alliance on Mental Illness, Nevada Chapter:**

The National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), Nevada Chapter is in support of A.B. 445. There was a mention of negative revenue, this \$5 million potential impact. We would look at that instead as a \$5 million investment in children's mental health services. Over the 2021 interim, about \$14 million was dedicated to children's mental health and wraparound services through the Interim Finance Committee process through American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 funding. In response partially to the U.S. Department of Justice report, the amount has not been fully appropriated this legislative session. We are up to about \$2 million, maybe \$5 million total, depending on what those budget closings look like. We are still a bit short of a comprehensive children's mental health program being fully funded here in the state of Nevada. This gets us part of the way there.

I would also like to support section 10, which would provide the reinvestment to our providers. We know our Medicaid rates are low in the state. I have had some great conversations with Assemblywoman Newby on ensuring that the provider rate increase from this fund would impact both fee-for-service Medicaid and managed-care Medicaid, which will likely be statewide by 2026. Anything impacting the fee-for-service provider rates would be phased out by then. I know NAMI Nevada is in support and looks forward to furthering children's mental health progress in the state.

**Jeanette K. Belz, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association:**

There is not much I can add. Lea knows a great deal about this. I want to thank the sponsor for her creative use of a solution that has not historically been used in this space.

**Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am testifying on behalf of anything that improves children's mental health. We are not Argentina. We do not disappear people. What I am saying by that is let us not send everybody out of state, let us address our own issues. We have that ability. We are growing our graduate medical education to give us more child and adolescent psychiatrists. What we need are more beds, more facilities, and then ultimately, more resources in the community. I will not say our friends on the East Coast, because they are in the Department of Justice, but they are giving us this year to solve the problem ourselves. They have already tipped their hand and said next year, we get to go to court. You can do this now because you choose to, or you can do this next year because there is a bayonet at your back. But those are the two choices we are winding up with now. I ask you to be proactive as opposed to reactive. I am part of the Nevada Psychiatric Association.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**  
Ditto.

**Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities:**

Individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities (IDD) are at an increased risk of co-occurring disabilities with mental health conditions. These mental health conditions include but are not limited to major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, anxiety disorder, et cetera. People with IDD and mental health conditions often experience symptoms that lead to services being provided within the mental health service system framework. Most mental health professionals do not receive sufficient training in the needs of the diverse population. Our Council does recognize the challenges that policymakers and administrators face in addressing the current needs of mental health care in Nevada. Current available treatment options in Nevada are insufficient to serve the current needs of the community. Increased access to mental health services is necessary to meet the needs of those with IDD and mental health conditions. We wholeheartedly support this legislation.

**Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:**

I would like to underscore the last person who was there in Carson City who said let us be proactive. I represented my Coalition on the call with the U.S. Department of Justice last year, and we need to be proactive in this matter. I also would like to ditto the testimony of Catherine Nielsen and the other people who are in support. Thank you to Assemblywoman Newby for bringing this bill and why not; Please support this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

There are no additional callers to testify in support. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 445? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on this bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 445. We are going to take a five-minute recess [at 11:52 a.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 12 p.m.]

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

We are going to call this meeting back to order to do a few work sessions before we break for lunch and go into recess, then come back a bit later. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint). We will turn it over to our Fiscal Analyst.

**Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. (BDR 40-327)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 137 (1st Reprint) expands the provisions relating to the confidentiality of information regarding referrals of an individual to a program for fetal alcohol syndrome to all fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. A fiscal note was provided by the Division of Health Care

Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services. If this bill were to be approved, a total of \$825,840 would have to be authorized in the bill, of which \$273,313 would be provided for State General Fund appropriations over the 2023-2025 biennium.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 137 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters.

Members, I thought we would be able to get through a few work sessions, but we are being called to the Assembly floor, so we must go downstairs. We will be in recess, and we will come back at the call of the Chair, but looking at the schedule that we are going to have for today, we may not get back here until around 5 p.m. We will stand in recess [at 12:03 p.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 7:10 p.m.]

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the continuing version of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means meeting. It seems like it is just one big meeting that goes on and on. We will bring the Committee meeting back to order, and we are going to open with a bill draft request introduction.

**BDR S-1205**—Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 526](#).)

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

This bill draft request (BDR) revises provisions relating to state financial administration. Members, this is just a BDR introduction and a vote in favor is not saying that you agree with the policy or not, but it just helps move it along in the process to become a bill. Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED FOR COMMITTEE  
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1205.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Members, because we need to get back to the floor, we will not hear any more bills now. We are just going to do work sessions. I will open the work session on Assembly Bill 6. I will turn it over to our Fiscal Analyst.

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

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 6 requires the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services to establish health care cost growth benchmarks and take certain actions related to benchmarks, defines related terms, and requires the Patient Protection Commission to submit benchmark recommendations. A fiscal note was submitted on this bill from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services. The Committee may wish to amend the bill to provide State General Fund appropriations of \$33,768 and authorizations of \$33,768 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and General Fund appropriations of \$42,694 and authorizations of \$42,694 in FY 2025 in order for the Division to establish a new economist position. The motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 6.

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 YEAGER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint). Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to electronic health records. We will turn it over to our Fiscal staff.

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

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

Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint) was presented by Senator Fabian Doñate, Senate District 10, on May 29, 2023. Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint) authorizes the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services to contract with one or more health information exchanges to be responsible for compiling statewide master indexes of patients, health care providers, and payers. The bill requires the Director to prescribe standards governing the maintenance and exchange of electronic health records and prohibits the Director from requiring any person to use the health information exchange.

The bill also requires medical facilities and health care providers, beginning January 1, 2028, to store, transmit, and exchange health records electronically in a manner that: (1) allows patients to electronically access their health records, and (2) provides for the interoperability of health records with the electronic health records and systems of other facilities and health care providers. Assembly Bill 7 (1st Reprint) appropriates \$3 million from the State General Fund to the Department to award grants to certain small facilities and health care providers in small business settings to assist with the implementation of an electronic health information exchange.

Regarding the fiscal impact, there were two fiscal notes submitted, one from the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the system cost for implementation and ongoing maintenance that would begin in fiscal year (FY) 2027 as well as contract staff that would be needed to facilitate the implementation also beginning in FY 2027. The system implementation cost was \$316,000, ongoing cost for the system would be \$395,520, and the contract staff costs totaled \$339,822. Again, those are all beginning in FY 2027.

The Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, had also identified the fiscal impact relating to the computer system interface costs for the health records system that would cost approximately \$222,000. Both the Division of Child and Family Services and the Aging and Disability Services Division testified during the bill hearing confirming that their costs would be out in the future biennium. Therefore, the Committee would not need to amend the bill to account for any appropriations or authorizations. If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the motion would be to do pass as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I want clarification. Did you say this was an optional program for the medical records for the doctors and patients? Is this an opt-in type of program?

**Brody Leiser:**

I know that the bill prohibits the Director from requiring any person to use the health information exchange. It does require medical facilities and health care providers beginning on January 1, 2028, to store, transmit, and exchange health records electronically in a manner that would allow patients to electronically access their health records and provide for the interoperability of health records with the electronic health records and systems of other health facilities and health care providers. Again, that is beginning on January 1, 2028.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED  
ASSEMBLY BILL 7 (1ST REPRINT).

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 YEAGER  
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign this floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 28 (1st Reprint). This bill establishes the Nevada Baby Bonds Program. I will turn it over to our Fiscal Analyst.

**Assembly Bill 28 (1st Reprint): Establishes the Nevada Baby Bonds Program.  
(BDR 18-356)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 28 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 17, 2023. Assembly Bill 28 (1st Reprint) establishes the Nevada Baby Bonds Trust Fund, which requires the State Treasurer, upon notification of the birth of a designated beneficiary, to, within the limits of money made available for the purpose, credit \$3,200 to the Trust Fund to the designated beneficiary. A designated beneficiary is a natural person born in the state on or after January 1, 2024, whose birth was subject to medical coverage provided under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program. The designated beneficiary may receive money from the Trust Fund if the beneficiary attests that they are at least 18 but less than 30 years of age; have been a resident of the state for at least 12 months immediately preceding the submission of the claim; and will use the money for postsecondary education, to purchase a home, start a business, or invest in financial assets of personal capital that provide a long-term gain to the wages or wealth of the beneficiary.



An amendment was submitted by the State Treasurer to reduce the State General Fund appropriation in section 16 from \$80 million to \$5 million over the biennium, so the amount would be \$2.5 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$2.5 million in FY 2025. This would allow the State Treasurer to expend not more than 5 percent of the Trust Fund's appropriation each year for administrative expenses, and it would amend section 9 to allow the State Treasurer to credit \$3,200 to the Trust Fund to designate beneficiaries through a random lottery system if there were insufficient funds to cover all children born under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program in a given year. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or discussions? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 28 (1ST REPRINT).

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 YEAGER  
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 128.

**Assembly Bill 128: Makes an appropriation to the Outdoor Education and Recreation  
Grant Program Account for the costs of the program. (BDR S-778)**

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

Assembly Bill 128 makes an appropriation to the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program Account for the cost of the program. Assembly Bill 128 was presented by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District 41, on May 16, 2023, and appropriates State General Funds of \$500,000 in each fiscal year of the 2023-2025 biennium to the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program Account created by *Nevada Revised Statutes* 407A.615. There were no amendments presented during the bill hearing for this legislation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions on what you just heard from Mr. Leiser? [There were none.] I do have an amendment for this bill [[Exhibit P](#)]. The bill as written would appropriate \$500,000 in each fiscal year for the 2023-2025 biennium. But Senate Bill 474 was part of the Governor's recommended budget at \$250,000. I am going to recommend that

we amend this bill to be more in line with the Governor's recommendation for \$250,000 in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium.

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 128.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to planning for the provision of behavioral health care. (BDR 39-325)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 30, 2023. Assembly Bill 201 (1st Reprint) expands the responsibilities related to the provision of behavioral health services of the Commission on Behavioral Health, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services. The bill requires the Department to quantify, track, and make recommendations on the spending of federal and state funds on the children's behavioral health system of care and the reinvestment of certain savings. This bill also requires the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services to collaborate with various state and local entities to conduct an interim study on the feasibility of a comprehensive state plan to provide a continuum of behavioral health care services for adults and children.

The bill creates a statewide mental health consortium to represent existing regional mental health consortia and reinstates the requirement that the subcommittee on the mental health of children of the Commission on Behavioral Health create a statewide plan for the provision of mental health services for children. The bill as amended had removed the fiscal impact for the Department of Health and Human Services' Division of Child and Family Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and Division of Health Care Financing and Policy. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to do pass as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED  
ASSEMBLY BILL 201 (1ST REPRINT).

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 YEAGER  
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 203 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 203 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to special license plates.  
(BDR 43-118)**

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

Assembly Bill 203 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to special license plates. The bill was presented by Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II, Assembly District 36, on May 23, 2023. Assembly Bill 203 (1st Reprint) authorizes the combination of personalized prestige license plates and certain special license plates associated with military or public service. The bill would expand the exemption from the payment of certain parking fees for vehicles with certain specially designed license plates associated with military service to any vehicle with certain specially designed license plates and family members of persons killed in the line of duty or who died of injuries sustained while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States. Assembly Bill 203 (1st Reprint) also provides for a criminal penalty for persons who make certain false statements or submit false, fraudulent, or misleading evidence in connection with an application for certain specially designed license plates.

Regarding the fiscal impact, the Department of Motor Vehicles provided a fiscal note on the bill indicating that the revised effective date had removed their programming impact to the Legacy system. There was also a fiscal note submitted by the Nevada System of Higher Education indicating that the bill as amended had removed their fiscal impact that was initially identified. There would be no required amendments to add funding or authorizations for this bill. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to do pass as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or discussion? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED  
ASSEMBLY BILL 203 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 33-150)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 30, 2023. Assembly Bill 252 (1st Reprint) prescribes new duties for the Administrator of the Division of Museums and History, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, including creating a website accessible to persons with disabilities, creating an Account for Improving Access to State Museums for Persons with Disabilities in the State General Fund and requiring monies to be expended only to improve access at institutions for the Division for persons with disabilities, revising membership qualifications of the Board of Museums and History, and requiring the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs to conduct a study during the 2023-2024 interim on issues that exist which limit the accessibility of persons with disabilities to access the institutions of the Division.

There was a fiscal note from the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs that requested \$25,000 to develop and maintain the website, and that would be an appropriation in fiscal year 2025. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to amend and do pass to include the \$25,000.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 252 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. Moving on, we will open the work session on Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing adoption. (BDR 11-658)**

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

Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing adoption. The bill was presented this morning by Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District 29. Assembly Bill 255 (1st Reprint) authorizes an agency that provides child welfare services to provide financial assistance to a family who adopts a child with special needs until the child graduates high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. The existing statute provides support until the child turns 18, becomes self-sustaining, or is emancipated.

A revised fiscal note was submitted by the Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services. There is some clarification provided about the change in the fiscal note as originally submitted versus the fiscal note as revised. The Division clarified during the bill hearing that the original fiscal note had only addressed the rural areas, and the Division realized that there is a need to address Washoe County and Clark County.

I am going to go over the appropriations and authorizations that would be needed to fund the costs for the fiscal note which are to provide adoption subsidies. This would impact three budget accounts. The first would be the Rural Child Welfare budget account. The funding needed in fiscal year (FY) 2024 for State General Fund appropriations would be \$58,022 and authorizations of \$78,932; and General Fund appropriations of \$70,772 and authorizations of \$90,975 in FY 2025. For the Washoe County Child Welfare budget, the funding needed in FY 2024 is General Fund appropriations of \$180,598 and authorizations of \$244,310; and General Fund appropriations of \$142,587 and authorizations of \$182,299 in FY 2025. In the Clark County Child Welfare budget, the funding needed in FY 2024 is General Fund appropriations of \$494,830 and authorizations of \$694,305; and \$641,828 in General Fund appropriations and authorizations of \$850,107 in FY 2025. The total for all three budgets over the biennium is General Fund appropriations of \$1,588,637 and authorizations of \$2,140,928. If the Committee wishes to provide funding for the adoption subsidies, the motion would be to amend to account for the General Fund appropriations and authorizations. The motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 255 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 258 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 258 (1st Reprint): Enacts certain provisions governing the confidentiality of certain personal information of a donor, member or volunteer of a nonprofit organization. (BDR 19-605)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 258 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. Assembly Bill 258 (1st Reprint) requires, with certain exceptions, a governmental entity to keep confidential any personal information in the records of governmental entities that identifies a person as a donor, member, or volunteer of a nonprofit organization, and prohibits, with certain exceptions, governmental entities from requiring that any person or nonprofit organization provide the governmental entity with personal information that identifies a donor, member, or volunteer of a nonprofit organization; releasing or publicizing or otherwise publicly disclosing personal information that identifies a donor, member, or volunteer of a nonprofit organization; or requiring a current or prospective contractor or grantee to provide a list of nonprofit organizations to which a contractor or grantee has provided support.

An amendment was submitted by the sponsor and among other various policy issues, it strikes section 2.5. It changes the effective date to July 1, 2024, and it requests that \$249,577 be placed in fiscal year 2025 in the Interim Finance Committee's Restricted Contingency Account for the Office of the Attorney General in the event that the Attorney General's Office requires additional resources to support the potential risk of exposed growth as a result of this bill. The motion would be to amend and do pass if the Committee wishes to move this bill.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 258 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DICKMAN AND O'NEILL  
VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEN KASAMA AND YEAGER WERE  
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing wages for persons with disabilities. (BDR 39-13)**

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

Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing wages for persons with disabilities. This bill was presented this morning by Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District 42. Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint) prohibits providers of jobs and day training services from entering into contracts with employers to provide for the employment of persons with developmental or intellectual disabilities a wage that is less than the state minimum wage starting January 1, 2025, and prohibits subminimum wages for all such providers starting January 1, 2028.

The bill also authorizes a recipient of jobs and day training services to have an advocate present at certain employment meetings. Assembly Bill 259 (1st Reprint) requires providers of jobs and day training services to develop a plan to transition persons earning less than the state minimum wage to earning at least the state minimum wage by January 1, 2028, or support such persons in obtaining competitive integrated employment, supported employment, or community activities related to the goals of the persons, and to assist such persons to participate in certain activities.

The bill also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to amend the Medicaid home and community-based services waiver to include certain rehabilitation services designed to assist persons in pursuing competitive integrated employment, including benefit counseling and job coaching as medical assistance under the State Plan for Medicaid, and to authorize the compensation of a recipient of Medicaid who is receiving prevocational services at a rate equal to or greater than the state minimum.

Regarding the fiscal impact, the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, indicated that the service costs associated with the new rehabilitation services to be added to the State Plan for Medicaid under this act were estimated to be \$1,066,080 per year beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2025. The Committee could consider amending the bill to appropriate State General Funds and authorize funding for the Aging and Disability Services Division to support those service costs. In FY 2025 this would require General Fund appropriations of \$395,729 and authorizations of \$670,351. If the Committee wishes to account for that funding, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 259 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.



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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 260.

**Assembly Bill 260: Exempts veterans service organizations from various fees imposed on persons conducting business in this State. (BDR 7-73)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 260 was heard on May 19, 2023. Assembly Bill 260 exempts veterans service organizations and any agents or officers of veterans service organizations from certain business fees, including the issuance and renewal of state business licenses, filings required in connection with the registration of registered agents, and various filings to satisfy requirements imposed on a business entity.

During the hearing, the Secretary of State testified that the annual fees related to the various organizations that would provide for the exemption of this would total a revenue loss of approximately \$4,500 per year. There would be no amendments as a result of this fiscal impact. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 260.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 261 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 261 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 18-470)**

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

Assembly Bill 261 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to water. This bill was presented by the Executive Director of WaterStart on May 16, 2023. Assembly Bill 261 (1st Reprint) requires the Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor,



to include a statement in the State Plan for Economic Development regarding the manner in which the state can maximize the efficient use of the water resources of the state through its economic development programs. The bill requires the Office of Economic Development to conduct a study of consumptive water use and economic development of businesses receiving certain abatements and submit a report of its findings to the Governor and Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 83rd Session of the Nevada Legislature.

Regarding the fiscal impacts, the Governor's Office of Economic Development initially submitted a fiscal note of \$25,000 associated with amending the State Plan for Economic Development. However, a subsequent fiscal note was submitted removing those costs. Originally, the Office of Energy, Office of the Governor, was tasked with the study at a cost of approximately \$300,000. However, in the amendment through the policy committee, the responsibility of the study was revised to the Governor's Office of Economic Development. Therefore, there is no longer an impact for the Office of Energy.

During the bill hearing, a conceptual amendment was presented that would delete section 3, which required the study. Therefore, there would be no cost associated with the study. That amendment is posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, and it limited the regional development authorities located in a county with a population of over 100,000. If the Committee wishes to move the bill, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 261 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 263 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 263 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions relating to the transmission of Legionnaires' disease by building water systems in certain health care facilities. (BDR 40-125)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 263 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. Assembly Bill 263 (1st Reprint) requires an owner or operator of a covered health care facility to minimize the risk of Legionnaires' disease transmissions by adopting and implementing a water management plan for the facility's water system, which must be reviewed annually by the Administrator of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services. The plan must be designed by a certified water management team and include provisions for water samples at specific locations.

The sponsor of the bill submitted a conceptual amendment and with the conceptual amendment, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health indicated that their fiscal note and the fiscal impact would be eliminated. The conceptual amendment changes the definition of covered health care facility to mean intermediate care facilities that are Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) certified nursing homes, facilities for skilled nursing that are CMS-certified skilled nursing homes, hospitals that are CMS certified as hospitals or critical access hospitals. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion with the conceptual amendment would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 263 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ANDERSON, DICKMAN, HAFEN, AND O'NEILL VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEN KASAMA AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing instructional time in public schools. (BDR 34-607)**

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

Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing instructional time in public schools. This bill was heard this morning and presented by Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva,

Assembly District 28. Assembly Bill 296 (1st Reprint) requires each school district to report to the Department of Education the aggregate time spent in each of its schools conducting and preparing for certain examinations and assessments. The bill requires the Department of Education to submit these reports to the Legislature or the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education and develop regulations prohibiting the use of more than 2 percent of the total number of annual minutes of attendance for such purposes, and provide assistance and develop corrective action plans for schools that use more than 2 percent of the total number of annual minutes of attendance for such purposes.

There was some discussion around the fiscal impact. Initially, the Department of Education had submitted a no impact fiscal note on the bill as introduced. Following the amendment out of the policy committee, information was provided by the Department of Education indicating that they would need 51 full-time-equivalent staff to address the workload required by the bill as amended. However, during the bill hearing this morning, Assemblyman D'Silva presented a proposed amendment that would amend section 1.5, subsection 4 to read that on or before July 1, 2025, the Department shall develop a plan on how it will provide assistance to schools that violate the limitation described in paragraph (a), subsection 2, *Nevada Revised Statutes* 390.805, and create a corrective action plan for such schools to limit the time to conduct or prepare for an examination or assessment to not more than 2 percent of the total number of annual minutes of attendance required for a pupil.

The amendment would only require the Department to develop a plan rather than provide assistance to each school. During the bill hearing, the Superintendent of Public Instruction testified that the proposed amendment by Assemblyman D'Silva would remove the Department of Education from the requirement to work with every single school and therefore removed its fiscal impact. If the Committee wishes to move this bill with the amendment proposed by Assemblyman D'Silva, there would be no requirement to add appropriations and authorizations as the Department of Education confirmed during the hearing that their fiscal impact would be removed. Therefore, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 296 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

I have read the proposed conceptual amendment. I am going to vote this out of Committee today; I look forward to seeing the amendment on the floor. However, I do want to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 310 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 310 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing affordable housing.  
(BDR 25-1032)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 310 (1st Reprint) was heard in Committee on May 19, 2023. This bill requires the Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry, subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such a purpose, to develop and implement a supportive housing grant program. The program must include a process for applying for a grant to procure and develop supportive housing and fund the operation of supportive housing partnerships. The Division must consult with the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing before approving any applications for a grant to procure and develop supportive housing; adopt regulations to carry out the grant program, which must include the criteria for eligibility to receive money and procedures for the submission and review of applications; and submit an annual report containing certain information about the grant program to the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

The bill also creates the Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund in the State Treasury to be used to carry out the grant program and makes an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund in an amount of \$32.2 million.

With respect to the fiscal impact of the bill, there is \$32.2 million in General Fund appropriations that are provided in section 4 of the bill. A fiscal note was submitted by the Department of Business and Industry, which is inclusive of the \$32.2 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024. The sponsor of the bill testified that for the \$282,302 that was anticipated in expenditures for FY 2025, that funding source would be available through gifts, grants, and donations in order to cover those expenditures. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to do pass as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions?

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

Is the \$32.2 million coming out of one-shot money? Do I understand correctly?

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

That is correct. Members, are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED  
ASSEMBLY BILL 310 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I am having a little trouble with this one, but I will vote yes to get it out of Committee and reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Are there any other comments? [There were none.] We have a motion on the floor.

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 319.

**Assembly Bill 319: Makes an appropriation to the State Department of Agriculture for universal free breakfast and lunch for Nevada pupils. (BDR S-1010)**

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

Assembly Bill 319 makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for universal free breakfast and lunch for Nevada pupils. Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District 41, presented this bill on May 19, 2023. As introduced, Assembly Bill 319 appropriated State General Funds of \$50 million in each fiscal year of the 2023-2025 biennium to the Department of Education to award grants to Nevada school districts to provide universal free breakfast and lunch to Nevada students.

During the bill hearing, Assemblywoman Jauregui presented an amendment to move the funding to the State Department of Agriculture that currently oversees this program. The amendment would also remove the fiscal year (FY) 2024 appropriation and reduce the FY 2025 appropriation from \$50 million to \$43 million based on projections provided by the Department to provide the universal free breakfast and lunch.

The appropriation was removed from FY 2024 in closing the budgets, and the money committees approved American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds in FY 2024 to provide for the universal free school meals for the 2023-2024 school year. That is the reason why the appropriation was removed from FY 2024 as part of the

amendment. If the Committee wishes to move the bill, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 319.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint): Establishes the Nevada Wildlife Conservation  
Program. (BDR 45-912)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 30, 2023.  
Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint) establishes the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program to support the preservation, protection, management, and restoration of wildlife and wildlife habitat. Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint) also creates the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program Account in the State General Fund and requires that money in the account be used to provide matching funds for federal grants or for the preservation, protection, management, and restoration of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint) provides that any unexpended money in the account including a direct legislative appropriation does not revert to the General Fund at the end of the fiscal year, and any interest earned in the account must stay within the account. Assembly Bill 349 (1st Reprint) directs the money in the Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program Account to be used in accordance with any recommendations of the Board of Nevada Wildlife Conservation Program, which consists of three members whose qualifications and duties are outlined in section 4 of the bill.

With regards to the fiscal impact as amended, the Department of Wildlife submitted a fiscal note on the bill as introduced but indicated that with the amendment there would be no fiscal impact that it determined at this time. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to do pass as amended.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED  
ASSEMBLY BILL 349 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to fetal alcohol spectrum  
disorders. (BDR S-774)**

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

Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. This bill was presented this morning by Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Assembly District 35. Assembly Bill 422 (1st Reprint) requires the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, to create a pilot program to be administered by the Autism Treatment Assistance Program to provide evidence-based services and support for children diagnosed with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder who do not meet the requirements to receive such services from existing programs.

The bill additionally requires the Division to submit a report of findings and recommendations resulting from the pilot program by July 1, 2025, to the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services.

The Aging and Disability Services Division submitted a fiscal note identifying the total fiscal impact of approximately \$2.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$2.6 million in FY 2025 for costs associated with contract staff, travel, equipment, operating costs, full-time state staff, and program training costs.

During the bill hearing, Assemblywoman Gorelow presented a proposed amendment, which is posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. Among other things, the proposed amendment clarifies that the pilot program would be to the extent that money is available. During the bill hearing this morning, the Aging and Disability Services Division testified and confirmed that with the amendment, the fiscal impact could be removed and indicated that there may be federal funds that would be available to assist with this pilot program. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, there would be no requirement to add

State General Funds or authorizations. If the Committee wishes to do that and move forward with the amendment presented by Assemblywoman Gorelow, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 422 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 428 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 428 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to economic development.  
(BDR 18-775)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 428 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. The bill requires the Office of the State Treasurer to establish a tuition reimbursement program for individuals who complete a Teacher Academy College Pathway Program or who have worked as a full-time licensed teacher in a public school for three years. In addition, the bill requires the Office of Workforce Innovation, Office of the Governor, to establish and administer a Career Pathways Demonstration Program to develop and implement career pathways that will enable students to prepare for employment in professions which serve the long-term needs of the state.

Assembly Bill 428 (1st Reprint) also requires the Clark County School District to offer a Teacher Academy College Pathway Program at every high school in the school district to enable pupils in grades 10 through 12 to prepare for employment in the profession of K-12 education. The sponsor of the bill submitted a conceptual amendment that includes a \$10 million appropriation to the Office of the State Treasurer to fund the tuition abatement program. This will go into an interest-bearing account that does not anticipate being drawn for five or more years. It also creates payments to individuals, which would be one-third over a three-year period. It provides language for expanding the program to other work-based learning opportunities and clarifies that the program is required for high schools with at least 250 students. If the Committee wishes to approve this, the motion would be to amend and do pass with the additional \$10 million.



**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions?

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I want to thank Assemblywoman Backus for working on this. I want to verify that the \$10 million would be available for students who graduated from schools that are also outside of Clark County, although it is only schools in the large school districts that would need to have an academy in every school site. I want to verify that other schools are able to apply for it that are not in Clark County.

**Assemblywoman Backus:**

I would have to look at the amendment. I do not have it in front of me, but I believe that the benefit is for anyone who does complete the program. If a school outside of the largest school district decides to have the pathways program at their school, then a student who goes through the pathways program would be eligible to continue on to a school within our state subject to the Nevada System of Higher Education. Once they finish the program and have additional training, it is the last funds that would be provided for in that \$10 million appropriation.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

One moment, members.

**Sarah Coffman:**

I overlooked that there was also a fiscal impact for the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation in the amount of \$289,026 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$331,870 in FY 2025. This is primarily for the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation for a New Nevada to comply with this. They would require a management analyst 3 position. The agency also indicated it would need a management analyst 1 position to serve as a program coordinator. It is estimated that these positions would incur approximately \$1,500 of in-state travel costs per year to support the Career Pathways Demonstration Program based on the agency's prior experience. There is also an estimated \$250,000 for software solutions that is included in that cost. That would also need to be appropriated to the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation in addition to the amendment that includes the \$10 million for the grant.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Thank you for that clarification. Members, are there any other questions or comments with that additional information? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 428 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing prescription drugs. (BDR 57-652)**

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

Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing prescription drugs. This bill was presented this morning by Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District 27. Assembly Bill 434 (1st Reprint) prohibits pharmacy benefit managers and health carriers, including governmental entities that provide coverage for employees, from discriminating against a covered entity that participates in the 340B Program to purchase drugs at a discounted rate or a pharmacy that contracts with such an entity; and with regard to reimbursement, prohibits a program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services to provide therapeutics to persons with human immunodeficiency virus from taking similar action. The bill also imposes certain limitations on the use of money available to administer the program to provide therapeutics to persons with human immunodeficiency virus.

There was a proposed amendment presented at the bill hearing, which is posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. The conceptual amendment would include language in section 1, subsection 2 that clarifies that provisions of the bill do not apply to covered drugs paid through Medicaid managed care organizations. During the bill hearing this morning, the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, confirmed that with the proposed amendment there would be no fiscal impact. There was testimony by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, indicating that the cost could not be determined. With the proposed amendment, if the Committee wishes to move the bill, there would be no need to add appropriations or authorizations. The motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments on this bill? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 434 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. Moving on, the next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 468.

**Assembly Bill 468: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for certain costs related to the Enterprise Resource Planning System. (BDR S-1110)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 468 was heard by the Committee on May 27, 2023. The bill provides for the following one-time appropriations for certain costs related to the Enterprise Resource Planning System:

- A one-time State General Fund appropriation of approximately \$21.6 million and a one-time State Highway Fund appropriation of \$5 million for costs associated with implementing the Enterprise Resource Planning System.
- A one-time General Fund appropriation of \$36,425 and a one-time Highway Fund appropriation of \$8,544 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software of the operations center for the Enterprise Resource Planning System.

There was testimony from the Director of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, who indicated that the state was taking a different direction with the Enterprise Resource Planning System. There would be a total required amount of \$206.4 million for this new system. She indicated that the estimate was based on the average of previously solicited bids that were provided by vendors as well as a 20 percent inflation factor. A 25 percent increase was for the Public Employees' Benefits Program and grant-related modules. That also included \$10 million that was provided by American Rescue Plan Act dollars.

The Committee asked the Director to provide a revised estimate, which excluded the 25 percent that was provided for the additional modules, and the Director provided that information. She indicated that the amount for the previously solicited average bids equated to \$131.9 million. The inflation factor that was then applied to that amount was \$26.3 million, and excluding the various modules, the total amount would be \$158.3 million for a one-time appropriation for the system that is not inclusive of the \$10 million and additional funding from the American Rescue Plan Act. If the Committee wishes to approve this, it would be General Fund appropriations of \$158,340,629 and American Rescue Plan Act funds of \$10 million, and the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 468.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on  
Assembly Bill 480.

**Assembly Bill 480: Makes an appropriation to the Interim Finance Committee to  
allocate to certain state agencies to implement language access plans.  
(BDR S-1155)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 480 was heard by the Committee on May 16, 2023. It provides  
a State General Fund appropriation of \$25 million for the Executive Branch agencies to  
implement language access plans required pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 232.0081.

The Office of Finance, Office of the Governor provided a conceptual amendment to change  
the appropriation to be funded to the Special Appropriations budget and have the State Board  
of Examiners administer the funds rather than having the funds go to the Interim Finance  
Committee (IFC) Restricted Contingency Account, which is where the money would go in  
the bill as introduced. If you wish to make those changes to have the money provided for in  
the Special Appropriations budget, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, we will not be accepting the motion as presented, and the monies would still go to  
the IFC Contingency Account. Members, I will accept any discussion on that.

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

For clarification, I believe it was \$25 million that would go to the IFC Contingency Account  
for approval. Is that correct?

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

That is correct. Members, are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.]  
I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 480.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. Members, I need to backtrack to  
Assembly Bill 468.

**Assembly Bill 468: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the  
Governor for certain costs related to the Enterprise Resource Planning System.  
(BDR S-1110)**

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

After voting on this measure, we realized that the amended version from the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor did not list the funds that will be coming from the State Highway Fund. I will ask the makers of the motion and the second to rescind their actions and members to rescind their votes. We will work session this bill at a later time after we have those dollar amounts corrected.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO RESCIND HER MOTION  
TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 468.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI RESCINDED HER PREVIOUS  
SECOND ON THE MOTION ON ASSEMBLY BILL 468.

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

THE MOTION PASSED TO RESCIND THE PREVIOUS VOTES ON  
ASSEMBLY BILL 468. (ASSEMBLYMEN KASAMA AND YEAGER  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The next item on our work session agenda is Assembly Bill 482 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 482: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor as loans for the replacement of an information technology service management provider and computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1146)**

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

Assembly Bill 482 makes State General Fund appropriations to the Enterprise Application Services Unit, Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, Department of Administration, for the replacement of an information technology service management provider and computer hardware and associated software. This bill was presented by Timothy Galluzi, Administrator, Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, on May 15, 2023. The bill appropriates State General Funds to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS), including \$299,974 for the replacement of the information technology service management provider and \$122,958 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 242.211, the entire cost of services provided by EITS must be recovered through user fees. Senate Bill 446 was requested by the Governor in order to allow EITS to be appropriated General Funds. The onetime General Fund appropriations in Assembly Bill 482 would be dependent upon the passage and approval of Senate Bill 446, which is currently in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Given the requirements of NRS 242.211 that all costs for services provided by EITS be recovered through user fees, as an alternative to the bill, the Committee could consider appropriating the General Funds as recommended but do so as a loan and require that EITS repay the General Fund. The bill could be amended to clarify that the appropriation is a loan and require EITS to repay the General Fund in annual installments over a four-year period with the loan repayments commencing on July 1, 2025. That would be fiscal year 2026. That time frame would allow for EITS to build the repayment costs into their rates that they charge their users beginning with the 2025-2027 biennium.

The consideration could be to either pass the bill as introduced, which would be dependent upon the passage and approval of Senate Bill 446, or alternatively, amend the bill to require that the appropriation be a loan with the repayment schedule as described.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

It will be the wish of the Chair to make the appropriations as a loan and require EITS to repay the General Fund. We would be amending the bill with that language. Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 482.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 487.

**Assembly Bill 487: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Information Security of the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services of the Department of Administration for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1129)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 487 was heard by the Committee on May 15, 2023. It appropriates State General Fund appropriations of \$17,147 to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS), Department of Administration, for computer hardware and software. As indicated by Mr. Leiser, *Nevada Revised Statutes* 242.211 provides that EITS must cover their entire cost through user fees. As previously indicated, in order to provide a similar motion as provided for on the previous bill, Assembly Bill 482, the Committee may wish to consider providing this as a General Fund appropriation in this current biennium and request the agency to repay this as a General Fund loan over the course of four years beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2026 and concluding at the end of FY 2029. If the Committee wishes to provide a similar motion to A.B. 482, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, to be consistent with the motion on the bill that we just passed, it would be the Chair's inclination to amend and do pass as a General Fund loan. Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 487.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 488.

**Assembly Bill 488: Makes appropriations to the Communication and Computing Unit of the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services of the Department of Administration for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, the replacement of components of a security firewall and security upgrades to mountaintop microwave sites. (BDR S-1128)**

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

Assembly Bill 488 makes appropriations to the Communication and Computing Unit of the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS), Department of Administration, for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, replacement of components of a security firewall, and security upgrades to mountaintop microwave sites. This bill was heard on May 15, 2023, and includes appropriations of \$101,678 for the Computer Facility budget for replacement computer hardware and software; \$33,042 for the Data Communications and Network Engineering budget for replacement of computer hardware and software; \$1,280,928 for the Data Communications and Network Engineering budget for the replacement of security firewall components; \$26,082 for the Telecommunications budget for the replacement of computer hardware and software; \$27,945 for the Network Transport Services budget for the replacement of computer hardware and software; and \$141,949 for the Network Transport Services budget for security upgrades to mountaintop microwave sites.

Similar to the last two bills, *Nevada Revised Statutes* 242.211 requires the entire cost of services provided by EITS to be recovered through user fees. In a manner consistent with the motions taken on the previous two bills, it would seem that the Committee may wish to amend this bill to appropriate the funds for the purposes that I noted but do so as a loan and require that EITS repay the State General Fund. The amendment would clarify that the appropriation is a loan and requires that EITS repay the General Fund in annual installments over a four-year period with the loan repayments commencing on July 1, 2025, or in fiscal year 2026. This allows the Division sufficient time to build the associated repayment costs into their rates beginning with the 2025-2027 biennium. Consistent with the last two bills, the motion would be to amend and do pass to account for the General Fund loan component.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] To be consistent with what we have done in the last two bills, I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 488.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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



I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 506.

**Assembly Bill 506: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor as loans to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services of the Department of Administration for the replacement of an information technology investments tracking system and computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1147)**

**Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 506 was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. Assembly Bill 506 provides a State General Fund appropriation of \$272,082, which consists of \$246,000 for the Office of Chief Information Officer budget for the replacement of systems for tracking information technology investments. The bill also provides \$26,082 for the Office of Chief Information Officer budget account to replace computer hardware and associated software.

As previously indicated in the last three bills, this bill is being provided as a General Fund appropriation. However, pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 242.211, the entire cost of services provided by the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, Department of Administration, must be recovered through user fees. The Committee may wish to consider a similar motion to the previous three bills, which provides a loan in the amount of \$272,082 for this biennium and has the loan repaid commencing in fiscal year (FY) 2026 concluding in FY 2029. If the Committee wishes to approve this as a General Fund loan, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Members, being consistent with the work that we have been doing on those last three bills, are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 506.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 507.

**Assembly Bill 507: Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for a staffing study and the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and software and various types of equipment, vehicles and systems. (BDR S-1157)**

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

Assembly Bill 507 makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for a staffing study and the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and software, various types of equipment, vehicles, and systems. The bill was presented by Kristina Shea, Deputy Director, Support Services, Department of Corrections, on May 19, 2023. I will spare the Committee going through each of the various sections unless you would like me to do so.

If not, I would summarize and indicate that in total, Assembly Bill 507 would appropriate \$6,887,426. This would include funding for replacement medical equipment, a staffing study, computer hardware equipment and software, exercise area enclosures, commercial kitchen and laundry equipment, a commercial bakery oven, replacement vehicles for inmate transportation, emergency battery system, security cameras, X-ray scanner, garbage truck, metal detectors, food delivery system, stab-resistant custody vests, utility carts for on-site transportation, among other things as outlined in the bill.

During the bill hearing, the Department of Corrections proposed an amendment. That amendment would do several things. First, the amendment would appropriate the funds identified in sections 3 through 25 inclusive to a separate budget account, specifically for one-time appropriations for transparency and tracking purposes. The proposed amendment would reduce the appropriation in section 4 for switch hardware from \$3,022,392 to \$2,822,306. The amendment also would remove the appropriation from section 16 for the Humboldt Conservation Camp for the purchase of security cameras. That institution was not funded to be open over the upcoming biennium. Lastly, the proposed amendment would take the amounts that were reduced in section 4 of \$200,000, and the reduction in section 16 of \$40,000, for a total reduction of \$240,000, and reallocate that funding to purchase operating ammunition, munitions, and ammunition storage lockers. The proposed amendment is posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. The Committee could accept one or more of the amendment components proposed by the Department, and if so, the motion would be to amend and do pass, depending on the decision or direction that is provided by the Chair.

**Chair Monroe-Moreno:**

Thank you for that explanation of the bill and the amendment. We are going to pull this bill from today's work session, and we will look at this bill again tomorrow as we do additional work sessions. That was the last bill on tonight's work session. We have a long day ahead of us tomorrow and a long night tomorrow. This takes us to the last item on today's agenda. I will open public comment for anyone who would like to provide public comment.

[Public comment was heard.]

Members, I will see you in a few minutes downstairs on the Assembly floor and then bright and early again tomorrow morning. This meeting is adjourned [at 8:45 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Cynthia Ihejirika  
Recording Secretary

---

Janice Wright  
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 proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 139](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5.

[Exhibit D](#) is a mock-up proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 422 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Assembly District No. 35.

[Exhibit E](#) is an information sheet submitted by Assemblywoman Angie Taylor, Assembly District No. 27, regarding [Assembly Bill 434 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 434 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted by Lea Case, representing Steve Messinger, Policy Manager, Nevada Primary Care Association.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated May 29, 2023, submitted by Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 252 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a PowerPoint presentation titled "AB283 Doula Rate Increase Bill Investing in Nevada's future families," submitted by Jollina Simpson, representing Make It Work Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 283 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 296 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28.

[Exhibit J](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 296 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Daniel H. Stewart, representing Clark County Education Association.

[Exhibit K](#) is a mock-up proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 349 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40.

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated May 29, 2023, from Mauricia M.M. Baca, State Director, The Nature Conservancy, in support of [Assembly Bill 349 \(1st Reprint\)](#) and [Assembly Bill 425 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 425 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15.

[Exhibit N](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 441 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Jason Mills, representing the Nevada Justice Association.

[Exhibit O](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint), submitted and presented by Jason Mills, representing the Nevada Justice Association.

[Exhibit P](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 128, presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1.